



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

Civil Works

FY 06 Enacted Fact Sheets

Book 2

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	1
Investigations.....	2
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.....	3
Cherry River Basin, WV.....	4
Des Plaines River, Illinois Phase II.....	5
Detroit River Master Plan, Detroit, MI.....	6
Detroit River Seawalls, MI.....	7
Licking River, Cynthiana, KY.....	8
Little Kanawha River, WV.....	9
Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, KY.....	10
Southeast Illinois Shoreline (Ohio River Flood Protection), IL.....	11
Mississippi Valley Division.....	12
Amite River and Tributaries, Bayou Manchac, LA.....	13
Bossier Parish Levee and Flood Control, LA.....	14
Crookston, MN.....	15
Davenport, IA.....	16
Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, IA.....	17
Pearl River Watershed, MS.....	18
Plaquemines Parish Urban Flood Control, LA.....	19
Red River of the North, ND & MN.....	20
River Des Peres, MO.....	21
Roseau River, MN.....	22
South Louisiana Hurricane Protection, LA.....	23
Southwest Coastal Louisiana, LA.....	24
St. Bernard Parish Urban Flood Control, LA.....	25
St. Charles Parish Urban Flood Control, LA.....	26
Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Study, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI.....	27
West Shore-Lake Pontchartrain, LA.....	28
Wood River Levee, IL.....	29
Mississippi River & Tributaries, General Investigations.....	30
Donaldsonville, LA.....	31
Memphis Metro Storm Water Management, TN.....	32
Millington, TN.....	33
Morganza to the Gulf, LA.....	34
Southeast Arkansas, AR.....	35
Tensas River Basin, LA.....	36
North Atlantic Division.....	37
East River Seawall, Queens County, NY.....	38
Lower Saddle River, Bergen County, NJ.....	39
Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, NJ.....	40
New Jersey Shoreline Alternative Long-Term Nourishment, NJ.....	41
North Shore of Long Island Asharoken, NY.....	42
Passaic River, Harrison, NJ.....	43
Rahway River Basin, NJ.....	44
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Highlands, NJ.....	45
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Keyport, NJ.....	46
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Leonardo, NJ.....	47
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, NJ.....	48
Shrewsbury River and Tributaries, NJ.....	49
South River, Raritan River Basin, NJ.....	50
Upper Rockaway River, NJ.....	51
Vicinity of Wiloughby Spit, VA.....	52
Northwestern Division.....	53
Boise River, Boise, ID.....	54

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Brush Creek, KS.....	55
Centralia, WA.....	56
Elliot Bay Seawall.....	57
Manhattan Kansas Local Protection, KS.....	58
Missouri River Levee System, Units L455 & R460-471, MO & KS.....	59
Skagit River, WA.....	60
Swope Park Industrial Area, MO.....	61
Upper Turkey Creek, KS.....	62
Willamette River Basin Review, OR.....	63
Pacific Ocean Division.....	65
Barrow Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, AK.....	66
Kenai River Bluff Erosion, AK.....	67
McGrath Streambank Erosion, AK.....	69
Wailupe Stream Flood Damage Reduction, HI.....	71
South Atlantic Division.....	73
Augusta, GA.....	74
Bogue Banks, NC.....	76
Brewton and East Brewton, AL.....	77
Daytona Beach Shores (Volusia County Beaches), FL.....	78
Egmont Key Shoreline, FL.....	80
Hancock County, MS.....	82
Lido Key, Sarasota County, FL.....	83
Pawleys Island.....	85
Philpott Lake (Section 216), VA.....	86
St John's County, FL.....	88
St Lucie County Beaches, FL.....	89
Surf City & North Topsail Beach, NC.....	90
Village Creek, AL.....	92
Walton County, FL.....	93
South Pacific Division.....	94
City of Carpinteria Shoreline.....	95
Coast of California, Los Angeles County.....	96
Coyote Dam.....	97
East Mesa, Las Cruces, NM.....	98
Fountain Creek and Tribs, North of Pueblo, CO.....	99
Grayson & Murderer's Creek, Walnut Creek.....	100
Llagas Creek.....	101
Navajo Nation, AZ, NM, UT.....	102
Ocean Beach.....	103
Pajaro River at Watsonville.....	104
Peninsula Beach, City of Long Beach.....	105
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.....	106
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, North Delta Islands & Levees.....	107
San Bernardino County, CA (Wilson & Oak Glen Creeks).....	108
San Clemente Shoreline.....	109
San Diego County Shoreline.....	110
San Francisquito Creek.....	111
San Joaquin River Basin, W. Stanislaus, Orestimba Creek.....	112
San Juan Creek, South Orange County.....	113
Solana Beach/Encinitas Shoreline Protection Study.....	114
South San Francisco Shoreline Study.....	115
Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, NM.....	116
Sparks Arroyo Colonia, El Paso, TX.....	117
Truckee Meadows, NV.....	118
Ventura and Santa Barbara County Shoreline.....	120

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Whitewater River Basin	121
Southwestern Division.....	122
Abilene, TX (Brazos River Basin-Elm Creek)	123
Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou, TX	124
Grand Lake Comprehensive Study, OK.....	126
Greens Bayou, Houston, TX.....	128
Lower Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, TX.....	129
Lower San Antonio River Basin (Tri-County), TX.....	130
North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR	131
Pine Mountain Lake, AR.....	132
Raymondville Drain, TX.....	133
Roma Creek, Rio Grande Basin, TX	135
Upper Trinity River Basin, TX.....	136
Construction.....	138
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.....	139
Dover Dam, OH – Dam Safety Assurance	140
Greenbrier River Basin (Marlinton), WV.....	141
Indiana Shoreline, IN	142
Island Creek, Logan, WV, Local Protection Project	143
Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV, VA, and KY	144
Lower Mud River, Milton, WV	146
Ohio River Greenway Public Access, IN.....	147
Presque Isle Peninsula, PA.....	148
W. Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, WV and PA	149
Mississippi Valley Division	150
Bois Brule Drainage and Levee District, MO.....	151
Breckenridge, MN.....	152
Cape Girardeau (Floodwall), MO.....	153
Chesterfield, MO.....	154
Comite River, LA	155
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA.....	156
Grand Isle and Vicinity, LA	157
Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, LA (HP)	158
Larose to Golden Meadow, LA (HP)	159
Meramec River Basin, Valley Park Levee, MO	160
Natchez Bluff, MS.....	161
New Orleans to Venice, LA (HP).....	162
Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, IL.....	163
Ouachita River Levees, LA.....	164
Red River below Denison Dam, LA, AR & TX.....	165
Southeast Louisiana, LA.....	166
Ste Genevieve, MO	167
West Bank and Vicinity, New Orleans, LA	168
Wood River Drainage and Levee District, IL	169
Mississippi River & Tributaries, Construction.....	170
Francis Bland-Eight Mile Creek, AR.....	171
Nonconnah Creek, TN & MS	172
St. Francis Basin, AR & MO	173
West Tennessee Tribs., TN.....	174
Yazoo Basin, MS, Backwater	175
Yazoo Basin, MS, Big Sunflower River	176
Yazoo Basin, MS, Main Stem.....	177
Yazoo Basin, MS, Mississippi Delta Headwater Project (DEC)	178
Yazoo Basin, MS, Reformulation Study	179

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Yazoo Basin, MS, Upper Yazoo Projects.....	180
Yazoo Basin, MS, Yazoo Backwater Pumps.....	181
North Atlantic Division	182
Atlantic Coast of Maryland, MD	183
Delaware Bay Coastline, DE & NJ Reeds Beach to Pierces Point	184
Delaware Coast Protection, DE	185
Delaware Coast, Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, DE	186
Delaware Coast, Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach, DE	187
Fox Point Barrier - Narrangansett Bay, RI.....	188
Great Egg Harbor Inlet and Peck Beach, NJ	189
Hackensack Meadowlands, NJ	190
Jennings Randolph Lake, MD & WV (Dam Safety).....	191
Joseph G Minish Historic Waterfront Park, NJ	192
Lake Merriweather, Goshen Dam and Spillway, VA	193
Long Beach Island, NY.....	194
Muddy River, MA	195
Orchard Beach, Bronx NY	196
Otter Brook Dam, NH (Dam Safety)	197
Passaic River Preservation of Natural Storage Areas, NJ	198
Prompton Lake, PA	199
Ramapo and Mahwah Rivers, Mahwah, NJ and Suffern, NY	200
Ramapo River at Oakland, NJ	201
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, NJ	202
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay (Port Monmouth), NJ	203
Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, NJ	204
Richmond, VA (Combined Sewer Overflow)	205
Sandbridge Beach, VA	206
Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, NJ	207
Virginia Beach, VA (Hurricane Protection)	208
Northwestern Division	209
Big Sioux River, Sioux Falls, SD	210
Buford – Trenton Irrigation District, ND	211
Mt. St. Helens Sediment Control, WA	212
Shoalwater Bay Shoreline Erosion, WA.....	213
Western Sarpy / Clear Creek, NE.....	214
Pacific Ocean Division	215
Alaska Coastal Erosion	216
Hawaii Water Management, HI.....	218
Iao Stream Deficiency Correction, HI	219
South Atlantic Division	220
Atlanta - Combined Sewer Overflow, GA.....	221
Brevard County, FL	222
Broward County, FL (Reimbursable).....	224
Brunswick County Beaches, NC.....	226
Dade County, FL	228
Dare County Beaches, NC	230
Folly Beach, SC.....	232
Fort Pierce Beach, FL.....	233
Lee County, FL (Reimbursement)	235
Myrtle Beach, SC.....	237
Oates Creek, Richmond County, GA (Def Corr)	238
Palm Beach County, FL (Reimbursement).....	240
Pinellas County, FL	242
Portugues and Bucana Rivers, PR.....	244
West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, NC	246

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

South Pacific Division.....	247
Caliente, NV.....	248
Corte Madera Creek.....	249
Coyote and Berryessa Creeks.....	250
Kaweah River.....	251
Lower Walnut Creek.....	252
Marysville/Yuba City Levee Reconstruction.....	253
Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection, Bernalillo to Bilen, NM.....	254
Murrieta Creek.....	255
Nogales Wash.....	256
Rio De Flag, AZ.....	257
San Lorenzo River.....	258
San Luis Rey River.....	259
Stockton Metropolitan Area Reimbursement.....	260
Tucson Drainage Area, AZ.....	261
Upper Guadalupe River.....	262
Yuba River.....	263
Southwestern Division.....	264
Arkansas City, KS.....	265
Central City, Fort Worth, Upper Trinity River Basin, TX.....	266
Clear Creek, TX.....	268
Dallas Floodway Extension, Trinity River Project, TX.....	270
Graham, TX (Brazos River Basin).....	271
Hunting Bayou, Houston, TX.....	272
Tenkiller Ferry Lake, OK (Dam Safety).....	274
Operation and Maintenance.....	275
Northwestern Division, Water Resource Region 17.....	277
Harlan County Dam Safety Study, NE.....	278
Pacific Ocean Division, Water Resource Region 19.....	279
Lowell Creek Tunnel, AK.....	280
South Pacific Division, Water Resource Region 13.....	282
Albuquerque Levees, NM.....	283

FLOOD AND COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION

INVESTIGATIONS

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Cherry River Basin, WV

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, Docket 2730, adopted 21 July 2004.

LOCATION: The Cherry River Basin is located in eastern West Virginia. The Cherry River, a total of 43 stream miles including the North and South Forks, flows through the counties of Nicholas, Pocahontas, Greenbrier, and Webster. The basin has a drainage area of 167 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: The reconnaissance study will evaluate flood damage prevention and associated water resource issues in the basin and for the communities of Richwood, Fenwick and other communities downstream. A collaborative planning approach will be utilized. The Cherry River Basin has experienced numerous severe floods including ones in 1954, mid-1960's, 1980's, July 2001, and most recently two events in November 2003. Over 370 residences, 25 businesses, three schools, nursing home, the Richwood Area Community Hospital, and city water and sewer lines were severely damaged or destroyed in the November 2003 flooding events. An extensive and sophisticated network of local citizen support exists through a formal organization supported by the Richwood city government and chamber of commerce.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 250.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 250.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocation for FY 2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	151.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	TBD
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate a reconnaissance study for the Cherry River watershed in West Virginia. Due to the size of the basin, the complex ownership of lands within the watershed, the number of stakeholders expected to be involved and the occurrence of three major flood events since 2000, it will be necessary to conduct the study over two years at a cost of \$250,000. Completion efforts would be undertaken once the balance to complete is appropriated.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete reconnaissance study in FY 2007 if funds are appropriated

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Byrd (WV), Rahall (WV-03)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Des Plaines River, Illinois Phase II

AUTHORIZATION: Section 419, WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53)

LOCATION: The Des Plaines River flows from southeast Wisconsin to northeast Illinois. It is 67 miles long, flowing through 33 municipalities.

DESCRIPTION: This study addresses reduction in flood damages for the entire Upper Des Plaines watershed, the mainstem and 15 tributaries, in Illinois and Wisconsin and includes ecosystem restoration, water quality, recreation and related purposes. There is frequent flooding. In 1986, the flood of record affected 15,000 residents, inflicted an estimated \$35 million in damages to 10,000 dwellings and 263 business and industrial sites and severely disrupted the entire Chicago metropolitan area transportation network. The FSCA was signed on 27 February 2002.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2007 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,520.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,520.0
Total Estimated Study Cost	11,040.0
Allocation to FY 2003	1,329.0
Allocation for FY 2004	500.0
Allocation for FY 2005	896.0
Allocation for FY 2006	495.0
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,300.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2006: Continue work on the feasibility study to include hydrology and hydraulic studies, environmental studies, economic studies, and plan formulation on pilot study tributaries and conducting the Feasibility Scoping Meeting with HQUSACE.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility phase completion by FY 2008, assuming funding received in FY 2007 and FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: This project was budgeted and funds were appropriated from FY 2001 to FY 2005. Funds were added in FY 2006. The non-Federal sponsors are concerned about a delay in the scheduled study completion date due to inadequate Federal funding.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen. Durbin (IL), Sen Obama (IL), Bean (IL-8), Hyde (IL-6), Kirk (IL-10), Schakowsky(IL-9), Ryan (WI-1)

DISTRICT: Chicago District

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Detroit River Master Plan, Detroit, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 568, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1999

LOCATION: City of Detroit, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: The Detroit River Master Plan is being developed by a consortium of government and private organizations to revitalize the 4.4 miles of river frontage reaching from the Ambassador Bridge to Canada to the MacArthur Bridge to Belle Isle, located in the City of Detroit, Michigan and to develop a Greenway Corridor along the full reach.

FY 2006 (\$000)

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):	Study
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 780.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	250.0
Cash	125.0
Other	125.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,030.0

Allocation thru FY 2003 \$ 327.0

Allocation for FY 2004 65.0

Allocation for FY 2005 64.0

Conference Amount for FY 2006 75.0

Allocation for FY 2006 74.0

Balance to Complete after FY 2006 250.0

Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate

N/A

Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio

TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The State of Michigan provided a Letter of Interest, dated 28 September 2004, in which the State expressed its interest to cost share in a feasibility study of Tri-Centennial State Park along a portion of the Detroit riverfront study area. Tri-Centennial State Park is a 31 acre park which will include a restored (bio-engineered) shoreline, a wetland stormwater demonstration pond, a fishing pond with stream environment, trail, visitor center and a marina. FY 06 funds will be used to complete the Project Management Plan and execute a Feasibility Cost Share Agreement. If there is time, feasibility level studies may be initiated for the Tri-Centennial State Park project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Anticipate feasibility phase completed in 4th quarter FY08.

OTHER INFORMATION: Sec. 568(a) authorizes a Greenway Corridor Study for shoreline protection, frontal erosion, and associated purposes along the Detroit River shoreline from the Belle Isle Bridge to the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, Michigan. Sec. 568(c) authorizes repair or rehabilitation of seawalls along the Detroit River in Detroit, Michigan with a total Federal limit of \$1,000,000. On 4 November 2004, Detroit District requested approval to combine Sec 568(a) and Sec 568 (c) of WRDA 1999 to allow focusing of funds on the primary areas of interest to the local stakeholders, the City of Detroit, State of Michigan, Detroit Riverfront Conservancy, the Southeast Michigan Greenway Initiative, and the American Heritage River Initiative. Without construction authority, Tri-Centennial State Park construction cannot proceed and the additional tasks and project delivery schedule associated with the use of Federal Feasibility study funds are not advantageous to the sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representatives Conyers (MI-14), Cheeks-Kilpatrick (MI-13)

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Detroit River Seawalls, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 568, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1999

LOCATION: Detroit River within the City of Detroit, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: An investigation has determined that there are sites along the 12.5 miles of the Detroit River in Detroit, Michigan that are in a state of severe deterioration and/or less than satisfactory condition. Possible restoration measures include traditional pile supported systems or rubble revetments as well as more ecosystem friendly (bio-engineered) options.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,000.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,222.0
Cash	611.0
Other	611.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,221.0
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 125.0
Allocations in FY2004	46.0
Allocations in FY2005	0
Conference Amount for FY2006	100.0
Allocations in FY2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	730.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds to be used to identify a non-Federal sponsor, develop a Project Management Plan, execute a Feasibility Cost Share Agreement and initiate a feasibility study for seawall repairs.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Anticipate feasibility phase completed in 4th quarter FY08.

OTHER INFORMATION: Sec. 568(a) authorizes a Greenway Corridor Study for shoreline protection, frontal erosion, and associated purposes along the Detroit River shoreline from the Belle Isle Bridge to the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, Michigan. Sec. 568(c) authorizes repair or rehabilitation of seawalls along the Detroit River in Detroit, Michigan with a total Federal limit of \$1,000,000. On 4 November 2004, Detroit District requested approval to combine Sec 568(a) and Sec 568 (c) of WRDA 1999 to allow focusing of funds on the primary areas of interest to the local stakeholders, the City of Detroit, State of Michigan, Detroit Riverfront Conservancy, the Southeast Michigan Greenway Initiative, and the American Heritage River Initiative. Without construction authority, Tri-Centennial State Park construction cannot proceed and the additional tasks and project delivery schedule associated with the use of Federal Feasibility study funds are not advantageous to the sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representatives Conyers (MI-14), Cheeks-Kilpatrick (MI-13)

DISTRICT: Detroit District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Licking River, Cynthiana, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the U. S. Senate on January 21, 1987 – Conference Report 105-271 on Appropriations for Energy and Water Development for FY 1998, 105th Congress First Session, Page 45.

LOCATION: Cynthiana is located in Harrison County on the South Fork of the Licking River, approximately 25 miles north of Lexington, Kentucky.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of two dry bed detention basins located along upstream tributaries of the South Fork Licking River in the Counties of Bourbon and Nicholas, Kentucky. The project would reduce existing damages up to 86 percent and has a construction cost in the range of \$17.3 million. The size of the South Fork basin above Cynthiana is 645 square miles.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,575.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	525.0
Cash	525.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,100.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocation for FY 2006	79.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,496.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	3.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Some of the FY 2006 funds (\$20,000) will be used to complete the feasibility phase and \$79,000 will be used to initiate PED activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Davis (KY-04)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Little Kanawha River, WV

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Environmental and Public Works of the U. S. Senate, adopted 21 March 1989.

LOCATION: The Little Kanawha River basin extends in a northwesterly direction from Upshur County, West Virginia to Parkersburg, Wood County, WV, (a distance of 169 miles) with a drainage area of 2300 square miles. Principal urban areas include Elizabeth, Grantsville, Glenville, and Burnsville.

DESCRIPTION: Flood control in the Little Kanawha River basin was originally planned to be accomplished through the construction of three dams however only one was completed. As a consequence, there remains a significant flooding history with recurring loss of life and property. In recent years, there has been significant growth and development in Gilmer County located in the upper portion of the basin, and near Parkersburg, West Virginia in the lower end of the basin. The watershed has been severely degraded due to landuse practices, mining, farming, oil and gas extraction, timbering, and other forms of damage. The stream connects much of central West Virginia with the Ohio River. The feasibility study will recommend stream channel fixes to improve aquatic habitat in the basin and to enhance a migratory bird habitat, since the river is along a fly-way. The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) signed the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement with the Corps of Engineers on 30 June 2004. A multi-agency effort is currently underway, including the sponsors, WV Conservation Agency, the Nature Conservancy and the Canaan Valley Institute.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 448.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	391.0
Cash	0
Other	391.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 839.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 58.0
Allocation for FY 2004	26.0
Allocation for FY 2005	167.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	110.0
Allocation for FY 2006	109.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	88.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	TBD
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete draft Feasibility Report, including formulation of project alternatives and completion of the draft Environmental Assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete feasibility study FY 2007 if funds are appropriated.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mollohan (WV-01), Capito (WV-02)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted on May 5, 1987 by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate.

LOCATION: The study area encompasses a drainage area of approximately 24 square miles including the west and south ends of the City of Louisville, Kentucky.

DESCRIPTION: The study is evaluating a combination of detention basins and the operational modifications and/or improvements to the pump stations located on the Ohio River associated with the existing Federally constructed flood damage prevention project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,683.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,683.0
Cash	600.0
Other	1,083.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,366.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 998.0
Allocation for FY 2004	230.0
Allocation for FY 2005	194.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	130.0
Allocation for FY 2006	129.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	132.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 budgeted funds are being used to continue the feasibility study consisting of environmental studies, formulation of the recommended plan, design and cost estimates of plan components, and completing the hydrologic and economic evaluation of project alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility study has been a budgeted line item since FY 1997. The study sponsor is the Metropolitan Louisville-Jefferson County Sewer District (MSD), a dependable sponsor. If funding is made available in FY 2007, funds will be used to complete the feasibility study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Northup (KY-3)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southeast Illinois Shoreline (Ohio River Flood Protection), Illinois

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, May 9, 1996.

LOCATION: The project area includes the southeast Illinois shoreline of the Ohio River and tributaries currently protected by urban levee/floodwall projects previously constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The projects are operated and maintained by the cities of Brookport, Harrisburg, Golconda, Reevesville/Cache River, and Rosiclare, Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The project would consist of rehabilitating the existing local flood protection facilities to their original operating conditions. Operation and maintenance has been conducted by the locals in accordance with original project requirements. Failure of these projects would result in major urban flooding from the Ohio River and would pose a threat to human life, health, and safety.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 200.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	200.0
Cash	100.0
Other	100.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 400.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocation for FY 2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	101.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds in the amount of \$99,000 will be used to prepare the PMP and execute the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement to initiate the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: A 905(b) reconnaissance-level report was initiated in 1997. The completed report recognized that the local sponsors have completed required Operation and Maintenance in accordance with the original agreements and that physical deterioration of structural features of the project has occurred due to age. All projects have exceeded their design life. If funding is made available in FY 07, the feasibility study could be completed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: Durban (IL), Obama (IL), Shimkus (IL-19)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Amite River and Tributaries, Bayou Manchac, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2571, 23 Jul 98

LOCATION: The study area includes the entire Bayou Manchac Watershed, which is located in Ascension, East Baton Rouge, and Iberville Parishes.

DESCRIPTION: This multi-purpose project will provide ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction to the study area and includes clearing and snagging Bayou Manchac with the possibility of using Spanish Lake Swamp as a storage area to increase stage lowering along Bayou Manchac.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,246
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,221
Cash	80
Other	2,141
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,467
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 206
Allocation for FY 2004	130
Allocation for FY 2005	74
Conference Amount for FY 2006	125
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,712
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete model and begin to calibrate and do test runs. May continue the NEPA process and hold public meetings depending on funding availability.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bossier Parish, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1983

LOCATION: Bossier Parish is located in the northwest corner of Louisiana, east of the Red River.

DESCRIPTION: The study is investigating alternatives to address water resource problems and needs in Bossier Parish, LA. Major streams located in the area include Red Chute, Bayou Bodcau, Loggy Bayou, Cypress Bayou, Flat River, and the Red River. Bossier Parish is affected by both headwater and backwater flooding.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	550
Allocations thru FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	65
Allocation for FY 05	153
Conference Amount for FY 06	75
Allocation in FY 06	74
Balance to Complete after FY 06	258
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the reconnaissance phase and prepare and negotiate Project Management Plan and Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement. The 905(b) report is scheduled to be submitted by 31 March 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Reconnaissance studies indicate a Federal interest in pursuing cost-shared feasibility studies. There are approximately 101,000 people in the in the 100-year flood plain area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen: Vitter and Landrieu (LA); House: McCrery (LA-04)

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Crookston, Minnesota (Red River of the North Basin)

AUTHORIZATION: SR, 30 Sep 74

LOCATION: City of Crookston, Polk County, Minnesota located approximately 25 miles east of Grand Forks, North Dakota.

DESCRIPTION: Feasibility Study for flood damage reduction efforts for areas along the Red Lake River in the City of Crookston, Minnesota providing flood protection for the Sampson's, Chase/Loring, and Jerome's neighborhoods.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 337
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 337
Cash	(0)
Other	(337)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 674
Allocations thru FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 60
Allocation for FY 2006	59
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	278
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits-Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Plan to complete Project Management Plan (PMP) in April, sign FCSA in May and begin study in May 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Peterson (MN-07); Sen: Coleman and Dayton (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Davenport, Iowa

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 201, FCA 1970.

LOCATION: The flood control project is located at Davenport, Iowa (population of 102,000 – 1999 census) in Scott County, on the right descending bank of the Mississippi River.

DESCRIPTION: An Engineering Documentation Report dated November 2005 recommends construction of a separable element of the authorized flood damage reduction project at Davenport, Iowa to protect the Davenport Water Treatment Plant which provides drinking water to over 130,000 people. The project includes construction of approximately 0.5 mile of floodwalls and levees that would protect the treatment plant area from a 200-year flood event. The estimated project cost for construction is \$7.0 million. The local sponsor, the City of Davenport, would be responsible for providing during construction a minimum of 25%, but not to exceed 50%, of total project costs assigned to structural flood control specified as follows: a minimum cash contribution of 5%; all lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal area facilities necessary for the project; and, any additional cash contributions necessary to make the total non-Federal contributions equal to 25% of total project costs assigned to structural flood control. The local sponsor would also be responsible for operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation of the completed project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>PED</u> \$854
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	285
Cash	(285)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	1,139
Allocation thru FY 2003	234
Allocation for FY 2004	123
Allocation for FY 2005	126
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	173
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8 %)	2.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.9

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue preconstruction engineering and design activities including preparation of final plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The project was authorized for construction in 1970 as part of a larger project to protect the Davenport riverfront, but construction was never initiated. A Limited Reevaluation Study was initiated in September 2001 at the request of the City of Davenport. This study determined that a separable element of the authorized project to protect the water treatment plant may be economically justified and resulted in a recommendation in June 2002 to prepare a detailed Engineering Documentation Report. The local sponsor is the City of Davenport, Iowa. The design agreement was executed on March 24, 2003.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Nussle (IA-01), Leach (IA-02); Sen: Grassley & Harkin (IA).

DISTRICT: Rock Island

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Iowa

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution dated July 1, 1958 and Sec 216, FCA 1970.

LOCATION: The City of Des Moines, Iowa.

DESCRIPTION: During the Great Flood of 1993, Polk County suffered more than \$152,000,000 in flood damages, mostly in the Des Moines metropolitan area. A feasibility report was completed in December 2005 that recommends constructing flood damage reduction facilities to protect vulnerable areas of Des Moines. The recommended plan includes reconstructing 13,300 feet of levees, improving 19 closure structures, and constructing a recreation trail on a segment of the Birdland Park levee. The proposed project would provide improved flood protection to over 850 residential properties and 650 commercial/industrial properties with estimated 500-year flood damages of over \$325 million. The project is economically justified and has a benefit-cost ratio of 2.7 to 1 and a total project cost of \$10.5 million. The City of Des Moines is local sponsor and would be responsible for a 35% cost share of all flood damage reduction components and a 50% cost share of recreation components. Completion of the Chief of Engineers' Report is scheduled for January 2006. The project is not authorized for construction.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$795
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	265
Cash	(265)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	1,060
Allocation through FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	17
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248
Balance to Complete After Fy 2006	530
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5-1/8%)	2.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.9

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) activities, including preparation of final plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Boswell (IA-3); Senators Harkin and Grassley (IA).

DISTRICT: Rock Island District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pearl River Watershed, MS

AUTHORIZATION: House and Senate Resolutions adopted 9 May 1979.

LOCATION: The study area is located in that portion of the Jackson, Mississippi, metropolitan area below the Ross Barnett Reservoir dam which is subject to flooding from the Pearl River.

DESCRIPTION: The Jackson Metropolitan Area, a primary regional economic center, suffers annual flood damages attributable to the Pearl River of approximately \$10 million. The flood of record occurred in 1979 causing \$440 million in damages in today's dollars. The feasibility study is investigating alternatives for flood damage reduction.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,375
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,834
Cash	(658)
Other	(2,176)
Total Estimated Cost	6,209
Allocations thru FY 03	2,056
Allocation for FY 04	358
Allocation for FY 05	317
Conference Amount for FY 06	650
Allocation for FY 06	644
Balance to Complete after FY 06	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue feasibility studies. Final feasibility report is scheduled to be completed in the fall of 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Study efforts include updating of a comprehensive levee plan proposed in a 1996 draft report and investigation of a lakes plan proposed by local interests as an alternative to the levee plan. There are approximately 10,000 people who live in the 100-year flood plain.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS); House: Thompson (MS-02), and Pickering (MS-03).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Plaquemines Parish Urban Flood Control, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2622, 16 Mar 00

LOCATION: Plaquemines Parish is located on the east and west bank of the Mississippi River, south of New Orleans, LA. The study area, located entirely within the parish, is urbanized and encompasses 22.7 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: Most of the development in the area is protected from Mississippi River and hurricane flooding by Federal and non-Federal levee systems. Flooding still occurs in the parish due to rainfall events. Flood control improvements are needed to reduce repetitive damages to structures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,902
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,814
Cash	(1,814)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,716
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 431
Allocation for FY 2004	85
Allocation for FY 2005	62
Conference Amount for FY 2006	125
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Supplemental Allocation for FY 2006	1,200
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities for FY 2006 include alternative analysis of plans and a value engineering study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Supplemental funds in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2006 provided \$1,200,000 to advance completion of the feasibility study. Funds will be used to perform surveys, take soil borings, and prepare detailed design of alternatives. The ability to advance completion will be determined by the local sponsor's ability to cost share. The local sponsor's ability to share the cost of an accelerated schedule is uncertain due to the catastrophic effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on Plaquemines Parish.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Melancon (LA-03); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River of the North Basin, MN, ND, SD & Manitoba, Canada

AUTHORIZATION: SR, 30 Sep 74

LOCATION: The Red River of the North is located on the eastern edge of North Dakota, and its basin includes parts of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Manitoba (Canada).

DESCRIPTION: A basin-wide reconnaissance study began in 2000, and a reconnaissance report was approved in September 2002. Three subsequent feasibility studies are under way: 1) Wild Rice River Basin, Minnesota; 2) Roseau, Minnesota; 3) Fargo-Moorhead and Upstream. The 2002 reconnaissance study continues to be a vehicle for developing additional feasibility studies for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration in the Red River Basin. A proposed basin-wide main stem study is on hold pending non-Federal sponsorship. Additional study efforts will be considered as stakeholders express an interest in them.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 7,730
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,520
Cash	(3,000)
Other	(3,520)
Total Estimated Cost	\$14,250
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 434
Allocation for FY 2004	40
Allocation for FY 2005	31
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,126
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to prepare supplemental reconnaissance analyses of Crookston, Minnesota and the Pembina River Basin in North Dakota to assess the potential for cost-shared feasibility studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Peterson (MN-07), Pomeroy (ND-AL); Sen: Coleman and Dayton (MN); Conrad and Dorgan (ND)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: River des Peres, Missouri

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a)(17) of WRDA 1990 (Public Law 101-640)

LOCATION: River des Peres drains a 111-square mile area in the city of St. Louis and St. Louis County, Missouri, and empties into the Mississippi River.

DESCRIPTION: This project includes University City and Deer Creek and will reduce flood damages affecting 550 structures. The University City portion consists of channel enlargement and stabilization along 2.5 miles of the University City branch of upper River des Peres, a 2.53 mile recreation trail within the improved channel right-of-way. The Deer Creek portion consists of 2.5 miles of channel widening and stabilization improvements along with a recreational trail through Brentwood, Maplewood, Rock Hill, and Webster Groves.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,867
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,289
Cash	(1,289)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,156
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,548
Allocation for FY 2004	51
Allocation for FY 2005	94
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,075
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.625%)	1.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the gathering of base data for existing conditions and formulate alternative plans for the University City portion.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: University City is the local sponsor for the University City portion. The city of Brentwood and the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District have shown renewed interest in the Deer Creek portion of the authorized project, which is on hold.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Clay (MO-01) and Carnahan (MO-03); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO)

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Roseau, Minnesota

AUTHORIZATION: SR, 30 Sep 74

LOCATION: Roseau, Minnesota is located in Roseau County in northwestern Minnesota approximately 10 miles south of the Canadian border and 65 miles east of the North Dakota border.

DESCRIPTION: The City of Roseau was devastated by a major flood in 2002 that had a duration which lasted several weeks and heavily impacted 80 percent of the town. A feasibility study is investigating several flood damage reduction alternatives.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 632	\$ 400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	632	133
Cash	(632)	(133)
Other	(0)	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,106	\$ 533
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	350	0
Allocation for FY 2005	237	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	44	75
Allocation for FY 2006	44	74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	326
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%)	1.36	1.36
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to complete the feasibility phase and initiate plans and specifications for the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Peterson (MN-07); Sen: Coleman and Dayton (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: South Louisiana Hurricane Protection, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Title 1, Investigations, Sec 5009, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act FY 2006 as amended by the FY 2006 Defense Appropriations Act.

LOCATION: The project is located in southeast Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: Funds were provided to conduct a comprehensive hurricane protection analysis and design to develop and present a full range of flood control, coastal restoration, and hurricane protection measures for South Louisiana. The initial \$8,000,000 provided in the EWDA Act FY 2006 is full Federal expense. Additional funds provided in the FY 2006 Defense Appropriations Act (Supplemental Number 3) are assumed to be cost shared.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$14,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,000
Cash	(6,000)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$20,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	8,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	7,920
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	12,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	12,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A preliminary technical report will be sent to Congress by June 2006 and work will be underway on the final technical report. Extensive modeling, environmental analysis, design, and public coordination efforts will be conducted.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Funds are intended to produce a preliminary technical report in 6 months and a final technical report in 24 months.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3), Baker (LA-6), Boustany (LA-7); and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Southwest Coastal Louisiana, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2747, 7 Dec 05

LOCATION: Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes

DESCRIPTION: The study will formulate solutions to provide hurricane protection and storm damage reduction in Cameron, Calcasieu, and Vermilion Parishes and will include the feasibility of constructing an armored 12-foot levee along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 500
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	0
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	500
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	500
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Efforts include plan formulation for multiple alternatives, hydrology and hydraulic, economic, environmental, legal, safety, and cost analyses. Public involvement will be a considerable element of the reconnaissance effort.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Boustany (LA-07), and Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: St. Bernard Parish Urban Flood Control, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2600, 22 Apr 99

LOCATION: St. Bernard Parish is located on the east bank of the Mississippi River south of, and contiguous to the city of New Orleans, LA.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study is investigating the drainage system related problems in St. Bernard Parish and will focus on providing flood damage reduction for the twenty-five year and ten-year rainfall events, while also reducing damages for larger events.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,566
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,458
Cash	(2,458)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,024
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 747
Allocation for FY 2004	85
Allocation for FY 2005	219
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	318
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	315
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	1,200
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	\$ 1,200
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (1.95%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Advance the feasibility study closer to completion, advance NEPA documentation, and complete all engineering documentation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Supplemental funds in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2006 provided \$1,200,000 to advance the completion of the study. The study has been temporarily postponed due to the impacts of Hurricane Katrina. Both local sponsors, the Lake Borgne Levee District and the St. Bernard Parish Government, were financially impacted by Hurricane Katrina and will wait until April 2006 before continuing the study. Original completion date for the study before Hurricane Katrina was early FY 2007 and is now being determined.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jefferson (LA-2), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: St. Charles Parish Urban Flood Control, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2599, 22 Apr 99

LOCATION: St. Charles Parish is located west of the city of New Orleans, LA, with its northern boundary along the southwest shore of Lake Pontchartrain.

DESCRIPTION: The study is addressing rainfall flooding problems in St. Charles Parish. The parish suffered severe rainfall flooding in November 1989, May 1995, and September 1998. Total damage payments since 1978 are \$72 million, with over 3,000 claims. Hurricane protection projects planned or underway are intended to reduce flooding associated with storm surges, but will not address problems associated with rainfall flooding.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,985
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,745
Cash	(794)
Other	(1,951)
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,730
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 150
Allocation for FY 2004	25
Allocation for FY 2005	438
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	200
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	198
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	1,100
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	1,100
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,074
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.125%)	1.28
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	1.28

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to complete hydraulic modeling of existing conditions and alternatives and continue economic and environmental studies of without-project conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Supplemental funds in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2006 provided \$1,100,000 to advance the completion of the study. Funds will be used to perform surveys, take soil borings, and design alternatives, as well as to conduct economic and environmental analyses of alternatives.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Melancon (LA-3), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Mississippi River Comprehensive Plan, IL, IA, MO, MN, WI

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 459 of WRDA 99, modified by Sec 404 of WRDA 00.

LOCATION: The study area includes the Upper Mississippi River above Cairo, Illinois, and the Illinois River.

DESCRIPTION: The Comprehensive Plan has evaluated several alternative plans to address flood damage reduction on a systemic basis. Also considered is: continued maintenance and improvement of the navigation project, management of nutrients and sediment, including bank erosion, habitat management, and increased recreation opportunities in the Upper Mississippi and Illinois River basins. The plan has identified potential future management actions and addressed recommendations for systemic improvements including both structural and nonstructural measures. Development and assessment of alternatives has been a collaborative effort among three Corps Districts, other Federal agencies, the states of IL, IA, MO, MN, and WI, and non-governmental stakeholders. Development of the Comprehensive Plan is being coordinated closely with the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System PED effort.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$5,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$5,800
Allocation thru FY 2003	2,417
Allocation for FY 2004	1,352
Allocation for FY 2005	950
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	784
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Completing assessment of the alternatives, preparation of a report for public review, revision of the report to incorporate public comments, and forwarding the report to higher level headquarters for review and policy compliance.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: As authorized in Sec. 459 of WRDA 99, the comprehensive plan is not cost-shared. Any resulting feasibility studies will be cost-shared.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Leach (IA-2); Boswell (IA-3); Latham (IA-4); Costello (IL-12); Evans (IL-17); LaHood (IL-18) and Shimkus (IL-19); Gutknecht (MN-1); Hulshof (MO-9) and Kind (WI-3). Sen: Grassley and Harkin (IA); Durbin and Obama (IL); Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: Rock Island

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: West Shore – Lake Pontchartrain, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, 29 Jul 71 and SR, 20 Sep 74

LOCATION: The study area, which includes portions of St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, and St. James Parishes, is located west of the Bonnet Carre' Spillway between the Mississippi River and Lakes Pontchartrain and Maurepas. Communities within the study area include Laplace, Reserve, Lutcher, Gramercy, and Garyville.

DESCRIPTION: Major flooding problems in the study area occurred from Hurricanes Betsy (1965) and Juan (1985), and the 1973 flood on the Mississippi River. The population of the study area has increased to over 47,000 in 1990. The average annual damages under existing conditions are estimated at \$17 million. A total of eight alternative alignments for providing increased levels of hurricane protection were evaluated during plan formulation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 1,974
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,474
Cash	(1,474)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,448
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,850
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	125
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Select a recommended plan and accomplish the final feasibility level analysis to prepare the final draft feasibility report and environmental impact statement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Melancon (LA-3), Baker (LA-6), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Wood River Levee, Illinois

AUTHORIZATION: Section 4 of the FCA 1938 (original project authority) is being used to conduct PED on the deficiency correction work. The Sec 216 of the FCA 1970 is the authority being used to conduct PED on the reconstruction work.

LOCATION: The project area is located in the Mississippi River flood plain of Madison County, Illinois, upstream of the city of East St. Louis. An urban design levee, authorized in 1938 and constructed in the 1950s, protects the area.

DESCRIPTION: The Limited Reconstruction Reevaluation Report (LRR) recommends rehabilitation of the levee system to include installation of additional relief wells and rehabilitation of existing relief wells (design deficiency) and pumping plants, closure structures and replacement or lining of gravity drains (reconstruction). These recommended actions are required to maintain the system's authorized level of protection.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,232
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	411
Cash	(411)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,643
Allocations thru FY 2003	884
Allocation for FY 2004	121
Allocation for FY 2005	127
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A %)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%) design deficiency	2.8
Reconstruction	2.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Finalize Limited Reevaluation Report and provide signed Chief's Report, complete design for first construction contract (a portion of the relief wells), and coordinate the Project Cooperation Agreement with the sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) for the entire project or separate PCA's (one for the deficiency correction features and one for the reconstruction features) will be developed and executed in accordance with standard operating procedures once new start construction funds are appropriated, and in the case of the reconstruction features, once those features are authorized by Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House : Costello (IL-12) and Shimkus (IL-19); Sen : Durbin and Obama (IL).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Donaldsonville to the Gulf, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR15 May 1998, Docket 2554

LOCATION: The study area is located in southeast Louisiana between Bayou Lafourche and the Mississippi River, from Donaldsonville to the Gulf of Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The expected study outcome will be to reduce flooding from hurricanes, tidal surges, rainfall events, protect hurricane evacuation routes, reduce agricultural and structural damages, and restore environmentally stressed habitat.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,039 *
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,500
Cash	(395)
Other	(3,105)
Total Estimated Study Cost	7,539
Allocations thru FY 2003	1,596
Allocation for FY 2004	859
Allocation for FY 2005	810
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	739
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	284
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	490
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp)	490
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A
* Includes cost of Reconnaissance Study	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study (hydraulic modeling, levee and structure designs, environmental investigation, and economic analysis.)

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Study is within the South Louisiana Comprehensive Coastal Protection Project. Donaldsonville data, maps, and design information will be used for the Comprehensive Project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Landrieu, and Vitter (LA); Melancon (LA-3), Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Baker (LA-6).

DISTRICT: New Orleans

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Memphis Metropolitan Area, Storm Water Management, TN & MS

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution dated 7 March 1996.

LOCATION: The study area includes all or part of five counties: Fayette, Shelby, and Tipton in Tennessee; DeSoto and Marshall in Mississippi. The area encompasses all or part of six major drainage basins, covering approximately 2,600 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the study is to evaluate the additional need for improvements for flood control, ecosystem restoration, water quality, and related purposes associated with storm water runoff and management in the area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	149
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	151
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to initiate reconnaissance study analyses by meeting with local interests to update the problems, needs, and forecasted land use, and to develop existing conditions in the study area.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The reconnaissance study phase could be completed by September 2007, subject to availability of funding, approval and certification of the reconnaissance report, and the signing of a feasibility cost sharing agreement with potential sponsors.

OTHER INFORMATION: A waiver has been requested to increase the traditional study cost from \$100,000 to \$300,000 because of the size of the study area and the number of potential sponsors that will require coordination. The benefit cost ratio will be determined during study analyses.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Blackburn (TN-7), Tanner (TN-8), Ford (TN-9), Wicker (MS-1).
Senate: Alexander and Frist (TN); Cochran and Lott (MS).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Millington & Vicinity, TN

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution dated 7 March 1996.

LOCATION: The Millington and Vicinity study area encompasses the Big Creek drainage basin, an area of approximately 154 square miles. This drainage basin includes the tributaries of Crooked Creek, Casper Creek, North Fork Creek, Royster Creek, Jakes and Bear Creeks, and Lateral A. Big Creek is a tributary of the Loosahatchie River and is located north of the Loosahatchie River in Shelby and Tipton Counties, Tennessee.

DESCRIPTION: The City of Millington and Vicinity is experiencing increased water elevations and erosion along Big Creek and tributaries due to urban development and runoff in the area. The feasibility study was initiated in January 2004 and possible solutions to these problems are being investigated as well as possible opportunities for ecosystem restoration and development of recreation features.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 275
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	275
Cash	(275)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 550
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	70
Allocation for FY 2005	73
Conference Amount for FY 2006	106
Allocation for FY 2006	105
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	27
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio:	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to complete feasibility study analyses and develop a preliminary draft report for review in preparation of an Alternative Formulation Briefing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The feasibility study phase could be completed in August 2007, subject to available funding, approval of the final report, and execution of a design agreement with potential sponsors.

OTHER INFORMATION: A feasibility cost sharing agreement was executed with Shelby County, TN and the Chickasaw Basin Authority in September 2003. Preliminary economic analyses indicate that no significant damages are expected as a result of flooding. However, there is opportunity for ecosystem restoration and recreation benefits. The remainder of the study will focus on ecosystem restoration with residual flood damage reduction and recreation benefits.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Tanner (TN-8); Senate: Frist and Alexander (TN).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Morganza to the Gulf, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2376, April 30, 1992, and WRDA 96 (PL 104-303, Sec. 425)

LOCATION: The project is located in south Louisiana between the Mississippi and Atchafalaya rivers. Bayou Lafourche forms the eastern study boundary and Bayou du Large and Louisiana Highway 311 form the western boundary. The eastern and western boundaries form the apex of a triangle at Thibodaux, Louisiana. The southern boundary is the Gulf of Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The Recommended Plan consists of a hurricane protection system that includes approximately 72-miles of earthen levees, nine 56' wide floodgates, three 125' wide floodgates, and a Lock Complex consisting of a 110' wide by 800' long lock with an adjacent 200' floodgate. The plan also includes twelve sets of 6' by 6' box culverts through the levees to allow normal tidal ebb and flow. Mitigation features of the plan include creation of 1,352 acres of marsh habitat and widening a 10,600' canal to 40' to enhance freshwater flow into the system. A 2004 Appropriation Act (P.L. 108-137) authorized Reach J-1 for construction by the Local Sponsor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	Reach J- 1 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>	<u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	52,000	350
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	17,333	18,000
Cash	(17,333)	(0)
Other	(0)	(18,000)
Total Estimated Cost	69,333	18,350
Allocations thru FY 03	10,285	0
Allocations for FY04	3,810	0
Allocations for FY 05	2,567	0
Allocations for FY06	10,960	0
Balance to Complete after FY06	24,378	350
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.625%)	2.1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.8	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 PED funds are being used to continue the pre-construction, engineering and design phase of the study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED could be completed by FY07.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction authorization is required for the remainder of the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Vitter and Landrieu, (LA); Melancon (LA-3), Baker (LA-6); Boustany (LA-7).

DISTRICT: New Orleans

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southeast Arkansas, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works adopted 23 June 1988.

LOCATION: The project area includes the Boeuf-Tensas and Bayou Bartholomew Basins of southeast Arkansas. Counties included are Jefferson, Lincoln, Drew, Ashley, Chicot, and Desha.

DESCRIPTION: The study will address current flooding, ecosystem restoration and water supply problems and needs.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,962
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,582
Cash	(4,295)
Other	(287)
Total Estimated Cost	9,544
Allocations thru FY 03	2,744
Allocation for FY 04	227
Allocation for FY 05	255
Conference Amount for FY 06	315
Allocation for FY 06	312
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,424
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue cost-shared feasibility phase studies, including the developmental of a feasibility report and a watershed management plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Flooding between November 1982 and January 1983 caused damages in excess of \$47 million to approximately 1,170,000 acres of primarily agricultural lands in the Boeuf-Tensas Basin. In addition, approximately 101,000 people live in the 100-year flood plain. Significant ecosystem restoration opportunities have been identified since completion of the reconnaissance report. Extensive multipurpose water use has induced ground-water declines and salt water intrusion in the area. Flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration are in the Federal interest and justify continuation of this important effort.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Ross (AR-04) and Berry (AR-01); Senate: Lincoln and Pryor (AR).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tensas River Basin, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Acts of 1928, 1944, and 1965.

LOCATION: The Tensas River Basin includes parts or all of Catahoula, Concordia, Richland, East Carroll, West Carroll, Ouachita, Morehouse, Franklin, Madison, and Tensas Parishes, Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: Flooding, water use, and environmental resources decline continue to be problems in the basin. The need to balance these competing demands is becoming more critical to ensure the wise and efficient use of the basin's water resources.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$11,550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	11,000
Cash	(5,500)
Other	(5,500)
Total Estimated Cost	22,550
Allocations thru FY 03	350
Allocation for FY 04	128
Allocation for FY 05	93
Conference Amount for FY 06	225
Allocation for FY 06	223
Balance to Complete after FY 06	10,756
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The study is being terminated in FY 2006 due to inability of local sponsor to enter into cost-sharing agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: There is no local sponsor capable of providing the non-Federal funds. Negotiations with potential sponsors, including Louisiana state agencies, failed to locate a cost-sharing sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA); House: Alexander (LA-05).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: East River Seawall, Queens County, New York

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution dated 22 May 2002, East River Seawall, Queens County, New York for a review of reports on water and related land resources needs, including restoration of shoreline protection measures in the Queensbridge area.

LOCATION: The seawall abuts the East River in Long Island City, Queens County, New York City, just north of the Queensboro (59th Street) Bridge. The seawall is located in Queensbridge Park, across the street from the Queensbridge Houses, the largest Federal housing project in the nation.

DESCRIPTION: The seawall is in a dilapidated condition and threatens the integrity and operation of the NYC Transit/Metropolitan Transit Authority's cathodic protection system, an integral component of the 63rd Street subway tunnel. The seawall is falling into the River. In its present condition, it imperils the continuity of operations of the subway system, and represents a hazard to city property, and human life.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$0	\$ 750
Cash		750
Other		0
Total Estimated Cost	\$100	\$1,500
Allocation Through FY 2003	100	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0	
Allocation for FY 2006	0	79
Balance to complete after FY 2006	0	671

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A Section 905(b) WRDA 1986 Preliminary Analysis report has been completed and approved by HQUSACE. Prior year reconnaissance funds are being used to finalize a Project Management Plan (PMP) and coordinate with potential non-federal sponsor. FY 06 feasibility funds will not be used until the FCSA execution.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D-NY-14)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Lower Saddle River, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: The project is located on the Lower Saddle River, in Lodi, Rochelle Park, Wallington, Saddle Brook, Garfield, and Paramus, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The area has suffered frequent and severe flooding and was devastated in September 1999 from Tropical Storm Floyd. The authorized project consists of channel improvements along 5.2 miles of the Saddle River and 1.7 miles of Sprout Brook. The project also includes the replacement or alteration of 12 bridges.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$11,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$1,500
Cash	1,500
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,500
Allocation Through FY 2003	6,451
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Balance to complete after FY 2006	4,385

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the limited reevaluation of the project including the update of the economic, environmental, and engineering studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The design agreement was executed in Feb 05 with NJDEP as the non federal sponsor. The NJDEP in support of the project, require local interests to replace or make compatible 4 of the 12 bridges modifications that are included in the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Steven Rothman (NJ-9), and Scott Garrett (NJ-5); Senators Robert Menendez (NJ) and Frank Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Control and Shoreline Erosion Control

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution, December 10, 1987; Senate Resolution, December 15, 1987.

LOCATION: The Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, NJ, project is located along the Atlantic coast of NJ in Ocean County, some 20 miles south of Asbury Park, NJ.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan for the project provides for two reaches. The northern reach from Point Pleasant Beach and Berkley Township, NJ, will consist of a berm and a dune for a length of 14 miles. The project will also require periodic nourishment every four years for the 50-year life of the project.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 750.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 250.0
Cash	250
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$1,000.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 92.5
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 123.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 534.5
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 296.0 1/
Balance to Complete after FY2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Excess to study needs.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: None Study is complete

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Study was completed in September 2005.

OTHER INFORMATION: Authorization is pending

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Rep. Smith (NJ-04)**, Frelinghuysen (NJ-11) & Saxton (NJ-03), Sen. Lautenberg (NJ) & Menedez (NJ)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District

Date: 30 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Control and Shoreline Erosion Control

STUDY NAME: New Jersey Shoreline, Alternative Long-Term Nourishment Study, New Jersey

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation dated December 10, 1987 for the New Jersey Shoreline.

LOCATION: The study area encompasses 127 miles of Atlantic coast of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Cape May.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will evaluate Regional Sediment Management methods to manage New Jersey's coastal projects on a regional basis to ensure maximum benefits are achieved from the Federal investment and reduce long-term periodic nourishment costs. The study will assess the development of a regional sediment budget; develop and improve understanding of the regional coastal processes; implement an efficient regional monitoring program; and develop a comprehensive beach, inlet, and borrow area management strategy.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost		<u>Study</u> \$ 2,062.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		2,012.0
Cash	2,012.0	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 4,074.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 206.7
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 138.3
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 203.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 74.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 1,440.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include continuing the development of the regional sediment budget, assessing sediment resources, and identifying specific Regional Sediment Management project opportunities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is to be determined; due to budget constraints funding is unknown at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed December 2002.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Lautenberg and Corzine (NJ); Rep LoBiondo (NJ-02), Freylinghuysen (NJ-11); Saxton (NJ-03)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: North Shore Long Island, Asharoken, NY

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, U.S. House of Representatives, adopted 13 May 1993.

LOCATION: The study area is located on the North Shore of Long Island, in the Town of Huntington in northeastern Suffolk County, New York.

DESCRIPTION: Asharoken Beach connects Eaton's Neck and part of the Village of Asharoken with the rest of the Village of Asharoken on the mainland of Long Island. The roadway along Asharoken Beach, Asharoken Avenue, provides the only vehicular access to Eaton's neck. Recent coastal storms have accelerated shoreline erosion and inundated highly developed areas. Asharoken has incurred major losses due to coastal erosion and flooding.

FY 2006 (\$000)

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 998
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	998
Cash	998
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	1,996
Allocation Through FY 2003	735
Allocation for FY 2004	82
Allocation for FY 2005	151
Allocation for FY 2006	30
Balance to complete after FY 2006	0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds are being used to finalized the draft feasibility report by July 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Steve Israel (NY-02)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Passaic River, Harrison, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101a(18)(B) of the WRDA of 1990 as modified by Section 102(p) of WRDA 1992.

LOCATION: This project is a separable element of the Mainstem Passaic River Flood Protection Project. It lies along the east bank of the Passaic River in the City of Harrison.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of levees and floodwalls providing 500-year level of protection to about 200 commercial and residential structures in Harrison New Jersey.

FY 2006 (\$000)

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	1,031*
Allocation for FY 2004	128
Allocation for FY 2005	367
Allocation for FY 2006	149
Balance to complete after FY 2006	325

*Includes \$300,000 of Passaic River Mainstem PED Funds.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue pre-construction engineering and design, including completion of an updated decision document.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection strongly supports the project and is willing to act as the cost-sharing partner.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Rahway River Basin, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation on 24 March 1998.

LOCATION: The Rahway River Basin is located in northeastern New Jersey within the metropolitan area of New Jersey counties of Essex, Union, and Middlesex.

DESCRIPTION: A reconnaissance study recommended further study of flood damage reduction improvements along the South Branch and Robinson's Branch of the Rahway River and environmental restoration in the City of Rahway and Town of Cranford.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$3,200
Cash	3,200
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$6,400
Allocation Through FY 2003	373
Allocation for FY 2004	77
Allocation for FY 2005	49
Allocation for FY 2006	79
Balance to complete after FY 2006	\$2,622

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study, including economic, hydraulic, and environmental analyses to establish baseline conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), Mike Ferguson (NJ-7), Donald Payne (NJ-10)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Raritan and Sandy Hook Bay, Highlands, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 1, 1990.

LOCATION: The Highlands study area is in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: It is situated with the Shrewsbury River to the east and Atlantic Highlands to the west and bounded by Raritan Bay to the north. The feasibility study will determine the viability of Federal participation in storm damage protection.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,750
Cash	1,750
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	3,500
Allocation Through FY 2003	453
Allocation for FY 2004	155
Allocation for FY 2005	159
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to complete after FY 2006	884

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase of the study, including additional data gathering and analyses, screening of alternatives, plan formulation and environmental scoping efforts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection is the cost-sharing partner for this study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Raritan and Sandy Hook Bay, Keyport, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 1, 1990.

LOCATION: The study area covers 1.4 square miles of the Borough of Keyport, in the northwestern portion of Monmouth County, and is situated along the coast of Raritan Bay.

DESCRIPTION: It is bordered by Chingarora Creek to the east, Matawan Creek to the west and Raritan Township to the south. The feasibility study would seek to determine the viability of Federal participation in storm damage protection.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,625
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,625
Cash	1,625
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,250
Allocation Through FY 2003	478
Allocation for FY 2004	130
Allocation for FY 2005	159
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to complete after FY 2006	759

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase of the study, including additional data gathering and analyses, screening of alternatives, plan formulation and environmental scoping efforts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection is the cost-sharing partner for this study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Raritan and Sandy Hook Bay, Leonardo, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 1, 1990.

LOCATION: The Leonardo study area is located in the northeastern portion of Middletown Township in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: Low-lying residential and commercial structures in the area experience flooding caused by coastal storm inundation. The feasibility study will determine the viability of Federal participation in flood and storm damage reduction.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study 1,375
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,375
Cash	1,375
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	2,750
Allocation Through FY 2003	1,039
Allocation for FY 2004	75
Allocation for FY 2005	162
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to complete after FY 2006	0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to finalize the draft feasibility report by July 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Union Beach, New Jersey

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation on August 1, 1990.

LOCATION: The study area is located in the northern portion of Monmouth County, New Jersey. It occupies about a 1.8 square mile area of land along the coast of Raritan Bay.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed plan provides for protection against beach erosion, tidal inundation, and wave attack along the shoreline as well as against tidal flooding from the bay and the tidal creeks.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,330
Cash	1,330
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,330
Allocation Through FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Allocation for FY 2006	59
Balance to complete after FY 2006	3,941

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds are being used to execute a Design Agreement and initiate the preconstruction, engineering and design (PED) phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Shrewsbury River Basin and Tributaries, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, adopted 7 May 1997.

LOCATION AND The study area includes the Townships of Sea Bright and Monmouth Beach in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: Frequent flooding occurs along the Shrewsbury River and its tributaries. Flooding is due to storm surges caused by hurricanes and northeasters that produce high tides, which back up normal river flow. Environmental restoration opportunities also exist within the river basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	1,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,800
Cash	1,800
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	3,600
Allocation Through FY 2003	414
Allocation for FY 2004	141
Allocation for FY 2005	79
Allocation for FY 2006	59
Balance to complete after FY 2006	1,107

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study, including economic, hydraulic, and environmental analyses to establish baseline conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: South River, Raritan River Basin, NJ (Flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration in South River, Middlesex County)

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation Resolution dated 13 May 1993.

LOCATION: The flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration study area is located within the lower Raritan River Basin in Middlesex County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The South River is the first major tributary of the Raritan River, located about 8.3 miles upstream of the Raritan Bay. The South River is tidally controlled from its mouth upstream to Duhernal Lake Dam. The March '93 Nor'easter, which is regarded as the worst on record, caused evacuations of more than 200 people from their homes and business. If the same flood were to occur today, it would cause about \$10 million in damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,000
Cash	1,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	4,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	69
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	119
Allocation for FY 2006	139
Balance to complete after FY 2006	2,673

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED) phase, including initiation of surveying and mapping activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: Several sites for ecosystem restoration have been selected, including a 350-acre island along the Washington Canal and South River. The estimated project cost is \$103,268,200, with an estimated Federal cost of \$67,124,300. The average annual benefits for the flood damage reduction project amount to \$9,161,400, all for flood damage reduction. The benefit-cost-ratio is approximately 2.2 to 1.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06), Rush Holt (NJ-12), and Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: Upper Rockaway River, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: U. S. House of Representatives Resolution Docket 2519,
dated May 7, 1997

LOCATION: The project area is located along the Rockaway River in Morris
County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: Approximately 1,000 structures in the basin are located
within the 100-year flood plain of the study area and experience frequent
damaging floods. The feasibility study involves the identification and
analysis of an array of plans for flood damage reduction and ecosystem
restoration. The NED plan is a combination of a diversion culvert,
channel improvements, non-structural measures, and environmental
restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Feas</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,200	\$3,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$1,200	\$1,200
Cash	1,200	1,200
Other	0	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,400	\$4,800
Allocation Through FY 2003	\$865	0
Allocation for FY 2004	\$194	0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$30	
Allocation for FY 2006		0 \$124
Balance to complete after FY 2006		0 \$3,476

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prior year funds are being used to finalize the draft
feasibility report in FY06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined
(sponsorship uncertain)

OTHER INFORMATION: Based on discussions with non-federal interests, it is
possible that the feasibility study may not recommend a project for
authorization since there is no clear consensus among the non-Federal
sponsor and local interests to support alternatives that may be in the
Federal interest including the NED plan.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Senators
Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Vicinity of Willoughby Spit, Norfolk, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 501 of WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662)

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of 7.3 miles of southern Chesapeake Bay extending from the tip of Willoughby Spit near the Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel to the Federal navigation project at Little Creek Inlet. The WRDA of 1986 authorized the project to include the construction and periodic nourishment of a 60-foot wide beach berm, at an elevation of 5.0 feet above mean low water, for the entire shoreline. With the assistance of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the City constructed a series of breakwaters along the Willoughby Spit-Ocean View shoreline in the late 1990's. State funding was discontinued before beach nourishment behind the breakwaters could be accomplished, leaving the project area with a reduced level of protection. In 2003, Hurricane Isabel destroyed the protective beach berm and nearly three quarters of the protective sand dune. Several dwellings were destroyed. The 7.3 miles of residential area sits virtually unprotected. Shoreline recession is a major problem in the easternmost portion of the shoreline. The City has recently requested a restart of the Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) investigations to include the conduct of a General Reevaluation Study to determine continued Federal interest in the authorized project or a reformulated project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 791	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		264
Cash	264	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 1,055	
Allocation thru FY 2003		80
Allocation for FY 2004		100
Allocation for FY 2005		200
Allocation for FY 2006		198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		213
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)		TBD
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to continue the General Reevaluation effort.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: A reconnaissance level study was conducted in FY 2004, which determined that the authorized project remains justified and would meet current day needs.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representative Drake (VA-2).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 26 January 2006

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Boise River, Idaho.

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 99, Section 414.

LOCATION: The multi-purpose Boise River project lies within a 64-mile stretch of the Lower Boise River in Ada and Canyon counties of Idaho.

DESCRIPTION: The Boise River is a tributary of the Snake River and located entirely in Idaho. The Corps of Engineers' Lucky Peak project is located on the river upstream of Boise, Idaho, along with the Bureau of Reclamation's Anderson Ranch and Arrowrock projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Recon	
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,364
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$1,136
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$2,500
Allocation thru 2003	\$72
Allocation for FY 2004	\$0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$13
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$100
Allocation for FY 2006	\$29
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	(N/A)
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	(N/A)

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the reconnaissance phase and develop a project management plan and feasibility cost sharing agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: These reservoirs are operated jointly for flood control and irrigation storage. Ada and Canyon counties have not experienced any severe flooding since the 1940's and there is a false sense of security with upstream dams. Non-continuous, non-Federal levees line the Boise River below the dams. This system provides less than 100-year level protection. Several emergency flood fights and rehabilitation projects have been completed since the 1970's. The rapid development is bringing about a renewed interest in flood damage reduction and environmental restoration as well as quality of life issues along the Boise River.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Simpson (ID-2) and Otter (ID-1); Senators Craig and Crapo (ID).

DISTRICT: Walla Walla

06 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Brush Creek Basin Study, Johnson County, Kansas and Jackson County, Missouri

AUTHORIZATION: Authorized by Resolution of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, July 24, 2002, Docket 2698

LOCATION: The study area is the Brush Creek Basin in Johnson County, Kansas and Kansas City, Missouri, and includes areas of Jackson County, Missouri.

DESCRIPTION: This feasibility study will examine a full range of structural and nonstructural measures to reduce recurring flood damages in the Brush Creek Basin. The feasibility study will take a multi-purpose watershed approach in considering opportunities for environmental ecosystem restoration, water quality improvement, and compatible recreation improvements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,150
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,000
Cash	1,000
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,150
Allocation thru FY03	\$ 0
Allocation for FY04	59
Allocation for FY05	59
Conference Amount for FY06	80
Allocation for FY06	79
Balance to Complete after FY06	\$953
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A feasibility study of the watershed basin will be initiated in FY06. Public involvement and public communication plans will be developed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility FY08

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed in September 2005. There are no authorization, cost of study, or scope changes of the study to date.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Emanuel Cleaver, (MO-5), Congressman Dennis Moore, (KS-05), Senator Pat Roberts (KS), Senator Kit Bond (MO).

DISTRICT: Kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Centralia, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401a of WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662)

LOCATION: The project area is located 80 miles south of Seattle in Lewis County, and includes the communities of Centralia and Chehalis.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project has been re-evaluated, resulting in a Chiefs Report that recommends a new project authorization. The project recommended for authorization includes setback levees along the Chehalis and Skookumchuck Rivers and modifications of the Skookumchuck Dam.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 11,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,000
Cash	5,000
Other	
 Total Estimated Cost	 \$ 16,000
 Allocations thru FY 2003	 \$ 7,712
Allocation for FY 2004	191
Allocation for FY 2005	125
Conference Amount for FY 2006	25
Allocation for FY 2006	25
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,947
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.8%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the Project Management Plan and Design Agreement for the pre-construction, engineering and design phase (PED) and continue coordination activities. Execution of the Design Agreement is scheduled for February 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED, FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction authorization is required for the project to move into construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Brian Baird (WA-03) and Norm Dicks (WA-06); Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA)

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Elliott Bay Seawall, Washington.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209 of the FCA of 1962 (PL 84-874). Study Resolution, Docket 2704, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, dated 25 Sep 2002; and Committee Resolution, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, dated 26 Sep 2002.

LOCATION: Elliott Bay is the portion of Puget Sound directly adjacent to downtown Seattle, King County in western Washington.

DESCRIPTION: The project will study the feasibility and Federal interest in renovating or replacing the aging and deteriorating seawall.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,913
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,759
Cash	
Other	4,759
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 9,672
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 68
Allocation for FY 2004	154
Allocation for FY 2005	324
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	743
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 3,624
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility study, with tasks including plan formulation and economic studies, and environmental coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility, FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: Schedule for earliest attainable completion for the phase is not consistent with prior submittals. The project team created a more detailed and accurate schedule since the last budget process.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Jim McDermott (WA-07) and Norm Dicks (WA-06), Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

06 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Manhattan Kansas Local Protection Project, KS

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970.

LOCATION: The City of Manhattan, Kansas, and an unincorporated area of Pottawatomie County, Kansas, are located northwest of the confluence of the Big Blue and the Kansas Rivers. The town and the unincorporated area are in the floodplain of both rivers and are protected from flooding by the Manhattan levee project.

DESCRIPTION: The existing levee system includes 29,000 feet of levee, 4,000 feet of channel improvement on the Kansas River, relief wells and two pumping plants. The area protected by the levee system includes over 1,500 homes, over 500 businesses and public facilities with an estimated investment value at over \$600 million. The feasibility study will identify and recommend alternatives to protect the infrastructure within the levee system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$1,121
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	958
Cash	958
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,079
Allocation thru FY03	\$ 33
Allocation for FY04	92
Allocation for FY05	38
Conference Amount for FY06	80
Allocation for FY06	79
Balance to Complete after FY06	879
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.125%)	1.9
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A feasibility study of the existing levee systems and potential modification of that systems will be initiated in FY06. Hydraulic studies of the river systems will continue in FY06. The environmental (NEPA documentation) will be initiated with initial agency and public coordination of the project completed in FY06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2010

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed in September 2005. There are no authorization, cost of study, or scope changes of the study to date.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Roberts (KS), Congressman Ryun (KS-02)

DISTRICT: Kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Missouri River Levee System (MRLS) Units L-455 and R 471-460, Missouri and Kansas (St. Joseph, Missouri)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of the 1970 Flood Control Act (PL 91-611), which provides authority to re-examine completed Civil Works projects

LOCATION: The study area includes the flood plain on both sides of the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Joseph, Missouri. Within the protected area of the levee system lie the City of St. Joseph, Missouri, the Rosecrans Memorial Airport and Missouri Air National Guard Base, and the cities of Elwood and Wathena, Kansas.

DESCRIPTION: Flood protection for the area is currently provided by MRLS Units L-455 on the left bank and R 471-460 on the right. The L-455 levee protecting St. Joseph, Missouri, is 15.6 miles long and averages 13 feet high. The R 471-460 levee, protecting Rosecrans Airport and the Missouri's Air National Guard complex, is 13.8 miles long and averages 15 feet high. The feasibility study will identify and recommend alternatives to protect infrastructure within the levee system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,770
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	900
Cash	850
Other	50
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,670
Allocation thru FY03	\$ 1,365
Allocation for FY04	99
Allocation for FY05	106
Conference Amount for FY06	175
Allocation for FY06	173
Balance to Complete after FY06	27
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.125%)	2.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The draft feasibility study and EIS will be completed July 06 with final feasibility study report submitted for approval in September 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility FY06

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) was signed in 1999. Cost changes identified in 2004 require an amendment to the FCSA. The amended FCSA is to be signed in February 2006. There are no other changes in authorization or scope of the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Bond (MO); Senator Talent (MO), Senator Roberts (KS); Representative Graves (MO-06); Representative Ryun (KS-02)

DISTRICT: Kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Skagit River, Washington.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209 of the FCA of 1962 (PL 84-874).

LOCATION: The study area is located 60 miles north of Seattle in the Skagit River Basin, and includes the cities of Mount Vernon, Burlington and Sedro-Woolley in Skagit County, Washington.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the project is to investigate and recommend solutions to provide flood damage reduction to these cities as well as reduced flooding to the rural area of the flood plain. Flood damage reduction alternatives being examined include levees, a diversion channel, additional flood control storage at five existing non-Federal dams, and other features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) Feasibility Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,881
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,319
Cash	1,279
Other	2,040
Total Estimated Cost	7,200
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,655
Allocation for FY 2004	493
Allocation for FY 2005	360
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	76
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility study including the preliminary hydraulic and physical design of alternative measures, and screening alternatives to maximize net flood damage reduction benefits. Complete without project condition report and identify alternatives for detailed evaluation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY2009

OTHER INFORMATION: The costs above reflect an interim feasibility study cost. The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) with the Non-Federal sponsor, Skagit County, is an interim FCSA and does not include the costs or scope of work to be accomplished after this fiscal year. A new FCSA must be negotiated to finalize the total costs and completion date. It is estimated the feasibility phase could be completed in FY 2009.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Rick Larsen (WA-02) and Norm Dicks (WA-06), and Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

District: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Swope Park Industrial Area, Kansas City, Missouri

AUTHORIZATION: A Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, United States House of Representatives on September 19, 1984, requested a review of potential flood damage reduction projects on the Blue River, vicinity of Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas.

LOCATION: The Swope Park Industrial Area is a local flood protection project located on the left descending bank of the Blue River. The 50-acre site drains about a 272 square-mile area, mostly in a highly urbanized part of the Kansas City Metropolitan Region. Within the corporate limits of Kansas City, Missouri, the industrial park is centered on 75th Terrace and bounded by a Union Pacific Railroad track and the Blue River channel.

DESCRIPTION: The Swope Park Industrial Area is business park within the urban core of Kansas City, providing over 400 skilled manufacturing jobs to the local economy. The entire study area is within the 100-year flood plain. The study is in the Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED) phase that will continue development of the engineering design and plans and specifications for future construction.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	250
Cash	250
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,000
Allocation thru FY03	\$ 130
Allocation for FY04	144
Allocation for FY05	219
Conference Amount for FY06	100
Allocation for FY06	99
Balance to Complete after FY06	158
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.125%)	1.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: PED will continue with the completion of the 65-percent Design Document Report (DDR) and initiation of construction plans & specifications for a phase to be recommended in the completed 65-percent DDR.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: PED FY

OTHER INFORMATION: There have been no changes to the study authorization or cost to date. The project requires authorization for construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Bond (MO), Congressman Cleaver (MO-5)

DISTRICT: Kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Turkey Creek Basin Study, Johnson and Wyandotte Counties, Kansas

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, U.S. House of Representatives, adopted February 16, 2000, Docket 2616

LOCATION: The study area covers about 20 square miles comprising the Turkey Creek basin in Wyandotte and Johnson Counties, Kansas from the headwaters to the upstream limits of the authorized Turkey Creek flood damage reduction project in the lower basin. The Turkey Creek channel through the upper segment of the fully urbanized basin is about 15 miles long.

DESCRIPTION: The objective of the feasibility study is to identify opportunities for Federal participation in structural and/or nonstructural flood damage reduction and for ecosystem restoration in the basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,232
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,232
Cash	954
Other	278
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,464
Allocation thru FY03	\$ 388
Allocation for FY04	150
Allocation for FY05	238
Conference Amount for FY06	100
Allocation for FY06	99
Balance to Complete after FY06	357
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.125%)	1.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility study. Conduct engineering design, hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, and economic and environmental analysis of alternatives. Initiate development of basin plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility FY07

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed with the City of Merriam, Kansas in 2002. There have been no changes to the study authorization or cost to date.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Pat Roberts, KS, Congressman Dennis Moore, (KS-03)

DISTRICT: kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Willamette River Basin Review, OR

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works & Transportation, 8 September 1988.

LOCATION: The Willamette River Basin, containing an area of approximately 12,000 square miles, is located in northwestern Oregon. Study focuses on the 13 existing Corps multiple-purpose reservoirs located on 6 major tributaries in the basin.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will determine if modifying the operation and storage allocation of the existing Corps system of 13 reservoir projects would better serve current and anticipated future water resource needs.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,284
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,450
Cash	1,089
Other	361
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,734
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 1,858.5
Allocation for FY 2004	5.0
Allocation for FY 2005	-31.5
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50.0
Allocation for FY 2006	49.5
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	402.5
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Work with local sponsor to revise the scope of the study and FCSA.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2010

OTHER INFORMATION: With the listing of salmon and steelhead as threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, Section 7 consultation has become the primary decision-making process for Corps Willamette basin activities. Appropriate Corps measures for limiting impacts of ongoing activities on threatened and endangered species, and assisting in the recovery of those species, will be identified and prioritized through this process. It is anticipated that NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions (BOs) will be completed in FY 2006. The BOs will address incidental take of the listed species occurring as a result of the Corps' ongoing Willamette activities and will identify and recommend a Reasonable and Prudent Alternative (RPA) that the Corps should undertake to assist in the recovery of those species. We anticipate that NMFS and USFWS recommendations contained in their BOs will address a number of aspects pertaining to Corps operations, including flow augmentation and fish passage and temperature control modifications to existing dams. Congressional approval is required for any actions that would significantly affect authorized purposes or involve major structural or operational changes at the existing projects. Any new projects developed for fish restoration may require specific authorization and funding from Congress, first to study and then to implement the measures.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: David Wu, OR-01; Earl Blumenauer, OR-03; Peter DeFazio, OR-04; Darlene Hooley, OR-05.

DISTRICT: Portland

6 February 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Barrow Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives Public Works Committee Resolution for Rivers and Harbors in Alaska, adopted 2 December 1970

LOCATION: Barrow, the northern most community in North America and the economic center for the North Slope Borough, is located on the Arctic Ocean about 750 miles north of Anchorage, Alaska.

DESCRIPTION: Barrow is a first-class city with about 4,400 residents. The majority of residents are Inupiat Eskimos. Changing coastal and climatic conditions have caused Barrow to experience increased frequency and severity of coastal storms. These storms produce hazardous conditions due to flooding and erosion. They pose a threat to public and private infrastructure, particularly the delivery of basic utility services to residents.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Feasibility</u> \$ 3,860
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,834
Cash	2,227
Other	1,607
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 7,694
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 705
Allocation for FY 2004	1,045
Allocation for FY 2005	605
Conference Amount for FY 2006	800
Allocation for FY 2006	792 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 713
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Phase II of the feasibility study will be conducted in FY2006. This is the detailed analysis of alternatives and optimization.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kenai River Bluff Erosion, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Section 55 of the 1974 WRDA P.L. 93-251 which states: "The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to provide technical and engineering assistance to non-Federal public interests in developing structural and non-structural methods of preventing damages attributable to shore and streambank erosion."

LOCATION: The Kenai River Bluff Erosion project is located in the city of Kenai, Alaska. The bluff extends from the mouth of the river for roughly one mile along the north bank of the river.

DESCRIPTION: Erosion of the bluff along the lower reach of the Kenai River threatens public, commercial, and private structures as well as roads, utilities, and historically significant buildings along the north bank of the river. The erosion is caused by direct wave action of Cook Inlet coincident with the high tides, upland runoff, direct rainfall, groundwater seepage, wind action, and river scour.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Technical Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,500
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 452
Allocation for FY 2004	50
Allocation for FY 2005	397
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 106
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to initiate a Technical Study to analyze data related to understanding and evaluating the bank erosion and stabilization problems along the Kenai River and is not intended to lead to recommendations of a specific water resources project. Studies to be performed include regional groundwater seepage and erosion analysis, regional wave analysis of lower Cook Inlet, hydrologic analysis of the Kenai River including its headwaters and tributaries to determine flow rate frequencies, and environmental and hydrologic impacts to the lower Kenai River and adjacent coastal shoreline.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: A Section 905(b) Report on Kenai River Bluff Erosion was drafted in July 2005 but was held in abeyance awaiting the findings of a technical analysis of the groundwater seepage problem and an evaluation of the ecosystem and fishery habitat in the lower Kenai River along the toe of the bluff.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Streambank Erosion Protection, McGrath, AK

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives Public Works Committee Resolution for Rivers and Harbors in Alaska, adopted 2 December 1970, and Section 117, Division C, EWDA FY05 (PL 108-447)

LOCATION: McGrath is located in the interior of Alaska and is surrounded on three sides by the Kuskokwim River. The town's location is 200 miles upstream from the river mouth on the Bering Sea, 221 miles northwest of Anchorage, and 269 miles southwest of Fairbanks. McGrath serves as the hub for transportation, government, and commercial services for the southern Interior region of Alaska. River access to McGrath is generally June through October when the Kuskokwim River is unfrozen. McGrath is accessible year-round by air.

DESCRIPTION: Bank erosion at McGrath is occurring at a historic rate of about 5 to 10 feet per year, threatening public facilities and residences along its eroding banks. Within a 50-year period erosion would cause the loss of public structures including the city offices, fuel and water storage tanks, and a main road, and over 70 private structures. Bank erosion protection measures along this reach of the river could significantly reduce the risk of damage to residences, businesses, and public facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,200
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 14
Allocation for FY 2004	68
Allocation for FY 2005	89
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	149 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 880
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate feasibility study under authority of Section 117 (full federal funding) if application of Section 117 approved by ASA(CW).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The reconnaissance report indicated that the cost sharing provisions of Section 117 (P.L. 108-447) could be applied to streambank erosion at McGrath because ice damage is a significant component of the erosion. If the ASA(CW) approves the request to invoke the cost sharing provisions of Section 117 due to McGrath's inability to cost share a feasibility study, then the feasibility study may be conducted at full federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 General Investigations
 Wailupe Stream, Oahu, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wailupe Stream, Oahu, HI

AUTHORIZATION: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002, Public Law 107-66.

LOCATION: Wailupe Stream is located approximately 8 miles southeast of Honolulu in eastern Oahu.

DESCRIPTION: The 100-year flood plain encompasses nearly 850 structures within the Aina Haina residential community. Wailupe Stream flows beneath Kalaniana'ole Highway, which is the major transportation link between East Oahu and the city of Honolulu and is subject to severe traffic disruption during flood events.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,892
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	964
Cash	964
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,856
Allocations thru 2003	168
Allocation for FY 2004	131
Allocation for FY 2005	238
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year 2006	1,959
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.38%)	1.28
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.02

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: General Revaluation Report FY 06 activities include the construction of a physical model by ERDC to determine modifications to Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge, the completion of hydraulic channel and debris basin designs, economic analysis, construction cost estimates, environmental assessment and independent technical review. FSM and AFB meetings scheduled for April and Sept 06, respectively.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of GRR is scheduled for March 07.

OTHER INFORMATION: Current schedule is based on completing and EA. Significant bridge modifications to Kalaniana'ole Highway Bridge will require the preparation of an EIS.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye (HI), Senator Daniel Akaka (HI), and Representative Neil Abercrombie (HI-1).

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Augusta/Richmond County Flood Control Study

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96 PL 104-303, Sec 414

LOCATION: Augusta Georgia, Richmond County, Georgia.

DESCRIPTION: Phase I Feasibility Study identifies several flood control alternatives in three water basins in Richmond County, GA – Rocky Creek, Phinizy Swamp Basin and the Augusta Canal. Phase II will focus on the Rae's Creek Basin. A Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed with the local sponsor, Augusta-Richmond County in November 1999. The study identifies potential Federal flood control interest, consistent with U. S. Army Corps of Engineers policies, costs, and benefits, and implements flood control projects that are economically cost effective and environmentally feasible.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,289
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,189
Cash	2,154
Other	35
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,478
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 1,452
Allocation for FY 2004	263
Allocation for FY 2005	74
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after 2006	302
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	3.1%
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Change scope of work to include "No Name Creek", a tributary of Raes Creek. Submit Final Phase I Report to SAD, Mar 06; District Engineer to Brief General Walsh, Mar 06; Chief's Report Sep 06; Conduct Phase II Alternative Formulation Briefing Meeting Dec 06; Submit Phase II Report to SAD Aug 07.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: August 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Phase I Feasibility is scheduled for completion in August 06 and Phase II Feasibility is scheduled to be completed in Aug 08 based on no funding in FY07.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Charlie Norwood GA-09) (R) and John Barrow (GA-12) (D)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bogue Banks Feasibility Study, North Carolina

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure dated 23 July 1998.

LOCATION: Bogue Banks is a 26-mile long barrier island located in Carteret County on the central North Carolina coast located approximately 40 miles southeast of New Bern, North Carolina. From west to east the incorporated towns on the island are Emerald Isle, Indian Beach, Salter Path, Pine Knoll Shores, and Atlantic Beach.

DESCRIPTION: The study is evaluating the feasibility of pursuing the construction of a shore protection project of some magnitude along the 26-mile long barrier island.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,894
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,800
Cash	(1,800)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,694
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 1,211
Allocation For FY 2004	309
Allocation For FY 2005	158
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation For FY 2006	74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	142
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (NA%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete draft Feasibility Report and conduct Alternative Formulation Briefing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: April 2007 for completion of Feasibility Report if funded in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Walter Jones (NC-03)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Brewton/East Brewton, AL

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted June 25, 1998 by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

LOCATION: Brewton, AL

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to develop solutions to reduce flood damage problems along Burnt Corn and Murder Creeks.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 675
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	675
Cash	675
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,350
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 182
Allocation for FY 2004	190
Allocation for FY 2005	94
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	74.25
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	134.75
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate 1.1 to 1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (1.1 to 1 at 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Alternatives analysis is currently underway and the Alternative Formulation Briefing is scheduled for April 2006. The Draft Feasibility Report will be submitted in Sep 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: FY 2006 allocation was reduced from \$189,000 (completion funds) in the Senate Report to \$75,000 in the Conference Report.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Jeff Sessions and Richard Shelby and Congressman Jo Bonner AL-01

DISTRICT: AL-01

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Volusia County Beaches (Daytona Beach Shores), FL

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution, docket number 2619, dated 16 February 2000.

LOCATION: Volusia County is located on the East Coast of Florida, approximately 80 miles south of Jacksonville and 250 miles north of Miami. The ocean shoreline of Volusia County is approximately 49.5 miles long.

DESCRIPTION: The authorization of the project is for Daytona Beach shores and adjacent areas. Therefore, the area covers the entire shoreline of Volusia County. The ocean shoreline of Volusia County is approximately 49.5 miles long. The study area is almost entirely developed. The Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Ponce De Leon Inlet navigation projects are within the limits of the study area. The Volusia County shoreline was heavily damaged during the 1999 and 2004 hurricane season.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 1,578
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,500
Cash	1,500
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,078
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 50
Allocation for FY 04	28
Allocation for FY 05	0
Conference Amount for FY 06	100
Allocation for FY 06	99
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,401
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Once the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement is executed, the feasibility phase studies could begin.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With adequate funding, the scheduled completion date for the feasibility study is Sep 09.

OTHER INFORMATION: The 905b analysis was completed in July 2004 and approved in September 2004. The Project Management Plan and the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement were initiated during FY 2005. The Jacksonville District COE submitted the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement (FCSA) on September 2004. However, to this date Volusia County has yet to sign the FCSA, resulting in the loss of the 2005 funding and placing the 2006 funding at risk of being redirected as well.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: John Mica (R) FL-7

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Egmont Key Shoreline Stabilization, Florida.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 420 of WDRA 2000

LOCATION: Egmont Key is located in the mouth of Tampa Bay on the Gulf of Mexico, on the west coast of Florida.

DESCRIPTION: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) mostly own the island. Other small owners include the U.S. Coast Guard and the Tampa Bay Pilots Association. The U.S. Coast Guard is in the process of transferring its remaining land to the USFWS. The entire western shore of the island is owned by the USFWS. Historic gun emplacements located on the western shore are being threatened by shoreline erosion.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,100
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 100
Allocation for FY 04	89
Allocation for FY 05	399
Conference Amount for FY 06	100
Allocation for FY 06	99
Balance to Complete after FY 06	413
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds received in FY 06 will be used to continue the feasibility study including engineering analysis, environmental documentation, and plan formulation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If adequate funding is provided, the feasibility study could be completed in FY 07.

OTHER INFORMATION: The USFWS owns most of the island including the entire western (Gulf Coast) shoreline. The Gulf Coast shoreline is in need of stabilization to protect historic structures. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection's (FDEP), recommended plan for stabilization was a groin structure on the north end of the island followed by beach renourishment to offset erosion. Sea turtles use the beach for nesting so a hardened shoreline was unacceptable. The St. Petersburg Harbor maintenance event placed approximately 600,000 cubic yards of material on the western

shore. The project has been praised by the FDEP, Tampa Bay Estuary Program, and the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Agency on Bay Management for its innovative use of dredged material to protect the historic structures on Egmont Key. The feasibility study is not at a point that the benefit cost ratio information can be computed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Mel Martinez (FL-R), Senator Bill Nelson (FL-D), Congressmen Bill Young (FL10-R), Jim Davis (FL11-D)

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Hancock County Seawall, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted May 22, 2000 by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

LOCATION: Hancock County, MS

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to develop solutions to alleviate flood damage, reduce shoreline erosion, and provide environmental restoration and protection for Hancock County.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 705
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	705
Cash	705
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,410
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 150
Allocation for FY 2004	107
Allocation for FY 2005	58
Conference Amount for FY 2006	308
Allocation for FY 2006	304.92
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	85.08
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate 4.4 to 1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (4.1 to 1 at 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility Report will be completed in March 2006 indicating no Federal interest. Two CAP projects will be recommended for construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Thad Cochran and Trent Lott and Congressman Gene Taylor, MS-04

DISTRICT: MS-05

Date: January 24, 2006

**FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lido Key, Sarasota County, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1999

LOCATION: Lido Key is approximately 2.4 miles long and is located approximately 45 miles south of Tampa. Lido Key is separated from Longboat Key to the north by New Pass and from Siesta Key to the south by Big Sarasota Pass.

DESCRIPTION: Hurricane and storm damage protection for the Gulf of Mexico shoreline of Lido Key.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	200
Cash	200
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 800
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 04	0
Allocation for FY 05	13
Conference Amount for FY 06	125
Allocation for FY 06	124
Balance to Complete after FY 06	463
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%)	5.87
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.69

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A Project Engineering and Design agreement is being prepared. Preparation of Plans and Specifications as well as permitting of the project will be initiated this year.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If adequate funding were provided, PED could complete in FY 07.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project was fully reauthorized under Section 364 of Water Resources Development Act of 1999, P.L.106-53 as follows: Each of the following projects is authorized to be carried out by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, as appropriate: (2) LIDO KEY BEACH, SARASOTA, FLORIDA – (A) IN GENERAL - The project for shore protection, Lido Key Beach, Sarasota, Florida, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1819) and deauthorized under section 1001(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)), at a total cost of \$5,200,000, with an estimated Federal cost of \$3,380,000 and an

estimated non-Federal cost of \$1,820,000. (B) PERIODIC NOURISHMENT – The Secretary may carry out periodic nourishment for the project for a 50-year period at an estimated average annual cost of \$602,000, with an estimated annual Federal cost of \$391,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of \$211,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Katherine Harris (R) FL-13

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pawleys Island, SC

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works resolution adopted 22 April 1988.

LOCATION: A 3.5-mile long barrier island located approximately 22 miles southwest of Myrtle Beach and 13 miles northeast of Georgetown, South Carolina.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed Federal project consists of construction of a 6,800 foot long protective sand berm, with two 350 foot tapers (7,500 feet total) along the southern reach of the island to reduce storm damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>PED</u> \$448
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	149
Cash	149
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$597
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 11
Allocation for FY 2004	34
Allocation for FY 2005	141
Conference Amount for FY 2006	154
Allocation for FY 2006	153
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	109
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the PED phase to include plans and specifications review and development of construction cost estimates.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: A request for exception to the public access policy is pending and the results of that report will impact the cost sharing requirements for this project. Based on existing public access the cost sharing for initial construction is 45 percent Federal and 55 percent non-Federal. If the policy exception is granted the cost sharing will change to 65 percent Federal and 35 percent non-Federal. Construction authorization is needed in the next WRDA.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Graham and DeMint, Congressman Brown SC-1

DISTRICT: Charleston

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Philpott Lake, Virginia (Section 216)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of Public Law 91-611, the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended (Review of completed projects).

LOCATION: Philpott Lake is located in Virginia, on the Smith River, 44.3 miles above its junction with the Dan River near Eden, North Carolina, and 35 miles from the Virginia-North Carolina State line. At spillway elevation, the reservoir extends upstream about 16 miles. The overall project covers 10,000 acres in Franklin, Henry, and Patrick Counties, Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: Philpott Lake was authorized in 1944 and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed construction in 1953. This project impounded 16 miles of the Smith River. Philpott Lake and the Smith River are significant natural resources for public use and enjoyment and are significant in the regional economy. The dam is operated for peaking hydropower using deep-water (hypolimnetic) releases. The highest flow is peak generation flow, which occurs daily. Between the generation releases, the stream is shallow and slow moving. The regulated releases significantly affect the temperature and flow regimes of the Smith River. There are concerns that Smith River resources including an existing brown trout fishery, native fish and invertebrate habitats, and water quality may be impaired by the operations of Philpott Dam. A native fish of the Smith River below Philpott Dam is the Federally listed, endangered Roanoke Logperch *Percina Rex*. The study will consider the effects of present operation of the Philpott Lake project on these significant natural resources and the effects of potential changes in operation of and releases from Philpott Dam on the lake and downstream waters.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,138
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,000
Cash	(1,000)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,138
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 17
Allocation For FY 2004	67
Allocation For FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation For FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	915
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (NA%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the reconnaissance phase, including finalizing a Project Management Plan and executing a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement, and initiate the feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Reconnaissance Phase: FY 2006. Feasibility Phase: FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Smith River and the fishery downstream of Philpott Lake are important to the economy of south central Virginia.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Virgil Goode (VA-05) and Bob Goodlatte (VA-09).

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Johns County Beaches, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution adopted June 11, 2000.

LOCATION: St. Johns County is located on the East Coast of Florida, approximately 30 miles south of Jacksonville and 300 miles north of Miami.

DESCRIPTION: The ocean shoreline of St. Johns County is approximately 42 miles long. The St. Johns County shoreline was heavily damaged during the 1999 hurricane season prompting a request to Congresswoman Tillie Fowler, at that time, for assistance. The study area will include all of St. Johns County.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 870
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	770
Cash	745
Other	25
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,540
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 90
Allocation for FY 04	11
Allocation for FY 05	20
Conference Amount for FY 06	100
Allocation for FY 06	99
Balance to Complete after FY 06	650
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Feasibility Phase studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The feasibility study could be completed in March 2008, dependent on adequate future appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility study is not at a point that the benefit cost ratio information can be computed. The Reconnaissance report was approved in April 2004. An FCSA was executed in September 2004.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: John Mica (R) FL-7

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Lucie County Beaches, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution adopted April 11, 2000.

LOCATION: St. Lucie County is located on the East Coast of Florida, approximately 225 miles south of Jacksonville and 100 miles north of Miami.

DESCRIPTION: The ocean shoreline of St. Lucie County is approximately 25 miles long. The impacts of the hurricane season of 2004-2005 emphasized the critical need for shoreline protection throughout this area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 988
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	988
Cash	0
Other	988
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,976
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 04	0
Allocation for FY 05	109
Conference Amount for FY 06	100
Allocation for FY 06	99
Balance to Complete after FY 06	780
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Feasibility phase studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The feasibility study could be completed in March 2008, dependent on adequate funding appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed in June 2004. The feasibility study is not at a point that the benefit cost ratio information can be computed. The non-Federal project sponsor (St. Lucie County) supports the study. The State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection, also supports shore protection initiatives for the critically eroding shoreline within the study area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mark Foley (R) FL-16

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Surf City and North Topsail Beach, NC

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure dated February 16, 2000, docket number 2617.

LOCATION: The Towns of Surf City and North Topsail Beach are located on Topsail Island. Topsail Island is a barrier island located about 25 miles northeast of Wilmington, NC. It is between New Topsail Inlet and New River Inlet. From north to south, the communities of North Topsail Beach, Surf City and Topsail Beach are located on Topsail Island.

DESCRIPTION: Local interests desire a shore protection project consisting of beach renourishment to provide protection to upland structures and the town's infrastructure.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,188
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,100
Cash	(2,100)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,288
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 644
Allocation For FY 2004	271
Allocation For FY 2005	196
Conference Amount for FY 2006	175
Allocation For FY 2006	174
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	903
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (NA%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility phase including the completion of the Alternative Formulation Briefing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Towns of Surf City and North Topsail Beach have established beach renourishment committees which have determined that property owners are willing to support a shore protection study and project, if feasible. The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed on February 13, 2002. Both towns were struck by several hurricanes in 1996 and 1999, which caused severe erosion and severely damaged or destroyed the primary dune system and the

structures along the ocean shoreline. Both towns are vulnerable to damages from future storm events. The northern 7 miles of North Topsail Beach is in a Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) Zone, which precludes it from being included in this study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Dole, Senator Edwards, Congressman McIntyre (NC-07), Congressman Jones (NC-03)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Village Creek, Birmingham Watersheds, AL

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted Mar 7, 1996 by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

LOCATION: Birmingham, AL

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to identify solutions to alleviate flood damage problems and ecosystem degradation in a comprehensive watershed study for Village and Valley Creeks Watersheds in metropolitan Birmingham, AL. The proposed project includes: upstream retention of flood flows; off channel flood storage areas; evacuation of structures in the floodway; development of continuous greenway; and construction of a recreational trail system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,343
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,343
Cash	1,343
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,686
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 786
Allocation for FY 2004	190
Allocation for FY 2005	253
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	15
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate 2.6 to 1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (2.4 to 1 at 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Alternatives analysis is currently underway and the Alternative Formulation Briefing is scheduled for March 2006. The Draft Feasibility Report will be submitted in July 2006. The Division Engineer's Notice is scheduled to be issued in Dec 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: FY 2006 allocation was reduced from \$253,000 (completion funds) in the Senate Report to \$100,000 in the Conference Report. However, \$15,000 in additional funding will complete the feasibility study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Jeff Sessions and Richard Shelby and Congressmen Spencer Bachus, AL-06 and Artur Davis, AL-07

DISTRICT: AL-06 and AL-07

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Walton County, FL

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted July 24, 2002 by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

LOCATION: Walton County, FL

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to identify solutions to problems such as shoreline erosion, environmental degradation, and flood damage for the Walton County shoreline.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,330
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,330
Cash	1,330
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,660
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	383
Allocation for FY 2005	646
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350
Allocation for FY 2006	346.5
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	-45.5
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate - TBD	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – TBD	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility Scoping Meeting was conducted in Jan 2006. The Draft Feasibility Report is scheduled to be submitted to CESAD in Sep 2006. The Division Engineers' Notice is scheduled to be issued in Dec 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The House Report had \$700,000 to complete the feasibility report and PED. The Conference Report reduced that amount to \$350,000 with \$200,000 for the feasibility report and \$150,000 for PED. SAM intends to use \$301,000 of the \$350,000 to complete the feasibility report.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Bill Nelson and Mel Martinez and Congressman Jeff Miller, FL-01

DISTRICT: FL-01

Date: January 24, 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: City of Carpinteria Shoreline Study, California

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act 1965, Section 208

LOCATION: The study is located on the Santa Barbara Co. coast, 80 miles north of Los Angeles, 15 miles north of Ventura, and 12 miles south of Santa Barbara, between Ash Ave and Linden Ave.

DESCRIPTION: There are approximately 13 structures affected by shoreline erosion and wave attacks. The structures behind the fronting properties may be affected by coastal flooding during storms. The study will investigate shoreline protection and coastal storm damage reduction along the Carpinteria shoreline.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,100
Cash	(836)
Other	(264)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 19
Allocation for FY 2004	25
Allocation for FY 2005	129
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	828
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue development of baseline conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Capps (CA-23)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Coast of California, Los Angeles County, California

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1965, Section 208 (PL 89-298)

LOCATION: The study is located along the coastline of Los Angeles County in Southern California. The 80 mile coastline extends from Point Dume southward to the San Gabriel River.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this study is to establish the coastal processes along Los Angeles County's shoreline through an oceanographic data collection and beach survey efforts, culminating in developing sediment budgets, predicting future shoreline changes, and developing a sand management plan for Los Angeles County.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	Study
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,620
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,620
Cash	(1,158)
Other	(1,462)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,240
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,016
Allocation for FY 2004	325
Allocation for FY 2005	357
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	823
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__ %)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue analysis of coastal processes data. Complete final beach profile, nearshore sediment compatibility assessment and prepare a comprehensive regional sand management plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways has issued grants to the non-Federal sponsor (Los Angeles Co.) to subsidize 50% of the non-Federal cash contribution for the study. Collaboration with Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the UC Berkeley, LA County Dept. of Public Works, LA County Dept. of Beaches & Harbors, and the CA Dept. of Boating & Waterways has occurred to accomplish study activities.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Waxman (CA-30), Harman (CA-36), Rohrabacher (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Coyote Dam, CA

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1999, Section 526

LOCATION: The study area is located on the east fork of the Russian River near the city of Ukiah, California.

DESCRIPTION: The study is evaluating the deferred water supply element of the authorized Federal project and the need for additional flood control as potential improvements to the dam.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$153	\$2,899
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	2,899
Cash	0	1,450
Other	0	1,449
Total Estimated Cost	\$153	\$5,798
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 141	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	6	0
Allocation for FY 2005	6	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	100
Allocation for FY 2006	0	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	2,800
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility public scoping meetings (03/06), geotechnical investigation and topographic survey contracts scopes of work (06/06).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: N/A

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: East Mesa, Las Cruces, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted August 12, 1986.

LOCATION: The study is located in the contributing watershed in the East Mesa area of the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The study will take a regional and collaborative perspective determining the Federal interest in environmental restoration, flood damage reduction and watershed planning in the study area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 915
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	915
Cash	(915)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,830
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	106
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	413
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility study to include preparation of existing conditions and future without project conditions for hydrology, geotechnical, environmental and economics.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION DATE FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The East Mesa region of Las Cruces continues to grow at a tremendous rate. Historically, arroyos meandered across the study area, providing invaluable riparian areas in the Chihuahuan landscape. The Chihuahuan Desert is one of the most biologically diverse ecoregions in the world. Currently, it is estimated that 85 to 90% of riparian habitat has been adversely altered within this biotic community due to various disturbances. The proposed project consists of Chihuahuan desert riparian ecosystem restoration, restoration of intermittent flow arroyos, and creation of floodplain meadow and seasonal wetland habitat. Restoration will improve habitat conditions of the Western Burrowing Owl, a federal species of concern. From a flood damage reduction perspective, there are seven small dams along the west side of the Organ Mountains, above the populated and developing areas, that pose a potential flood damage threat. The dams were recently inspected, and it was found that they are no longer functioning properly and may be unsafe. The City is concerned about the potential flood damage threat that the dams pose. If the dams fail, flood waters and sediment would impact populated and developing areas. Completion of the watershed study is imperative to identifying a Federal interest in environmental restoration, flood damage reduction, and watershed planning within the study area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Pearce, NM-02

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Fountain Creek, and Tributaries, Colorado

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopted in September 1976.

LOCATION: The watershed study is located on Fountain Creek and its tributaries in central Colorado.

DESCRIPTION: Fountain Creek and its tributaries have a long history of flooding, with the most recent events occurring in 1997 and 1999. The flood in 1999 caused approximately \$100,000,000 in damages. Roads, bridges, and residential and agricultural improvements were flooded, sewer lines were ruptured and significant sedimentation and erosion resulted. Constricted channel capacity and encroaching development have contributed to flood damages and environmental degradation in the watershed. In addition, there have been significant impacts to the natural ecosystem, resulting from the intrusion of non-native species and the impact of urbanization. The watershed study will take a regional and collaborative perspective in which all thirteen participating governments may benefit identify potential projects under other authorities to address flood control, erosion, sedimentation and environmental restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,510
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,510
Cash	(1,510)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,020
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 65
Allocation for FY 2004	158
Allocation for FY 2005	714
Conference Amount for FY 2006	125
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	449
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility level watershed study to include completion of hydraulic and hydrologic analyses.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study area has suffered from flooding, erosion, and environmental degradation for many years. The watershed study will consist of a comprehensive analysis of the entire contributing drainage area. Economic feasibility will be determined in the feasibility level watershed study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Hefley, CO-05 and Salazar, CO-03

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Walnut Creek Basin, Grayson and Murderer's Creeks, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution 19 Jun 63

LOCATION: The study is located in and around the city of Pleasant Hill in Contra Costa County, California, about 20 miles east of the city of San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION: Completed Walnut Creek Project, which lies adjacent to this project area, was authorized by the FC Act of 1960. As a result of continued rapid urbanization, several tributary channels in the upper Walnut Creek Basin are experiencing flood and drainage problems outside of the existing Walnut Creek Project area. Flooding in 1982, 1983, 1997, and as recently as New Year's weekend 2006, has resulted in damages in the city of Pleasant Hill.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Feasibility Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,750
Cash	1,750
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,500
Allocations thru FY 2003	36
Allocations for FY 2004	205
Allocations for FY 2005	314
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,096
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Without project conditions conference (F3) for first phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility completion (second phase) in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed June 2003. The study is comprised of two phases. The cost estimate represents both phases. A decision will be made whether to proceed to the second phase at the F3 conference.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller (CA-7); Tauscher (CA-10); Pombo (CA-11)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS / CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Llagas Creek, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) of 1999 (Public Law 106-53, Section 501(a))

LOCATION: Morgan Hill, San Martin and Gilroy, Santa Clara County, California

DESCRIPTION: Llagas Creek is a conduit to the Pajaro River and the Monterey Bay and is especially prone to flooding, having recorded floods in 1937, 1955, 1962, 1963, 1969, 1982, 1997 and 1998. Congress authorized USACE to assume the completion of the project from the Natural Resources Conservation Service, who initiated project construction in 1973, and completed about half of the originally authorized project. The project consists of channel improvements, and a diversion channel providing a 100-year level of protection to urban areas and between 5-10-year level of protection to agricultural areas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,900	\$58,000 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	37,000 2/
Cash	0	0
Other	0	37,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,900	\$95,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,321	2,321
Allocation for FY 2004	305	305
Allocation for FY 2005	210	321 3/
Conference Amount for FY 2006	450	450
Allocation for FY 2006	446	446
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	618	54,607 1/
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5-3/8%)		0.23
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		0.18

1/ Includes the PED.
2/ Cost of land only.
3/ \$111 received under CG appropriation.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete 2nd administrative draft of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and initiate design efforts to get 15% final design.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Depending on congressional legislation and optimal funding, the earliest attainable PED completion is FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The original Congressional language to the USACE was permissive about constructing the remainder of the project, therefore, USACE initiated efforts for a General Reevaluation Report for which in FY 2005 a preliminary economic analysis indicated a BCR of 0.23, thereby stopping study efforts. Congressman Pombo and LTG Carl Strock met at the end of FY 05 and agreed that clearer and directive Congressional language is needed to prepare final designs and initiate construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Pombo CA-11, Lofgren CA-16, Farr CA-17

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Navajo Nation Flood Plain Delineation, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-53 Section 520, Water Resources Development Act 1999.

LOCATION: The Navajo Nation encompasses 26,000 square miles in northeastern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southern Utah.

DESCRIPTION: The study will assess previous flood damage to residential, commercial, agricultural, environmental resources, and evaluate structural and non-structural measures being considered for reducing flood damages in the region. The Committee has provided additional funds to undertake flood delineation studies on the Navajo Nation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$12,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,000
Cash	(4,000)
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$16,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 100
Allocation for FY 2004	24
Allocation for FY 2005	21
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	494
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	11,361
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate Special Study. Complete New Mexico portion of Flood Plain Study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Renzi (AZ-1), Franks (AZ-2), Pastor (AZ-4), Udall (NM-3), Bishop (UT-1), Senators Kyl (AZ), Mc Cain (AZ), Domenici (NM)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ocean Beach, San Francisco, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution, adopted 3 August 1989

LOCATION: San Francisco, California

DESCRIPTION: Shoreline erosion threatens municipal infrastructure.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,400
Cash	800
Other	600
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,800
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	5
Allocation for FY 2005	158
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,039
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue coastal engineering data gathering, surveys, and prepare sediment transport report

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: Based on preliminary screening of alternatives, the Sponsor has submitted a request for the Corps to initiate a section 933 study to place dredged sands on the eroded shoreline.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Pelosi CA-08, Lantos CA-12

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pajaro River at Watsonville, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Original Reevaluation Authorization for Construction: Flood Control Act of 1996 (Public Law 89-789, November 7, 1966). Current Reevaluation Study: Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1990 (Section 107, Public Law 101-640, November 28, 1990)

LOCATION: City of Watsonville and town of Pajaro, Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, California

DESCRIPTION: The Pajaro River Flood Control study is evaluating alternatives for reducing flood damages to the City of Watsonville area along the Corralitos Creek, beginning upstream of Green Valley Road, continuing east to the confluence of Salsipuedes Creek to Pajaro River and along the Pajaro River from mile 12/5 to the east of Watsonville, to the river's mouth at the Pacific Ocean to the west.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$7,352
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$7,352
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 5,135
Allocation for FY 2004	601
Allocation for FY 2005	526
Conference Amount for FY 2006	740
Allocation for FY 2006	733
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	357
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Submit Draft General Reevaluation Report and Environmental Impact Statement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable PED completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Farr CA-17

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enabled Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Peninsula Beach, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopted 28 Sep 94.

LOCATION: The study is located along the Pacific Ocean just west of the entrance to Alamos Bay and north of the Long Beach breakwater.

DESCRIPTION: Study will investigate the ongoing beach erosion problems along the highly-developed shoreline in Long Beach, California and will develop alternative solutions. Existing protective beach is experiencing severe erosion that is exposing residential and commercial properties valued at over \$200M. Average rate of erosion is estimated to be 10 to 30 ft per year along the 100-ft wide beach and winter storms could cause shoreline erosion of 50 to 150 ft along this area and result in damages to back shore development. During the 1983 storms, the 175-ft protective beach was breached, resulting in waves overtopping a seawall and causing damages to development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 430
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	430
Cash	(270)
Other	(160)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 860
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 117
Allocation for FY 2004	5
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	308
Allocation for FY 2006	305
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	3
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Revise the Project Management Plan, complete the Alternative Analysis, and complete the Environmental Impact Statement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Revision of Project Management Plan is necessary to include a required Environmental Impact Statement report and to delete the Hazardous Toxic Radioactive Waste work. These changes are estimated to increase the total cost.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Rohrabacher (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Special Study, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Resolution, 1 June 1948

LOCATION: The special study area is located in Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Contra Costa counties, California and extends from Walnut Grove south to Tracy and from the city of Stockton west to Suisun Bay. The area within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta consists of about 700,000 acres of land segregated into some 100 tracts and islands and 1,100 miles of levees.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the study is to produce a regional planning report (RPR) for flood reduction, salinity intrusion caused by levee failures, navigation, recreation, fish and wildlife, and long term management of the complex island/waterway network in the Delta.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 7,755
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,790
Cash	2,395
Other	2,395
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,545
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5,302
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,354
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Work allowance is planned for reprogramming to a related study.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The study is on hold pending the Local Sponsor direction to proceed. Recently, with the California Performance Review, the Department of Water Resources and the Reclamation board will be combining functions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A; the study is on hold.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study is part of the CALFED process, closely associated with the Levee System Integrity Program which USACE is the Federal lead. The study is on hold pending the Local Sponsor direction to proceed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller (CA-7); Tauscher (CA-10); Pombo (CA-11); Senators Feinstein and Boxer (CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Delta Islands and Levees, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Resolution, 1 June 1948; Conference Report 108-357 dated 7 November 2003 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (P.L. 108-137).

LOCATION: The study area is located in Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Contra Costa counties, California and extends from Sacramento south to the city of Stockton and west to Suisun Bay. This area within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta consists of about 700,000 acres of land segregated into some 100 tracts and islands and 1,100 miles of levees.

DESCRIPTION: This study will prioritize and evaluate environmental restoration, flood protection and related purposes for the Delta Islands and Levees. Delta Islands and Levees is a spin-off of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Special Study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Reconnaissance</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$153	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	2,000
Cash	0	0
Other	0	2,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$153	\$4,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	41	0
Allocations for FY 2005	79	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	250
Allocation for FY 2006	33	214
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	1,786
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete reconnaissance phase and initiate feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of feasibility phase in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study is part of the CALFED process, closely associated with the Levee System Integrity and Environmental Restoration Programs. USACE is the Federal lead. USACE is evaluating all islands in the Delta to investigate flood protection and ecosystem restoration opportunities. The 905 (b) report was approved by SPD in September 2005. Negotiations for the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement are nearing completion. The non-federal sponsor, California Department of Water Resources, has submitted a Letter of Intent to initiate this study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller (CA-7); Tauscher (CA-10); Pombo (CA-11); Senators Feinstein and Boxer (CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enabled Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wilson and Oak Glen Creeks, California

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by House Committee on Public Works, adopted 8 May 1964.

LOCATION: The study area encompasses approximately 12 square miles in the vicinity of Yucaipa within San Bernardino County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The city of Yucaipa's current population is approximately 46,000. Wilson Creek and Oak Glen Creek originate in the San Bernardino Mountains and flow in a south and southwesterly direction and join each other in Yucaipa. The drainage has been altered by urbanization, resulting in changes to the floodway, sediment movement and habitat. Runoff has increased substantially posing an increased flood risk within the city limits. The study will investigate flood control and environmental restoration

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,045
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,045
Cash	(815)
Other	(230)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$2,090
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	81
Allocation for FY 2005	139
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	429
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete feasibility scoping meeting, without project conditions Mar 06 and initiate evaluation of different design alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Awaiting approval of project cost increase due to schedule delays.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Lewis (CA-41) Baca (CA-43)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Clemente Shoreline, California

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act 1965, Section 208 and P.L. 106-60

LOCATION: The study is located on the Pacific Coast of southern California, south of the city of Los Angeles and approximately 59 miles north of the city of San Diego.

DESCRIPTION: The city of San Clemente is experiencing a continuous loss of shore protection and recreational beach width. Damages to coastal, residential, and commercial properties from storm-induced waves have become a serious threat. The study will investigate alternatives to provide shoreline protection to San Clemente and the adjacent rail line.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,121	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,121	250
Cash	1,058	250
Other	63	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,242 1/	\$1,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 572	0
Allocation for FY 2004	122	0
Allocation for FY 2005	241	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	188	100
Allocation for FY 2006	186	\$ 99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	651
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A	N/A

1/ See other information.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete alternative analysis report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Primary benefit for project area is the avoided cost to build a seawall to protect the railroad line. Currently, total benefits may not be sufficient to find Federal interest for a project. Further analysis will be conducted in FY06 to definitively determine if there is a Federal interest. Anticipate an increase in total study cost if study continues to a final report.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Feinstein, Boxer, Congresspersons Issa (CA-49), Cox (CA-48), Calvert (CA-44), Cunningham (CA-50), Davis (CA-53)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Diego County Shoreline, California

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act 2000, Section 414

LOCATION: The study area is located along the San Diego Co., CA coastline and is bordered by Mexico to the south and Orange Co. to the north.

DESCRIPTION: This study is investigating alternatives to mitigate the downcoast erosion caused by the Oceanside Harbor and to provide shoreline protection to the San Diego County Shoreline (Oceanside). This study involves evaluating the impacts to the shoreline due to the Camp Pendleton Harbor and estimating the impacts to the shoreline if the Harbor had not been constructed. The threat of damages to structures along the shoreline has been steadily increasing with the continued erosion of the beaches.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,900
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$1,041
Allocation for FY 2004	156
Allocation for FY 2005	204
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	400
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Conduct scoping meeting for the without project condition and respond to comments.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study is being funded at 100% Federal expense in accordance with WRDA 2000. The City of Oceanside justified the study at full Federal cost based upon obvious impacts of the Federal jetty/breakwater at Camp Pendleton (Del Mar Harbor) on erosion of downcoast City beaches. The study will recommend apportioning the Federal and non-Federal costs to construct the project in accordance with the magnitude of interference of sand transport caused by the Federal jetty/breakwater.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Issa (CA-49), Cox (CA-48), Calvert (CA-44), Cunningham (CA-50), Davis (CA-53)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Francisquito Creek, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 4 of Flood Control Act, 1941

LOCATION: San Francisquito Creek is located about 22 miles south of San Francisco, California.

DESCRIPTION: San Francisquito Creek has an inadequate carrying capacity due to vegetation sedimentation, land subsidence, levee settlement and erosion. Flooding on the creek affects the city of Menlo Park in San Mateo County, and Palo Alto and East Palo Alto in Santa Clara County. San Francisquito Creek starts at the base of Searsville Dam at Stanford University and flows into the San Francisquito Bay about 2.5 miles south of the Dumbarton Bridge. As a result of record rainfall in February 1998, San Francisquito Creek overtopped its banks, affecting approximately 1,700 residential and commercial structures and causing more than \$26.6 million in property damages. The study will evaluate potential improvement plans to help alleviate flooding problems, as well as address environmental degradation of the watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Recon</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$156	\$3,732
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	3,732
Cash	0	1,866
Other	0	1,866
Total Estimated Cost	\$156	\$7,464
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	25	0
Allocation for FY 2005	124	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	225
Allocation for FY 2006	7	216
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	3,516
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete reconnaissance study and initiate Feasibility Study which occurred in November 2005 with the signing of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: FCSA was signed in November 2005. Members of the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA) include the cities of East Palo Alto, Palo Alto and Menlo Park, the San Mateo County Flood Control District, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District. All five members must agree on all major decisions.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lantos CA-12, Eshoo CA-14

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: SJRB, West Stanislaus, Orestimba Creek, CA

AUTHORIZATION: H.R. 8 May 1964

LOCATION: The project is located in western Stanislaus County, CA, including the town of Newman.

DESCRIPTION: The city suffered flood related losses in 1998, 1995, 1986, 1983, and 1980. Riparian habitat for the endangered Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle has also been affected by flooding in the area. Over the past 50 years, changes to the topography and drainage patterns have occurred with the construction of the Delta Mendota Canal, the California Aqueduct and Interstate 5. The study will analyze potential solutions for flood damage reduction, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes for Orestimba Creek. Proposed alternatives include a flood attenuation basin, bypass channel and channel improvements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 <u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,964
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,964
Cash	2,964
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,928
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$1,376
Allocation for FY 2004	197
Allocation for FY 2005	62
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY2006	1,230
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility phase; refine alternatives, define NED alternative, develop restoration components.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding will allow for completion in FY08.

OTHER INFORMATION: The NED plan and alternatives will be refined in FY06 to provide for an F4 conference early in FY 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Cardoza (CA-18); Radanovich (CA-19)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME: San Juan Creek, South Orange County, California

AUTHORIZATION: Santa Ana River Basin & Orange County (SARBOC) adopted by Resolution of Committee on Public Works, House, 8 May 64

LOCATION: The study area is located in South Orange County, about 40 miles Southeast of Los Angeles, California.

DESCRIPTION: The watershed covers approximately 176 square miles. The study will examine flood control, channel stability, environmental restoration and recreation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,600
Cash	(1,500)
Other	(100)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$3,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	54
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	247
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,299
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Feasibility phase. Coordinate toward public meeting.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Calvert (CA-44), Cox (CA-48)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Solana-Encinitas Shoreline, California

AUTHORIZATION: House Document Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution dated 22 April 1999.

LOCATION: The study area is located along the southern California coastline in the cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach, San Diego County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The environmental restoration study will evaluate alternatives on reducing the rate of bluff erosion and environmental restoration and/or enhancement of the San Elijo Lagoon.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,188	\$1,725
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	2,188	575
Cash	1,512	575
Other	676	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$4,375	\$2,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	994	0
Allocation for FY 2004	835	0
Allocation for FY 2005	121	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	375
Allocation for FY 2006	238	133
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0	1,592
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prepare Final Feasibility Report May 06, complete Interim Report for the San Elijo Lagoon, sign Chief's Report in Jun 06 and initiate PED.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2006 and PED phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Boxer, Congresspersons Issa (CA-49), Cunningham (CA-50)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: South San Francisco Shoreline, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution Docket 2697 dated July 24, 2002, WRDA (PL 94-578), Section 142, amended by WRDA 86 (PL 99-662)

LOCATION: The study area is located along the shoreline of South San Francisco Bay, California, extending from the City of Palo Alto to the City of San Leandro and includes 15,100 acres of salt ponds.

DESCRIPTION: The study will re-examine tidal and fluvial flooding problems and potential alternative solutions as well as opportunities to restore wetland habitat along the bay shoreline that would support threatened and endangered species including the salt marsh harvest mouse and the California clapper rail.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 7,815
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	7,815
Cash	0
Other	7,815
Total Estimated Cost	\$15,630
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	5
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation for FY 2006	597
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,213
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds will be used to continue feasibility through the without project conditions (F3) milestone.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The Feasibility study for the first Interim study is scheduled to be completed in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement for the first interim study report for the Santa Clara County and Alviso Ponds was signed on September 26, 2005 and feasibility was initiated.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lantos CA-12, Stark CA-13, Eshoo CA-14, Honda CA-15, Lofgren CA-16

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1941 and Section 442 of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The project is located in the southwest portion of the greater Albuquerque metropolitan area. The study area includes the 22.5 square miles southwest valley drainage area and the 147.5 square mile west mesa contributing area.

DESCRIPTION: The project will reduce flood damages to Albuquerque's southwest valley. The project includes improvements to existing drains, construction of detention basins, additional channels, and an outlet structure to the Rio Grande.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,335
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	445
Cash	(445)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,780
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	256
Allocation for FY 2005	493
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	91
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue preconstruction engineering and design.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of preconstruction engineering and design in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction of the project is not yet authorized.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Sparks Arroyo Colonia, El Paso, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate, adopted August 12, 1986.

LOCATION: The study area is located along Sparks Arroyo in southern El Paso County, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will make flood drainage reduction recommendations for Sparks Addition and adjacent colonias.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	500
Cash	(500)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	97
Allocation for FY 2005	162
Conference Amount for FY 2006	198
Allocation for FY 2006	196
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	45
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility study to include completing the hydrologic and hydraulic analyses, conduct geotechnical, cultural, environmental, and rights-of-way investigations.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study area is close to El Paso's employment centers, which include high concentrations of commercial and industrial development. It is adjacent to the rapidly growing east, northeast, and lower valley sections of El Paso. On June 20, 1999, a thunderstorm centered in the study area, caused flooding in the community of Sparks Addition and closed Interstate 10 for eight hours. Continued rapid population growth is expected both in the floodplain and in the drainage basin, having doubled to 35,000 since 1990. Much of the growth is in the form of small, unregulated subdivisions (colonias) and has changed land use patterns in the area. As a result, the drainage into the floodplain can be expected to cause greater damages over time. During a preliminary study review, it was determined that additional sub basins contributed to Sparks Arroyo's flooding problems. Following the local sponsor's approval, hydraulic analysis of these additional sub basins will be incorporated into the project scope to insure the project provides sufficient flood damage protection for the community.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Reyes, TX-16

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Truckee Meadows Flood Control Study, NV

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1962, PL 87-874 (76 Stat. 1173, H.R. 13273); WRDA 1988, Sec. 3(a)(10)

LOCATION: Vicinity of Reno/Sparks, Washoe and Storey Counties, NV

DESCRIPTION: The Truckee River basin drains an area of 3,060 square miles in eastern California and western Nevada and empties into Pyramid Lake. The Truckee River flood plain in the Reno & Sparks metropolitan area encompasses about 8,900 acres, mostly urban development, along both banks of the river. The maximum flood of record, January 1997, caused about \$700M in damages. Significant, damaging floods have occurred about every 10 yrs. A feasibility report was completed in February 1985. The project as authorized for construction in WRDA 1988 includes \$78M for construction of floodwalls, levees, bridge replacements, channel enlargements, a flood detention basin, and recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. In 1992, during PED, it was concluded that the project lacked economic feasibility, and was classified as "deferred." In 1994, due to flood threat and high population growth and development, the local sponsor requested reactivation. WRDA 1996 initiated the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) in two phases: 1) reconnaissance; and 2) feature development, cost benefit analysis, and cost allocation. The reconnaissance study (Aug 1997) determined potential construction feasibility of the project. Phase two of the GRR was initiated in 1998 and is ongoing.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 25,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 10,704
Allocations for FY 2004	2,310
Allocations for FY 2005	2,474
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,500
Allocation for FY 2006	3,465
Balance to Complete after (FY 2006)	\$ 6,847
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue work on General Reevaluation Report (GRR) and NEPA documents.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY07 (GRR).

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY06 Act language changes this project such that it is no longer consistent with policy. The Administration supports multi-purpose projects, however, the act language to 1) credit the sponsor for purchase of lands, easements and rights-of-way, implementation of project monitoring and assessment, and construction and implementation of recreation, ecosystem restoration, and water quality improvement features, including the

provision of 6700 acre-feet of water rights no later than the effective date of the Truckee River Operating Agreement for re-vegetation, reestablishment and maintenance of riverine and riparian habitat of the Lower Truckee River and Pyramid Lake, whether expended prior to or after the signing of the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), shall be fully credited to the non-federal sponsor's share of costs for the project; and 2) to combine separable units into one economic reach or unit. The act language regarding sponsor credit is consistent with general Corps policy for the crediting of Sponsor's purchase of lands, easements and rights-of-way as described within the Structural Flood Control model PCA. The act language regarding the treatment of the Truckee Meadows Flood Control Study as one unit is not consistent with general Corps policy.

The GRR/PED phase will be 100% federally funded, per CECW-PE memo dated 5 Dec 1997.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gibbons (NV-2); Senators Reid and Ensign

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties Shoreline, California

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1965, Section 208

LOCATION: The study area is located along the coastline of Ventura and Santa Barbara counties approximately 150 miles of the Pacific Ocean coastline.

DESCRIPTION: The study is a continuation of the Coast of California Storm & Tidal Wave Study, in which San Diego County and Orange County have been completed, and Los Angeles County is scheduled to complete in FY06. The study will evaluate the coastal processes along Ventura Counties and Santa Barbara Counties toward developing a long-term sand management strategy that will restore and preserve beach areas and enhance the coastal environment. The study will also involve the quantification of sediment sources, sinks, and transport characteristics, the quantification and interpretation of past shoreline changes, the establishment and testing of techniques for assessing shoreline response to natural forces and human activity on local and regional bases, and developing a means of rapid dissemination of information from the study to all interested parties, including governmental planning, engineering and regulatory agencies, and others interested in the coastline of Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,390
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,390
Cash	(805)
Other	(585)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,780
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	15
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,236
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility. Coordinate deployment of wave gages (non-fed).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The State of California Department of Boating and Waterways has encumbered funds to partially cover the non-Federal cash contribution for the study effort. The local sponsor has accelerated in-kind services activities to maintain project schedule, until additional Federal funds become available.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressperson Capps (CA-23)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Whitewater River Basin, Thousand Palms, Riverside County, California

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b)(10) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000

LOCATION: The study area is located in Coachella Valley, Riverside County, in the vicinity of Thousand Palms.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of constructing four levees to provide flood protection for the southern portion of the alluvial fan, which includes the communities of Palm Springs, Rancho Mirage, Palm Desert, Thousand Palms, and Desert Hot Springs.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	PED
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,380
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	794
Cash	(794)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$3,174
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 771
Allocation for FY 2004	454
Allocation for FY 2005	89
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	967
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.10

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the revised hydraulic model, continue the intermediate Detailed Design Report, and coordinate with USFWS.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Congresswoman Bono has expressed concerns about funds removed from project and general lack of progress. However, from initiation of PED in FY 01 thru FY 06, less than a net of \$100K was moved from the study. The team is reviewing cost-saving alternatives in order to keep the cost below the 902 limit. The lower reach of the project is being re-designed to prevent flood waters from encroaching upon the Coachella Valley Fringed-Toed Lizard Preserve.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Bono (CA-45)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Abilene, TX (Brazos River Basin)

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Resolution dated 12 August 1954.

LOCATION: In the north central Texas city of Abilene (Taylor County).

DESCRIPTION: Prior feasibility studies focusing on flood damage reduction were completed in FY91. The previous plan is being reassessed based on current conditions. It is anticipated that the revalidated plan will be similar to the FY91 plan and would include a combination of detention, diversion and channel modifications with incorporated ecosystem restoration opportunities along Elm Creek.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 1,448
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,191
Cash	768
Other	423
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,639
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 528
Allocation for FY 2004	57
Allocation for FY 2005	99
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	665
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete existing conditions hydrologic and hydraulic models, estimate damages and revalidate the 1991 study findings.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, this feasibility study would be completed in 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Neugebauer, TX-19.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, White Oak Bayou (Houston), Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 211 of the WRDA 1996 (Construction subject to ASA(CW) approval; Reimbursement for non-Federal work).

LOCATION: The flood damage reduction project is located in Harris County, Houston, Texas. White Oak Bayou is a tributary channel to Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries, and is located within the city limits of Houston, Texas. The stream extends approximately 26 miles to a terminus near State Highway 290.

DESCRIPTION: The primary study area problem is frequent flooding of residential properties along White Oak Bayou, and its tributaries. A series of detention reservoirs and channel adjustments in the upper reaches could facilitate drainage in the watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,156
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,006
Cash	(0)
Other	(4,006)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 8,162
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 450
Allocation for FY 2004	66
Allocation for FY 2005	228
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	3,363
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2006: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to initiate the reimbursement to the Harris County Flood Control District (HCFCD) of the Federal share of the costs for the completed reconnaissance phase of the study upon approval by the Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), and for Corps of Engineers' coordination costs while the non-Federal Sponsor completes the General Re-Evaluation Report and submits final document to HQ and ASA(CW).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The General Re-evaluation Report is scheduled for approval by the ASA(CW) in December 2006. Hence, the project would move into the PED phase in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 211 of WRDA 96 authorizes non-Federal interests to plan, design, and construct, and be reimbursed for flood control projects up to the Federal share of costs for the work accomplished.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressmen

Culberson (TX-7), A. Green (TX-9), G. Green (TX-29); and Congresswoman Jackson Lee (D-18).

DISTRICT: Galveston

DATE: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Grand Lake, Oklahoma

AUTHORIZATION: Section 449 of the WRDA of 2000

LOCATION: Northeastern, Oklahoma in Ottawa County

DESCRIPTION: Grand Lake was constructed by the Grand River Dam Authority and became operational in 1941. Reservoir purposes include hydroelectric power (operated by GRDA) and flood control (directed by the Corps of Engineers). Lands were acquired up to elevation 750 by the State of Oklahoma. The Federal Works Agency, working with others, acquired flowage easements between elevations 750 ranging up to 760. Those easements (between elevations 750 and 760) were transferred to the USACE in 1959. In response to increasing public concerns, Congress authorized a study. The September 1998 Real Estate Adequacy Study report states that theoretical backwater effects of Grand Lake were found to exceed the limits of existing flowage easements if Grand Lake were a "new" USACE project. Congress later established Section 449 of the WRDA of 2000 which authorizes a feasibility study at full Federal cost if the ASA(CW) determines that Federal actions have been a significant cause of the backwater effects at Grand Lake.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,173
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	4,173
Allocation thru FY 2003	7
Allocation for FY 2004	18
Allocation for FY 2005	188
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	3,762
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Reconnaissance phase funds will be used to prepare a Letter Report and submit to ASA(CW) for a determination on proceeding with a full federally financed feasibility study, in accordance with Section 449 of the WRDA of 2000. The Project Management Plan will be updated. If the ASA(CW) determines that Federal actions have been a significant cause of the flooding, feasibility study activities would be initiated at full Federal expense.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Contingent upon receiving ASA(CW) concurrence to conduct the feasibility study at full Federal expense in FY 2006, the earliest attainable completion for the feasibility phase is FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: In accordance with Section 449 of WRDA 2000, the feasibility phase of the study may be conducted at full Federal expense, if the ASA(CW) determines the Corps operation of Grand Lake significantly attributes to the backwater flooding at the project. Currently, a non-Federal sponsor willing to cost share in the feasibility phase of the study has not been identified.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Inhofe and Coburn, OK; and Congressman Boren, OK-2, and Ryun, KS-2.

DISTRICT: Tulsa District

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coast Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Greens Bayou, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 (a) (21) of WRDA 90 (part of Buffalo Bayou and Tribes.); Section 575, WRDA 96; Section 350, WRDA 96

LOCATION: The project is located in Harris County and the city of Houston, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized flood control project includes 25 miles of stream enlargement, 14 miles of stream clearing, and four flood detention basins. Coordination with the local sponsor, the Harris County Flood Control District (HCFCD), has determined that reformulation of the project is necessary. The new plan recommended consists of 3.7 miles of channel improvement in the upper reaches of the watershed and a detention basin near the downstream terminus of the channel improvements. There is no non-structural component in the new plan.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$9,320
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$9,320
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$7,847
Allocation for FY 2004	571
Allocation for FY 2005	340
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	74
Balance to Complete After FY06	488
Benefit to Cost Ratio (5 3/8%)	4.01
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.9

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to finalize the General Reevaluation Report/ Environmental Assessment (GRR/EA); approval of the GRR/EA; initiate preparation of the Project Management Plan; prepare budget paperwork; and initiate preparation of the Project Cooperation Agreement for construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) in FY 2007, if funds are provided.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Jackson Lee (TX-18); Congressmen Culberson (TX-7); and Green (TX-29)

DISTRICT: Galveston District

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

STUDY NAME AND STATE: Lower Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution 2547 dated 11 March 1998.

LOCATION: The Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins (GSAR) are located in south central Texas, extending southeasterly from Kerr and Bandera Counties, respectively, to the Texas Gulf coast.

DESCRIPTION: This study addresses flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration in the Lower Guadalupe River Basin (from the confluence of the San Antonio and Guadalupe Rivers to San Antonio Bay) in an interim feasibility study under the authority for the GSAR Feasibility Study. Project will investigate solutions to reduce flooding on the Guadalupe River below Victoria, Texas and provide opportunities for ecosystem restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>STUDY</u> \$ 2,774
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,657
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 5,431
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 15
Allocation for FY 2004	3
Allocation for FY 2005	99
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,608
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 Funds will be used to negotiate and sign a Federal Cost Sharing Agreement (FSCA), and initiate Feasibility Study. First activities will be surveying and mapping.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: The Feasibility Phase is scheduled to complete in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressman Paul (TX-14), Congressman Hinojosa (TX-15).

DISTRICT: Galveston

DATE: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lower San Antonio River Basin (Tri-County), TX

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution 2547 dated 11 March 1998.

LOCATION: Goliad, Karnes and Wilson Counties in south central Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The lower portion of the San Antonio River Basin in these counties will be investigated to identify improvements in the interest of flood damage reduction, with secondary interests in ecosystem restoration and recreation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 2,247
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,219
Cash	2,219
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,466
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 188
Allocation for FY 2004	406
Allocation for FY 2005	388
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	148
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,117
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate ecosystem evaluation, continue the existing conditions phase of the feasibility study, and complete the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling and the flood warning modeling.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding the earliest attainable completion date for this feasibility study is 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Urbanization upstream and in portions of the watershed has resulted in increased waterborne pollutants affecting the San Antonio River and major aquifers in the region (the Carizzo and Gulf Coast aquifers).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Hinojosa, TX-15; Doggett, TX-25; Cuellar, TX-28.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Study or Project

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Section 576 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999

LOCATION: Arkansas, Pulaski County, North Little Rock, Arkansas River

DESCRIPTION: Flood control measures for a large portion of the downtown area of North Little Rock in a common drainage basin referred to as Dark Hollow area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>PED</u> \$ 1,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	600
Cash	600
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,400
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 761
Allocation for FY 2004	131
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	769
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.875%)	0.92
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	0.79

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The provided will be used to complete the Limited Reevaluation Study and Draft Environmental Assessment to identify the recommended plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion date is FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 576 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 directed the Corps to review the plan proposed by the non-Federal sponsor, and determine if the project is economically justified, technically sound, and environmentally acceptable. The design cost-sharing agreement was executed with the city of North Little Rock on 30 May 2000. The Limited Reevaluation Report is scheduled to be available for review in July 2006. The benefit to cost ratio is less than unity, therefore the completed report will close current Corps efforts.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Lincoln and Pryor (AR), Congressman Snyder (AR-2).

DISTRICT: Little Rock District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pine Mountain Lake, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1965

LOCATION: The dam site is located at mile 35.7 on Lee Creek, 12 miles north of Van Buren, Arkansas in Crawford County.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a multipurpose reservoir (flood control, water supply, recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement). The reservoir would control runoff from 168 square miles. Capacity would be 261,000 acre-feet of which 93,100 would be for flood control and 168,000 for water supply, fish and wildlife and recreation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$8,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$8,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 295
Allocation for FY 2004	98
Allocation for FY 2005	79
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,429
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3.125%)	1.38
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	0.8

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds will be used to continue the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) phase of Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). The FY 2006 effort will focus on initiating the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Agency scoping and initial public meetings are planned for April 2006 and May 2006. The existing environmental resource inventory conducted in the 1970s will be updated.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion date for the PED phase is FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: PED activities will be accomplished at upfront Federal financing, with the non-Federal sponsor paying its share of PED in the first year of construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Lincoln and Pryor, AR, Congressman Boozman, AR-3.

DISTRICT: Little Rock District (SWL)

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Raymondville Drain, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401(a) of Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (PL 99-662).

LOCATION: The project is located in Hidalgo and Willacy Counties, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: This is one of three separable elements of the Lower Rio Grande Basin that was authorized for construction by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The authorized plan provides for enlarging existing and constructing new channels - a total of 43.8 miles of channel work.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$7,036
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$7,036
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$1,056
Allocation for FY 2004	532
Allocation for FY 2005	428
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete After FY2006	4,723
Benefit to Cost Ratio (5 3/8%)	5.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 efforts consist of the development of the baseline hydrology and hydraulic, economic, and environmental baseline without project conditions for Willacy County. This information will be used to finalize the Flood Damage Analysis (FDA) Model facilitating the start of formulation of flood control measures.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2013, if optimal funding is provided.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Hidalgo County Drainage District (HCDD) #1 with the concurrence of Willacy County became the lead sponsor for the project on 17 April 2001 and subsequently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Galveston District on 18 September 2001. Under this agreement the project was reformulated to provide protection to portions of Hidalgo County, in the vicinity of Edinburg, Texas and to incorporate locally constructed flood control protection in Hidalgo County. The agreement also provided that the HCDD #1 would perform all work tasks and requirements for the development of the project features in Hidalgo County with USACE assuming the same for project features in Willacy County. There are three main concerns by the local sponsor that require legislative action. The concerns are 1) that the description of the authorized Raymondville project be revised to include the work from Edinburg, Texas through the Raymondville Drain.; 2) credit to the sponsor for both planning and design work and construction activities that the sponsor is undertaking for the

project features within Hidalgo County; and 3) consideration under the Ability to Pay provision contained in WRDA 96 or to have the non-Federal cost share reduced to 10%.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Hinojosa (TX-15), Doggett (TX-25), and Ortiz (TX-27).

DISTRICT: Galveston District

Date: February 24, 2006

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction.

STUDY NAME AND STATE: Roma Creek, Rio Grande Basin, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Study is under the authority of Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and House Resolution 2710, dated 21 May 2003.

LOCATION: The study area is located in and around the City of Roma, in Starr County, TX.

DESCRIPTION: The Arroyo Roma and the Arroyo Los Morenos along with backwater from the Rio Grande River have been identified as potential major sources of flooding in the City of Roma, Texas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,275
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,175
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 2,450
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,176
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2006: Finalize the Project Management Plan (PMP) and sign a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA), then begin the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: There has been recurrent flood damages to residents and businesses within the floodplains of the Arroyo Roma, Arroyo Los Morenos, and other associated tributaries. Based on the Texas Water Development Board population projection for the City of Roma, it is estimated that approximately 9,000 residents and 1,944 homes may be affected by a 100-year flood event. The City of Roma is one of the most economically depressed U.S. cities and will have to find its 50% share of feasibility cost from outside sources.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressman Doggett (TX-25).

DISTRICT: Galveston

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Trinity River Basin, TX

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Resolution adopted 22 April 1988.

LOCATION: The Upper Trinity River basin extends upstream from the confluence of the East Fork and the mainstem of the Trinity River, and has a drainage area of approximately 7,873 square miles and includes the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex.

DESCRIPTION: Preliminary watershed-wide feasibility investigations identified 88 measures for more detailed study. Subsequently, six supplemental scopes of work have been initiated with eleven cities, one county and one special district to undertake more complex studies for the purposes of addressing flood damage reduction, environmental restoration and recreation opportunities within these areas

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 16,810
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	16,000
Cash	6,654
Other	9,346
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 32,810
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 9,279
Allocation for FY 2004	907
Allocation for FY 2005	1,429
Conference Amount for FY 2006	800
Allocation for FY 2006	792
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,403
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Develop existing conditions for ecologic, engineering, real estate, cultural and hydrologic and hydraulic modeling for the Dallas Floodway and Stemmons North Industrial Corridor Interim Feasibility Study and Big Fossil Creek Watershed and complete the ongoing Central City Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision and Project Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion date for this feasibility study is 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The completion of the Dallas Floodway study is integral to the city of Dallas' plans and a delay in its completion will cause a delay in the implementation of the overall city plan for the achievement of environmental, recreational, mobility and economic opportunities for the neighborhoods bordering the Trinity River. The completion of the Big Fossil Watershed Interim Feasibility Study is very important to the nine local governments in the watershed and their desire to address flood damage reduction solutions, while identifying

associated water quality, ecosystem restoration and recreational opportunities.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Johnson, TX-3; Hall, TX-4; Hensarling, TX-5; Barton, TX-6; Granger, TX-12; Thornberry, TX-13; Edwards, TX-17; Neugebauer, TX-19; Marchant, TX-24; Burgess, TX-26; Johnson, TX-30; Sessions, TX-32.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

CONSTRUCTION

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Dover Dam, OH – Dam Safety Assurance

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act, Approved 11 August 1939

LOCATION: Tuscarawas County, Ohio, on the Tuscarawas River, a tributary of Muskingum River; 173.6 miles above the mouth of the Muskingum River.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes evaluation of detected hydrologic deficiency, structural instability, abutment erodibility, and significant dam failure impacts to population and the local economy.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 805
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 805
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	211
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation for FY 2006	594
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Conduct H&H studies to develop flood routings; perform structural engineering analyses to determine structural stability and evaluate alternatives; develop alternatives; develop cost estimates for alternatives; perform geotechnical studies to determine rock strengths and other parameters for stability analysis

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Voinovich (OH); DeWine (OH); Ney (OH-18)

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Greenbrier River Basin (Marlinton), WV

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 579 WRDA 1996, P.L. 104-303, as amended by Sec. 360 of WRDA 1999 P.L. 106-53

LOCATION: The Greenbrier River Basin (Marlinton) is located in eastern West Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: The river flows 167 miles through the counties of Pocahontas, Greenbrier, Monroe, and Summers. The basin has a drainage area of 1,641 square miles. The plan for Marlinton would consist of over 16,000 feet of levee/floodwall to be constructed on both sides of the river, protecting the downtown Marlinton and Riverside areas, and associated pump stations to handle interior drainage.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 84,150
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	9,350
Cash	9,350
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 93,500
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 5,537
Allocation for FY 2004	1,273
Allocation for FY 2005	1,812
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	73,548
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (<u>5 3/8%</u>)	0.55 to 1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	0.44 to 1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Phase II P&S; complete Phase III DDR and initiate P&S.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete PED for Phase II in FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Project authorization of \$47,000,000 needs to be increased to reflect current project cost estimate.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Byrd (WV), Rockefeller (WV), Rahall (WV-03)

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Indiana Shoreline, IN

AUTHORIZATION: Section 501(a), WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662), as amended.

LOCATION: The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is owned by the National Park Service and is located in state of Indiana.

DESCRIPTION: The project attempts to mitigate for littoral drift losses and erosion caused by the Michigan City Harbor structures. The project plan is to provide beach nourishment in the amount of 264,500 cubic yards at five-year intervals for 50 years.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006(\$000)</u>
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$184,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$184,000
Allocation to FY 2003	10,257
Allocation for FY 2004	773
Allocation for FY 2005	444
Allocation for FY 2006	272,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	172,254
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate and complete biological and physical monitoring and a full aerial survey of the shoreline.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2035

OTHER INFORMATION: The construction is being completed by the Corps of Engineers at 100 percent federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Visclosky (IN-1), Lugar (R-IN), Bayh (D-IN)

DISTRICT: Chicago

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood & Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Island Creek, Logan, WV, Local Protection Project

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662)

LOCATION: Logan, WV at the confluence of the Guyandotte River and Island Creek.

DESCRIPTION: Recommended project includes widening the Island Creek channel to an 80-foot bottom width for a distance of 3,600 feet upstream of its confluence with the Guyandotte River, construction of two retaining walls, and implementation of a flood warning system (FWS).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 16,017
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	9,744
Cash	1,373
Other	8,371
Total Estimated Cost	\$25,761
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 3,333
Allocation for FY 2004	56
Allocation for FY 2005	47
Conference Amount for FY 2006	305
Allocation for FY 2006	302
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	12,279
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	3.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.8

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Coordinate review and approval of General Reevaluation Report (GRR), coordinate review and approval of PCA, execute PCA, implement FWS and sponsor initiate acquisition of real estate.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction scheduled for completion in FY 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: GRR has not been approved by OASA(CW).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Byrd (WV), Rockefeller (WV), Rahall (WV-03)

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act of 1981 (PL 96-367).

LOCATION: The Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and the Upper Cumberland River are located in southwestern WV, southeastern KY, and western VA.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes levees, floodwalls, pump stations, the floodproofing and evacuation of structures located in the flood hazard areas; and development of relocation sites for the affected areas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,334,471 <u>1/</u>
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	133,365
Cash	(100,965)
Other	(32,400)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,467,545
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 840,388 <u>1/</u>
Allocation for FY 2004	55,430
Allocation for FY 2005	35,308
Conference Amount for FY 2006	31,100
Allocation for FY 2006	30,789 <u>2/</u>
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,372,556
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	(N/A)
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	(N/A)

1/ Includes \$850K paid by Judgment Fund for settled claim.

2/ Reflects a \$311K rescission.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue each element of the Section 202 program as listed:

Kentucky

Town of Martin: Continue Phase 1 construction, continue real estate activities and initiate school design

Pike County (Tug Fork): Continue voluntary floodproofing and acquisition program

Martin County: Continue voluntary floodproofing and acquisition program

Pike County (Levisa Fork): Headquarter and OASA review of DPR, Initiate development of the PCA

Floyd County: Continue DPR

Johnson County: Continue DPR

Clover Fork: Continue nonstructural implementation.

City of Cumberland: Continue implementation.

Harlan County: Continue implementation.

Middlesbough: Complete construction.

Bell County: Funds are being used to continue the DPR.

Knox County: Funds are being used to continue the DPR.

Whitley County: None.

Virginia

Grundy, VA: Initial construction of the ringwall (Phase 1), continue voluntary floodproofing and acquisition program, continue VDOT US460 relocations contract, initiate police station relocation, complete pedestrian bridge design and complete the levee/ringwall tie-in design (Phase II).

Buchanan County: Complete ringwall design for schools.

Dickenson County: Executed PCA, initiate school relocation design.

West Virginia

McDowell County: Continue voluntary floodproofing and acquisition, complete Kimball Town Hall/Fire Station relocation, complete detailed design/plans and specs on schools and initiate construction on schools.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Ongoing subject to future appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: Congress, in Section 202 of the Fiscal Year 1981 Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act, stated that benefits of the 202 project exceed costs.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Byrd and Rockefeller (WV), Rahall (WV-03); Senators McConnell and Bunning (KY), Rogers (KY-5); Senators Allen and Warner (VA), Boucher (VA-09)

DISTRICT: Huntington and Nashville

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lower Mud River, Milton, WV

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 580 WRDA 1996 (PL 104-30); Sec 340 WRDA 2000 (PL 106-54)

LOCATION: City of Milton, located in Cabell County, WV, on the Mud River

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan is a levee, approximately 8,300 feet long, which would provide protection from a 250 year flood event

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 38,850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,950
Cash	2,823
Other	10,127
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 51,800
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 2,317
Allocation for FY 2004	1,270
Allocation for FY 2005	411
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,250
Allocation for FY 2006	1,238
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	33,624
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (<u>5 3/8%</u>)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue with Detailed Design Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete DDR in first quarter of FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Limited re-evaluation report to Division for approval this FY.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rahall (WV-03), Byrd (WV), Rockefeller (WV)

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ohio River Greenway Public Access, Indiana

AUTHORIZATION: Section 559, WRDA 96 (P.L. 104-303)

LOCATION: The Ohio River Greenway Corridor is seven miles in length, is located across from Louisville, Kentucky, and adjoins the McAlpine Locks and Dam project and the Falls of the Ohio National Wildlife Conservation Area in the Indiana communities of Jeffersonville, Clarksville, and New Albany.

DESCRIPTION: This project will enhance public access to the amenities of the Ohio River in the vicinity of an existing local flood protection project. The local flood protection project continues to serve its function; however, it separates or cuts off the communities from the riverfront and provides them with limited access for operation and maintenance of the facilities. If constructed today, the project would provide the local communities opportunities to more efficiently operate and maintain the existing flood control facilities and provide better access to environmental and other amenities of the Ohio River. Federal participation in discrete recreation facilities is authorized, but these facilities will not be implemented as part of the project. The main project features consist of a vehicular parkway, pedestrian and multi-use paths, a bridge, and two levee cuts for additional access to the river.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 20,850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	20,850
Cash	14,338
Other	6,512
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 41,700
Allocation thru 2003	1,986
Allocation for FY 2004	533
Allocation for FY 2005	1,599
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	14,752
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (6.875%)	1.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds of \$1,980,000 will be used to complete construction of the Jeffersonville segment (\$580,000) and to initiate and complete construction of the New Albany segment (\$1,400,000).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If funding is made available each year, construction will be complete in FY 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project was in the President's budget in fiscal years 2001 through 2005. The project was suspended in FY 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lugar (IN), Bayh (IN), Sodrel (IN-9)

DISTRICT: Louisville

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction, General
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Presque Isle Peninsula, PA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 501, WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662)

LOCATION: Presque Isle, PA

DESCRIPTION: Presque Isle Peninsula is a State Park located in the city of Erie, Erie County, Pennsylvania, on the southern shore of Lake Erie. The initial shoreline stabilization project, completed in 1992, constructed 55 rubblemound breakwaters and placed 560,000 tons of sand. Through 2042, approximately 55,000 tons of new sand will be required to nourish the beaches each year.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	STAGE I	STAGE II
	Initial Construction	Periodic Re-nourishment
Estimated Federal Cost	\$13,435	\$42,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,435	42,100
Cash	13,435	42,100
Other	0	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$26,870	\$84,200

Allocation thru 2003	\$13,435	\$5,640
Allocation for FY 2004		485
Allocation for FY 2005		276
Conference Amount for FY 2006		465
Allocation for FY 2006		465
Balance to Complete after FY 200		\$33,825
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5-3/8%)		
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Work is to perform annual beach re-nourishment in the 14th year of a 50 year cost shared project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: 2042

OTHER INFORMATION: Federal funding has been at lower than required levels in the past two years although the FY06 Conference allocation (\$465,000) is greater than funding in FY05 (\$276,000). Decreased funding is impacting the performance of the storm damage reduction project and is impacting stakeholder relationship.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Santorum (PA); Spector (PA); English (PA-21)

DISTRICT: Buffalo

Date: 26 January 2006

**FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: W. Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, WV and PA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 581, WRDA 1996 as amended by Section 363, WRDA 1999.

LOCATION: West Virginia and Pennsylvania

DESCRIPTION: Section 581, as modified by Section 363, authorizes the Corps to design and construct flood control measures in the Cheat and Tygart River Basins, WV and to implement structural and nonstructural flood control, stream bank protection, stormwater management, and channel clearing and modification measures in the Lower Allegheny, Lower Monongahela, West Branch Susquehanna and Juniata River Basins, PA, at a level of protection sufficient to prevent future losses to communities in the basins from flooding such as occurred in January 1996, but not less than a 100 year level of protection. Section 581(b) of WRDA 1996 identified 16 communities in the above river basins as priority communities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) Study & PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 90,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 6,000
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 96,000
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 8,867
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ -50
Allocations for FY 2005	\$ 444
Conference Amount for FY2006	\$ 750
FY2006 Allocation	\$ 742
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$79,997
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%):	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES(LRP Only): Complete Parsons, WV PMP; Continue with Philippi, WV PED; and continue with Belington, WV Feasibility Study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Parsons, WV Feasibility FY 2008; Philippi, WV PED FY 2007; and Belington, WV Feasibility Study FY 2007, all funding dependent.

OTHER INFORMATION: The amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to Section 581, as amended, is \$12,000,000. This is the maximum federal participation unless modified by later law. Existing remaining authority based on current allocations thru FY 2006 is \$4,182,000. A total authorized amount of \$90,000,000 is required to complete work for currently identified projects over the next 10 years and is being considered for WRDA inclusion. \$13,150,000 has been previously appropriated of which allocations thru FY 2006 is \$10,003,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mollohan (WV-1), Murtha (PA-12) and Shuster (PA-9)

DISTRICT: Pittsburgh

Date: 26 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Bois Brule Levee and Drainage District, Missouri

AUTHORIZATION: FCA 36 and 65; WRDA 99; E&WDAA 02

LOCATION: The project is located on the right bank of the Mississippi River and is predominately in Perry County, Missouri but has a small part in Randolph County, Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The existing project consists of 33.1 miles of levee, 341 relief wells and 4 pump stations. The deficiency correction work will provide additional underseepage control measures in the form of 297 relief wells, seepage berms, and a seepage cutoff trench; ditching and culvert improvements; three additional pump stations; and restoring the elevation of some parts of the back levee.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,420
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	620
Cash	(0)
Other	(620)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 26,040
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,399
Allocation for FY 2004	913
Allocation for FY 2005	1,328
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,810
Allocation for FY 2006	1,792
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	19,988
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.125%)	1.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to construct 25 additional relief wells, award a new relief well construction contract in June 2006 and construct 16 relief wells; prepare plans and specifications for the embankments and ditching contract; and work with the sponsor on land acquisition efforts for the embankments and ditching contract and the pump stations contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project cooperation agreement for the deficiency correction work was executed 21 April 2004.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Inconsistent with Administration Policy.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Emerson (MO-8); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Breckenridge, Minnesota

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 320, WRDA 00

LOCATION: Breckenridge is located in Wilkin County along the Red River of the North, which divides Breckenridge, Minnesota from Wahpeton, North Dakota.

DESCRIPTION: Overland flooding from the Red River of the North causes frequent and significant flood related problems for the city. The project includes a diversion channel and a system of levees to protect the city from flood related damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 13,170
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,830
Cash	(1,097)
Other	(7,733)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 22,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 3,563
Allocation for FY 2004	4,688
Allocation for FY 2005	422
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,125
Allocation for FY 2006	1,114
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	3,383
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 5/8%)	1.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to finalize contractor payments on Stage 1 and continue Stage 2 plans and specifications for levee features.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Existing local levees provide marginal protection due to their incomplete coverage and unreliable condition. Failure of these existing levees during a large flood could cause catastrophic damages. The City of Breckenridge is very concerned about the adequacy of the levee system. During the 1997 flood, over \$35 million in flood damages were experienced in Breckenridge. Construction of the project is closely linked to construction of the Wahpeton, North Dakota, Section 205 project; the two projects must be constructed concurrently. Inadequate Federal funding for Breckenridge is delaying both projects. The State of Minnesota is very supportive of a permanent flood control project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Peterson (MN-7) and Pomeroy (ND-AL); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN) and Conrad and Dorgan (ND).

DISTRICT: St. Paul District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Cape Girardeau (Floodwall), MO

AUTHORIZATION: Section 204, FCA 50; E&WDAA 04; E&WDAA 05.

LOCATION: The project is located on the right bank of the Mississippi River flood plain between river miles 51.6 and 52.8 above the Ohio River in Missouri.

DESCRIPTION: The area protected by the Cape Girardeau flood protection project lies within the corporate limits of the City of Cape Girardeau, Missouri. The overall length of the project is 8,240 feet consisting of 2,175 feet of levee; 6,065 feet of floodwall; 2 pumping stations; 5 closure structures; and other appurtenant structures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 9,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 9,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	497
Allocation for FY 2005	745
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,461
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to finalize Engineering Documentation Report; complete design for rock berm to stabilize existing retaining wall, floodwall work (joint repairs and toe drain replacement), and pump stations (mechanical, electrical, and miscellaneous structural work); and coordinate the Project Cooperation Agreement with the sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Local sponsorship currently is provided by two levee districts. City of Cape Girardeau is working with the levee districts to assume project sponsorship. PCA will be executed with the city.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Emerson (MO-8); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Chesterfield, MO

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b)(18), WRDA 00.

LOCATION: The Chesterfield project is located along the right bank of the Missouri River between river miles 46 and 38.5.

DESCRIPTION: The existing private levee system is 11.5 miles and protects approximately 4,240 acres from the 100-year flood event. During the Great Flood of 1993, the existing levee failed causing flood damages in excess of \$200,000,000. The project consists of raising the existing levees on the Missouri River and Bonhomme Creek to provide protection from a 500-year flood event along with relief wells, a sheet pile cutoff, and berms to control underseepage. Other features include roadways, railroad and roadway closure structures, retaining walls, relocations, pumping stations with gravity structures, and environmental mitigation features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 44,647
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	24,041
Cash	(3,434)
Other	(20,607)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 68,688
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 883
Allocation for FY 2004	295
Allocation for FY 2005	275
Conference Amount for FY 2006	900
Allocation for FY 2006	891
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	42,303
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.625%)	1.93
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.48

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to execute a Project Cooperation Agreement in the third quarter and, pending the sponsor's acquisition of all necessary real estate interests, initiate construction of Baxter Road Closure Structure in the fourth quarter.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Expected final clearance of the feasibility study with addenda and the signing of the EIS Record of Decision should place the project in accord with administration policy this fiscal year. Under Section 104 of WRDA 1986, the local sponsor, the Monarch-Chesterfield Levee District received three credit applications for work: (1) construction of three pump stations within the protected area, (2) levee improvement from Centaur Road to Interstate 64/U.S. 40, and (3) realignment of the levee near Boone's Crossing interchange and levee improvement along the left bank of Bonhomme Creek. The sponsors have expressed an interest in seeking legislative assistance for credit for post-authorization work they have completed. Recent analysis identified potential induced flooding to eleven specific structures as a result of raising the levee from the existing 100-year elevation to the 500-year elevation. Two structures will require protection using minor floodwalls and embankments, and three properties will require flowage easements

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Akin (MO-2); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Comite River, Louisiana

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 101(11), WRDA 92; 301 (b) (5), WRDA 96; Sec 371, WRDA 99.

LOCATION: The Comite River is tributary of the Amite River east of Baton Rouge, LA. The project is located between the Comite and Mississippi Rivers north of the Town of Baker, LA, and south of the Town of Zachary, LA.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for the construction of a 12-mile-long diversion channel providing flood protection for the residents of the Comite River Basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$114,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	49,000
Cash	(8,390)
Other	(40,610)
Total Estimated Cost	163,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 17,511
Allocation for FY 2004	4,153
Allocation for FY 2005	8,070
Conference Amount for FY 2006	6,254
Allocation for FY 2006	6,191
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	78,075
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	3.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue construction of Lilly Bayou Control Structure (LBCS) Phase II, and continue plans and specifications for highway bridges, drop structures, and other project features.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funding in FY 2006 is not adequate to fully support the continued construction of the Lilly Bayou Control Structure or the design of other project features.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: East Baton Rouge Parish, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 101(11), WRDA 92; Sec 301(b)(5), WRDA 96; Sec 101(a)(21), WRDA 99; Sec 116, CAA 03.

LOCATION: The project area lies between the Mississippi and Amite Rivers in the Baton Rouge metropolitan area.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of approximately 66 miles of channels in five sub-basins within East Baton Rouge Parish, LA. The five sub-basins are Blackwater Bayou and its tributaries; Beaver Bayou; Jones Creek and tributaries; Ward Creek and its tributaries; and Bayou Fountain. The purpose of the project is to reduce flooding by channel modifications in the five watersheds.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 CONSTRUCTION (\$000)</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$122,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	65,000
Cash	(42,000)
Other	(23,000)
Total Estimated Cost	\$187,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 4,072
Allocation for FY 2004	403
Allocation for FY 2005	421
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	116,362
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%)	2.59
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The project cooperation agreement (PCA) will be negotiated in FY 2006 subject to re-authorization based on the Post Authorization Change (PAC) report presenting revised work-in-kind features. Funds will also be used to complete the P&S on Jones Creek contract #1 and continue engineering, and detailed design report on Ward Creek.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The non-Federal sponsor (East Baton Rouge Parish) had requested to be grandfathered to pre-WRDA 96 cost sharing (i.e., minimum non-Federal share of 25 percent); however, that language was not included in the WRDA 96 language or subsequent bills. East Baton Rouge Parish has agreed to negotiate the PCA at WRDA 96 cost sharing (minimum non-Federal share of 35 percent), but continues to request pre-WRDA 96 cost sharing. A PAC report was prepared to demonstrate the authorized project was still economically justified in light of significant project cost increases that had occurred since completion of the feasibility study in 1996 and to support authorization for non-Federal interests to perform additional work-in-kind.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana

AUTHORIZATION: Phase I - Sec 204, FCA 1965; Phase II - Sec 301(b)(6), WRDA 1996; Sec 410, WRDA 1999; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located in the town of Grand Isle, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: Grand Isle is a low-lying barrier island located along the Gulf of Mexico in Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, approximately 50 miles south of New Orleans, Louisiana.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 36,949
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,834
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 49,783
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 20,819
Allocation for FY 2004	372
Allocation for FY 2005	66
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	675
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	668
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	15,024
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	15,024
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) funds to complete the project at full Federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, LA (Hurricane Protection)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 204, FCA 65; Sec 92, WRDA 74; Sec 805, WRDA 86; Sec 116(k), WRDA 90; Sec 102, WRDA 92; Sec 325, WRDA 96; Sec 432, WRDA 00; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located in St. Bernard, Orleans, Jefferson, St. Tammany, and St. Charles Parishes in Southeast Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides hurricane protection adjacent to Lake Pontchartrain.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$581,971
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	159,989
Total Estimated Cost	\$741,960
Allocations Thru FY 2003	\$445,238
Allocation for FY 2004	7,274
Allocation for FY 2005	4,945
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	4,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	3,960
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for CG)	25,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for CG)	25,000
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	120,554
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	120,554
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.125)	9.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)	5.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue construction on authorized project features; rehabilitate and repair the project related to the consequences of hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico; and accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) funds (\$120,554) to complete the project at full Federal expense; and, additional Construction, General (CG) funds (\$25,000) to rehabilitate and repair Corps projects related to the consequences of hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean in 2005. The additional CG funds are not reflected in the project cost estimate.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Larose to Golden Meadow, LA (Hurricane Protection)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 204, FCA 65; Sec 325, WRDA 99; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located about 30 miles southwest of New Orleans, along Bayou Lafourche between the communities of Larose and Golden Meadow in Lafourche Parish, Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of navigable floodgates in Bayou Lafourche at Larose and at Golden Meadow along with approximately 40 miles of ring levee.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$83,458
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	33,284
Total Estimated Cost	\$116,742
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$77,886
Allocation for FY 2004	356
Allocation for FY 2005	448
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	750
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	742
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	4,026
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	4,026
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3.25%)	119.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	94.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Leon Theriot Lock has been authorized as part of the Larose to Golden Meadow project. Currently awaiting legislative authorization to allow the Leon Theriot Lock to be constructed as work-in-kind credit. The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) funds to complete the project at full Federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Meramec River Basin, Valley Park Levee, MO

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 2(h), PL 97-128; Sec 1128, WRDA 86; Sec 333, WRDA 99; Sec 146, E&WDAA 04.

LOCATION: The project is located in St. Louis County, Missouri, adjacent to the left descending bank of the Meramec River at river mile 21 above the confluence with the Mississippi River.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes 3.2 miles of levee with 3 feet of freeboard above the 100-year flood profile, 6 gravity drains, 3 closure structures, 5 detention areas, 41 relief wells, and environmental mitigation. A portion of the levee consists of an "engineered fill" composed of a clay cap surrounding a fill made from crushed material from an abandoned glass plant in the path of the levee.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 36,905
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,523
Cash	(2,478)
Other	(10,045)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 49,428 ^{1/}
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 20,525
Allocation for FY 2004	4,219
Allocation for FY 2005	5,545
Conference Amount for FY 2006	7,582
Allocation for FY 2006	7,506
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	-890 ^{1/}
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (8.875%)	1.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	38.1

^{1/} Update of final cost estimate is pending financial close-out of project.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the final flood protection contract and pay contractor for FY 2005 and FY 2006 work; finalize plan for bottomland hardwoods mitigation and award mitigation contract or purchase credits from a mitigation bank in September 2006; award purchase orders for miscellaneous repairs needed prior to turning the project over to sponsor; submit hydraulics and mapping data to FEMA for updating flood insurance maps and rates; complete OMRRR manual and as-built drawings; finalize all LERRDs credits except pending lawsuit about condemnation compensation; conduct audit of LERRDs credits.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 President's budget reflected completion in FY 2006. However, \$200,000 of FY 2006 funds will be carried over for final mitigation, miscellaneous repairs, and hired labor efforts required to close out the project in FY 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Akin (MO-2); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO)

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Natchez Bluff, MS

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96

LOCATION: The project is located in Natchez, Mississippi, and extends along the bluff line for approximately 1 mile from "Natchez Under-the-Hill," located just north of the U.S. Highway 84 bridge at river mile 363.3, to the intersection of Park Avenue with Clifton Avenue.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for stabilizing the bluff by constructing a stable foundation and rebuilding the bluff face using a combination of retaining walls and reinforced earth techniques. There are four designated work reaches: Clifton Avenue-Learned Mill Road, Area 3; Madison Street to State Street, Area 4; Bluff Above Silver Street, Area 6; and Bluff Above "Natchez Under-the-Hill," Area 7. The City of Natchez is the project sponsor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$15,539
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,062
Cash	(5,355)
Other	(707)
Total Estimated Cost	\$21,601
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$14,993
Allocation for FY 2004	- 1
Allocation for FY 2005	300
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	247
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete construction and prepare O&M manual. Construction is scheduled for completion in February 2006. The project is scheduled to be turned over to the non-Federal sponsor in September 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Corps of Engineers entered into a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with the city of Natchez on 4 March 1998 for construction of Area 3, the Clifton Avenue to Learned Mill Road portion of the Natchez Bluffs Project. In July 2000, problems associated with the installation and use of the drainage system were identified. This resulted in modification of the drainage system design on the subsequent work items 4, 6, and 7. Corrugated metal pipe was utilized in lieu of polyethylene pipe. These items are all functioning as designed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Pickering (MS-3); Sen: Cochran and Lott (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: New Orleans to Venice, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 203, FCA 62; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located in Plaquemines Parish along the east bank of the Mississippi River from Phoenix, LA, down to Bohemia, LA, and along the west bank of the river from St. Jude, LA, down to Venice, LA.

DESCRIPTION: Features include levees, floodwalls, and a floodgate. The project provides protection from hurricane tidal overflow. On the west side of the Mississippi River, the project consists of enlarging ~3 miles of existing back levee between St. Jude and City Price, LA; enlarging ~13 miles of existing back levee between City Price and Tropical Bend, LA (Reach A); enlarging ~12 miles of existing back levee between Tropical Bend, LA, and Fort Jackson, LA; and constructing a floodgate at Empire, LA (Reach B-1); enlarging ~ 9 miles of existing back levee between Fort Jackson and Venice, LA (Reach B-2); and enlarging ~ 34 miles of existing Mississippi River levee (West Bank River Levee). On the east side of the Mississippi River, the project consists of enlarging ~ 16 miles of existing back levee between Phoenix and Bohemia, LA (Reach C).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$189,021
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	66,652
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$255,673
Allocations Thru FY 2003	\$150,951
Allocation for FY 2004	1,813
Allocation for FY 2005	1,097
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	2,700
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	2,673
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	32,487
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	32,487
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3%)	6.82
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) funds to complete the project at full Federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Nutwood Drainage and Levee District, IL

AUTHORIZATION: Section 203, FCA 62

LOCATION: The Nutwood Drainage and Levee District protects 10,360 acres of primarily agricultural land located in Greene and Jersey Counties, Illinois, on the left bank of the Illinois River between river miles 15.2 and 23.7 above the mouth of the Illinois River.

DESCRIPTION: This Federally constructed levee provides protection for a 20-year recurrence interval flood. During the flood of 1993, the levee was breached completely, inundating the area and causing a disruption of traffic on Illinois Routes 100 and 16 for over three months. The recommended plan of improvement for this project includes reconstruction of 11.4 miles of existing levees, construction of approximately one-quarter mile of new levee, improved pumping capabilities, and construction of seepage control measures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 12,043
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,015
Cash	(1,413)
Other	(2,602)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 16,058
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,422
Allocation for FY 2004	117
Allocation for FY 2005	89
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	10,217
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.625%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue efforts in obtaining the "Construction in Illinois Floodways" permit from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), Office of Water Resources (OWR).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: IDNR-OWR's approval and issuance of a permit are needed prior to execution of a Project Cooperation Agreement and initiating construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Evans (IL-17); Sen: Durbin and Obama (IL)

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ouachita River Levees, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 1 and Sec 6, FCA 28; Sec 5, FCA 36; and Sec 101 FCA 50.

LOCATION: The Ouachita River levee system is located in northeast Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: The levee system is comprised of three separate levee segments totaling 11.5 miles on the west bank at West Monroe, Bawcomville, and Columbia and 105.8 miles of levee on the east bank from Bastrop to Sandy Bayou. The recommended plan consists of rehabilitation of existing levees and raising a portion of the levee to the 1956 project design grade.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$30,198
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,945
Cash	(654)
Other	(4,291)
Total Estimated Cost	35,143
Allocations thru FY 2003	24,874
Allocation for FY 2004	1,822
Allocation for FY 2005	800
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,960
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3-1/4%)	9.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to initiate Phase I of gravel surfacing in the Monroe to Sandy Bayou reach. Contract is scheduled to be awarded in July 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Ouachita River Levees are critical to the lives and property of the citizens in the Monroe-West Monroe urban area. The Item 2 levee enlargement in the Bastrop to Monroe reach will provide the authorized level of protection to the Monroe urban area. The resurfacing of the levee in the Monroe to Sandy Bayou Reach will ensure that the levee can be inspected and maintained during severe flood events such as experienced in FY 2001.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Alexander (LA-5); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River Below Denison Dam, LA, AR & TX

AUTHORIZATION: FCA 46; E&WDAA 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 02, 03.

LOCATION: Project facilities are located along the Red River from the vicinity of Index, AR, to Boyce, LA, along the right bank, and to Pineville, LA, along the left bank.

DESCRIPTION: The overall project provides flood damage reduction for about 1.7 million acres, half of which are located behind levees. The project protects the flood plain from crop damage; loss of livestock; damage to levees, railroads, highways, industries, and other river and urban developments. The authorized project provides for enlargement and/or rehabilitation of existing levees and construction of new levees or bank protection or channel realignment where levee setbacks are impossible or uneconomical.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$87,233
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,241
Cash	(0)
Other	(3,241)
Total Estimated Cost	\$90,471
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$82,864
Allocation for FY 2004	1,356
Allocation for FY 2005	43
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,000
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to award contract for gravel resurfacing of Louisiana levees currently scheduled for April 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Fully funded in FY 2006 with physical completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Ross (AR-4) and Alexander (LA-5); Sen: Lincoln and Pryor (AR); Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southeast Louisiana, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 533, WRDA 96 and WRDA 99; Sec 108, E&WDAA 96; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located on the east bank of the Mississippi River in Orleans Parish, and on the east and west banks of the river in Jefferson Parish. St. Tammany Parish work is located in and around the communities of Slidell, Mandeville, Covington, Madisonville, Abita Springs, and Lacombe.

DESCRIPTION: In Orleans Parish, work includes improving five major drainage lines, adding pumping capacity to two pump stations, and adding a new pump station. In Jefferson Parish, work includes improvements to about twenty-four drainage canals, additional pumping capacity for four pump stations, and the addition of two new pump stations. Improvements in St. Tammany Parish include channel enlargements, retention ponds, levees, and elevation of flood-prone structures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$666,688
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	104,042
Total Estimated Cost	\$770,730
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$355,821
Allocation for FY 2004	26,956
Allocation for FY 2005	32,426
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	27,000
Allocation FY 2006 (E&WD)	26,730
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	224,755
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for FCCE)	224,755
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.625%)	2.66
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.50

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) funds to complete the project at full Federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Ste. Genevieve, MO

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 401(a), WRDA 86

LOCATION: The project is located in Ste. Genevieve County, Missouri, adjacent to the west bank of the Mississippi River between miles 121 and 125 above the confluence of the Ohio River.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a 3.5 mile long levee that provides Urban Design Flood protection from Mississippi River flooding; a gravity drain pump station facility with a 575 cubic feet per second capacity and three electric-powered pumps; a 505-acre ponding area; interior drainage ditching and grading; two closure structures, road, railroad, and utility relocations; 24 relief wells; tree screens; an environmental mitigation area; and other features. The authorized project includes channel widening and one small levee along North and South Gabouri Creeks and recreation facilities such as picnic areas and trails on flood control lands along the tributary improvements and the levee.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$36,097
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,850
Cash	(4,643)
Other	(9,207)
Total Estimated Cost	\$49,947
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$30,368
Allocation for FY 2004	159
Allocation for FY 2005	194
Conference Amount for FY 2006	550
Allocation for FY 2006	544
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,832
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8 1/4%)	1.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the final operation and maintenance manuals and as-built drawings, financially close out the Urban Design Levee, and complete the draft General Reevaluation Report currently scheduled for September 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The benefit cost ratio and remaining benefit remaining cost ratio are 1.0 based on the authorizing documentation which states: ".....Congress finds that, in view of the historic preservation benefits resulting from the project, the overall benefits of the project exceed the costs of the project."

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Carnahan (MO-3); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: West Bank and Vicinity, New Orleans, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 401 (b), WRDA 86; Sec 101(a) (17) and 101 (b) (11), WRDA 96; Sec 328, WRDA 99; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located on the west bank of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of New Orleans in Jefferson, Orleans, and Plaquemines Parishes.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides hurricane protection to Westwego to Harvey Canal area (22 miles of levees and floodwalls); Lake Cataouatche area (12 miles of levees and floodwalls); and East of Harvey Canal area, both East and West of Algiers Canal (24 miles of levees and floodwalls and a navigable floodgate).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006(\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$304,459
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	54,261
Total Estimated Cost	\$358,720
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 82,191
Allocation for FY 2004	21,181
Allocation for FY 2005	25,753
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	28,000
Allocation FY 2006 (E&WD)	27,720
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp FCCE)	147,614
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp FCCE)	147,614
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.75%)	12.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	14.8

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accelerate the completion of unconstructed portions of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), and Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Wood River Drainage and Levee District, Illinois

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 4, FCA 38; Sec 204, FCA 65.

LOCATION: The project area lies in the Mississippi River floodplain of Madison County, Illinois, just upstream of the City of St. Louis.

DESCRIPTION: The original project provided for local flood protection works. The project was modified to provide for the construction of a 45 cfs pumping station with ditches and necessary appurtenant facilities for removal of water impounded by the existing levee. The project plan includes a pump station, collector ditches, and three relief wells. It also provides for the modification of an existing gravity drain.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,098
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	365
Cash	(244)
Other	(121)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,463
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 184
Allocation for FY 2004	57
Allocation for FY 2005	53
Conference Amount for FY 2006	590
Allocation for FY 2006	584
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	220
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375 %)	1.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The Project Cooperation Agreement was executed 28 October 2005. Funds are being used to complete design and award pumping station contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Costello (IL-12) and Shimkus (IL-19); Sen: Durbin and Obama (IL).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Francis Bland Floodway Ditch (Eight Mile Creek), AR

AUTHORIZATION: 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act and WRDA 1986, Section 103.

LOCATION: The project is located in Greene and Craighead Counties, AR

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of 12.4 miles of channel improvement (4.4 miles urban and 8.0 miles rural). It will provide flood damage protection from the 100-year flood for the urban area of Paragould, AR.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 15,062
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,738
Cash	(1,040)
Other	(4,698)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 20,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 8,874
Allocation for FY 2004	572
Allocation for FY 2005	1,083
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,274
Allocation for FY 2006	3,241
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,292
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.875%):	5.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	6.9

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete channel enlargement Item 2, Phase 2 – awarded May 05.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Scheduled completion of final phase of construction (Item 2, Phase 2) is September 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Final phase of construction is on schedule.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Berry (AR-1). Senate: Lincoln and Pryor (AR).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Nonconnah Creek, TN & MS

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1986, Section 401; WRDA 2000, Section 334.

LOCATION: The Nonconnah Creek Project is located in southern Shelby County in southwest Tennessee.

DESCRIPTION: It provides flood protection for approximately half of the City of Memphis and consists of five separable elements. The flood control element consists of 7.7 miles of channel enlargement and 10.5 miles of channel clearing. The environmental element is a 33-acre nature area and the recreational element consists of 8.8 miles bike/hike trails and 0.8-mile nature trail. WRDA 2000 conditionally authorized a 5-mile extension of the flood control element and an addition of 18.2 miles of bike/hike trails to the recreational element, if the Secretary finds the work justified.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 27,890
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	10,846
Cash	(5,072)
Other	(5,774)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 38,736
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 16,981
Allocation for FY 2004	1,709
Allocation for FY 2005	818
Conference Amount for FY 2006	470
Allocation for FY 2006	465
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,923
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.875%):	0.75
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to examine options to initiating Item 2, Phase 1 channel improvements.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction completion of Item 2, Phase 1 in FY 2008 is dependent on successful resolution of water quality issues and funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Limited Reevaluation Report for the authorized environmental & recreation elements was approved on 30 March 2004. However, the City of Memphis deferred amendment of the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) pending a reassessment of the need for these elements. The authorized flood control and recreation extensions study is complete. The study produced no viable flood control option in the extension area and no work is programmed for these elements.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Ford (TN-9), Blackburn (TN-7). Senators: Alexander and Frist, (TN);

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Francis Basin and Tributaries, AR & MO

AUTHORIZATION: FCA's 1928 (Sec 10); 1936 (Sec 4 & 8a); 1938 (Sec 2); 1941 (Sec 3e); 1944 (Sec 3); 1946 (Sec 3 and Sec 10q); 1950 (Sec 204); 1958 (Sec 203); 1965 (Sec 204); 1968 (Sec 203); WRDA 1974 (Sec 42); Omnibus 2001 (Sec 104), PL 106-554 authorized the project for flood protection and control of headwater and backwater floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.

LOCATION: The project is in southeastern Missouri and northeastern Arkansas

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for protection against headwater floods and backwater flooding of the Mississippi River by means of a detention reservoir at Wappapello Lake, MO, improvements to the St. Francis and Little Rivers and their tributaries, levee construction, pumping plants, a siphon, water level control structures and a floodgate.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 445,470
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,876
Cash	(0)
Other	(1,876)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 447,346
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 383,568
Allocation for FY 2004	6,003
Allocation for FY 2005	5,357
Conference Amount for FY 2006	6,800
Allocation for FY 2006	6,732
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	43,810
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2.5%):	2.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	2.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to continue the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) for Upper 10 & 15 Mile Bayou (10 Mile Diversion, Ditch 15 and upper 10 & 15 Mile Bayous); complete U. S. Hwy 79 Bridge – awarded September 98; and St. Francis County Bridge at 15 Mile Bayou mile 13.8 – awarded August 03; initiate Crittenden County Bridge at 15 Mile Bayou mile 18.8 – awarded November 05; continue 15 Mile Bayou channel enlargement, Item 1 - awarded May 05; Buffalo Island Outlet Structure – awarded September 05; acquire rights-of-way on Pigot Seepage Demo; construction management and engineering and design.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: GRR on Upper 10 & 15 Mile Bayous is scheduled to be completed in 2008; construction on 10 & 15 mile Bayou channel enlargement, item 1, County Bridge 18.8 and Buffalo Island Outlet could be completed in FY 2007 if funds are available.

OTHER INFORMATION: The cost of \$1,164,000 for a decision document on Upper 10 & 15 Mile Bayou was added to the project cost.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Berry AR-1, Emerson MO-8. Senate: Pryor and Lincoln (AR); Bond and Talent (MO)

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: West Tennessee Tributaries, TN

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 203, FCA 1948(project construction); Sec 207, R&HA 1966 (relocation of gas transmission lines at Federal expense); Sec 3, WRDA 1974 (acquisition of 32,000 acres of mitigation lands); Sec 183, WRDA 1976 (levee construction east of authorized diversion channel).

LOCATION: This is a flood damage reduction project located along the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers and tributaries in west Tennessee, in Weakley, Madison, Gibson, Obion, Dyer, Crockett, Lauderdale and Haywood Counties, Tennessee.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of 225 miles of channel improvements; construction of 7.6 miles of levees; 174 water control structures; 216 erosion control structures; 37 miles of water management connector channels to restore bottomland hardwoods and fisheries; and the acquisition of 32,000 acres of mitigation lands.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 169,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,400
Cash	(0)
Other	(5,400)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 175,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 54,299
Allocation for FY 2004	85
Allocation for FY 2005	78
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	114,890
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2.5%):	1.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to initiate a reevaluation of a demonstration project along the Obion River System to alleviate unresolved water resource problems in the west Tennessee area.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: A preliminary draft Limited Reevaluation Report could be completed in FY 2007, if funded.

OTHER INFORMATION: Only 93 miles of the authorized channel improvements have been completed and 13,527 acres of the mitigation lands purchased. There have been a number of obstacles associated with this project, including denial of water quality by the state of Tennessee and lawsuits challenging the EIS. In 1992, the state of Tennessee asked that the project be reactivated with efforts focused on developing an environmentally sensitive design. Two demonstration projects were found to be feasible in 1996; however, activities were stalled due to issues regarding mitigation land acquisition. In 1993, the sponsor requested that the Corps undertake a reevaluation of a demonstration project along the Obion River System.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Tanner (TN-8). Senate: Frist and Alexander (TN).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Yazoo Backwater Less Rocky Bayou, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCAs 41 and 44 authorize the construction of a levee and pumping plants to protect a portion of the Yazoo Basin against all but large floods of the Mississippi and define flood control as including channel and major drainage improvements.

LOCATION: The Yazoo Backwater Project lies in the southern part of the Delta in west-central Mississippi.

DESCRIPTION: It is situated between the mainline Mississippi River levee and the escarpment which forms the eastern boundary of the Delta and is subject to backwater flooding from the Mississippi River. It extends from just north of Vicksburg approximately 60 miles to the vicinity of Hollandale and Belzoni, MS, and comprises about 2,000 square miles.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$203,550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	150
Cash	(150)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	203,700
Allocations thru FY 03	59,294
Allocation for FY 04	100
Allocation for FY 05	10
Conference Amount for FY 06	270
Allocation for FY 06	268
Balance to Complete after FY 06	143,878
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2-1/2%)	4.24
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to perform pumping operations at the greentree reservoirs and initiate construction of a new outlet for greentree reservoir No. 8.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The four existing greentree reservoirs provide adequate waterfowl mitigation for the Yazoo Backwater Project as it now exists; however, a new outlet structure is needed at greentree reservoir No. 8.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02); Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCAs 1944 (Sec. 10); 1946 (Sec. 10); 1950 (Sec. 204); 1962 (Sec. 203); and 1965 (Sec. 204) authorized the project for flood control on the Big Sunflower and Little Sunflower Rivers, Hushpuckena and Quiver Rivers and their tributaries, and on Hull Brake-Mill Creek Canal, Bogue Phalia, Ditchlow Bayou, Deer Creek, and Steele Bayou.

LOCATION: The Steele Bayou Basin lies within the Delta region of west-central Mississippi.

DESCRIPTION: The Steele Bayou Basin's 752-square-mile drainage area runs from north of Greenville to its confluence with the Yazoo River just north of Vicksburg. The Big Sunflower River Basin has experienced flooding in recent years. The project provides flood protection and environmental enhancements for this region.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$114,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	523
Cash	(450)
Other	(73)
Total Estimated Cost	115,123
Allocations thru FY 03	103,059
Allocation for FY 04	615
Allocation for FY 05	805
Conference Amount for FY 06	4,000
Allocation for FY 06	3,960
Balance to Complete after FY 06	6,161
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2-1/2%)	8.1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue Item 66 A/B Swan Lake levee and for reforestation of mitigation lands; prepare an Engineering Documentation Report containing an implementation plan for the work; complete plans and specifications; initiate construction of erosion control and sediment reduction measures in the Yazoo Basin in August 2006; and complete index of biotic integrity environmental/water quality indicators.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Completion of Item 66 A/B Swan Lake levee and reforestation of mitigation lands will be delayed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02); Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Main Stem, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCA's 1936, Sec. 4 and 8a; 1941, Sec. 3b and 3g; and 1946, Sec. 3, 10f, and 10g authorized the Yazoo Headwater Projects to provide protection to the Yazoo Basin against Headwater floods.

LOCATION: The Main Stem feature in the Yazoo Basin consists of new and enlarged levee improvements along the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, and Coldwater Rivers from Yazoo City to Prichard, MS; and channel clearing, cutoffs, and channel enlargement along the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, and Coldwater Rivers from Yazoo City to Arkabutla Lake.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized work provides protection to adjacent areas against floods. The major remaining work includes raising deficient levees and closure of gaps in the Yazoo River levee system. This work is deferred until completion of the Mississippi River mainline and Yazoo Backwater levees.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$229,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	11
Cash	(0)
Other	(11)
Total Estimated Cost	229,111
Allocations thru FY 03	34,675
Allocation for FY 04	23
Allocation for FY 05	12
Conference Amount for FY 06	23
Allocation for FY 06	23
Balance to Complete after FY 06	194,367
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2-1/2%)	5.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue monitoring Sheley Bridge bank stabilization.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Monitoring is directed by Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1982.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-2) and Wicker (MS-1); Sen: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Delta Headwaters Project, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Emergency Jobs Appropriations Act of 1982; WRDA 1986, Sec 103e authorized a joint project to be undertaken with the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Agricultural Research Service to provide erosion control work in watersheds of the Yazoo Basin hills.

LOCATION: The project is located in the eastern (hill) section of the Yazoo River Basin, MS.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of 16 watersheds, ranging in size from 1 square mile (Town Creek) to over 600 square miles (Coldwater River), with features that include bank stabilization, grade control structures, floodwater-retarding structures, and channel modifications for flood damage reduction, bank stabilization and sedimentation/erosion control.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$362,709
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	362,709
Allocations thru FY 03	309,274
Allocation for FY 04	16,691
Allocation for FY 05	14,964
Conference Amount for FY 06	22,000
Allocation for FY 06	21,780
Balance to Complete after FY 06	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete seven ongoing construction contracts including 3 riser pipes, 1 box culvert, 2 bank stabilization items, and 1 low drop grade control structure; complete design on 12 additional items; and initiate construction on 15 contracts including 6 riser pipes – March 06, May 06, May 06, June 06, July 06, July 06; 2 box culvert grade control structures – February 06, March 06; 2 low-drop grade control structures – April 06, April 06; 3 bank stabilization items – February 06, April 06, May 06; 1 high drop grade control structure – February 06; and 1 floodwater-retarding structure – April 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project provides important flood control, environmental, water quality, and sediment reduction benefits in addition to economic stimulus benefits to the basin.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02) and Wicker (MS-01); Senate: Cochran and Lott (MS)

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Reformulation Unit, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCA's of 1936, Sec. 4 and 8a; 1941, Sec 3b and 3g; and 1946, Sec. 3, 10f, and 10q authorized Yazoo Headwater Projects to provide protection to the Yazoo Basin against Headwater floods.

LOCATION: The Yazoo Backwater Area is located in the lower Delta in west-central Mississippi between the east bank Mississippi River levees on the west and the hill east of the Yazoo River.

DESCRIPTION: The Backwater area extends from just north of Vicksburg, Mississippi, to the vicinity of Greenville, Mississippi. A complete reformulation of all remaining unconstructed authorized projects in the Yazoo Basin is ongoing.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$50,370
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	50,370
Allocations thru FY 03	31,230
Allocation for FY 04	1,270
Allocation for FY 05	2,379
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,980
Allocation for FY 06	1960
Balance to Complete after FY 06	13,531
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8-1/2%)	1.25
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to address comments on the Yazoo Backwater Draft Reformulation Report to release the final report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Reformulation Study covers the remaining authorized unconstructed features of the Yazoo Basin, which will be accomplished in four phases. The first two phases of the Yazoo Basin Reformulation, Upper Steele Bayou and Upper Yazoo Projects, are completed and under construction. The third phase, the Yazoo Backwater study, will be finalized in the fall of 2006. The fourth and final phase, the Tributaries study, was delayed until construction on the Upper Yazoo Projects phase advanced to provide an outlet for the tributaries. Construction of the Upper Yazoo Projects has advanced to the point that the Tributaries study will resume in FY 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02) and Wicker (MS-01); Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Projects, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCAs 1936, Sec. 4 and 8a; 1941, Sec. 3b and 3g; 1946, Sec. 3, 10f, and 10q; and 1965, Sec. 204 authorized the Yazoo Headwater Projects to provide protection to the Yazoo Basin against Headwater floods.

LOCATION: The UYP includes channel and levee features along the main channel of the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, and Coldwater Rivers from the vicinity of Yazoo City, MS, to the vicinity of the confluence of Arkabutla Creek with the Coldwater River.

DESCRIPTION: The project will provide flood protection for this region through reduction of flood stages up to 3 feet in most areas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$369,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	369,000
Allocations thru FY 03	197,610
Allocation for FY 04	13,392
Allocation for FY 05	5,129
Conference Amount for FY 06	13,275
Allocation for FY 06	13,142
Balance to Complete after FY 06	139,727
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8-1/2%)	1.25
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete channel Items 5A – awarded May 02, and 6A – awarded Aug 05.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: No funds are included in the FY 2007 budget request. This will delay completion of the project by at least one year, will not allow initiation of any new construction work, and will delay remaining project flood control and economic benefits to the area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02) and Wicker (MS-01); Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yazoo Basin, Yazoo Backwater Pump, MS

AUTHORIZATION: FCA's 1941, Sec 3(b); 1944, Sec 10; 1965, Sec 204; WRDA 86, Sec 103; WRDA 96, Sec 202 authorized the project to protect a portion of the Yazoo Basin against all but large floods of the Mississippi River.

LOCATION: This project is located in Issaquena County, MS.

DESCRIPTION: This project is a flood damage reduction project in Issaquena County, MS, at the mouth of Steele Bayou near its confluence with the Yazoo River.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$221,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	221,000
Allocations thru FY 03	24,273
Allocation for FY 04	11,929
Allocation for FY 05	-12,096*
Conference Amount for FY 06	20,000
Allocation for FY 06	43,800
Balance to Complete after FY 06	153,094
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2-1/2%)	4.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

* Funds revoked for FCCE (Hurricane Katrina) to be restored in FY06 supplemental.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue design on the recommended plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The local sponsor strongly supports construction of this project. By letter, 21 Aug 92, the Board of Mississippi Levee Commissioners requested that reformulation of the Yazoo Backwater Project be expedited utilizing the full resources of the Vicksburg District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Flood damage reduction to the Yazoo Backwater area can be expedited by completing design of the Yazoo Backwater when a recommended plan is finalized as a part of the Yazoo Backwater Reformulation. The recommended plan (pump plant and acquisition of 62,500 acres of reforestation) was presented in the draft report, 5 Sep 00, with the final report scheduled for the fall of 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Thompson (MS-02); Senate: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Atlantic Coast of Maryland Shoreline Protection, MD

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1986

LOCATION: Fenwick and Assateague Islands form the Atlantic Coast of Maryland and extend in a north-south direction from Delaware Bay to Chincoteague Inlet, Virginia. The project is located in Worcester County, Maryland.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of widening and raising the beach from 4th Street in Ocean City, MD to the Maryland - Delaware line (about 8.2 miles) and a 0.3 mile transition into Delaware, construction of a steel sheetpile bulkhead from 4th street to the north end of the boardwalk at 28th Street (about 1.5 miles), construction of a sand dune from the north end of the boardwalk to the Maryland - Delaware line (about 6.7 miles plus a 0.3 mile transition into Delaware), and project operation and maintenance (non-Federal cost). The long-term features of the project include monitoring and renourishment (cost shared 53%/47%) over an economic life of 50 years. Maintenance of the dune and berm above +6 ft meters National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD) is the financial responsibility of the non-Federal sponsor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$270,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	229,700
Cash	229,166
Other	534
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$500,000
Allocation thru FY 03	38,157
Allocation for FY 04	376
Allocation for FY 05	404
Allocation for FY 06	4,851
Balance to Complete After FY 06	226,512
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (8-5/8%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to perform annual monitoring activities, to perform periodic renourishment and to continue Borrow Area and Hot Spot study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$200,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the project would be completed in September 2044.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes (MD) and Mikulski (MD), and Representatives Gilchrest (MD-01), Ruppertsberger (MD-02), Cardin (MD-03), Hoyer (MD-05), and Cummings (MD-07).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction, General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Bay Coast, Reeds Beach to Pierces Point, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 (b) (6) of WRDA 1999.

LOCATION: Reeds Beach and Pierces Point are residential bay-front communities located along the Delaware Bay in Middle Township, Cape May County, NJ.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan at each location consists of a one-time placement of sand to achieve an 80-foot wide berm that slopes from an elevation of +5.5 feet NGVD at the landward edges of berm, to an elevation of +3.5 feet NGVD at the seaward edge of berm. The project was formulated for ecosystem restoration, but also provides hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits for the communities of Reeds Beach and Pierces Point.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$3,290.0 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		\$1,770.0 1/
Cash	\$ 1,372.0	
Other	\$ 398.0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$5,060.0 1/
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 424.0
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 47.0
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 367.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 817.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 1,635.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		N/A 2/
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)		N/A 2/

1/ Not inflated to mid construction, due to unknown funding availability

2/ Environmental Restoration

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to finalize, review and approve the LRR and coordinate the PCA.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is to be determined due to budget constraints.

OTHER INFORMATION: This project entails a one-time placement of sand and is an environmental restoration project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. LoBiondo (NJ-02) & Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), Sen. Lautenberg (NJ) and Menendez (NJ)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District

Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction,

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Coast Protection, DE

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1968 and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662)

LOCATION: The project is located in Sussex County, Delaware, on the Atlantic Ocean at Indian River Inlet.

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement consists of constructing a sand bypassing plant and operation of said plant for periodic nourishment of a feeder beach to nourish the feeder beach on the north side of the inlet and protect the Delaware Route 1 highway. The nourishment consists of reimbursing the State of Delaware for the Federal share of the annual operation and maintenance costs of the sand bypass plant. Initial construction was completed in 1990.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Construction</u> \$10,600.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$12,500.0
Cash 1,235.0	
Other 11,265.0	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 23,100.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5,803.0
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 127.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 140.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 317.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 4,213.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 1/8)	2.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	22.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to reimburse the State of Delaware for operation of the sand by-pass plant/

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is contingent on funding and is to be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: LCA was signed with the State of Delaware, Oct 1988. Yearly Federal funds are to be reimbursement to the State of Delaware for operations of the Sand By-Pass Plant.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Castle (DE-AL), Sen. Carper (DE) & Biden (DE).

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction,

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Fenwick Island, DE

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 (b)(11) of WRDA 2000

LOCATION: Fenwick Island is located in Sussex County, Delaware, along the Atlantic coastline just north of the Delaware-Maryland state border and Fenwick Island State Park borders it to the north.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan provides for a berm and dune, with a crest over the total project length (6,500 feet). The recommended plan would also include dune grass, dune fencing, and suitable beachfill with periodic beach nourishment to ensure the integrity of design. The recommended plan requires initial beachfill and subsequent periodic nourishment every four years.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 34,000.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		\$ 31,700.0
Cash	\$31,699.0	
Other	\$ 1.0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 65,700.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 514.0
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 127.0
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 1,621.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 1,887.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 29,851.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 5/8%)		2.1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		2.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete initial beachfill construction

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE:

Initial construction – June 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Local sponsor is the Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Castle (DE-AL), Sen. Carper (DE) and Biden (DE)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District

Date: 27 Feb 06

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction,

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany to South Bethany, DE

AUTHORIZATION: Title I, Section 101 (a) (15) of WRDA 1999

LOCATION: The Bethany Beach/South Bethany project area stretches for approximately 2 miles along the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean coast of Delaware in Sussex County, Delaware.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended project consists of initial beachfill, with subsequent nourishment every three years. The recommended plan consists of a sand fill beach and dune project, in two independent discontinuous segments, for both Bethany Beach and South Bethany.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 84,500.0 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 45,500.0 1/
Cash 45,105.0	
Other 395.0	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 130,000.0 1/
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 425.9
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 121.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 178.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 2,970.0 1/
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 80,805.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 3/8%)	1.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.7
1/ Initial construction: Total 27,700.0 Federal \$18,000.0 Non Federal \$ 9,700.0	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the Limited Reevaluation Report, coordinate a Project Cooperation Agreement and Real Estate. Remaining funds (\$2,607.0) are being held to FY07 for initiation of initial construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of initial construction is contingent on funding and completion is to be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Initial construction can't be started until the LRR is approved and a PCA is signed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep Castle (DE-AL), Sen. Biden (DE) & Carper (DE).

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Fox Point Hurricane Barrier, RI.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 352 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 and Section 333 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The Fox Point Hurricane Protection Barrier is located across the Providence River in Providence, Rhode Island, about one mile from the downtown area.

DESCRIPTION: The barrier is a 700-foot long concrete structure, 25 feet high and contains a 214-foot long pumping station and three 40 foot by 40 foot tainter gates. The pumping station contains five 4,500 horsepower pumps. When closed, the gates prevent entry of tidal floodwaters into the city. Work to rehabilitate the project, consistent with the 1998 Condition Survey Report, is being performed by the City of Providence with 65 percent Federal reimbursement. The City has completed rehabilitation of the tainter gates and pumps. Remaining work includes miscellaneous pump station repairs and replacement of the electro-mechanical control system for the pumps. The control system has been in service for close to forty years and due to its age repair parts are nearly impossible to obtain. Corps participation in the project is currently limited to Federal appropriations of \$2,475,000.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

		<u>Major Rehab</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 3,380,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		1,820,000
Cash	(0)	
Other	(1,820,000)	
Total Estimated Project Cost		5,200,000
Allocations thru FY 2003		1,610,000
Allocation in FY 2004		180,000
Allocation in FY 2005		15,000
Allocation in FY 2006		520,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006		1,055,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2 5/8%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to reimburse the City for 65 percent of their costs to complete eligible work to repair the pump station and replace the electro-mechanical control system.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Condition Survey Report was prepared in April 1998, with a supplement dated August 1998, to review the overall condition and operation of the barrier. Investigations found the barrier to be consistent with modern design criteria and local hydrologic conditions. Deficiencies identified during the investigation, consisting of pump and tainter gate rehabilitation and miscellaneous pump station repairs, were the result of deferred maintenance by the non-Federal project sponsor. A Project Cooperation Agreement was executed on 8 April 2002 between the Corps and the City of Providence, Rhode Island.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Chafee (RI) and Reed (RI)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction, General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction,

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Great Egg Harbor to Peck Beach, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Committee Resolutions on 15 December 1970 under the provision of Section 201 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965 and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: The project is located in Cape May and Atlantic Counties, New Jersey. Great Egg Harbor Inlet Peck Beach is occupied in its entirety by the City of Ocean City and extends from Great Egg Harbor Inlet southward to Corson Inlet.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan consists of providing initial beachfill, with subsequent periodic nourishment. The beachfill extends from Surf Road southwest to 34th Street. This plan required the initial placement and will require periodic nourishment every three years. The material for the initial construction, and periodic nourishment will be taken from the ebb shoal area located offshore of the Great Egg Harbor Inlet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$234,100.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		\$136,900.0
Cash	\$134,344	
Other	\$ 2,556	
Total Estimated Cost		\$371,000.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 37,469.0
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 6,650.0
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 89.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 445.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$189,447.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8 5/8%)		2.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		6.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to accomplish plans and specifications and coordination for the environmental permits for the 5th renourishment cycle.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. LoBiondo (NJ-02) & Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), Sen. Lautenberg (NJ) & Menendez (NJ).

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Hackensack Meadowlands, New Jersey

AUTHORIZATION: Section 324 of WRDA 1992, as amended.

LOCATION: The Hackensack Meadowlands, located in Bergen and Hudson Counties, New Jersey is an integral part of the New York - New Jersey Harbor estuary.

DESCRIPTION: Located in a highly urbanized and industrialized area, approximately 8,450 acres of wetlands and waterbodies that remain in the Meadowlands make this the largest remaining brackish tidal wetland complex in the estuary. These remaining degraded wetlands and waterbodies are especially significant for concentrations of federal trust species including waterfowl, wading birds, shorebirds, raptors, anadromous fish, estuarine fish, and terrapins.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	12,500,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	6,500,000
Cash	6,500,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	19,000,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	2,500,000
Allocation for FY 2004	77,000
Allocation for FY 2005	308,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	8,130,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (N/A)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to update the numerical flood control models developed under this authority to reflect recently constructed structures, collecting necessary geotechnical and engineering data related to sites identified by the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission (NJMC) for environmental improvement, in coordination with the separate environmental restoration study, the HRE - Hackensack Meadowlands Restoration Study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: The subject authorization was funded in FY 1995, 2004 and 2005. The non-federal sponsor is the NJMC (formerly the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission). A Project Management Plan was prepared in August 1999. A Design Agreement with the NJMC was executed in March 2000 to perform the technical studies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Rothman (NJ-9)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION GENERAL)

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction (Dam Safety)

PROJECT NAME: Jennings Randolph Lake Dam Safety Assurance Project, MD & WV

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 1203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (P.L. 99-662).

LOCATION: Jennings Randolph Lake is located on the North Branch Potomac River on the state line between Garrett County, Maryland, and Mineral County, West Virginia. The dam site is located approximately eight miles upstream from the confluence with Savage River at Bloomington, MD.

DESCRIPTION: The existing project, which was formerly known as Bloomington Lake, was completed in 1981. The dam is a rolled earth and rockfill structure with an impervious core rising 296 feet from the streambed and extending 2,130 feet across the valley. The dam includes a dike 900 feet long on the left (north) bank, and a spillway with tainter gates along the ridge between the dike and the dam. The project provides low flow augmentation, water quality control for acid mine drainage abatement, flood control, water supply for the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area, and recreation. With a full conservation pool, the lake, controlling a drainage area of 263 square miles, is about 5.5 miles long and has a surface area of 952 acres. In order to meet current dam safety criteria, a project modification will be undertaken to allow the project to adequately pass the probable maximum flood. Based on the 2004 value engineering investigation, a supplemental roller-compacted concrete spillway in the saddle dike area has been identified as the recommended alternative.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	14,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	700
Total Estimated Cost	15,000
Allocation thru FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	410
Allocation for FY 05	568
Allocation for FY 06	396
Balance to Complete after FY 06	12,926
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5-5/8%)	18.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	15.0

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete technical analyses for the Phase III final design effort, including hydraulic, structural, and geotechnical analyses, and completion of plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$12,926,000 in FY 07, a fully funded contract would be awarded and construction completed in September 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Bartlett (MD-06), Mollohan (WV-01) and Senators Byrd and Rockefeller (WV) and Sarbanes and Mikulski (MD)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Waterfront Park and Historic Area, Newark, NJ.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101a(18)(B) of the WRDA of 1990 as modified by Section 102(p) of WRDA 1992 and Section 301(b)(10) of WRDA 1996.

LOCATION: The project lies along the west bank of the Passaic River between Bridge and Brill Streets in the City of Newark.

DESCRIPTION: Phase I consists of the construction of 6,000 feet of new bulkhead, and 3,200 feet of restored riverbank and wetlands. Remaining phases of the project include a walkway and park facilities along the river. The non-Federal sponsors are the State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection for Phase I and the City of Newark for Phases II and III.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	Phase I <u>Construction</u>	Phases II/III <u>Remainder</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$34,300,000	\$23,850,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,000,000	17,650,000
Total Estimated Cost	37,300,000	41,500,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	15,396,000	
Allocation for FY 2004	1,767,000	
Allocation for FY 2005	0	
Allocation for FY 2006	2,227,000	0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	14,910,000	23,350,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (2.1 @ 7.75%)		
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (2 @ 7%)		

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prior year funds and FY 06 funds are being used to continue ongoing construction of Contract #4 (Phase I - Bulkhead).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Donald Payne (NJ-10), and Steven Rothman (NJ-9); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lake Merriweather, Little Calfpasture (Goshen Dam), Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 507(3), Water Resources Development Act of 1996

LOCATION: 30 miles northwest of Lexington, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: Lake Merriweather, a 425-acre impoundment created by a 38 foot high dam known as the Goshen Dam, is located in the western part of Virginia, 30 miles northwest of Lexington, Virginia. The Goshen Dam is an earthen structure with a reinforced concrete overflow spillway 158 feet wide equipped with a series of 10, 14' wide by 9.5' high crest control gates. The National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America owns the lake and dam and its purpose is to provide recreation and flood control. The dam's existing spillway capacity does not meet National Dam Safety Regulations and the spillway's crest gates susceptibility to damage during flood events raise serious concerns about possible dam overtopping or failure during a large flood event. A technical study recommending fixing (setting) the existing spillway crest at elevation 1369 and roller compacted concrete armor of the dam embankment was approved by HQUSACE in February 2000.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 6,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 8
Allocation for FY 2004	58
Allocation for FY 2005	77
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,887
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to update the decision document and prepare the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With adequate funding, project could be completed in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project costs are 100% Federal up to authorized amount of \$6,000,000. The non-Federal Sponsor is the Commonwealth of Virginia acting in behalf of the National Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America, the dam's owner.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Goodlatte (VA-6) and Davis (VA-11).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District
Date: 27 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Atlantic Coast of Long Island, Long Beach Island, New York

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

LOCATION : The project area consists of seven miles of shoreline along the south shore of Long Island from Jones Inlet to East Rockaway Inlet.

DESCRIPTION The project would provide storm damage protection to communities along this barrier island by constructing a protective beach berm backed by a dune system, constructing four new groins, and rehabilitating sixteen existing groins. The project also includes periodic beach nourishment on a five-year cycle for a period of 50 years following initial construction.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$120,900,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		65,100,000
Cash	64,157,000	
Other	943,000	
Total Estimated Cost		186,000,000

Allocation Through FY 2003		1,828,000
Allocation for FY 2004		375,000
Allocation for FY 2005		183,000
Allocation for FY 2006		148,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		118,366,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.9 @ 7.625%)		
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (2.5 @ 7 %)		

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES : FY 06 funds are being used to complete a Limited Reevaluation Report, to initiate and complete the plans and specifications for the first construction contract, and execute a PCA with the non-federal sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of the first constructable element for this project could be attained by September 2006, which would complete the PED phase and allow for execution of a construction PCA.

OTHER INFORMATION: The State has its share of initial construction funds available.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Peter King (NY-03).

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Environmental Restoration (ER)

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Muddy River, Boston & Brookline, Massachusetts

AUTHORIZATION: Section 424 of WRDA 1999 and Section 522 of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The Muddy River is a 3.5-mile urban waterway located in eastern Massachusetts in the communities of Boston, Brookline and Newton.

DESCRIPTION: WRDA 2000 authorizes the Secretary to carry out a project for flood control and environmental restoration substantially in accordance with the Phase I Master Plan developed by the City of Boston, subject to the conditions described in the Evaluation Report. The authorized project involves dredging approximately 200,000 cubic yards of sediment to deepen the Muddy River, removal or replacement of undersized culverts, bank stabilization and restoration of riparian vegetation. The project will increase flood control, improve water quality, restore aquatic and riparian habitat, and promote recreational use of the river and surrounding parklands. The project will be implemented in two phases. Phase I involves the installation of culverts at two locations, day-lighting a section of the river and modification of a bridge/culvert headwall for flood damage reduction. Phase II involves dredging the river for both flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>FDR</u>	<u>ER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 19,175,000	\$ 23,270,000	\$ 42,445,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	10,325,000	15,530,000	25,855,000
Cash	(10,265,000)	(12,500,000) ^{1/}	(22,765,000)
Other	(60,000)	(3,030,000)	(3,090,000)
Total Estimated Project Cost	29,500,000	38,800,000	68,300,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 488,000	\$ 588,000	\$ 1,076,000
Allocation in FY 2004	11,000	15,000	26,000
Allocation in FY 2005	97,000	132,000	229,000
Allocation in FY 2006	1,485,000	0	1,485,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	17,148,000	22,535,000	39,683,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 3/8%)	3.2	N/A	3.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.2	N/A	3.2

^{1/} The local sponsor has requested a betterment that will be financed by the local sponsor at 100% sponsor cost.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue design of Phase I work, including preparation of plans and specifications. Work includes project surveys, geotechnical explorations, foundation design, hydrologic and hydraulic modeling, traffic analysis and preliminary layouts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FDR FY 2010. ER FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Decision Document, dated September 2003, recommends implementation of both FDR and ER elements. In a letter dated 7 May 2004 to OMB, the ASA (CW) expressed support for the FDR elements of the project, but determined that the ER elements do not demonstrate environmental significance and are therefore not justified. The Design Agreement was approved on March 23, 2005. Costs to prepare the Decision Document are included in the Design Agreement and will be financed 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal. Funds appropriated through FY 2004 may be used for design of the entire project. Funds appropriated in FY 2005 and thereafter will be used for design and construction of the flood damage reduction element of the project only. Committee report language is needed to use future appropriations for the design or construction of ecosystem restoration features of the project. The Design Agreement for the entire project was signed on 13 June 2005 with the City of Boston.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Kennedy (MA) and Kerry (MA), and Representatives Frank (MA-04), Lynch (MA-09) and Capuano (MA-08)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Orchard Beach, NY.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 309(e) of WRDA 1992, and Section 554 of WRDA 1996.

LOCATION AND Orchard Beach is located on the north side of Long Island Sound in the Borough of the Bronx in Pelham Bay Park.

DESCRIPTION: Orchard Beach is an artificial beach that was constructed by the City of New York. The beach is located along a crescent-shaped strip of land that is about 1,000-feet wide and one-mile long and has groins at the north and south terminal points. Coastal erosion has reduced the size of the existing beach to an extent such that serious overcrowding occurs among the beach users.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,900,000
Estimated Non Federal Cost	4,900,000
Cash	4,900,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	9,800,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	513,000
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	80,000
Allocation for FY 2006	223,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,084,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (4.9 @ 7.625%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (5.3 @ 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to complete plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction schedule to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 309(e) of WRDA 1992 and Section 554 of WRDA 1996 limited the Federal cost to \$5,200,000. The final revaluation report concludes that a beach fill project with periodic nourishment is economically justified based on recreational benefits. While the initial construction can be accomplished under the current authorization, additional authorization would be required prior to the first renourishment contract in order to cost share future nourishments, which are scheduled to take place every five years after completion of initial construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Joseph Crowley (NY-7) and Jose Serrano (NY-16).

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction (Dam Safety Assurance)

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Otter Brook Dam, New Hampshire (Dam Safety Assurance)

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1944.

LOCATION: Otter Brook Dam is located within the Ashuelot River Watershed in the town of Keene in southern New Hampshire. The dam site is located along Otter Brook about 2.4 miles above its confluence with the Branch River and about 4.9 miles above the confluence of the Branch and Ashuelot Rivers.

DESCRIPTION: Otter Brook Dam was constructed in 1958 as a single-purpose flood control project. The main dam is composed of an earth filled embankment with rock slope protection, 1,288 feet in length, with a maximum height of 133 feet above the riverbed. Storage capacity of the reservoir is 17,600 acre-feet at spillway crest. The dam includes an uncontrolled concrete overflow spillway, 145 feet in length, through a rock cut in the west abutment. The project has prevented \$28.7 million in damages to date. Dam safety modifications involve the construction of a new concrete weir using mechanical fuseplugs designed to fail prior to exceeding discharge capacity. Failure of the fuseplugs would lower the spillway crest elevation, increasing spillway capacity sufficiently to discharge the probable maximum flood.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

	<u>Construction</u>
	(\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	3,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	3,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	0
Allocation in FY 2004	400
Allocation in FY 2005	1,284
Allocation in FY 2006	1,416
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 1/8%)	2.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A continuing contract was awarded on 11 May 2005 and construction of dam safety assurance measures was initiated in July 2005. FY 2006 funds are being used to complete construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Otter Brook Dam has performed satisfactorily since placed in operation in 1958. The project is in good overall condition, with the only significant dam safety problem being the spillway cannot pass the design flood as computed under current hydrologic criteria. During a hydrologic event in the magnitude of the revised spillway design flood, inflow at Otter Brook Lake would exceed spillway capacity, overtopping the dam by one foot and jeopardizing the embankment structure. Catastrophic failure of the dam during the spillway design flood would cause an estimated \$92 million in property damage and place nearly 14,000 people at risk in the densely populated City of Keene and other downstream communities. Construction of a new spillway at Otter Brook Dam will greatly enhance the protection of life and property in the Ashuelot and Connecticut River Basins, require minimal additional operations and maintenance efforts and have no net impact on the local environment. Average annual benefits for dam safety modifications are \$709,000 at June 2004 prices, of which \$555,600 is for flood control and \$153,400 for recreation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: None.

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Passaic River Preservation of Natural Flood Storage Areas, New Jersey

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a)(18)(A) of the WRDA of 1990 as modified by Section 102(p) of WRDA 1992

LOCATION: The project is located in the Central Basin of the Passaic River.

DESCRIPTION The Passaic River Basin suffers from severe and repeated flooding. The project consists of the acquisition of 5,350 acres of natural flood storage areas, much of it wetlands that could be developed. By preserving the land as natural flood storage areas, the project will prevent flooding from becoming worse in the future.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$20,400,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$1,700,000
Cash	\$1,700,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$22,100,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	\$9,838,000
Allocation for FY 2004	\$321,000
Allocation for FY 2005	\$2,820,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$2,970,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$4,451,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.02 @ 7.625%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.1 @ 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES : FY 06 funds are being used to continue acquisition of natural flood storage areas. Approximately 800 acres are to be acquired with available funds.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The non-Federal sponsor is the State of New Jersey.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11) and William Pascrell, JR. (NJ-8); Senators Robert Menendez (NJ) and Frank Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction, General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction,

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Prompton Dam, PA

AUTHORIZATION: HD 113, 80th Cong., 1st Sess; HD 522, 887th Cong., 2nd Sess

LOCATION: Prompton Dam is located one-half mile upstream of the Village of Prompton, PA on the West Branch Lackawaxen River. The project is 31 miles upstream of the Lackawaxen River's confluence with the Delaware River at Lackawaxen, PA.

DESCRIPTION: The plan to protect against the effects of the probable maximum flood widens the spillway from 50.0' to 130.0'; raises the dam by placing the 7.0' retaining wall on top of the existing embankment; and incorporates a 5.0' high erodible spillway embankment on top of a 5.0' lowering of the existing spillway crest. The erodible spillway embankment would maintain the flood control storage provided by the existing project. Under extreme flood events, the 5.0' embankment would be overtopped and eroded down to the permanent spillway crest, thereby increasing spillway flow capacity to safely pass without danger of the dam being overtopped. This plan also includes a realignment of the existing access road requiring a new bridge over the spillway.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 25,600.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		
Cash	N/A	
Other	N/A	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 25,600.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		
Allocations FY 2004		
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 800.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 8,395.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 16,405.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The scope of work for Phase I includes: widening the spillway from 50 feet to 85 feet; lowering the spillway depth by 5 feet; construction of a 5 foot high fuse plug in the spillway; placement of rip rap protection around the stilling basin and in the outlet channel; placement of material excavated from the spillway in the designated fill area to the west of the spillway; and construction of diversion ditches.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phase I will be completed in FY07. Remainder of project is contingent of receipt of additional funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: Due to the anticipated break in the funding stream to complete construction, a phased approach to for construction has been undertaken. The scope of work for Phase I is described under FY 2006 activities.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen. Specter (PA), Sen. Santorum (PA), Rep. Sherwood (PA)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 30 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Ramapo and Mahwah Rivers, Mahwah, New Jersey and Suffern, New York (Ramapo and Mahwah River Construction Project)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: The proposed project is located on the Ramapo and Mahwah Rivers in Mahwah, New Jersey and Suffern, New York.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of channel improvements to 13,000 feet of the Ramapo River, Mahwah River, and Masonicus Brook. Environmental protection measures are included in the project.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

	FY 06
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$17,250,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$5,750,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$23,000,000
Allocation Through FY 2003	1,915,000
Allocation for FY 2004	209,000
Allocation for FY 2005	212,000
Allocation for FY 2006	186,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$14,728,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.3 @ 8.25%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.6 @ 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to update and complete the PMP for GRR, coordinate with the states of New York and New Jersey, and to initiate design evaluation tasks.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Design phase completion is to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project was ready for construction in 1990, but work was never initiated due to the lack of project cooperation agreements with New York and New Jersey. The States are now interested in implementing the project due to severe damage suffered from Tropical Storm Floyd in 1999 and other recent floods. Changes in the project area require that the project be reformulated to meet current conditions.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Elliot Engel (NY-17), Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), Scott Garrett (NJ-5); Senators Charles Schumer (NY), Hillary Clinton (NY), Robert Menendez (NJ), and Frank Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Ramapo River at Oakland, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and section 301(a)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

LOCATION: The project is located on the Ramapo River in the Borough of Oakland in Bergen County, and Wayne Township and the Borough of Pompton Lakes in Passaic County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: This project consists of a channel modification of 5,800 feet of the Ramapo River and the installation of flood control gates at the existing Pompton Lake Dam. The channel modification contract was completed in January 2003. The installation of the flood control gates in the Pompton Lake Dam is under construction with an August 2006 completion.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$20,600,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		2,000,000
Cash	1,100,000	
Other	900,000	
Total Estimated Cost		22,600,000
Allocation Through FY 2003		10,402,000
Allocation for FY 2004		2,850,000
Allocation for FY 2005		3,880,000
Allocation for FY 2006		1,300,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		2,168,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.4 @ 7.375%)		
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.4 @ 7.375%)		

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete the ongoing Pompton Lake Dam Construction Contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006, provided \$2.2 million are reprogrammed into the project by March 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives William Pascrell, Jr., (NJ-08), and Scott Garrett (NJ-5); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay (Section 506), NJ.

AUTHORIZATION: The Flood Control Act of 1962 authorized a dual purpose Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection project for Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, NJ. Section 506 (b)(3)(C) of WRDA 1996 authorizes periodic nourishment for 50 years from initiation of construction of each project, subject to a review of the project in accord with Section 934 of WRDA 1986, as amended.

LOCATION: The Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay project area is situated at the southern end of Lower New York Bay between the Raritan River and Sandy Hook in Middlesex and Monmouth counties, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The previously constructed project consists of segmented sections of beach fill, groins, and levees surrounding various communities in Keansburg, East Keansburg and Laurence Harbor. Required report includes re-evaluation of Federal interest in periodic nourishment of these previously completed projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>		<u>Design Phase</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		1,054,000	30,000,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:		351,000	15,000,000
	Cash	351,000	15,000,000
	Other	0	0
Total Estimated Cost		1,405,000	45,000,000
Allocation Through FY 2003		331,000	
Allocation for FY 2004		67,000	
Allocation for FY 2005		117,000	
Allocation for FY 2006		186,000	0
Balance to Complete After FY 2006		353,000	30,000,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (2.9 @ 7.625%)			
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (3.1 @ 7%)			

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to finalize the Re-Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, necessary to justify Federal interest in remaining nourishment cycles.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Design phase completion is to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (NJ-06); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Port Monmouth, New Jersey.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The project area is in Middletown Township, Monmouth County, NJ, situated between Pews Creek and Comptons Creek.

DESCRIPTION: The selected plan in the June 2000 feasibility report includes about 7,070 feet of levees, 3,585 feet of floodwalls, 2,640 feet of dune (4,640 feet of placement with taper sections), a storm- tide gate, and periodic beach nourishment on a 10-year cycle. The project also includes interior drainage and mitigation features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$40,650,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	29,550,000
Total Estimated Cost	70,200,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	N/A
Allocation for FY 2005	36,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	39,129,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.3 @5.875%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.1 @7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 Congressional added funds are being used to complete the plans and specifications for the beach replenishment contract, and negotiate and execute a Project Cooperation Agreement with the non-federal sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: This is not a typical shore protection project. The beach fill component and renourishment components are small (12%) when compared to the flood control features of the total project first cost.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Frank Pallone (NJ-06), and Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Frank Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Raritan River Basin Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey
(Green Brook Flood Control Project)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401 (a) Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Section 102, Energy & Water Appropriations Act FY 98.

LOCATION: The Green Brook Sub-Basin project is located within the Raritan River Basin in north-central New Jersey in Middlesex, Somerset and Union Counties.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan includes a system of levees and floodwalls, along with bridge raisings, closure structures, individual floodproofings and buy outs in the lower portion of the sub-basin and channel modifications in the Stony Brook portion of the sub-basin. The upper portion of the sub-basin has been deferred, pending additional study and local approval.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$274,800,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		91,600,000
Cash	25,200,000	
Other	66,400,000	
Total Estimated Cost		366,400,000
Allocation Through FY 2003		48,279,000
Allocation for FY 2004		4,210,000
Allocation for FY 2005		7,285,000
Allocation for FY 2006		4,950,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		210,076,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.3 @ 7.625%)		
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.4 @ 7%)		

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete the Segment U and Segment R1 levee construction contracts and continue the Finderne Farm Wetland Mitigation contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Mike Ferguson (NJ-07), Representative Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11).

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Alleviation, Richmond, Virginia (Combined Sewage Overflow (CSO) Control Program)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(c)(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 as amended by Section 504 of The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 and Section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999

LOCATION: Richmond, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The Richmond Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) project is located in the City along the James River. The City of Richmond is under special compliance order by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality to implement a CSO control program in order to comply with the Clean Water Act. The project consists of studies and design to support the re-evaluation of City of Richmond's Combined Sewer Overflow Long Term Control Plan (LTCP). Work will include reliability and interface planning for Combined Sewer Overflow and Dry Weather Flow facilities and the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Satellite locations. Also included will be collection and laboratory analysis of river and CSO samples required as part of the CSO LTCP re-evaluation study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 30,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 10,000
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 40,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,049
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 351
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 124
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 742
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 26,734
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds will be used to continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Design agreement was executed in September 2001.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Scott (VA-3) and Cantor (VA-7).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 27 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sandbridge Beach, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as modified by Section 338 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000

LOCATION: Virginia Beach, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The community of Sandbridge is located in the southeastern section of the city of Virginia Beach. The project area is located along five miles of the Atlantic coast of Virginia. It is bounded on the south by the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge and on the north by the Naval Training Facility at Dam Neck. The project consists of the construction of a beach berm with an average width of 50 feet and at an elevation of 6.0 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD). This beach community, primarily residential, is comprised of rental cottages and permanent residences. In addition to the initial beach fill, the project also provides for periodic beach nourishment over the 46-year economic life of the project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Continuing Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 185,597
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 99,936
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 285,533
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 6,298
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 2,970
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 176,329
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to update environmental permits and prepare project plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Project Cooperative Agreement (PCA) was executed on 19 August 2002 and construction of the initial beach berm was completed in May 2003.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representative Drake (VA-2).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 27 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 1958, as modified by Section 854 of WRDA 1986, Section 4 of WRDA 1988, and Section 102r of WRDA 1992.

LOCATION : The project consists of 21 miles of shoreline from the Township of Sea Bright to the Manasquan Inlet in Monmouth County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides beach restoration and storm damage protection with the construction of a 100-foot wide beach berm at an elevation of 10 feet above mean low water (MLW). Construction also includes the notching of existing stone groins and outfall pipe extensions. The project requires periodic nourishment of the beaches on a 6 year cycle for a period 50 years from initial construction.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$755,700,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	406,900,000
Cash	358,600,000
Other	48,300,000
Total Estimated Cost	1,162,600,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	126,718,811
Allocation for FY 2004	193,000
Allocation for FY 2005	179,000
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	625,639,189
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (1.3 @ 8.25%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (1.5 @ 7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES : FY 2006 funds are being used to initiate construction of the renourishment contract for the Long Branch reach of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Frank Pallone (NJ-06), Christopher Smith (NJ-04), and Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Senators Frank Lautenberg (NJ) and Robert Menendez (NJ).

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Virginia Beach Hurricane Protection, Virginia Beach, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 501(a) of WRDA 1986 as modified by WRDA 1992 and Section 355 of WRDA 1996

LOCATION: Virginia Beach, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The project provides hurricane protection (140-year storm event) and beach erosion control for a 6-mile segment of the Virginia Beach ocean front that is comprised of a heavily developed commercial district supporting a large tourist industry. Dense residential development exists on the north end of the project area. The project features include a new higher and wider beach that extends for the full 6-mile length of the project. It will be periodically nourished over the project life of 50-years. A concrete seawall extends for about 4 miles north of Rudee Inlet to 58th Street where it ties into an existing dune system that is augmented with additional sand and erosion control features for the remaining 2 miles of the project. The project also includes about 3 miles of new reconstructed boardwalk and bike paths, a storm water runoff system consisting of 2 pump stations that discharge off shore through submarine pipelines. Appropriate beach access structures consisting of ramps and stairs and dune crossover facilities are also provided.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Continuing Construction</u>
Estimated Federal	\$ 247,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 33,000
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 280,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 75,854
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 1,080
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 1,109
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 8,461
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 160,496
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (7%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	8.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to complete construction for the 79th Street pump station ocean outfall, and complete the manhole covers and flap gate repairs on the 16th and 42nd Street ocean outfalls, which will complete the initial construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006 for initial construction.

OTHER INFORMATION: Initial construction is anticipated to be essentially complete in FY 06. There will be an annual requirement (funding) for monitoring activities and beach re-nourishment on about a 3-year cycle.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representative Drake (VA-2).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District
Date: 27 January 2006

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Big Sioux River at Sioux Falls, SD

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96, Public Law 104-303

LOCATION: Sioux Falls is located on a large bend of the Big Sioux River and at the confluence with Skunk Creek in the south half of Minnehaha County in southeastern South Dakota.

DESCRIPTION: The project is an improvement of an existing project. It will consist of raising the levee from the diversion dam to the upstream tie-off, raising the diversion channel levee, modifying the chute and stilling basin, raising the diversion dam, raising the levees on Skunk Creek, raising Big Sioux levees downstream of Skunk Creek, and providing for bridge improvements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 34,179
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	11,393
Cash	3,171
Other	8,222
Total Estimated Project Cost	45,572
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 10,869
Allocation for FY 2004	805
Allocation for FY 2005	1,018
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	20,002
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.375%)	1.24
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to award a fully funded construction contract for Phase 2 of the project. This includes rising of the levees on the Big Sioux River and Skunk Creek on the west side of the city. Plans and specifications for Phase 3 of the project will be completed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: There is very strong local support for the project and no opposition.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Thune (SD) and Johnson (SD); Representative Herseth (SD-AL)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Buford Trenton Irrigation District Land Acquisition, ND

AUTHORIZATION: Section 336 of WRDA 1996.

LOCATION: Buford Trenton Irrigation District is located in the flood plain along the left (north) bank of the Missouri River near its confluence with the Yellowstone River, upstream from Williston, ND in Williams County in northwestern ND.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to acquire from willing sellers, a permanent flowage and saturation easement over lands that have been affected by rising groundwater and the risk of surface flooding.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Construction</u>	
Estimated Federal Cost	\$31,500	<u>1/</u>
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	
Cash	0	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Cost	\$31,500	
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$25,346	
Allocation for FY 2004	1,745	
Allocation for FY 2005	1,402	
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,125	
Allocation for FY 2006	1,114	
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,893	
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	

1/ Project authorized at a cost not to exceed \$34,000,000.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funding will be used to purchase of additional easements from willing sellers.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The BTID project consists of some 12,249 acres and 64 landowners. Eight landowners in the BTID submitted claims totaling \$187,000 in October 1971 for damage from the Corps project. These claims were denied by the Government in January, 1974. As a result of increased river stages and a rising ground water table from the backup in the Garrison Reservoir, the Corps installed two pump stations using operation and maintenance general funds in 1978. Ground water levels have continued to rise notwithstanding the operation of the two pumping stations.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Pomeroy, ND-AL, Senators Dorgan (ND) and Conrad (ND)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mount St. Helens Sediment Control, WA

AUTHORIZATION: 1985 Supplemental Appropriations Act, Public Law 99-88, based on the Feasibility Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated Dec 1984.

LOCATION: Located within Cowlitz County, WA.

DESCRIPTION: Project features include: 1) sediment retention structure (SRS), 2) levee improvements, and 3) downstream dredging.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 199,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,600
Cash	21,000
Other	24,600
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 244,100
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 117,025
Allocation for FY 2004	291
Allocation for FY 2005	301
Conference Amount for FY 2006	495
Allocation for FY 2006	490
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	81,392
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate 2.7%	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio 2.6 (7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The allocation amount of \$490,000 will be used for continued sediment monitoring to track flood protection levels. In addition, a general reconnaissance report will be initiated to determine if ecosystem restoration actions are prudent in the Cowlitz and Toutle watersheds. Baseline studies will be completed along with a detailed Project Management Plan for the feasibility level phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: Mountain runoff flowing into the SRS impoundment area now passes over the spillway, instead of through the outlet structure as a result of sediment accumulation above the top level of outlet pipes. Increasingly more and more sediment will pass the SRS as the sediment impoundment level continues to rise behind the SRS. Future actions will address the increased downstream sedimentation and its impact to the authorized levels of flood protection for the developed areas along the Cowlitz River and river navigation as it relates to current authorization. Several local advocates are in regular contact with the Corps Portland District, expressing their passionate interests regarding continuing efforts to secure a permanent solution for sediment control and addressing issues of environmental restoration in and around Mt. St. Helens.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Patty Murray, (WA); Senator Maria Cantwell, (WA); Rep Brian Baird (WA-03).

DISTRICT: Portland

24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Shoalwater Bay Shoreline Erosion, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 545 of WRDA 2000 (PL 106-541)

LOCATION: Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation, Pacific County, Washington

DESCRIPTION: The project would address flood and coastal storm damage reduction resulting from deterioration of the barrier dune that has previously protected the Shoalwater Reservation from storm events that coincide with high tides.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$19,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	19,600
Allocation thru 2003	1,071
Allocation for FY 2004	735
Allocation for FY 2005	367
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	15,942
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Project Cooperation Agreement (06/06) and award the north flood berm extension fully funded construction contract (07/06).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction, 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: Congress added language in WRDA 2000 and the FY 2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act that the project be formulated, designed, constructed and maintained at 100% Federal expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Brian Baird (WA-03) and Norm Dicks (WA-06); and Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, NE

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b) (21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The Western Sarpy/Clear Creek project area is located along and on both banks of the Lower Platte River and a portion of the Elkhorn River in eastern Nebraska.

DESCRIPTION: The area has a significant, long-term flooding problem. The flood control project will consist of 50-year left and right bank levees. Existing levees will be reconstructed, along with portions of new levee construction. The project will incorporate a new Camp Ashland (Nebraska Army Nat Guard) levee that has been funded by the Guard. Conservation measures to lessen impacts to endangered species are included with the project. Also, the sponsors are completing nonstructural measures, consisting of flood proofing of cabins and homes. These measures became a separate element without credit to sponsors.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$11,660
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,278
Cash	1,501
Other	4,777
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$17,938
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 963
Allocation for FY 2004	361
Allocation for FY 2005	889
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	7,962
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.875%)	1.82
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete project design and complete contracting and construction activities for conservation measures. Initiate smaller levee fully funded construction contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: The PCA was approved by ASA (CW) on 7 April 2004 and delegated to the district commander for execution. The agreement was executed on 28 April 2004.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Terry (NE-2), and Fortenberry (NE-1) and Senators Hagel (NE) and Nelson (NE)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Alaska Coastal Erosion, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Section 117 of Public Law 108-447

“SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to carry out, at full Federal expense, structural and non-structural projects for storm damage prevention and reduction, coastal erosion, and ice and glacial damage in Alaska, including relocation of affected communities and construction of replacement facilities.”

LOCATION: Kivalina, Newtok, Shishmaref, Koyukuk, Barrow, Kaktovik, Point Hope, Unalakleet, and Bethel, Alaska

DESCRIPTION: *“The Committee has provided \$2,400,000 for Alaska Coastal Erosion. The following communities are eligible recipients of these funds: Kivalina, Newtok, Shishmaref, Koyukuk, Barrow, Kaktovik, Point Hope, Unalakleet, and Bethel. Section 117 of Public Law 108-447 will apply to this project.” Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, 2006, Senate Report 109-84, Page 41. The Conference report provided \$2.4M in CG funds for this project.*

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 56,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	TBD
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 56,000*
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,400
Allocation for FY 2006	2,400
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 53,600
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 2.3 (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

*Estimated costs for known requirement at 3 of the 9 listed communities

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Tab E reports (CAP Section 14 format) on all communities, initiate designs for protective works at 3 communities, execute PCA and 4th quarter award for construction at one community.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: TBD. Requirements to be defined in Tab E reports.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage

PROJECT NAME: Hawaii Water Management, State of Hawaii.

AUTHORIZATION: Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, as enacted by Section 1(a)(4) of Public Law 106-554

LOCATION: Islands of Oahu, and Kauai, State of Hawaii

DESCRIPTION: With the decline of the sugarcane industry in the State of Hawaii, the existing irrigation systems, which were built in the 19th century, are in a state of disrepair. These systems, located on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, Oahu, and Kauai continue to play a valuable role in sustaining and encouraging new and diversified agriculture.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$9,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,250
Cash	5,250
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$15,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$1,996
Allocation in FY 2004	745
Allocation in FY 2005	496
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation in FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	5,028
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	n/a
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	n/a

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to prepare plans and specifications for irrigation systems at Waiahole, Oahu and Kokee, West Kauai which are currently underway and is expected to be completed by April 2006. Actions to develop a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) and preliminary coordination with the local sponsor will be initiated.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction is scheduled to complete in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Administration implementation guidance for FY01 directed, subject to approval of the reconnaissance report, the development of a design agreement and subsequent cost sharing of design and construction of the project according to Army policy. FY01 Construction General funds were provided with the following language. "... that the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to use \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate design and construction of the Hawaii Water Management Project, including Waiahole Ditch on Oahu, Kau Ditch on Maui, Pioneer Mill Ditch on Hawaii, and the complex system on the west side of Kauai [sic]."

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye, HI, Senator Daniel Akaka, HI

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Iao Stream Flood Control, Maui, Hawaii

AUTHORIZATION: The original project was constructed under Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (PL 90-483). The design is being conducted, as authorized by the Chief of Engineers by letter report, 28 Mar 95.

LOCATION: The Iao Stream Flood Control Project is located in the town of Wailuku on the island of Maui.

DESCRIPTION: The project was completed in October 1981. The project includes a debris basin, a system of diversion levees, and two reaches of channel improvements. The project has prevented an estimated \$24,200,000 in damages to date. However, high stream flows undermined the levees in late 1981 and again in August 1989. The County of Maui had repeatedly repaired the project, but with unsatisfactory results. At the request of the county, the Corps conducted an initial authorization study for corrective action in accordance with Modification to Completed Projects program.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$15,952
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,589
Cash	8,389
Other	200
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$24,541
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$2,430
Allocation in FY 2004	-215
Allocation in FY 2005	444
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation in FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	12,922
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.32
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.46

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to release draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Engineering Documentation Report (EDR) for public review. The EA will be completed this fiscal year.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction is scheduled to be completed in FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: none

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Daniel K. Inouye (HI), Senator Daniel K. Akaka (HI) and Representative Ed Case (HI-2).

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

DATE: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Atlanta - Combined Sewer Overflow, GA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992; Section 504, WRDA of 1996; and Section 502, WRDA of 1999.

LOCATION: Atlanta, GA

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement is to prevent sewer overflows along Rock and Vine Streets as well as other areas in the City of Atlanta.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	333
Cash	333
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,333
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,000
Allocation for FY 2006	990
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	10
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – TBD	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – TBD	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 budgeted funds will be used to prepare an Engineering Documentation Report to define project scope, identify sponsor, develop project cooperation agreement, prepare environmental compliance documents, and prepare a construction schedule.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson and Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, GA-04.

DISTRICT: GA-04

Date: January 24, 2006

**FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Brevard County Shore Protection Project, Florida.

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation Resolution of 23 September 1982; Section 101(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996; and Section 418 of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: Brevard County is located on the east coast of Florida at the approximate midpoint of the peninsula.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project has been divided in two segments: North Reach and South Reach. The North Reach consists of restoration of 9.4 miles of shoreline and the south reach consists of restoration of 3.4 miles of shoreline.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 140,467
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	109,367
Cash	109,342
Other	25
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 249,834
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 24,427
Allocation for FY 04	174
Allocation for FY 05	2,841
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 06	495
Balance to Complete after FY 06	112,530
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not Available for current work
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not available for current work

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The CG funds will be used to continue the GRR/Feasibility study for the 7.6 mile Mid-Reach including environmental, economic and engineering activities. A 50/50 percent feasibility level cost share agreement to address this GRR effort was executed 26 October 2004.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The GRR/Feasibility study could be completed in FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: WRDA 2000 authorized a GRR to evaluate 7.1 miles (should have been 7.6) between the north and south reaches that was excluded because of near-shore hard-grounds. A PCA has been executed for the North and South reaches for a period of 50 years and the initial construction has been completed. The feasibility study is not at a point that the benefit cost ratio information for the Mid-Reach can be computed. The BCR for the North reach is 1.9, for the South reach, 1.1.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Dave Weldon (R) FL-15

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Broward County, Florida - North County Line to Hillsboro Inlet (Segment I), Hillsboro Inlet to Port Everglades (Segment II) and, Port Everglades to the south county line (Segment III)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965, (Segment I); Section 506 (a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, (Segments II & III); Section 311 of WDRA 1999(reimbursement for preconstruction planning and design).

LOCATION: Broward County is located on the lower Atlantic Coast of Florida about 30 miles north of Miami.

DESCRIPTION: The initial authorization for the project provided for construction by the local sponsor with reimbursement of the Federal share of eligible costs. Segment I of the project consists of about 4 miles of shorefront of which 1.8 miles are located along the City of Deerfield Beach. Initial beach fill is authorized along the City of Deerfield Beach shorefront, and periodic nourishment is authorized along the entire 4 miles from the north county line to Hillsborough Inlet. Segment I has not been constructed to date. Segment II consists of 11.5 miles of shorefront south of Hillsborough Inlet to Port Everglades, including Pompano Beach, Lauderdale by the Sea, and Fort Lauderdale. The county initially constructed the project along 3.0 miles at Pompano Beach in 1970 and nourished Pompano Beach and Lauderdale by the Sea along a total of 4.5 miles in 1984. The next renourishment of Segment II by the sponsor is anticipated in 2007. Segment III consists of about 8 miles of shorefront south of Port Everglades. The county initially constructed 1.6 miles at J.U. Lloyd State Park in 1978 and renourished that reach in 1990 and 2006. The county also initially constructed 5.2 miles at Hollywood and Hallandale in 1980 and renourished this reach in 1990 and 2005.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 118,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	91,000
Cash	91,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$209,400
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 21,380
Allocation for FY 04	224
Allocation for FY 05	810
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 06	742
Balance to Complete after FY 06	95,244
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.375%)	2.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	9.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: H.R. 109-86 (pg. 31) indicated that all of the FY 06 appropriation is for reimbursement for Segment III work only. Therefore, the sponsor will be reimbursed for the Federal share of the E&D costs for preparation of their GRR and P&S for Segment III, up to the limit of available funds.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Seg. I (north county line to Hillsborough Inlet): Fed participation has not begun, currently awaiting execution of a Design Agreement and Fed and non-Fed funds in order for USACE to initiate a GRR for initial construction (new start approval). The authorized limit, currently set for Fed participation in cost sharing for this segment, is 10 years after initial construction.

Seg II (Hillsborough Inlet to Port Everglades): Fed participation in cost sharing can extend to 2020 based upon Section 506 WRDA 1996 subject to additional PCA execution, which is needed for Fed participation in cost sharing for each future periodic nourishment by the sponsor (beginning in 2007 or 2008).

Seg. III (Port Everglades to south county line): Fed participation in cost sharing expires in 2028 based upon Section 506 of WRDA 1996 (subject to additional PCA execution for each periodic nourishment by the sponsor). A PCA was executed in September 2004 for only the ongoing renourishment of Seg. III by the sponsor. Their renourishment contract is scheduled for completion in January 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 311 of WDRA 1999 provides for reimbursement of the Federal share of the E&D costs for Segment III at the time the sponsor awards their renourishment contract. The sponsor provided their financial information for engineering and design costs with their reimbursement request in November 2005 for \$3.1 million. The sponsor will complete their renourishment contract in winter or spring of FY 06 and will send their request for reimbursement of the Federal share (estimated at \$14 million) for the renourishment contract and construction management costs during the fall or winter of FY 06. The sponsor will await an 18 month monitoring timeframe required by the state, prior to awarding the renourishment contract for Segment II in summer FY 07. A Design Agreement for preparation of a GRR by USACE for initial construction of Segment I (for the city of Deerfield Beach) was approved in FY 05 and is currently awaiting signature by the city. Separate new PCAs are required prior to construction on Segment I and Segment II. The RBRRCR information is from the Coast of Florida study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D) FL-20

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Brunswick County Beaches – Oak Island, Holden Beach and Caswell Beach Portion – General Reevaluation Report (GRR), North Carolina

AUTHORIZATION: Project Authorized House Document No. 511, 89th Congress, 2d Session, Cape Fear River to North Carolina – South Carolina State Line, 7 November 1966, which is know as Flood Control Act of 1966, Section 203.

LOCATION: Brunswick County, North Carolina – the extreme Southeastern portion of North Carolina.

DESCRIPTION: The reevaluation study is reevaluating the improvements recommended in General Design Memorandum – Phase I; Hurricane Wave Protection – Beach Erosion Control; Brunswick County, North Carolina, which addressed improvements consisting of dune and beach restoration fills covering a total coastline reach of 25.2 miles which applied to the contiguous shores of the towns of Yaupon Beach and Long Beach (Now the Town of Oak Island), located on Oak Island, and the three discrete, incorporated barrier islands of Holden Beach, Ocean Isle Beach and Sunset Beach. Ocean Isle was covered under a separate GRR and Sunset Beach has not requested to be included in the study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 212,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	113,000
Cash	112,100
Other	900
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 325,000
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 5,621
Allocation For FY 2004	631
Allocation For FY 2005	623
Conference Amount for FY 2006	225
Allocation For FY 2006	223
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	204,902
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.875%)	1.90
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.80

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue coastal and environmental studies and prepare draft General Reevaluation Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008, if not funded in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mike McIntyre (NC-07)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Dade County, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1968 (HD 335/90/2), WRDA of 1974 (PL 93-251, Sect. 69), Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985 and WRDA of 1986 (PL 99-662)

LOCATION: Dade County is located along the southern Atlantic coast of Florida at Miami.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides 13 miles of beach fill and periodic nourishment. The project area consists of that part of the Atlantic shoreline of the county from Government Cut north to Bakers Haulover Inlet (9.3 miles), Haulover Beach Park (1.2 miles), and Sunny Isles, which extends north of Haulover Beach Park (2.5 miles). The project provides for a protective and recreational beach with a dune for beach erosion control and hurricane protection along 9.3 miles and a protective and recreational beach along 3.7 miles. The berm width is 50 feet at elevation +9.0 feet MLW for 10.5 miles and 20 feet wide at +9.0 feet MLW for 2.5 miles.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 177,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	161,500
Cash	159,661
Other	1,839
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 339,100
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 78,597
Allocation for FY 04	304
Allocation for FY 05	104
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,350
Allocation for FY 06	1,336
Balance to Complete after FY 06	97,259
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds will be used to update the economics which were last updated in September 1992, continue E&D, including Geotechnical investigation and NEPA coordination on a new alternative offshore sand source and prepare acquisition strategy plans for north Miami Beach. A Design Documentation Report (DDR) is scheduled for completion in FY 06 for the Bal Harbour portion of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Federal participation in cost sharing expires in 2025 for the project except the Sunny Isles portion for which Federal

participation in cost sharing expires in 2038.

OTHER INFORMATION: Field work and NEPA coordination for a new offshore borrow area is scheduled for completion in winter 2006 in order to allow approval of the plans and specifications and advertisement of the renourishment contract for north Miami Beach in spring 2007. The renourishment contract award is scheduled in summer 2007. Coordination with state and Federal agencies for completion of the NEPA document was completed in November 2005 for the DDR. Following completion in 2006, the DDR will be forwarded for review by higher authority. Funding for this project in FY 06 was by congressional add; no update/computation of the benefit cost information was performed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R) FL-18, Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D) FL-20, and Kendrick B. Meek (D) FL-17

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Dare County, North Carolina

AUTHORIZATION: Project Authorized by Section 101 of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The project is located on the northern coast of North Carolina about 40 miles south of the North Carolina-Virginia state line.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized plan of improvement consists of a 25-foot-wide dune at elevation 13 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD) and a 50 foot wide berm to be constructed at elevation 7 feet NGVD along two separate stretches of shoreline. The most northern segment begins approximately 1 mile north of the southern Kitty Hawk town limits and extends for approximately 3.1 miles into Kill Devil Hills. The southern segment begins near the northern boundary of the Town of Nags Head and extends 10.1 miles to the northern property boundary of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Total length of the project is approximately 14.1 miles.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 830,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	800,000
Cash	793,844
Other	6,156
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,630,000
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 986
Allocation For FY 2004	873
Allocation For FY 2005	881
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,875
Allocation For FY 2006	1,856
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	825,404
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.125%)	1.64
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.76

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the construction phase, including biological and physical monitoring, real estate acquisition and update the economics to include recreation analysis.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2011 to complete initial construction if no funds provided in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Dole, Senator Burr, Congressman Jones
(NC-03)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Folly Beach, SC

AUTHORIZATION: Section 501(a), WRDA 86 and Section 108, P.L. 102-104

LOCATION: The project is located on Folly Island, approximately 12 miles south of the City of Charleston, SC.

DESCRIPTION: Initial project construction was completed in 1993; approximately 2.7 million cubic yards of sand were placed on the beach over a total project reach of 28,200 feet. During the 2004 hurricane season Folly Beach endured five tropical storms and a strong northeaster with offshore wave heights ranging up to 25 feet with the passage of Hurricane Charlie. Storm damages resulted in a loss of material from the project beach and the protective berm. As a result of the extraordinary 2004 hurricane season, Congress appropriated funds for emergency preparedness, response, and recovery through Public Law 84-99. A construction contract was subsequently awarded on March 4, 2005.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$98,689
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	17,415
Cash	16,595
Other	820
Total Estimated Cost	\$116,104
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 10,844
Allocation for FY 2004	155
Allocation for FY 2005	8,723
Conference Amount for FY 2006	60
Allocation for FY 2006	59
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 78,908
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8 7/8%)	1.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.96

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Carryover funds are being used to complete the placement of material on the beach and accomplish grassing and fencing activities. Placement was completed in early December 2005; approximately 2.3 million cubic yards of sand were placed on the beach. FY06 funds of \$59,000 are being utilized for environmental monitoring following the 2005 renourishment. The District is scheduled to receive funds from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for the purpose of completing a Project Implementation Report. Funds of \$60,000 will be expended to determine if the project sustained enough damage to be repaired under the P.L. 84-99 program. Funds of \$5.6 million have been earmarked as FCCE funds for this project (should it meet criteria).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2013

OTHER INFORMATION: It was determined that the Charleston Harbor jetties built in the late 1800's by the Corps of Engineers has caused 57% of the erosion at Folly Beach resulting in cost sharing of 85/15 instead of 65/35.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Graham and DeMint, Congressman Brown SC-1

DISTRICT: Charleston

Date: 20 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ft. Pierce Beach Shore Protection Project, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-53, WRDA 1999, Section 313 (additional 1 mile); Section 301 of the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1092) and section 506(a) (2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3757) (50 years).

LOCATION: Ft. Pierce Beach is located on Hutchinson Island in St. Lucie County on the east coast of Florida. Ft. Pierce Beach is about 120 miles north of Miami and about 225 miles south of Jacksonville.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project provides for initial restoration and periodic nourishment beginning at the south jetty of the entrance to the Ft. Pierce Harbor Federal navigation project for a distance of 1.3 miles to include Surfside Park at its southern limit. Under the original authority, a MHW extension of 50 feet was recommended with a berm elevation of +10 feet MLW chosen to tie in with the existing berm elevation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 38,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	21,900
Cash	21,820
Other	80
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 60,000
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 9,492
Allocation for FY 04	2,561
Allocation for FY 05	1,776
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 06	148
Balance to Complete after FY 06	24,123
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.125%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Regular and Supplemental funds will be used on the authorized 1.3 mile project to initiate plans and specifications for nourishment upon approval in spring 2007 and for review and approval of Limited Reevaluation Report for the 1.3 mile project. This LRR recommends the cost sharing change to reflect harbor mitigation associated with downdrift on adjacent shores resulting from the Federal navigation project at Fort Pierce Inlet and a change in the renourishment interval from 6 years to 2 years. Approval of the LRR is anticipated in spring 2006. Once approved, a PCA amendment will be executed prior to the next renourishment in 2007. In addition to the work effort associated with the P&S and LRR, as discussed previously, efforts to address an erosion problem that is occurring within the northern 3,000 feet of the

authorized project will be undertaken after execution of a 75/25 percent design agreement followed by the preparation of a GRR.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: This project is in the construction phase with a completion date of September 2020.

OTHER INFORMATION: Based on the impact of four hurricanes on the State of Florida in September 2004, FY05 Emergency Supplemental funding was provided for restoration of the project. This emergency re-nourishment was completed in June 2005. Hurricanes Katrina, Ophelia and Wilma impacted the project in 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mark Foley (R) FL-16

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lee County, Florida Shore Protection Project

AUTHORIZATION: Section 309, Public Law 106-541, GASPARILLA AND ESTERO ISLANDS, FLORIDA; Section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1073); Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 426i-1); Section 312, Public Law 106-53, LEE COUNTY, CAPTIVA ISLAND SEGMENT, FLORIDA, PERIODIC BEACH NOURISHMENT; Section 506(b)(3)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3758); Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 126i-1); and Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: Lee County is located on the lower Gulf Coast of Florida, about 90 miles south of the entrance to Tampa Bay. Gasparilla, Captiva, and Estero Islands are popular residential and resort areas, accessible by bridge or causeway.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project provides for Federal participation in beach erosion control measures for parts of the gulf shoreline of Lee County through the provision of a protective and recreational beach along 2.7 miles of Gasparilla Island, 4.7 miles of Captiva Island, and 4.6 miles of Estero Island.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 59,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	115,200
Cash	114,805
Other	395
Total Estimated Cost	\$175,000
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 4,792
Allocation for FY 04	112
Allocation for FY 05	2,824
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 06	742
Balance to Complete after FY 06	51,330
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%) Estero 2.5, Gasparilla 3.2	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%) Estero 2.3, Gasparilla 2.9	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to reimburse Lee County for work on Gasparilla and Estero Islands.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The construction of the Captiva segment will be complete in Spring FY 06. Completion of reimbursement for Gasparilla and Estero is dependent on funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: Based on the impact of four hurricanes on the state of Florida in September 2004, FY 05 Emergency Supplemental funding was provided for rehabilitation of Captiva Island to its pre-hurricane condition. Construction completion is scheduled for March 2006. Initial construction of the Estero Island and Gasparilla Island segments is currently planned for 2006 by Lee County under the authority of Section 206 of WRDA 1992. Estero and Gasparilla were not eligible for supplemental funds because the storms were prior to initial nourishment.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Connie Mack (R) FL-14

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Myrtle Beach, SC

AUTHORIZATION: P.L. 101-640, Section 101(a)(20)

LOCATION: The project is located along the northeastern coast of South Carolina. This area is commonly referred to as the Grand Strand.

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement placed 6.3 million cubic yards of sand over a total project reach of 25.4 miles of beach encompassing three separate reaches. The North Myrtle Beach reach was completed in May 97, the Myrtle Beach reach was completed in January 1998, and the Garden City/Surfside reach was completed in November 1998. Periodic nourishment will be required approximately every eight to ten years.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 140,535
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	75,672
Cash	74,033
Other	1,639
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 216,207
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 33,357
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 107,104
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8 ¼ %)	3.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	14.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds of \$74,000 will be used to evaluate erosion rates to determine if renourishment is needed at this time. The District is scheduled to receive funds from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for the purpose of completing Project Implementation Reports (PIR) for each of the three reaches. Funds of \$180,000 will be expended to determine if the project sustained enough damage to be repaired under the P.L. 84-99 program. If the project qualifies, it will also be evaluated to determine if it is in the Federal interest to undergo the scheduled renourishment activity at the same time. Funds of \$8.5 million have been earmarked as FCCE funds for this project (should it meet criteria) and an additional \$4.8 million have been earmarked as CG funds for this project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Graham and DeMint, Congressman Brown SC-1

DISTRICT: Charleston

Date: 20 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Construction General
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Oakes Creek Deficiency Correction, GA

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: The project is located entirely within Richmond County, Georgia and crosses into the City of Augusta, Georgia. The creek is a tributary to Butler Creek that flows into the Savannah River just downstream of the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam Navigation Project about 13 miles south of Augusta and 203 river miles above the mouth of the Savannah River.

DESCRIPTION: The Oates Creek Deficiency Correction project includes remedial work on the upper and lower earthen channels of the project. The upper channel work (about 1,650 feet) includes regrading the channel, construction of a drop structure in the moderately steep gradient to prevent the headcutting from continuing upstream, and riprapping half of the sideslope of the channel. The lower channel work (about 3,860 feet) includes regrading the design channel configuration by excavating built-up sediments, removing damaged erosion control matting, and the placement of a 12-foot-wide concrete pilot channel to contain normal nominal flows.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$9,422
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$3,141
Cash	\$665
Other	\$2,476
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,563
Allocations thru 2003	\$356
Allocations for 2004	(\$85.7) 1/
Allocations for 2005	\$0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$375
Allocations for 2006	\$371
Balance to Complete after 2006	\$8,695
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.78%)	1.13%
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3%

1/ Adjustment to balance the cost share agreement

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete solicitation package for advertisement in fourth quarter FY06. Solicitation will be held until construction funds are available.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Funds to initiate construction were first appropriated in FY 2001. FY2006 funds will complete the design. FY 2007 funds would have been used to complete channel excavation and placement of concrete low flow channel works and the construction of a drop structure in the upper channel.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Barrow (GA-12) (D)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Palm Beach County, Florida – (1962 Authorization) North County Line to Lake Worth Inlet and South Lake Worth Inlet to the South County Line (Jupiter/Carlin, Ocean Ridge, Delray, and Boca Raton segments)

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1962 for the overall project, WRDA 1986 Section 934 for Delray Beach only, and WRDA 1996 Section 506(b) for Jupiter/Carlin, Ocean Ridge, Delray and Boca Raton segments.

LOCATION: Palm Beach County is located on the lower east coast of Florida about 50 miles north of Miami.

DESCRIPTION: There are two segments of the project for which the project sponsors recently completed renourishment contracts in 2002. These are the 4th periodic nourishment of the Delray Beach segment and the first periodic nourishment of the Jupiter/Carlin segment. The USACE has recently completed 2 renourishments Delray Beach and Ocean Ridge that included 100% Federal cost under PL 84-99 authority for replacement of the erosion losses attributed to the 2004 hurricanes.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 67,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	143,300
Cash	141,839
Other	1,461
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 210,500
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 18,237
Allocation for FY 04	920
Allocation for FY 05	2,645
Conference Amount for FY 06	2,450
Allocation for FY 06	2,425
Balance to Complete after FY 06	42,973
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.875%)	2.1 North Boca Raton; 1.3 Jupiter/Carlin
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.5 N Boca Raton; 5.5 Jupiter/Carlin

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds will be used to reimburse the sponsors up to limit of available funds for the remaining Federal share of renourishment costs for Jupiter/Carlin segment (\$2,225,000), North Boca Raton (\$198,300), Delray Beach (\$124,600), and Ocean Ridge (\$33,300). In addition, FY06 funds will be used to complete review and coordination of the Limited Reevaluation Report and Plans & Specifications being prepared by the sponsor for the upcoming renourishment of the North Boca Raton segment in FY07. No regular funds will be used for additional construction until the Government's obligation for Jupiter/Carlin is liquidated.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Jupiter/Carlin: Fed participation in cost sharing expired in 2005 and may be extended to until 2045 based upon Section 506 of WRDA of 1996.

Ocean Ridge: Fed participation in cost sharing expires in 2047 based upon Section 506 of WRDA of 1996.

Delray Beach: Fed participation in cost sharing expires in 2023 under Section 934 of WRDA 1986.

North Boca Raton: Fed participation in cost sharing expired in 1998 and may be extended to until 2038 based upon Section 506 of WRDA of 1996.

OTHER INFORMATION: This is a reimbursable project (1962 authorization). The local sponsor completed re-nourishment of the Jupiter/Carlin segment in 2002. The local sponsor prepared a Limited Reevaluation Report for the Boca Raton segment in order to meet their schedule for next re-nourishment contracts in winter 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: E. Clay Shaw (R) FL-22

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pinellas County, Florida Shore Protection Project

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 1966, and the Water Resources Development Act of 1986

LOCATION: Pinellas County is on the gulf coast of Florida, about midway down the peninsula. It extends northerly about 39 miles from the main entrance to Tampa Bay to the vicinity of the mouth of the Anclote River. The Pinellas County coast consists of numerous barrier islands which are narrow and low, ranging in width from about 200 to 2000 feet.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project provides for Federal participation in beach erosion control measures for parts of the gulf shoreline of Pinellas County through the provision of a protective and recreational beach along 5,000 feet at Clearwater Beach Island, 49,000 feet at Sand Key, 9,200 feet at Treasure Island, and 5,600 feet at Long Key.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 161,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	108,900
Cash	108,626
Other	274
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 270,400
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 52,766
Allocation for FY 04	2,097
Allocation for FY 05	19,790
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,500
Allocation for FY 06	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 06	85,362
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to complete the construction contract in FY 06 for the Sand Key second renourishment as well as completion of a Blind Pass borrow area study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction of the Sand Key segment will be completed in June 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funding for this project in FY 06 was by congressional add; no update/computation of the benefit cost information was performed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Michael R. Bilirakis (R) FL-9; Bill Young (R) FL-10

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Portugues and Bucana Rivers, Puerto Rico

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1970 and Water Resources Development Act of 1986

LOCATION: The improvements are in and near Ponce on the Portugues and Bucana Rivers on the south coast of Puerto Rico.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for two multiple-purpose reservoirs for flood control, water supply, general recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement; enlargement of 5.7 miles of Bucana River and 2 miles of Portugues River; a 1.3 mile diversion channel connecting the Portugues River to lower Bucana River; and debris basins at the Bucana and Portugues Rivers. All work is programmed except the water supply increment of Portugues Dam.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 535,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	181,900
Cash	77,924
Other	103,976
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 717,300
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 400,947
Allocation for FY 04	2,374
Allocation for FY 05	2,619
Conference Amount for FY 06	14,000
Allocation for FY 06	13,860
Balance to Complete after FY 06	115,600
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	1.3 to 1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.7 to 1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue work on Cerrillos Additional Recreational Areas (\$4.0M, 2 year contract). Complete plans and specifications including BCOE for Portugues Dam.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Cerrillos Additional Recreational Areas will complete in FY 07. If no funding is provided in FY 07 for the Portugues Dam, advertisement and award will occur in the second quarter of FY 08 with a completion date in FY 12.

OTHER INFORMATION: If the Portugues Dam is not funded in FY 07, it will be difficult to include this project in the FY 08 Business Line due to the current criteria of fiscal continuity. Most of the foundation work has been completed in addition to the significant

investment made by both the federal and non-federal sponsor to date. There are some 16,500 structures, most of them residential and commercial, that would be impacted by the 100-year event without the Portugues Dam in place. Without the Portugues Dam, the lower channels provide only 25-year level of protection rather than the 100-year level as designed. Additionally, the full benefits of the lower portion of the project will not be realized. The residual flooding will continue to impact the City of Ponce, the second largest metropolitan area in Puerto Rico. During Hurricane Georges, extensive damage was experienced on the Portugues entrance channels, including the levee which almost failed, thus causing extensive flood damages to the upstream core of the City. RBRCR is for remaining Portugues Dam portion only.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Honorable Luis G. Fortuño, Resident Commissioner

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: West Onslow Beach, North Carolina.

AUTHORIZATION: Project Authorized by Water Resources Development Act of 1992, Section 101.

LOCATION: Town of Topsail Beach, NC.

DESCRIPTION: The existing authorized project is located along approximately 3-miles of the oceanfront at Topsail Beach on the southern end of Topsail Island.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 124,707
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	117,612
Cash	116,416
Other	1,196
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 242,319
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$1,561
Allocation For FY 2004	566
Allocation For FY 2005	311
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation For FY 2006	594
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	121,675
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%)	2.08
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.09

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue General Reevaluation Report (GRR). The GRR would redefine the project scope of the project authorized by HD 102-393 dated September 23, 1992. The GRR would likely result in a Post Authorization Change (PAC). Work will include draft report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The GRR would be completed in FY 2008 if no funds provided in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Dole, Congressman McIntyre (NC-07)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 23 January 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Caliente, Nevada

AUTHORIZATION: PL 109-103 p. 3-4, CR p. 4.

LOCATION: City of Caliente, Lincoln County, in southeastern Nevada, 55 miles North of Las Vegas.

DESCRIPTION: Provide a grant to the City of Caliente, Nevada for the City to expend for the purpose of purchasing construction equipment to be used by the City in construction local flood control measures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$2,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Allocation for FY 2006	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Develop and execute Grant Agreement. Distribute Grant funds.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman **Gibbons** (NV-2), Senator Reid

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Corte Madera Creek Watershed, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1962

LOCATION: Marin County, California. Corte Madera Creek and its tributaries drain an area of 28 square miles into the west side of San Francisco Bay 9 miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

DESCRIPTION: The study will examine improvements to stream function and flood damage reduction by exploring potential physical and management measures including storm water management, development and sedimentation measures and creek and habitat improvements and maintenance. Local groups have requested a watershed study to examine potential constructed and management improvements to the function of the watershed, both to improve migration of the threatened Steelhead (et al) and reduce flood damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	2,000
Cash	0	0
Other	0	2,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$100	\$4,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100	0
Allocation for FY 2006	100	0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	2,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Reconnaissance, 905(b) Report, Project Management Plan and Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006 for reconnaissance phase. Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1986 Sec 401 (c); WRDA 1988 Sec 26; WRDA 1990 Sec 101 (a) (5)

LOCATION: The project is located in San Jose and Milpitas, in Santa Clara County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The Coyote Creek Element of the Coyote and Berryessa Creeks Project was physically complete in April 1997. The Berryessa Creek Element was authorized for Section 211 credit in WRDA 96; however, the sponsor, Santa Clara Valley Water District, has elected not to pursue this credit and has requested the Corps to resume the study. The Berryessa Creek Element consists of approximately 4 miles of channel improvements and upgrading existing berms. The project is necessary for flood protection for a densely populated and highly industrialized area within the cities of Milpitas and San Jose.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 43,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	35,500
Cash	5,130
Other	30,370
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 78,800
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 33,860
Allocation for FY 2004	127
Allocation for FY 2005	367
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY2006	8,575
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.5%) Coyote only	3.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue General Reevaluation Report (GRR). Study conference scheduled for third quarter of FY06. Complete the development of the recommended plan and Locally Preferred Plan for the project. Start working on Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the GRR and initiation of PED in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project is authorized for construction and has a Sec. 902 limit exemption.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Pombo (CA-11); Stark (CA-13); Eshoo (CA-14); Honda (CA-15); Lofgren (CA-16); Senators Boxer and Feinstein

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kaweah River, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96

LOCATION: The project is located within the Tulare Lake Basin in the southeastern portion of the San Joaquin Valley between the cities of Fresno and Bakersfield, CA.

DESCRIPTION: The Kaweah River drains about 560 square miles from the Sierra Nevada Mountains into Lake Kaweah (Terminus Dam). Terminus Dam was completed in 1962, and has provided limited flood protection to Visalia and other rapidly developing urban areas along the Kaweah River. The project plan is to enlarge Lake Kaweah by 42,600 acre-feet by raising the spillway 21 feet to provide additional flood control and water conservation space.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 33,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	23,710
Cash	3,710
Other	20,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 57,410
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 17,585
Allocation for FY 2004	6,516
Allocation for FY 2005	4,997
Conference Amount for 2006	4,300
Allocation for FY 2006	4,257
Balance to Complete after 2006	345
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.125%)	1.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete work at the riparian mitigation and endangered species sites, complete O&M manual for the Terminus Dam, complete vernal pool mitigation for Tulare Lakebed site, complete new inundation map for areas downstream of dam.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Work for the project will be completed FY06. Maintenance and monitoring for the mitigation sites is required beyond FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: After the first filling, there were areas noted around the perimeter of the lake that will require repairs. Current funding appears adequate to cover the cost of repairs.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Radanovich (CA-19); Costa (CA-20); Nunes (CA-21); Thomas (CA-22); Senators Boxer and Feinstein

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lower Walnut Creek, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1960

LOCATION: The project is located on Walnut Creek and the lower reaches of its principal tributaries of Pacheco, Grayson, San Ramon, Las Trampas and Galindo Creeks and the lower and upper reaches of Pine Creek in Contra Costa County, California, about 20 miles southeast of San Francisco. The current project provides flood protection to residential, commercial and agricultural lands within the urban and suburban areas of Walnut Creek, Concord, Pacheco, and Pleasant Hill.

DESCRIPTION: The original project included about 22 miles of channel improvements consisting of channel enlargement, channel stabilization, and levees along Walnut Creek and the lower reaches of San Ramon and Las Trampas Creeks, channel improvement of Pine and Galindo Creeks and backwater levees on Lower Grayson and Pacheco Creeks. A general reevaluation report (GRR) was initiated in June 2003 to consider the addition of ecosystem restoration objectives to the authorized project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$75,660
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	27,970
Cash	6,510
Other	21,460
Total Estimated Cost	\$103,630
Allocations to 30 September 2003	\$72,412
Allocations for FY 2004	167
Allocations for FY 2005	97
Conference Amount FY 2006	188
Allocation for FY 2006	186
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,798
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Develop hydrologic model for watershed; initiate public scoping workshop (F2).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the GRR in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: Constrained funding has limited initiation of additional studies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller (CA-7); Tauscher (CA-10); Pombo (CA-11)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Marysville-Yuba City, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Acts of 1917, 1928, 1941 and River and Harbor Act of 1937

LOCATION: The project is located within the boundaries of the Sacramento River Flood Control System in the area including the Feather and Yuba Rivers and their tributaries, Sutter Bypass and the cities of Marysville and Yuba City and the communities of Linda and Olivehurst.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of reconstructing Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees by installing toe drains, stability berms, and slurry cut-off walls and backfilling a drainage ditch. The project also includes levee height restoration, the installation of relief wells, and about 76 acres of fish and wildlife mitigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$38,150
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,750
Cash	4,660
Other	8,090
Total Estimated Cost	\$50,900
Allocations to 30 September 2003	\$32,614
Allocations for FY 2004	4,490
Allocations for FY 2005	374
Conference Amount for FY 2006	372
Allocation for FY 2006	368
Balance to Complete after FY 2007	\$ 304
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	5.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Ongoing mitigation site monitoring.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of currently scoped project in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The non-Federal sponsor has requested technical assistance with the reconstruction of levees for certification by FEMA. Seepage and boils were experienced along the left bank of the Feather River in RD-784 and along the right bank of the Feather River in LD-1 during the flooding experienced New Year's weekend 2006. Federal and non-Federal interests are jointly investigating the issue to determine if it is a project deficiency.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Herger (CA-2); Lungren (CA-3)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Middle Rio Grande Flood Protection, Bernalillo to Belen, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA of 1986.

LOCATION: The project is located on the Rio Grande in central New Mexico, between Bernalillo and Belen, New Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: A General Reevaluation Report is currently underway reconfirming the feasibility of the Isleta, Mountainview, and Belen units of the project. The project consists of the rehabilitation and reconstruction of approximately 50 miles of spoil bank levees to provide flood control along the Rio Grande. The project will protect the municipalities of Corrales, Los Lunas, Bosque Farms, and Belen. Approximately 47,800 residents and \$1.47 billion dollars worth of property are currently located in the 270-year floodplain. Construction of the Corrales Unit of the project was completed in 1997.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 46,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	15,600
Cash	(15,600)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 62,400
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 10,399
Allocation for FY 2004	353
Allocation for FY 2005	322
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation for FY 2006	594
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	35,132
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (8-7/8%)	3.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	5.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue public involvement activities, hydraulic and economic evaluations, and initiate National Environmental Protection Act investigations in support of the General Reevaluation Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable continuation of the engineering analyses in support of the General Reevaluation Report.

OTHER INFORMATION: There are two endangered species in the project area – the Southwest Willow Flycatcher and the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01; Pearce, NM-02

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Murrieta Creek, California

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-377 Energy and Water Appropriation, Fiscal Year 2001, Section 103

LOCATION: The project encompasses Murrieta Creek in Riverside and San Diego counties, California. Murrieta Creek is a major tributary to the Santa Margarita River.

DESCRIPTION: The Project is a multi-purpose flood control, environmental restoration and recreation project along 7.5 miles of Murrieta Creek. The major project features include channel widening and deepening; an environmental corridor along the length of the project, a 270 acre multi-use detention basin, a wetland restoration area, a recreation park and 3 bridge replacements. The project is divided into four phases.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 67,907
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	40,215
Cash	(9,722)
Other	(30,493)
Total Estimated Project Cost	108,122
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,069
Allocation for FY 2004	3,723
Allocation for FY 2005	1,702
Allocation for FY 2006	3,712
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,750
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	57,701
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	5.9
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	.40

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design and repairs to Phase I construction Sep 06, complete Phase I O&M manual and Intermediate DDR Aug 06 and initiate Phase II Plans & Specs.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: Storms in January 2005 caused heavy damage to Phase I construction. Repairs caused an increase of \$3M and 12 month delay to the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Calvert (CA-44), **Bono** (CA-45), **Issa** (CA-49)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Nogales Wash, Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1990, Section 101 (a)(4); WRDA 1996, Section 303 & 404; WRDA 2000, Section 302

LOCATION: The project is located in the extreme southern Arizona in the central and northern portions of the city of Nogales, about 60 miles south of Tucson.

DESCRIPTION: The project has two separable features, a flood-warning system in Mexico and the United States and a channel and levee construction at Chula Vista, Arizona. Urbanization in the twin cities of Nogales, Sonora, Mexico and Nogales, Arizona, with a combined population of 240,000 has increased runoff into the Nogales Wash, causing flood/erosion problems.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 14,295
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,723
Cash	(1,200)
Other	(523)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 16,018
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 3,332
Allocation for FY 2004	927
Allocation for FY 2005	1,115
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	5,951
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.875%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Signed Project Cooperation Agreement and initiated construction Dec 05. Construction contract for Clearing and Grubbing was awarded Dec 05. Complete plans and specifications Feb 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Grijalva (AZ-7); Pastor (AZ-4); Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resource Development Act 2000

LOCATION: The project area is located partly within the city of Flagstaff and entirely within Coconino County, Arizona. The area is subject to flooding from Rio de Flag and Clay Avenue Wash.

DESCRIPTION: The plan consists of channel modifications, construction of a detention basin, berms and floodwalls in the Thorpe Park area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 35,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	19,100
Cash	(19,100)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 54,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,744
Allocation for FY 2004	1,985
Allocation for FY 2005	1,160
Allocation for FY 2006	3,465
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,500
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	26,646
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.375%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Mainstem plans & specifications 90% Jul 06 and begin Internal Technical Review Aug 06. Complete LRR and submit to USACE HQ Apr 06, and complete negotiations with BNSF regarding real estate issues Sep 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE Optimal funding would enable physical construction completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: It became apparent in 2004 that the total project cost could exceed the maximum project cost (902) limit. Alternative methods of construction, value engineering workshops and other actions are in process to reassess project costs. Preparations of plans and specifications will resume in early February 2006 pending a City of Flagstaff Council meeting. Once the design intent is accepted by the project team, a revision with specific "Cash" and "Other" sponsor requirements will be determined.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Renzi (AZ-1), Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Lorenzo River, CA

AUTHORIZATION: WRDAs 1996 and 1999; Energy & Water Development Appropriation Act, 2004

LOCATION: The project is located within the city limits of Santa Cruz, CA.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of floodwalls on top of various portions of the San Lorenzo River levees, levee toe-drains, a controlled overflow, channel dredging, flood proofing and habitat restoration measures. Bank stabilization was added to the project in WRDA 99. The project will provide a 70-year level of protection (equivalent to FEMA 100 year). The Corps completed a flood control project in 1959. Since then, excessive sediment deposition in the streambed has reduced the flood carrying capacity to about a 30-year event (as compared to the design capacity of about a 150-year event).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 24,550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,470
Cash	6,386
Other	2,354
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 33,290
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 18,436
Allocations for FY 2004	1,774
Allocations for FY 2005	1,155
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,443
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.75%)	.88
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.80

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate plans and specifications for dredging options.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in October 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Bank erosion control was authorized as part of the project in the WRDA 99. House Report 107-112 from FY2002 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002 states in part: "... it was the intent of Congress that the Corps of Engineers treat the modification as a seamless part of the original project, and that the bank erosion control portion of the project not be treated as a separate project subject to a separate new start decision." This effort required an amendment to the PCA. The amendment was signed by the ASA(CW) in March 2004. A contract was awarded in April 2004 for the bank erosion control. This contract is physically complete. The final planning for the dredging portion of the authorized project is being prepared. The dredging will complete the authorized project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Eshoo (14-CA); Honda (15-CA); Farr (17-CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Luis Rey Flood Control Project, California

AUTHORIZATION: Section 201 FC Act of 1965 (Auth 1970), WRDA 86, Section 1165
Appropriations Bill 1990, WRDA 1990, Title I, Section 102.f, WRDA 96, Section 301 (a)(3)

LOCATION: The project is located along the lower 7.2 miles of the San Luis Rey River, in and around the City of Oceanside, San Diego County, California.

DESCRIPTION: Authorized plan provides for 5.4 miles of a double levee, stone-protected channel with a soft bottom; 1330 feet of parapet walls; six interior drainage ponds; and a 5-mile bicycle trail. Authorized project will provide a maximum of 270 -year protection from upstream limits at College Blvd. The completed levee system prevented approximately \$23.5M (2000 PL) in damages during the 1993 floods.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 80,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	22,300
Cash	4,050
Other	18,250
Total Estimated Cost	\$102,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 60,680
Allocation for FY 2004	74
Allocation for FY 2005	300
Allocation for FY 2006	990
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	17,956
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8 7/8%)	.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.48

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Section 7 consultation. Complete Post Authorization Decision Document (PADD) Jul 06, monitoring, cowbird trapping, arundo removal, some vegetation clearing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: O&M plan for authorized plan, completed in 1998, included a vegetation removal procedure, negotiated with regulatory agencies. At the time USFW recognized only one endangered species, the least bell's vireo, within project area. Critical habitat for the vireo has been designated, and seven other species were listed as endangered. Project has not been turned over to sponsor. FEMA flood insurance has partially been lifted.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Feinstein, Boxer, Congressperson Issa (CA-49)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Stockton Metropolitan Area, CA (Sec. 211)

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act, 1996 (Sec. 211(f)); Energy & Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000

LOCATION: The primary project area is in the city of Stockton, California. The area extends from Bear Creek on the north, Mormon Slough on the south, the confluence with the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta on the west and Jack Tone Road on the east.

DESCRIPTION: Project will reimburse the sponsor for locally constructed improvements made to the existing levee system along the Bear Creek System and the Calaveras River System. After flooding in northern California in 1986, FEMA initiated a flood zone restudy of the Stockton area. Draft Flood Insurance Rate Maps were released delineating a larger 100-year flood plain than previously recorded, affecting approximately 251,000 residents.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$35,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,100
Cash	2,400
Other	9,700
Total Estimated Cost	\$47,800
Allocations to 30 September 2003	\$13,266
Allocations for FY 2004	1,435
Allocations for FY 2005	2,221
Conference Allowance for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$13,828
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.875%)	2.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue reimbursement to San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency (SJAFCA).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of reimbursement by FY 2007.

ISSUES AND OTHER INFORMATION: Crediting report concluded that San Joaquin Area Flood Control Agency's improvements to Lower Mosher Slough area (non-Federal cost of \$4.3 million) are not eligible for reimbursement. Improvements to 12,000 feet of Upper Calaveras River Levee System (non-Federal cost of \$3.28 million), 3,300 feet of Upper Mosher Creek (non-Federal cost of \$812,000) and permitting costs of \$773,000 were also determined to be ineligible for reimbursement. These areas did not meet Corps minimum flow criteria.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Doolittle (CA-4); Pombo (CA-11); Cardoza (CA-18)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tucson Drainage Area (Tucson Arroyo), Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act, 1938, WRDA 1999, Section 101(a)(5)

LOCATION: The project is located within the 12-mile-reach of the Tucson Arroyo/Arroyo Chico watershed within the city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan consists of two detention basin complexes – one referred to as the Randolph Golf Course Detention Basin in the upstream part of the watershed (completed by Pima County in May 1996) in accordance with a Section 104 agreement, and the second referred to as Park Avenue Basin complex in the center of the watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 22,867,000 ^{1/}
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	14,133,000
Cash	(1,850,000)
Other	(12,283,000)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 37,000,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 2,697,000
Allocation for FY 2004	862,000
Allocation for FY 2005	699,000
Allocation for FY 2006	9,900,000
Conference Amount for FY 2006	10,000,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,042,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.875%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.2

^{1/} This includes \$1,667,000 of Section 104 Credit that will not be redeemed.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete plans & specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Potential cost increase of \$3M due to delays in design and increases in cost of materials.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Pastor (AZ-4); Grijalva (AZ-7); Kolbe (AZ-8), Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Guadalupe River, CA

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1999, Section 101(a)(9)

LOCATION: The project area is located along the Upper Guadalupe River, in the city of San Jose, Santa Clara County.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended project includes channel widening, a bypass channel and construction of levees and floodwalls.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$111,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	100,600
Cash	10,600
Other	90,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$212,100
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,070
Allocation for FY 2004	127
Allocation for FY 2005	560
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,500
Allocation for FY 2006	3,465
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	105,278
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5-5/8%)	1.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Plans and Specs for Reach 10B and Reach 12, complete Longitude Profile Study, and award Reach 10B construction contract in May 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2015.

OTHER INFORMATION: NED Plan provides a 50-year level of protection, while sponsor supports a Locally Preferred Plan (LPP) that incorporates recreation, long-term recovery of riparian habitat and provides a 100-year level of protection. WRDA 1999 authorized the LPP with Federal participation limited to the NED. The new project costs are \$238 million. Reauthorization required for 902 fix. Pending WRDA legislation includes fix based on recently completed Limited Reevaluation Report (23 Feb 2005).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Pombo CA-11, Eshoo CA-14, Honda CA-15, Lofgren CA- 16

DISTRICT: San Francisco

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Yuba River, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 1999

LOCATION: Yuba River lies between the Feather and American Rivers in northern California. The project is located in Sutter and Yuba Counties approximately 50 miles north of Sacramento. The principal urban centers within the project area include Marysville, Yuba City, Linda and Olivehurst.

DESCRIPTION: Recommended project, which lies downstream of Daguerre Point and Yuba goldfields, would include levee improvements including installation of slurry walls, constructing landside berms, toe drains, and levee raising along the Yuba and Feather Rivers. The area has experienced 7 major floods. Despite modifications for flood protection over past years, the area is still vulnerable to catastrophic flooding as demonstrated by floods of Feb 86 and Jan 97.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 PED/CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 22,850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	10,850
Cash	8,150
Other	2,700
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 33,700
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,400
Allocations for FY 2004	850
Allocations for FY 2005	474
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,200
Allocation for FY 2006	1,188
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 18,938
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.875%)	2.9
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue General Reevaluation Report (GRR).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the GRR in July 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction General funding has been provided in FY03 - FY06. Deeper slurry walls and other measures to control seepage not anticipated during feasibility will increase the cost and scope. Further design has been delayed until the GRR is approved. The local sponsor has requested a GRR be prepared for Congressional authorization to increase cost and scope and add ecosystem restoration to the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Herger (2-CA); Lungren (3-CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

6 February 2006

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Arkansas City, Kansas

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 1986

LOCATION: Arkansas City, Kansas

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of raising and extending the existing levee and modifying the lower end of the Walnut River Channel

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 24,900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,300
Cash	(4,200)
Other	(4,100)
Total Estimated Cost	33,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	16,947
Allocation for FY 2004	2,705
Allocation for FY 2005	889
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,619
Allocation for FY 200	2,619
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY 2006 will be used to complete project construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion date for project construction is FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Brownback and Roberts, (KS); Congressman Tiahrt (KS-4).

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Central City, Fort Worth, Upper Trinity River Basin, TX

AUTHORIZATION: Section 116, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2005 (P.L. 108-137). "The project for flood control and other purposes on the Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-298), as modified, is further modified (Public Law 108-447, Section 116) to authorize the Secretary to undertake the Central City River Project, as generally described in the Trinity River Vision Master Plan, dated April 2003, as amended, at a total cost not to exceed \$220,000,000, at a Federal cost of \$110,000,000, and a non-Federal cost of \$110,000,000, if the Secretary determines the work is technically sound and environmentally acceptable. The cost of the work undertaken by the non-Federal interests before the date of execution of a project cooperation agreement shall be credited against the non-Federal share of the project costs if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project."

LOCATION: The project area is located in metropolitan Fort Worth, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The Central City project (Federal project) is a portion of the non-Federal Sponsor's (Tarrant Regional Water District, TRWD) overall vision for the project area located at the confluence of the Clear and West Forks of the Trinity River and is described in the Trinity River Vision Master Plan, Central City Segment (overall non-Federal project in which the Federal project is a subset). The project revisits the flood protection provided by the existing authorized Fort Worth Floodway, provides environmental enhancements, improves recreation, and revitalizes the urban area. The project would restore the Standard Project Flood (SPF) level of protection for the Federally authorized Fort Worth Floodway project. In addition, the bypass channel would reduce flooding threats in the "sump areas" that still remain in the 100-year floodplain.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 110,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	110,000
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 220,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	7,000
Allocation for FY 2006	6,930
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	103,070
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Design of civil and structural components, negotiation and signing of a

design agreement, refinement of cultural resources, design and identification of ecological mitigation, geo-technical analysis, hydraulic analysis, program management, real estate investigation and detailed study of valley storage mitigation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion date of construction is 2018.

OTHER INFORMATION: Total project as envisioned by the sponsor would cost \$435 million, so delineating \$220 million portion that meets all the appropriate rules for separability has been a challenge. The project sponsor is pursuing modified authorization to cover the full \$435 million project. BCR/RBCR is "N/A" because project authorization does not require economic justification.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Granger, TX-12.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coast Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Clear Creek, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1968

LOCATION: The project is located in Harris and Galveston Counties, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the project is flood damage reduction for an extensively developed urban area. The authorized project consist of approximately 15.3 miles of channel enlargement and bend easing, more stringent regulations restricting development of the 100-year floodplain, and a second outlet channel with a gated structure between Clear Lake and Galveston Bay. The local sponsors are the Harris County Flood Control District, Galveston County and, for the General Reevaluation Report (GRR), Brazoria Drainage District No.4.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$98,550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	59,500
Cash	(7,900)
Other	(51,600)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$158,050
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$24,166
Allocation for FY 2004	1,132
Allocation for FY 2005	1,359
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,125
Allocation for FY 2006	1,114
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$67,936
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3 1/4%)	2.12
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete development of the National Economic Development Plan(NED); complete development of the National Environmental Restoration Plan (NER) identify the NED/NER Plan; select a recommended plan; prepare the draft engineering appendix; complete the plan formulation appendices; conduct an independent technical review; and hold an Alternatives Formulation Briefing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If optimally funded, the project construction will be complete in FY 2014.

OTHER INFORMATION: Dredging and construction of the second outlet channel was completed in July 1997, and the outlet and gated structure were transferred in March 1998 to the local sponsor for operation and maintenance. Opposition to the authorized project over environmental concerns arose during construction in 1997 and, as a result, led to the preparation of a General Reevaluation Report that is currently ongoing. The GRR is scheduled for completion in November 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (TX); Congressmen Al Green

(TX-9), DeLay (TX-22) and Paul (TX-14).

DISTRICT: Galveston District

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Dallas Floodway Extension, TX

AUTHORIZATION: Section 351, River and Harbor Act 1965 (P.L. 89-298); modified by Section 351 WRDA 1996 (P.L. 104-303); and Section 356 of WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53).

LOCATION: The project area is located in metropolitan Dallas, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The Dallas Floodway Extension project consists of a Chain of Wetlands (1.5 miles upper; 2.2 miles lower), two SPF levees (Lamar Street-2.9 miles and Cadillac Heights-2.3 miles), 123 acres of wetlands for ecosystem restoration, realignment of the Trinity River at IH-45, 31 miles of linear recreation and 1,179 acres of mitigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 107,460
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	51,441
Cash	7,986
Other	43,455
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 158,901
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 29,892
Allocation for FY 2004	9,216
Allocation for FY 2005	8,410
Conference Amount for FY 2006	11,250
Allocation for FY 2006	11,137
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	48,805
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7-1/8%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.8

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The Lower Chain of Wetlands contract awarded in August 2005 is under construction and is scheduled to be fully funded in March 2006. The city will be reimbursed \$7M in April 2006 for prior construction activities, as authorized in Section 351 of WRDA 96.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion of construction is 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: There are anticipated to be 7 contracts for the construction of the project. To date, one is complete (Cell D) and one was awarded in FY05. The third contract (Upper Chain of Wetlands) is scheduled for award in FY07.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Johnson, TX-30; Sessions, TX-32.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Graham, TX (Brazos River Basin)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 (a)(30), WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53).

LOCATION: The project is located in the north central Texas city of Graham (Young County).

DESCRIPTION: The project includes a buy-out of 113 structures within the 10-year floodplain, installation of a flood warning system estimated to provide a 12-hour warning time, construction of 2.1 miles of hike/bike trail and 0.6 miles of nature train, and ecosystem restoration of 129 acres.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 8,353
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,747
Cash	807
Other	3,940
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 13,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 280
Allocation for FY 2004	40
Allocation for FY 2005	197
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,094
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7-1/8%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Demolition activities of structures within the project area.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion date for construction is 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: If funding isn't received in FY07 to continue demolition activities, structures which have already been acquired by the sponsor will remain vacant and subject to misuse.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Neugebauer, TX-19.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT NAME: Hunting Bayou, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a)21 of WRDA 1990 (Part of Buffalo Bayou and Tributaries); and Section 211(f)(7) of WRDA 1996 (Reimburse sponsor).

LOCATION: The project is located in Houston and Harris County, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project consists of 14.3 miles of stream improvements, recreation trails, picnic facilities, parking areas, and a comfort station.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 88,890
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	76,950
Cash	(8,900)
Other	(68,050)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$165,840
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 1,017
Allocation for FY 2004	3
Allocation for FY 2005	6
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete After FY 2007	\$87,493
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6 3/8%)	10.1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	7.9

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: (Sponsor) Finalize and submit a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) for USACE review; (Federal) Provide oversight and review of project study efforts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The project will be complete in FY 2012, assuming non-Federal construction completion of FY 2011, with audit and potential reimbursement in 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 211 of WRDA 96 authorizes non-Federal interests to plan, design, and construct Federal flood control projects, and after approval of the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) by ASA(CW) be reimbursed up to the Federal share of costs for the work accomplished. The non-Federal sponsor is Harris County Flood Control District (HCFCD). The sponsor will conduct design and construction efforts using local funds. Any funding that is made available would be used to negotiate and execute a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA), conduct project oversight and review, and initiate reimbursement to the project sponsor for the Federal share of the GRR after ASA(CW) approval. The GRR is scheduled for completion in December, 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn (TX) and Hutchison (TX); Congressmen Al Green (TX-9), Gene Green (TX-29), Culberson (TX-7), and Congresswoman Jackson Lee (TX-18).

DISTRICT: Galveston District

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tenkiller Ferry Lake, Oklahoma (Dam Safety)

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1938

LOCATION: On the Illinois River 7 miles northeast of Gore, Oklahoma, and 22 miles southeast of Muskogee, Oklahoma.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of an auxiliary spillway with five 50-foot wide by 35-foot high tainter gates to be constructed near the right abutment of the embankment. The spillway structure will be similar to the existing spillway.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 39,889
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	39,889
Allocations thru FY 2003	27,666
Allocation for FY 2004	2,592
Allocation for FY 2005	3,909
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,200
Allocation for FY 2006	5,200
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY 2006 will be used to complete project construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe and Coburn, OK; and Congressman Boren, OK-2.

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

**GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION**

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Harlan County Lake Dam Safety Assurance Evaluation

AUTHORIZATION: Harlan County Lake, NE, originally authorized under the Flood Control Acts of 1938, 1941 and 1944.

LOCATION: Harlan County Lake is located on the Republican River near Republican City, NE.

DESCRIPTION: The authorized purposes of the project are flood control, irrigation, recreation and fish and wildlife. The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) operates the irrigation purpose.

FY 2006 (\$000)

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	O&M	
	<u>Special Item</u>	
Estimated Federal Cost		\$1,907,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		0
Cash		0
Other		0
Total Estimated Project Cost		\$1,907,000
Allocation thru FY 2003		\$824,000
Allocation for FY 2004		283,000
Allocation for FY 2005		384,700
Conference Amount for FY 2006		320
Allocation for FY 2006		317 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		414,983
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		NA

1/ Reflects reduction of \$3,000 for 1% rescission.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Substantial completion of Dam Safety Evaluation Report and NEPA process.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is scheduled for FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study is required under the Corps Dam Safety Assurance Program. The study costs are included in the annual joint-use O & M costs. The Irrigation Districts must pay 15.35 percent of annual joint-use O & M costs. The study requires coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) because there are six Reclamation projects in the basin upstream of Harlan County Lake, and this study must take into account the hydrologic adequacy of those lakes.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Chuck Hagel and Ben Nelson; Representatives Doug Bereuter and Tom Osborn (NE).

DISTRICT: Kansas City

26 January 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Operations and Maintenance
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lowell Creek Tunnel, Seward Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: 1) Flood Control Act, 25 August 1937 (House Doc. 154, 75th Congress, 1st Session) as adopted, provides for the construction of a diversion dam 25 feet high and 400 feet long, and for a concrete lined tunnel 10 feet in diameter and 2,070 feet long through Bear Mountain to protect the city of Seward from the floodwaters of Lowell Creek. 2) Section 510 of the Water Resources and Development Act of 2000, Public Law 106-541, and the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 106-60, to "carry-out, on an emergency, one-time basis, necessary repairs of the Lowell Creek Tunnel in Seward, Alaska, at Federal expense and at a total cost of \$3,000,000."

LOCATION: Seward, Alaska

DESCRIPTION: Lowell Creek Tunnel is located in Seward, Alaska and consists of a 25 foot high by 400 feet long diversion dam and a 2,070 feet long, 10 foot diameter, concrete lined tunnel to divert the flows of Lowell Creek away from Seward, Alaska. The project was transferred to the City of Seward in 1940 for operations and maintenance.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	O&M
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 90
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 90
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 3,326
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 90
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 90
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to install a ladder and gate to access the downstream end of the tunnel outlet to reduce slip and fall safety hazards during the winter low flow months when annual inspections are required under the Inspection of Completed Works program.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: The project was constructed by the Federal government but the operations and maintenance responsibility was transferred to the City of Seward, Alaska in 1940. Under the Inspection of Completed Projects authority (Operations and Maintenance, General) the Alaska District Corps of Engineers inspects the project and provides technical advice to the local government on maintenance requirements. The City of Seward has been challenged to provide adequate maintenance because access to the project is limited to the low flow periods of January through March of any given year. Maintenance can rarely occur in the same year of an inspection due to the short construction period. The Federal government has had to effect repairs

three times since 1969 under the authority of P.L. 84-99. Of the WRDA 2000 cost limit of \$3M, \$1,992,519 has been spent performing repairs that were completed in March of 2003.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Stevens, Senator Murkowski, and Representative Don Young.

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Albuquerque Levees, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: PL 109-103, Title 1 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006

LOCATION: Albuquerque, New Mexico

DESCRIPTION: The forty miles of levee that comprise the Albuquerque Unit of the Middle Rio Grande Flood Control Project provide flood protection to the most highly developed area in the state of New Mexico. The levees were authorized in 1948 and 1950 and the Corps of Engineers completed construction of the levees in 1955. The local sponsor for the levee system is the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>O&M</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,132
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,132
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	152
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A detailed evaluation of the levees within the Albuquerque Unit will be performed in FY 2006 to determine structural integrity, impacts of vegetative growth, and performance under current hydrologic conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Levee evaluation report will be completed in FY 2007 using carry over funds from FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Recent Federal Court decisions have raised a question of land ownership between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (local sponsor) within the study area. Resolution of this issue will require Congressional action.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Hydropower.....	284
Construction.....	285
Northwestern Division	286
Bonneville Powerhouse (Phase II, Major Rehab), OR	287
Garrison Dam & Power Plant (Major Rehab), ND	288
South Atlantic Division	290
Buford Powerhouse, GA (Major Rehab).....	291
Hartwell Lake Powerhouse, GA & SC (Major Rehab).....	292
Thurmond Lake Powerhouse, GA & SC (Major Rehab)	294
Southwestern Division.....	296
Whitney Lake (Powerhouse)	297
Operation and Maintenance	299
Northwestern Division, Water Resource Region 10	300
Missouri River between Fort Peck Dam and Gavins Point, SD	301

HYDROPOWER

CONSTRUCTION

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bonneville Powerhouse Phase II Major Rehab, OR

AUTHORIZATION: Bonneville Project Act of 1937, August 20, 1937.

LOCATION: Bonneville Powerhouse 1 is located at the Bonneville Lock and Dam Project, on the Columbia River 42 miles east of Portland, OR

DESCRIPTION: Rewind or repair six generators, replace ten turbines: rehabilitate and repair the 1st Powerhouse bridge cranes and rails; rehab and repair or replace the electro-mechanical governor; and rehab and repair the wicket gates.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 124,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	000
Total Estimated Cost	\$124,300 <u>1/</u>
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 79,538
Allocation for FY 2004	3,131
Allocation for FY 2005	4,152
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	32,529
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Costs fully allocated to Power are reimbursable by Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Turbine replacement and generator rehabilitation for Unit 2 will be completed in FY06. Turbine replacement for Unit 10 will be completed in FY06. Turbine replacement and generator rehabilitation of Unit 8 will begin in FY06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Bonneville Power Administration will fund the turbine replacement and generator rehabilitation of the remaining three units. No further funds will be requested through Appropriations beginning in FY 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen Murray – WA; Baird, WA-03; Blumenauer, OR-03;

DISTRICT: Portland

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Garrison Dam and Power Plant, ND (Major Rehabilitation)

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1944, PL 78-534

LOCATION: The Garrison Dam Project is located in McLean and Mercer Counties in North Dakota on the Missouri River approximately 77 river miles upstream of Bismarck near Riverdale, North Dakota.

DESCRIPTION: Garrison Dam and Reservoir is a multi-purpose project consisting of a rolled earth-filled dam with a sheet pile cutoff, a hydroelectric power plant, and a reservoir with storage capacity of 23,821,000 acre feet for flood control, navigation, power, recreation, irrigation, and municipal supply. Five hydraulic turbine-driven generating units with a total plant rated capacity of 518 MW and the operation and maintenance facilities are housed in the powerhouse. The present hydropower benefits directly associated with Garrison Power Plant include (1) clean, non-polluting power generation for the region, and (2) average power generation revenues of about \$33.6 million per year to the U.S. Treasury. This major rehabilitation project will replace the existing turbine runners on all five units with new runners designed to improve reliability and maximize efficiency over a broad range of operating conditions. An addendum to the major rehabilitation project was approved by HQUSACE on 15 September 2004. The addendum work will address upgrades to electrical components that will allow the project to maximize the full reliability and efficiencies obtained in the powerhouse upgrades.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$106,260
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$106,260
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$37,359
Allocation for FY 2004	9,536
Allocation for FY 2005	8,103
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,582
Allocation for FY 2006	3,546
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	47,716
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (7.75%)	1.98
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ration (7%)	2.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The allocation amount of \$3,546,000 will include completion of the turbine and generator rehab. Design and construction activities will begin on the existing transformers, electrical power train, peripheral equipment, and switchyard equipment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: When the turbine and generator rehab is complete, the generators will have increased capacity and ratings significantly greater than the capability of the existing electrical power train and peripheral equipment. The turbines and generators both will be capable of producing 112.5 MW each. The existing electrical power train equipment and systems, along with associated peripheral equipment, are rated for 98 MW capacities of the turbines and generators prior to the rehabilitation. The replacement of the existing transformers, electrical

power train, peripheral equipment, and switchyard equipment is estimated at \$51,399,700 with an incremental benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.52. The Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), the Federal power marketing agency with marketing jurisdiction over the power produced at Garrison, has provided a letter of support for the recommended plan.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Pomeroy (ND-AL), Senators Dorgan (ND) and Conrad (ND)

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Buford Powerhouse, Georgia (Major Rehab)

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945, as amended.

LOCATION: Buford, GA

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement is to rewind the three generators and replace the three turbines, excitors, sluice gates and SCADA system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$30,900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$30,900
Allocation thru 2003	\$17,241
Allocation for FY 2004	7,211
Allocation for FY 2005	1,883
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,812
Allocation for FY 2006	5,784
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	-1,219 <u>1/</u>
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – 2.4 to 1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – 2.4 to 1	

1/ Excess funds will be used to repay projects that advanced funds to this project in prior year.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 budgeted funds will be used to complete the contract on the sluice gate, award a contract and complete construction of the crane rehab, which will complete the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: The project will be completed in FY 06.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson and Congressmen Thomas E. Price, GA-06, John Linder, GA-07 and Nathan Deal, GA-10.

DISTRICT: GA-06, 07, 10

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Hartwell Major Rehab

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act approved 17 May 1950 and Flood Control Act approved 3 July 1958

LOCATION: The project is located on the Savannah River, 89 miles north of Augusta, Georgia and 305 miles north of the mouth of the river

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan involves the rewinding of four generator units, the refurbishment of the four older turbines, and the replacement of key electrical/mechanical peripheral equipment to improve the overall reliability of the project, to reduce operation and maintenance costs, and to reduce unscheduled outages and repair costs. All work is programmed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$32,637
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$0
Cash	\$0
Other	\$0
Total Estimated Cost	\$32,637
Allocations thru 2003	\$28,293
Allocations for 2004	\$2,530
Allocations for 2005	\$1,081
Conference Amount for 2006	\$733
Balance to Complete after 2006	\$0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8%)	1.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (8%)	37.8

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete switchyard upgrade and all major rehab actions and contract closeout.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Physical completion April 2006; Fiscal completion September 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction will complete in FY2006. Hartwell's power plant switchyard serves as a connection point between several different power-generating facilities. Timely completion of the rehab project has lessened the impacts on the production and delivery of electricity to the preference customers, not only that power produced by the Hartwell power plant, but also that power produced and transmitted in the vicinity. Switchyard work has been performed in phases in order to minimize interruption in power production and transmission during the seasons.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Norwood, GA-9, R; Rep Barrett SC-3, R

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 26, 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Thurmond Major Rehab, GA & SC

AUTHORIZATION: None required.

LOCATION: The project is located on the Savannah River, 22 miles north of Augusta, Georgia and 216 miles north of the mouth of the river.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan involves the rewinding of seven generator units, the replacement of the turbine rotating parts, and the refurbishment or replacement of key peripheral equipment in order to improve the overall reliability of the project, to reduce operation and maintenance costs, to reduce unscheduled repair costs, and to provide additional hydropower capacity, power revenues and environmental improvements. All work is all programmed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$69,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$0
Cash	\$0
Other	\$0
Total Estimated Cost	\$69,700
Allocations thru 2003	\$47,848
Allocations for 2004	\$ 5,278
Allocations for 2005	\$ 4,456
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 5,700
Allocations for 2006	\$ 5,643
Balance to Complete after 2006	\$ 6,475
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.3%
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete turbine replacement contract. Complete design for miscellaneous work.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: Funding of \$5.7M in FY 06 will allow completion of turbine work and initiation of miscellaneous work (the replacement of the two Station Service Units, Replacement of the Oil-Filled Bus, Replacement of the CO2 Fire Suppression System, cleanup of the Asbestos in the Cable trays and the final coating of the Transformer deck), and to fund a regional reprogramming action. A lack of FY07 funds will require all new contracts to be put on hold. With completion of the main work, there will be an increase capacity for power production of 94.5 mega watts. New auto venting turbines (AVT) have been demonstrated to improve dissolved oxygen for 22 miles down stream of J Strom Thurmond Dam improving riverine habitat in this reach of the Savannah River

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Norwood (GA-9) (R) and Rep. Barrett (SC-3) (R)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: 23 January 2006

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Whitney Lake (Powerhouse), TX (Major Rehab)

AUTHORIZATION: FCA 1941 (P.L. 228-77); RHA 1937 (P.L. 685-75); FCA 1970 (P.L. 91-611).

LOCATION: The project is located on the Brazos River, about 75 miles southwest of Dallas, Texas. The powerhouse is located at the dam, approximately 5.5 miles southwest of Whitney, Texas, on State Highway 22.

DESCRIPTION: Replace the two turbines, rewind and uprate the two generators, and replace necessary peripheral items and equipment within the powerhouse. The total increase in power output of the plant will be from 30 megawatts to 42 megawatts.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 26,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 26,250
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 618
Allocation for FY 2004	571
Allocation for FY 2005	1,574
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,413
Allocation for FY 2006	3,379
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	20,108
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the powerhouse renovation project, rehabilitate the powerhouse overhead crane, and evaluate contractor submittals for the turbine and generator rehabilitation contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion of construction is 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: The main contract for the project is for rehabilitation of the two turbine-generator units. The project was not in the FY 2006 budget, but funds were added by Congress. However, these funds were not sufficient to award a fully funded contract to complete the final design, manufacturing and installation of the rehabilitated turbine-generator unit. A service contract is being developed that will include a base bid (for design), and options for manufacturing and installing the various components. Sufficient funding is available to award the base for this contract. Some options may be awarded in FY 2006 depending on the actual contract amount. Since the project is not included in the FY 2007 budget, award of all options will not be possible. Continued lack of adequate funding would increase probability of

failure of the existing generators and loss of generation. Failure of the Whitney units would result in a loss of 57 million kilowatt hours per year of clean energy to the citizens of Texas until the units could be repaired. In addition, the government would realize a loss of at least \$1M per year to the Treasury in power production payments during the time the units are down.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Edwards, TX-17.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Operations & Maintenance

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Hydropower

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Missouri River between Fort Peck Dam, Montana, and Gavins Point Dam, South Dakota and Nebraska (Section 33)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 33 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1988 (PL 100-676).

LOCATION: Potential sites are along the Missouri River between Ft. Peck Dam, Montana and Gavins Point, South Dakota and Nebraska

DESCRIPTION: Work includes bank stabilization, sloughing easements, maintenance to existing structures, the Cumulative Environmental Impact Statement (CEIS).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Operations & Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 140,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	140,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 8,525
Allocation for FY 2004	271
Allocation for FY 2005	288
Conference Amount for FY 2006	315
Allocation for FY 2006	311
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	130,604
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The allocation amount will be used to continue work on a Cumulative Environmental Impact Statement for bank stabilization along the Missouri River. The purpose of the study is to determine the existing physical condition of the river channel, project future channel conditions and determine the impacts that bank stabilization may have on alluvial processes and channel formation. The information can be used to help guide future decisions regarding construction under this project authority.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: The final report for the CEIS is scheduled for completion in June 2008 and the Record of Decision scheduled for August 2008

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: This work is consistent with Administration Policy, but is low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Rehberg (MT-AL); Herseth (SD-AL); Fortenberry (NE-1); Senator Conrad (ND); Senator Dorgan (ND), Representative Pomeroy (ND-AL); Senator Burns (MT),

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Commercial Navigation	302
Investigations	303
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division	304
Greenup Locks and Dam (Lock Extension), KY and OH	305
Upper Ohio River Navigation System Study, PA (Emsworth, Dashields and Montgomery Locks and Dams)	306
Mississippi Valley Division	307
Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, LA	308
Calcasieu Lock, LA	309
Calcasieu River and Pass Navigation, LA	310
Port of Iberia, LA	311
Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, AR and LA	312
Upper Miss River – Illinois Waterway System, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	313
North Atlantic Division	315
AIWW Bridges at Deep Creek, VA	316
Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Craney Island, VA	317
Piscataqua River, NH	318
Searsport Harbor, ME	319
Pacific Ocean Division	320
Akutan Harbor, AK	321
Anchorage Harbor Deepening, AK	322
Barbers Point Harbor Modification, HI	323
Coffman Cove, AK	324
Delong Mountain Harbor, AK	325
Haines Harbor, AK	326
Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor Modification, HI	328
Knik Bridge Crossing, AK	330
Kotzebue Small Boat Harbor, AK	331
Little Diomede Harbor, AK	333
Mekoryuk Harbor, AK	334
Nawiliwili Harbor Modification, HI	336
Unalakleet Harbor, AK	338
Unalaska Harbor, AK	340
South Atlantic Division	341
Milepoint, FL	342
Port Everglades Harbor, FL	343
St. Petersburg Harbor, FL	344
Savannah Harbor Expansion, GA	346
South Pacific Division	348
Humboldt Bay Long Term Shoal Management	349
Los Angeles County (DMMP)	350
Redwood City Harbor	351
Southwestern Division	352
Cedar Bayou, TX	353
Corpus Christi Ship Channel, TX	355
GIWW, Brazos River to Port O'Connor, TX	357
GIWW, High Island to Brazos River, TX	359
GIWW, High Island to Brazos River Realignments, TX	360
GIWW, Port O'Connor to Corpus Christi Bay, TX	361
GIWW, Vicinity of Port Isabel, TX	363
Matagorda Ship Channel, TX	364
Construction	366
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division	367
John T. Myers Locks Improvements, IN and KY	368

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, KY	369
Sault Ste. Marie (Replacement Lock), MI.....	370
Mississippi Valley Division	371
Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.....	372
Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, MN.....	373
Mel Price Lock and Dam, IL & MO	374
Mississippi River Ship Channel, Gulf to Baton Rouge, LA.....	375
Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR & LA.....	376
North Atlantic Division	377
Delaware River Main Channel, NJ, PA & DE	378
James River Channel, VA	379
Norfolk Harbor and Channels, VA (Deepening)	380
Pacific Ocean Division	381
Bethel Bank Stabilization.....	382
Dillingham Emergency Bank Stabilization.....	383
False Pass Harbor, AK.....	385
Kaunalapau Harbor, HI.....	386
Nome Harbor, AK	387
St Paul Harbor, AK	389
Unalaska Harbor, AK.....	390
South Atlantic Division	391
Brunswick Harbor, GA	392
Gulfport Harbor, MS	394
Jacksonville Harbor, FL.....	395
Pascagoula Harbor, MS	397
Ponce De Leon Inlet, FL.....	398
Port Everglades, FL.....	399
St Lucie Inlet, FL.....	400
Tampa Harbor - Port Sutton Channel, FL	402
Tuscaloosa Area Office, AL.....	403
Wilmington Harbor, NC.....	404
Wrightsville Beach, NC.....	406
South Pacific Division.....	407
Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening	408
San Francisco Bay to Stockton (John F. Baldwin and Stockton Ship Channels)	409
Operations and Maintenance	410
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division, Water Resource Region 04	411
Arcadia Harbor, MI	412
Ashland Harbor, WI	413
Caseville Harbor, MI	414
Cedar River Harbor, MI	415
Grand Marais Harbor, MI.....	416
Harbor Beach Harbor, MI	417
Kewaunee Harbor, WI	418
Leland Harbor, MI.....	419
Little Lake Harbor, MI	420
Manitowoc Harbor, WI	421
Menominee Harbor and River, MI and WI.....	422
New Buffalo Harbor, MI	423
Pentwater Harbor, MI	424
Port Washington Harbor, WI.....	425
Sebewaing River, MI	426
Sturgeon Bay Harbor and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, WI	427
Two Rivers Harbor, WI	428
Northwestern Division	429

Table of Contents
Fiscal Year 2006
Enacted Fact Sheets

Lake Crockett.....	430
Pacific Ocean Division	431
Cordova Harbor, AK	432
Pohoiki Bay, HI	433
South Pacific Division.....	434
Crescent City Harbor	435
Jack D. Maltester Channel (San Leandro Marina)	436
Moss Landing Harbor	437
Napa River.....	438
Noyo River and Harbor.....	439
Petaluma River (Lower).....	440
Pillar Point Harbor	441
Pinole Shoal Management	442
Port Hueneme	444
Port San Luis	445
Redwood City Harbor	446
San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy	447
Southwestern Division.....	448
GIWW, Chocolate Bayou, TX.....	449

COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION

INVESTIGATIONS

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Greenup Locks and Dam (Lock Extension), KY and OH

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-541, WRDA 2000, Section 101(b)(15)

LOCATION: Greenup Locks & Dam is located on the Ohio River at river mile 341 near Greenup, KY in Greenup County, KY and Scioto County, OH.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of a 600' extension of the auxiliary lock chamber to 1200', extension of the downstream guide wall, filling emptying system improvements, installation of a miter gate quick changeout system for faster repairs to the lock miter gates, and environmental mitigation measures. This project is a gateway to the nation's largest inland port – Huntington Tri-State. It is the 8th busiest of the Corps of Engineers 230 locks and dam projects. Average annual tonnage for the lock exceeds 66 million tons/year. Energy-related commodities dominate the traffic through the lock with coal accounting for 58 percent and petroleum products almost 10 percent of the total. Nearly all of the coal is destined for domestic electric utilities, with much of the coal coming from Appalachian coal fields.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 12,200.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 12,200.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 4,701.0
Allocation for FY 2004	2,058.0
Allocation for FY 2005	1,054.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	225.0
Allocation for FY 2006	223.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,164.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8 %)	2.7 to 1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.0 to 1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: PED activities include continuing design of the lock extension, review miter gate plans and specs, and design of lock maintenance bulkheads.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete PED in FY 2007 if funds are appropriated (project has been in PED since 2000). Project could move to Construction, General appropriation in FY 07 with the award of two construction contracts: fabrication of miter gates and construction of mooring cells.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Strickland (OH-06), Davis (KY-04), Voinovich (OH), DeWine (OH), Bunning (KY), McConnell (KY)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Ohio River Navigation System Study, PA (Emsworth, Dashields and Montgomery Locks and Dams)

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the US Senate dated May 16, 1955 and resolution adopted by the US House of Representatives Committee on Public Works and Transportation dated March 11, 1982.

LOCATION: Ohio River, PA

DESCRIPTION: Emsworth, Dashields and Montgomery are the uppermost Lock and Dam structures on the Ohio River and are located at river miles 6.2, 13.3 and 31.7, respectively, below the "Point" in Pittsburgh, PA. All three have dual lock chambers, 110' x 600' and 56' x 360', which are undersized compared to the other downstream Ohio River navigation facilities. A feasibility study is being conducted to identify the NED Plan, evaluating both 2 for 3 and 3 for 3 lock replacement strategies.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$15,010
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$15,010
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 225
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 327
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 606
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 1,275
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 1,262
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$12,590
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%):	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Efforts are continuing on the advancement of a feasibility study, reliability analysis, compilation of a GIS database, inspection of Montgomery and Dashields dams, cumulative project effects, and developing a Cultural Resource baseline.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY2010, with efficient funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: These facilities are 70+ years of age and exhibit signs of significant structural degradation. The absence of this project in the FY07 budget and inefficient funding have resulted in delays in planning solutions to the extensive structural degradation problems at these facilities, threatening the integrity of the Ohio River Navigation System.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Specter (PA), Santorum (PA), Hart (PA-4), Doyle (PA-14), Murphy (PA-18), Peterson (PA-5)

DISTRICT: Pittsburgh

Date: 24 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, LA

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbors Act of 1968

LOCATION: The study area is located in south-central Louisiana in the vicinity of Morgan City and in the parishes of Assumption, St. Mary, and Terrebonne.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides a 20-by 400-foot navigation outlet for the major marine fabrication and repair facilities east of Morgan City, which build mobile offshore petroleum drilling rigs. The project also provides a harbor of refuge for rigs and related floating equipment from Gulf hurricanes. The lower reach of the project, across the Atchafalaya Bay and Bar, is the navigation access to the Gulf for facilities along the Lower Atchafalaya River in Morgan City. The study is addressing channel enlargement to a depth of 35 feet over a bottom width of 400 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,807
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,610
Cash	(3,610)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	7,417
Allocation thru FY 2003	785
Allocation for FY 2004	747
Allocation for FY 2005	675
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,402
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase of the study, including benefit analysis, hydraulic studies to determine maintenance dredging requirements, designs and cost estimates, environmental analyses, and economic market risk analyses.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Study is not in the FY 2007 Budget. It was to be completed in FY 2006 by the New Orleans District, but the Mississippi Valley Division reassigned the study in July 2005 to the Vicksburg District to continue feasibility study. Additional funding of \$1,322,500 is needed in FY 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Landrieu and Vitter (LA); and Tauzin (LA-3)

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

STUDY NAME: Calcasieu Lock, LA

AUTHORIZATION: SR, 29 Sep 72 and HR, 12 Oct 72

LOCATION: Calcasieu Lock is a feature of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Florida, and the Mexican Border Project. The lock is located east of the Calcasieu River, approximately 10 miles south of Lake Charles, Louisiana, in Calcasieu Parish.

DESCRIPTION: The lock prevents saltwater intrusion from the Calcasieu River into the Mermentau River basin, a major rice producing area. Calcasieu Lock, which was completed in 1950, has dimensions of 13 by 75 by 1,206 feet and is structurally sound. The lock is congested due to increasing traffic. Intracoastal Waterway Locks, Louisiana, a reconnaissance study completed in 1992, determined that there is an immediate need for capacity increases at Bayou Sorrel and Calcasieu Locks. The Calcasieu Lock Section 905(b) analysis found a benefit-cost ratio of 1.2:1 for provision of a new lock and recommended proceeding with feasibility phase studies. A benefit –cost ratio has not yet been calculated for the feasibility phase.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,391
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$4,391
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$1,503
Allocation for FY 2004	65
Allocation for 2005	115
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,510
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.625%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Develop overflow map to be used by Economics to determine the extent of damages if vessels are able to use the lock for safe passage at all times.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: TBD

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility cost increased from \$3,100,000 to \$4,391,000 for the following reasons:

 Delays in funding will require completed portions of the economics analysis to be redone because data will be more than 3 years old.

 All activities not yet performed have been inflated four percent.

 Feasibility management costs increased because of the longer study time.

 Engineering costs increased for work and cost data already prepared to be refreshed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Boustany (LA-07) and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Calcasieu River and Pass Navigation, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Interim study under the Mermentau, Vermillion, and Calcasieu Rivers and Bayou Teche, Louisiana study authority (RHA 22 Dec 44 and 2 Mar 45, HRs 23 Jun 64, 5 Oct 66, 3 Oct 68, and 2 Dec 70).

LOCATION: The study area is located in southwestern Louisiana in Calcasieu and Cameron Parishes.

DESCRIPTION: The existing Calcasieu River and Pass project provides for a 40- by 400-foot wide channel from the Gulf of Mexico to the wharves of the Port of Lake Charles (mile 34.1); a turning basin at mile 29.6; and a 35- by 250-foot deep channel from Mile 34.1 to Mile 36. Tonnage has increased from 40.9 million tons in 1990 to 50.7 million tons 1999. A significant portion of the tonnage is crude oil, refined petroleum products, industrial chemicals, and other bulk cargo. Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) vessel traffic has been increasing and is projected to increase significantly in the near future. Deep-draft vessels cannot meet on the relatively narrow channel, and traffic is restricted to one-way at a time, which causes costly delays to vessels that must wait until traffic moving in the opposite direction clears the channel. The plans being considered in the reconnaissance phase would provide for the construction of an anchorage area in the lower reach of the ship channel near the Gulf of Mexico. Potential alternative plans that could be considered in the feasibility study are anchorage areas and by-pass channels/passing lanes. The Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District is the potential sponsor for the feasibility study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,017
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,900
Cash	(1,900)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,917
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5
Allocation for FY 2004	95
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation for FY 2006	594
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,206
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the reconnaissance phase and continue into feasibility. Specific efforts include scoping meetings and initiation of traffic simulation modeling.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility study cost was increased from \$3,000 (\$1,500 both Fed and Non-Fed) to \$3,800,00 (\$1,900 both Fed and Non-Fed).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Boustany (LA-7); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

STUDY NAME: Port of Iberia, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 431, WRDA 2000

LOCATION: The Port of Iberia is located in south central Louisiana near the Louisiana coast in Iberia Parish.

DESCRIPTION: The Port has access to the Gulf of Mexico via their own Commercial Canal, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) project, the Freshwater Bayou project, and the locally constructed Freshwater Lock By-Pass. The study is addressing the feasibility of providing a deeper and wider access channel to the port through enlargement of existing channels. The plan includes dredging from the Port of Iberia along Commercial Canal to the GIWW, then along the GIWW to Freshwater Bayou, and then along Freshwater Bayou to the Gulf of Mexico to provide a 20-foot deep by 150-foot wide navigation channel.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA: (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,940	\$4,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,800	1,500
Cash	(524)	(1,500)
Other	(2,276)	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,740	\$6,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 881	0
Allocation for FY 2004	1,137	0
Allocation for FY 2005	767	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	67	425
Allocation for FY 2006	155	332
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	\$4,168
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the ongoing economic analysis, prepare the final feasibility report and initiate the PED phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Study - FY 2006; PED – To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The first cost of the tentatively selected plan is estimated to be \$203,000,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Melancon (LA-3), Boustany (LA-7), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, AR

AUTHORIZATION: 1983 SAA (PL 98-63), 30 Jul 83, and WRDA 1996, Sec 402.

LOCATION: Study area is located in northwest Louisiana and southwest Arkansas and includes the 135 miles of the Red River between Shreveport, LA, and Index, AR.

DESCRIPTION: The study is investigating alternatives for extending navigation from Shreveport, LA, to Index, AR.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,725
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,185
Cash	2,705
Other	480
Total Estimated Cost	6,910
Allocations thru FY 03	3,230
Allocation for FY 04	198
Allocation for FY 05	149
Conference Amount for FY 06	150
Allocation for FY 06	148
Balance to Complete after FY 06	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5-1/8%)	1.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.1

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: An Alternative Formulation Briefing was held for the project in December 2005. Funds are being used to address HQUSACE/CEMVD policy concerns provided in the Planning Guidance Memorandum in preparing the draft report for public review. Cost-shared feasibility phase studies should be completed in the fall of 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Ongoing feasibility studies are scheduled to be completed in October 2006. The tentatively recommended plan is a two lock and dam plan to Garland, Arkansas. Investigations conducted to date indicate that the project is economically feasible. This project is not in the President's budget for the PED phase; however, it will require construction authorization.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen: Lincoln and Pryor (AR); Vitter and Landrieu (LA); House: McCrery (LA-04) and Ross (AR-04).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation and Ecosystem Restoration

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Mississippi River – IL Waterway System, IL, IA, MO, MN & WI (Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program, IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, Flood control Act of 1970 (PL 91-611), pending new authorization language in draft WRDA 05.

LOCATION: The program area comprises the Upper Mississippi River System, as defined by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (WRDA 1986), which includes the Upper Mississippi River from Minneapolis, Minnesota, to Cairo, Illinois; the Illinois Waterway from Chicago to Grafton, Illinois; and navigable portions of the Minnesota, St. Croix, Black and Kaskaskia Rivers. This multi-use resource supports an extensive navigation system (made up of 1200 miles of 9 foot channel and 37 lock and dam sites), a diverse ecosystem (2.7 million acres of habitat supporting hundreds of fish and wildlife species), floodplain agriculture, recreation and tourism.

DESCRIPTION: The Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study was completed in Sept 2004 after more than 14 years of intensive study and evaluation of the navigation improvement and ecological restoration needs for the UMR-IWW system for the years 2000-2050. The system is a vital part of our national economy and a valuable ecological resource. The 1200 miles of 9' foot channel created by the 37 lock and dam sites allow waterway traffic to move from one pool to another providing an integral regional, national, and international transportation network. The system is significant for certain key exports and the Nation's balance of trade. For example, in 2000, the Upper Mississippi River System carried approximately 60 percent of the Nation's corn and 45 percent of the Nation's soybean exports. The UMRS ecosystem consists of 2.7 million acres of bottomland forest, islands, backwaters, side channels and wetlands—all of which support more than 300 species of birds, 57 species of mammals, 45 species of amphibians and reptiles, 150 species of fish, and nearly 50 species of mussels. More than 40 percent of North America's migratory waterfowl and shorebirds depend on the food resources and other life requisites (shelter, nesting habitats, etc.) that the system provides. It also provides boating, camping, hunting, trapping and other recreational opportunities. The resulting study final recommendation includes a program of incremental implementation and comprehensive adaptive management to achieve the dual purposes of ensuring a sustainable natural ecosystem and navigation system. With congressional appropriations for Preconstruction, Engineering and Design (PED) beginning in February 2005, the study team adopted a working title of UMRS Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP) to distinguish PED efforts from the Feasibility Study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 59,780
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 59,780
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 3,013
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	10,400
Conference Amount for FY 2006	10,000
Allocation for FY 2006	9,900
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$36,467
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 activities are focused on the continuation of the 34 projects that began Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) in February 2005. These PED project activities were selected and designed to support the broad based implementation specified in the Final Recommended Plan, including: the initiation of design for small scale navigation improvements – mooring cells, buoys, and switchboats; initiation of design for two new 1200' locks at LD 25 and LD 22 (minimal start on La Grange); conducting environmental mitigation studies; supporting research into non-structural improvements and demand forecasting tools; develop plans for ecosystem restoration adaptive management; initiate design of fish passage projects; initiation of planning for dam point control at LD 25; and initiation of design for several habitat restoration and floodplain restoration projects. Many of the large-scale Navigation Efficiency and Ecosystem Restoration projects will require at least 3 years of concentrated PED effort before their first construction contract award could be let.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Indeterminate without construction authorization or consistent dependable appropriations. Several small scale navigation efficiency and ecosystem restoration projects will be ready for construction before the end of FY2006. Dependent on the level of funding, large scale navigation and ecosystem projects could be ready to let their first construction contracts in 3-5 years.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction authorization is included in draft WRDA 05.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Nussle (IA-1); Leach (IA-2); Boswell (IA-3); Latham (IA-4); Kind (WI-3); Manzullo (IL-16); Evans (IL-17); LaHood (IL-18); Shimkus (IL-19); Costello (IL-12); Clay (MO-1); Akin (MO-2); Hulshof (MO-9); Emerson (MO-8); Carnahan (MO-3); Gutknecht (MN-1); Kline (MN-2); Oberstar (MN-8); Sen. Bond and Talent (MO), Obama (IL).

DISTRICT: Rock Island District

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Atlantic Intra-coastal Waterway Bridge Replacement at Deep Creek, Chesapeake, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of Flood Control Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-611)

LOCATION: Chesapeake, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The bridge, constructed in 1934, is a Federally owned and operated facility and assists in navigation. The bridge passes over the Dismal Swamp Canal where U.S. Route 17 crosses. The city of Chesapeake requested the need to modify or replace the bridge. In October 1996, the approved Initial Appraisal concluded that the bridge is functionally obsolete because of its narrow roadway and poor alignment with the connecting roads, compounded by increasing traffic volumes. The preliminary plan is to replace the bridge with a five lane, split leaf pit bascule bridge. The City of Chesapeake (local sponsor) will assume ownership and OMRR&R responsibilities of the new bridge.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,441	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		0
Cash	0	
Other	0	
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$2,441	
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$1,278	
Allocation for FY 2004	825	
Allocation for FY 2005	0	
Allocation for FY 2006	49	
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	289	
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.125%)	9.1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	6.8	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will used to initiate the draft PCA, and respond to OMB questions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project does not have construction authorization.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representative Forbes (VA-4).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Craney Island, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted on September 24, 1997 by House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

DESCRIPTION: Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area (CIDMMA) is a 2,500-acre man-made containment area located along the south bank of the James River in Portsmouth, VA. It was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946 and constructed from 1956 through 1958. Craney Island is federally owned and operated and is used by private interests, local municipalities, and Federal and Commonwealth Government agencies for disposal of dredged material from Norfolk Harbor and adjacent waterways. Virginia Port Authority (VPA) has expressed interest in expanding the containment area to the east. The expansion could provide land for a long-term berthing and port facility adjacent to the Norfolk Harbor Channel. VPA is the non-Federal sponsor and executed the feasibility cost-sharing agreement with the Corps in 1999.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA(\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,053	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		3,053
Cash	3,053	
Other	0	
Estimated Total Study Cost		\$ 6,106
Allocation thru FY 2003		\$ 2,592
Allocation for FY 2004		373
Allocation for FY 2005		189
Allocation for FY 2006		99
Balance to complete after FY 2006		0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.125%)	4.4	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.6	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to finalize the feasibility study and initiate coordination of the Chief of Engineer's Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Davis (VA-1), Drake (VA-2), Scott (VA-3) and Forbes (VA-4).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Portsmouth Harbor & Piscataqua River, Upper Turning Basin, New Hampshire and Maine

AUTHORIZATION: Section 437 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: Portsmouth Harbor is located at the mouth of the Piscataqua River along the state boundary between New Hampshire and Maine.

DESCRIPTION: Portsmouth Harbor is the only deep-water port in New Hampshire and is New England's fifth largest port. The Federal project provides for about 6 miles of tidewater channel and turning basins, 35 feet deep and 400 to 1,000 feet wide, extending from deep water at the entrance of the harbor up the Piscataqua River. WRDA 1986 authorized the enlargement of the two lower turning basins and some channel reaches to accommodate larger tank ships (petroleum and liquefied natural gas) and bulk cargo carriers. These improvements were completed in 1990. The upper turning basin and approach channel were not enlarged or widened at that time and the New Hampshire Port Authority now believes that increased navigation traffic warrants these improvements. Section 437 of WRDA 2000 authorizes a study to determine the feasibility of widening the upper turning basin to 1,000 feet. A 905(b) report was completed in August 2004 and approved in October 2004.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	400
Cash	400
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$900
Allocations thru FY 2003	0
Allocation in FY 2004	75
Allocation in FY 2005	25
Allocation in FY 2006	25
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	375
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to execute a Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement with the New Hampshire Pease Development Authority in May 2006. FY 2006 funds will also be used to initiate the feasibility study; including interagency coordination, hydrographic surveys, cultural resource surveys and initial plan formulation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Maintenance dredging of the 35-foot channel in the upper harbor reach was completed in FY 2001, and is required about every five years. The upper harbor reach is narrow, winding and subject to severe tidal currents. Widening the upper turning basin and channel would require extensive ledge removal and was estimated to cost \$15 million in the 1984 feasibility report. Funds to continue the feasibility study are not included in the FY 2007 Budget. Study efforts will be suspended until the construction backlog is reduced and funds become available to continue this effort.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sununu (NH) and Gregg (NH), and Representative Bradley (NH-01)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Searsport Harbor, Searsport, Maine

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution dated 26 July 2000.

LOCATION: Searsport Harbor is located at the head of Penobscot Bay, about 26 miles south of Bangor, Maine.

DESCRIPTION: Searsport Harbor provides a local fishing and recreational boating harbor to the west, and a deep-draft commercial industrial harbor at Mack Point to the east. The existing Federal project at Searsport Harbor includes a 35-foot channel and turning basin which provides access to the terminal facilities at Mack Point. These facilities have direct rail access to Bangor and serve petroleum and bulk cargo importers and forest product exporters. The Maine Department of Transportation recently upgraded the facilities at Mack Point, including berth deepening to 42 feet. In 2003, waterborne commerce totaled 1.3 million tons. The State has requested the Corps to examine deepening of the existing 35-foot channel and turning basin to eliminate tidal delays and support the State's expanded commercial shipping operations at Searsport Harbor. The Section 905(b) Analysis Report was certified on 24 September 2004.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	500
Cash	500
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$1,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	0
Allocation in FY 2004	75
Allocation in FY 2005	31
Allocation in FY 2006	124
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	370
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds have been used to sign a Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement with the Maine Department of Transportation on 7 December 2005. FY 2006 funds are also being used to initiate the feasibility study, including hydrographic surveys, sediment testing, benthic and cultural resource surveys and initial plan formulation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Maintenance dredging of the 35-foot channel has not been necessary since its completion in 1964 due to low shoaling rates. The State's plan to develop an adjacent area (Sears Island) as a container terminal was cancelled in the early 1990's due to public controversy over environmental impacts. Environmental interests had favored redevelopment of the facilities at Mack Point, which the State has now constructed. Funds to continue the feasibility study are not included in the FY 2007 Budget. Study efforts will be suspended until the construction backlog is reduced and funds become available to continue this effort.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Snowe (ME) and Collins (ME), and Representative Michaud (ME-02)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Akutan Harbor, AK

AUTHORIZATION: Section 138, FY 2006 Energy and Water Development Appropriations, P. L. 109-103

LOCATION: The city of Akutan lies on the north shore of Akutan Bay, a large, well-protected bay opening to the Bering Sea on the eastern side of Akutan Island. The city is about 40 miles east of Unalaska/Dutch Harbor.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of two rubblemound breakwaters totaling 700 feet to protect the entrance harbor entrance channel and dredging a 12 acre mooring basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	300
Cash	300
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,200
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	9
Allocation for FY 2005	180
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 216
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 1.48 (5 5/8%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 1.48 (7%)	

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue preparation of plans and specifications. In addition, a Limited Reevaluation Report reflecting the revised authorization of the General Navigation Features and associated cost sharing will be prepared for approval by POD, in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, dated, 22 April 2000. Upon completion and approval by POD, the LRR will be forwarded to ASA(CW) to accompany the Chief of Engineer's Report and the Final Feasibility Study for OMB review. The Chief of Engineer's Report was completed in December 2004 and a Design agreement was executed on 1 March 2005.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Anchorage Harbor Deepening, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101, Rivers and Harbors Act of 1958, modified by Section 199 of WRDA 76, and further modified by Section 118, Division C, EWDA 2005

LOCATION: Anchorage Harbor is located on the north side of Anchorage.

DESCRIPTION: It serves as Alaska's regional port and provides services to approximately 80% of the total population of Alaska. Vessels with drafts up to 40 feet must now dock during high tide and offload their cargo. Significant delays have occurred when deeper draft vessels were unable to dock at the port because of limited available water depths. The purpose of the project is to deepen the harbor from -35 MLLW to -45 MLLW along the length of the modified intermodal marine facility, and to deepen the Cook Inlet Navigation Channel to -45 MLLW.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,400
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 244
Allocation for FY 2004	8
Allocation for FY 2005	149
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,404
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the reconnaissance report in accordance with Section 905(b) of WRDA 86 and initiate the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: If the Secretary of Army determines from the reconnaissance report that the expanded Port of Anchorage will be used by DOD vessels with drafts of greater than -35 feet, the Anchorage Harbor Deepening shall be at full federal expense, including the feasibility report, General Navigation Features, berthing areas, and O&M of the project up to the dock face (Section 118(a)(2), Division C, EWDA 2005).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations
Barbers Point Harbor Modification, Oahu, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Barbers Point Harbor Modification, Oahu, HI

AUTHORIZATION: Section 103 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 27 October 1965 (Public Law 89-298), in accordance with provisions contained in House Document No. 93, 89th Congress, 1st Session.

LOCATION: Barbers Point (Kalaeloa) Harbor is located on the Ewa plain along the southwestern coast of the island of Oahu, approximately 20 road miles west of Honolulu.

DESCRIPTION: The project purpose is to maximize cargo transportation efficiency (ultimately resulting in reducing the price of goods to consumers) by deepening the harbor entrance channel and basin to allow for larger (deeper draft) vessels to enter the harbor. In addition, a 375-foot jetty is proposed to mitigate cross currents within the harbor entrance channel which pose a hazard to navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,503
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,503
Cash	1,083
Other	420
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,006
Allocations thru 2003	1,085
Allocation for FY 2004	141
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year 2006	39
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.11
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.11

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Real Estate Report, update USFWS Coordination Act Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Earliest attainable completion for Feasibility Phase is FY07.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project continues to be a high priority with State of Hawaii.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye, (HI)

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Coffman Cove, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives adopted on 24 July 2002 regarding improvements for navigation and related water and land resource purposes near Coffman Cove, Alaska.

LOCATION: Coffman Cove is located in southeast Alaska on the northeast coast of Prince of Wales Island, approximately 73 air miles northwest of Ketchikan.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed expansion of the existing small boat harbor includes extending the primary head-walk float offshore, relocating the existing seaplane float, adding a main finger float, adding new 30 foot and 40 foot slip floats, providing a new work float, increasing skiff ramp capacity, and providing utilities to the float system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 763
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	600
Cash	600
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,363
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 24
Allocation for FY 2004	70
Allocation for FY 2005	79
Conference Amount for FY 2006	600
Allocation for FY 2006	594 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 6
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP) and negotiate a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) for the feasibility phase studies. Because the community needs primarily an improved moorage and dock system which are local service facilities, the feasibility report will focus on developing plans and designs but not recommend Federal participation in the improvements

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The Section 905b report was completed on 16 March 2005 and identified the need for improved local service facilities but did not show the need for any general navigation facilities such as breakwaters or navigation channels.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: DeLong Mountain Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Not authorized for construction. Study authorized under Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works, 2 Dec 70; review reports on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska.

LOCATION: The DeLong Mountain Harbor is located in Northwestern Alaska, 75 miles north of Kotzebue and 650 miles northwest of Anchorage.

DESCRIPTION: The DeLong Mountain harbor study evaluates a state owned port on the Chuckchi Sea that serves the Red Dog Mine, the world's largest zinc mine. This is a deep draft navigation study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Feasibility</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,684	\$ 4,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,684	7,000
Cash	0	0
Other	5,684	7,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 11,368	\$ 11,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	4,481	0
Allocation for FY 2004	172	0
Allocation for FY 2005	546	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	490	760
Allocation for FY 2006	485 1/	752 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	3,248
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility report and environmental impact statement, to respond to comments from the public review, and to prepare the draft final report and environmental impact statement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Congressional action is required to authorize the study and start construction. The local sponsor, the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, has conducted engineering efforts for the onshore facilities to support this project. The project includes a trestle capable of direct loading concentrate into bulk carriers at an estimated cost of \$175 Million, and a 17,000-foot long dredged channel to deep water at an estimated cost of \$75 Million.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Haines Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Not authorized for construction. Study authorized under Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works, 2 Dec 70; review reports on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska.

LOCATION: Haines is located in southeast Alaska, 90 miles northwest of Juneau.

DESCRIPTION: Haines has a developed marine, land and air transportation hub for the northern part of Southeast Alaska. The existing harbor is inadequate in terms of size and design to accommodate the needs of the existing demands of resident and transient users. The current harbor configuration is exposed to southeast winds, causing reduced maneuverability and damage to vessels and harbor facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	250
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	292
Allocation for FY 2005	223
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue Preconstruction, Engineering, and Design. The foundation design for the breakwater will continue, as well as work on mitigation features.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Congressional action is required to authorize the study and start construction. The Chief's Report was signed in December 2004, and this study is included in the draft 2005 WRDA Bill.

The recommended plan includes a 103-meter long north spur breakwater, a 154-meter long first portion of the main breakwater, a 316-meter long second portion of the main breakwater, a 46.7-meter long stub breakwater attached to the existing breakwater, a 51.2-meter long extension of the existing breakwater to the south, and a 33.3-meter long south spur breakwater. These breakwaters will provide the additional moorage area and improve protection to the existing moorage area. Dredging and relocation of the existing entrance channel will be necessary because of the breakwater extension providing additional protection for the existing basin. Dredging of the new mooring area and construction of the float system will provide required and properly sized moorage for the fleet utilizing the harbor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations
Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor Modification, Hawaii, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor Modification, Hawaii, HI

AUTHORIZATION: The existing project was authorized under the River and Harbor Acts of 1950 and 1965. The study for modifications is being conducted under Section 209 of Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1962.

LOCATION: Kawaihae Deep Draft Harbor is located on the northwest coast on the Island of Hawaii..

DESCRIPTION: The existing Federal project at Kawaihae Harbor was completed in 1962 and enlarged in 1973 and consists of an entrance channel, harbor basin and breakwater. The purpose of this project is to alleviate the wave surge problem, which adversely affects commercial shipping activities. Potential modifications being analyzed include basin deepening and extending several breakwaters

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,200
Cash	1,100
Other	90
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,400
Allocations thru 2003	241
Allocation for FY 2004	303
Allocation for FY 2005	119
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year 2006	438
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	1.36
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.36

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue feasibility study investigations. Work includes continuation of alternative analysis and EIS documentation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of Feasibility Phase is scheduled for FY08.

OTHER INFORMATION: Limited funding distribution and inflation have resulted in increased feasibility phase costs.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye (HI), Senator Daniel Akaka (HI), Representative Ed Case (HI-2).

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Knik Bridge Crossing, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Study authorized under Resolution of House Committee on Public Works, 2 Dec 70; review reports on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska and Section 118© - Hydrodynamic Modeling, of P.L. 108-447.

LOCATION: The Knik Arm Crossing is located near the City of Anchorage connecting it and the Mat-Su Borough.

DESCRIPTION: The models of Knik Arm, including the proposed crossing, impacts of Port Mackenzie, and shoaling at the Port of Anchorage will be conducted. Though mainly focusing upon sedimentation issues in the existing Federal navigation channel, the impacts of any potential future bridge structures in the Knik Arm will be analyzed in modeling efforts to determine the effects and impacts on shoaling at the Port of Anchorage.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 3,158
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,158
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	20
Allocation for FY 2005	400
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,243
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate technical modeling and conduct a general study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2010

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kotzebue Small Boat Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors in Alaska Resolution, 2 December 1970. The resolution reads in part: *"Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is hereby requested to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska, published as House Document Numbered 414, 83^d Congress, 2nd Session, . . . Northwestern Alaska, published as House Document Numbered 99, 86th Congress, 1st Session, . . . and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining whether any modifications **contained herein are advisable at the present time.**"*

LOCATION: Kotzebue is located at the northwest end of the Baldwin Peninsula, approximately 550 miles northwest of Anchorage, Alaska, and about 40 miles north of the Arctic Circle. Kotzebue is located in the Northwest Arctic Borough, and is the center of government for the Borough.

DESCRIPTION: The project is to reduce damages to boats and barges from ice during the winter and spring, and provide for safe boat moorage area to replace a beach mooring and tie-up area that was eroded by storms, and was protected to reduce further erosion. The protection system makes it unsafe to store, tie-up, moor, or beach small craft along this beach area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	600
Cash	500
Other	100
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,450
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 175
Allocation for FY 2004	38
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 349
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Negotiate feasibility cost share agreement and define in-kind services.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: City government has had difficulty obtaining local share funding and is reluctant to sign an agreement without certain funding. Preliminary economic analysis indicates the project is justifiable with probable benefits exceeding costs. Winter moorage facilities have an estimated benefit cost ratio of 8.0 and the small boat facilities range from unity to over 2.0.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Little Diomed Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors in Alaska Resolution, 2 December 1970. The resolution reads in part: *"Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors is hereby requested to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska, published as House Document Numbered 414, 83rd Congress, 2nd Session, . . . Northwestern Alaska, published as House Document Numbered 99, 86th Congress, 1st Session, . . . and other pertinent reports, with a view to determining whether any modifications **contained herein are advisable at the present time.**"*

LOCATION: Diomed, AK (aka Ingalik, AK). Diomed is located at the western edge of Little Diomed Island. Diomed is 2-1/2 miles from Big Diomed Island, which belongs to Russia; 0.6 miles from Russian waters and airspace, and 27 miles from the tip of the Seward Peninsula of Alaska.

DESCRIPTION: The project is to reduce damages to boats and barges from storms and rocks eroded from the island by storm waves and winter ice action. Diomed is a subsistence community that relies on water transportation to obtain most large goods, all fuels, and a large percentage of the required food for the village.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,000
Cash	500
Other	500
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,100
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 190
Allocation for FY 2004	28
Allocation for FY 2005	99
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 585
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete feasibility cost share agreement and initiate survey work.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: Feasibility agreement in negotiation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mekoryuk Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Not authorized for construction. Study authorized under Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works, 2 Dec 70; review reports on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska, and Section 117 (PL 108-447), Division C, EWDA FY05.

LOCATION: Mekoryuk is a Yup'ik Native community located on the North Coast of Nunivak Island in the Bering Sea, 553 air miles west of Anchorage, Alaska. Mekoryuk is the only community on the 1,700 square mile island. Mekoryuk is a second-class city in Alaska's Unorganized Borough.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is for navigation improvements. The existing Corps harbor was built in 1986 and has an unacceptable wave environment. The harbor is also not large or deep enough to handle larger commercial fishing boats involved in the fisheries around Nunivak Island.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	500
Cash	500
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 85
Allocation for FY 2004	30
Allocation for FY 2005	69
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 217
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study scoping and to encourage the local sponsor to obtain its cost sharing funds so the feasibility study agreement may be signed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: The existing small boat harbor, defined by a 510 foot breakwater designed and constructed by the Corps of Engineers in 1986, does not provide adequate protection for the small craft (18-26 feet) of the Mekoryuk fleet and boats are damaged or founder in the harbor during storms. The harbor is dry at low tide and delays are experienced awaiting sufficient depth of water for entering or leaving the harbor. Having to wait for high tide forces fishing boats to remain idle for as long as six hours during the short commercial harvest season and, during storms, jeopardizes boats unable to access the harbor. Time and labor are lost due to the inconvenience of moving boats to safer moorages with the approach of storms. Erosion and sedimentation in the harbor are secondary factors of economic interest.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations
Nawiliwili Harbor Modification, Kauai, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Nawiliwili Harbor Modification, Kauai, HI

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209 Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874)

LOCATION: Nawiliwili Harbor is located on the southeast coast of the island of Kauai and is the island's principal commercial harbor.

DESCRIPTION: Harbor improvements were completed between 1930 to 1960. The harbor consists of a breakwater 2,045 feet in length, and an S-shaped entrance channel 40 feet deep with a minimum width of 600 feet and a length of 2,400 feet. The current navigation conditions of the harbor are unsatisfactory to meet the requirements of large 920-foot long cruise line ships to maneuver within a channel that was originally designed for 492-foot vessels. During high wind conditions, the harbor pilots feel the margin of safety to navigate large cruise vessels safely through the S-shaped entrance channel is very narrow.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	750
Cash	675
Other	75
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,500
Allocations thru 2003	22
Allocation for FY 2004	-15
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year (BY-1)	603
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate feasibility phase study to develop methodology for economic analysis and determine a preliminary benefit-to-cost ratio. A hydrographic survey, numerical modeling, and environmental efforts will be initiated after the preliminary economic analysis is completed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The feasibility phase is expected to be completed in FY 2009 depending availability of sufficient funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Ed Case (HI-2) and Senator Daniel Inouye (HI)

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Unalakleet Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Not authorized for construction. Study authorized under Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works, 2 Dec 70; review reports on Rivers and Harbors in Alaska.

LOCATION: Unalakleet is located at the mouth of the Unalakleet River on the Norton Sound Coast of western Alaska. The city is about 150 air miles east-southeast of Nome, Alaska and 395 miles northwest of Anchorage, Alaska .

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is for navigation improvements. Unalakleet needs improved access to their fish processing plant and for subsistence fisherman. Shallow sand bars at the mouth of the Unalakleet River currently delay and often cause spoilage of catches while waiting for tides to allow boats to enter the river.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 944
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	944
Cash	944
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,888
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 229
Allocation for FY 2004	120
Allocation for FY 2005	218
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 129
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study to prepare evaluate detailed alternatives of projected benefits and costs of alternatives to improve navigation at Unalakleet. The Coastal Hydraulics Laboratory is analyzing wind and wave data to determine design requirements and shoaling rates that would be used to design navigation improvements at Unalakleet.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Unalakleet has a modern fish processing facility and has served as the homeport for a major herring fleet. The commercial salmon fishery and growing sport fishing industry contribute to the local economy. Subsistence is an important cultural and economic issue for the community.

General navigation problems include emerging sandbars in the generally shallow water along the coast of Norton Sound off Unalakleet that bar entry into the mouth of the river except at the daily highest tide, causing delays in passage into the Unalakleet River. This requires vessels to wait

for favorable tides prior to entering the river channel. Vessels impacted by the bars include fuel and freight barges and commercial and subsistence vessels.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Unalaska Harbor, AK

AUTHORIZATION: Section 314 of Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of 2005, PL 108-375

LOCATION: Unalaska overlooks Iliuliuk Bay and Dutch Harbor on Unalaska Island in the Aleutian Chain. It lies 800 air miles from Anchorage and 1,700 miles northwest of Seattle.

DESCRIPTION: The project would consist of a 180-meter long rubblemound breakwater, a 145-meter long floating breakwater, and a second 245-meter floating breakwater. The proposed location is at the southwest corner of Amaknak Island locally referred to as "Little South America." The project would also require the dredging of 31,600 cubic meters of sand and gravel and 4,800 cubic meters of rock to complete the local sponsor's moorage basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	225
Cash	225
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,125
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	639
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 1.3 (5 5/8%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 1.13 (7%)	

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Project Cooperation Agreement, geotechnical exploration and drilling of the harbor site, and initiate plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Milepoint, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution, Docket 2550, of House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure adopted March 24, 1998.

LOCATION: Mile Point is located on the north bank of the St. Johns River in Duval County in north Florida.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will determine the cause of severe erosion, sinkholes, and high velocities in the study area with the aim of developing a plan to reduce or eliminate the negative impacts.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 784
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	665
Cash	640
Other	25
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,449
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 166
Allocation for FY 04	13
Allocation for FY 05	335
Conference Amount for FY 06	235
Allocation for FY 06	233
Balance to Complete after FY 06	37
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY06 will be used to continue feasibility study effort to include completing engineering studies, environmental studies, and preparing draft feasibility report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If adequate funding is provided, the feasibility study could be completed in FY 07.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Corrine Brown (D) FL-3, Ander Crenshaw (R) FL-4

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Port Everglades Harbor, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution, Docket 126, of House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure adopted May 9, 1996.

LOCATION: Port Everglades is a man-made port located in Broward County along south Florida's east coast.

DESCRIPTION: The study scope includes widening and deepening the major channels and basins within the port due to the expected use of larger and deeper draft vessels. The study also investigates expanding the Port into the Dania Cutoff Canal, to include a turning basin at the end of the Southport Channel.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,095
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,820
Cash	2,185
Other	635
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,915
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 1,734
Allocation for FY 04	91
Allocation for FY 05	93
Conference Amount for FY 06	175
Allocation for FY 06	174
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,003
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY06 will be used to continue feasibility study effort to include completing environmental studies and continue planning and engineering analyses.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The feasibility study could complete in FY 08 if adequate funding is appropriated.

OTHER INFORMATION: An amendment to the Cost Sharing Agreement will be executed in FY06 to include additional studies and formulation efforts associated with finalizing the mitigation plan and completion of the feasibility study. The feasibility study is not yet at a point where the benefit cost information is available.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Clay Shaw (R) FL-22

FACT SHEET
(INVESTIGATIONS)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Petersburg Harbor, FL

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbor Act of 1950 (House Document 70, 81st Congress, 1st Session).

LOCATION: The project is located on the central west coast of Florida in Tampa Bay.

DESCRIPTION: The Authorized project includes an entrance channel 24 by 300 feet from Tampa Bay southerly and thence westerly along south side of Port of St. Petersburg basin to Bayboro Harbor; a 24-foot depth in the port basin and in the area between the entrance channel and the Maritime Service south bulkhead; a channel 15 by 100 feet in Bayboro Harbor along southwesterly 300 feet of the Maritime Service bulkhead; a basin 12 by 800 by 700 feet to 1,400 feet in Bayboro Harbor; a channel 12 by 75 feet by 300 feet in the mouth of Salt Creek; an entrance channel 20 by 200 feet extending northerly about 5.5 miles from deep water in lower Tampa Bay, and thence a channel 19 by 250 feet leading westward to the 24-foot-depth entrance channel, and a channel 16 by 200 feet by 6,200 feet on the easterly side of the Point Pinellas lighted beacon.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 951
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	317
Cash	317
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,268
Allocations through FY 03	116
Allocation for FY 04	399
Allocation for FY 05	159
Conference Amount for FY 06	200
Allocation for FY 06	198
Balance to Complete after FY 06	79
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	Not yet available
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	Not yet available

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to continue the GRR efforts including channel design, environmental documentation, economic analysis, and plan formulation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If adequate funding were provided, PED could complete in FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: The GRR will include updated economics and costs. The

previous economic analysis was completed in 1979 and the project had a 2.9 to 1 BCR at that time.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Bill Young (R) FL-10

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Savannah Harbor Ecosystem, GA and SC

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96 PL 104-303, Sec 414

LOCATION: The Savannah River Basin encompasses an area of 11,000 square miles in Georgia and South Carolina. Major cities in the basin are Savannah and Augusta, Georgia, and Aiken, South Carolina. Savannah Harbor Ecosystem Restoration focuses on the Lower Savannah River upstream to the vicinity of I-95 where there is a tidal influence from the Atlantic Ocean, approximately 35 miles.

DESCRIPTION: Recent studies by the Corps of Engineers, the states of Georgia and South Carolina, and Federal and State agencies have highlighted that there are current water resource problems and needs being encountered in the Savannah River Basin that should be investigated. Dissolved oxygen (D.O.) levels in Savannah Harbor were identified by several major stakeholders. Evaluation of dissolved oxygen in Savannah Harbor is a complex issue due to the dynamic nature of the tidal estuary, the complicated hydraulic processes in the harbor, and uncertainties associated with related biological components. The historical seasonal lowering of dissolved oxygen in Savannah Harbor is well documented and illustrates an annual impairment of the estuary's ecosystem. Increased channel depths have reduced vertical mixing; higher salinity levels and lower D.O. have resulted. It appears from initial studies that the low D.O. problem in the lower harbor has been caused by the cumulative affect of past harbor deepening and maintenance. Data from sampling during summer low flow periods indicate D.O. levels below 1.0 in the navigation channel. These levels are not supportive of a healthy, productive, aquatic ecosystem.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>FEAS</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,960
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,960
Cash	1,960
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,920
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 749
Allocation for FY 2004	80
Allocation for FY 2005	139
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	596
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The preliminary alternatives have been evaluated and screened down to several alternative plans. The Enhanced Model will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: March 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The Ecosystem Study is a spin off from Savannah River Basin Comprehensive Study. The Savannah Harbor Ecosystem Restoration Study is intended to identify (1) the causes of the recurring low D.O. levels, and (2) the most cost-effective way of improving D.O. levels in Savannah Harbor. Savannah District has partnered with the City of Savannah in this study to evaluate opportunities to increase dissolved oxygen in the harbor, such as oxygen injection, modification of hydrologic regime or installation of structures to increase mixing. The study has very strong interest from a unique coalition of EPA, USFWS, state resource agencies, and major industries. The enhanced hydrodynamic, salinity, and DO models will be used in the evaluation. The City of Savannah and major industrial agencies on the Savannah River have been reluctant to continue the study in FY 2006. A new sponsor may have to be found for continuation of this project into the remainder of the feasibility phase. Since this study was scoped to address the cumulative historic impacts, there may be an impact to Savannah Harbor Expansion if this study does not go forward.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen. Jim DeMint (SC), Rep. Joe Wilson (SC-2), Rep. Jack Kingston (GA-01), Sen. Saxby Chambliss (GA), Sen. Johnny Isakson (GA)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 24, 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Humboldt Long-term Shoal Management Study, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution 23 September 1982

LOCATION: Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California

DESCRIPTION: Navigation improvements for increased shoaling due to deepening in 2000.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Recon</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$150	\$1,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	1,500
Cash	0	0
Other	0	1,500
Total Estimated Cost	\$150	\$3,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	36	0
Allocation for FY 2005	77	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	125
Allocation for FY 2006	37	87
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	1,413
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Sponsor is pursuing State financial support through legislative process, revise Project Management Plan, and sign Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement scheduled in September 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: Sponsor will seek State funding support in FY06 legislative cycle for cost sharing the study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

STUDY NAME AND STATE: Los Angeles County, California (Regional Dredged Material Management Plan)

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 92, Section 204 amended by WRDA 96, Section 207

LOCATION: The study area encompasses the LA River Estuary, Port of LA, Port of Long Beach and Marina Del Rey Harbor.

DESCRIPTION: The study will investigate disposal management alternatives for contaminated dredged sediments.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,000
Cash	(0)
Other	(2,000)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$4,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	312
Allocation for FY 2004	271
Allocation for FY 2005	564
Conference Amount for FY 2006	850
Allocation for FY 2006	841
Conference Amount for FY 2006	850
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	12
Benefits to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Alternative Analysis Conference Jul 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: FY 2006 funds will be used to complete the feasibility report and programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Waxman (CA-30), Harman (CA-36), Rohrabacher (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles.

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Redwood City Harbor (Deepening), CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Resolution 2511, adopted 7 May 1997

LOCATION: The study area is located in San Mateo County, about 20 miles south of San Francisco at the mouth of Redwood Creek, California.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed study will address deepening the project to a greater depth than the authorized depth of 30 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,000
Cash	1,000
Other	1,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,901
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include updating Project Management Plan, sign Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) in April 2006, and complete sixty percent of F3 milestone (without project condition).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: In 1999, the non-federal sponsor, the Port of Redwood City did not have the financial capability to cost share the feasibility study; the Port however, now has strongly expressed financial capability. Pending signing of the FCSA (expected April 2006) and receipt of sponsor funds, the San Francisco District and the Port will initiate the feasibility study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lantos CA-12, Eshoo CA-14

DISTRICT: San Francisco

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Cedar Bayou, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 349(a)(2) of WRDA 2000 (Construction). Additional authorization needed to conduct PED activities on a plan other than the authorized project.

LOCATION: Cedar Bayou is a small coastal stream that originates in Liberty County, Texas, east of Houston. It is navigable on the north end just below the Highway 146 bridge at Mile 11 and meanders south along the eastern portion of the City of Baytown, Texas to Mile -3.0 at the intersection of the Houston Ship Channel (HSC). The Federally maintained section extends from its junction with the Houston Ship Channel near Mile -3.0 eastward across Galveston Bay, to the mouth of Cedar Bayou (the mouth being at Mile 0) to Mile 3.0.

DISCRIPTION: The previously authorized and improved portion of the navigation project extends from its junction with the Houston Ship Channel near the upper bay at Mile 25, eastward across Galveston Bay, to the mouth of Cedar Bayou to a point 3 miles upstream. The project dimensions are 10 by 100 feet. The proposed and newly authorized project extends the channel by 8 miles with similar dimensions.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 803
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	267
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	1,070
Allocation thru FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	107
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	647
Benefit to Cost Ratio (5 3/8%)	2.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.1

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2006: The congressionally added funds will be used to begin the PED phase of the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: This project was authorized for construction by Section 349(a)(2) of WRDA 2000 subject to a determination by the Secretary that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. Since the project is now authorized, credit cannot be given to the non-Federal sponsor as allowed under Section 203(d) of WRDA 86 for their costs of the feasibility study against their share of ultimate project construction

costs. Additional authorization is required to provide credit to the non-Federal sponsor for their share of feasibility studies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn (TX) and Hutchison (TX), Congressmen Poe (TX-02), Paul (TX-14), and Edwards (TX-17).

DISTRICT: Galveston

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME: Corpus Christi Ship Channel (52'), Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, 1 August 1990.

LOCATION: The project is located in Nueces County, Texas

DESCRIPTION: The Corpus Christi Ship Channel (45-foot) project is 40 miles long, Federally constructed deep-draft navigation project serving the ports at Harbor Island, Ingleside, and Corpus Christi in Nueces County. The recommended plan of improvement will deepen the channel to 52 feet, widen the channel across the bay to 530 feet, add 200 feet wide barge lanes on each side of the channel across Corpus Christi Bay and extend the La Quinta Channel 1.4 miles at a depth of 39 feet. Two ecosystem restoration sites will also be constructed. Tonnage transported on the Corpus Christi Ship Channel averaged above 60 million tons over the past five years.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,365
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	455
Total Estimated Study Cost	1,820
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 30
Allocation for FY 2004	189
Allocation for FY 2005	735
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	114
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	2.65
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to continue preparation of first set of Plans and Specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project is crossed by over 50 pipelines that will be required to be relocated to a deeper depth and/or removed from the channel. Policy Guidance Letter (PGL) #44 states that the costs for relocation shall be paid for by the non-Federal sponsor and the pipeline owner. Under navigational servitude, the pipeline owner would be required to bear the entire expense. PGL #44 increases the costs of the project for the local sponsor by approximately \$25 million. This project still requires WRDA authorization. WRDA authorization language should also direct that the pipeline owners are required to relocate the pipelines at their own expense.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (TX); Congressmen Edwards (TX-17), Paul (R-14) and Ortiz (TX-27).

DISTRICT: Galveston

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, 1970 Flood Control Act (Review of Completed Projects)

LOCATION: The study area includes approximately 71 miles of the existing GIWW navigation project in Brazoria, Matagorda, and Victoria Counties, from the Brazos River to Port O'Connor, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The primary purpose of the study is improvements to navigation. The study will address operational and environmental problems identified by users. Navigation problems have been identified at Caney Creek, Jones Creek, Matagorda Bay, San Bernard River, Jones Lake and Bank Erosion along miles 408-420 and 446-451. The current interim study is evaluating delays and one-way traffic at Caney Creek.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>STUDY</u> \$ 6,650
Estimate Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimate Study Cost	\$ 6,650
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 3,648
Allocation for FY 2004	140
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,813
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to update the Project Management Plan in preparation of continuing feasibility study activities in FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008, assuming receipt of capability level funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: An Interim Feasibility study was completed for Matagorda Bay Reroute in June 2002, and is awaiting construction authorization. The remaining problem area is at Caney Creek. The problems at the San Bernard will be studied as one system in conjunction with the Brazos River Flood Gates under the GIWW Modifications Feasibility study. Since this is part of the Inland Waterways system, feasibility studies are funded at 100% Federal expense, and construction measures are to be cost-shared 50/50 with the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The State of Texas is the non-Federal Sponsor for the GIWW and continues to maintain a high interest in the waterway because of the economic importance and their

responsibility to provide dredged material disposal areas.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressman Paul (TX-14).

DISTRICT: Galveston

DATE: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) – High Island to Brazos River, Texas (PED).

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, Flood Control Act of 1970 (Review of completed projects).

LOCATION: The study area includes approximately 85 miles of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) in Galveston and Brazoria Counties, from High Island, Texas, to the Brazos River.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended project includes a sediment basin at Rollover Pass, widening the channel area an additional 75 feet for a length of 1400 feet at Sievers Cove, widening the channel at the Texas City Wye, setting back existing mooring facilities by 80 feet at Pelican Island, establishing a mooring basin at Greens Lake, and protecting existing open channels from wave action at the West Bay washout.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 PED (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,160
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$1,160
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$0
Allocation for FY 2004	27
Allocation for FY 2005	158
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	579
Benefit to Cost Ratio (5 3/8%)	2.17
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to complete the Project Management Plan and project schedule and initiate design for plans and specifications for the Pelican Island Moorings and Texas City Wye modifications to include surveys, slope stability analysis, layout and structural design.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility report was completed in December 2003, and the Chief's report completed in April 2004. However, the project is not yet authorized for construction. Operational problems identified by users along this reach of the GIWW include shoaling problems at Rollover Pass, alignment problems at Sievers Cove, problems accessing the Texas City Channel from the GIWW, alignment problems with the Galveston Causeway, mooring additions and modifications, and a washed out area in West Bay

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Paul (TX-14), and DeLay (TX-22): Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX).

DISTRICT: Galveston District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), High Island to Brazos River Realignment, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, Flood Control Act of 1970 (Review of Completed Projects).

LOCATION: The study area includes approximately 85 miles of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) in Galveston and Brazoria Counties, from High Island, Texas, to the Brazos River.

DESCRIPTION: The problems to be addressed include difficulties negotiating three sharp bends near High Island; negotiating a double "S" curve near Freeport; difficulties negotiating the intersection with the Chocolate Bayou Channel; and developing long range disposal plans.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 1,600
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 36
Allocation for FY 2004	136
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,379
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

ACTIVITIES FOR 2006: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to initiate preparation of the Project Management Plan and to refine the study schedule.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Fiscal Year 2008, assuming receipt of capability level funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: Investigations to identify potential solutions to resolve the navigation issues along this reach of the GIWW have been divided into two interim feasibility studies. The first study is the GIWW, High Island to Brazos River, TX study which is addressing potential improvements to the waterway between Rollover Pass and West Bay. That study has moved into the Pre-construction Engineering Design (PED) phase. This study is the second interim study which is the GIWW, High Island to Brazos River Realignment, TX feasibility study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressmen Paul (TX-14) and DeLay (TX-22).

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Port O'Connor to Corpus Christi Bay, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of the Flood Control Act 1970 (Review of Completed Projects).

LOCATION: The study area includes approximately 79 miles of the Texas section of the main channel of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) in Calhoun, and Nueces Counties, extending from Port O'Connor to the Kennedy Causeway in Corpus Christi, TX.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will focus on the resolution of navigation problems which directly affect the GIWW and its traffic to allow for a more effective, safe, and efficient waterway. The Reconnaissance Report concluded the investigation of additional refinements in the interest of increased economic efficiency, safety, and related environmental impacts is within the Federal interest.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,130
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 4,130
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,566
Allocation for FY 2004	237
Allocation for FY 2005	377
Conference Amount for FY 2006	325
Allocation for FY 2006	322
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	628
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to complete feasibility study efforts on the relocation of the moorings at Port O'Connor and the Corpus Christi reroute, and prepare a draft interim feasibility report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Fiscal Year 2008, assuming receipt of capability level funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: Thirty-one (31) miles of this reach of the waterway are within the critical habitat of the endangered whooping crane. This segment has been addressed under a separate feasibility study for the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, and is therefore excluded from consideration. Tonnage transported along the approximately 79 miles of the Texas section of the main channel of the GIWW totaled nearly 16,600,000 tons in 2001. Navigational difficulties caused by frequent shoaling at various locations within the remainder of this reach, traffic congestion near Port O'Connor, and the lack of navigational aids and mooring facilities

have been previously identified by users as areas of concern.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressmen Paul (TX-14), Hinojosa (TX-15), and Ortiz (TX-27).

DISTRICT: Galveston

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW), Vicinity of Port Isabel, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, Flood Control Act of 1970 (Review of Completed Projects).

LOCATION: The navigation study is located at the extreme southern end of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GIWW) in the vicinity of Port Isabel, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: Cameron County, along with a number of other local entities, is interested in a possible realignment of the GIWW so that it no longer passes between the waterfront of the City of Port Isabel and Long Island, but instead travels directly from the point where it crosses underneath the Queen Isabella Causeway to the point at which it intersects the Brownsville Ship Channel. The proposed change will enhance safety and transportation efficiency on the waterway by removing a sharp turn at the northern end of Long Island.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,763
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 3,763
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 40
Allocation for FY 2004	59
Allocation for FY 2005	504
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350
Allocation for FY 2006	346
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,814
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

ACTIVITIES FOR 2006: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to continue the Feasibility Study (perform more detailed environmental, economic, and engineering analyses on the alternatives) so that a recommended plan can be identified.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: Feasibility phase is scheduled for completion in Fiscal Year 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Over the years, a number of very serious accidents have occurred within this reach of the GIWW, culminating in the tragic September 15, 2001 barge collision with the Queen Isabella Causeway. The collision collapsed portions of the span and resulted in 8 deaths and a major economic setback for the people and businesses that depend on access to South Padre Island for their livelihood.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressman Ortiz (TX-27).

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation.

STUDY NAME AND STATE: Matagorda Ship Channel, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the House Committee on Environment and Public Works dated 8 September 1988.

LOCATION: The existing study provides for an outer bar and jetty channel 38 feet deep, 300 feet wide and about 4 miles long from the Gulf of Mexico through a man-made cut across Matagorda Peninsula; an inner channel 36 feet deep, 200 feet wide and about 22 miles long across Matagorda and Lavaca Bays to Point Comfort; a Turning Basin at Point Comfort 36 feet deep and 1000 feet square; and dual jetties at the entrance from the Gulf of Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The natural closing of the Pass Cavallo Inlet along with Matagorda Bay currents has increased velocities through the jetties causing severe erosion of the Bay bottom and jeopardizing vessels that have to traverse the navigation channel opening between the entrance Jetties into Matagorda Bay. Surveys have indicated depths that exceed 100 feet in the proximity of the Jetties. The existing conditions pose an immediate danger as natural occurrences such as tropical storm-related winds and tides may cause a collapse of some portions of the MSC jetty denying access to local ports. This would result in a loss of benefits of approximately \$8,000,000 per year. The cost of removal and reconstruction of failed jetties would be much higher than a planned relocation of one of the jetties to reduce the strong current.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,925
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,500
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 3,425
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 352
Allocation for FY 2004	439
Allocation for FY 2005	209
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	826
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to complete the Feasibility Scoping Meeting, Cultural Surveys, and initiate the draft Feasibility Report, Environmental Assessment, and Engineering Appendices.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Fiscal Year 2007, assuming receipt of capability level funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study will investigate improving the stability of the jetties, and assuring the integrity of the inlet of the present ship channel for navigation purposes. The natural closing of the Pass Cavallo is increasing velocities in the inlet and jetties, scouring the foundation of the jetties, and jeopardizing vessels that have to traverse the navigation channel opening. Preliminary economics indicate a favorable benefit to cost ratio for both the deepening of the channel and for jetty stability.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); Congressman Paul (TX-14).

DISTRICT: Galveston

DATE: February 24, 2006

CONSTRUCTION

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: John T. Myers Locks Improvements, Indiana and Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101, WRDA 00 (P.L. 106-541)

LOCATION: John (J.) T. Myers Locks and Dam are located at Ohio River Mile 846.0, about 3 miles below Uniontown, KY. The lock itself is reached from the Indiana shore.

DESCRIPTION: The J.T. Myers Locks Improvements Project will extend the 600-foot x 110-foot auxiliary lock chamber to a 1,200-foot x 110-foot lock chamber, which will give the project twin 1,200-foot locks.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 112,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Estimated Inland Waterways Trust Fund Cost	112,500
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 225,000
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 4,934
Allocation for FY 2004	965
Allocation for FY 2005	1,167
Conference Amount for FY 2006	700
Allocation for FY 2006	693
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	217,241
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.625%)	1.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to complete construction of the first Site Preparation contract and continue preconstruction engineering and design on the lock.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If funding is made available each year, construction will be complete in FY 2013.

OTHER INFORMATION: Office of Management and Budget clearance for budgeting with a low priority for funding was received May 2005. The project has received construction appropriations from congressional appropriation in Fiscal Years 2004, 2005 and 2006 which has allowed initiation and completion of the first site preparation contract. The project cost estimate is being evaluated by the Corps and should be complete for use in the FY 2008 budget cycle.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lugar (IN), Bayh (IN), Hostettler (IN-08), McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Whitfield (KY-01)

DISTRICT: Louisville

Date: 25 January 2006

**FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: The Water Resources Development Act of 1996

LOCATION: The project is located on the Tennessee River at Mile 22.4 near Grand Rivers, Kentucky.

DESCRIPTION: The modernization of the existing facility will include the addition of a 110-foot x 1200-foot lock landward and adjacent to the existing 110-foot x 600-foot lock, and the relocation of an existing railroad, highway, and powerhouse access road. The railroad and highway will be relocated downstream of the new lock's lower gates and will require the construction of two bridges across the Tennessee River. The powerhouse access road will be relocated from the east bank to the west bank and will require the construction of a new ramp.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 641,800
Construction General	\$ 320,900
Inland Waterways Trust Fund	\$ 320,900
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 641,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 111,746
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 22,582
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 28,372
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 23,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 22,770
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 456,330
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate 7 5/8%	1.6
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: There are two large construction contracts that are scheduled to be completed in the winter and spring of 2006: the Upstream Cofferdam contract (\$15.5M) and the Bridges Substructure contract (\$36.9M). Two new construction contracts awarded late in the summer of 2005 are also ongoing. The \$8M East Bank Approaches construction contract will be substantially completed by the end of FY 2006. The \$88.6M Superstructures construction contracts is proceeding at a slower than normal pace due to a shortfall of funding in FY 06. Remaining engineering and design efforts for the project have also been slowed in FY 2006 due to a shortfall of funds.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2014.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Whitfield, KY-01, Senators McConnell and Bunning, Kentucky

DISTRICT: Nashville

Date: February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sault Ste. Marie (Replacement Lock), Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 1149, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986 (PL 99-662), as amended by Sec 107(a)(8), WRDA 1990 (PL 101-640), Sec 330, WRDA 1996 (PL 104-303) and Sec 330, WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53)

LOCATION: The Sault Ste. Marie (Replacement Lock) project is located in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. The St. Marys River connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. This is a critical link in the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence Seaway navigation system.

DESCRIPTION: The St. Marys River project includes four navigation locks, connecting channels, compensating works for the regulation of Lake Superior, and a 21-megawatt hydroelectric power plant. Currently, two locks, the MacArthur and Poe, service loaded commercial vessel traffic. The larger Poe Class vessels, including the 1,000-footers, which comprise 70 percent of the carrying capacity of the U.S. Great Lakes Fleet, are restricted to the large Poe Lock. The Davis Lock is rarely used and the Sabin Lock is in disrepair and has been closed for several years. The Replacement Lock project provides for the construction of a new Poe-sized lock to replace the existing Davis and Sabin Locks.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u> (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 260,386
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	81,327
Cash	81,327
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 341,713
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 6,883
Allocation for FY 2004	2,006
Allocation for FY 2005	2,110
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	247,902
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.125%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (0.8)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to continue design efforts on the guide walls, channel deepening, and lock. Upon approval of the Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) efforts would resume on PCA coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction would be completed in 2016.

OTHER INFORMATION: The LRR was sent from HQ to ASA (CW) on 18 February 2005 for review and approval. The revised LRR, with responses to the ASA (CW) comments was sent to HQ on 30 September 2005. Letters were sent to the Departments of Transportation, Commerce and Homeland Security on 28 October 2005 requesting that they provide their views on the importance of this project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI), Voinovich (OH), DeWine (OH); Representatives Stupak (MI-1), Ehlers (MI-3), Knollenberg (MI-9), Visclosky (IN-1), Oberstar (MN-8), and Obey (WI-7)

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 455,RHA 56; Sec 186, WRDA 76; Sec 844, WRDA 86;Sec 326, WRDA 96; DOD Supp, 06.

LOCATION: The project is located in New Orleans, Louisiana, within the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, a vital link in the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway system.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for a new inland navigation deep draft lock.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Construction</u>	
Estimated Federal Cost	\$704,045	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	67,295	
Total Estimated Cost	\$771,340	
	General Appropriation (\$000)	Inland Waterway Trust Fund (\$000)
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 47,245	\$ 47,245
Allocation for FY 2004	5,384	5,384
Allocation for FY 2005	5,618	5,618
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (E&WD)	5,625	5,625
Allocation for FY 2006 (E&WD)	5,568	5,569
Conference Amount for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for CG)	12,500	0
Allocation for FY 2006 (DOD Supp for CG)	12,500	0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	288,207	288,207
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.875%)	3.5	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	5.0	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue the A/E contract for Phase I design of the lock, appurtenant features, and engineering and design; award the West Bank River Levee Phase I contract; continue community mitigation measures; issue final payment on the Florida Ave Siphon; remove sunken items; continue sampling, testing and analysis of sediments within the Industrial canal which is required for an ongoing lawsuit; and rehabilitate and repair the project related to consequences of hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The FY 2006 Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations provided additional Construction, General (CG) funds (\$12,500) to rehabilitate and repair Corps projects related to the consequences of hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean in 2005. The additional CG funds are not reflected in the project cost estimate.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, MN (Major Rehabilitation)

AUTHORIZATION: RHA 1930

LOCATION: Lock and Dam No. 3 is located on the Mississippi River about 57 miles downstream of St. Paul, MN, and 6 miles upstream of Red Wing, MN.

DESCRIPTION: A General Reevaluation Report (GRR) is being prepared to address related problems of navigation safety and the integrity of the Wisconsin embankments that maintain the navigation pool. The proposed project will not improve navigation efficiency or mitigate a reliability problem. It is important to note that Lock and Dam 3 was built differently than the other locks and dams in order to preserve the high quality floodplain habitat on the Wisconsin side that led the original designers to take more risk with the embankments (which are just a series of low spot dikes and natural ground which often overflow) and building the lock and dam in a river bend which results in an outdraft current. The outdraft current tends to sweep down bound tows toward the gated dam. The present condition is not safe even with a helper boat. Eleven accidents have occurred with tows colliding with the gated part of the dam. Navigation accidents can lead to loss of water control, overtopping, and erosion of the embankments. Failure of the embankment system could result in an accidental drawdown of Pool 3, with adverse effects on the river environment, navigation, and operation of two large electrical generating plants. The recommended plan includes an extended landward guidewall with channel modifications to improve navigation safety and strengthening the Wisconsin embankments that maintain the navigation pool.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Construction</u>	<u>General</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 57,200	
General Appropriations	(28,600)	
Inland Waterways Trust Fund	(28,600)	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 57,200	
	<u>IWTF</u>	<u>Appropriations</u>
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,930	\$ 1,930
Allocation for FY 2004	232	232
Allocation for FY 2005	55	55
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742	743
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 25,641	\$ 25,640
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%)	2.0	2.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.7	1.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the draft General Reevaluation Report and EIS, complete ITR, distribute draft report for public and agency review, and initiate a Design Documentation Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Lock and Dam 3 Wisconsin embankments are in a very deteriorated condition and are likely to fail soon. Regulatory agencies and the towing industry support the proposed project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Kline (MN-02), McCollum (MN-04), Kind (WI-03); Sen: Feingold and Kohl (WI); Dayton and Coleman (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Melvin Price Lock and Dam, IL & MO

AUTHORIZATION: Internal Revenue Code of 54, Title I – Replacement of Locks and Dam 26; WRDA 86, 90, 92, 96; and CAA 01.

LOCATION: Melvin Price Lock and Dam is located in Madison County, Illinois, and St. Charles County, Missouri, at approximately mile 200.8 above the mouth of the Ohio River.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes one 1,200-foot lock; one 600-foot lock (authorized separately); a gated dam with nine tainter gates; an overflow dike; removal of most of the existing structure; relocation/abandonment of the Burlington Northern Railroad bridge; and a visitor center. Recreation facilities will be developed with the City of Alton, Illinois, consistent with WRDAs 1986, 1990, 1992, 1996 and PL 106-554. Mitigation lands were provided to compensate for wildlife losses due to creation of a new pool for the two-mile distance downstream of the existing structure.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 743,924
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,917
Cash	(8,917)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 752,841
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 733,722
Allocation for FY 2004	463
Allocation for FY 2005	717
Conference Amount for FY 2006	563
Allocation for FY 2006	557
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	8,465
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.875%)	2.1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	100.5

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to prepare as-built drawings for operation and maintenance manuals; initiate design work for structural and mechanical deficiencies; construct modifications to docking facility; complete Real Estate audits; and begin roadway, promenade, and sewer extensions as part of recreation development under the Project Cooperation Agreement with the City of Alton.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The cost estimate is being revised to include the cost of correcting the approved structural and mechanical deficiencies. The preliminary estimate for these repairs is approximately \$10 million.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Costello (IL-12), Shimkus (IL-19), and Akin (MO-2); Sen: Durbin and Obama (IL); Bond and Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mississippi River Ship Channel, Gulf to Baton Rouge, Louisiana

AUTHORIZATION: 2nd SAA 85; WRDA 86; WRDA 88; E&WDAA 93.

LOCATION: The project is located in the southeast portion of Louisiana below Baton Rouge, LA, consisting of the Mississippi River and its major outlet to the Gulf of Mexico, Southwest Pass.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for the construction of a 55-foot navigation channel on the Mississippi River from the Gulf of Mexico to Baton Rouge, LA. To date, a 45-foot channel has been constructed. Mitigation improvements are being constructed in Plaquemines Parish. These include major modification to the Belle Chasse water treatment plant and the construction of pipelines to deliver freshwater to lower Plaquemines Parish during times of high salinities caused by the 45-foot channel.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (000) <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$196,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	492,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$688,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 27,552
Allocation for FY 2004	83
Allocation for FY 2005	- 1
Conference Amount for FY 2006	172
Allocation for FY 2006	170
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	168,396
Benefit to Cost Applicable Rate (2.625%)	7.2
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue mitigation efforts in Plaquemines Parish.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Jindal (LA-1), Jefferson (LA-2), Melancon (LA-3), Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River Emergency Bank Protection, AR, LA, OK, and TX

AUTHORIZATION: RHA 68; WRDA 76.

LOCATION: The project is located in northwest Louisiana, southwest Arkansas, southeast Oklahoma, and northeast Texas, along the Red and Old Rivers between the mouth of Old River at its juncture with the Mississippi River and Denison Dam, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for protection of critical infrastructure and land along the river. The project plan provides for revetment, dikes, or cutoffs that can be accomplished in advance of developing the design for the entire project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$135,959
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,182
Cash	(7)
Other	(2,175)
Total Estimated Cost	138,141
Allocations thru FY 2003	132,498
Allocation for FY 2004	296
Allocation for FY 2005	- 3
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,200
Allocation for FY 2006	3,168
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to award the construction contract for Bois D'Arc, AR, revetment which is scheduled for September 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Fully funded in FY 2006 with physical completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Inconsistent with Administration policy.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Ross (AR-4) and McCrery (LA-4); Sen: Lincoln and Pryor (AR); Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware River Main Channel Deepening, NJ, PA, DE

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(6) Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as modified by Section 308 Water Resources Development Act of 1999 and by Section 306 Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The project extends over 100 miles from deep water in Delaware Bay to the tri-state, Ports of the Delaware River including Philadelphia and Beckett Street Terminal, Camden, New Jersey. It involves the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the States of NJ & DE.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan of improvement deepens the existing Federal navigation Channel (Philadelphia to the Sea project) from the 40 foot project to 45 feet, widens bends, and deepens an anchorage along with relocation and addition of navigation aids.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Construction \$179,000.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 71,350.0
Cash	59,424.0
Other	11,926.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$250,350.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 17,226.0
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 1,335.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 1,366.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 2,228.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$156,845.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 7/8%)	1.14
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.03

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to continue coordination with the State of Delaware regarding the permit, continue to work with the sponsor to address the disposal issues that are a concern to the State of NJ with regard to the coastal zone determination and continue to complete the coordination to comply with the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Plans and Specifications for the Environmental Restoration contracts will be upgraded by our Engineering Division and readied for construction. Finally, the approved January 2002 Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) will be updated and coordinated with USACE and sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction completion cannot be determined until coordination with local sponsors is completed and a PCA is executed.

OTHER INFORMATION: Talks between the Governors of Pennsylvania and New Jersey continue in order to resolve any outstanding issues which are preventing the Local Sponsor from signing the PCA.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Brady (PA-01), Weldon (PA-07), Castle (DE), Andrews (NJ-01), LoBiondo (NJ-02), Saxton (NJ-03), Sen. Specter (PA), Santorum (PA), Biden (DE), Carper (DE), Menendez (NJ) & Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 JAN 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: James River, Deepwater Turning Basin, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbor Act of 1962

LOCATION: Richmond, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The study area includes a 25-foot deep and up to 600-foot wide and 2,770-foot long turning basin adjacent to the Richmond Deepwater Terminal, about 5 miles downstream from the city of Richmond. The terminal handles bulk, breakbulk, and container cargo. The turning basin is authorized up to a depth of 35 feet and width of 825 feet. Larger ships, some reaching a length of 559 feet and a width of 85 feet, frequently experience problems when exiting the turning basin. Based on current operations there is a need to expand the width of the turning basin. Under these circumstances, when a ship now arrives at the terminal and makes its turn to prepare for docking, contact is sometimes made with the river channel bank. In order to complete the turn, the ship is then forced to back up and to swing around at a distance of only about 25 feet from the wharf. The turning basin is also used by other large vessels including oil barges and large bulk ships which call on other down stream ports. These vessels must travel to the turning basin to accomplish the turn necessary to make the return trip down the James. There is concern of a serious accident that would cause damage to vessels or the wharf.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,390
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 122
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 1,512
Allocation thru FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 35
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 10
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 965
Balance to Complete After FY 2007	\$ 380
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.125%)	0.10
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	0.11

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds will be carried over as they are insufficient to initiate and complete construction which must be done within a one year period.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: If remaining required funds are received in FY 2007, construction will be initiated and completed during that FY.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Scott (VA-3) and Cantor (VA-7).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District
Date: 27 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Norfolk Harbor and Channels (Deepening), Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985 and Section 201(a) of WRDA 1986

LOCATION: Hampton Roads, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The project encompasses a 25-square mile natural harbor serving the ports of Norfolk, Newport News, Portsmouth, Chesapeake, and Hampton, Virginia. Programmed work encompasses (1) deepening a 2.5 mile section of the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River from a depth of 35 feet to 40 feet, including an 800 foot turning basin, and (2) the construction of the 50-foot inbound element. Unprogrammed work encompasses deepening the existing main channels to a depth of 55 feet, constructing a new ocean channel to a depth of 60 feet, and deepening a 6.3-mile section of the Southern Branch to a depth of 45 feet. Dredging the outbound channels to a depth of 50 feet was completed in 1988, the Lower Bay Beneficial Uses Study was completed in August 1994, and the construction of a 1500-foot diameter anchorage area with a depth of 50 feet was completed in September 1999.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost (CoE)	\$ 126,038
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 132,321
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$ 258,359 ^{1/}
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 21,973
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 2,218
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 1,980
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 3,189
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 96,678
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (5.125%)	1.9
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.5

^{1/} Total Estimated Federal Cost is \$ 262,700,000, which includes US Coast Guard and US Navy appropriations.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to initiate and complete construction of the Atlantic Ocean Channel.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction of this project was advanced in FY 2003 to align with the state appropriations earmarked for the project as requested by the Non-Federal Sponsor. The Congress added funds for construction in FY 2003, FY 2004, and FY 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives J. Davis (VA-1), Drake (VA-2), Scott (VA-3), Forbes (VA-4), Goode (VA-5), Goodlatte (VA-6), Cantor (VA-7), Moran (VA-8), Boucher (VA-9), Wolf (VA-10) and T. Davis (VA-11).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 27 January 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

**FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bethel Bank Stabilization, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2001, as enacted by Section 1(a)(2) of Public Law 106-377, and House Conference Report No. 106-988, page 211

LOCATION: The city of Bethel is in southwestern Alaska along the northwest bank of the Kuskokwim River, approximately 400 miles west of Anchorage. Bethel is approximately 65 miles upriver from the mouth and is at the upriver limit of tidal influence from the Bering Sea.

DESCRIPTION: Bethel is the major educational, economic, social, and cultural community in the Southwest Alaska Region, serving numerous smaller villages along the Yukon-Kuskokwim River Delta. The Corps of Engineers completed construction of a bank stabilization project along the Bethel waterfront in 1997. The river has since eroded the silts of the river bottom along a reach of 1,200 linear feet upstream of the existing project to the point of threatening the seawall and adjacent uplands. The project purpose is to stabilize the riverbank to prevent further erosion and possible failure of the existing facilities along the Bethel waterfront.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 26,753
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,735
Cash	4,735
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 31,488
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 17,791
Allocation for FY 2004	(50)
Allocation for FY 2005	200
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,750
Allocation for FY 2006	3,712 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 5,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 3.4 (6.375%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 3.4 (7%)	

1 Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Finalize contract documents and award contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Preliminary economic analysis indicates the project is justifiable with a benefit to cost ratio of 3.4.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Dillingham Emergency Bank Stabilization

AUTHORIZATION: PL 99-190, Sec 116, enacted on 19 Dec 85, Congressional add by Stevens to a Supplemental Military Appropriation Bill. Section 116 of Public Law (PL) 99-190, enacted in 1986, reads as follows:

Sec. 116. The Secretary of the Army is directed to accomplish emergency bank stabilization work at Bethel, Dillingham, and Galena, Alaska, at full Federal cost, within available funds, at an estimated cost of \$1,500, 000. Such funds were previously appropriated in Public Law 99-141 (99 Stat. 564).

The U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee report 103-291 on the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill of 1994 included the following language pertaining to Dillingham:

Dillingham Storm Damage Reduction—The Corps is encouraged to investigate measures to protect structures in Dillingham, Alaska threatened by an incomplete project. The committee expects the Corps to assess needs to complete the necessary repairs to the project and to itemize additional needs for submission in the next authorization process.

Public Law 103-316 appropriated "Construction, General" funds to the Corps of Engineers for Dillingham shoreline erosion control in fiscal year 1995. The Senate Appropriations Committee language on Dillingham reads as follows:

The Committee recognizes the urgent situation associated with severe wave and storm damage at Snag Point near Dillingham, Alaska. The Corps of Engineers has estimated the construction cost of a timber pile bulkhead to retard the damage to be \$1,000,000. The Committee has provided \$1,000,000, subject to an increase in the authorization level in Public Law 99-190, for this work.

LOCATION: Dillingham, Alaska, population 2,400, lies 327 air miles southwest of Anchorage and 175 miles southeast of Bethel in southwest Alaska. It is a major regional center in Bristol Bay, the site of a world-class commercial salmon fishery.

DESCRIPTION: The project is to stabilize the bank on the west side of the small boat harbor entrance and close the gap between the existing revetment at the east harbor entrance back to the existing dock facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 11,668
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12
Cash	0
Other	12
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 11,680
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 3,429
Allocation for FY 2004	240
Allocation for FY 2005	529
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,000
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 4,500
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete letter reports on the two remaining work phases, initiate design (PED), ready to advertise west side work in 4th quarter.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: False Pass Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: 2000 Water Resources Development Act, Public Law 106-541

LOCATION: False Pass is located on the eastern shore of Unimak Island about 650 miles southwest of Anchorage.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of two rubblemound breakwaters, 388 meters and 180 meters in length, to create a 2.4 hectare mooring basin dredged to -5.8 meters MLLW and dredging an entrance channel to -6.1 meters MLLW. The harbor would provide mooring for approximately 56 gillnet vessels and 12 crab fishing vessels. The Aleutians East Borough is the Local Sponsor for the project.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Construction</u> \$ 16,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,600
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 22,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 1,086
Allocation for FY 2004	(35)
Allocation for FY 2005	792
Conference Amount for FY 2006	7,000
Allocation for FY 2006	6,930 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 7,557
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 1.2 (6 5/8%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 1.2 (7%)	

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue construction of the harbor including placement of breakwater materials. Environmental monitoring will be conducted this year and several years following construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME: Kaunalapau Harbor, Lanai, HI.

AUTHORIZATION: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2001, Section 1(a)(2), (PL 106-377); Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2002 (PL 107-66) and FY 2003 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Division D - Energy and Water Development Appropriations, 2003 (PL 108-7).

LOCATION: The Kaunalapau Harbor is located on the southwestern coast of the Island of Lanai.

DESCRIPTION: The project will repair the existing breakwater which was built during the 1920's. The existing rubblemound breakwater is approximately 250 feet in length with a crest elevation of about (+)10 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$23,619
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,624
Cash	2,624
Other	0
Estimated Total Project Cost	\$26,243
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$5,288
Allocation in FY 2004	2,483
Allocation in FY 2005	2,978
Conference Amount for FY 2006	13,000
Allocation in FY 2006	12,870
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	0.14
Remaining Benefits Remaining costs Ratio (7%)	---

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The construction contract was awarded in July 2004. Construction activities are on-going.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction is scheduled to be completed in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Repeated storms in the 1980's and 1990's have significantly damaged the breakwater at the existing harbor. The State of Hawaii harbor is utilized by inter-island barges, which provide 98 percent of the goods into the island. The harbor has been closed periodically for fuel barges, and future events can severely damage the entire economic fabric of the island. The project documentation was not submitted through the conventional Civil Works processes because of a low benefit to cost ratio of 0.14. However, because of the extreme importance of the harbor, Congress provided prior funds in Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts of 1993, 1994, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye (HI), Senator Daniel Akaka (HI), and Representative Ed Case (HI-2)

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Nome Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 99, Sec. 101(a)(1) as modified by PL 107-66, Energy and Water Development Appropriation for FY 2002

LOCATION: Nome Harbor is located on the southern coast of the Seward Peninsula in western Alaska. The city is approximately 863-km northwest of Anchorage.

DESCRIPTION: Nome is the transportation and commerce center for Northwest Alaska. The project consists of a new 1,070 meter-long entrance channel protected by a 910-meter long rubblemound breakwater, replacement of an existing causeway bridge, a 70-meter rubblemound breakwater-extension on the existing causeway, sediment collection basins, and filling of the existing entrance channel. The harbor will provide protected moorage for the existing 170 vessels as well as a fleet of 40 barges and transshipment vessels providing cargo and fuel service to the region.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 49,027
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,542
Cash	0
Other	6,542
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 55,569
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 1,214
Allocation for FY 2004	18,675
Allocation for FY 2005	16,268
Conference Amount for FY 2006	13,000
Allocation for FY 2006	12,870 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 1.6 (6-7/8%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 2.0 (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to complete the construction of the causeway bridge, the 910-meter long rubblemound breakwater, and dredging the west sediment trap. There is a claim on rock quantities overruns currently being evaluated. The Contractor is also discussing a potential dredging claim.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: The construction contract was awarded in September 2003. Over \$32,000,000 of placement has occurred to date. The project consists of a new 1,070 meter-long entrance channel protected by a 910-meter long rubblemound breakwater, replacement of an existing causeway bridge, a 70-meter rubblemound breakwater extension on the existing causeway, sediment collection basins, and filling of the existing entrance channel.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Saint Paul Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b)(3) of WRDA 96, modified by Section 303 of WRDA 99, with technical corrections in Division D, Section 105 of EWDA 03

LOCATION: Saint Paul is located on a narrow peninsula on the southern tip of Saint Paul Island, the largest of five islands in the Pribilofs, in the eastern Bering Sea of Alaska. It lies 47 miles north of Saint George Island, 240 miles north of the Aleutian Islands, 300 miles west of the Alaska mainland, and 750 air miles west of Anchorage.

DESCRIPTION: The original harbor was constructed in 1990. The current harbor improvements project includes construction of three offshore reefs to protect the main breakwater, deepening of the entrance channel and maneuvering basin, construction of other inner harbor improvements and scour protection for the main breakwater, restoration of circulation in the salt lagoon, and construction of a small boat harbor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 65,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	16,250
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 81,250
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 19,121
Allocation for FY 2004	17,158
Allocation for FY 2005	9,049
Conference Amount for FY 2006	6,000
Allocation for FY 2006	5,940 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 13,732
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: 1.4 (5 3/8%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 2.3 (7%)	

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute PCA for Phase III – small boat harbor and prepare plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Unalaska Harbor, AK

AUTHORIZATION: Section 314 of Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act of 2005, PL 108-375

LOCATION: Unalaska overlooks Iliuliuk Bay and Dutch Harbor on Unalaska Island in the Aleutian Chain. It lies 800 air miles from Anchorage and 1,700 miles northwest of Seattle.

DESCRIPTION: The project would consist of a 180-meter long rubblemound breakwater, a 145-meter long floating breakwater, and a second 245-meter floating breakwater. The proposed location is at the southwest corner of Amaknak Island locally referred to as "Little South America." The project would also require the dredging of 31,600 cubic meters of sand and gravel and 4,800 cubic meters of rock to complete the local sponsor's moorage basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 15,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	9,200
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 25,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,000
Allocation for FY 2006	990 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$14,810
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: (5 5/8%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: 1.13 (7%)	

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Project Cooperation Agreement, geotechnical exploration and drilling of the harbor site, and initiate plans and specifications.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Construction, General
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Brunswick Harbor Deepening, GA

AUTHORIZATION: PL 106-53, Sec 101(a)(19); PL 108-7; and PL 108-137, Sec 149

LOCATION: Brunswick Harbor is a deep-water port located in Brunswick, Glynn County, Georgia with the inner channels extending through St. Simon's Sound, Brunswick River and East River.

DESCRIPTION: The project purpose is to deepen the navigation channel for safe and efficient passage of larger vessels. A six foot deepening in the inner harbor from 30 to 36 feet and in the bar channel from 32 to 38 feet, Construct a new turning basin in Upper East River, and widen all areas of the inner harbor to 400 feet. Construct a new offshore island to serve as a beneficial use of dredged material and construct 10 acre migratory bird nesting island and a 1,300 foot bend widener for safe ship handling. Other improvements include the restoration of 69 acres of marshland as mitigation for the new East River Turning Basin, and the raising of the Andrews Island Disposal area dike to regain lost capacity.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$66,028
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$35,553
Cash	\$33,553
Other	2,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$101,581
Allocations thru 2003	\$12,258
Allocations for 2004	\$5,773
Allocations for 2005	\$9,657
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$19,100
Allocations for 2006	\$18,909
Balance to Complete after 2006	\$19,431
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.78%)	1.2%
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.7%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the Inner Harbor channel from the Colonels Island terminal facilities to ocean bar channel.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The existing 30-foot deep channel at Brunswick constrains shipping traffic. Under present conditions, many vessels calling the port incur costly tidal delays and require light loading. In addition, the Inner Harbor Channel is constrained to only 200 feet wide at the location of the old Sidney Lanier Bridge, causing concerns from the harbor pilots. The plan of improvement will reduce transportation costs for current and projected traffic. Although the Georgia Ports Authority was the sponsor for the feasibility and PED phase, the Georgia Department of Transportation is now the local sponsor for implementation and long-term maintenance. FY2007 funds would have been used to complete all of the dredging in East River and its associated mitigation activities for the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Jack Kingston (GA—01), Sen. Saxby Chambliss (GA), and Sen. Johnny Isakson (GA)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 23, 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Gulfport Harbor, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Chapter IV, Page 331, Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1985; Section 202, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986; Section 4(n), WRDA 1988; and, Section 439, WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: Gulfport, Mississippi

DESCRIPTION: Gulfport Harbor is located on the Gulf Coast, in Harrison County, Gulfport, Mississippi. The deep draft ship channel runs southward from Gulfport through Mississippi Sound into the Gulf of Mexico. The General Re-evaluation Report is being prepared to formulate alternative plans and determine the feasibility of widening of the project to the authorized width.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$37,090
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	14,911
Cash	12,308
Other	2,603
Total Estimated Cost	\$52,001
Allocation thru 2003	\$26,715
Allocation for FY 2004	292
Allocation for FY 2005	1,445
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,200
Allocation for FY 2006	1,188
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,450
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – 1.14 to 1	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – 1.12 to 1	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 funds will be used to complete the General Re-evaluation Report as scheduled in the design cost sharing agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Thad Cochran and Trent Lott and Congressman Gene Taylor, MS-04.

DISTRICT: MS-04

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Jacksonville Harbor, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a) (17), WRDA 1999 for the project and as modified by PL 109-103, Section 129 for the extension. Resolution by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopted February 5, 1992 and House Report 108-10, page 808.

LOCATION: The project area is located at the mouth of the St. Johns River in Duval County on the east coast of Florida.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of deepening the main channel to a project depth of 40 feet from the 40-foot contour in the Atlantic Ocean to mile 20; realignment of Cuts 39-41 of the main channel; deepening the West Blount Island Channel along Cuts F and G to 38-foot depth from the main channel to the JEA/JPA petroleum terminal; and raising the existing dikes on the east end of Bartram Island to accommodate the material from deepening of the West Blount Island Channel and the west end of Bartram to accommodate the material from terminal channel. In addition, a second GRR will study deepening to 45 feet from the mouth to river mile 20.0.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 39,600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	33,600
Cash	33,575
Other	25
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 73,200
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 18,722
Allocation for FY 04	3,152
Allocation for FY 05	1,954
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 06	371
Balance to Complete after FY 06	15,401
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.875%)	1.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.3

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The added FY 2006 funds will be used to modify feasibility cost sharing agreements from 50/50 to 75% Federal and 25% Local Sponsor and re-apportion the funds. Within the local funds made available to the construction project, the funds were re-apportioned to collect the non-Federal share of the feasibility effort. The funds will also be used to continue processing the two feasibility efforts. Future work on the feasibility activities for both the extension (design) and improvement (feasibility and PED) will be budgeted under the GI Appropriation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If adequate funding is provided, the extension construction could be completed in FY 07 and the GRR study in FY 09.

OTHER INFORMATION: A 50/50 cost sharing agreement for the feasibility level GRR (Feasibility) was executed on 1 July 2005. An amendment will be executed to adjust the cost share in accordance with the language above. A 50/50 cost sharing agreement for the feasibility level GRR (2) was executed on 17 May 2004. An amendment will be executed to adjust the cost share in accordance with the language above. A 75/25 design cost sharing agreement for the extension was executed on 1 July 2005. Benefit cost ratio information is for the harbor extension portion.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Corrine Brown (D) FL-3,
Congressman Ander Crenshaw (R) FL-4

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pascagoula Harbor, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Section 202, Water Resources Development Act of 1986

LOCATION: Pascagoula, Mississippi

DESCRIPTION: Pascagoula Harbor project is located on the Gulf Coast, Pascagoula, Mississippi. The deep draft ship channel runs southward from Pascagoula through Mississippi Sound into the Gulf of Mexico.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$73,001
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	31,999
Cash	18,547
Other	13,452
Total Estimated Cost	\$105,000
Allocation thru 2003	\$35,127
Allocation for FY 2004	3,230
Allocation for FY 2005	317
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,500
Allocation for FY 2006	3,465
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	30,862
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – N/A	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 funds will be used to continue construction of the Pascagoula River Confined Disposal Facility, which was approved in the Pascagoula Harbor Dredged Material Management Plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Thad Cochran and Trent Lott and Congressman Gene Taylor, MS-04.

DISTRICT: MS-04

Date: January 24, 2006

**FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ponce De Leon Inlet, FL

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-53 (WRDA 1999), Section 101(b) (8).

LOCATION: Ponce de Leon Inlet is located in Volusia County on the eastern coast of Florida about 65 miles south of St. Augustine Harbor and 57 miles north of Canaveral Harbor.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for a 1000-foot south jetty extension toward the ocean and parallel to the north jetty, with scour apron.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,600
Cash	3,600
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 8,000
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 259
Allocation for FY 04	54
Allocation for FY 05	14
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,313
Allocation for FY 06	1,300
Balance to Complete after FY 06	2,773
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.375%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.4

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to execute a PCA, advertise, award, and commence construction on the South Jetty Extension. Construction contract award will be based on availability of funds and approved acquisition strategy.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The construction of the project could be completed in FY 2007 if adequate funds are appropriated.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Mel Martinez (FL-R), Senator Bill Nelson (FL-D), Congressman Tom Feeney (FL24-R)

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Port Everglades Harbor, FL

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 2000, Section 515

LOCATION: Port Everglades is a man-made port located in Broward County along south Florida's east coast.

DESCRIPTION: Non-Federal interests constructed the Southport channel and Turning Notch without an executed project cooperation agreement (PCA). WRDA 2000, Section 515 has provisions for the reimbursement to the non-Federal interest the sum of \$15,003,000, as determined by the Secretary, for the Federal share of the costs incurred by the non-Federal interests.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 15,003
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	7,888
Cash	6,754
Other	1,134
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 22,891
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 04	1,876
Allocation for FY 05	355
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 06	371
Balance to Complete after FY 06	12,401
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (6.625%)	1.4
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	4.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to partially reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the Federal portion for improvements made to the Port.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction has been completed by the local sponsor. Reimbursement is dependent upon future appropriation of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Port Everglades Limited Reevaluation Report (LRR) dated April 1998 was approved by ASA(CW) on 25 January 2004.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Shaw (FL22-R)

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Lucie Inlet, Florida

AUTHORIZATION: Section 201 of Public Law 98-298 dated October 27-1965, Title II – Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 STAT. 1073; 42 USC 1962d-5), as amended by Section 131 of the 1976 Water Resources Development Act (90 STAT. 2928). In accordance with Section 201, the House and Senate Public Works Committees approved the St. Lucie, Florida Federal navigation project by Resolutions dated May 9, 1974 and May 31, 1974, respectively.

LOCATION: The project area is located in Martin County on the east coast of Florida near the town of Stuart about midway between Cape Kennedy and Miami.

DESCRIPTION: Improvements approved in 1974 included (1) Extension of the north jetty, (2) Construction of a south jetty, (3) Construction of a detached breakwater south of the tip of the north jetty, (4) Excavation of a sand impoundment basin adjacent to the north jetty, (5) A channel through the bar cut 16 feet deep by 300 feet wide; tapering to 10 feet deep and 150 feet wide through the inlet; 7 feet deep by 100 feet wide to the Intracoastal Waterway, and (6) Transfer of suitable sand to the beach south of the inlet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 24,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,700
Cash	4,700
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 29,200
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 16,035
Allocation for FY 04	-1
Allocation for FY 05	0
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,500
Allocation for FY 06	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 06	6,981
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	1
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.69

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY 2006 will be used to prepare a LRR to verify the economic benefits of the remaining work, prepare P&S, and develop a construction contracting strategy under the existing PCA executed in 1978. The remaining jetty elements are; raising the seaward most 450 feet of the north jetty and extending the south jetty 200 feet to its authorized length of 1200 feet

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: This project is in the construction phase. Pending receipt of sufficient funds, construction of the remaining

jetty elements could be completed in September 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Prior to 2002, only the channel, detached breakwater, and the north jetty were constructed to their authorized and recommended lengths and dimensions. The south jetty was constructed 200 feet short of its recommended length. The impoundment basin was not constructed to depth as rock was encountered. The Design Memorandum (DM) for St. Lucie Inlet, Florida, Navigation Project dated May 2000 evaluated the justification of constructing the remaining authorized project elements in order to provide a safer, a more efficient and navigable channel, and bypassing of suitable maintenance material to the down drift beaches to account for impacts attributed to the navigation project. Recommendations in the DM included raising the seaward most 450 feet of the north jetty, resulting in a 500-foot long weir section, (2) construction of the impoundment basin, and (3) extending the south jetty 200 feet to its authorized length. Construction of the impoundment basin was completed August 2002.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mark Foley (R) FL-16

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tampa Harbor – Port Sutton Channel, FL

AUTHORIZATION: The Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-541), Section 101(b)(12).

LOCATION: Port Sutton is located on the northeast side of Hillsborough Bay in Hillsborough County on the West Coast of Central Florida.

DESCRIPTION: The existing project is 34 feet deep with a channel width of 200 feet. The existing project is not Federally maintained. The project as authorized in WRDA 2000 is 42 feet deep, 290 feet wide and 3,700 feet long. The sponsor has requested that a narrower, 200 feet wide channel be constructed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,800
Cash	4,800
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$11,600
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 738
Allocation for FY 04	164
Allocation for FY 05	182
Conference Amount for FY 06	1,000
Allocation for FY 06	990
Balance to Complete after FY 06	4,726
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.875%)	1.5
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	1.7

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be utilized to complete design efforts, execute a Project Cooperation Agreement, and commence construction. Construction contract award will be based on availability of funds and approved acquisition strategy.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction of the project could be completed in FY 2007 if adequate funding is provided.

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction, General funds were first appropriated in FY 91.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Mel Martinez (FL-R), Senator Bill Nelson (FL-D), Congressmen Bill Young (FL10-R), Jim Davis (FL11-D), Adam Putnam (FL12-R)

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tuscaloosa Site Office, AL

AUTHORIZATION: Section 111, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, P.L. 108-447

LOCATION: Tuscaloosa, AL

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement is to relocate the Black Warrior-Tombigbee River project management office. Relocating the project office will result in consolidation of offices, improved security, and separate Government Owned Contractor Operated facilities from the Government offices.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$32,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$32,000
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	4,000
Allocation for FY 2006	3,960
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	28,040
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – N/A	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 funds will be used to acquire real estate and award a design build contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: TBD

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Richard Shelby and Jeff Sessions and Congressman Artur Davis, AL-07.

DISTRICT: AL-07

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wilmington Harbor 96 Act, North Carolina

AUTHORIZATION: Project Authorized by WRDA 86, Section 201; WRDA 96, Section 101

LOCATION: Wilmington Harbor 96 Act project is located on the Cape Fear and Northeast Cape Fear Rivers in the vicinity of Wilmington on the southern coast of North Carolina in New Hanover and Brunswick Counties.

DESCRIPTION: The plan of improvement consists of deepening the ocean bar and entrance channels from the authorized depth of 40 feet to 44 feet, deepening the authorized 38-foot project to 42 feet up to and including the anchorage basin immediately upriver from the State Ports Authority dock, and extending the anchorage basin northward by 300 feet; the existing 400-foot wide channel will be widened to 600 feet over a total length of 6.2 miles including Lower and Upper Midnight and Lower Lilliput reaches; widen five turns and bends by 100 to 200 feet providing a total average channel width of 500 to 675 feet; widening the Fourth East Jetty Channel to 500 feet over a total length of 1.5 miles; deepening the 32-foot channel between Castle Street and the Hilton Railroad Bridge, the 32-foot turning basin just above the mouth of the northeast Cape Fear River on the west side to 38 feet; and the 25-foot channel from the Hilton Railroad Bridge to 750 feet upstream all to a depth of 38 feet; deepening the 25-foot channel from 750 feet upstream of the Hilton Railroad Bridge to the turning basin near the upstream limits of the project to 34 feet, along with widening of the channel from 200 to 250 feet; and widening the turning basin from 700 to 800 feet; and mitigation to include construction of a 30 acre embayment, acquisition of about 700 acres of existing marsh and upland areas for preservation of habitat to offset losses of wetlands and primary nursery areas, and construction of a fish passage structure around Lock and Dam #1. The plan of improvement for the dredged material disposal facility consists of incrementally raising the dikes at the Eagle Island confined disposal facility to a maximum of 40 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 313,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	155,000
Cash	(106,800)
Other	(48,200)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 468,300
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 183,570
Allocation For FY 2004	15,799
Allocation For FY 2005	17,645
Conference Amount for FY 2006	19,900

Allocation For FY 2006	19,701
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	76,585
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7.625%)	1.30
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.90

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Include the completion of the Passing Lane portion of the Anchorage Basin/Passing Lane contract and completion of construction of the Eagle Island FY05/FY06 incremental raise to cells 2 and 3. We will also continue the required physical and biological monitoring; the development of the general re-evaluation report and dredge material management plan. Develop plans and specifications, issue award and fully fund two solicitations; one for ditching at Eagle Island and one for incrementally raising Eagle Island cell 1.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Assuming no funding in FY 2007 and level out year funding at FY 2006 amount, the project can be completed in FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: The General Re-evaluation Report will also include a review of potential implemental alternatives for the three lock and dam structures on the Cape Fear River above Wilmington.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Senator Dole, Senator Burr, Congressman McIntyre (NC-07), Watt (NC-12), Price (NC-04), Coble (NC-06), Jones (NC-03), Hayes (NC-08), McHenry (NC-10), Butterfield (NC-01), Taylor (NC-11), Etheridge (NC-02), Miller (NC-13), and Congresswomen Foxx (NC-05) and Myrick (NC-09).**

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina

AUTHORIZATION: Project authorized by Water Resources Development Act of 1986 and WRDA 1996.

LOCATION: New Hanover County, North Carolina – the extreme Southeastern portion of North Carolina.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for construction of a dune with a crown width of 25 feet at an elevation of 15 feet above mean low water and a berm with a crown width of 50 feet and a top elevation of 12 feet above mean low water for a distance of 14,000 feet. Federal participation in future nourishment was initially authorized for 10 years but was extended for the life of the project by Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 24,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,000
Cash	12,916
Other	84
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 37,000
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 5,398
Allocation For FY 2004	0
Allocation For FY 2005	154
Conference Amount for FY 2006	890
Allocation For FY 2006	881
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	17,567
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (8.625%)	2.41
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	2.58

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Construction, General (CG) funds will be used to place sand on the beach in accordance with the PCA signed in June 1990 for the life of the project at a cost-sharing of 65% federal and 35% non-federal. This CG work will be limited to available funds.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: No impact.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mike McIntyre (NC-07)

DISTRICT: Wilmington
Date: 26 January 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME: Port of Los Angeles (LA Harbor Channel Deepening), California

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act 1986 Sec 203, Water Resources Development Act 2000, Sec 101(b)(5)

LOCATION: The project is located at the Port of Los Angeles on the coast of southern California in San Pedro Bay, approximately 25 miles south of downtown Los Angeles.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility completed under Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 recommended deepening the main channel from the current depth of -45 feet to -53 feet. Deepening the channel will accommodate vessels entering international maritime commerce with drafts that extend beyond the current limit, and improve navigation safety and shipping efficiencies.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 60,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	161,300
Cash	(129,040)
Other	(32,260)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 222,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 21,644
Allocation for FY 2004	13,291
Allocation for FY 2005	20,423
Allocation for FY 2006	2,673
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,700
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,669
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (7%)	3.8
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)	32.2

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue dredging of main channel.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project has increased cost from \$194,000,000 to \$222,000,000, primarily for an additional disposal site. The Corps supports the increase to the project and currently views the increase as mostly a Non-Federal cost. Talks between the Corps and the local sponsor to develop the cost sharing requirements are still ongoing.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons **Harman** (CA-36), **Rohrabacher** (CA-46), **Royal-Allard** (CA-34), Senators **Boxer** and **Feinstein**.

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Francisco Bay to Stockton, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers & Harbors Act, 1965

LOCATION: Project is located on navigation channels that extend from the San Francisco Bay entrance to the Port of Stockton through San Francisco, Marin, Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, and San Joaquin Counties.

DESCRIPTION: The project will deepen the entire navigation channel from San Francisco Bay to the Port of Stockton.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$119,065
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	21,602
Cash	2,544
Other	19,058
Total Estimated Cost	\$141,447
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 66,937
Allocation for FY 2004	542
Allocation for FY 2005	333
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	51,055
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (3-1/4%)	3.0
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	3.6

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Post processing of aerial survey data, channel design, and initiation of the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report documentation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2013.

OTHER INFORMATION: Increasing local regulations are acting to restrict the Corps ability to perform both necessary O&M and deepening dredging within the Delta. The Corps San Francisco and Sacramento Districts are cooperating with the Ports of Stockton and Sacramento, and with the Corps Environmental Research and Development Center to develop a course of action to permit these activities to continue. This effort, combined with extensive field investigations and required documentation will delay completion of the General Revaluation Report to January 2009.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lundgren CA-3, Miller CA-7, Pelosi CA-8, Lee CA-9, Tauscher CA-10, Pombo CA-11

DISTRICT: San Francisco

6 February 2006

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Arcadia Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 2 March 1905, as amended.

LOCATION: Arcadia Harbor is located on the east shore of Lake Michigan, 193 miles northeast of Chicago, Illinois, and 15 miles north of Manistee, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: Arcadia is a shallow draft harbor that experiences severe shoaling requiring annual dredging. The Federal Channel is maintained at a depth of nine feet to facilitate recreational use. Arcadia has been dredged every year since 1973 with an average of approximately 7,000 cubic yards removed each year.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u> /1	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 71
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 71
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	72
Allocation for FY 2006	71
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$71,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Hoekstra (MI-02)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Ashland Harbor, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 5 August 1886

LOCATION: Ashland Harbor is located at head of Chequamegon Bay, on the south shore of Lake Superior, about 65 miles east of Duluth, MN

DESCRIPTION: Ashland Harbor consists of a federal channel and basin protected by an 8,000 foot breakwater.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 147
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 147
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	149
Allocation for FY 2006	147
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Breakwater Maintenance) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds will be used to conduct surveys, and perform routine breakwater stone maintenance with in-house plant.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Kohl (WI); Representative Obey (WI-07)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Caseville Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 23 October 1962, as amended.

LOCATION: Caseville Harbor is at the mouth of the Pigeon River, about 17 miles southwest of Port Austin, Michigan in an area known as the Thumb of Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: A dredged entrance channel leads from deep water in Saginaw Bay to the mouth of Pigeon River and then upstream for 0.3 miles. On the north side of the entrance channel, a breakwater extends toward the bay from the mouth of the river. The public and state commissioned marinas facilitate small-craft traffic in and out of Caseville Harbor. Caseville was last dredged in 2005, removing approximately 15,700 cubic yards of material and placing it on the beach, south of the harbor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 230
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 230
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	115
Allocation for FY 2006	114
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 116
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: No dredging of the Federal project is scheduled for 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Miller (MI-10)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Cedar River Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 2 August 1882.

LOCATION: Cedar River Harbor is located along the west shore of Lake Michigan, 24 miles northeast the Wisconsin/Michigan border.

DESCRIPTION: Cedar River Harbor is a shallow draft harbor maintained at a depth of 10 feet. It was last dredged in 1999 when approximately 48,000 cubic yards

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 488
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 488
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	495
Allocation for FY 2006	488
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$488,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, perform sampling and analysis, prepare an environmental assessment, perform necessary real estate activities to secure access to an upland disposal site, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging to the extent funds are available.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Stupak (MI-01)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Grand Marais Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 14 June 1880, as amended.

LOCATION: Grand Marais Harbor of Refuge is located along the southern shore of Lake Superior, about 70 miles east of Marquette, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: The harbor was formed by three structures built in the late 1800s. These structures consist of two parallel piers and a timber pile dike breakwater. The two piers protect the channel at the harbor entrance and the pile dike breakwater provided sheltered water for vessels. The harbor is designated as a harbor of refuge, but the timber pile breakwater that is supposed to provide protection for vessels is no longer maintained because it is submerged and is in ruins. The project would involve the construction of a shorter re-aligned breakwater that would replace the timber pile breakwater.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,800
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 6,800
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 215
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,530 /2
Allocation for FY 2006	1,509
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 5,076
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Breakwater Replacement) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

2/ Conference amount shown for added work does not include \$13,000 conference allowance of budgeted amount of \$14,000 that will be used for navigation channel condition surveys.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: The plans and specifications and environmental analysis for the construction of the detached breakwater will be completed.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Stupak (MI-01)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Harbor Beach Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 3 March 1871, as amended.

LOCATION: Harbor Beach is an artificial harbor about 60 miles north of the head of the St. Clair River on Lake Huron. A dredged entrance channel leads west from deep water in Lake Huron between detached breakwaters to a dredged anchorage basin inside the north breakwater.

DESCRIPTION: Harbor Beach is an important harbor of refuge for large vessels on the west shore of Lake Huron. Also, the harbor receives traffic from many small vessels due to the accessibility of the public docks southwest of the harbor and a launching ramp on the north side. Harbor Beach was last dredged in 1998, removing approximately 59,000 cubic yards of material and placing it in open water, east of the harbor. This harbor needs to be dredged to maintain the channel for both large and small vessels.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 444
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 444
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	450
Allocation for FY 2006	444
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$444,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, perform sampling and analysis, prepare an environmental assessment, perform necessary real estate activities to secure access to an upland disposal site, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging.

OTHER INFORMATION: In the past, dredge material has been dumped into open water. If this is no longer acceptable to the State of Michigan then the local sponsor would be required to find an upland site for disposal.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Miller (MI-10)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Kewaunee Harbor, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 3 March 1881.

LOCATION: Kewaunee Harbor is located on the west shore of Lake Michigan, about 105 miles north of Milwaukee, WI, and about 78 miles from Green Bay. The harbor is at the mouth of the Kewaunee River.

DESCRIPTION: Project consists of an outer basin protected by a 2,980-foot converging north breakwater and shore connection, and an 1,850-foot south pier, a north pier 650 feet long, and an entrance channel 505 feet wide through the outer basin and 150 feet wide between piers; an interior turning basin; a northerly channel extending 100 feet wide; and a north basin. The project depth for all channels is 20 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 255
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 255
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	259
Allocation for FY 2006	255
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Breakwater Maintenance) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds will be used to conduct surveys, and perform routine breakwater stone maintenance with in-house plant.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Kohl (WI); Representative Green (WI-08)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Leland Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 30 August 1935, as amended.

LOCATION: Leland Harbor is located along the east shore of Lake Michigan at the mouth of the Carp River, about 40 miles north of Frankfort, Michigan, and 40 miles southwest of Charlevoix, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: Leland Harbor is a shallow draft harbor that provides a harbor of refuge. Leland Harbor has been dredged every year since 1971 with an average of approximately 19,000 cubic yards removed each year. Dredge material is placed on the beach.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 78
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 78
Allocation thru FY2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY2004	0
Allocation for FY2005	0
Conference Amount for FY2006	79
Allocation for FY 2006	78
Balance to Complete After FY2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$78,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Camp (MI-04)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Little Lake Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 2 March 1945, as amended.

LOCATION: Little Lake Harbor is located on the south shore of Lake Superior about 21 miles west of Whitefish Point and 30 miles east of Grand Marais, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: Little Lake Harbor is a shallow draft harbor typically maintained at a depth of 8 to 12 feet. The harbor provides for a small craft harbor of refuge with an entrance channel from Lake Superior into Little Lake. Despite the protection provided by breakwaters and revetments, the harbor shoals in rapidly due to shifting sand and cobbles that wash over the structures. The full project depth is not usually available because of this rapid shoaling. Little Lake was last dredged in 2004 with approximately 19,000 cubic yards of material removed and placed on the beach.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 300
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	167
Allocation for FY 2006	164
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	136
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: No dredging of the Federal project is scheduled for 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Stupak (MI-01)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: Existing project was authorized in Rivers and Harbors Act of 2 March 1907, as amended. The proposed Federal channel deepening work is not authorized.

LOCATION: The Manitowoc Harbor project is located in Wisconsin along the west shore of Lake Michigan approximately 79 miles north of Milwaukee.

DESCRIPTION: Corps responsibilities include maintenance of the Federal navigation structures, and maintenance dredging of the outer and inner channels to the harbor. Larger vessels cannot access the inner harbor, thus forcing commercial ships to offload cargo onto barges offshore for delivery to inner harbor businesses.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,250
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	405
Allocation for FY 2006	399
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	851
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Channel Deepening and Expansion) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: No activities are proposed for FY2006. With additional funds in the amount of \$773k and authorization, the extension of the project could be completed.

OTHER INFORMATION: The approach channel was at one time authorized by the RHA of 1935, but was deauthorized by the RHA of 1962. If authorized, funds would be used for design, NEPA compliance, and to increase the depth in the Manitowoc River from 12 to 18 feet between the upper limit of the Federal channel and the Canadian National Railroad Bridge, and to modify the project to include a 100-foot wide, 500-foot long, 23 feet deep approach channel as a southern appendage to the project at the location of the vehicle ferry facility.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Petri (WI-06)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: Existing project was authorized in Rivers and Harbors Act of 3 March 1871, as amended. The proposed Federal channel deepening work is not authorized.

LOCATION: The Menominee Harbor and River project is located in Menominee County, Michigan and Marinette County, Wisconsin, along the western shore of Lake Michigan and within the Green Bay.

DESCRIPTION: Corps responsibilities include maintenance of the Federal navigation structures, and maintenance dredging of the outer and inner channels to the harbor. Larger vessels cannot access the inner harbor, thus forcing commercial ships to offload cargo onto barges offshore for delivery to inner harbor businesses. The requested additional activities include increasing the depth of the outer channel of Menominee Harbor from 23 to 26 feet, and increasing the depth of the channel between the piers and the river from 21 to 24 feet.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	394
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,606
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Channel Deepening) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: None.

OTHER INFORMATION: The additional depth for the project is not authorized. The requested project depths are below the currently authorized depths at Menominee Harbor and River, therefore Operation and Maintenance funds could not be expended without specific authorization. The requested dredging was at one time authorized by the River and Harbors Act of 1960, and deauthorized on April 15, 2002, in accordance with Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-662). Act language is needed to direct implementation of the deeper maintenance depths. Report language is needed to specify purpose of additional funds.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Stupak (MI-01)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: New Buffalo Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 1962.

LOCATION: New Buffalo Harbor is located on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan about 20 miles south of St. Joseph, Michigan and 75 miles from Chicago, Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a 10-foot deep entrance channel in Lake Michigan protected on each side by breakwaters, and an 8-foot deep inner channel in the Galien River. The total length of the channels is about 2100 feet. New Buffalo was last dredged in 2005 with approximately 11,000 cubic yards of material removed and placed on the beach.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 70
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 70
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	71
Allocation for FY 2006	70
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$70,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Upton (MI-06)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Pentwater Harbor, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 2 March 1867, as amended.

LOCATION: Pentwater Harbor is located along the east shore of Lake Michigan, 146 miles northeast of Chicago, Illinois, and 14 miles south of Ludington, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: Pentwater Harbor is a shallow draft harbor maintained at a depth of 12 feet. The harbor experiences extensive shoaling at the mouth, making passage unsafe. Pentwater has been dredged every year since 1963 with an average of approximately 11,000 cubic yards removed each year. Dredge material is placed on the beach.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 89
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 89
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	90
Allocation for FY 2006	89
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The \$89,000 will be used to conduct surveys, prepare plans and specifications, advertise and award a contract, and perform maintenance dredging.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Hoekstra (MI-02)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Port Washington Harbor, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 11 July 1870.

LOCATION: Port Washington Harbor is located on the west shore of Lake Michigan, about 53 miles south of Manitowoc and about 29 miles north of Milwaukee, WI.

DESCRIPTION: Project consists of an outer stilling basin enclosed by a converging north breakwater and shore connection 2,537 feet long; a 456-foot long extension of a privately owned rubblemound and coal wharf on the south; a turning basin 21 feet deep and 750 feet wide in the stilling basin; an entrance channel 21 feet deep and about 2,500 feet long through the south side of the stilling basin to the west and north interior basins which are maintained at an 18-foot depth.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 189
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 189
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	192
Allocation for FY 2006	189
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Breakwater Maintenance) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds will be used to conduct surveys, and perform routine breakwater stone maintenance with in-house plant.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Kohl (WI); Representative Sensenbrenner (WI-05)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Sebewaing River, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 3 June 1896.

LOCATION: The Sebewaing River drains an area of 105 square miles in Huron and Tuscola Counties of the Lower Peninsula of Michigan, and discharges into Saginaw Bay. A dredged entrance channel, marked by buoys, leads southeast from the 8 foot contour in Saginaw Bay through the mouth of the Sebewaing River and upstream about 4,000 feet.

DESCRIPTION: Being a shallow draft harbor, Sebewaing River is used by recreational vessels. The channel is severely shoaled at the mouth of the river with less than 3 foot of available draft in some sections. Sebewaing Harbor was last dredged in 1996, removing approximately 58,000 cubic yards and placing it upland, north of Bay Street.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 827
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 827
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	324
Allocation for FY 2006	320
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	507
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Maintenance Dredging) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds will be used to perform surveys and prepare an upland disposal site for future maintenance dredging. Minor maintenance dredging may be completed.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representative Miller (MI-10)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Sturgeon Bay Harbor and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbor Act of 3 March 1873, as amended.

LOCATION: Sturgeon Bay Canal cuts through the Door County Peninsula connecting Green Bay and the southern portion of Lake Michigan approximately 52 miles northeast of Green Bay and about 128 miles north of Milwaukee, WI.

DESCRIPTION: Project consists of an outer basin formed by two breakwaters; a revetted canal; and entrance channel 23 feet deep from Lake Michigan to 800 feet west of the east entrance to the canal; a channel 22 feet deep through the revetted canal and Sturgeon Bay, to Sherwood Point, a total length of about 8.6 miles; and a tuning basin 20 feet deep at the city of Sturgeon Bay.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 228
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 228
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	231
Allocation for FY 2006	228
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Breakwater Maintenance) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds will be used to conduct surveys, and perform routine breakwater stone maintenance with in-house plant.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Kohl (WI); Representative Green (WI-08)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Two Rivers Harbor, Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of 3 March 1871, as amended.

LOCATION: Two Rivers Harbor is located in Wisconsin, on the west shore of Lake Michigan, approximately 82 miles north of Milwaukee and about 101 miles south of Green Bay, via the Sturgeon Bay Canal.

DESCRIPTION: Corps responsibilities include maintenance of the Federal navigation structures, and maintenance dredging of the outer and inner channels to the harbor. The south pier and revetment were repaired in 2003 in an effort to reduce significant wave forces being transferred to the inner harbor. To complete the wave dampening effect the north pier and revetment need repair.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000) /1</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,587
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,587
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	378
Allocation for FY 2006	373
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	4,214
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ All cost and allocation data reflect the costs and allocations attributable to the added work (Pier and Revetment Repair) as identified in the supporting Members Fact Sheet for the FY2006 E&W Appropriations add.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY2006: Initiation of design of repairs to the north pier and revetment and associated sampling, surveying and environmental analysis and coordination will be accomplished in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: The design and plans and specifications could be completed and construction initiated with the balance of funds, thereby protecting the inner harbor and the existing fishing companies from destructive wave forces off Lake Michigan.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Petri (WI-06)

DISTRICT: Detroit

DATE: 24 January 2006

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lake Crockett (Keystone Harbor)

AUTHORIZATION: Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945

LOCATION: Central western shore of Whidbey Island in Puget Sound, Island County, Washington. The project is located within the Ebey's Landing National Historic Reserve and is in the vicinity of an underwater state park.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for an 18 to 25 foot deep, 6-acre basin connecting Admiralty Inlet to the eastern ferry terminus for the Keystone-Port Townsend route. A stone breakwater protects a 200-foot-wide entrance channel. This project is a harbor of refuge.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	ongoing
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	NA
Cash	NA
Other	NA
Total Estimated Cost	ongoing
Allocations thru FY 2003	ongoing
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	64
Conference Amount for FY 2006	308
Allocation for FY 2006	304
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Dredge in September 2006

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006, maintenance

OTHER INFORMATION: Federal maintenance dredging occurs about once every 5-6 years. The project was last dredged in 1999

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Rick Larsen (WA 2), Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) & Maria Cantwell (D-WA)

DISTRICT: Seattle

06 February 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Operations and Maintenance
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Cordova Harbor, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: 1) Rivers and Harbors Act, 30 August 1935 (R & H Committee Doc. 33, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session) as adopted, provides for a sheltered small boat harbor of 8.26 acres with a depth of -10 feet MLLW protected by north and south breakwaters of 1,100 feet and 1,400 feet respectively, with provision for a future expansion of 10.4 acres to -14 feet MLLW. 2) Under the River and Harbor Act of 14 July 1960, Section 107, P.L. 86-645, authorized by the Chief of Engineers, 29 June 1978, harbor expansion is approved to 20 acres by the removal of the 1,400 foot breakwater, the construction of a 2,000 foot breakwater, and an increased depth for the entrance and access channel to -16 feet MLLW.

LOCATION: Cordova, Alaska

DESCRIPTION: Cordova, Alaska is located on the east side of Prince William Sound on Orca Inlet approximately 150 miles east-southeast of Anchorage. The harbor is used as a base of operations for commercial fishing, and serves as a harbor of refuge for 476 commercial fishing vessels. Approximately 650 boats and skiffs are based in the Cordova area. The Cordova canning season is the longest and most diversified in the state.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 790
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 790
Allocations thru 2003	\$ 11,558
Allocation in 2004	\$ 0
Allocation in 2005	\$ 0
Conference Amount for 2006	\$ 540
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 540
Balance to Complete after 2006	\$ 250
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Obtain environmental clearances and prepare contract plans and specifications for awarding a maintenance dredging contract to remove approximately 15,000 cubic yards of material from the harbor entrance and access channel and restore the project to its Congressionally authorized depth.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Waterborne in 2003 was 34,000 tons. The city of Cordova has identified a disposal site for the dredged material adjacent to the harbor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Stevens, Senator Murkowski, and Representative Don Young.

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Operations and Maintenance
Pohoiki Bay, Hawaii, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pohoiki Bay, Hawaii, HI

AUTHORIZATION: Section 107 of Rivers and Harbors Act of 1960 (PL 86-645), as amended.

LOCATION: The Pohoiki Bay Improvements project is located on the east coast of the island of Hawaii.

DESCRIPTION: The project was completed in April 1979 and consists of a 90-foot long breakwater protecting a locally financed ramp. It is the only harbor on the entire east side of the island of Hawaii for subsistence commercial fishing and recreational boating. Federal maintenance responsibilities encompass only the breakwater, dredging of the launch ramp, and shoreline facilities are the maintenance responsibility of the local sponsor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>P&S</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$300
Allocations thru 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	90
Allocation for FY 2006	89
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year 2006	211
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.38%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds will be used to conduct a topographic survey.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of plans and specifications in FY2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Ed Case (HI-02).

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Crescent City Harbor, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1918, 1922, 1927, 1935, 1937, 1945, 1965

LOCATION: Crescent City Harbor is located on the California coast about 350 miles north of San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION: The project is a shallow-draft channel. It is a critical harbor of refuge and supports a Coast Guard search & rescue station that provides Homeland Security for the region.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$467
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$450
Allocation for FY 2006	\$444
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for Dredge Material Management Plan and preliminary engineering and design for future maintenance dredging. Unobligated funds will be carried over into FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. Funds for maintenance dredging will be requested for FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project has a 5-year dredging cycle and was last dredged in FY 1998. Severe winter storms have contributed to unusually heavy shoaling.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: This project is consistent with Administration policy but low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Thompson CA-01**

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Jack D. Maltester Channel, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1965. Name change auth WRDA 1986 (PL99-662) & WRDA of 1992 (originally San Leandro Marina, CA)

LOCATION: Jack D. Maltester Channel is located on the southeast shore of San Francisco Bay in Alameda County.

DESCRIPTION: The project is a shallow-draft channel, mainly light commercial and recreational navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$675
Allocation for FY 2006	\$665
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for preliminary engineering and design for future maintenance dredging. Unobligated funds will be carried over into FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. Using unobligated carryover funds from FY 2006 and with optimal funding in FY 07 maintenance dredging could be accomplished.

OTHER INFORMATION: The local sponsor (City of San Leandro) is responsible for furnishing a suitable upland dredge material disposal site for the project. Maintenance dredging was last completed in December 2001. The project has a 4 year cycle and is therefore overdue for maintenance.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: This project is consistent with Administration policy but low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Stark CA-13**

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Moss Landing Harbor, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1945

LOCATION: Moss Landing Harbor, California at Monterey Bay is located about 95 miles south of San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION: The project is a shallow-draft channel, mainly light commercial and recreational navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 552
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 234
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$1,328
Allocation for FY 2006	\$1,310
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to perform scheduled periodic maintenance dredging.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M phase. FY 2006 maintenance dredging is scheduled for completion in early FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Winter storms continue to damage the jetties which will lead to increased shoaling and danger to navigation.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: This project is consistent with Administration policy but low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Farr CA-17

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Napa River, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1935, 1946

LOCATION: Napa River is a tributary of San Francisco Bay that flows through Solano and Napa Counties between the cities of Napa and Vallejo.

DESCRIPTION: The project is a shallow-draft channel, mainly light commercial and recreational navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$675
Allocation for FY 2006	\$665
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for preliminary engineering and design for future maintenance dredging. Unobligated funds will be carried over into FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. Using unobligated carryover, and with optimal funding in FY 07 maintenance dredging could be accomplished.

OTHER INFORMATION: The local sponsor (Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District) is responsible for furnishing a suitable upland dredged material disposal site for the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06**

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Noyo River and Harbor, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1930, 1945, 1960, 1962, WRDA 1976, WRDA 1986.

LOCATION: Noyo River and Harbor is located at Fort Bragg on the California coast, approximately 140 miles north of San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION: The project is a shallow-draft channel. It is a critical Harbor of Refuge and supports a Coast Guard search & rescue station that provides Homeland Security for the region.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u> FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$225
Allocation for FY 2006	\$222
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for preliminary engineering and design for maintenance dredging. Maintenance dredging will be accomplished in FY 2006 if funds become available and a disposal site is available.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. If a disposal site and FY2006 funds become available, maintenance dredging could be initiated and completed in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Due to severe entrance shoaling, the US Coast Guard is requesting emergency dredging in FY 2006. The shoaling limits the Coast Guard missions of Homeland Security and Search and Rescue.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Petaluma River, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1880, 1930.

LOCATION: The Petaluma River is located on San Pablo Bay in Sonoma and Marin Counties, California.

DESCRIPTION: This project is a shallow-draft channel, mainly light commercial and recreational navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$921
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$945
Allocation for FY 2006	\$931
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for preliminary engineering and design for future maintenance dredging. Unobligated funds will be carried over into FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. Using unobligated carryover funds from FY 2006, and optimal funding in FY 2007, maintenance dredging of both Across The Flats and River Channels could be accomplished.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Across the Flats Channel is on a 3-year dredging cycle (last dredged in FY 1998) and the River Channel is on a 4-year dredging cycle (last dredged in FY 2003). The extent of future dredging will depend upon the level of funding and disposal site availability.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pillar Point Harbor

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1948, authorized name change WRDA 1990 (originally Half Moon Bay Harbor, CA)

LOCATION: Pillar Point Harbor is located on Half Moon Bay about 25 miles south of San Francisco, CA

DESCRIPTION: Project consists of breakwaters only, no navigation channel.
The project is a critical harbor of refuge with mainly light commercial and recreational navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$276
Allocation for FY 2005	\$117
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$450
Allocation for FY 2006	\$444
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used for preliminary engineering and design for future breakwater repairs. Unobligated funds will be carried over into FY 2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M Phase. Using unobligated carryover from FY 2006 and with optimal funding in FY 07, the breakwater could be repaired.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project original name was Half Moon Bay.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lantos CA-12, Eshoo CA-14

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pinole Shoal Management Study, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Appropriation Act of 2005

LOCATION: The project area includes the northern San Francisco Bay and extends throughout the California Delta. The California Delta encompasses the region of the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers with San Francisco Bay.

DESCRIPTION: This project will create a Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for the placement and re-use of dredge material in support of the COE's deep draft navigation mission, levee repair and maintenance, wetland restoration and other beneficial uses.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$467
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$225
Allocation for FY 2006	\$222
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funding provided in FY06 is being used to initiate a Framework Plan to identify Agency participation, the structure of the study's management, and define the scope of future investigation. An Executive Committee has been established, consisting of the COE, USEPA, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), CALFED, and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. This Committee, in association with the numerous stakeholders keenly interested in the outcome, will focus the study efforts toward establishing streamlined regulatory compliance and agreeable and achievable sediment testing and water quality criteria.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, which provides water supply to 2/3rd of California. Delta Levees are in dire need of repair, requiring significant quantities of sediment for critical rehabilitation activities. A multiple levee break, or a break in the western Delta, could render Delta water supply unusable for months. Beneficial reuse of dredged sediments has not been widely instituted in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta even though the use of upland disposal for beneficial reuse throughout San Francisco Bay has been promoted via a inter-agency Long Term Management Study for dredging/disposal, which spells out where and how much disposal of dredged sediments can occur over time. To allow for widespread upland reuse to occur in the Delta, a Long Term Management Study strategy should be devised for the Delta geographic area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Thompson CA-01, Lundgren CA-03, Miller CA-07, Cardoza CA-18**

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Port Hueneme, Ventura County, CA

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbors Act of 1888 (House Doc. 362, 90th Congress, 2nd session)

LOCATION: Port Hueneme is located approximately 65 miles northwest of the city of Los Angeles and 1 mile southeast of Channel Islands Harbor.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of an Approach Channel, Entrance Channel, two jetties and basins.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>O&M</u>	
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A	
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A	
Cash	N/A	
Other	N/A	
Total Estimated Cost	N/A	
Allocations thru 2003	N/A	
Allocations for FY 2004	\$	206
Allocations for FY 2005		284
Conference Amount for FY 2006		450
Allocation for FY 2006		444
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds allocated in FY06 are being used to perform hydrographic condition surveys and to develop plans and specifications for the upcoming maintenance dredging project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimal funding in FY 2007, maintenance dredging of the entrance and approach channels could be accomplished.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project is cost shared 81% Corps and 19% Navy. If additional funds are appropriated for the Corps, it will require an additional 19% contribution for the Navy (Navy funding IS NOT guaranteed). Currently a Section 107 Deepening project is on hold due to contaminated material. If the section 107 project goes forward, maintenance dredging will be performed in conjunction with the project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Capps (CA-22)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Port San Luis, CA

AUTHORIZATION: River and Harbors Act of 1888 (House Doc. 148, 88th Congress, 1st session)
(amended 1893, 1898)

LOCATION: Port San Luis is a harbor located about 190 miles northwest of the city of Los Angeles and 245 miles southeast of the city of San Francisco.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a 2,400 ft. rubble mound breakwater.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>O&M</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru 2003	N/A
Allocations for FY 2004	\$ 130
Allocations for FY 2005	1,055
Conference Amount for FY 2006	450
Allocation for FY 2006	444
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds allocated in FY06 are being used to complete the rubble mound breakwater contract.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: Remaining funds, if any, will be identified for reprogramming.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Consistent with the administration policy of maintaining Federally authorized projects.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Capps (CA-22)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Redwood City Harbor, CA

AUTHORIZATION: R&H Act 1910, 1930, 1935, 1945, 1950

LOCATION: Redwood City Harbor is located on the southwest shore of San Francisco Bay in San Mateo County, CA

DESCRIPTION: Redwood City Harbor (including San Bruno Shoal) serves commercial deep-draft navigation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 184
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 467
Conference amount for FY 2006	\$4,470
Allocation for FY 2006	\$4,408
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete FY 2005 continuing contract for maintenance dredging. Initiate and complete maintenance dredging for FY 2006 cycle.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project is currently in O&M phase with next maintenance dredging cycle scheduled for FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Local sponsor has an ongoing Feasibility Study for channel improvements.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lantos CA-12, Eshoo CA-14

DISTRICT: San Francisco

Date: 26 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Appropriation Act of 1991

LOCATION: San Francisco Bay Area (including San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, and Suisun Bay), CA

DESCRIPTION: Policy objectives of the SF Bay Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) are to identify an acceptable array of dredged material disposal sites, develop management, economic and environmental plans for these sites, implement a decision making framework for site usage, streamline permit procedures, and establish long term site monitoring.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Operations and Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	N/A
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	N/A
Cash	N/A
Other	N/A
Total Estimated Cost	N/A
Allocations thru FY 2003	N/A
Allocation for FY 2004	\$1,841
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 936
Allocation for FY 2006	\$1,420
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	N/A
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 efforts are to continue funding Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) labor in support of Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) efforts; continue scientific research to validate "environmental" dredging windows (the times of year during which dredging is allowed, established to protect certain species of fish under the purview of the Endangered Species Act); continue preparation of the Regional Dredged Material Management Plan/Environmental Impact Study (DMMP/EIS); continue to study the relationship of methyl mercury generation to wetlands creation at Hamilton Wetlands Restoration Site.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: Additional funds will be required in future years to complete the study on effects of mercury methylation in wetland restoration projects using dredged material, and continue preparation of the Regional DMMP/EIS. Lack of funds will result in a delay in addressing the methylmercury issue, which could impact the implementation of LTMS by limiting beneficial reuse sites for Federal dredging projects, resulting in disposal options that have no environmental benefit and potentially higher costs.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: **Thompson CA-01, Lundgren CA-03, Woolsey CA-06, Miller CA-07, Pelosi CA-08, Lee CA-09, Tauscher CA-10, Pombo CA-11, Lantos CA-12, Stark CA-13, Eshoo CA-14, Honda CA-15, Lofgren CA-15**

DISTRICT: San Francisco

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Navigation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: GIWW, Chocolate Bayou, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: House Document 217, 89th Congress, 1st Session

LOCATION: This navigation project is located between Galveston and Freeport in Brazoria County, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides a shallow draft channel from the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at Mile 376 through Chocolate Bay and Chocolate Bayou to a point 8.2 miles north of Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The project dimensions are 12 x 125 feet. Maintenance of the project to authorized dimensions is a Federal responsibility.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY2006 (\$000)
	<u>Maintenance</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,782
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,782
Allocation thru 2003	\$0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,800
Allocation for FY 2006	1,782
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Perform maintenance dredging in accordance with Dredged Material Management Plan. Channel is currently in critical shoaled condition.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Project also received \$3M in emergency supplemental funding which will be used to restore the channel to pre-hurricane (Rita) conditions. The combined effect of this and the \$1.8M provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act will be restoration of the channel to authorized depth. Statistics compiled for calendar year 1996 show a movement of 3,845,000 tons of commerce.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison, (TX) Congressman Paul (TX-14), DeLay (TX-22).

DISTRICT: Galveston

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Environment	450
Investigations	451
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division	452
Columbus Metropolitan Area, Lower Big Darby (Hellbranch) OH	453
Eighteenmile Creek, Niagara County, NY	454
Fox River Environmental Dredging, WI	455
Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, PA	456
Metropolitan Region of Louisville, Jefferson County, KY	458
New River, Claytor Lake, VA	459
Onondaga Lake, NY	460
Powell River Watershed, VA	462
Rouge River Supplemental Watershed Management Plan, MI	463
South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River (Bubbly Creek), IL	464
Western Lake Erie Basin Study, OH, IN, and MI	465
Mississippi Valley Division	467
Amite River and Tributaries Ecosystem Restoration, LA	468
Baraboo, WI	469
Blue Earth River Ecosystem Restoration, MN & IA	470
Clear Lake Watershed, IA	471
Illinois River Ecosystem Restoration, IL	472
Minnesota River Basin, MN	473
Minnehaha Creek Watershed, UMR Lake Itasca to Lock and Dam 2, MN	474
Peoria Riverfront Development, IL	475
St. Croix River Basin, MN & WI	476
St. Croix River Relocation of Endangered Mussels, MN & WI (Zebra Mussel Control, Upper Miss River)	477
St. Louis Riverfront, MO & IL	478
White River Basin Comprehensive, AR and MO	479
Mississippi River and Tributaries	480
Spring Bayou, LA	481
North Atlantic Division	482
Anacostia River and Tributaries, MD and DC	483
Baltimore Metro Watr Res-Patapsco and Back River, MD	484
Blackstone River Watershed Restoration, MA	485
Bronx River Basin, NY	486
Chesapeake Bay Shoreline-Maryland Coastal, MD	487
Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Sedi Budg, Model, MD & PA	488
Christina River Watershed, DE	489
Coastal Massachusetts Ecosystem Restoration, MA	490
Delaware River Basin Comprehensive, NJ, NY, DE	491
Eastern Shore, Mid Chesapeake Bay Island, MD	492
Elizabeth River Basin, Env Restoration, VA	493
Elizabeth River, Hampton Roads, VA	494
Flushing Bay, NY	495
Four Mile Run Restoration, VA	496
Hudson - Raritan Estuary, Gowanus Canal, NY	497
Hudson - Raritan Estuary, Lower Passaic River, NJ	498
Middle Potomac River Basin, Cameron/Holmes Run, VA	499
Middle Potomac River Greater Seneca/ Muddy Br, MD	500
NJIWW Environmental Restoration, NJ	501
Peckman River Basin, NJ	502
Schuylkill River Basin Estuarine, PA	503
Schuylkill River Basin Wissahickon Creek Basin, PA	504
Stony Brook, Millstone River Basin, NJ	505

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins, PA.....	506
Northwestern Division	507
Adams County, CO.....	508
Amazon Creek, OR	509
Chehalis River Basin, WA	510
James River, SD & ND	511
Lake Washington Ship Canal, WA	512
Skokomish River, WA.....	513
Walla Walla Watershed, OR and WA.....	514
Willamette River Environmental Dredging, OR	515
Willamette River Floodplain Restoration, OR.....	516
Pacific Ocean Division	517
Kahuku Watershed, HI	518
South Atlantic Division	520
Allatoona Lake (Little River), GA.....	521
Indian, Sugar, Intrenchment, & Federal Prison Cks., GA.....	522
Santee Delta Environmental Restoration	523
Savannah Harbor Ecosystem Restoration	524
Tybee Island North Beach.....	526
South Pacific Division.....	528
Aliso Creek Mainstem, CA.....	529
Arana Gulch Watershed, CA	530
Arroyo Seco Watershed, CA	531
Ballona Creek, Ecosystem Restoration, CA.....	532
Bolinás Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration, CA.....	533
CALFED Levee Stability Program, CA.....	534
City of Inglewood, CA	535
City of Norwalk, CA	536
City of Santa Clarita, CA.....	537
Corte Madera Creek Watershed, CA	538
Coyote Creeks, Lwr San Gabriel WS, CA (Westminster, Coyote & Carbon Crk WS)	539
Desert Hot Springs, CA	540
Eastern Municipal Water District, CA	541
Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and Tribes	542
Hamilton City/Sacramento & San Joaquin, CA	543
Laguna Creek Watershed.....	545
Laguna De Santa Rosa	546
Los Angeles County Drainage Area, CA (Cornfields)	547
Malibu Creek Watershed, CA.....	548
Morro Bay Estuary, CA.....	549
Mugu Lagoon, CA.....	550
Orange County Special Area Management Plan, CA	551
Pima County, AZ	552
Rio Grande Basin, NM, CO & TX	553
Rio Grande Bosque Rehabilitation, NM	554
Rio Salado Oeste, Salt River, AZ	555
Russian River Ecosystem Restoration, CA	556
San Bernardino Lakes and Streams, CA	557
San Jacinto River, Ecosystem Restoration, CA	558
San Joaquin Valley Region, CA	559
San Pablo Bay Watershed, CA	560
Santa Ana River and Tribes, Big Bear Lake, CA.....	561
Santa Clara River Watershed, CA	562
Santa Cruz River (Grant Rd. to Ft. Lowell Rd.), AZ	563
Santa Cruz River, Paseo De Las Iglesias, CA	564

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Santa Fe, NM.....	565
Santa Rosa Creek Ecosystem Restoration, CA.....	566
Sonoma Creek and Tributaries, CA.....	567
Sun Valley Watershed, CA.....	568
Tahoe Basin, CA & NV.....	569
Tahoe Regional Planning, CA & NV.....	570
Westminster, East Garden Grove, CA.....	571
Southwestern Division.....	572
Colonias-Lower Rio Grande Basin along TX & Mexico Borders, TX.....	573
Grand (Neosho) River Basin Watershed, OK, KS, MO & AR.....	574
Oologah Lake Watershed, OK & KS.....	575
Resacas at Brownsville, TX.....	576
Southeast Oklahoma Water Resource Study, OK.....	577
Southwest Arkansas, AR.....	578
Spavinaw Creek Watershed, OK and AR.....	579
Washita River Basin, OK.....	581
Wister Lake Watershed, OK.....	582
Construction.....	584
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.....	585
Calumet Region, IN.....	586
Central West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure, WV.....	587
Cook County, IL.....	588
Genesee County, MI.....	589
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER), IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, PA, NY and WI.....	590
George W Kuhn Drain, Oakland County, MI (Twelve Towns Drain).....	592
Indianapolis Environmental Infrastructure, IN.....	593
Negaunee, MI.....	594
Ohio Environmental Infrastructure.....	595
Onondaga Lake, NY.....	596
Southern and Eastern Kentucky Environmental Infrastructure.....	598
Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure.....	599
South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, PA.....	600
Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Program (Chartiers Direct Stream Removal 1).....	602
Mississippi Valley Division.....	604
Ascension Parish, LA, Environmental Infrastructure.....	605
Desoto County, MS.....	606
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA, Environmental Infrastructure.....	607
East St. Louis and Vicinity, IL.....	608
Iberia Parish, LA, Environmental Infrastructure.....	609
Livingston Parish, LA, Environmental Infrastructure.....	610
Madison and St. Clair Counties, IL.....	611
Mille Lacs Regional Wastewater, MN.....	612
Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure, MS.....	613
Northeast Minnesota, MN.....	614
Northern Wisconsin, WI.....	615
Mississippi River and Tributaries.....	616
Wolf River, Memphis, TN.....	617
North Atlantic Division.....	618
Baltimore Metro - Gwynns Falls, MD.....	619
Chesapeake Bay Environmental Program, MD, VA & PA.....	620
Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD & VA.....	622
Cumberland, MD and Ridgeley, WV.....	623
Delaware Bay Coastline, Pt. Mahon, DE & NJ.....	624
Delaware Bay Coastline, Villas, DE & NJ.....	625

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Embrey Dam, VA.....	626
Lake Champlain Watershed Initiative, VT.....	627
New York City Watershed, NY.....	628
Northeast Counties Environmental Infrastructure, PA.....	629
Richmond, VA (Combined Sewer Overflow).....	630
South Central Pennsylvania Environment Improvement Program, PA.....	631
Southeastern Pennsylvania, PA.....	632
Northwestern Division.....	633
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux, SD.....	634
Duwamish / Green, WA.....	636
Missouri and Middle Mississippi Enhancement Project, MO.....	637
Missouri National Recreational River, NE & SD.....	638
Missouri River Restoration, ND.....	639
Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters Restoration, WA.....	640
Rural Idaho, ID.....	641
Rural Montana, MT.....	642
Sand Creek Watershed, NE.....	643
Pacific Ocean Division.....	644
Kake Dam, AK.....	645
South Atlantic Division.....	646
Coastal MS Wetlands Restoration, MS.....	647
Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements, FL.....	648
Lakes Marion and Moultrie, SC.....	650
Stanly County Wastewater Infrastructure, NC (Enviro Infra).....	651
South Pacific Division.....	653
Abandoned /Inactive Non-coal Mine Restoration.....	654
Central New Mexico, NM.....	655
City of Santa Clarita (Perchlorate), CA.....	656
Harbor/South Bay Water Recycling, CA.....	657
Lake Davis Water Treatment.....	658
New Mexico Environmental Infrastructure, NM.....	659
Rio Salado, Phoenix & Tempe Reaches, AZ.....	660
Rural Nevada, NV.....	661
Rural Utah, UT.....	662
Sacramento Area, CA.....	663
San Ramon Valley Recycled Water, CA.....	664
Tahoe Basin Restoration, NV & CA.....	665
Tahoe Basin Tribal Partnerships, CA & NV.....	666
Tres Rios, AZ.....	667
Tribal Partnership Program.....	668
Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Rest, CA.....	670
Southwestern Division.....	672
Elm Fork Basin, OK (Chloride Control).....	673
Lawton, OK.....	675
North Padre Island, Packery Channel, TX.....	676
Red River Basin Chloride Control, TX & OK.....	677
San Antonio Channel Improvement, TX.....	678
Tar Creek Cleanup, OK.....	679

ENVIRONMENT

INVESTIGATIONS

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Columbus Metropolitan Area, Lower Big Darby (Hellbranch) OH

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives, adopted 14 July 1970.

LOCATION: The study area encompasses the Big Darby Creek Basin in the central part of Ohio within the counties of Franklin, Pickaway, Madison, Union, Logan, Champaign, and Clark, Ohio.

DESCRIPTION: Big Darby Creek, including Hellbranch, represents one of the most biologically diverse aquatic systems in the Midwest, supporting more than 100 species of fish and 38 species of mussels. The watershed provides habitat for 14 species classified by the state or Federal government as endangered and 98 species classified as threatened or potentially threatened. The focus of the study will be flood control and environmental restoration. The product of the study will be a Watershed Action Plan analyzing land use scenarios and other information to help area officials develop regulations and to identify potential ecosystem restoration projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 457.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	397.0
Cash	397.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 854.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 128.0
Allocation for FY 2004	237.0
Allocation for FY 2005	40.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	53.0
Allocation for FY 2006	52.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete feasibility study including evaluation of alternatives and completion of environmental analysis.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete feasibility report in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION:

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Hobson (OH-07), Oxley (OH-04), Pryce (OH-15), DeWine (OH), Voinovich (OH)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

Date: 23 Jan 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment (primary) as well as Navigation, Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Hydropower, Recreation, and Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Eighteenmile Creek, Niagara County, NY

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401, WRDA 1990 (P.L. 101-640)

LOCATION: The study area includes the Eighteenmile Creek watershed in Niagara County, New York

DESCRIPTION: Project elements in the Great Lakes Remedial Action Plan (RAP) Agreement include the planning, design, and construction management of a habitat restoration project below Burt Dam in the Town of Newfane (NY), preliminary sediment data collection and land use GIS development, a bioaccumulation assessment of surface sediments collected in the International Joint Commission (IJC) designated Great Lakes Area of Concern (AOC), and a comprehensive investigation of measures designed to identify and de-list beneficial use impairments in the AOC. Numerous problems affect the AOC and its related IJC defined use impairments and so the comprehensive watershed study, in coordination with Federal, state, and local entities would address existing and future problems in the watershed caused by various agricultural, industrial, and urban activities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>RAP Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 380.5
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 390.0
Cash	\$ 0
Other	\$ 390.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 770.5
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 145.513
Allocation in FY 2004	\$ 71.426
Allocation in FY 2005	\$ 70.53
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 60.0
Allocation in FY 2006	\$ 59.4
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 33.631
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Development of a "State of the Basin" report for the use of the RAP

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: 2007 is the earliest attainable completion FY for completion of the project.

OTHER INFORMATION: NA

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Louise M. Slaughter D-NY-28

DISTRICT: Buffalo District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Fox River Environmental Dredging, Wisconsin.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 312, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1990 (PL 101-640), as amended.

LOCATION: The Fox River and Green Bay Harbor are located in northeastern Wisconsin. The study area encompasses the Lower Fox River, which is defined as that 39-mile segment of the Fox River, beginning at the mouth of Lake Winnebago, Wisconsin and terminating at the mouth of Green Bay, Wisconsin.

DESCRIPTION: The study is examining the environmental dredging and disposal requirements of approximately 3 million cubic yards of contaminated sediments. The non-Federal sponsor is the State of Wisconsin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 924.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	800.0
Cash	400.0
Other	400.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,724.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 198.0
Allocations in FY 2004	0
Allocations in FY 2005	34.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocations in FY 2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The non-Federal sponsor terminated the feasibility study on January 05, 2006. A portion of the FY06 funding will be used for project closeout and for in-kind service credit payback to non-Federal sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Not applicable because of project termination by non-Federal sponsor.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Feingold (WI), Kohl (WI); Representatives Green (WI-08), Petri (WI-06)

DISTRICT: Detroit District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, Pennsylvania

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 312 (b) of WRDA 1990, as modified by Sec 205 of WRDA 96 (PL 104-303)

LOCATION: Mahoning River, Western Pennsylvania

DESCRIPTION: The Mahoning River Basin covers approximately 1,132 square miles in northeastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania. More than 750,000 people live within the basin along the study reach of Trumbull and Mahoning Counties, Ohio, and Lawrence County, Pennsylvania. This feasibility study includes the Pennsylvania portion of the Mahoning River, which is approximately 12 miles of the Lower Mahoning River (Ohio border at river mile 12 downstream to the confluence with the Shenango River south of New Castle, PA). Deposition of uncontrolled industrial era residue from nine major Mahoning River valley steel plants has resulted in the degradation of the aquatic ecosystem and has become a threat to public safety and health as evident in the Ohio Department of Health, Human Health Advisory (HHA) issued in 1986 and for the Pennsylvania portion by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection – Public Health Advisory 2001. The respective HHA and PHA consists of two warnings: (1) cautioning against contact with the sediments and (2) restrictions of fish consumption. This project will help to restore over 11 miles of water and related land resources back to a baseline condition. Possible solutions include: removal of in-river contaminated sediments; removal of in-river and riverbank contaminated sediments; a combination thereof; coupled with bioremediation of insitu-contaminated sediments. The local communities throughout the study reach in Pennsylvania have expressed support for the study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,300.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 1,300.0
Cash	TBD
Other	TBD
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,600.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 33.0
FY 2004 Allocation	\$ 9.0
FY 2005 Allocation	\$ 8.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 125.0
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 124.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$1,126.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to work with the potential sponsor(s) to execute an FCSA and to develop a Project Management Plan for the study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The reconnaissance report was completed in May 2001 at a cost of \$250,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Santorum (PA), Specter (PA), Hart (PA-04), DeWine (OH), Ryan (OH-17),

DISTRICT: Pittsburgh District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Metropolitan Region of Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted on May 5, 1987 by the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate.

LOCATION: The study are covers approximately 386 square miles and includes the metropolitan region of Louisville and extends over six counties in north central Kentucky and south central Indiana.

DESCRIPTION: The ecosystem restoration efforts will involve a comprehensive examination of the problems contributing to the ecosystem degradation and development of alternative means for their solution. In coordination with the sponsor, the first area to study is the Louisville Pond Creek area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 330.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	330.0
Cash	165.0
Other	165.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 660.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	130.0
Allocation for FY 2006	129.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	329.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The sponsor has deferred the initiation of the feasibility phase this fiscal year and has requested that the available funds be reprogrammed to the Metropolitan Louisville, Mill Creek, Kentucky feasibility study which was initiated in FY 2005.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The study sponsor is the Metropolitan Louisville-Jefferson County Sewer District (MSD), a dependable sponsor. The "Balance to Complete after FY 2006" assumes that \$129,000 of the FY 2006 funds will be reprogrammed to the Metropolitan Louisville, Mill Creek, Kentucky feasibility study. If funding is made available in FY 2007, funds will be used to initiate the feasibility study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Northup (KY-3)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: New River, Claytor Lake, VA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives, adopted 10 May 1962.

LOCATION: Claytor Dam and Lake is a pump-storage hydropower project located near Radford, VA about 30 miles upstream of the Corps' Bluestone Lake, on the New River.

DESCRIPTION: Claytor Lake is owned by American Electric Power for the generation of hydropower. In the upper two miles of the lake, sedimentation is the greatest along the inside of the relic river meander bends. This has smothered benthic habitat and reduced water depths and fisheries habitats. Initial consideration of concepts and project alternatives has included the restoration of habitat features including deep water structures, the establishment of emergent, transitional and terrestrial vegetation, and the construction of adjacent embayment or wetland features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 301.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	195.0
Cash	195.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 496.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 106.0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	43.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocation for FY 2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	53.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/AI

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility study efforts in FY 2006 include project scoping (NEPA); formulation of project alternatives; and completion of the preliminary draft Environmental Assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete Feasibility Study in FY 2007 if funds are appropriated.

OTHER INFORMATION: Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement executed 27 June 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Boucher (VA-09)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Onondaga Lake, New York

AUTHORIZATION: Section 573, WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53), as amended.

LOCATION: Onondaga Lake is located in north central New York State and is a part of the New York State Barge Canal System and Oswego River System. The city of Syracuse is located along the south shore of the lake. The lake empties into the Seneca River, also a part of the NYS Barge Canal.

DESCRIPTION: Onondaga Lake has a total drainage area of 285 square miles and a surface area of 4.6 square miles. The major water resource problem associated with the lake is its degraded water quality and habitat. Buffalo District leads the Onondaga Lake Partnership (OLP) consisting of local, state, and Federal agencies in developing and implementing lake and watershed improvement projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 9,697.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 9,697.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,578.9
Allocation in FY 2004	520.0
Allocation in FY 2005	660.3
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750.0
Allocation in FY 2006	742.5
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	6,195.3
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to organize, lead, and execute OLP committee activities, continue progress on a comprehensive watershed-scale management study of the Onondaga Lake watershed, develop lake restoration goals and objectives, peer review of significant decision documents, organize and attend public meetings and events, formulate and implement outreach tools, and develop future project and budget requirements.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project phase is authorized through 2014 and subject to budgetable annual appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 131 of Energy & Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-103) amended Section 573, WRDA 1999 as follows:

- ONONDAGA LAKE, NEW YORK.--Section 573 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 372) is amended--
- (1) in subsection (f) by striking "\$10,000,000" and inserting "\$30,000,000";
 - (2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

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

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Walsh (NY-25), Schumer (NY), Clinton (NY).

DISTRICT: Buffalo District

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Powell River Watershed, VA

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution dated 27 September 2000.

LOCATION: The Powell River originates in southwest Virginia and flows southwest across the Tennessee border, where it empties into the Clinch River. The Powell River is characterized by narrow valleys and steep topography. Decades of surface and sub-surface coal mining and acid mine drainage have severely impacted numerous tributaries as well as the watersheds.

DESCRIPTION: Restoring the damaged portions of this unique ecosystem will benefit the eleven endangered mussel species and two threatened fish species. The Powell River Watershed Project Study Plan identified 12 contaminated creeks that contribute to the ecosystem degradation of the Powell River watershed. These creeks will be evaluated in three interim feasibility reports that will develop a watershed management plan containing potential corrective measures. The interim feasibility reports will evaluate measures which provide modification of hydrology or substrate by eliminating heavy metals in the water and increasing the pH of the water to normal levels through use of active (filtration) and passive (weirs, impoundment and wetland creation) systems for restoration of the ecosystem. The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was executed on July 20, 1998 with Lee-Norton-Wise-Scott Planning District Commission (LENOWISCO). The Ely and Puckett Creeks interim report was completed in May 2000.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,558.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,558.0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$3,116.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	1,088.0
Allocations for FY 2004	113.0
Allocations for FY 2005	159.0
Conference Allowance for 2006	200.0
Allocations for FY 2006	198.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to complete the Straight, Reeds, Jones and Cox Creeks interim report and complete the Bundy Creek, Craborchard Creek, Pigeon Creek and Jordan Branch interim report. The estimated cost of the feasibility phase is \$3,116,000, which is to be shared on a 50-50 basis by Federal and non-Federal interests.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Allen and Warner (VA), Boucher (VA-9)

DISTRICT: Nashville District

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rouge River Supplemental Watershed Management Plan, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 102 of the River and Harbor Act of 1966.

LOCATION: The Rouge River is located in southeast Michigan, primarily within the metropolitan Detroit area of Wayne, Oakland, and Washtenaw Counties, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: The study area encompasses 48 communities and portions of 3 counties of southeast Michigan. The supplemental basin-wide watershed management study explores multipurpose water quality management measures and improvements, including flow management, the ecological/physical impacts of watershed dams, stream buffering and general riparian corridor management. The study also investigates the urban impacts on cold-water fisheries, natural resource preservation and ecosystem restoration in an urban setting, and the Rouge's environmental infrastructure, navigation recreation and education opportunities, and flood management issues.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA(\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 350.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	250.0
Cash	250.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 600.0
Allocation thru FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	53.0
Allocation for FY 2005	20.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	90.0
Allocation for FY 2006	89.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	188.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	TBD

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The Project Management Plan and Feasibility Cost-Share Agreement could be prepared after receipt of the Non-Federal Sponsor letter of intent.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion for feasibility study is FY07.

OTHER INFORMATION: There are no Federal projects or sponsors identified for the portion of the watershed above the Gateway Area. The Gateway Area is the location of a Corps flood control project along the most downstream 8 miles of the river to its confluence with the Detroit River. Until such time as solutions to flash flow conditions in the upper watershed caused by increasing urbanization and impervious drainage are implemented, it is believed that low damage flooding and bank erosion will negate any restoration activities along the upper watershed. There are no known erosion, flood damage reduction, or ecosystem restoration projects in the upper watershed; however, some may be identified as the Supplemental Watershed Management Plan is developed.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI); Representatives Cheeks-Kilpatrick (MI-13), Dingell (MI-15)

DISTRICT: Detroit District

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River (Bubby Creek), IL

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the Senate Committee on E&PW adopted 20 July 2005.

LOCATION: The South Fork of the South Branch (SFSB) of the Chicago River is a 6,600-foot long channel that begins near Racine Avenue and 38th Street, along the north side of the Racine Avenue Pump Station (RAPS) and flows north to the South Branch of the Chicago River. The project lies within the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The SFSB of the Chicago River has been greatly altered through urban development. In the 1800's the area was developed as the famed Union Stockyards and most portions of the original channel were filled with refuse and animal waste. A combined sewage overflow system was constructed in the late 1800's and over 30 square miles of Chicago drain to the RAPS, which overflow to the SFSB of the Chicago River. Of significant concern are impacts associated with an impervious watershed, stream channel filling and widening, large quantities of biological refuse, and an unnatural and flashy hydraulic regime.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>RECON</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>FEAS</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100.0	TBD
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	TBD
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$100.0	TBD
Allocations to FY 2003	\$ 0	0
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 0	0
Allocations for FY 2006	\$100.0	100.0
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 0	TBD
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete 905(b) reconnaissance report, develop PMP and negotiate Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete 905(b) by September 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: The City of Chicago Department of Environment is a supportive and enthusiastic local sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lipinski (IL/3), Senator Durbin

DISTRICT: Chicago District

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment (primary) as well as Navigation, Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Recreation, and Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Western Lake Erie Basin Study, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 441, WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53)

LOCATION: The study area includes the watersheds of the Maumee, Ottawa and Portage Rivers in North West Ohio, Eastern Indiana, and South East Michigan

DESCRIPTION: The study involves a comprehensive investigation of measures to improve fish and wildlife habitat, navigation, flood damage reduction, recreation, and water quality in the Maumee, Ottawa and Portage River watersheds. The combined watersheds have a drainage area of approximately 7,200 square miles, with the Maumee River contributing about 24 percent of the surface water flow into Lake Erie. A primary issue is pollution from non-point source discharges, particularly agricultural runoff. Non-point source pollutants and suspended sediments degrade water quality and contribute to the approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of sediment dredged annually from the Maumee River navigation channel and Bay. Equally important are flood storage capacity, and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat. The comprehensive watershed study, in coordination with Federal, state, and local entities would address existing and future problems in the watershed caused by various agricultural, industrial, and urban activities. In order to facilitate this effort, the Western Lake Erie Basin Partnership was formed with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and four other Federal partners, three Governors' representatives, and other state and local stakeholders including the Maumee River Basin Partnership of Local Governments.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,000.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 2,000.0
Cash	\$ 0
Other	\$ 2,000.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,000.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation in FY 2004	\$ 0
Allocation in FY 2005	\$ 0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 500.0
Allocation in FY 2006	\$ 495.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,505.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Development of the without project conditions report needed for the completion of the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: 2008 is the earliest attainable completion FY for completion of the feasibility study.

OTHER INFORMATION: NA

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST:

Ohio: Representative Marcy Kaptur D-OH-9, Representative Paul Gillmor R-OH-5, Representative Michael Oxley R-OH-4, Representative John Boehner R-OH-8, Senator George Voinovich R-OH, Senator Michael DeWine R-OH

Indiana: Representative Mark Souder R-IN-3, Representative Mike Pence R-IN-6, Senator Richard Lugar R-IN, Senator Evan Bayh D-IN

Michigan: Representative John Dingell D-MI-15, Representative John J. H. "Joe" Schwarz R-MI-7, Senator Carl Levin D-MI, Senator Debbie Stabenow D-MI

DISTRICT: Buffalo District

Date: 24 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Amite River and Tributaries Ecosystem Restoration, LA

AUTHORIZATION: SR, 14 Apr 67

LOCATION: Study area includes the 2,200 square-mile Amite River drainage basins in southeastern Louisiana and southwestern Mississippi. The basin includes all or portions of eight parishes in Louisiana and four counties in Mississippi.

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will determine the most practicable alternative to restore the Amite River ecosystem and reduce flood damages which will consider repairs to meanders upstream along the Amite River to help restore the river to its natural conditions and improve water quality.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	Study
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,600
Cash	(0)
Other	(2,600)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 100
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	97
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,305
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Working on completing model and beginning to calibrate and do test runs. May continue the NEPA process and hold public meetings depending on funding availability.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility cost sharing agreement was signed on 4 Mar 05. The non-Federal sponsor is the Pontchartrain Levee District.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-06), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA)

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Baraboo River, WI

AUTHORIZATION: HR 14 Jun 72

LOCATION: The Wisconsin River Basin extends 430 miles from the northern border of Wisconsin and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to the river's confluence with the Mississippi River just below Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, in the southeastern corner of the state. The basin consists of over 12,000 square miles primarily in central and southeastern Wisconsin. The Baraboo River is a major tributary to the Wisconsin River. The confluence of the two rivers is located at Portage, Wisconsin.

DESCRIPTION: The reconnaissance study was initiated in November 2000 and was completed in May 2002. The study identified at least five potential feasibility studies: ecosystem restoration at Petenwell Lake; a Wisconsin River basin watershed and water quality management study; aquatic ecosystem restoration at Prairie du Sac; a lower Wisconsin River streambank and aquatic ecosystem habitat restoration study; and ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction – Caledonia levee and Blackhawk Park.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,545
Cash	(2,000)
Other	(2,545)
Total Estimated Cost	\$11,395
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 260
Allocation for FY 2004	36
Allocation for FY 2005	2
Conference Amount for FY 2006	60
Allocation for FY 2006	59
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	5,493
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate the feasibility study for the Caledonia Levee.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined

OTHER INFORMATION: Initiation of the feasibility phase is contingent upon signing of a feasibility cost sharing agreement with Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baldwin (WI-02), Kind (WI-03), Obey (WI-07); Sen: Feingold and Kohl (WI)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Blue Earth River Ecosystem Restoration, MN and IA (Minnesota River Basin)

AUTHORIZATION: HR, 10 May 62

LOCATION: The Blue Earth River basin is located in Minnesota and Iowa south of the City of Mankato, Minnesota.

DESCRIPTION: The Blue Earth River aquatic ecosystem restoration study will evaluate measures to restore habitat and connectivity between the Minnesota River and 1,200 miles of perennial tributary streams that have been isolated from the main stem for nearly a century. The study would assess options at the Rapidan Dam including removal, modification, and rehabilitation of the structure.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	750
Cash	(750)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,500
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	80
Allocation for FY 2006	79
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	671
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to begin geotechnical analyses at Rapidan Dam. The FCSA is to be signed in July 2006 when non-Federal funds are available.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Gutknecht (MN-01), Latham (IA-04); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN); Harkin and Grassley (IA).

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Clear Lake Watershed, Iowa (Clear Lake Restoration Project in Clear Lake, IA)

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2720, 1 October 2003.

LOCATION: Clear Lake is a 3,625-acre natural lake, located near the town of Clear Lake, in north central Iowa.

DESCRIPTION: The primary problems relate to delivery and resuspension of sediments and nutrients, reduction in water depths, and loss of aquatic plants. Potential features to address these problems and restore ecosystem diversity include dredging, island creation, marsh restoration, and construction of off-shore rock dikes to reduce wind fetch and sediment resuspension

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$120
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cost	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$120
Allocation Through FY 2003	0
Allocation For FY 2004	65
Allocation For FY 2005	48
Conference Amount For FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Full FY 2006 funding will not be needed. The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement will not be executed. Sponsor plans to accomplish the principle proposed project feature using State revenue and a local match. Minimal funding will be needed under the Recon phase to close out the project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Latham (IA-4). Sen: Grassley and Harkin (IA).

DISTRICT: Rock Island

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Illinois River Ecosystem Restoration, IL

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, Flood Control Act 1970 and Section 519 (Illinois River Basin Restoration), WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: Entire Illinois River Basin including tributaries. The Illinois River and Waterway flows southwest across Illinois connecting Lake Michigan with the Mississippi River.

DESCRIPTION: In August 2000, the State of Illinois and the Corps of Engineers entered into a cost-sharing agreement to conduct a feasibility study for the restoration of this nationally-significant river system. The study emphasizes identifying and evaluating restoration activities related to the State of Illinois' Integrated Management Plan for the Illinois River Watershed and Illinois Rivers 2020 Initiative. The Illinois River Basin has experienced the loss of ecological integrity due to sedimentation of backwaters and side channels, degradation of tributary streams, fluctuations in hydrologic regimes and water levels, loss of floodplain and tributary connectivity, and other adverse impacts caused by human activity. Alternatives have been developed that include watershed/tributary restoration, side channel and backwater restoration, water level management, and floodplain restoration and protection. A joint report is being prepared to address this authority and the related Illinois River Basin Restoration Sec 519 (WRDA 2000) project. The study involves the efforts of four districts (Rock Island, St. Louis, Chicago, and Detroit).

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):

	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,428.5
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,328.5
Cash	(2,328.5)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,757.0
Allocation through FY 2003	\$1,827.0
Allocation for FY 2004	96.0
Allocation for FY 2005	159.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350.9
Allocation for FY 2006	347.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Public review is scheduled for March 2006 and a Director's Report in September 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: LaHood (IL-18), Hastert (IL-14), Shimkis (IL-19), Evans (IL-17), Manzullo (IL-16), Johnson (IL-15), Biggert (IL-13), Weller (IL-11), Kirk (IL-10), Schakowsky (IL 9), Bean (IL-8), Davis (IL-7), Hyde (IL-6), Emanuel (IL-5), Gutierrez (IL-4), Lipinski (IL-3), Jackson (IL-2), Rush (IL-1); Sen: Durbin & Obama (IL)

DISTRICT: Rock Island

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Minnesota River Basin, MN and SD

AUTHORIZATION: HR, 10 May 62

LOCATION: The Minnesota River originates at the Minnesota-South Dakota border, flows 335 miles and joins the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minnesota. The river drains 16,770 square miles in Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota and Iowa.

DESCRIPTION: This study will evaluate projects/methods to reduce flood damages, restore aquatic ecosystems, create wildlife habitat, reduce erosion and sediment, and improve water quality in the Minnesota River Basin and upper Mississippi River. Since settlement, the native prairie has been replaced by agriculture and urbanization with constructed drainage systems. Ninety percent of wetlands that existed pre-settlement have been drained. As a result, the Minnesota River experiences recurring floods and contributes substantial sediment and nutrient loads to the Mississippi River. The December 2004 reconnaissance report recommended one watershed study and two feasibility studies for ecosystem restoration projects. The watershed study would involve extensive interagency and local-State-Federal cooperation to develop a watershed management plan. The study would integrate the efforts of a wide range of agencies, leading to more cost-effective use of existing resources.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,006
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,740
Cash	(2,000)
Other	(1,740)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 7,746
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 71
Allocation for FY 2004	111
Allocation for FY 2005	28
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	3,697
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to coordinate Project Management Plans (PMP) for the three recommended studies. The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreements for two of these studies will be signed in July 2006 when non-Federal funds are available.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Recon – FY 2007; Feasibility – To Be Determined

OTHER INFORMATION: PMP development for Blue Earth River Feasibility study is included in this reconnaissance study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Kline (MN-02), Gutknecht (MN-01), Peterson (MN-07); Herseth (SD-AL); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN); Thune and Johnson (SD).

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Minnehaha Creek Watershed, MN (Upper Mississippi River, Lake Itasca to L/D 2, MN)

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2597, 15 Apr 99

LOCATION: Hennepin County, Minnesota

DESCRIPTION: The feasibility study will include the development of a Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan to assist in identifying project areas with a Federal and local interest.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,210
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,210
Cash	(0)
Other	(2,210)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,420
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 82
Allocation for FY 2004	179
Allocation for FY 2005	299
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,576
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete review of the final watershed plan, February 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Work on the study will be halted early in 2006 due to lack of Federal funds.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Ramstad (MN-03) and Sabo (MN-05); Sen: Coleman and Dayton (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Peoria Riverfront Development, IL

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2500, May 9, 1996

LOCATION: Illinois River between Henry and Naples, Illinois, with specific focus on Peoria Lake from Illinois River Mile 181.0 to 158.0 and tributaries draining into Peoria Lake.

DESCRIPTION: The State of Illinois, Department of Natural Resources, is the sponsor for this project. The feasibility study phase was completed in 2003, and the Preconstruction, Engineering, and Design (PED) Phase was initiated in Jan 2004 following receipt of state funding. The principal goal is to improve depth diversity enhancing aquatic habitat in Peoria Lake with ancillary recreational benefits. The recommended plan includes dredging approximately 200 acres within Lower Peoria Lake to create deepwater habitats and constructing three islands with a total area of 75 acres. In September 2004, approval was given to construct the Upper Island (55 acres of dredging and a 21-acre island) as a Critical Restoration Project under the Illinois River Basin Restoration Authority (Sec 519, WRDA 2000). Separate authorization is still needed for the lower islands based on costs exceeding the Section 519 limits.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)

	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,470
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	490
Cash	(490)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,960
Allocations thru FY 2003	32
Allocation for FY 2004	\$184
Allocation for FY 2005	74
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$1,081
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue PED Phase on Upper Island and develop a design agreement for Lower Islands.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009 for PED of Lower Island.

OTHER INFORMATION: Upon execution of the PCA and subject to the availability of funds, all remaining PED activities and subsequent construction of the Upper Island would be accomplished under the Illinois River Basin Restoration, IL (Sec 519) program using Construction, General funds.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: LaHood (IL -18)

DISTRICT: Rock Island

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Croix River Basin, MN & WI

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2705, 25 Sep 02

LOCATION: The St. Croix River Basin is in eastern Minnesota and western Wisconsin, and joins the Mississippi River near Prescott, Wisconsin.

DESCRIPTION: This study will focus primarily on water resource and environmental protection problems and opportunities in the tributary watersheds and the mainstem of the St. Croix River. Urban development in the watershed is becoming an increased concern in the basin, and watershed planning would likely be an important study recommendation. This study will establish the Federal interest in proceeding with projects that reduce flood damages, create and protect wildlife habitat, control nuisance species, reduce erosion and sediment, and maintain or improve water quality. Other water resource and recreation opportunities will also be considered.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 940
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	740
Cash	(370)
Other	(370)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,680
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	80
Conference Amount for FY 2006	120
Allocation for FY 2006	119
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	741
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete 905(b) report, and seek development of one PMP and Feasibility Cost Share Agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study will complement the outputs from other Federal, State and local initiatives and will be a cooperative effort with local watershed boards, state resource agencies, non-governmental organizations and other Federal agencies, including the NRCS and USFWS. Potential sponsors may include watershed management organizations, counties, municipalities, or state agencies.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Consistent with Administration policy, but low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Kennedy (MN-06); Kind (WI-03); Obey (WI-07); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN); Feingold and Kohl (WI).

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: St. Croix River Relocation of Endangered Mussels, MN & WI (Zebra Mussel Control, Upper Mississippi River)

AUTHORIZATION: The study was undertaken under the authority of Section 216 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1970 which authorizes investigations for modification of completed projects or their operation when found advisable due to significantly changed physical or economic conditions and for improving the quality of the environment in the overall public interest. The study will be performed at full federal expense in accordance with ER 1105-2-100, paragraph 2-8.c.(3) and EP 1165-2-1, paragraph 12-5.a., the foundation of which is Section 105(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: St. Croix and Upper Mississippi Rivers.

DESCRIPTION: This feasibility study is consistent with recommendations in the approved Section 905(b) Reconnaissance Report, which recommended a \$2.1 million feasibility study at full Federal expense to investigate zebra mussel control measures throughout the entire Upper Mississippi and Illinois waterways, including the St. Croix River. As stated in the final Biological Opinion for the operation and maintenance of the Federal 9-Foot Navigation Channel Project on the Upper Mississippi River, the study is required in order to comply with Section 7(a)(2) of the 1973 Endangered Species Act (ESA).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 2,160
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,160
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,912
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to initiate a feasibility study for the management of zebra mussels to protect and conserve the endangered mussels on the St. Croix River. Studies will be conducted on the status of native and zebra mussels in the St. Croix and connecting Upper Mississippi River pools, including Lake Pepin, a known major source of zebra mussels. A risk-based model will be developed to evaluate the most likely pathway for further zebra mussel invasion, a timeline, estimated long-term population characteristics, sensitive areas, and potential ecological consequences. This model will be used to focus the development and evaluation of potential management actions, such as measures to control dispersal of zebra mussels in the St. Croix basin, and measures to manage existing zebra mussel populations in the St. Croix and adjacent UMR pools. In the event that zebra mussel control is only partially effective and/or determined to not be feasible, there is also a need to have structured, consistent, and fully transparent decision-making processes to determine triggers and criteria for relocation and/or artificial propagation of winged mapleleaf. The Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP), a decision support tool, will be used to address the sensitive issue of protection and conservation of endangered mussels on the St. Croix River.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Gutknecht (MN-01); Kline (MN-02); Kennedy (MN-06); Baldwin (WI-02); Kind (WI-03); Obey (WI-07); Nussle (IA-01); Sen: Feingold and Kohl (WI); Dayton and Coleman (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: St. Louis Riverfront, MO & IL

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2642, 21 June 2000.

LOCATION: The study area is comprised of approximately 3,011 square miles located in St. Louis city, St. Louis County, and Jefferson County in Missouri and St. Clair, Madison, and Monroe Counties in Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The reconnaissance study addressed flood damage reduction, aquatic habitat restoration, and harbor safety issues. The reconnaissance study recommended proceeding into the feasibility phase for the St. Louis North Riverfront Ecosystem Restoration and possibly the Meramec River Ecosystem Restoration. Aquatic habitat restoration investigations focused on the St. Louis Riverfront from downtown to the Chain of Rocks Park, the Meramec River, and the River des Peres watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$	1,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		900
Cash		(900)
Other		(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$	2,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$	363
Allocation for FY 2004		97
Allocation for FY 2005		30
Conference Amount for FY 2006		75
Allocation for FY 2006		74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$	836
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (N/A)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The feasibility study for the St. Louis North Riverfront will continue with focus on HTRW investigations and evaluation of existing conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Due to insufficient funds, the reconnaissance addendum for the Meramec River watershed will not be completed in FY 2006. Although the reconnaissance report did not recommend pursuing ecosystem restoration in the River Des Peres watershed (due to lack of a sponsor), a potential sponsor has recently stepped forward and an addendum to the reconnaissance report will be prepared to recommend continuing into the feasibility phase.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Clay (MO-01), Carnahan (MO-03), Costello (IL-12), and Shimkus (IL-12); Sen: Bond and Talent (MO), Durbin and Obama (IL)

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: White River Comprehensive Basin, AR & MO

AUTHORIZATION: Section 202, WRDA 2000; Section 729, WRDA 1986

LOCATION: The White River Basin comprises approximately 28,000 square miles in northeastern Arkansas and southern Missouri.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the study is to develop a comprehensive watershed plan for the White River Basin. The comprehensive plan will serve as a framework for the environmentally sustainable development of water resources within the White River Basin. The problems and potential solutions will be examined in a comprehensive manner because of the interrelationships of the problems and potential solutions to all of the significant resources in the basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 4,460
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,300
Cash	(2,150)
Other	(2,150)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 8,760
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 814
Allocation for FY 2004	323
Allocation for FY 2005	293
Conference Amount for FY 2006	800
Allocation for FY 2006	792
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,238
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio:	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to continue the recreation portion of the study and the fisheries studies on the White River. Surveys will be initiated on cross sections along the Cache River for hydrological modeling studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To Be Determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed on May 22, 2002, with Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission (now Arkansas Natural Resources Commission), Arkansas Waterways Commission, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and the Arkansas Chapter of the Nature Conservancy. Locals desire cost sharing be changed from its current rate to 75 percent Federal and 25 percent non-Federal and to credit toward the non-Federal share of the study in-kind contributions provided by the non-Federal interest up to 100 percent of the non-Federal share. Locals also desire credit be made retroactive to the date of the cost share agreement.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Berry (AR-1), Snyder (AR-2), Ross (AR-4). Sen: Lincoln & Pryor (AR), Emerson & Talent (MO).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
 FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
 Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Ecosystem Restoration

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Spring Bayou, LA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure adopted 24 March 1998.

LOCATION: The study area includes the Spring Bayou, LA, Area, and any adjacent parishes that impact the area.

DESCRIPTION: The Spring Bayou Area is comprised of several U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service refuges and state wildlife management areas, along with adjacent lands that have traditionally been recognized as one of the most significant fish and wildlife and wetland ecosystems in the South. Over time, these environmental features have deteriorated.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,003
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,250
Cash	1,047
Other	203
Total Estimated Cost	3,253
Allocations thru FY 03	549
Allocation for FY 04	203
Allocation for FY 05	199
Conference Amount for FY 06	450
Allocation for FY 06	445
Balance to Complete after FY 06	607
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to initiate feasibility phase studies, upon signing of the feasibility cost-sharing agreement (scheduled for April 2006).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Reconnaissance study findings indicate that proposed improvements would provide positive environmental benefits and also help to reduce headwater flooding. A financing plan is currently being prepared by the local sponsor for the non-Federal share of the study cost. The financing plan includes cash and work-in-kind.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Alexander (LA-5); Senate: Vitter and Landrieu (LA).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Anacostia River and Tributaries, MD & DC (Comprehensive Plan)

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Public Works and Transportation Resolution, 8 September 1988

LOCATION: The study area includes the entire Anacostia River watershed encompassing approximately 180 square miles in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland and the District of Columbia. The Anacostia River has one of the most densely populated watersheds within the Chesapeake Bay basin. Although the watershed reflects a system that has suffered from years of urbanization and environmental neglect, major restoration efforts since 1987 are beginning to improve conditions.

DESCRIPTION: This study will seek to continue the progress by working with stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan to protect and restore the watershed and by developing specific restoration projects to be implemented in the near future.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 382	\$ 2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	2,000
Cash	0	0
In-Kind	0	2,000
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 382	\$4,000
Allocation through FY 03	0	0
Allocation for FY 04	130	0
Allocation for FY 05	144	0
Allocation for FY 06	108	90
Balance to Complete after FY 06	0	\$ 1,910
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds of \$108,000 are being used to finalize the project management plan, and negotiate and execute the feasibility cost sharing agreement. Feasibility funds of \$90,000 will be used to initiate the feasibility study, including data collection, environmental analyses, and public coordination towards development of a comprehensive restoration and protection plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$400,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in out years, the feasibility study could be completed in September 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Mikulski (MD), Sarbanes (MD) Representatives Hoyer (MD-05), Wynn (MD 04), Van Hollen (MD 08), Norton (DC)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Baltimore Metropolitan Area - Patapsco and Back Rivers, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the United States House of Representatives, adopted 30 April 1992.

LOCATION: The Patapsco River is the main shipping channel for the Port of Baltimore and extends into the heart of Baltimore City, including Baltimore's Inner Harbor. The upstream area flows through Howard, Baltimore and Anne Arundel Counties before entering the tidal portion in Baltimore City, in the Middle Branch. The Patapsco is one of the most heavily utilized and populated waterways within the Chesapeake Bay, as it is located in the urbanized areas of central Maryland, and includes a population of over 750,000 residents. Back River drains the northeastern portions of Baltimore City and southeastern Baltimore County and empties into Chesapeake Bay.

DESCRIPTION: The study will assess the watershed/ecosystem problems and potential solutions in several areas including environmental dredging, shoreline stabilization, wetland creation and restoration, and the beneficial use of dredged material.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$73	\$4,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	0	4,500
Cash	0	200
Other	0	4,300
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 73	\$9,000
Allocation through FY 03	0	0
Allocation for FY 04	0	0
Allocation for FY 05	31	0
Allocation for FY 06	42	156
Balance to Complete After FY 06	0	4,344
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds of \$42,000 are being used to finalize the project management plan, and negotiate and execute the feasibility cost sharing agreement. Feasibility funds of \$156,000 will be used to initiate the feasibility study, including data collection, environmental analyses, and public coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$1,200,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in September 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes and Mikulski (MD), and Congressman Cardin (MD-03)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Blackstone River Watershed Restoration, Massachusetts and Rhode Island

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the U.S. Senate, Committee on Public Works, adopted 12 September 1969.

LOCATION: The study area includes the entire Blackstone River Watershed, which originates in Worcester, Massachusetts and flows southward to the National Estuary of Narragansett Bay in Pawtucket, Rhode Island.

DESCRIPTION: The watershed is approximately 540 square miles and encompasses 30 cities and towns in south central Massachusetts and northern Rhode Island. There is one Federal flood control reservoir and four local protection projects within this relatively small watershed to alleviate flooding in urban areas and protect major utilities and roadways. These projects consist of over 9 miles of channel improvements, dikes, floodwalls, tunnels and conduits, which have decreased the value and diversity of fish habitat in the project areas and have altered the natural hydrologic regime of the watershed. The Blackstone River is also the largest single source of pollutants such as suspended solids, PCB's, metals and organics discharging into Narragansett Bay. One source of this pollution is the re-suspension of contaminated sediments, which have collected behind existing impoundments along the river. The study will evaluate possible measures to correct the numerous problems of the Blackstone River Watershed and improve its overall resource value. A feasibility cost-sharing agreement was executed with the Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs on 24 May 1999. By letter dated 31 May 2001, the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management declined to participate in the feasibility study due to funding constraints.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,527
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,100
Cash	1,100
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$2,627
Allocations thru FY 2003	1,048
Allocation in FY 2004	-4
Allocation in FY 2005	9
Allocation in FY 2006	84
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	390
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study, including cost estimates and plan evaluation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funds to continue the feasibility study are not included in the FY 2007 Budget. Study efforts will be suspended until the construction backlog is reduced and funds become available to continue this effort.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Neal (MA-2) and McGovern (MA-3)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Bronx River Basin, New York

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure Resolution adopted 24 March 1998, Docket #2551

LOCATION: The Bronx River study area occupies 56.4 square miles in central and lower Westchester County and Bronx County of the City of New York.

DESCRIPTION: Local communities throughout the Bronx River Basin have suffered flooding and environmental degradation as a result of storm events. The reconnaissance study, certified in January 2000, recommended further study of flood damage protection and environmental restoration at 18 sites along the river.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,250
Cash	2,250
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	4,500
Allocation Through FY 2003	124
Allocation for FY 2004	26
Allocation for FY 2005	119
Allocation for FY 2006	372
Balance to complete after FY 2006	1,608

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase, including existing conditions, engineering modeling, environmental sampling, programmatic assessment of the watershed, and coordination with non-Federal interests.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Joseph Crowley (NY-7), Jose Serrano (NY-16), and Nita Lowey (NY-19)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Erosion, Maryland Coastal Management Feasibility Study, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works resolution dated 23 May 2001.

LOCATION: The study area includes the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay coastal zone and tributaries in Maryland.

DESCRIPTION: The study area includes over 4,000 miles of shoreline and a watershed of over 64,000 acres. The study is designed to provide better tools to individual landowners and develop an overall masterplan that reduces hurricane and storm damage, protects vital natural resources, and develops coastal restoration projects within the coastal zone. In particular, the study will emphasize the restoration of coastal function, protection of vital infrastructure and resources, and the restoration of aquatic ecosystem habitat. A feasibility study cost sharing agreement was executed with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources in September 2004.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$3,147
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,147
Cash	0
Other	3,147
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$6,294
Allocation through FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	1
Allocation for FY 05	\$166
Allocation for FY 06	\$520
Balance to Complete After FY 06	\$2,460
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the efforts initiated in FY 05 and to further complete the Coastal Masterplan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$1,000,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in September 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes (MD), Mikulski (MD), Representatives Gilchrest (MD-01), Wynn (MD-04), Cardin (MD-05), Hoyer (MD-03), and Ruppertsburger (MD-02).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Chesapeake Bay Sediment Budget, Modeling and Regional Sediment Management Feasibility Study, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works resolution dated 23 May 2001.

LOCATION: The study area encompasses the Chesapeake Bay and tributaries in the state of Maryland, and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, draining some 20,000 square miles along the east coast of the United States. The area is rural in the northern and southern portions of the watershed, and urban to suburban in the center portions of the watershed. The model will benefit the entire Chesapeake Bay watershed.

DESCRIPTION: The Sediment Budget, Modeling and Regional Sediment Management study is incorporating new parameters for sediment transport, re-suspension, and shoreline erosion into the existing Chesapeake Bay water quality model. The study will build on the existing Chesapeake Bay Model to develop the baseline data necessary for evaluating impacts from bay sedimentation and shoreline erosion. The Chesapeake Bay Program will use the revised model to reevaluate the sediment budget for the Chesapeake Bay, develop sediment load reductions and allocations, and implement a sediment management strategy for the bay.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,753
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,753
Cash	0
Other	1,753
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$3,506
Allocation through FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	108
Allocation for FY 05	250
Allocation for FY 06	446
Balance to Complete After FY 06	949
Benefit to Cost Ratio Application Rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue with the data collection and model development efforts initiated in FY 05.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$700,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes (MD), Mikulski (MD), Representatives Gilchrest (MD-01), Wynn (MD-04), Cardin (MD-05), Hoyer (MD-03), and Ruppertsburger (MD-02).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental/Watershed

STUDY NAME: Christina River Watershed, PA, DE & MD

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the United States Senate dated October 29, 1997.

LOCATION: The Christina River Basin is located in Chester, Delaware, and Lancaster Counties in PA; New Castle County in DE, and Cecil County in MD. The river drains a 565 square mile area and its major tributaries include the Brandywine, Red Clay, and White Clay Creeks.

DESCRIPTION: Measures to be evaluated to restore and protect the watershed include improvements to water quality, restoring streambanks, providing public access to the streams and dedicated greenway corridors, acquiring critical lands, cleaning up the watershed, establishing an urban wildlife refuge and rejuvenating the Wilmington Delaware waterfront.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 1,460.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		1,300.0
Cash	1,300.0	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 2,760.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 100.0
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 30.0
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 30.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 149.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 1,151.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities will include preparation of 500 year flood plain mapping, baseline environmental inventory (existing conditions), cultural resources investigations, hydraulic modeling, geotechnical investigations and testing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of the Feasibility Phase is to be determined, due to budget constraints funding in known at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed in February 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen. Biden and Carper, DE; Rep. Castle, DE-AL; Sen. Spector and Santorum, PA; Rep. Weldon, PA-7; Pitts, PA-16; Sen. Sarbanes and Mikulski, MD; Rep. Gilchrest MD-1.

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Coastal Massachusetts Ecosystem Restoration, Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bays (Malden River Ecosystem Restoration, Malden, Medford & Everett, Massachusetts & Pilgrim Lake Ecosystem Restoration, Truro/Provincetown, Massachusetts)

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 23 July 1997.

LOCATION: The Coastal Massachusetts Ecosystem Restoration Study encompasses the coastal shoreline and associated waters within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts located along Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bays.

DESCRIPTION: The Malden River Ecosystem Restoration Study is the first interim feasibility study under the Coastal Massachusetts Ecosystem Restoration Study. The Malden River flows through the cities of Malden, Medford and Everett to its confluence with the Mystic River. The Mystic Valley Development Commission (MVDC) is a tri-city legislative body established by the state and approved by the communities to address commonly shared issues such as land development and river restoration. The MVDC has partnered with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to conduct a feasibility study to determine possible ecosystem restoration efforts for the Malden River. A Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement (FCSA) was executed with MVDC on 15 October 2002. Restoration and remediation of the Malden River are critical to the success of MVDC's master-planned development and to the protection of public health.

The Pilgrim Lake Ecosystem Restoration Study is the second interim feasibility study. The 717-acre Pilgrim Lake study area is located within the towns of Truro and Provincetown, Massachusetts. Pilgrim Lake was historically not a lake, but an embayment called East Harbor that was connected to Cape Cod Bay by a tidal inlet. In 1868, Pilgrim Lake was formed when the embayment was cut-off from tidal flow by the construction of a dike across the inlet. In 1956, the state installed the lake's present water control system, which consists of a culvert and clapper valve system. Pilgrim Lake suffers from eutrophication, and does not support the historic shellfish resources. The lake and all upstream affected areas are within the Cape Cod National Seashore. A FCSA was executed with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management on 1 April 2005.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 562
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	420
Cash	420
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$982
Allocations thru FY 2003	200
Allocation in FY 2004	28
Allocation in FY 2005	90
Allocation in FY 2006	40
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	204
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to complete the Malden River interim feasibility study in April 2006 and to continue efforts on the Pilgrim Lake interim feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Malden River Interim Study FY 2006. Pilgrim Lake Interim Study FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funds to continue the feasibility study are not included in the FY 2007 Budget. Study efforts will be suspended until the construction backlog is reduced and funds become available to continue.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Markey (MA-7) and Representative Delahunt (MA-10)

DISTRICT: New England District.

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental/Watershed

STUDY NAME: Delaware River Comprehensive Watershed Study

AUTHORIZATION: This study is being conducted under Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986, as amended by Section 202 Of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The Delaware River Basin is located in 42 counties in portions of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. It drains an area of approximately 13,540 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: Study will use a comprehensive approach to watershed management in collaboration with the Delaware River Basin Commissions (DRBC) efforts to develop a "new comprehensive water resources plan for the basin". It will address restoration needs which include: ecosystem restoration, protection and enhancement; dredged material disposal, water quality control (including acid mine drainage abatement with dredged material), floodplain management and flood damage protection; and associated land resources.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 2,100.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		1,650.0
Cash	1,650.0	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 3,750.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 450.0
Allocations FY 2004		0
Allocations FY 2005		0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 124.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 1,526.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement, develop the PMP and convene the Study Delivery Team and initiate data collection.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion is to be determined due to budget constraints, funding for this study is unknown at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Recon study was completed in FY2005; Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement is to be signed by April 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: The study area contains parts of the following Congressional Districts: Reps Gilman, NY-20; Sweeney, NY-22; Boehlert, NY-23; Hinchey, NY-26; Andrews, NJ-1; LoBiondo, NJ-2; Saxton, NJ-3; Smith, NJ-4; Roukema, NJ-5; Holt, NJ-12; Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Castle, DE-AL; PA; Brady, PA-1; Fattah, PA-2; Holden, PA-6; Weldon, PA-7; Greenwood, PA-8; Sherwood, PA-10; Kanjorski, PA-11; Hoeffel, PA-13; Toomey, PA-15; Pitts PA-16. In addition, Congressional interest in the study area lies with Sen. Schumer & Clinton, NY; Menedez & Lautenberg, NJ; Biden & Carper, DE; Santorum & Specter, PA.

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Eastern Shore - Mid Chesapeake Bay Island, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works Resolution, 5 June 1997

LOCATION: The Mid-Chesapeake Bay region includes the counties of Queen Annes, Talbot, Dorchester, Somerset, Wicomico, and a portion of Kent in Maryland.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan consists of two parts: island restoration at James Island and island restoration/protection at Barren Island. Implementation of both James and Barren Island parts are critical to achieving the ecosystem benefits for the recommended plan. The James Island project component will provide the primary dredged material disposal capacity required as well as restore critical island habitat. The Barren Island project component will provide some dredged placement capacity, will protect the existing island resources, will reduce erosion of the existing shoreline at Barren, create wetlands and will protect areas of SAV from high wave energy.

	FY 2006 (\$000)	
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Feas</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	2,618	\$1,489
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,618	801
Cash	0	0
Other	2,618	801
Total Estimated Study Cost	5,236	\$2,290
Allocation thru FY 03	563	0
Allocation for FY 04	831	0
Allocation for FY 05	724	0
Allocation for FY 06	500	0
Balance to Complete After FY 06	0	1,489
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete the feasibility study and Environmental Impact Statement, including public involvement in order for this study to be authorized in WRDA 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$983,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, plans and specifications could be completed in January 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes (MD) and Mikulski (MD), and Representatives Gilchrest (MD-01), Ruppertsberger (MD-02), Cardin (MD-03), and Cummings (MD-07).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Elizabeth River Basin, Phase I (Scuffletown Creek), Hampton Roads, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Section 312(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, amended

LOCATION: Elizabeth River Basin

DESCRIPTION: The Elizabeth River is approximately 20 miles in length and has a drainage area of about 165 square miles. Urban, rural, industrial, and residential areas blend together along the Elizabeth River and its branches. More than 13,000 vessels use the Elizabeth River annually, many while navigating the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. Three hundred years of industry and commerce have made the river one of the nation's most contaminated waterways. Only limited wetlands in the 20-mile reach remain to support wildlife and filter pollution. This sub-estuary of the Chesapeake Bay provides spawning grounds for fish, habitat for rare terns, peregrine falcons and great egrets, and mud flats for shellfish. In 1993 the Chesapeake Bay Program identified the Elizabeth River as a "Region of Concern" - targeting it as one of three sites in the Bay watershed where contaminants pose the greatest threat to natural resources. Phase I consists of the sediment remediation for the Scuffletown Creek site.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006(\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	250
Cash	250
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 1,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	400
Allocation for FY 2004	-235
Allocation for FY 2005	144
Allocation for FY 2006	248
Budget Request for FY 2007	0
Balance to Complete After FY 2007	193
Amount that could be used in FY 2007	193
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to continue Preconstruction, Engineering and Design for the Scuffletown Creek sediment remediation project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Drake (VA-2), Scott (VA-3) and Forbes (VA-4).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 30 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Elizabeth River Basin, Environmental Restoration, Phase II (Scott's Creek and Paradise Creek), Hampton Roads, Virginia

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure dated September 14, 1995 and Section 312(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, amended

DESCRIPTION: The study area encompasses the entire Elizabeth River Basin, which includes Suffolk, Portsmouth, Chesapeake, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach, within the Southside Hampton Roads area of southeastern Virginia. The Elizabeth River is approximately 20 miles in length and has a drainage area of about 165 square miles. Urban, rural, industrial, and residential areas blend together along the Elizabeth River and its branches. More than 13,000 vessels use the Elizabeth River annually, many while navigating the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. Three hundred years of industry and commerce have made the river one of the nation's most contaminated waterways. Only limited wetlands in the 20-mile reach remain to support wildlife and filter pollution. This sub-estuary of the Chesapeake Bay provides spawning grounds for fish, habitat for rare terns, peregrine falcons and great egrets, and mud flats for shellfish. In 1993 the Chesapeake Bay Program identified the Elizabeth River as a "Region of Concern" - targeting it as one of three sites in the Bay watershed where contaminants pose the greatest threat to natural resources. Phase II of the project encompasses the conduct of a feasibility report on Paradise Creek.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 650
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		\$ 600
Cash	600	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Project Cost		\$ 1,250
Allocation thru FY 2003		\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004		0
Allocation for FY 2005		70
Allocation for FY 2006		99
Balance to Complete After FY 2006		481
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to continue the Feasibility Study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Drake (VA-2), Scott (VA-3) and Forbes (VA-4).

DISTRICT: Norfolk District

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Flushing Bay and Creek, New York

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives adopted 28 September 1994 to determine the feasibility of improvements in the interest of water quality and other purposes.

LOCATION: Flushing Bay and Creek, New York is located adjacent to LaGuardia Airport in the Borough of Queens, New York.

DESCRIPTION: The Flushing Bay and Creek watershed is highly urbanized with a dense mixture of residential, recreation, commercial, industrial and institutional development. Flushing Bay and Creek has experienced environmental degradation due to storm water runoff, combined sewer outfalls and changes in hydrology and bathymetry.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Feas</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,364	\$2,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$1,364	700
Cash	1,364	700
Other	0	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,728	\$2,800
Allocation Through FY 2003	1,207	0
Allocation for FY 2004	28	0
Allocation for FY 2005	129	0
Allocation for FY 2006	0	84
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0	2,016

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prior year feasibility funds are being used to complete the feasibility phase in FY06. The study will evaluate alternatives considering the economic and environmental benefits and will identify potential plans for restoration, conceptual designs and estimated costs.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of feasibility phase in FY06.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Joseph Crowley (NY-7) and Gary Ackerman (NY-5)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Four Mile Run, VA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1965

LOCATION: The Four Mile Run watershed extends over a drainage area of 19.1 square miles, primarily in the City of Alexandria and Arlington County, Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: Due to frequent flash flooding in the 1960's and 1970's in these areas, the Corps of Engineers constructed a local flood protection project on Four Mile Run, completing the project in 1983. The constructed project provides protection from flood flows of 27,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) on Four Mile Run and fluvial and tidal backwater stages from the Potomac River. The existing project features levees and floodwalls with associated interior drainage facilities, an improved channel, and the addition of and modification to several highway and railroad bridges. In recent years, the non-Federal sponsors of the project, the City of Alexandria and Arlington County, expressed interest in environmental enhancements to the flood protection project that would not jeopardize the authorized project's level of flood protection. Following completion of a 905(b) analysis, the feasibility study was scoped and negotiated with Alexandria and Arlington in 2003. The feasibility study is focused on evaluating opportunities to restore aquatic and riparian habitat in the levee corridor and upstream watershed while maintaining a 100-year level of protection for the Arlington and Alexandria communities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,860
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,860
Cash	0
In-Kind	1,860
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$3,720
Allocation through FY 03	49
Allocation for FY 04	108
Allocation for FY 05	298
Allocation for FY 06	396
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,009
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase efforts, including hydraulic analyses, baseline environmental analyses, watershed assessment, development of concept designs, preparation of feasibility designs, and public coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$800,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in September 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Allen (VA) and Warner (VA); Representative Moran (VA-08).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Hudson-Raritan Estuary, Gowanus Canal, NY

AUTHORIZATION: House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution (Docket Number 2596) dated 15 April 1999.

LOCATION: The study area is the Gowanus Canal and Creek, off Bay Ridge Channel in Upper New York Harbor, Brooklyn, NY.

DESCRIPTION: The Canal and Creek extend less than one mile, with widths ranging from 200 to 500 feet and depths of 18 to 30 feet. As a part of the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, a national environmental resource, the waters of the canal and the surrounding shoreline, mudflats, intertidal, marshes and adjacent upland areas provide valuable habitat for many important commercial and recreational fish species, a wide variety of plant and wildlife resources and serves as a major flyway for migrating birds. Restoration measures could include hot spot removal of off-channel contaminated sediments, support to ongoing contaminant reduction efforts, creation of wetlands for wildlife habitat and water quality improvements, creation/conversion of estuarine habitats and alteration of hydrology/hydraulics to improve flushing and water quality.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,500
Cash	2,500
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	520
Allocation for FY 2004	250
Allocation for FY 2005	238
Allocation for FY 2006	495
Balance to complete after FY 2006	997

Note: The reconnaissance phase was funded as part of the comprehensive Hudson-Raritan Estuary Environmental Restoration, NY & NJ

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase that was initiated in January 2002. The efforts include data collection, economic, hydraulic, and environmental analyses necessary to establish baseline conditions and formulate plan alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: The District initiated the reconnaissance phase in January 2000 and completed the 905b Analysis Fact Sheet in June 2000, which identified locations for further study within the harbor, including the Gowanus Creek and Canal.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Owens (NY-11), Velasquez (NY-12), Senators Clinton (NY) & Schumer (NY).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Hudson-Raritan Estuary, Lower Passaic River, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: House of Representatives Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution (Docket Number 2596) dated 15 April 1999.

LOCATION : The study area includes the Passaic River, downstream of the Dundee Dam in north central New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The Lower Passaic is considered one of the most degraded and contaminated estuarine environments in the nation. Its restoration is a component of the Hudson-Raritan Estuary. Remediation and restoration will also significantly reduce the loading of contaminated sediments into the NY/NJ Harbor that will result in a reduction of O&M disposal costs for navigational dredging. USACE and EPA have identified the study as a national pilot under the Urban Rivers Restoration Initiative MOU. The objective is to optimize solutions for remediation and restoration through a cooperative and collaborative effort of the USACE feasibility study and the USEPA superfund remedial investigation. The solutions must address each agency's goals for the project including: remediation of contamination, improvement of water quality, improvement of aquatic habitat, reduction in contaminant loading, reduced navigational dredging costs, and increased regional and national economic development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$4,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,500
Cash	4,500
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$9,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	2,700
Allocation for FY 2004	285
Allocation for FY 2005	248
Allocation for FY 2006	545
Balance to complete after FY 2006	3,152

Note: The reconnaissance phase was funded as part of the comprehensive Hudson-Raritan Estuary Environmental Restoration, NY & NJ

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds are being used to continue this feasibility phase. The efforts include data collection, inventory of restoration opportunities, environmental analyses necessary for baseline conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Menendez (NJ), and Lautenberg (NJ); Rep. Pascrell (NJ-8), Rothman (NJ-09) and Frelinghuysen (NJ-11)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Middle Potomac River - Cameron Run/Holmes Run, VA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee, dated 26 January 1956, 6 July 1959, and 23 May 2001.

LOCATION: The Cameron Run watershed is 42 square miles in area and is located in Fairfax County, the City of Alexandria, and the City of Falls Church.

DESCRIPTION: The region is completely urbanized with nearly 95% of the watershed developed with mixed residential and commercial use. Today, the mainstem Cameron Run is a flood control channel and its historic floodplain is now primarily a transportation corridor, with the Capitol Beltway paralleling the stream channel. Industrial, commercial, and residential areas have replaced areas where wetlands and forests once attenuated floodwaters.

Degraded water quality has resulted from the extreme channelization, as indicated by increases in temperature and algal production, channel instability, and disconnection from floodplain and wetland areas. In addition, non-point source pollution and urban stormwater runoff greatly affect the health of this watershed. The channelization of Cameron Run mainstem has also resulted in numerous fish blockages to migratory fish. The feasibility study is evaluating opportunities to restore aquatic and riparian habitat, reduce incidental flood damages in conjunction with habitat improvement, enhance channel aesthetics and habitat, and develop strategies to maintain the long-term viability of flood control measures and habitat restoration actions.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,462
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,462
Cash	0
In-Kind	2,462
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$4,924
Allocation through FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	1
Allocation for FY 05	79
Allocation for FY 06	396
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,986
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase efforts, including preparation of concept designs for the watershed alternatives, public involvement, and documentation of existing conditions.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$800,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in March 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Allen (VA) and Warner (VA); Representatives Moran (VA-08) and Davis (VA-11).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Middle Potomac River - Great Seneca/Muddy Branch, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Resolutions of the Senate Public Works Committee, dated 26 January 1956, 6 July 1959, and 23 May 2001.

LOCATION: Great Seneca Creek and Muddy Branch are two adjacent tributaries to the Potomac River. Both streams are wholly located in Montgomery County, Maryland, and enter the Potomac about 7 miles upstream of Great Falls.

DESCRIPTION: The Great Seneca Creek watershed measures 75 square miles in area and contains over 210 miles of stream. The Muddy Branch watershed measures 19 square miles in area and contains 58 miles of stream, of which 28 total stream miles are in the mostly urban City of Gaithersburg. Work conducted in these streams to date indicates that there are areas of degraded biological health. Both of these watersheds are showing the effects of urbanization and suburban growth, alterations in stormflow characteristics and concentration of flow due to increasing impervious surface and storm drain construction, and increasing stream widening and/or deepening leading to further channel instability and loss of habitat. The feasibility study will assess how to protect, repair, and restore the biological health of the streams.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,473
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,473
Cash	0
In-Kind	1,473
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$2,946
Allocation through FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	1
Allocation for FY 05	55
Allocation for FY 06	248
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,169
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue the feasibility study, including collection and review of existing data, public involvement activities, watershed assessment, and development of concept designs.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$600,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in May 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Mikulski (MD) and Sarbanes (MD); Representatives Van Hollen (MD-08) and Bartlett (MD-06).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

STUDY NAME: New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, Environmental Restoration, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives Resolution dated 12 September 1996.

LOCATION: The New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway navigation project is located from Manasquan River to the Delaware Bay and is 117 miles long used by commercial as well as recreational vessels.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended project will provide for ecosystem restoration measures including modifications to current dredging practices with an emphasis on techniques for recycling and the beneficial use of dredged material.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Study</u>	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,690.0	\$ 750.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 1,590.0	\$ 250.0
Cash	1,440.0	250.0
Other	0	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,280.0	\$1,000.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$1,540.0	\$ 0
Allocations FY 2004	0	\$ 5.0
Allocations FY 2005	0	\$ -4.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 74.0	\$ 0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 76.0	\$ 749.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include completion of data collection and completion of the draft feasibility report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of the Feasibility and Preconstruction Engineering and Design Phases are to be determined, due to uncertainty of funding at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Lautenberg and Corzine (NJ); Representative LoBiondo (NJ-02), Smith (NJ-04); Saxton (NJ-03)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Peckman River and Tributaries, NJ (Peckman River in Northern New Jersey)

AUTHORIZATION: U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution Docket 2644, adopted June 21, 2000.

LOCATION: The Peckman River Basin study area for flood control and ecosystem restoration is located in Essex and Passaic Counties, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The Peckman River originates in the Town of West Orange and flows through the towns of Verona, Cedar Grove, and Little Falls to its confluence with the Passaic River in West Paterson. The Basin experiences frequent flooding from intense thunderstorms and heavy rainfall. These storms can deposit large amounts of precipitation in the watershed, producing significant runoff, which quickly surpasses the capacity of the river channel, and bridge and culvert openings. The current state of the river ecosystem reflects the type of long-term degradation often associated with heavily urbanized watersheds and provides opportunities for ecosystem restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$2,200
Cash	2,200
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,400
Allocation Through FY 2003	\$72
Allocation for FY 2004	\$160
Allocation for FY 2005	\$198
Allocation for FY 2006	\$149
Balance to complete after FY 2006	\$1,621

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue the feasibility phase of the study, including plan formulation and local coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), William Pascrell, Jr., (NJ-08)

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental/Watershed

STUDY NAME: Schuylkill River Estuarine

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives on the Schuylkill River Basin, Pennsylvania, adopted March 16, 2000, Docket 2626.

LOCATION: The study area is located within the 1,916-square-mile Schuylkill River Basin in Southeastern Pennsylvania.

DESCRIPTION: The study will evaluate potential solutions for estuarine ecosystem measures in the Schuylkill River Basin, flood plain management, streambank erosion control, water quality management, stream flow and corridor management measures, and geographic information system modeling.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 925.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		\$ 675.0
Cash	675.0	
Other	0	
Total Estimated Cost		\$1,600.0
Allocations thru FY 2003		\$ 136.0
Allocations FY 2004		\$ 59.0
Allocations FY 2005		\$ 55.0
Allocations FY 2006		\$ 49.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006		\$ 626.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to execute the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement, establish Study Delivery Team and initiate data collection.,

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility phase completion is to be determined, due to unknown funding, at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement is schedule for execution March 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Reps Brady, PA-1; and Fattah, PA-2

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District

Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental/Watershed

STUDY NAME: Schuylkill River, Wissahickon River Basin, PA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the United States House of Representatives, dated 15 March 1988.

LOCATION: Study area is located in southeastern Pennsylvania, along the Wissahickon Creek, a tributary to the Schuylkill River. The 25-mile long creek is about 13 miles upstream of the confluence with the Delaware River in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, draining an approximate area of 64 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: Study will evaluate potential solutions for ecosystem restoration, flood plain management measures, streambank erosion control, water quality management, stream flow and corridor management, and geographic information system modeling, as well as opportunities for local flood damage reduction measures in the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 879.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	754.0
Cash	754.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,633.0
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 186.0
Allocations FY 2004	\$ -25.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 79.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 49.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 590.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include continuation of data collection and outlining of plan formulation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of the feasibility phase is to be determined, due to funding constraints at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility cost-sharing agreement was executed on April 12, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Specter, PA; Rep. Hoeffel, PA-13; Rep. Fattah, PA-2

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Stony Brook, Millstone River Basin, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, adopted 5 August 1999.

LOCATION: The study area includes the entire Millstone River, which includes the Stony Brook sub basin. The Millstone River Basin is located in north-central New Jersey, halfway between Philadelphia and New York City.

DESCRIPTION: The Millstone River Basin, a major tributary of the Raritan River, is 238-square miles and is located in portions of Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Hunterdon, and Somerset Counties. The Stony Brook, the largest tributary to the Millstone River, is located near Princeton Township, New Jersey. This sub-basin has a drainage area of 56 square miles.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$3,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		3,400
Cash		3,400
Other		0
Total Estimated Cost		\$6,800
Allocation Through FY 2003		456
Allocation for FY 2004		142
Allocation for FY 2005		119
Allocation for FY 2006		124
Balance to complete after FY 2006		2,559

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to continue feasibility phase of the study, including data gathering and analyses, screening of alternatives, plan formulation and environmental scoping efforts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility Phase completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Ferguson (NJ-7), and Rodney Frelinghuysen (NJ-11); Senators Menendez (NJ) and Lautenberg (NJ).

DISTRICT: CENAN

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

STUDY NAME: Susquehanna & Delaware River Basin, PA (Southern Anthracite Coal Region Water Resources)

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution, dated 22 May 02.

LOCATION: The Southern Anthracite Coal Region includes portions of Carbon, Luzerne, Columbia, Northumberland, Northampton, Lehigh, Schuylkill, Dauphin, Berks, and Lebanon Counties and straddles the headwaters of the Nescopeck, Catawissa, Shamokin, Mahanoy, Mahantango, Wiconisco, Swatara, Schuylkill and Lehigh River watersheds, which feed directly into the Susquehanna and Delaware River Basins.

DESCRIPTION: The region has been intensely mined for Anthracite Coal since the early 1800's, resulting in serious and long-lasting environmental damage including loss of aquatic and terrestrial habitat. This comprehensive study would address aquatic ecosystem restoration, acid mine drainage abatement, floodplain management, flood control and water supply.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feas</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 407	3,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	0	3,000
Cash	0	1,500
Other	0	1,500
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 407	6,000
Allocation through FY 03	100	0
Allocation for FY 04	49	0
Allocation for FY 05	173	0
Allocation for FY 06	85	0
Balance to Complete After FY 06	0	3,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to finalize the project management plan and negotiate and execute the feasibility cost sharing agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$500,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the feasibility study could be completed in September 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Holden (PA- 17)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Adams County, Colorado.

AUTHORIZATION: House resolution adopted June 21, 2000 (Docket 2640).

LOCATION: Adams County just north of the Denver Metropolitan area, CO

DESCRIPTION: Primary purpose is ecosystem restoration. Also may investigate flood damage reduction through structural and non-structural means.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$161	\$1,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	1,000
Cash	0	500
Other	0	500
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$161	2,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$24	0
Allocation for FY 2004	97	0
Allocation for FY 2005	25	2
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	150
Allocation for FY 2006	15	134
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0	864
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds are being used to obtain the Sponsor's Letter of Intent, prepare and execute the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA), finalize the Project Management Plan (PMP), and initiate the feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: For reconnaissance phase – FY 2006; for feasibility phase – FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The South Platte River Commission, representing numerous federal, state, and city agencies, in concert with private and non-profit organizations, has developed and has been implementing a master restoration plan of the South Platte River in Denver since 1995. As part of that plan, this study builds upon two studies/projects in the Denver area. The first is a 3500 foot stretch of the South Platte River constructed in 2002 between I-25 and Lakewood Gulch under Section 1135 of WRDA 1986. Also, we are currently conducting a General Investigations study in the Zuni and Sun Valley Reaches of the South Platte River in Denver. We completed the Feasibility phase of that study and have initiated the Preconstruction Engineering and Design phase. .

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Diana DeGette (CO-1) and Robert Beauprez (CO-7).

There is also strong congressional interest and support from Senator Ken Salazar and Representatives Mark Udall (CO-2), Scott McInnis (CO-3), Marilyn Musgrave (CO-4), and Tom Tancredo (CO-6).

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET

General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Amazon Creek, OR

AUTHORIZATION: Senate report 107-39 in the annual 2001 Energy and Water Development Act. It states, "The Committee has provided \$100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of Amazon Creek in the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area." Congress did not provide any further definition of the scope of the study to accompany that appropriation.

LOCATION: The Eugene-Springfield metro area is located in Lane County, Oregon at the northern end of the Willamette Valley at the junction of several rivers: the McKenzie, the Middle Fork of the Willamette, the Coast Fork of the Willamette, the Willamette River mainstem, and Amazon Creek, a major tributary to the Long Tom River.

DESCRIPTION: Comprehensive watershed review of Amazon Creek. Study to include but not limited to flood reduction, environmental restoration, water quality, endangered species conservation, watershed protection and waterway improvements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 1,923
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,750
Cash	750
Other	1,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,673
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 173
Allocation for FY 2004	247.9
Allocation for FY 2005	209
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	247.5
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,045.6
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continuation of the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility cost share agreement was signed September 2003. FY2006 activities will include two public workshops and a two-day team-building seminar between the Corps and the local sponsors to prepare a without-project condition report that will be used as an appendix to the feasibility report.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Ron Wyden and Gordon Smith, OR; Rep. Peter DeFazio, OR-04

DISTRICT: Portland, OR

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Chehalis River Basin, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401a of WRDA 1986 (PL 99-662)

LOCATION: The Chehalis River Basin is located in central western Washington and is 80 miles south of Seattle. It includes portions of Grays Harbor, Thurston, and Lewis Counties. The Chehalis River rises in the southern Cascade Mountains and empties into Grays Harbor and the Pacific Ocean.

DESCRIPTION: This study is a comprehensive evaluation of the water resource needs in the entire Chehalis River basin. It focuses on ecosystem restoration, but also is addressing watershed management, water quality improvements, incidental flood damage reduction and recreation. The purpose of the study is to evaluate water resource problems and opportunities in the basin, to formulate and screen potential solutions to these problems and recommend a series of actions and projects that have a Federal interest and are locally supported.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,792
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,650
Cash	
Other	2,650
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,442
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 639
Allocation for FY 2004	166
Allocation for FY 2005	251
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 1,687
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility phase, including completion of the without project conditions report for ecosystem restoration and coordination with the non-Federal sponsor on potential project identification.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility, FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility study cost share agreement was signed August 2001. This study is separate from the Centralia, WA, PED project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Brian Baird (WA-03) and Norm Dicks (WA-06) and Senator Patty Murray (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

06 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: James River, South Dakota (James River Water Development District)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 401(b) of WRDA 1986.

LOCATION: The James River and adjacent areas located in eastern South Dakota. The James River basin occupies 14,000 square miles in South Dakota and is bounded by the Missouri River drainage to the west and the Big Sioux and Vermillion River basins to the east. The Sand Lake Wildlife Refuge is located at the upper end of the study area.

DESCRIPTION: The primary study purpose is ecosystem restoration in association with flood damage reduction. The James River has the flattest gradient of any river of its length in North America, falling only about 135 feet along its entire 474 mile course in South Dakota. It is also poorly drained and numerous floods have occurred since 1881. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Mitigation Policy classifies the James River as "Resource Category 1." Category 1 habitats have high values and are unique and irreplaceable on a national basis.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,914
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,914
Cash	0
Other	1,914
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,828
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$358
Allocation for FY 2004	260
Allocation for FY 2005	397
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	602

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Revise Project Management Plan (PMP) and Feasibility Cost Share Agreement (FCSA); complete floodplain mapping; begin development of HEC-RAS hydraulic model; develop Elm River hydrologic model and scope of work for Phase I of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); continue geomorphology studies, public involvement, and Tribal consultation; review contracted work products for the EIS; and conduct alternatives analysis.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study addresses an array of Federal and non-Federal actions and will provide a basis for evaluating future permit actions. The sponsor has requested an evaluation of opportunities for wetland restoration, as well as an analysis of structural, non-structural, and management options to reduce damage associated with flood duration. The sponsor will do their full 50 percent contribution as in-kind services.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Herseth, (SD-AL), Senators Johnson (SD) and Thune (SD).

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Lake Washington Ship Canal, Washington.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216 of the FCA of 1970, (PL 91-611)

LOCATION: The Lake Washington Basin is located in and around Seattle, Washington and includes Lake Washington, Lake Sammamish, the Cedar River, and tributaries and the Lake Washington Ship Canal and estuary.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the study is to develop a recommended plan to restore habitat for salmon and other species.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,361
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,893
Cash	1,365
Other	3,528
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 10,254
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 3,221
Allocation for FY 2004	469
Allocation for FY 2005	387
Conference Amount for FY 2006	235
Allocation for FY 2006	233
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,051
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete real estate work for a suite of restoration projects that will be recommended for Federal implementation. Prepare and review an interim feasibility report, programmatic environmental impact statement, and biological assessment. Complete a Synergy Report for the Ship Canal, Chittenden Locks and estuary to identify potential restoration projects and determine if further studies are needed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE. Phase 1 Feasibility, FY 2008. Phase 2 Feasibility, FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study is being conducted in two phases. Phase 1 covers the eastern portion of the Lake Washington Basin. Phase 2 covers the Western portion of the basin, including the Corps Hiram Chittenden Locks and Ship Canal.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Jay Inslee (WA-01), Jim McDermott (WA-07), Dave Reichert (WA-08), and Adam Smith (WA-09); Senators Patty Murray (D-WA), and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Skokomish River, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209 of the FCA of 1962 (PL 87-874)

LOCATION: Mason County and the Skokomish Indian Reservation, Washington. The Skokomish River basin is located in northwest Washington, along the southeast portion of the Olympic Peninsula.

DESCRIPTION: The basin consists of 80 river miles, and 260 miles of tributaries. The river flows into the southern end of Hood Canal, an arm of Puget Sound. The last six miles of the Skokomish River runs through the Skokomish Indian Reservation. The City of Tacoma's Cushman Dam hydroelectric project was constructed on the Skokomish River in 1926. A second City of Tacoma dam diverts nearly all flow from the North Fork of the Skokomish River to a power plant. The purpose of the study is to investigate water resource problems and opportunities in the basin and recommend solutions for implementation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,466
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,236
Cash	1,236
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	2,702
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$140
Allocations for FY 2004	
Allocations for FY 2005	25
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocations for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY2006	1,202
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the reconnaissance phase by executing the FCSA in March 06 and initiate feasibility study phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Feasibility, FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: A favorable 905(b) report was completed in 2000, but the study was deferred at the sponsor's request. Mason County and the Skokomish Tribe provided letters of intent in March 2005 to sponsor resumption. Feasibility study costs and completion date are based on a Reconnaissance Report completed in 2000 and are currently being negotiated with the sponsors.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Norm Dicks (WA-9) and Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Walla Walla River Basin, OR and WA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Senate Committee on Public Works adopted July 27, 1962 (Columbia River and Tributaries).

LOCATION: The project is located on the mainstem and tributaries of the Walla Walla River in Southeast Washington and Northeast Oregon.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the project is environmental restoration; focusing primarily on establishing year round instream flows.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

		FY
2006 (\$000)		Recon
Feasibility		
Estimated Federal Cost	\$537	\$3,177
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	\$3,177
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$537	\$6,354
Allocation thru 2003	\$537	\$786
Allocation for FY 2004		\$684
Allocation for FY 2005		\$812
Conference Amount for FY 2006		\$300
Allocation for FY 2006		\$297
Balance to Complete After FY 2006		\$598
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continued development of 4-5 different measures for environmental restoration in the basin. Activities cover technical issues, relating to the addition of water exchange to the Scope Of Work.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The feasibility cost share agreement was signed May 2002. Efforts are consistent with other ongoing restoration measures in the basin, which include the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) under the auspices of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Summer steelhead and bull trout are two aquatic species within the basin that are listed under the ESA. The sponsor will shortly confirm if they want to expand the scope to develop a new measure, Water Exchange. This project is one of a few nationwide that has a Native American Tribe as a sponsor (Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation).

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman McMorris (WA-5) Congressman Walden (OR-2); Senators Murray and Cantwell (WA), Senators Wyden and Smith (OR).

DISTRICT: Walla Walla

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET

General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Willamette River Environmental Dredging, OR

AUTHORIZATION: Amended Section 224, WRDA 1999 (amending Section 312, WRDA 1990)

LOCATION: The Lower Willamette River Ecosystem Restoration project is from Willamette Falls to its confluence with the Columbia River.

DESCRIPTION: The study will assess the feasibility of ecosystem restoration, including remediation of contaminated sediments over a portion of a 25 mile reach of the Willamette River in Portland, Oregon. The project will assess opportunities to: (1) increase the number of interconnected, active channels and open slack water areas; (2) increase shallow-sloped and less reinforced shoreline areas and bank vegetation; (3) improve access to tributary streams; (4) increase emergent wetlands and riparian forest; and (5) improve sediment and water quality.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,191.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,000.0
Cash	1,500.0
Other	1,500.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 6,191.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 391.0
Allocation for FY 2004	144.4
Allocation for FY 2005	151.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	160.0
Allocation for FY 2006	158.4
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,346.2
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Phase I of the Feasibility Study and initiate Phase II.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2011

OTHER INFORMATION: This study is currently in Phase I of feasibility. Development of a detailed Project Management Plan (PMP, a detailed scope of work for the feasibility study) and Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement (FCSA) was completed and signed respectively in August 2003. The more detailed technical work associated with the study will be accomplished during the feasibility phase. The City of Portland is the non-Federal sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Gordon Smith (OR) and Ron Wyden; Representatives David Wu (OR-1), Earl Blumenauer (OR-3), Peter DeFazio (OR-4), Darlene Hooley (OR-5), (OR).

DISTRICT: Portland

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Willamette River Floodplain Restoration, OR

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation adopted September 8, 1988

LOCATION: The Willamette River Basin, containing an area of approximately 12,000 square miles, is located in northwestern Oregon.

DESCRIPTION: The study will assess opportunities to modify existing flood plain features in the Willamette Valley to reduce flood damages while restoring natural wetlands and promoting ecosystem restoration. This flood plain restoration project offers an excellent opportunity to provide additional flood protection for the Willamette Basin through non-structural flood plain restoration measures. Restoration of natural flood plain function also offers an excellent opportunity to restore habitat conditions for threatened and other species of fish and wildlife.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,877
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,485
Cash	742
Other	743
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,362
Allocation thru FY 2003	362.2
Allocation for FY 2004	308.9
Allocation for FY 2005	326.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400.0
Allocation for FY 2006	396.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	483.9
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility phase studies

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: A Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement was signed and executed in February 2004. The non-federal sponsor for the study is the Willamette Restoration Initiative (WRI), working through its formal financing body, the Mid-Willamette Council of Governments. WRI was selected by the Northwest Power Planning Council as the lead planning entity for development of the Willamette Sub basin Plan under the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. Floodplain Restoration is a central element of Governor Kulongoski's Willamette Restoration Legacy Project. The State of Oregon through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has provided financial and technical support to the study. The first phase of the study will focus on assisting the sponsor in development of the Willamette Sub basin Plan for submittal to the Council. The second phase of the study will look specifically at opportunities for restoring natural floodplain functions along the Middle and Coast forks of the Willamette River. We anticipate that the flood plain restoration study will provide a vehicle for implementing downstream habitat restoration actions identified in NMFS biological opinion for continued operation and maintenance of the 13 Corps reservoirs in the Willamette Basin.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Peter DeFazio (OR-4), Gordon Smith (OR) and Ron Wyden (OR).

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
General Investigations
Kahuku, Oahu, HI

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kahuku, Oahu, HI

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209 Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874)

LOCATION: The Kahuku Watershed is located in the northeast coast of Oahu within the James Campbell Wildlife Refuge and is administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

DESCRIPTION: The 905(b) analysis identified opportunities to expand, enhance and protect wetland habitat within the James Campbell Wildlife Refuge located on the northeast coast of Oahu, and administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). This leased area, which is utilized by threatened and endangered bird species, is being considered for expansion by the USFWS.

Through discussion with the Kahuku community, the project sponsors have decided that shifting the primary focus of the study to flood control as a primary objective would better serve the community's interests. The area historically has been subject to repeated flooding and drainage problems that impact the entire community, including residences and commercial establishments. Although categorized as a "watershed" study, the project is proceeding with a primary focus on providing flood control protection with environmental considerations. The alternative flood damage reduction solution will be fully described and cost estimates provided in the final report.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	600
Cash	500
Other	100
Total Estimated Cost	1,200
Allocations thru 2003	99
Allocation for FY 2004	65
Allocation for FY 2005	79
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after Fiscal Year 2006	258
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Draft Feasibility Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Earliest attainable completion of Feasibility Phase is FY07.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Daniel Inouye (HI), Senator Daniel Akaka (HI), and Representative Ed Case (HI-2)

DISTRICT: Honolulu District

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Allatoona Lake Watershed, GA

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 2000

LOCATION: Bartow County, Cherokee County, Cherokee County, Cobb County, Dawson County, Etowah County, Forsyth County, Lumpkin County and Pickens County, GA.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to evaluate environmental problems and recommend environmental restoration measures, including structural and non-structural approaches, for the Little River Watershed which drains into Lake Allatoona. The study will also identify and recommend measures, including structural and non-structural approaches, to alleviate shoreline erosion and sedimentation problems along Lake Allatoona, Little River and the Etowah River.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$3,100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,100
Cash	3,100
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$6,200
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 740
Allocation for FY 2004	218
Allocation for FY 2005	367
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,478
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate - TBD	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio - TBD	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Public workshops are scheduled to be held.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2011

OTHER INFORMATION: The Senate Report had \$750,000 to continue the feasibility report. The Conference Report reduced that amount to \$300,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson and Congressmen Thomas E. Price, GA-06, John Linder, GA-07 and John P. Gingrey, GA-11.

DISTRICT: GA-06, 07, 11

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Indian, Sugar, Intrenchment & Snapfinger Creeks, GA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted Sep. 28, 1994 by House Committee on Public Works and Transportation

LOCATION: Fulton and DeKalb Counties, GA.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of the feasibility study is to develop portions of a comprehensive watershed plan for metropolitan Atlanta, including Indian, Sugar, Intrenchment, Federal Prison and Snapfinger Creeks. Development of portions of the master plan will be based on a thorough assessment of the changes in stream hydrology, morphology, water quality and habitat and ecology.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,250
Cash	2,250
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,500
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 42
Allocation for FY 2004	131
Allocation for FY 2005	145
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,635
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate - TBD	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio - TBD	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Investigate project alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The House Report had \$680,000 to continue the feasibility report. The Conference Report reduced that amount to \$300,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson and Congressmen John Lewis, GA-05 and Thomas E. Price, GA-06.

DISTRICT: GA-05 and 06.

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santee Delta Environmental Restoration, SC

AUTHORIZATION: P.L. 106-53, Section 444

LOCATION: The Santee River below Lake Marion extends 87 miles to the ocean. The area below Highway 17, approximately river mile 12, is generally considered the Santee Delta. The delta consists of coastal islands composed of tidal marsh, managed wetlands, forest openings, virgin barrier island beaches and maritime forests.

DESCRIPTION: Damming of the Santee River in the early-mid 1900's cutoff the sediment supply to the delta. Problems identified include saltwater intrusion, wetland degradation, invasive exotic plant growth, shoreline erosion, recreation and aquatic habitat decline. Management of the existing wetlands has helped compensate for these losses; however, because of the rapid loss of coastal habitat caused by development, additional wetland restoration and protection is needed within the Santee Delta.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 600
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	500
Cash	0
Other	500
Total Estimated Cost	\$1,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 62
Allocation for FY 2004	19
Allocation for FY 2005	19
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	451
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Negotiations for execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement are underway. Once the FCSA is executed we will begin a feasibility study to include collection and review of existing information within the Santee Delta watershed and field verification of specific problems and opportunities identified.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2009

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Graham and DeMint, Brown SC-1

DISTRICT: Charleston

Date: 20 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Savannah Harbor Ecosystem, GA and SC

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 96 PL 104-303, Sec 414

LOCATION: The Savannah River Basin encompasses an area of 11,000 square miles in Georgia and South Carolina. Major cities in the basin are Savannah and Augusta, Georgia, and Aiken, South Carolina. Savannah Harbor Ecosystem Restoration focuses on the Lower Savannah River upstream to the vicinity of I-95 where there is a tidal influence from the Atlantic Ocean, approximately 35 miles.

DESCRIPTION: Recent studies by the Corps of Engineers, the states of Georgia and South Carolina, and Federal and State agencies have highlighted that there are current water resource problems and needs being encountered in the Savannah River Basin that should be investigated. Dissolved oxygen (D.O.) levels in Savannah Harbor were identified by several major stakeholders. Evaluation of dissolved oxygen in Savannah Harbor is a complex issue due to the dynamic nature of the tidal estuary, the complicated hydraulic processes in the harbor, and uncertainties associated with related biological components. The historical seasonal lowering of dissolved oxygen in Savannah Harbor is well documented and illustrates an annual impairment of the estuary's ecosystem. Increased channel depths have reduced vertical mixing; higher salinity levels and lower D.O. have resulted. It appears from initial studies that the low D.O. problem in the lower harbor has been caused by the cumulative affect of past harbor deepening and maintenance. Data from sampling during summer low flow periods indicate D.O. levels below 1.0 in the navigation channel. These levels are not supportive of a healthy, productive, aquatic ecosystem.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>FEAS</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,960
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,960
Cash	1,960
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,920
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 749
Allocation for FY 2004	80
Allocation for FY 2005	139
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	596
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The preliminary alternatives have been evaluated and screened down to several alternative plans. The Enhanced Model will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: March 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: The Ecosystem Study is a spin off from Savannah River Basin Comprehensive Study. The Savannah Harbor Ecosystem Restoration Study is intended to identify (1) the causes of the recurring low D.O. levels, and (2) the most cost-effective way of improving D.O. levels in Savannah Harbor. Savannah District has partnered with the City of Savannah in this study to evaluate opportunities to increase dissolved oxygen in the harbor, such as oxygen injection, modification of hydrologic regime or installation of structures to increase mixing. The study has very strong interest from a unique coalition of EPA, USFWS, state resource agencies, and major industries. The enhanced hydrodynamic, salinity, and DO models will be used in the evaluation. The City of Savannah and major industrial agencies on the Savannah River have been reluctant to continue the study in FY 2006. A new sponsor may have to be found for continuation of this project into the remainder of the feasibility phase. Since this study was scoped to address the cumulative historic impacts, there may be an impact to Savannah Harbor Expansion if this study does not go forward.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen. Jim DeMint (SC), Rep. Joe Wilson (SC-2), Rep. Jack Kingston (GA-01), Sen. Saxby Chambliss (GA), Sen. Johnny Isakson (GA)

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 24, 2006

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tybee Island Channel Impact Feasibility Study, GA

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate adopted April 29, 1963; Resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives adopted June 19, 1963; and Resolution by the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works dated 8 November 2001.

LOCATION: Tybee Island is a 3.5-mile long barrier island, located 18 miles east of Savannah at the mouth of the Savannah River on the Atlantic Ocean. The mostly-developed island is bordered on the north by the South Channel of the Savannah River, on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, and on the south and west by the Back River and other tidal creeks. Tybee Island has an average width of 0.5 miles and the ground elevation varies from 10 to 18 feet above mean low water (MLW) and slopes westward to the salt marshes. The City of Tybee Island, Georgia, is the non-Federal partner on the feasibility study.

DESCRIPTION: Two potential project purposes have been identified: (1) Determine if the Savannah Harbor Federal Navigation Project is adversely impacting the shores of Tybee Island, Georgia, including both the shoreline protected by the Tybee Island Shoreline Protection Project and the shoreline along the north end of Tybee Island; and (2) Determine if the existing Tybee Island Shoreline Protection Project should be modified to include shore protection for the north end of Tybee Island. Phase I feasibility will concentrate on the impacts on the federal channel to federal shore protection project. Phase II feasibility will focus on incorporating North Beach into the Federal project limits.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
	<u>RECON</u>	<u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 116	\$ 525
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	525
Cash	0	525
Other	0	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 116	\$1,050
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	116	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	125
Allocation for FY 2006	0	124
Balance to Complete after 2006	0	401
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Scope the project, prepare a PMP, execute FCSA, and complete Recon phase, and then initiate Feasibility Phase I.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: March 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: Phase I Feasibility Study of Channel impacts focus and scope is to look at channel impacts of the whole Tybee Island. Alternatives to be evaluated if impact is determined include sand by-pass, changes in operation and maintenance or change to cost sharing percentages for future beach renourishment. The Georgia Ports Authority has agreed to fund up to \$375,000 for studies aimed at determining possible impacts to the beach from the Savannah Harbor Federal Navigation Channel.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Kingston GA R-1

DISTRICT: Savannah District

Date: January 24, 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Aliso Creek Mainstem, California

AUTHORIZATION: Santa Ana River Basin & Orange County (SARBOC) adopted by Resolution of Committee on Public Works, House: 8 May 64

LOCATION: The study area is located in South Orange County, approximately 40 miles southeast of Los Angeles, California.

DESCRIPTION: The watershed covers approximately 36 square miles. The study was previously funded as part of the overall Aliso Creek Watershed Management study. Channel degradation and flood damage along the mainstem of Aliso Creek and some of its tributaries has caused severe environmental degradation. This degradation has caused increasing monetary and non-monetary losses to adjacent infrastructure and environmental resources. The study will examine channel stability, environmental restoration and recreation.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,400
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,400
Cash	(910)
Other	(490)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$2,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	1
Allocation for FY 2005	206
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350
Allocation for FY 2006	347
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	846
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Feasibility phase, conduct public workshop, complete baseline report Sep 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressperson Cox (CA-48)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Arana Gulch Watershed, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Resolution dated June 25, 1999.

LOCATION: The study area is located in Santa Cruz County, California, adjacent to the Port of Santa Cruz. The study area includes 2,200 acres of coastal watershed and seven miles of stream.

DESCRIPTION: The study will involve a collaborative watershed planning effort to restore passage for endangered anadromous fish, restore native riparian vegetation, improve water quality, improve connectivity of the upper habitat, and reduce erosion and sedimentation throughout the watershed. Additionally, the beneficial use of sediment from the stream and harbor is being considered as part of a Regional Sediment Management initiative.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	Recon	Feasibility
Estimated Federal Cost	\$178	\$1,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	1,000
Cash	0	500
Other	0	500
Total Estimated Cost	\$178	\$2,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 120	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	48	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	50
Allocation for FY 2006	10	39
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	961
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Completion of Project Management Plan. If sponsor is authorized to sign the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA), it may be possible to initiate Feasibility in FY 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: Extensive communications and negotiations with the sponsor regarding the scope and estimated cost have been resolved and the FCSA is anticipated to be signed in February 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Honda CA-15, Farr CA-17

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Arroyo Seco Watershed (Arroyo Seco Watershed Environmental Restoration Feasibility Study), California

AUTHORIZATION: Senate Public Works Committee Resolution, Document No. 838, June 25, 1969 (LACDA)

LOCATION: The Arroyo Seco Watershed is located in the city of Pasadena, Los Angeles County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The study will evaluate non-structural flood management water quality and habitat restoration and opportunities for associated water quality improvements. The primary focus of the study, per the Sponsor's request, will be the identification of candidate sites for spin-off environmental restoration studies that will further the goal of watershed management for the region.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,350
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,350
Cash	(760)
Other	(590)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,700
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	54
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,197
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Conduct the public workshop Oct 05 and provide summary response.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed 15 August 2005. Public Workshop was held 26 October 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Schiff (CA-27), Becerra (CA-30), Drier (CA-26).

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ballona Creek Ecosystem Restoration

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 216, Flood Control Act of 1970, Supplemented by House Resolution 28 Sep 94

LOCATION: The study area encompasses approximately 2,120 acres near Marina del Rey, California about 20 miles southwest of the city of Los Angeles.

DESCRIPTION: The study will evaluate coastal wetland and riparian habitat restoration, improvements to water quality, trash migration, recreation and educational purposes along the lower reach of the creek.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 2,300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	2,300
Cash	(871)
Other	(1,429)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,600
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	107
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,995
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete hydrology modeling, continue coastal hydrodynamic modeling, environmental inventory, and study coordination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswomen Harman (CA-36); Waters (CA-35); Watson (33)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Report 2473, 7 March 1996

LOCATION: Pacific coastline in Marin County, CA, between Stinson Beach & Bolinas

DESCRIPTION: Subtidal and intertidal habitats are being lost to sedimentation. The study will examine solutions that would restore and maintain a natural tidal prism configuration and tidal circulation in the lagoon.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,250
Cash	954
Other	1,296
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,500
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$1,445
Allocation for FY 2004	-2
Allocation for FY 2005	61
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	149
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	597
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility activities include complete data review, reformulate management objectives, complete conceptual model, collect/evaluate additional field data, refine the future lagoon evolution under the "without" project condition and reformulate project alternatives. Initiate a revised Draft Feasibility Study & Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: N/A

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: CALFED Levee Stability Program, CA

AUTHORIZATION: P.L. 108-361, Section 103 (f) (3) (B); P.L. 109-103

LOCATION: The San Francisco Bay Delta is an integral part of California's agricultural and water supply systems. The project is located east of the San Francisco Bay and is part of Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Solano and Yolo Counties. The project area consists of over 1,000 miles of levees protecting 738,000 acres of agricultural land.

DESCRIPTION: The Delta system is an integral part of state and Federal water supply systems. Public Law 108-361 directed the Secretary of the Army to complete a report describing the levee stability reconstruction projects and priorities that will be carried out under this title during years 2005 through 2010.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$500
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY2006	500
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate and complete a 180-day report describing the Federal levee stability reconstruction projects and priorities that will be carried out through 2010.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: There is strong local support by the non-Federal sponsor, California Department of Water Resources, Bureau of Reclamation and the California Bay-Delta Authority. A collaborative planning environment is key to the CALFED program. Funding of \$500K was contained in Title II of PL 109-103 and transferred to the Corps in December 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller (CA-7); Tauscher (CA-10); Pombo (CA-11); Cardoza (CA-18); Senators Boxer and Feinstein

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: City of Inglewood, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 219(c) amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, Section 108(a)(26)

LOCATION: The City of Inglewood is located in the south central part of Los Angeles County.

DESCRIPTION: The city of Inglewood is mostly a residential community and has a population of approximately 116,000 people. The proposed work will provide plans and specs for construction of water transmission pipelines, which would provide a more dependable water supply for the city.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$761
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	255
Cash	(255)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$1,016
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$125
Allocation for FY 2004	195
Allocation for FY 2005	317
Conference Amount for FY 2006	125
Allocation for FY 2006	124
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Pre-design Report and preliminary plans and specifications for alternative water treatment process for the City's water treatment plant.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Waters (CA-35)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: City of Norwalk, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 219(c) amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, Section 108(a)(28)

LOCATION: The City of Norwalk is located in the southwest part of Los Angeles County.

DESCRIPTION: Norwalk is mostly a residential community with a population of approximately 94,000. The proposed study will upgrade fire system and water transmission main. The project will also address the Drainage System Master Plan and the Urban Runoff Plan.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$337
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	113
Cash	(113)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$450
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 65
Allocation for FY 2004	65
Allocation for FY 2005	127
Conference Amount for FY 2006	80
Allocation for FY 2006	79
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete plans and specifications for Ph I design, (upgrade Norwalk Park Water Reservoir) May 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Napolitano (CA-38)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: City of Santa Clarita (Santa Clara River Restoration), California

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the Committee on Public Works, June 18, 1963; and Public Law 406, 75th Congress, approved August 28, 1937.

LOCATION: The study area is located in northern Los Angeles County, California. The headwaters of Santa Clara River begin from the Angeles Mountains and flows southwesterly across northern Los Angeles County, crossing Santa Clarita Valley and the city of Santa Clarita and continuing southwesterly across the County of Ventura before reaching the Pacific Ocean.

DESCRIPTION: Urbanization has outpaced the valley's ability to provide the corresponding appropriate level of flood protection. Also, the preservation of the riparian community along the river has now become a forefront issue as the community attempts to find a balance between growth and protection of the environment.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,500
Cash	(100)
Other	(1,400)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	10
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,391
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete the Project Management Plan, execute Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement Jun 06, and initiate the feasibility study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The City of Santa Clarita and the Sanitation District of Los Angeles County are intended to be co-sponsors to this investigation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman McKeon (CA-25).

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Corte Madera Creek Watershed, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1962

LOCATION: Marin County, California. Corte Madera Creek and its tributaries drain an area of 28 square miles into the west side of San Francisco Bay 9 miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

DESCRIPTION: The study will examine improvements to stream function and flood damage reduction by exploring potential physical and management measures including storm water management, development and sedimentation measures and creek and habitat improvements and maintenance. Local groups have requested a watershed study to examine potential constructed and management improvements to the function of the watershed, both to improve migration of the threatened Steelhead (et al) and reduce flood damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100	\$2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	2,000
Cash	0	0
Other	0	2,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$100	\$4,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100	0
Allocation for FY 2006	100	0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	2,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Reconnaissance, 905(b) Report, Project Management Plan and Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006 for reconnaissance phase. Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: The Coyote Creek, Lower San Gabriel Watershed (Westminster, Coyote and Carbon Canyon), California

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1936, House Resolution dated 8 May 1964

LOCATION: The study area is located 25 miles east of Los Angeles in Orange County and Los Angeles County, CA in The Coyote Creek and Carbon Canyon Creek watersheds encompassing approximately 165 square miles.

DESCRIPTION: The Coyote Creek Watershed has been substantially altered by urban development, which has degraded the environment and habitat and increased flooding in the area. The study will evaluate potential solutions for environmental restoration and flood protection in the watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$1,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,700
Cash	(895)
Other	(805)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$3,400
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	97
Allocation for FY 2005	96
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350
Allocation for FY 2006	346
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$1,161
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue Feasibility phase, hold Public Workshop Jan 06, and initiate and define baseline conditions and watershed management plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Phase I is a general Watershed Master Plan (WMP) using the grant funding. Grant funds are from the Rivers and Mountain Cons. (\$100K), the Coastal Conservancy (\$130K) and the CA Resource Water Quality Control Board (CARWQCB) (\$200K). Phase I WMP work efforts will be completed by Mar 06 and Jan 07 to meet grant deadlines.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Royce (CA-40), Rohrabacher (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Desert Hot Springs, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 219(c) amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, Section 108(a)(23)

LOCATION: The study area is located approximately 110 miles from Los Angeles in the city of Desert Hot Springs, Riverside County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The proposed work will provide plans and design to protect one of the premier groundwater resources in the country by collecting the treating wastewater and abatement of septic tanks systems that threaten the high-quality groundwater aquifer and help create a sufficient stream of recycled wastewater.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$605
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	202
Cash	(202)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$807
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$116
Allocation for FY 2004	130
Allocation for FY 2005	159
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete 30% of the plans and specifications for Ph I design Jan 06 and stop work as requested by the sponsor. Develop a scope of work for a new study for the region and prepare the final report for the study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The local sponsor has requested to stop work on Phase I design after completing 30% of design phase. The reason for work stoppage is the local developer will design and construct the new proposed water transmission main.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Lewis (CA-41) Bono (CA-45)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Eastern Municipal Water District, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 219(c), amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, Section 108(a)(24)

LOCATION: The project is located in Riverside County, California, approximately 70 miles east of Los Angeles.

DESCRIPTION: The project will consist of preliminary engineering investigations, design, and environmental documentation for over 30 miles of non-reclaimable waste pipelines, and pumping plants required to manage high salinity wastes and brines resulting from industrial processes and water supply desalination. Three separate pipelines will be constructed to link the cities of Moreno Valley, Temecula, and the unincorporated community of Winchester to an existing brine management system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$4,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,300
Cash	1,300
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$5,300
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 102
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,000
Allocation for FY 2006	990
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,908
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete 30% concept design and Environmental Assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Calvert (CA-44) Bono (CA-45)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Espanola Valley, Rio Grande and Tributaries, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: Section 4 of the 1941 Flood Control Act

LOCATION: The study area is located within the Española Valley, in north central New Mexico, and includes the Pueblos of Ohkay Owingeh (formerly known as San Juan), Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso.

DESCRIPTION: This watershed feasibility study will be a cooperative effort with the three Native American Pueblos of Ohkay Owingeh (formerly known as San Juan), Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>RECONNAISSANCE</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 520	\$ 1,850
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	1,850
Cash	(0)	(1,850)
Other	(0)	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 520	\$ 3,700
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 380	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	60	0
Allocation for FY 2005	72	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	8	492
Allocation for FY 2006	8	487
Balance to Complete After FY06	0	1,363
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement and initiate the feasibility study to include public outreach and coordination; and the preparation of existing conditions and future without project conditions hydrology and geotechnical.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: This watershed feasibility study will be a cooperative effort with the three Native American Pueblos of Ohkay Owingeh (formerly known as San Juan), Santa Clara, and San Ildefonso. The Pueblos will cost share and participate equally as the non-Federal sponsors for the feasibility study. The primary purpose of this study is ecosystem restoration along the Rio Grande. Restoration features will improve and increase riparian woodland, riparian shrub, and emergent wetland habitat in the study area, including habitat of the endangered Rio Grande Silvery Minnow and the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Udall, NM-03

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Hamilton City, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874); HR 8 May 64

LOCATION: The project is located in Glenn County, California, along the west bank of the Sacramento River about 85 miles north of Sacramento and includes Hamilton City and the surrounding rural area. The project extends from the Sacramento River to the east to the Glenn Colusa Canal to the west, and about two miles north and six miles south of Hamilton City.

DESCRIPTION: The project area lies just north of the existing Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees and within the area of extent of the Chico Landing to Red Bluff bank protection project. The feasibility study was accomplished as part of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study with the State of California Reclamation Board as the non-Federal sponsor. The project includes construction of 6.8 miles of setback levee to provide more reliable flood protection to the community and surrounding area, degradation of the existing "J" levee to allow for reconnection of the river to the floodplain, and restoration of about 1,500 acres of native habitat between the new setback levee and the Sacramento River. The levee would perform at 3 distinct levels of protection that are associated with three different average levee heights: from north to south, four and two-fifths mile of levee averaging 7.5 feet would provide a 90 percent confidence of passing a 75-year event; 1,000 feet of levee averaging 6 feet in height would provide a 90 percent confidence of passing a 35-year event; and 1.6 miles of levee averaging 3 feet in height would provide a 90 percent confidence of passing an 11-year event.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,343
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	780
Cash	780
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,123
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	50
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	248
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2,045
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) Agreement executed 13 December 2005; continue PED phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding will enable completion of PED in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: In FY07 the 35% design will be completed; 90% design is scheduled to be completed in FY08.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Herger (CA-2); Senators Feinstein and Boxer

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

**FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Laguna Creek Watershed, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 411 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2000 (Public Law 106-541)

LOCATION: Line E, Fremont, Alameda County, California

DESCRIPTION: The watershed drains into the San Francisco Bay and has a drainage of more than 25 square miles. The study will evaluate potential alternatives for flood damage reduction in the densely populated Fremont area. Historically, there has been significant flooding along Line E and its tributaries. One of the planning objectives is to construct improvements along Line E and its tributaries to reduce the risk of flooding and the need for FEMA flood insurance.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) Recon</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100	\$1,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	1,000
Cash	0	0
Other	0	1,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$100	\$2,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 18	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	30	0
Allocation for FY 2005	14	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	75
Allocation for FY 2006	38	36
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	964
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prepare, negotiate and sign Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement. Initiate Feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement is currently being negotiated with the local sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Stark CA-13

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Laguna de Santa Rosa, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 209, Flood Control Act of 1962, PL 87-874

LOCATION: The Laguna de Santa Rosa is a tributary of the Russian River located approximately 13 miles west of the city of Santa Rosa in Sonoma County, California.

DESCRIPTION: Historically, this area has served as a naturally occurring 7,000-acre storm detention basin during flooding of the Russian River and is a valuable coastal fresh water wetland. The local community believes that siltation has reduced the ability of the Laguna de Santa Rosa to function as a major flood basin and that thousands of acres of wetlands habitat have been lost or degraded. Endangered species (steelhead trout and red-legged frogs) are being negatively impacted due to the loss of habitat. The study will investigate and evaluate solutions to this siltation problem in order to restore both the storm detention function and wetland habitat of the area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,875
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,875
Cash	937
Other	938
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,750
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 387
Allocation for FY 2004	87
Allocation for FY 2005	125
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	979
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility study. Initiate sediment data collection and sediment transport analysis.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project Management Plan has been revised to incorporate the sedimentation modeling, which is extensive and expensive. Once the Sponsor has reviewed the Project Management Plan, the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement will be amended. The sediment modeling and data collection will take over a year and a half to complete. This work must be completed before proposed sites can be evaluated.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Los Angeles County Drainage Area (LACDA) Cornfields, California

AUTHORIZATION: House Public Works & Transportation Committee Resolution, 11 Jun 69 (LACDA) Docket

LOCATION: The study area is within the Los Angeles County Drainage Area, approximately five miles northeast of downtown Los Angeles, California.

DESCRIPTION: The river is mostly concrete lined, providing little environmental or aesthetic relief from urban development. The parcel referred to as "the Cornfields" is a former railroad maintenance and switching yard. The approved reconnaissance report contains the recommendation to investigate three additional specific locations in the study area. These locations are Taylor Yard, the Arroyo Seco confluence and the Mission Road Yard. Each of these areas has been identified for potential ecosystem restoration opportunities. The study will evaluate opportunities to restore the river's natural riparian environment and habitat.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,900
Cash	(950)
Other	(950)
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 68
Allocation for FY 2004	25
Allocation for FY 2005	86
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	979
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement, begin Feasibility phase, and conduct feasibility scoping meeting.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: This study is the city's number one priority to align with their revitalization efforts. The Corps intends to expand this study area to match the area defined by the city's efforts.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressperson Roybal-Allard (CA-34), Senator Feinstein

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Malibu Creek Watershed, California

AUTHORIZATION: Committee on Public Works and Transportation 5 Feb 92.

LOCATION: Malibu Creek is located approximately 30 miles west of downtown Los Angeles, California. The drainage area covers approximately 110 mi² of the Santa Monica Mountains and Simi Hills. Malibu Creek and its tributaries drain into Malibu Lagoon and Santa Monica Bay. Approximately two-thirds of the watershed is located in northwestern Los Angeles County, and the remaining one-third is in southeastern Ventura County.

DESCRIPTION: The study will focus on environmental restoration of Malibu Creek and specifically the removal of Rindge Dam, doubling available habitat for endangered steelhead trout, Pacific lamprey, and other aquatic species. Potential for multiple beneficial uses of trapped sediments.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,050
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,050
Cash	(733)
Other	(317)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 2,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	410
Allocation for FY 2004	185
Allocation for FY 2005	263
Conference Amount for FY 2006	85
Allocation for FY 2006	84
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	108
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__ %)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Prepare baseline conditions report and milestone review conference and initiate comparison and evaluation of study alternatives to identify the tentatively recommended plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Sponsor and Corps have revised the study scope and changes to the PMP are being negotiated at this time. There is an estimated \$1 million increase in the overall costs to complete the feasibility study in FY 2008.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Gallegly (CA-24); Waxman (CA-30)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Morro Bay Estuary, California

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Resolution docket 2527, adopted 27 May 1997.

LOCATION: The study area is located in a natural embayment on the Central Coast of California, about 60 miles North of Point Conception, in the city of Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo County, California.

DESCRIPTION: Morro Bay Harbor and associated wetlands provide valuable habitat for aquatic wildlife and an important refuge for migratory birds and marine animals. The study will identify potential projects to restore sensitive habitat through improving tidal circulation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Study \$ 1,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	1,200
Cash	(650)
Other	(550)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,400
Allocations thru FY 2003	695
Allocation for FY 2004	18
Allocation for FY 2005	59
Conference Amount for FY 2006	175
Allocation for FY 2006	173
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	255
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility study and develop alternatives.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons, Capps (CA-23), Thomas (CA-22).

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mugu Lagoon, California

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Section 406

LOCATION: The study is located in Ventura County, within the Calleguas Creek Watershed.

DESCRIPTION: The study initially addressed changes in Mugu Lagoon and later increased to include investigations within the Calleguas Creek Watershed for potential flood prevention and environmental restoration opportunities. The watershed is approximately 350 square miles. A primary area of concern is still the Mugu Lagoon as it contains several Federal and State endangered and threatened species and is one of the few wetlands remaining in Southern California. The study has preliminarily evaluated alternatives for flood prevention and environmental restoration opportunities. The resulting report will be used to spin off feasibility studies for specific project areas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,200
Cash	(600)
Other	(600)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 2,400
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 875
Allocation for FY 2004	97
Allocation for FY 2005	136
Conference Amount for FY 2006	82
Allocation for FY 2006	81
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	11
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Hold feasibility review conference Jun 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: A number of problems and opportunities have been identified and will be pursued by spin-off feasibility studies. These studies will be performed via our General Investigations and/or Continuing Authority Programs. The document prepared for this investigation will be used to initiate these feasibility studies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Capps (CA-23), Gallegly (CA-24)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Orange County Special Area Management Plan

AUTHORIZATION: Res by Committee on Public Works HR, adopted 8 May 1964, and Section 4 of the Flood Control Act of 1941. HR2425, 14 May 94.

LOCATION: San Diego Creek Watershed and San Juan Creek/western San Mateo Creek Watersheds, Orange County, California

DESCRIPTION: Special Area Management Plans (SAMPs) are being conducted in coordination with the existing California Natural Community Conservation plan. SAMPs will provide a comprehensive plan and a balance between economic development and aquatic resource protection. SAMPs will result geographic areas eligible for abbreviated Section 404 permitting procedures and geographic areas with local and federal regulatory protections.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,917
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 1,917
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$1,342
Allocation for FY 2004	251
Allocation for FY 2005	155
Conference Amount for FY 2006	169
Allocation for FY 2006	167
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 2
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete draft and final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for San Diego Creek Watershed. Complete the draft and final EIS for San Juan Creek/San Mateo Creek Watershed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Feinstein, Congresspersons Miller (CA-42), Calvert (CA-44), Cox (CA-48)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Pima County (Tres Rios Del Norte), Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act 1938 (Gila River & Tributaries), and House Resolution 2425, 17 May 1994

LOCATION: The study area is located in Pima County and encompasses the metropolitan area of Tucson, the second largest city in Arizona.

DESCRIPTION: The study will investigate the water resources development opportunities including environmental programs, incorporation of historical cultural features, flood control, and recreation in Pima County.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,000
Cash	(1,154)
Other	(1,846)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 6,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,207
Allocation for FY 2004	650
Allocation for FY 2005	663
Conference Amount for FY 2006	450
Allocation for FY 2006	445
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	35
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete draft Feasibility Report (F5) Apr 06 and Environmental Impact Statement, public review of draft documents, and final public meeting Oct 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Pending cost increase due to addition of Civil Works Review Board requirements and incorporating water supply into the recommended plan.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Pastor (AZ-4), Grijalva (AZ-7), Kolbe (AZ-8)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Rio Grande Basin, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 729 of WRDA 1986. Amended by Section 202 of WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The Rio Grande Basin is located in the states of Colorado, New Mexico and Texas, and encompasses an area over 160,000 square miles, from the headwaters in central Colorado to its mouth on the Gulf of Mexico near Brownsville, Texas.

DESCRIPTION: Water conveyance and delivery, ecosystem degradation, and flooding are major issues in the basin. Water supply and flood control in the Rio Grande Basin fall under the management and jurisdiction of an international treaty, an interstate compact, and several Federal, State and local agencies. The study will take a regional and collaborative perspective to investigate ecosystem restoration, water supply and invasive species issues.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,900
Cash	(1,900)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,800
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 708
Allocation for FY 2004	32
Allocation for FY 2005	94
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	247
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	819
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The on-going feasibility study for the "Forgotten River" reach includes contracting for geospatial data analysis and conducting geomorphological and environmental analysis, public meetings, feasibility scoping meeting, plan formulation and sponsor review.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study for "Forgotten River" Reach, Texas.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Salazar, CO-03; Wilson, NM-01; Pearce, NM-02; Udall, NM-03; Reyes, TX-16; Bonilla, TX-23

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME: Rio Grande Bosque Rehabilitation, New Mexico (Bosque Wildfires)

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 108-137, Section 116, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004

LOCATION: The project is located in the Middle Rio Grande bosque in and around Albuquerque, New Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes restoration of burned bosque areas and management measures to reduce future fire potential.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>O&M</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 11,637
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 11,637
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 3,000
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 4,677
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 4,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 3,960
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Restore areas that were burned during the summer of 2003 and undertake management measures that will reduce the fire potential in areas with a high fire risk. Measures will include removal of unnecessary jettyjacks, removal of dead wood, removal of non-native plants, planting of native species and related restoration and public safety measures.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project will be completed in FY 2007 using carryover funds from FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: Following fires that occurred in the Rio Grande Bosque in July 2003, Congress authorized the Corps to assist with restoration of the burned area and removal of flammable debris in the bosque. Up to \$12 million was earmarked from the Corps' Operation and Maintenance budget to undertake this work in fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rio Salado, Oeste, Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act 1938, Section 6 (Gila River & Tributaries), and House Resolution 2425, 17 May 1994

LOCATION: The study area is located along 8 miles of the Salt River, from 19th Avenue to 83rd Avenue, downstream (West or Oeste) of the ongoing Rio Salado project.

DESCRIPTION: The study will address restoration of riparian habitat in conjunction with water quality, flood control and recreation purposes.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,000
Cash	(1,320)
Other	(680)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 756
Allocation for FY 2004	390
Allocation for FY 2005	387
Conference Amount for FY 2006	230
Allocation for FY 2006	228
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	239
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete draft Feasibility Report (F5) Apr 06 and Internal Technical Review.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Pastor (AZ-4), Grijalva (AZ-7), Kolbe (AZ-8)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Russian River Ecosystem Restoration, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Public Work Resolution, September 1994

LOCATION: The study area consists of the Russian River, which is 110 miles long and flows into the Pacific Ocean about 55 miles north of the entrance to San Francisco Bay.

DESCRIPTION: The study will address the affects of flood control and other man made elements on the watershed; restoration of a sustainable riparian ecosystem and anadromous fish habitat; and other beneficial uses.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Feasibility</u> \$3,325
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,325
Cash	165
Other	3,160
Total Estimated Cost	\$6,650
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 687
Allocation for FY 2004	36
Allocation for FY 2005	165
Conference Amount for FY 2006	400
Allocation for FY 2006	396
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,041
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include continue feasibility phase including development of Watershed Management Plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Russian River Watershed Plan of Action fulfilled Phase I of the watershed study. Phase II will result in completing of a Russian River Watershed Management Plan. Included in the study will be evaluation of the affects of flood control and other man-made elements on the watershed, alternatives for restoration of a sustainable riparian ecosystem and anadromous fish habitat, and other beneficial uses.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Bernardino Lakes and Streams, California

AUTHORIZATION: Santa Ana River and Tributaries Authority, House Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, 8 May 1964

LOCATION: The study area is located approximately 50 miles east of Los Angeles in the City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County, California

DESCRIPTION: The study will focus on environmental restoration and sustainable development for a series of lakes and streams in the riparian corridor in connection with the Santa Ana River vicinity.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Recon</u>	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100	\$ 500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	500
Cash	0	(500)
Other	0	(0)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$100	\$1,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	0	0
Allocation for FY 2004	0	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100	150
Allocation for FY 2006	100	147
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0	353
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate and complete the recon phase in Jul 06 and initiate the feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Lewis (CA-41)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Jacinto River Environmental Restoration and Water Quality Improvement, San Jacinto, California (San Jacinto Basin Long-Term Storage Program)

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1936; WRDA 1986, PL 99-662; House Resolution 9 October 1998; Section 416 WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The San Jacinto River is located in the San Jacinto Watershed in Riverside County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The study will investigate the creation, preservation, and restoration of environmental and riparian habitat along the San Jacinto River, in the city of San Jacinto. The river provides floodwater conveyance and a source for water supply and wildlife habitat. In addition, the multi-purpose benefits of groundwater recharge, water supply and water recycling will be studied in conjunction with the proposed environmental restoration.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>Recon</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$28
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	23
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Review existing 905(b) Reconnaissance study for new sponsor.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable recon phase completion in FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressional Representatives: Bono (CA-45)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Joaquin Valley Region, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1936 (PL 74-738, Sec. 6)

LOCATION: The project is located in the San Joaquin Valley, in southern California, and includes the counties of Stanislaus, Madera, Merced, Fresno, Kings, Tulare and Kern.

DESCRIPTION: A reconnaissance study consisting of watershed management in the San Joaquin Valley.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Allocation for FY2006	\$100
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate and complete reconnaissance study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: A summit to initiate development of an integrated and comprehensive water plan for seven counties in the San Joaquin Valley in October 2005 resulted in ongoing coordination through four working groups to develop regional water needs associated with flood control, water supply, water quality, and environmental enhancement. The Corps continues to be engaged in the overall effort to determine the Federal interest in pursuing potential projects or a watershed study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Cardoza (CA-18); Radanovich (CA-19); Costa (CA-20); Nunes (CA-21); Thomas (CA-22); Senators Boxer and Feinstein

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Pablo Bay Watershed, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Northern California Streams, Section 209, Flood Control Act of 1962

LOCATION: The watershed is within the San Francisco Bay drainage basin in Marin, Sonoma, Napa, Solano and Contra Costa counties. San Pablo Bay is the northern arm of San Francisco Bay.

DESCRIPTION: The study will address potential Federal participation for environmental restoration of the area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,700
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,700
Cash	475
Other	2,225
Total Estimated Cost	\$5,400
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$1,019
Allocation for FY 2004	41
Allocation for FY 2005	275
Conference Amount for FY 2006	475
Allocation for FY 2006	470
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	895
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include continue feasibility, including identification of restoration areas, development of project restoration plans and provide technical, planning, and design assistance to program sponsors.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: San Pablo Bay Watershed and its associated wetlands are a critical stop along the Pacific Flyway, hosting tens of thousands of migratory waterfowl, shorebirds, and other avian species.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06, Miller CA-07, Pelosi CA-08

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santa Ana River and Tributaries, Big Bear Lake, California

AUTHORIZATION: Santa Ana River and Tributaries Authority, House Resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works, 8 May 1964

LOCATION: The study area is located in the San Bernardino Mountains, San Bernardino County, near the headwaters of the Santa Ana River.

DESCRIPTION: The local lake problems are a result of increased sedimentation deposits, which creates excessive noxious aquatic plant growth that contributes to shallow conditions and water quality issues. The study will address this broad range of issues and solutions for restoration of aquatic habitat for fish and wildlife, water quality, and flood control capabilities, which will improve public access and recreation opportunities

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,350
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,350
Cash	(4,350)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$8,700
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 97
Allocations for FY 2004	154
Allocations for FY 2005	815
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,400
Allocations for FY 2006	1,386
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,898
Benefit Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue baseline studies and complete the feasibility scoping meeting in Jun 06 and initiate alternative formulation activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Lewis (CA-41)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santa Clara River Watershed, California

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution by the Committee on Public Works, June 18, 1963; Public Law 406, 75th Congress, approved August 28, 1937

LOCATION: The Santa Clara River watershed is approximately 1,600 square miles and encompasses portions of Ventura and Los Angeles Counties.

DESCRIPTION: This dual-sponsored study will address problems and needs associated with flooding and ecosystem restoration opportunities. Key elements of the study are to develop hydrologic, hydraulic and sediment models for this watershed and a comprehensive Watershed Management Plan.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$4,050
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,050
Cash	(138)
Other	(3,912)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$8,100
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 200
Allocation for FY 2004	97
Allocations for FY 2005	179
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocations for FY 2006	247
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$3,327
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete topographic surveys and the hydrologic analysis for the watershed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Sponsors have an urgent need to complete this watershed study. Ventura County alone estimated flood related damages along the Santa Clara River to be over \$20 million from the storms in January 2005.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Capps (CA-23), Gallegly (CA-24), McKeon (CA-25)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santa Cruz River (Grant Road to Ft. Lowell Road), Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act 1938 (Gila River & Tributaries), and House Resolution 2425, 17 May 1994

LOCATION: Santa Cruz River reach from Congress to Prince (local name is El Rio Medio) is located approximately 5 miles northwest of downtown Tucson. The study would determine if there is Federal interest in providing ecosystem restoration along the river in this reach.

DESCRIPTION: The study would address restoration opportunities and identify measures that restore valuable environmental resources of the Santa Cruz River, restore riparian and wetland habitat, and improve water quality through natural filtration in constructed wetlands.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,625
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,625
Cash	(1,455)
Other	(170)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,250
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 35
Allocation for FY 2004	65
Allocation for FY 2005	276
Conference Amount for FY 2006	350
Allocation for FY 2006	346
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	903
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Work towards the Preliminary Alternative Report (F4) Nov 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Project Management Plan, approved in July 2005, has been revised to include the addition of water supply which has increased the study costs. An additional cost increase will occur for the flood damage reduction feature.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressman Grijalva (AZ-7); Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

**FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects**

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias Flood Control and Environmental Restoration), Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1938 (Gila River and Tributaries) and House Resolution 2425, 17 May 1994.

LOCATION: The Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias) is located in southeast Arizona within Pima County and flows through the city of Tucson, the second largest city in Arizona.

DESCRIPTION: The study will investigate the design and development of a low flow bank protection, incorporating historical, cultural, flood control, recreation, water resources, and environmental restoration. Emphasis will be placed on ecosystem restoration of existing degraded riparian habitat.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Feasibility</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,825	\$3,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,825	1,250
Cash	(860)	(1,250)
Other	(965)	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,650	\$5,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,194	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	252	0
Allocation for FY 2005	359	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	0	50
Allocation for FY 2006	20	29
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0	3,721
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Conduct State and Agency Review, Civil Works Review Board (F9) Oct 05, and complete Chief's Report in Feb 06. Execute the Design Agreement in Apr 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable PED phase completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Pastor (AZ-4), Grijalva (AZ-7), Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT /STUDY NAME: Santa Fe, New Mexico

AUTHORIZATION: Rio Grande and Tributaries, Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941 (PL 228-77) and House Resolution dated April 11, 1974.

LOCATION: The study is located in Santa Fe County, New Mexico, along the Santa Fe River in north central New Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The study will take a regional and collaborative perspective making recommendations for flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and watershed planning within the Santa Fe River watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>RECONNAISSANCE</u>	<u>FEASIBILITY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 178	\$ 900
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0	900
Cash	(0)	(900)
Other	(0)	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 178	\$1,800
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 117	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	17	0
Allocation for FY 2005	31	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	13	237
Allocation for FY 2006	13	233
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	0	667
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement and initiate the feasibility level watershed study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of the feasibility study in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The study area has suffered from flooding, erosion, and environmental degradation for many years. The City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County are the joint local sponsors.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Udall, NM-03.

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Santa Rosa Creek Ecosystem Restoration, CA

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Public Works Resolution, September 1994

LOCATION: Santa Rosa Creek is located in Santa Rosa, California.

DESCRIPTION: Santa Rosa Creek, a tributary to the Russian River, was channelized by the Soil Conservation Service in the 1960s to provide flood control protection to the surrounding City of Santa Rosa. The existing flood control structures have resulted in habitat loss. The sponsor initiated this study in 1999 to restore the degraded areas and restore parts of the creek as salmonid spawning habitat. A draft hydrologic study, completed in August 2002, concluded that the predicted one percent flows on the Santa Rosa Creek significantly exceed the capacity of the existing flood control structures. The sponsor has reviewed the Corps' hydrologic study and has requested that flood damage reduction be incorporated as a purpose of this study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,500
Cash	1,250
Other	1,250
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 656
Allocation for FY 2004	-41
Allocation for FY 2005	266
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,322
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Completion of the surveying and topographic mapping effort, which will be crucial in the development of existing floodplains and habitat surveys.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: There has been an impact to the study's schedule due to over a year delay in the survey/mapping effort being conducted by the Sponsor. The Corps and the Sponsor are working together to resolve the schedule impact. The mapping is important to determine the floodplains and associated flood damage reduction benefits. This information is needed to determine if the flood damage reduction component should be added to the study. The District requested the F3 milestone conference include a feasibility-scoping meeting to revisit the scope of the remaining feasibility work. At this time, it would be decided whether to include the flood damage reduction component, which would double the cost and time of the study. If this component is added, it could result in a nine year Feasibility Study, requiring funding at an average of \$500,000 per year.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sonoma Creek & Tributaries, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Northern California Streams, Section 209, Flood Control Act of 1962

LOCATION: Sonoma County, California

DESCRIPTION: Provide environmental restoration and flood protection. Potential solutions to be considered are flood plain restoration, setback levees for flood protection and stream restoration, beneficial reuse of dredged material, and geomorphic modifications to protect, restore, and enhance restoration of tidal, seasonal, and freshwater wetlands.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	Feasibility \$2,250
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,250
Cash	0
Other	2,250
Total Estimated Cost	\$4,500
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 297
Allocation for FY 2004	55
Allocation for FY 2005	150
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,649
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue feasibility phase work, including hydraulic analysis, topographic survey, environmental baseline data collection, geotechnical studies/reports (sediment modeling, Baylands load evaluation & source analysis, and soil survey) to establish baseline conditions of the watershed.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility study completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: N/A

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Thompson CA-01, Woolsey CA-06, Miller CA-07

DISTRICT: San Francisco

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sun Valley Watershed, California

AUTHORIZATION: House Public Works & Transportation Committee Resolution dated 11 June 1969 (LACDA)

LOCATION: The Sun Valley watershed study area is adjacent to the Tujunga Wash watershed in Sun Valley on the east side of the San Fernando Valley in California.

DESCRIPTION: Potential federal interest for Sun Valley Watershed was determined in the Tujunga Wash Environmental Restoration 905(b) Reconnaissance report. The study will evaluate the potential for environmental restoration and flood damage reduction within the Sun Valley Watershed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 1,650
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,650
Cash	(825)
Other	(825)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 3,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	148
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,502
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete a Project Management Plan and Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement and initiate the feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Berman (CA-28), Sherman (CA-27).

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lake Tahoe Basin, CA & NV

AUTHORIZATION: Committee Resolution, United States Senate, 19 Dec 95

LOCATION: The 500 square mile project is the Lake Tahoe Basin watershed in the Sierra Nevada Mountains straddling the border of California and Nevada approximately 50 miles southwest of Reno, NV.

DESCRIPTION: Lake Tahoe is a valuable environmental resource. Habitats have been substantially altered through construction and development activities resulting in significant losses in water quality and ecosystem diversity. The principal purpose of this PED is to provide design of implementing activities including technical and regulatory structures to improve environmental quality at Lake Tahoe while maintaining health of the economy.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 PED
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,167
Cash	1,167
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,667
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	93
Allocations for FY 2005	801
Conference Amount for FY 2006	860
Allocation for FY 2006	851
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,755
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: PED is very active with significant local participation, with initial products complete and next products in progress.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gibbons (NV-2); Doolittle (CA-4); Senators Reid and Ensign (NV); Senator Feinstein (CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tahoe Regional Planning, CA & NV

AUTHORIZATION: Section 211, Water Resources Development Act 1999 (amends Sec 503 of WRDA 96)

LOCATION: The 500 square mile project is the Lake Tahoe Basin watershed in the Sierra Nevada Mountains straddling the border of California and Nevada. The basin is approximately 100 miles northeast of Sacramento, CA and 50 southwest of Reno, NV.

DESCRIPTION: Lake Tahoe is a valuable environmental national resource. Habitats have been substantially altered through development and construction activities resulting in significant losses in water quality and ecosystem diversity. The principal purpose of this authority is to provide planning and design assistance to non-Federal entities in the implementation of pre-construction and programmatic assistance in support of the \$1.5 billion local, state, Federal and private Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), a broad watershed restoration effort.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,800
Cash	1,800
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	78
Allocations for FY 2005	204
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,423
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate and complete planning and design and initiate construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is unscheduled at this time.

OTHER INFORMATION: Multiple agreements with several watershed agencies are anticipated. First agreement with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) provides assistance with the EIP Science Advisory Group structure. Subsequent cost share agreements are being negotiated with Tahoe California Conservancy, Incline Village, and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gibbons (NV-2); Doolittle (CA-4); Senators Reid and Ensign (NV); Senator Feinstein (CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

STUDY NAME: Westminster/East Garden Grove Watershed Study, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1936, House Resolution dated 8 May 1964

LOCATION: The Watershed area encompasses approximately 90 square miles and is located in Western Orange County 25 miles southeast of the city of Los Angeles.

DESCRIPTION: The study will focus on watershed management, flood control, ecosystem restoration, water quality and water supply solutions. The watershed lies on a flat coastal plain, and is almost entirely urbanized with residential and commercial development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,750
Cash	(1,790)
Other	(960)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$5,500
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5
Allocation for FY 2004	65
Allocation for FY 2005	331
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Allocation for FY 2006	495
Balance to Complete After FY 06	\$ 1,854
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue the feasibility phase, hold Public Workshop in Jan 06, and complete baseline conditions report in Sep 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable feasibility phase completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Royce (CA-40), Rohrabacher (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME: Colonias – Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(c) (18), WRDA 1992. (Design Only)

LOCATION: Rural communities and neighborhoods located within 150 miles of the U.S.-Mexican border.

DESCRIPTION: Colonias have a lack adequate water supply and wastewater infrastructure and frequently also lack other basic services. Purpose of studies are to provide technical and design assistance concerning wastewater treatment facilities, water systems, intake structures, raw water pipelines and pumps, distribution lines, and storage tanks for Colonias in the United States located along the U.S.-Mexico border.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>PED</u> \$1,605
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	
Cash	535
Other	
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$2,140
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 294
Allocation FY 2004	63
Allocation FY 2005	339
Conference amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	860
Benefits to Cost Ratio	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds will be used to coordinate with the Texas Secretary of State Office and the Texas Water Development Board to identify additional high priority Colonias. Complete Planning and Design for Villa Nueva and continue Planning and Design for the La Presa Colonia. Complete Rose Acres Platting.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison; (TX) Congressmen Cuellar (TX-28), Hinojosa (TX-15), Edwards (TX-11), Doggett (TX-25), and Ortiz (TX-27)

DISTRICT: Galveston District

Date: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Grand (Neosho) River Basin Watershed, Kansas and Oklahoma

AUTHORIZATION: Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1965

LOCATION: The study area consists of the 8,000 square-mile Grand/Neosho River Basin above Pensacola Dam (Grand Lake) in northeastern Oklahoma and southeastern Kansas.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan in the reconnaissance report is a collection of separate structural and ecosystem restoration measures to address flood control and ecosystem issues and opportunities. Further coordination of local problems and opportunities is recommended for Baxter Springs, Oswego, Parsons, Neosho County, Chanute, Coffey County, Burlington, John Redmond Reservoir, Emporia, Council Grove Lake, and Marion Reservoir.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,200
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,000
Cash	(1,500)
Other	(1,500)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 6,200
Allocation thru FY2003	\$ 55
Allocation for FY 2004	73
Allocation for FY 2005	42
Conference Amount for FY 2006	150
Allocation for FY 2006	148
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,882
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete recon phase and initiate feasibility phase.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on execution of the feasibility cost sharing agreement in FY 2006, the earliest attainable completion date for the feasibility phase of the study is FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Brownback KS, Senator Roberts KS, Senator Inhofe OK, Congressmen Boren, OK-2, Moran, KS-1, Ryun, KS-2, and Tiahrt, (KS-4)

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Oologah Lake Watershed, Oklahoma and Kansas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 206, Flood Control Act 1958; Resolution adopted on May 25, 1960 by the House Committee on Public Works.

LOCATION: The Verdigris River basin drainage area is approximately 4,300 square miles and is located in southeastern Kansas and northeastern Oklahoma.

DESCRIPTION: The study will address impacts of upstream development on aquatic and terrestrial habitat within the Basin. Upstream development has also adversely affected the water quality at Oologah Lake, which is a water supply source for the city of Tulsa.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>STUDY</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 2,362
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,312
Cash	(2,312)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,674
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 229
Allocation for FY 2004	76
Allocation for FY 2005	202
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250
Allocation for FY 2006	247
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,607
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Feasibility studies activities will include conducting the feasibility scoping meeting, completing alternative formulation, and continue alternative screening.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion date for the feasibility phase of the study is FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: A feasibility cost-sharing agreement was signed in July 2002 with the Tulsa Metropolitan Utility Authority, the local sponsor. Kansas Water Office has expressed an interest in joining the study as a cost share sponsor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe, OK; Congressmen Sullivan, OK-1, and Boren, OK-2.

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment.

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Resacas at Brownsville, Texas.

AUTHORIZATION: House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Resolution , 10 November 1999.

LOCATION: The City of Brownsville is located along the Rio Grande River in south Texas and has requested a study of the Resacas of the Rio Grande. Resacas are small lakes and reservoirs formed from the meandering of the Rio Grande and are capable of providing a certain level of flood protection for the city (similar to detention reservoirs).

DESCRIPTION: The primary purpose of the study is environmental restoration. The study effort will evaluate the environmental restoration of the resacas, improved flood protection, and enhanced water storage.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>STUDY</u> \$ 2,066
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,966
Cash	(1,696)
Other	(270)
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 4,032
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 569
Allocation for FY 2004	195
Allocation for FY 2005	198
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	74
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	1,030
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal Year 2006 funds are being used to continue the plan formulation activities of the feasibility study. Work will include one or more of the following activities: surveys, development of the project conditions, soil borings, ecosystem restoration assessment modeling, and recommended plan determination.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008, assuming receipt of capability level funding.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement was signed on 17 April 2002. During the past 10 years, siltation and plant growth have reduced the capacity of the resacas, and the city would like to investigate economical ways of restoring and preserving the resacas. The non-Federal sponsor for the project is the Brownsville Public Utilities Board.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Cornyn and Hutchison (both TX); and Congressman Ortiz (TX-27).

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southeast Oklahoma Water Resource Study, Oklahoma

AUTHORIZATION: 1983 Supplemental Appropriations Act (PL 98-63)

LOCATION: The region includes the approximate southeast quadrant of Oklahoma, encompassing 29 counties that comprise both the Kiamichi River Basin and other sub-basins of tributaries to the Red River as well.

DESCRIPTION: The study will examine environmental restoration opportunities in the region to restore degraded habitat that has increased with land use changes. The majority of the 1,830-square mile study basin lies within the Ouachita ecoregion, one of the smallest ecoregions in the nation. The Ouachita ecoregion occupies approximately 0.2-percent of all the ecoregions in the U.S. This ecoregion hosts diverse assemblages of flora and fauna and is especially noted for the Federally-protected endangered mussel species in the Kiamichi River basin that comprises one of the three known populations in the nation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$3,586
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,476
Cash	(2,732)
Other	(744)
Total Estimated Cost	7,062
Allocations thru FY 2003	193
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	40
Allocation for FY 2006	40
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	3,353
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided will be used to continue feasibility studies, to include habitat evaluation and analysis of stream flow characteristics.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion for the feasibility phase of the study is FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Oklahoma Water Resources Board was the sponsor for Phase I of the study and will continue in subsequent phases.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Inhofe (OK)

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental (Ecosystem Restoration)

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southwest, Arkansas, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Red River Basin, AR, TX, LA, and OK Comprehensive Study Authority (PL 98-63).

LOCATION: Study area includes parts of four counties in Southwest, Arkansas in Red River/Little Red River Basins. The area contains four Army Corps of Engineers lakes: DeQueen, Dierks, Gillham, and Millwood.

DESCRIPTION: The watershed study would evaluate flooding, irrigation, restoration of fish and wildlife habitat, water quality, and water releases for navigation and recreation.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,225
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,125
Cash	(1,125)
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$2,350
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 45
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100,000
Allocation for FY 2006	99
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,081
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The funds provided will be used to identify local sponsors, prepare a Project Management Plan (PMP) and negotiate and execute the feasibility cost sharing agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: If the feasibility cost sharing agreement is executed in FY 2006, the earliest attainable completion date for the feasibility study would be FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: More than one sponsor could be identified for follow-on feasibility studies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Lincoln and Pryor, AR, Congressman Ross, AR-4.

DISTRICT: Little Rock District (SWL)

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Spavinaw Creek Watershed, Oklahoma and Arkansas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1965 (PL 89-298)

LOCATION: The 415-square mile watershed for Eucha and Spavinaw lakes is located in Mayes and Delaware Counties, Oklahoma and in Benton County, Arkansas

DESCRIPTION: The study will focus on lakes Eucha and Spavinaw, and the portion of Spavinaw Creek between the two lakes. Aquatic ecosystem degradation of both lakes has accelerated as the confined animal feeding operations, primarily poultry and swine, have increased. External and internal nutrient loading, thermal stratification of the lake, low dissolved oxygen content, and excessive algae blooms combine to impair the aquatic ecosystem and reduce water quality. The lakes are situated in the only portion of the Ozark Highlands ecoregion that lies within Oklahoma. This ecoregion represents the only extensive mountainous topography between the Appalachian Chain and the Rockies, and hosts the only flora and fauna associated with the oak/hickory forest cover in Oklahoma.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)	
		<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$	404
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		304
Cash		(265)
Other		(39)
Total Estimated Cost		708
Allocations thru FY 2003		22
Allocations for FY 2004		26
Allocations for FY 2005		86
Conference Amount for FY 2006		60
Allocation FY 2006		59
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		211
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue in plan formulation for feasibility study to analyze, screen, and select alternatives; conduct feasibility scoping meeting with headquarters; preliminary design and cost estimates; begin environmental analysis; produce draft feasibility report and environmental assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion for the feasibility phase of the study is FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Inhofe and Coburn (OK), Congressmen Sullivan (OK-1) and Boren (OK-2)

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Washita River Basin

AUTHORIZATION: Red River and Tributaries above Denison Dam, Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico, House Resolution dated 25 February 1938; Senate Resolutions dated 18 February 1954 and 19 June 1962.

LOCATION: The Washita River is a 7,790 square miles tributary to the Red River in Oklahoma. The Washita River flows into Lake Texoma, located on the Red River between Oklahoma and Texas.

DESCRIPTION: Federal interests were identified for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration. The city of Pauls Valley, Oklahoma, indicated an interest in flood control and ecosystem restoration. A number of other water resource problems and needs were identified, including watershed runoff conditions increasing the risks of golden algae blooms in the Washita arm of Lake Texoma, and all of Lake Texoma, that are toxic to fish and people. The Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation indicated a concern for the golden algae issue, but declined to participate with the Corps.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Study</u> \$ 450
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	350
Cash	(175)
Other	(175)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 800
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 70
Conference Amount for FY2004	30
Balance to Complete after FY2005	33
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation for FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	268
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Sponsor coordination continued in the first quarter of 2006, but no sponsors could be identified to continue into feasibility studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: A request was submitted to change the study status to inactive in January 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe, OK; and Congressman Cole, OK-4.

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wister Lake Watershed, Oklahoma, Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study

AUTHORIZATION: Resolution adopted January 28, 1955 by the Senate Committee on Public Works

LOCATION: Wister Lake is located on the Poteau River at river mile 60.9, approximately 2 miles south of Wister, in LeFlore County, Oklahoma.

DESCRIPTION: This aquatic ecosystem restoration study will evaluate alternatives for in-lake solutions at Wister Lake. Excessive sedimentation and turbidity; wind and wave action, external and internal nutrient loading; excessive algae growth; thermal stratification and low dissolved oxygen levels; and excessive iron and manganese compounds re-suspending into the water from lake bed sediments are problems impairing the ecosystem at Wister Lake and contributing to habitat loss and degradation of the aquatic environment in the lake.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 300
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	200
Cash	(0)
Other	(200)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 500
Allocations thru FY2003	69
Allocations FY 2004	21
Allocations FY 2005	41
Conference Amount for FY 2006	50
Allocation FY 2006	49
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	120
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided will be used for feasibility scoping meeting, screening of alternatives, alternative selection, conduct environmental assessment and economic studies, final design and cost estimate and to complete draft feasibility report and environmental assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion for the feasibility phase of the study is FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Wister Lake is located in the Crosstimbers Ecoregion, one of the most altered ecoregions in the U.S. The Federally protected American Burying Beetle is known to occur downstream from the dam, and the lake provides a migratory link between the

waterfowl refuge to the north and a State wildlife and forest management area to the southwest. The lake is also rich in cultural resources and has many sites listed on the National Register for Historic Places. This study receives direct appropriations from the state legislature and is keenly watched by OK State Senator Corn.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe (OK), Congressman Boren (OK-2)

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

CONSTRUCTION

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME: Calumet Region, IN

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219f(12) of WRDA 1992 (PL 102-580), as amended

LOCATION: This project covers needs in Benton, Jasper, Lake, Newton, and Porter Counties, in the state of Indiana.

DESCRIPTION: This project will provide technical planning, design and construction to non-federal interests who have environmental infrastructure needs in Benton, Jasper, Lake, Newton, and Porter Counties, IN. These needs include development of wastewater treatment and related facilities and water supply, treatment, and distribution.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$30,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	10,000
Cash	10,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	40,000
Allocations to FY 2003	6,880
Allocation for FY 2004	1,418
Allocation for FY 2005	1,965
Allocations for FY 2006	16,767
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design and execute the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) to initiate construction of Hammond Sanitary District (HSD) Storm Sewer Relief Interceptor; execute the PCA to initiate the construction contract to connect seven residences to Chesterton's sanitary sewer; executed a PCA to demolish an old treatment plant in Portage; execute the PCA to initiate construction of the City of Valparaiso Union Street Area Storm Sewer Project Phase I, Project I; and complete design of sewer improvement projects with New Chicago and Cedar Lake.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: Complete construction of Portage by FY 06; HSD by FY 07; Chesterton by FY 07. In addition, complete design of New Chicago and Cedar Lake by FY 06.

OTHER INFORMATION: FY06 funds being carried over due to delay by sponsor in getting approval for the recommended plan for Gary Headworks design and delay on Hammond project due to HSD decision to use their design consultant.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Visclosky (IN-1)

DISTRICT: Chicago

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Central West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure, WV

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 571 WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53)

LOCATION: The area consists of twenty counties in central West Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: The program purpose is to provide design and construction assistance for environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development, including projects for wastewater treatment, water supply, and surface water resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 10,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,333
Cash	3,333
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 13,333
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 281
Allocation for FY 2004	329
Allocation for FY 2005	766
Conference Amount for FY 2006	563
Allocation for FY 2006	557
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	8,067
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue design and construction activities for projects initiated prior to FY 2006, and initiate new projects upon completion of selection process.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phase ongoing and subject to future appropriation.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Capito (WV-2), Byrd (WV), Rockefeller (WV)

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME: Cook County, IL

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992 (PL 102-580), Section 219(f)(54), as amended in Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001, (PL 106-554), see HR 4577, Chapter 14, Division B, Section 108.

LOCATION: This project is located in Cook County, IL.

LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION: This project provides technical planning, design and construction assistance to non-federal interests who have environmental infrastructure needs. These needs may be related but not limited to development and protection of water supply systems and waste water systems, combined sewer overflows, and remediation of adverse water quality impacts and storm water impacts to waste water systems. Currently the projects identified for applicability to this authorization are Calumet Park, Flossmoor, Brookfield Zoo, Chicago Heights and La Grange.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2007 Construction (\$000)</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$35,000 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$11,666
Cash	11,666
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$46,666
Allocations to FY 2003	406
Allocation for FY 2004	171
Allocation for FY 2005	289
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	33,763
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute PCA and initiate construction of sewer improvements at two schools in Calumet Park. Coordinate with Brookfield Zoo on proposed water, sanitary and storm line replacement, repairs and extensions for construction in FY07. Coordinate with the Village of La Grange on the proposed approximately 2600 lineal foot, 72-inch Maple Ave. relief sewer for initiating construction in FY07. Continue coordination with Chicago Heights on possible future stormwater drainage improvement project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete construction of Calumet Park by FY07. Complete construction at Brookfield Zoo in FY07. Complete construction on the Village of La Grange project in FY08.

OTHER INFORMATION: \$35,000,000 is the amount authorized to be appropriated to this project pursuant to Section 108 and is the maximum Federal participation unless modified by later law.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lipinski (IL-3), Jackson (IL-2)

DISTRICT: Chicago

DATE: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Genesee County, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f)(59), Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992 (PL 102-580), as amended.

LOCATION: Genesee County, Michigan

DESCRIPTION: The Genesee County Drain Commission (GCDC) provides sanitary sewer collection and treatment for a service area over 680 square miles, for 32 municipalities in 6 counties including Genesee, Oakland, Lapeer, Saginaw, Shiawassee and Livingston. The existing wastewater collection and treatment infrastructure has reached its planned capacity. The project consists of 2 separable elements. The first is the design and construction of a Precipitation Gauge Network to anticipate capacity stresses. The second separable element is the Kearsley Creek Interceptor (KCI), which involves the design of approximately 22 miles of interceptor sanitary sewers to accommodate regional service needs and to provide infrastructure for economic growth and development.

	FY 2006 (\$000)
<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,700 /1
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,233
Cash	2,233
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 8,933
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 190
Allocation for FY 2004	17
Allocation for FY 2005	192
Conference Amount in FY 2006	338
Allocation for FY 2006	335
Balance to complete after FY 2006	5,966
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (TBD)	
1/ Amount reflects the Project's authorized Federal limit.	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Letter Report for KCI in Jan-06 and Execute Design Agreement for the KCI in Feb-06. Award KCI Design contract in Apr-06. Award Construction Contract for the Precipitation Gauge Network in Mar-06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction of Precipitation Gauge Network to be completed in FY 2006. Design of Kearsley Creek Interceptor to be completed in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Levin (MI); Representatives Kildee (MI-09), Miller (MI-10), Rogers (MI-08)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration (GLFER), Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York and Wisconsin

AUTHORIZATION: Section 506 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2000 (PL 106-541)

LOCATION: Multiple sites throughout the Great Lakes basin

DESCRIPTION: Congress has found that the Great Lakes comprise a nationally and internationally significant fishery and ecosystem, one that should be developed and enhanced in a coordinated manner. This program enables the Corps to utilize its planning, design, and construction expertise for projects to restore the Great Lakes fishery and ecosystem. Development of a support plan to define how the program will be implemented involved cooperation with basin-wide representatives from natural resource agencies and tribal authorities. A wide range of environmental projects could be executed under this program, including riparian habitat and wetland restoration, dam removal to reestablish free flowing tributaries, construction of fish passage over existing structures, improving spawning and nursery habitat, erosion and sedimentation control, and construction of facilities to preserve historic fish stocks. Basin-wide, fishery and natural resource interests have a strong interest in this program to help eliminate and control non-indigenous species introductions, a major threat to the Great Lakes ecosystem. The Great Lakes Fishery Commission is sponsor for Support/implementation Plan development. State and local agencies, and non-profit organizations are eligible to sponsor individual projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ TBD /1
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	TBD /1
Cash	TBD /1
Other	TBD /1
Total Estimated Cost	\$ TBD /1
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	71
Allocation for FY 2005	430
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	TBD /1
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

1/ Program will entail implementation of multiple projects throughout the Great Lakes basin.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 Funds will be utilized to finalize the program support plan, coordinate with potential non-Federal sponsors and complete Preliminary Restoration Plans for the highest priority projects identified thus far, and to initiate feasibility phase work. High priority projects identified to date include: Red Mill Pond (IN), Boardman River Dam Removal (MI), Frankenmuth Dam Fish Passage (MI), Ford Estate Dam Fish Passage (MI), Ballville Dam (OH), Cattaraugus Creek (NY).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Program will entail construction of various fishery and ecosystem restoration projects throughout the Great Lakes basin. It is anticipated that the first project will be constructed in FY07.

OTHER INFORMATION: A Project Implementation/Support Plan has been drafted in partnership with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission (GLFC) and is currently under review at ASA(CW). Previous ASA(CW) guidance has directed that CG funds can be used to continue and initiate projects and program coordination activities concurrent with support plan finalization.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Levin (MI), Stabenow (MI), Feingold (WI), Kohl (WI), Bayh (IN), Lugar (IN), Voinovich (OH); Representatives Upton (MI-06), Stupak (MI-01), Hoekstra (MI-02), Camp (MI-04), Obey (WI-07), Visclosky (IN-01), Kaptur (OH-09), Lipinski (IL-03)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: George W Kuhn Drain, Oakland County, Michigan (Twelve Towns Drain)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f)(29), Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992 (PL 102-580), as amended.

LOCATION: The George W. Kuhn Drain is located in the southeast corner of Oakland County in southeast Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: The Twelve Towns Drainage Improvement Project renamed the George W. Kuhn Drain is in the final phases. The sponsor is the Oakland County Drain Commission (OCDC).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u> (\$000)	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 20,000 /1
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,635
Cash	6,635
Other	0
Total Estimated Study Cost	\$ 26,635
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 308
Allocation for FY 2004	306
Allocation for FY 2005	272
Conference Amount in FY 2006	50
Allocations in FY 2006	49
Balance to complete after FY 2006	19,065
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (TBD)	

1/ Amount reflects the Project's authorized Federal limit.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete Environmental Coordination for Phase 3 design and complete design phase Aug-06. Coordinate with sponsor on new design efforts.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Design of all currently identified phases will be completed in Sep-06. New design efforts to be coordinated in Feb-06.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 219 (WRDA 1992), as amended, authorizes a \$20.0 million Federal participation in a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in Oakland County. The authority requires 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal cost sharing. All costs in excess of the authorized Federal amount will be the responsibility of the non-Federal sponsor. The OCDC has not yet identified all desired scopes of work for Federal participation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Levin (MI); Representatives Rogers (MI-08), Knollenberg (MI-09), McCotter (MI-11), Levin (MI-12)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Indianapolis Environmental Infrastructure, IN

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219 of WRDA 1992, P.L. 102-580, as amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001, P.L. 106-554, Appendix D, Division B, Section 108 and EWDA 2004, P.L. 108-137, Section 153

LOCATION: Indianapolis is located in Marion County on the White River in central Indiana.

DESCRIPTION: The city is formulating a plan to mitigate water quality impacts from its combined sewer overflows (CSOs). The relatively low flow of the White River magnifies the water quality impacts from CSOs as well as from other point source and non-point source discharges into the White River. The initial phase of this project will identify and evaluate modifications that should be included in the city's final CSO Long Term Control Plan to improve compatibility with the Central Indianapolis Waterfront Concept Master Plan, specifically for the Fall Creek segment, and provide a recommended sequence for construction of selected design alternatives.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Design</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 35,500	TBD
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	11,825	TBD
Cash	11,825	TBD
Other	0	TBD
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 47,325	TBD
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 45	0
Allocation for FY 2004	314	0
Allocation for FY 2005	889	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	275	0
Allocation for FY 2006	272	0
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	33,980	TBD
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue technical planning and design assistance for the Fall Creek segment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of design depends on availability of funding (both federal and non-federal). There are many large dollar design contracts, such as geotechnical investigations, hydraulic modeling, etc. that need to be awarded to complete design. Authorization for construction is contained in FY 2004 EWDA. Smaller construction projects would be attainable as early as FY 2006 pending Sponsor approval/financing and execution of a PCA.

OTHER INFORMATION: Upgrade of water/sewer systems and development of potable water are important for public health and welfare.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Lugar (IN), Bayh (IN), Visclosky (IN-01), Carson (IN-07)

DISTRICT: Louisville

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Negaunee, Michigan

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f)(60), Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992 (PL 102-580), as amended.

LOCATION: The City of Negaunee is located near the south shore of Lake Superior in Alger County, Michigan.

DESCRIPTION: The project involves necessary upgrades to the city's wastewater treatment plant and related infrastructure to meet 2004 State and Federal mandated wastewater treatment permit requirements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 10,000 /1
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,333
Cash	3,333
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 13,333
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 196
Allocation for FY 2004	168
Allocation for FY 2005	444
Conference Amount in FY 2006	200
Allocation for FY 2006	198
Balance to complete after FY 2006	8,994
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (TBD)	

1/ Amount reflects the Project's authorized Federal limit.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Construction of the second round Federal participatory projects will be accomplished in Feb-06. A Letter Report and Design and Construct Agreement for the third phase of Federal participatory projects will be initiated in Apr-06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction of the second round Federal participatory projects will be accomplished in Feb-06. Completion of the third phase will be in Nov-06.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Levin (MI); Representative Stupak (MI-01)

DISTRICT: Detroit

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ohio Environmental Infrastructure

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 594 (g) of WRDA 1999, as amended by Section 130 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2006.

LOCATION: The Ohio Environmental Infrastructure Program provides assistance to communities throughout the state of Ohio.

DESCRIPTION: The program provides for design and construction assistance of environmental infrastructure projects. The focus of the program is on water and wastewater treatment, combined sewer overflow problems, acid mine drainage, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development. Reimbursable projects are allowed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost *	\$240,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	80,000
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$320,000
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 5,487
Allocation for FY 2004	4,647
Allocation for FY 2005	19,545
Conference Amount for FY 2006	13,000
Allocation for FY 2006	12,870
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	197,451
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate: N/A	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio: N/A	
* Current Authority Limit	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue design and construction activities for projects initiated prior to FY 2006, and initiate 26 projects identified in FY 2006 Conference Report.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phases ongoing and subject to future appropriation.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Voinovich (OH), DeWine (OH); entire Ohio delegation – 18 districts

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION GENERAL)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Onondaga Lake, New York

AUTHORIZATION: Section 573, WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53), as amended.

LOCATION: Onondaga Lake is located in north central New York State and is a part of the New York State Barge Canal System and Oswego River System. The city of Syracuse is located along the south shore of the lake. The lake empties into the Seneca River, also a part of the NYS Barge Canal.

DESCRIPTION: Onondaga Lake has a total drainage area of 285 square miles and a surface area of 4.6 square miles. The major water resource problem associated with the lake is its degraded water quality and habitat. Buffalo District leads the Onondaga Lake Partnership (OLP) consisting of local, state, and Federal agencies in developing and implementing lake and watershed improvement projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 30,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,857
Cash	12,857
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 42,857
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 10,910
Allocation in FY 2004	0
Allocation in FY 2005	2,200
Conference Amount for (BY-1)	3,500
Allocation in FY 2006	3,465
Balance to Complete after (BY-1)	13,425
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds appropriated in FY01 and FY02 are being used by the Corps to execute 4 ongoing projects and 5 on-going grants. Funds appropriated in FY05 are being used to execute 1 new grant agreement for combined sewer overflow abatement. The Corps will use the Construction General funds appropriated in FY06 to execute additional design and grant agreements through the OLP to continue combined sewer overflow abatement and other water quality and habitat improvement projects.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project phase is authorized through 2014 and subject to unbudgetable annual appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: Corps cannot budget Construction General (CG) funds under the current authority because projects are environmental infrastructure projects, which are not consistent with Administration Policy. Section 131 of Energy & Water

Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-103) amended Section 573, WRDA 1999 as follows:

ONONDAGA LAKE, NEW YORK.--Section 573 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 372) is amended--

(1) in subsection (f) by striking "\$10,000,000" and inserting "\$30,000,000";

(2) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Walsh (NY-25), Schumer (NY), Clinton (NY).

DISTRICT: Buffalo

Date: 23 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southern and Eastern Kentucky Environmental Infrastructure

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 531 of WRDA 1996 (PL 104-303), as amended by Sec. 532 of WRDA 1999 (PL 106-53); amended by Sec. 127 of EWDA 2003, Division D (PL 108-7).

LOCATION: The project location comprises a 29 county region in southern and eastern Kentucky.

DESCRIPTION: The program provides for design and construction assistance of environmental infrastructure projects. The focus of the program is on wastewater treatment and collection systems and environmental restoration in cooperation with Kentucky PRIDE. Reimbursable projects are allowed.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost *	\$ 40,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,333
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 53,333
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 19,937
Allocation for FY 2004	100
Allocation for FY 2005	2,186
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	16,292
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio:	N/A
* Current Authority Limit	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue design and construction activities for selected projects; select future projects in conjunction with Kentucky PRIDE.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phase ongoing and subject to future appropriation.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rogers (KY-05); Bunning (KY); McConnell (KY).

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 340 of Water Resource Development Act 1992, as amended by Sec. 359 of P. L. 104-303, Sec. 368 of P. L. 106-53, and Sec. 550 of P. L. 106-541.

LOCATION: The project area consists of sixteen counties in southern West Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: The program provides for design and construction assistance for environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development, including projects for wastewater treatment, water supply, surface water resource protection and development, and environmental restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost *	\$ 40,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,333
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 53,333
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 9,429
Allocation for FY 2004	215
Allocation for FY 2005	3,770
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	25,844
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio:	N/A
* Current Authority Limit	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue design and construction activities for projects initiated prior to FY 2006 and select new project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Phases ongoing and subject to future appropriation.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Byrd (WV), Rockefeller (WV); Rahall (WV-03).

DISTRICT: Huntington

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, Pennsylvania

AUTHORIZATION: Section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1992 (Public Law 102-580); Section 107 of the Energy and Water Resources Appropriations Act (E&WDAA), 1996; Section 345 of the Water Resources Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-303); E&WDAA, 1998 (Public Law 105-62) and 1999 (Public Law 105-245); Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1999; Sections 351 and 548 of WRDA 99 (Public Law 106-53); Section 101 of the FY05 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Public Law 108-447).

LOCATION: Pennsylvania

DESCRIPTION: The program consists of an 18 county area in South Central Pennsylvania. The program involves design and construction of projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply, storage treatment and distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 180,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 60,000
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$240,000
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 99,120
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 5,800
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 9,935
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$ 9,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 8,910
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 56,235
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%):	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES (LRP only): Fully fund previously executed PCA's for Fayette Business Park, Menallen, Mt. Pleasant, and Quemahoning. Execute new PCAs for Franklin Twp, Central Mainline, New Kensington, and National Pike.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: The amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 313, as amended, currently is \$180,000,000 and is the maximum Federal participation unless modified by later law.

Pursuant to section 313, as amended, funds appropriated in FY 93 through FY 97 are to be allocated 50 percent to the Chesapeake Watershed (NAD) and 50 percent to the Ohio River Watershed (LRD). Pursuant to section 313, as amended, and the E&WDAA, 1998, funds appropriated in FY 98 are allocated 1/3 to Chesapeake, 1/3 to Ohio, and 1/3 to Northeastern Pennsylvania. Pursuant to the E&WDAA, 1999, 1/3 of funds appropriated in FY 99 are allocated to Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Section 102 of the E&WDAA, FY00 and FY01 limits reimbursements to \$10 million per project/program per fiscal year and \$50 million for all projects/programs nationwide per fiscal year.

The E&WDAA, 98, 99, and 00 and section 206 of the WRDA 99 prohibit the application of a fully allocated funding policy to this project, among others, and requires the award of continuing contracts. This project will be implemented in accordance with those laws.

Subject to the above limitations on allocations, available project funds will be reallocated among project elements if necessary to support ongoing contracts. Should the maximum Federal participation be attained or appropriated funds be exhausted project-wide, either ongoing projects will be terminated or contributed funds will be obtained from non-Federal sponsors to support these projects.

Section 101 of the FY05 Consolidated Appropriations Act limits reimbursements to \$10 million per state per fiscal year.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: English (PA-03), Hart (PA-4), Peterson PA (PA-5), Shuster (PA-9), Sherwood (PA-10), Kanjorski(PA-11) Murtha (PA-12), Doyle (PA-14), Murphy (PA-18)

DISTRICT: Pittsburgh

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Program
(Chartiers Direct Stream Removal 1)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219, WRDA 1992, as amended by Section 504, WRDA 1996; Section 502, WRDA 1999 and Section 108, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act 2001.

LOCATION: Allegheny County, PA

DESCRIPTION: Allegheny County has over 80 communities with sanitary sewer systems that overflow raw sewage into streams and rivers during wet weather. This 200 square mile area contains a population of approximately 850,000. Project would consist of technical, planning, design and construction assistance to the Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Program (3RWWDP). Assistance would be to priority areas of the County which are under a court order by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows. The 3RWWDP is a partnership of regulatory agencies, municipalities, governmental and environmental groups working to develop solutions to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Design and Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$20,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 6,667
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$26,667
Allocations thru FY2003	\$ 346
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 46
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 390
Conference Amount for FY2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 742
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$18,476
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%):	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design and prepare a construction PCA for Sheraden Park. Complete letter report and prepare PMP and PCA for Homestead Run.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: The Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority have provided a letter of intent for Sheraden Park. Three Rivers Wet Weather program managers have consulted with local communities about future projects and their support as potential non-Federal sponsors is expected.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Santorum (PA), Doyle (PA-14)

DISTRICT: Pittsburgh

Date: 26 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ascension Parish, LA (Environmental Infrastructure)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 219, WRDA 92; Sec 502, WRDA 99; Sec 108, CAA 01

LOCATION: The project is located in southeastern Louisiana in Ascension Parish.

DESCRIPTION: The project will provide for sewer and water related infrastructure development including a 7.5 MGD Regional wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), collection system, and small improvement projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,667
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,222
Cash	(2,222)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 8,889
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 159
Allocation for FY 2004	880
Allocation for FY 2005	360
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 4,897
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete design of Phase I of the Regional WWTP near Prairieville, LA.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter.

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: DeSoto County Wastewater Treatment, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 219, WRDA 92; Sec 502, WRDA 99; Sec 108, CAA 01; Section 6006, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005; Section 123, E&WDA 06.

LOCATION: DeSoto County is located in north Mississippi, just south of Memphis, TN.

DESCRIPTION: The county's rapid growth necessitates expansion of existing sewer systems and the development of new systems into one unified countywide system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 55,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	65,000
Cash	(tbd)
Other	(tbd)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 120,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5,056
Allocation for FY 2004	9,086
Allocation for FY 2005	6,358
Conference Amount for FY 2006	20,000
Allocation for FY 2006	19,800
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	14,700
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete construction on all five construction contracts for the eastern division treatment system that were awarded in prior fiscal years (\$5.2M). The eastern system is scheduled to be placed in operation in Feb 06. FY06 funds will also be used to support interim accounting and provide reimbursement to the sponsor so as to achieve an approximate 75/25 cost sharing (\$6.0M); FY06 funds will be used to develop a new Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) for future work performed under Section 123 of Public Law 109-10 and coordinate its approval with ASA(CW) (\$0.5M). Execution of the PCA is scheduled for July 2006. The new PCA will allow for the Non-Federal sponsor to be primarily responsible for all future work, subject to oversight by the government. The balance of FY06 funds will be carried over to reimburse the sponsor for project costs incurred in FY07 (\$8.1M).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006 for construction under Section 219 of WRDA 92, as amended.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 123 of Public Law 109-10 allows non-Federal sponsor to make contract awards, with the Corps providing reimbursements after projects costs are incurred and approved. This will result in a carryover of FY06 funds. Since Federal participation is limited to \$55,000,000, the non-Federal sponsor will be responsible for all costs above that amount. If the sponsor pursues its envisioned \$120,000,000 project, the authorized 75% Federal/25% non-Federal cost share would not be achieved.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Wicker (MS-1); Sen: Cochran and Lott (MS).

DISTRICT: Memphis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: East Baton Rouge Parish, LA (Environmental Infrastructure)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 219, WRDA 92; Sec 502, WRDA 99; Sec 108, CAA 01

LOCATION: The project is located in East Baton Rouge Parish, LA.

DESCRIPTION: The project will provide for sewer and water related infrastructure development including survey monumentation and other small improvement projects

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,667
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,222
Cash	(2,222)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 8,889
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 140
Allocation for FY 2004	1,139
Allocation for FY 2005	444
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,573
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to design and construct sewer force mains in the East Baton Rouge vicinity, develop a sewer plan for the downtown Baton Rouge Area, and continue the monumentation effort.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME: East St. Louis & Vicinity, Illinois, Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Damage Reduction

AUTHORIZATION: Section 204, FCA 65; Section 137, WRDA 76; E&WDAA 97; Section 310, WRDA 00.

LOCATION: The original project is located in Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois, along the east bank of the Mississippi River between river miles 175 and 195 above the mouth of the Ohio River.

DESCRIPTION: The project area includes approximately 55,000 acres of flood plain that is protected by a levee system along the Mississippi River, the Chain of Rocks Canal, the Prairie du Pont Canal, and the Cahokia Creek Diversion Channel and an additional 51,000 acres of upland area that drain into these bottomlands. The project will restore bottomland forest habitat (1,700 acres), flood plain prairie habitat (1,100 acres), marsh and shrub swamp habitat (840 acres), lake habitat (460 acres), and upland riparian forest (380 acres). It will also restore 10 miles of flood plain stream and 178 miles of tributary streams. Flood damage reduction is incidental to the restoration project with an estimated \$1,445,000 in reduced average annual flood damages.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 126,807
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	68,351
Cash	(33,801)
Other	(34,550)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 195,158
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 2,914
Allocation for FY 2004	117
Allocation for FY 2005	45
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	123,434
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A %)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete preconstruction engineering and design; and, pending authorization, execute PCA in 3rd quarter and initiate construction in 4th quarter.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Chief's Report was signed in December 2004. Based on change in project outputs and cost, congressional authorization is required for construction.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Costello (IL-12); Sen: Durbin and Obama (IL).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Iberia Parish, LA (Environmental Infrastructure)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 219, WRDA 92; Sec 108, CAA 01

LOCATION: The project is located in Iberia Parish, Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides planning, design and construction assistance for sewer and water related environmental infrastructure improvements including a 1.5 MGD wastewater treatment plant to serve the northern part of the parish.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)

	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,666
Cash	(1,666)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 6,666
Allocations thru FY 2003	36
Allocation for FY 2004	438
Allocation for FY 2005	56
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,099
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete design of a 1.5 MGD wastewater treatment plant to serve the northern part of the parish.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Boustany (LA-7); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Livingston Parish, LA (Environmental Infrastructure)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 219, WRDA 92; Sec 502, WRDA 99; Sec 108, CAA 01

LOCATION: The project is located in Livingston Parish, Louisiana.

DESCRIPTION: The project will provide planning, design and construction assistance for sewer and water related environmental infrastructure improvements including a comprehensive infrastructure master plan for the parish, small improvement projects within the current sewer and water systems, and other related features.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)

	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 6,666
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,221
Cash	(2,221)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 8,887
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 54
Allocation for FY 2004	644
Allocation for FY 2005	139
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	371
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	5,458
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to construct sludge drying beds and force main improvements for the Parish Sewer District #1 and advance recommendations of the master plan.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Baker (LA-6); Sen: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT NAME: Madison and St. Clair Counties, IL

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f)(55), WRDA 92; Section 504, WRDA 96; Section 502, WRDA 99; Section 108(d)(55), CAA 01.

LOCATION: The project is located in Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of separating out combined sanitary and storm water sewers to improve water quality and reduce sewer backups into homes and replacing undersized and broken sanitary sewer lines.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$10,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,300
Cash	(3,300)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$13,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,158
Allocation for FY 2004	144
Allocation for FY 2005	1,435
Conference Amount for FY 2006	750
Allocation for FY 2006	742
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	6,521
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (_____ %)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue construction on the combined sewer overflow project for the City of Belleville, Illinois.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funds were reprogrammed from the project in prior years with a commitment to restore as needed. The next items of work to be accomplished would be additional components in the City of Belleville and preparation of plans and specifications for a combined sewer overflow problem in the Eagle Park neighborhood in Madison County.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Costello (IL-12) and Shimkus (IL-19); Sen: Durbin and Obama (IL).

DISTRICT: St. Louis District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: Mille Lacs Regional Wastewater, MN (Garrison/Kathio Township)

AUTHORIZATION: Sec. 219, WRDA 92; Sec. 108 (d) (61), CAA 2001

LOCATION: The City of Garrison and Kathio Township are located on the western shore of Mille Lacs Lake, Crow Wing and Mille Lacs Counties, Minnesota.

DESCRIPTION: Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended by Section 108(d)(61) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001 authorized \$11,000,000 for a wastewater infrastructure project for the City of Garrison and Kathio Township, Minnesota. The proposed project involves construction of a regional sewage collector system in Mille Lacs County that would service the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe and the surrounding localities. The collection system would replace the area's patchwork of unreliable septic tanks.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 11,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,666
Cash	(3,656)
Other	(10)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 14,666
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 46
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	161
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,125
Allocation for FY 2006	1,114
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	9,679
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: A design agreement was signed on 4 April 2005 between the Corps of Engineers and Garrison-Kathio-West Mille Lacs Lake Sanitary (GKWMLL) District, and a contract is underway for project design. Project design and environmental compliance activities are scheduled for completion during the 3rd quarter of FY 06. A construction Project Cooperation Agreement will be executed during the 4th quarter of FY 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Legislative Drafting Service (LDS) were requested for WRDA language to expand the project area to include other portions of Crow Wing county between City of Garrison and Kathio Township. This will be critical for execution of Construction Project Cooperation Agreement. LDS were also provided to expand project area to allow for the provision of sanitary services on additional Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Reservation lands.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Oberstar (MN-8); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN)

DISTRICT: St. Paul District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Mississippi Environmental Infrastructure, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 592, WRDA 99; Sec 120, E&WDAA 2004; Sec 101, CAA 2005.

LOCATION: The Mississippi (Section 592) project provides environmental infrastructure assistance to communities throughout the State of Mississippi.

DESCRIPTION: Project includes project design and construction assistance for wastewater treatment and related facilities, combined sewer overflows, water supply and storage and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 100,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	33,333
Cash	(0)
Other	(33,333)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 133,333
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,159
Allocation for FY 2004	1,903
Allocation for FY 2005	11,777
Conference Amount in FY 2006	25,000
Allocation for FY 2006	24,750
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	60,411
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue projects in Madison County, Hancock County (Pearlington), City of Olive Branch, City of Helena, Coahoma County, Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College, City of Vicksburg, West Rankin, and City of Gulfport; and to initiate new projects in Mississippi.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Update of water/sewer systems and development of potable water is important for public health and welfare. The amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to Section 592 currently is \$100,000,000 and is the maximum Federal participation unless modified by later law. Available program funds will be reallocated among project elements as necessary to support ongoing design and construction. Should the maximum Federal participation be attained or appropriated funds be exhausted program-wide, each non-Federal sponsor has the option of either suspending work on its project pending receipt of additional Federal authority and/or Federal funds or, for PCAs executed to date, terminating the PCA with the Federal Government and continuing work on its project without Federal participation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Wicker (MS-1), Thompson (MS-2), Pickering (MS-3), Taylor (MS-4); Sen: Lott and Cochran (MS).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Northeastern Minnesota, MN

AUTHORIZATION: Section 569, WRDA 99.

LOCATION: The area considered for assistance includes the Minnesota counties of Cook, Lake, St. Louis, Koochiching, Itasca, Cass, Crow Wing, Aitkin, Carlton, Pine, Kanabec, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Benton, Sherburne, Isanti, and Chisago.

DESCRIPTION: Section 569 provides the Corps of Engineers the authority to assist public entities in the 17-county area with water-related infrastructure projects. Work under Section 569 may be in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in northeastern Minnesota, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 40,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,333
Cash	(varies by project)
Other	(varies by project)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 53,333
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 5,171
Allocation for FY 2004	386
Allocation for FY 2005	660
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,750
Allocation for FY 2006	3,712
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	30,071
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Construction is continuing on four projects with PCAs signed in FY 05 including Koochiching County, Bois Forte Indian Reservation, Biwabik and Grand Portage Indian Reservation. Ten new projects were selected for design and/or construction in FY 06 including projects at Aurora, Cass Lake, Cromwell, Emily, Ely, Duluth-Morgan Park, Keewatin, Koochiching County, Orr, and Tower, Minnesota.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Oberstar (MN-8); Sen: Dayton and Coleman (MN).

DISTRICT: St. Paul District

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Northern Wisconsin Environmental Assistance, WI

AUTHORIZATION: Section 154, CAA of 2001; Sec 119, CAA 2005

LOCATION: The Northern Wisconsin Environmental Infrastructure Assistance area includes the counties of Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, and Iron. The program area includes a significant area of the shoreline of Lake Superior and the Upper Mississippi River watersheds.

DESCRIPTION: The program provides assistance to northern Wisconsin public entities in the "form of design and reconstruction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in northern Wisconsin, including projects for navigation and inland harbor improvement and expansion, wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply and related facilities, environmental restoration, and surface water resource protection and development."

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 40,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,333
Cash	(varies by project)
Other	(varies by project)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 53,333
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 141
Allocation for FY 2004	7,728
Allocation for FY 2005	8,882
Conference Amount for FY 2006	8,000
Allocation for FY 2006	7,920
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	15,329
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Construction is continuing on four projects with PCAs signed in FY 05 including Lake Namakagon, Mercer, Glidden, and Butternut. Seven new projects were selected for design and/or construction in FY 06 including projects at Parkland, Hurley, Bayfield, Red Cliff Indian Reservation, LaPointe, Bad River Indian Reservation and Ashland. All FY 06 selected projects are within LRE.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Obey (WI-7); Sen: Feingold and Kohl (WI).

DISTRICT: St. Paul District

DATE: 6 February 2006

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Wolf River, Memphis, TN

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 00, Section 101(b)(25)

LOCATION: The Wolf River ecosystem restoration project is located in Shelby and Fayette Counties, Tennessee

DESCRIPTION: The project includes stabilization weirs on Wolf River and its tributaries, hiking/biking trails, a wildlife corridor, and 3 boat ramps.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 8,039
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 4,491
Cash	(1,590)
Other	(2,901)
Total Estimated Cost	\$12,530
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 266
Allocation for FY 2004	460
Allocation for FY 2005	2,245
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,500
Allocation for FY 2006	3,465
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,603
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio:	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to complete Item 1 channel weirs – awarded Sep 04; initiate Item 2 channel weirs – awarded May 06; and initiate design of Item 3 tributary weirs.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The construction phase of this project is expected to be completed in FY 2010, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project cost estimate is expected to increase by 26% from \$9.9 million to \$12.5 million pending approval by the project sponsors. The revised cost estimate is attributable to increased construction costs and changes in the channel geometry which resulted in design revisions and the relocation of some of the stabilization weirs. The cost increase is within the 902 project cost limit. Overall, the scope of the authorized project has not changed significantly enough to impact the projected ecosystem restoration benefits. Because of changes in the channel geometry over the last five years, the number of main channel and tributary weirs is expected to decrease. However, the stabilization weirs will be strategically located and fortified to capture the projected benefits.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Blackburn (TN-7), Tanner (TN-8), Ford (TN-9); Senate: Alexander and Frist (TN)

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Baltimore Metropolitan Water Resources, Gwynns Falls, MD.

AUTHORIZATION: FY 2004 Energy & Water Development Appropriations Act, PL 108-137, FY 2006 Energy & Water Development Appropriations Act, PL 109-103

LOCATION: The Gwynns Falls watershed is located in Baltimore County and City, and drains through the Baltimore Harbor into the Chesapeake Bay. The Gwynns Falls watershed is approximately 66 square miles in area.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes environmental restoration measures such as restoring wetlands, stabilizing streambanks, rehabilitating the sewer system, and retrofitting stormwater management features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	9,529
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,071
Total Estimated Cost	14,600
Allocation thru FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	0
Allocation for FY 05	200
Allocation for FY 06	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 06	7,349
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete plans and specifications for Phase 1, prepare and execute the PCA, and advertise and award the construction contract in the summer of 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of 2,000,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the project could be completed in FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes and Mikulski (MD); and Representatives Cardin (MD-03) and Cummings (MD-07)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, MD, VA and PA.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 510 of Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996, as amended by Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2004, 117 Stat. 1830.

LOCATION: Projects are located on the tributaries to the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: (1) Smith Island, MD, is located in the Chesapeake Bay, straddling the MD-VA state line. The project consists of upgrades to two wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs); (2) The City of Scranton is located in the northeastern portion of Pennsylvania. The proposed work consists of upgrades to the existing WWTP; (3) Taylor's Island/Punch Island Road, MD, is located at the confluence of the Little Choptank River and the Chesapeake Bay. The project entails construction of approximately 5,200 linear feet of shoreline protection; (4) The Middle Branch River is located in Baltimore City, MD, and would entail creation of wetlands and implementation of a trash removal system; (5) The Rappahannock River Oyster Restoration project was completed in 2001; (6) The Tylerton Shoreline Protection project was completed in 2003; (7) An environmental impact statement (EIS) is underway for introducing non-native oyster species into the Chesapeake Bay; (8) Ewell/Rhodes Point is located on Smith Island, Maryland. The proposed work consists of shoreline protection using a bulkhead. (9) Additional projects include Anacostia River Watershed Wetland Restoration - MD, Bodkin Island Habitat Restoration - MD, Still Pond Shoreline Protection - MD, Highland Beach Shoreline Protection - MD, and separating combined sewer overflows in PA.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	10,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,333
Total Estimated Cost	13,333
Allocation Thru FY 03	3,557
Allocation for FY 04	822
Allocation for FY 05	1,490
Allocation for FY 06	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 06	2,151
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete construction of the Tylerton Wastewater Treatment Plant, design for the Ewell Wastewater Treatment Plant, surveys and decision document for Taylors Island/Punch Island Road Shoreline Protection, initiate and complete construction of Punch Island Road, completion of Warner Street Phase I Trash Interceptor, design of the Scranton Waterwater Treatment Plant upgrades, and continue the EIS for the non-Native Oyster study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$2,151,000 in FY 07, construction would be completed on Taylors Island and Ewell Wastewater Treatment Plant.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, MD, VA and PA.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sarbanes (MD), Mikulski (MD), Santorum (PA), Specter (PA), Warner (VA), Allen (VA), Gilchrest (MD-01), Cardin (MD-03), Kanjorski (PA-11), Davis (VA-01), Schrock (VA-2), Scott (VA-3), and Forbes (VA-4)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD & VA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 704(b) WRDA 1986, as amended by Section 505 WRDA 1996, Section 342 WRDA 2000, the FY 02 Energy & Water Development Appropriations Act, and the FY 06 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

LOCATION: The Chesapeake Bay is located in the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: The first phase of the project consisted of a multi-agency Federal and State of Maryland program to restore oyster populations in Maryland's portion of the Chesapeake Bay. This \$3,334,000 project included construction and rehabilitation of oyster reefs to create disease-free oyster habitat; construction of seed bars for production and collection of disease-free oyster seed or "spat;" planting disease-free spat in locations which best foster oyster reproduction and health; and monitoring the performance of the project to increase oyster populations.

The second phase of the project consists of producing a long-term master plan for future restoration sites, and construction of oyster habitat restoration sites in Tangier and Pocomoke Sounds and the Great Wicomico River in Virginia, as well as in several Chesapeake Bay tributaries in Maryland. The Virginia project consists of restoring 284 acres of oyster habitat and planting disease-resistant native oysters and seed (158 acres in Tangier and Pocomoke Sounds and 126 acres in the Great Wicomico River). The Maryland project will continue the activities performed for the first phase.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Construction \$30,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	10,000
Cash	0
In-Kind	10,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$40,000
Allocation through FY 03	8,458
Allocation for FY 04	4,562
Allocation for FY 05	1,785
Allocation for FY 06	2,227
Balance to Complete after FY 06	12,968
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to continue development of a long-term master plan, to monitor completed restoration sites, and to restore additional oyster habitat and planting oysters and seed within the Chesapeake Bay region in Maryland and Virginia.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$4,500,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the program could be completed in September 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Mikulski and Sarbanes (MD); Senators Allen and Warner (VA); Senators Santorum and Specter (PA); Representatives Gilchrest (MD-01), Cardin (MD-03), Hoyer (MD-05), Davis (VA-01), Drake (VA-02), and Scott (VA-03).

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Cumberland, MD

AUTHORIZATION: Section 535 of WRDA 96 and Section 580 of WRDA 99

LOCATION: The Cumberland, MD and Ridgeley, WV flood control project is located at the junction of the North Branch of the Potomac River and Wills Creek along the panhandle borders of northwest Maryland and northeast West Virginia.

DESCRIPTION: In the early 1950's during the construction of the Cumberland, MD and Ridgeley, WV project, the terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio (C&O) Canal was filled in. The Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1999 authorized the project at \$15 million and directed the Secretary of the Army to modify the project for flood control and other purposes at Cumberland, MD, to undertake, as a separate part of the project, restoration of the historic C&O Canal substantially, in accordance with the design analysis previously prepared for the National Park Service in February 1998.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	9,750
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,250
Cash	0
Other	5,250
Total Estimated Cost	15,000
Allocation through FY 03	1,805
Allocation for FY 04	3,228
Allocation for FY 05	2,790
Allocation for FY 06	891
Balance to Complete after FY 06	1,036
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete construction of the .25-mile part of the project. Plans and specifications can also be initiated for the next section of work if the railroad bridge issue is resolved (see other information).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding and an increase in project authorization to fund the entire 1.2-mile project, construction could be completed in FY 2011.

OTHER INFORMATION: Funding authorization must be increased to \$25 million to complete the 1.2-mile project. The rewatering project includes a requirement for a railroad bridge to carry the existing Western Maryland Scenic Railroad train over the new canal prism to connect to the existing CSX mainline. A task force of local entities is evaluating options for funding and carrying out this work. This is not a Federal responsibility.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Sarbanes (MD) and Mikulski (MD), Congressman Bartlett (MD-06)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction, General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Bay Coast, Port Mahon, DE

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101 (a) (12) of WRDA 1999.

LOCATION: The project area is located east of Dover, DE, along the Delaware Bay Coastline in Kent County.

DESCRIPTION: It is an ecosystem restoration and protection project consists of beachfill with periodic nourishment to provide for horseshoe crab and shorebird habitat. It also includes rising of State Road 89 and placement of riprap along the road to protect the wetland, west of the road. The project will also restore degraded wetland habitat west of the State Road 89.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Construction \$19,400.0 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$10,500.0 1/
Cash 10,153.0	
Other 347.0	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 29,900.0 1/
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 650.4
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 176.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 222.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$ 990.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$ 17,361.6
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Initial Construction Costs are Total Costs \$9,220.0; Federal \$ 6,000.0; Non Federal \$3,220.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds (\$105.0) will be used to finalize, review and approve the LRR and develop a PCA; remaining funds (\$885.0) will be carried over to FY07.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion is to be determined due to project not being authorized.

OTHER INFORMATION: Awaiting OMB approval of report since 1999. Funds have been added for construction since 2003. Budgeting for this project is dependent on OMB approval.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. Castle (DE-AL), Sen. Carper (DE) & Biden (DE)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
Construction, General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Delaware Bay Coast, Villas & Vicinity, NJ

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(a) of WRDA 1999.

LOCATION: Project is located along the Delaware Bay in Middle and Lower Townships, Cape May County, New Jersey.

DESCRIPTION: The recommended plan, restoring horseshoe crab and shore bird habitats, is a one-time placement of sand to provide a berm. Seventeen outfalls located in the project boundaries will be extended about 100 feet. The project does not include periodic nourishment for the shoreline area

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$5,730.0 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$3,050.0 1/
Cash	\$2,710.0
Other	\$ 340.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$8,780.0 1/
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 766.0
Allocations FY 2004	\$ 39.0
Allocations FY 2005	\$ 45.0
Allocations FY 2006	\$1,820.0
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$3,060.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A 2/
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A 2/

1/ Not inflated to mid construction, due to unknown funding availability

2/ Environmental restoration

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds (\$185.0) are being used to develop, review and approve the LRR and coordinate a PCA. Remaining funds (\$1,365) will be carried over to FY2007.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion date is to be determined due to budget constraints.

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Rep. LoBiondo (NJ-02) & Frelinghuysen (NJ-11), Sen. Lautenberg (NJ) & Menendez (NJ)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District
Date: 27 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rappahannock River, Virginia, Embrey Dam, Dam Removal

AUTHORIZATION: Section 590 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999

LOCATION: Fredericksburg, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The project area encompasses the upstream limits of the Rappahannock River through City of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania and Stafford counties, Virginia. This is in the vicinity of the river fall line. The City of Fredericksburg, Stafford County, and state environmentalists support the restoration of this beautiful river to its more natural state of a free flowing river. This would allow for the migration of fish to upstream areas. The project will provide for fish passage by removal of the Embrey Dam located at approximately river mile 109. Also included in the project are sediment removal, bank stabilization and riparian restoration behind the dam and preservation of the historic Rappahannock canal.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 10,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 282
Cash	0
Other (LERRDs)	\$ 282
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 10,282
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,682
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 2,580
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 1,510
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 1,485
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 1,743
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds are being used to initiate Phase IV construction of the Rappahannock Canal Pump Station and Intake Structure for the Embrey Dam Removal Project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The contract for removal of the Embrey Dam was awarded in May 2004 and the project is schedule to be completed in February 2007.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representative Davis (VA-1).

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME: Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont and New York (Lake Champlain Watershed Initiative)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 542, WRDA 2000 (P.L. 106-541)

LOCATION: The project area encompasses the Lake Champlain watershed, in New York and Vermont.

DESCRIPTION: Major tributaries include the Winooski River in Vermont and the Saranac River in New York. The basin is experiencing environmental degradation problems that are to be addressed in a comprehensive approach. The effort will complement State and local efforts in pollution prevention, control, and restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$20,000,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$10,800,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$30,800,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	42,000
Allocation for FY 2004	86,000
Allocation for FY 2005	76,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$1,485,000
Balance to complete after FY 2006	\$18,311,000
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (N/A)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to complete report, execute 4 project cooperation agreements (Lake George, Plattsburgh and Town of Keene in New York, and City of S. Burlington in VT), and initiate implementation of the projects.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project construction completion to be determined, subject to availability of funds.

OTHER INFORMATION: The GMP lays out a framework to address pollution prevention, control, and environmental restoration. Under this program, individual projects are identified, prioritized, and certified by individual states for implementation. The process will be analogous to that employed for the New York City Watershed project, where upon approval of the Program's GMP, individual design, design/construct, or construction projects/efforts will be recommended based on a Project Fact Sheet. The cost sharing is 65% Federal and 35% non-Federal.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Patrick Leahy (VT), Jeffords (VT), Clinton (NY), Schumer (NY); Representatives Bernie Sanders (VT-At Large), John Sweeney (NY-20), John McHugh (NY-23)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 25 January 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME: New York City Watershed, New York

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1996, Section 552 and WRDA 1999, Section 340 - Water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development.

LOCATION: The Watershed is located within eight New York counties: Delaware, Greene, Schoharie, Ulster, Sullivan, Westchester, Putnam and Dutchess.

DESCRIPTION: 36 projects have been certified by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) as eligible under the Section 552 program. 26 cost sharing agreements have been executed with various sponsors. The projects include stream bank restorations, design and installation of sewer and stormwater collection systems, stormwater management studies and implementation of whole farm planning.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$42,500,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$14,100,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$56,600,000

Allocation Through FY 2003	4,898,000
Allocation for FY 2004	1,283,000
Allocation for FY 2005	3,340,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$742,000 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	32,237,000

Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (N/A)

Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio (N/A)

1/ In FY 2006 Appropriations Act, \$7,202,815 in earmarked federal funds from the Hudson River at Athens, NY project are provided for this project.

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds in the amount of \$742,000 are being used to continue work on 4 existing cost-sharing agreements, Stormwater Management Project in Carmel, NY, Pathogen Monitoring Station, Westchester County Stormwater Management Study, and Chestnut Creek Stream Restoration Project in Ulster County. Works on the Stamford Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Project and the Precision Feeding Program for Farms in Delaware County will be accomplished utilizing \$450,000 out of the transferred earmarked funds as stated above.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Execute 3 more agreements in FY 06.

ISSUES AND OTHER INFORMATION: All of the 36 projects certified to date are cost reimbursement type projects. House Report 109-86 (FY06 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill) directs the Corps to make available unexpended balances contained in FY98 and 99 Energy & Water Acts to dredge the Federal Channel in the vicinity of Hudson City Light to the north dock at Union Street, Athens, NY for NYC Watershed projects in Delaware and Greene Counties, NY

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Sweeney (NY-20), Kelly (NY-19), Lowey (NY-18), Hinchey (NY-22), Senators Schumer (NY) and Clinton (NY)

DISTRICT: New York

Date: 26 January 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION GENERAL)

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: Northeast Pennsylvania Infrastructure Program, PA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219 of Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-580), as amended by Section 504 of Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-303) and Section 502(f)(11) of WRDA 1999 (P.L. 106-53).

LOCATION: The authorized program area consists of the following Pennsylvania counties: Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, Wayne, Sullivan, Bradford, and Monroe.

DESCRIPTION: The program allows for the design and construction of environmental infrastructure including water and wastewater systems. Identified projects in PA include: (1) Halls Station Sewer Project, (2) Muncy Creek Route 405/442 Sewer Project, and (3) Halls Station Water Project in Lycoming County; (4) Athens Sewer Extension Project, in Bradford County; (5) Nicholson Sewer Project in Wyoming County; and Clark's Summit Sewer Project in Lackawanna County.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	20,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	6,667
Total Estimated Cost	26,667
Allocation thru FY 03	139
Allocation for FY 04	1,156
Allocation for FY 05	1,525
Allocation for FY 06	1,930
Balance to Complete after FY 06	15,250
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds are being used to close out the Halls Station Sewer Project, complete construction for the Muncy Creek Route 405/442 Sewer Project, execute the Project Cooperation Agreement and initiate construction for projects identified in Bradford County, and prepare the NEPA documentation and letter report for the Nicholson Sewer Project, the Halls Station Phase IA Water Project and the Clark's Summit Sewer Project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: With optimum funding of \$5,280,000 in FY 07 and optimum funding in the out years, the Athens Sewer Project in Bradford County and the Clark's Summit Sewer Project could be completed in FY 07, and the Nicholson Sewer Project and Halls Station Phase IA Project could be completed FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Sherwood (PA-10)

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Alleviation, Richmond, Virginia (Combined Sewage Overflow (CSO) Control Program)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(c)(17) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 as amended by Section 504 of The Water Resources Development Act of 1996 and Section 502 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999

LOCATION: Richmond, Virginia

DESCRIPTION: The Richmond Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) project is located in the City along the James River. The City of Richmond is under special compliance order by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality to implement a CSO control program in order to comply with the Clean Water Act. The project consists of studies and design to support the re-evaluation of City of Richmond's Combined Sewer Overflow Long Term Control Plan (LTCP). Work will include reliability and interface planning for Combined Sewer Overflow and Dry Weather Flow facilities and the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Satellite locations. Also included will be collection and laboratory analysis of river and CSO samples required as part of the CSO LTCP re-evaluation study.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 30,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	\$ 10,000
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 40,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 2,049
Allocation for FY 2004	\$ 351
Allocation for FY 2005	\$ 124
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 742
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 26,734
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Fiscal year 2006 funds will be used to continue Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED) activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Design agreement was executed in September 2001.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Warner (VA) and Allen (VA). Representatives Scott (VA-3) and Cantor (VA-7).

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT NAME: South Central Pennsylvania Environment Improvement Program, PA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 313 of WRDA 1992 (P.L. 102-580), as amended by WRDA 96 (P.L. 104-303), Energy and Water Appropriations Acts of FY 96 (P.L. 104-46), FY 98 (P.L. 105-62), and FY 99 (P.L. 104-245), Omnibus Consolidated and Energy Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 99 (P.L. 105-245), Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (P.L. 106-53) and Section 101 of the FY05 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

LOCATION: The program authorizes the Corps to provide design and construction assistance on projects located in 24 counties in south central Pennsylvania.

DESCRIPTION: Projects include wastewater treatment and related facilities; water supply, storage, treatment and distribution facilities; or surface water resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:</u>	FY 06 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	105,916
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	35,305
Total Estimated Cost	141,221
Allocation Through FY 03 (NAB)	55,996
Allocation for FY 04 (NAB)	5,287
Allocation for FY 05 (NAB)	3,847
Allocation for FY 06	4,455
Balance to Complete after FY 06	36,331
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 06 ACTIVITIES: FY 06 funds are being used to complete and initiate the design and construction of projects identified by Congressman Shuster.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Project are being completed as funding is provided.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Shuster PA-09, Murtha PA-12, Sherwood PA-10, Peterson, PA-05, Kanjorski, PA-11

DISTRICT: Baltimore

DATE: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Restoration

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Southeastern PA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 566 of WRDA 96, Southeastern Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure

LOCATION: Southeastern PA

DESCRIPTION: Program is to be used for assistance in the form of design and construction assistance for water related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Construction \$25,000.0 1/
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	TBD 2/
Cash	TBD
Other	TBD
Total Estimated Cost	\$ TBD
1/ Authorized amount for program	
2/ Dependent on how Federal funds are allocated (phases)	
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 3,562.4 1/
Allocations FY 2004	750.0 2/
Allocations FY 2005	67.0 3/
Allocations FY 2006	594.0 4/
Balance to Complete after FY2006	\$20,026.6
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Funds added for Logan/Wissinoming Homes, Delaware Canal, New Logan Homes, South Central Incinerator, Mill Creek, Cobbs Creek and other areas within authority but not named specifically

2/ Cobbs Creek & Mill Creek

3/ Cobbs Creek & Mill Creek

4/ Cobbs Creek & Tacony Creek

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Activities include a letter report on Tacony Creek; Design Agreement coordination for 3 areas within Cobbs Creek and 1 in Mill Creek; coordinate and execute Project Management Plan for all 4 projects

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined. Depends on future appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: Areas have been studied in this authority: South Central Incinerator (completed), New Logan Homes((temporary suspension), Logan/Wissinoming Homes (temporary suspension) and Delaware Canal (Completed). Still pending are the Cobbs Creek (3 interim studies) Mill Creek and Tacony Creek areas.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Sen Specter and Santorum, (PA), Rep Brady (PA-01) and Fattah (PA-2)

DISTRICT: Philadelphia District

Date: 30 Jan 06

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration – (Title VI)

AUTHORIZATION: P.L. 106-53, Water Resources Development Act of 1999 and Public Law 106-541, Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The lands subject to Section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (WRDA 99) are generally Corps lands located in South Dakota that were acquired by the Secretary of the Army for the implementation of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program. Land to be transferred to the State is Corps land that is located above the top of the exclusive flood pool of the Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point projects and located outside the external boundaries of a reservation of an Indian Tribe. Lands to be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior are those lands located above the top of the exclusive flood pool of the Big Bend and Oahe projects and located within the external boundaries of the reservation of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for (1) transfer in fee title of Corps of Engineers lands (outside the boundaries of Indian reservations) above the top of the exclusive flood pools at Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall and Gavins Point dam/reservoir projects to the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks (SDGFP); (2) transfer in fee title of Corps lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe (CRST) Indian Reservation and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (LBST) Indian Reservation that are above the top of the exclusive flood pools at the Oahe and Big Bend Projects to the Department of Interior to be managed in trust for the two respective Tribes; (3) transfer of all Corps recreation areas in South Dakota to SDGFP, CRST or LBST; and (4) establishment of a \$165.4 million trust fund in the Federal treasury (\$108 million for the State and \$57.4 million for the Tribes).

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 102,713
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	0
Cash	0
Other	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 102,713
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 22,889
Allocation for FY 2004	8,773
Allocation for FY 2005	5,109
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,750
Allocation for FY 2006	3,712
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	62,230
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The allocation amount will be used to continue study of sediment contamination in the Cheyenne River, and to fund administrative expenses. Funding will be granted to the State and Tribes in accordance with Title VI.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: Technical amendments in WRDA 2000 to the original legislation required cultural resources site stabilization and stewardship contracts with the State and Tribes are funded by O&M funds. On February 8, 2002 the recreation areas in South Dakota were transferred to the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks. Perpetuity leases for the eight recreation areas near the dams were completed in May 2002. Lands within the reservation were transferred to the Department of Interior in June 2002.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Herseth, (SD-AL), Senators Thune (SD) and Johnson (SD)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT NAME: Duwamish and Green River Basin, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b) (26) of WRDA 2000

LOCATION: The project is located in the Duwamish/Green River Basin, in King County in northwestern Washington State.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes construction at 45 sites throughout the entire Duwamish/Green River Basin, from high in the Cascade Mountains to Elliott Bay in Puget Sound. Features include providing wood and gravel; levee removals, Fish blockages, tidal marsh construction and stream rehabilitation to the stream environment.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$106,660
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	57,440
Cash	4,900
Other	52,540
Total Estimated Project Cost	164,100
Allocation thru 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	386
Allocation for FY 2005	1,110
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,875
Allocation for FY 2006	1,856
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	103,308
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Cost Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute Project Cooperation Agreements for Site 1, and Riverview Park; award and fully fund the tidal marsh construction contract on Site 1 and the side channel construction contract on Riverview Park. Continue planning and design efforts on 5 additional features.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction, 2016

OTHER INFORMATION: The project is planned to be implemented over a 10-year period with various jurisdictions sponsoring the appropriate project features.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Dave Reichert (WA-08); Jim McDermott (WA-07), Norm Dicks (WA-06), and Adam Smith (WA-09); and Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT NAME AND STATE: Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers Enhancement Project

AUTHORIZATION: Section 514 (b)(1) of the 1999 Water Resources Development Act, as amended

LOCATION: The project area includes the Middle Mississippi River, from the mouth of the Ohio River to the mouth of the Missouri River, and the Missouri River, from its mouth to its headwaters near Three Forks, Montana.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for those activities necessary to protect and enhance fish and wildlife habitat compatible with water-related needs of the region. Habitat development and enhancement projects will be constructed within the river channels, floodplain, and the Missouri River main stem reservoirs, projects will be constructed at 65 percent Federal, 35 percent non-Federal cost, and operated and maintained by a non-Federal sponsor.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	TBD
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	TBD
Total Estimated Project Cost	TBD
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$107
Allocation for FY 2004	437
Allocation for FY 2005	470
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,313
Allocation for FY 2006	1,300
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	TBD
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used for Planning and Design activity for Lake Contrary, a Missouri River Oxbow Lake, and Osage River lock and dam #1 fish path, which will restore 80 miles of a historic fish migration route; complete P&S on City of Washington habitat restoration, initiate studies for 3 new projects, and project coordination activities.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: TBD

ISSUES AND OTHER INFORMATION: Projects developed under this authority enable States to assemble corridors of environmentally revitalized river channel and adjacent floodplain habitat which would have a multiplying and reinforcing effect on similar types of environmental restoration activities accomplished under other authorities. This project aids in addressing threatened and endangered species issues on the Missouri and Middle Mississippi Rivers.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Bond (MO), Senator Talent (MO), Congressman Hulshof (MO-09), and Congressman Graves (MO-06).

DISTRICT: Kansas City

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Missouri National Recreational River, NE & SD

AUTHORIZATION: Section 707 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (PL 95-625) which amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (90-542)

LOCATION: The Missouri River between Gavins Point Dam and Ponca State Park, Nebraska. This includes Cedar and Dixon Counties in Nebraska and Yankton, Clay and Union Counties in South Dakota.

DESCRIPTION: Development of the river to protect and enhance the existing qualities which resulted in its classification as a National Recreational River under the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Qualities include scenic, environmental, fish and wildlife, cultural and recreational values of the river reach. Development includes threatened and endangered species habitat, erosion protection, easement acquisition, river access sites, and recreation facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>		FY 2006 (\$000)
		<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost		\$ 21,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost		4,041
Cash	621	
Other	3,420	
Total Estimated Cost		\$ 25,041
Allocations thru 2003		\$ 8,507
Allocation for FY 2004		653
Allocation for FY 2005		675
Conference Amount for FY 2006		486
Allocation for FY 2006		481
Balance to Complete after FY 2006		10,684
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate		N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)		N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The sixty-percent design contract for the pile-and-drift bank protection structures to protect river values from erosion was completed during the first quarter. Development of a Real Estate Letter design memorandum for submission and approval for third quarter acquisition of conservation and sloughing easements is ongoing.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: With the recent headquarters approval of the overarching Real Estate Design Memorandum, the Corps has the ability for the first time in 25-years to purchase easements and fee title for protection of lands within the Missouri National Recreational River program. There is high agency interest in real estate actions. The design work for demonstration bank protection will be fully coordinated with the National Park Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Bank protection is fully supported by the local landowners, and has received tentative support from the environmental agencies.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Nelson (NE), Senator Hagel (NE), Congressman Fortenberry (NE-1), Senator Johnson (SD), Senator Thune (SD), Congresswoman Herseth (SD-AL)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Missouri River Restoration, ND

AUTHORIZATION: Title VII of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: North Dakota

DESCRIPTION: The authorized project is a statewide program to improve conservation, reduce sediment deposition and take others steps necessary for improved management of the Missouri River.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA \$(000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	<u>Construction</u> \$10,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	to be determined
Cash	to be determined
Other	to be determined
Total Estimated Project Cost	to be determined
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 18
Allocation for FY 2004	39
Allocation for FY 2005	45
Conference Amount for FY 2006	188
Allocation for FY 2006	186
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	10,212
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Efforts will continue in FY 06 to organize the required multi-agency task force under Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) guidelines. Funding will be used to develop a Project Management Plan, identify a cost-sharing sponsor, and prepare a draft cost share agreement for the Assessment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: Once the task force is organized, a sponsor identified, and a cost sharing agreement executed, the assessment study required by WRDA 2000 will be initiated.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Dorgan and Conrad (ND) and Representative Pomeroy (ND).

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT NAME: Puget Sound & Adjacent Waters Restoration, WA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 544, WRDA 2000

LOCATION: The Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters region encompasses over 15,000 square miles in northwest Washington State, and incorporates all waters in the Puget Sound drainage basin and the Straits of Juan de Fuca.

DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to provide ecosystem restoration in the Puget Sound area and to expedite construction of critical restoration projects by developing an identification and prioritization process using existing locally provided information.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$40,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	21,540
Cash	14,000
Other	7,540
Total Estimated Project Cost	61,540
Allocation thru FY 2003	93
Allocation for FY 2004	201
Allocation for FY 2005	974
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,500
Allocation for FY 2006	1,485
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	37,247
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Sign Project Cooperative Agreements for Lake Washington Gravel Nourishment and Skokomish Estuary; and award the dike removal & boardwalk construction contract for Skokomish Estuary and the beach nourishment contract for Lake Washington Gravel Nourishment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Construction, FY 2013

OTHER INFORMATION: Decision documents for additional sites will be initiated in FY 2006.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Jay Inslee (WA-01), Rick Larsen (WA-02), Brian Baird (WA-03), Norm Dicks (WA-06), Jim McDermott (WA-07), David Reichert (WA-08), and Adam Smith (WA-09); and Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Maria Cantwell (D-WA).

DISTRICT: Seattle

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rural Idaho, ID

AUTHORIZATION: Section 595 of WRDA 1999, PL 106-53, as modified by Sec 126 of the 2003 Omnibus Appropriation Act.

LOCATION: Rural communities in the State of Idaho.

DESCRIPTION: The primary objective of this program is to assist State of Idaho rural communities with design and construction of water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

	FY 2006 (\$000)
Estimated Federal Cost	Construction
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	\$25,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$6,250
	\$31,250
Allocation thru 2003	\$0
Allocation for FY 2004	\$1,784
Allocation for FY 2005	\$2,497
Conference Amount for FY 2006	\$5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	\$4,950
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$15,769
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (N/A)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (N/A)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Burley and Coolin, complete construction of wastewater system; Emmett and Rupert, complete design and begin construction of wastewater system; Upper St Joe, complete construction of water systems; Bonner's Ferry, complete construction of water system; minor coordination for Spirit Lake Restoration, Donnelly, develop PMP, sign PCA and begin design of I&I and surface water protection; Driggs, sign PCA and begin waste water treatment facility plan design; Shelley Regional, develop PMP, sign PCA and begin wastewater system design; Smelterville, develop PMP, sign PCA and begin design for wastewater and surface water treatment.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: TBD

OTHER INFORMATION: Work under this program is shared between Walla Walla and Seattle. Total program authorization is \$25M.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen Otter (ID-1) and Simpson (ID-2); Senators Crapo and Craig (ID).

DISTRICT: Walla Walla

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rural Montana, MT

AUTHORIZATION: Section 595 of WRDA 1999, PL 106-53

LOCATION: Rural Montana

DESCRIPTION: Provide design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests for carrying out water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in rural Montana.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	8,333
Cash	8,333
Other	0
Total Estimated Program Cost	\$ 33,333
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 685
Allocation for FY 2004	2,173
Allocation for FY 2005	1,477
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	15,715
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ration (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete funding and construction of the projects at Livingston, Manhattan, Gardiner-Park and Drummond. Execute PCA's with Lewistown and Grant Creek. Consider projects at other congressionally directed sites as funding permits.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: Work accomplished under this Program is shared between Seattle and Omaha District's within Northwestern Division. Total program authorization is \$25 Million.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Max Baucus (MT), Senator Conrad Burns (MT); Representative Dennis Rehberg (MT-AL).

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
Construction General

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sand Creek Watershed

AUTHORIZATION: Section 101(b) (19) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

LOCATION: The Sand Creek Watershed study area is located in eastern Nebraska in Saunders County. This is a reach extending for several miles on Sand Creek, upstream of the confluence of Sand Creek and Wahoo Creek.

DESCRIPTION: The project purposes are to reestablish wetlands, reduce sedimentation, and improve water quality for the benefit of fish and wildlife.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$19,505
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	11,388
Cash	5,646
Other	5,742
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$30,893
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 915
Allocation for FY 2004	441
Allocation for FY 2005	489
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,500
Allocation for FY 2006	2,475
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	15,185
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The allocation amount will be used to complete revisions to the Post Authorization Change Report, prepare an amendment to the existing Project Cooperation Agreement to reflect the removal of work to be completed by the project sponsor, and to complete design on the breakwater and sediment trap at the upper end of Lake Wanahoo prior to the lake filling. Advertise and award one or more fully funded construction contracts during the third and fourth quarters of this fiscal year.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined

OTHER INFORMATION: The project and PCA are currently being modified so that the sponsor will be responsible for the design and construction of the embankment, outlet works and spillway. A revised project cost estimate is being prepared.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representative Jeff Fortenberry (NE-1), Senators Hagel (NE) and Nelson (NE)

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

PACIFIC OCEAN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Kake Dam, Alaska

AUTHORIZATION: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2001, PL 106-377 and modified in EWDA of FY 2004.

LOCATION: The city of Kake is located in southeast Alaska on the northwest shore of Kupreanof Island about a 100 air miles south of Juneau.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a gravity concrete dam at Kake approximately 53 feet upstream from the previous dam, covering an area about 4,750 square feet, and a spillway height of 17.7 feet. It includes an intake structure, complete with fish screen and trash rack, and would house intake lines for the city and hatchery water supply.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 11,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 11,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 652
Allocation for FY 2004	140
Allocation for FY 2005	5,400
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950 1/
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 5,258
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

1/ Reflects a rescission of 1%

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue construction of the concrete dam.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Stevens (AK), and Murkowski (AK). Congressman Young (AK-1).

DISTRICT: Alaska

Date: 6 February 2006

SOUTH ATLANTIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Coastal MS Environmental Restoration, MS

AUTHORIZATION: Section 528, Water Resources Development Act of 2000

LOCATION: Coastal Mississippi

DESCRIPTION: A comprehensive restoration plan for Deer Island will be developed to return it to its 1895 shoreline through the creation of wetlands (possibly 1,000 acres) and offshore reef restoration for wave attenuation as well as correct the breach on the western end of Deer Island and eliminate the continuing erosion at Grand Bayou.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$10,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	5,385
Cash	5,385
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$15,385
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,500
Allocation for FY 2006	2,475
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	7,525
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate – TBD	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio – TBD	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: The FY 2006 funds will be used to complete the Decision Document to address the breach on the western end of Deer Island and the erosion at Grand Bayou. Also, prepare plans and specifications and award the construction contract. In addition, FY 2006 funds will be used to initiate the investigation of the comprehensive restoration of Deer Island with the preparation of an Engineering Documentation Report with the intent of returning it to its 1895 shoreline through the creation of wetlands (possibly 1,000 acres) and offshore reef restoration for wave attenuation.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Thad Cochran and Trent Lott and Congressman Gene Taylor, MS-04.

DISTRICT: MS-04

Date: January 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements Program, Florida.

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-554, Section 109.

LOCATION: The program's improvements are located in the Florida Keys, on the southern tip of Florida.

DESCRIPTION: The primary objective of the Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements Program is to improve the quality of nearshore waters within the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary, the nation's largest marine protected area, with the construction of both stormwater and wastewater treatment facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 100,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	53,800
Cash	0
Other	53,800
Total Estimated Cost	\$1 53,800
Allocations thru FY 03	\$ 391
Allocation for FY 04	209
Allocation for FY 05	1,418
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,000
Allocation for FY 06	1,980
Balance to Complete after FY 06	96,002
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds will be used to partially reimburse the local sponsors for construction of wastewater and stormwater treatment facilities within municipalities located in the Florida Keys. The first projects to be constructed as part of the program are the Key Colony Beach Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation project and one of Key West's stormwater projects.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Completion of reimbursement is contingent upon future appropriations.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Sanctuary includes 2800 square miles of nearshore waters extending from just south of Miami to the Dry Tortugas. Adjacent to the Florida Keys land mass are spectacular, unique and nationally significant marine environments, including seagrass meadows, mangrove islands, and extensive living coral reefs. This area contains the nation's largest living coral reef with four million people per year visiting the reef to view its living beauty. The Sanctuary's water quality, affected by

human development of the adjoining Keys and other factors, influences the coral reef and the multitude of living organisms dependent on the reefs. The BCR information is not applicable to this environmental infrastructure project.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL18-R),
Congressman Debbie Wasserman Schultz (FL20-D).

DISTRICT: Jacksonville

Date: 6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lakes Marion and Moultrie, SC

AUTHORIZATION: P.L. 102-580, Sec. 219, and P.L. 106-53, Sec. 502(f)(25) authorized construction assistance and \$5,000,000 for water supply treatment and distribution projects, as amended by P.L. 106-554, Sec. 108(c)(4) for \$15,000,000, as amended by P.L. 108-137, Sec. 126 for \$35,000,000 and authorized wastewater treatment in addition to water supply.

LOCATION: Central South Carolina

DESCRIPTION: Using Lake Marion as a source, the system will provide potable water to satisfy the immediate and future water supply and sewer needs for a large portion of five counties and six municipalities located in central South Carolina in the proximity of Lake Marion. The proposed project includes construction of an 8 MGD (million gallon per day) water treatment plant, installation of approximately 62 miles of water transmission pipeline (includes six separable reaches), and installation of a sewer component. A \$25.5 million construction contract for the water treatment plant was awarded on 7 September 2004.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 62,206
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	20,736
Cash	18,786
Other	1,950
Total Estimated Cost	\$82,942
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 14,657
Allocation for FY 2004	271
Allocation for FY 2005	2,665
Conference Amount for FY 2006	6,000
Allocation for FY 2006	5,940
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	38,673
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete construction of the water treatment plant in July 2006 and possibly fund, to the extent of available funds, construction of a portion of the Santee Reach.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008

OTHER INFORMATION: This project has been a Congressional add to the budget every year since FY 2001. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers currently has authority to expend \$35 million for planning, engineering, design, and construction assistance.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Graham and DeMint, Congressman Clyburn, SC-6

DISTRICT: Charleston

Date: 20 Jan 06

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Stanly County Wastewater Infrastructure, North Carolina.

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended on 15 December 2000 by the FY 2001 Omnibus Appropriations Act.

LOCATION: Stanly County is located in mid-southern North Carolina about 26 miles northeast of Charlotte, North Carolina.

DESCRIPTION: Improvement of environmental wastewater infrastructure facilities at multiple sites within Stanly County. Construction has been completed at an initial site by replacing a substandard wastewater pumping station and 4,000 feet of force main sewer line in the Town of Norwood. Design activities are underway at a second site to improve wastewater collection facilities for Millingport Elementary School and connecting these facilities with the City of Albemarle sewage collection system. Proposed improvements include 9,200 feet of force main, 24,000 feet of gravity line, and four (4) pump stations.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,398
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,116
Cash	1,003
Other	113
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 4,514
Allocation Thru FY 2003	\$ 26
Allocation For FY 2004	186
Allocation For FY 2005	844
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,200
Allocation For FY 2006	1,188
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1,154
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (NA%)	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design activities under the existing Design Agreement dated 22 July 2005, execute a PCA, and construct a force main and gravity piping portion of the project to serve wastewater infrastructure requirements at Millingport Elementary School in Albemarle County, NC. The PCA for the construction activities is scheduled for the Spring of 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The septic tank system serving the Millingport Elementary School is currently failing. The septic tank system is being replaced with over 33,000

feet of wastewater pipeline and four pump stations to connect the school to the City of Albemarle wastewater collection system. Failure to repair this system could lead to action taken by the Stanly County Health Department to revoke the operation permit for the school cafeteria and possibly school closure.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Hayes (NC-08)

DISTRICT: Wilmington

Date: 24 January 2006

SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Restoration of Abandoned Mine Sites Program

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1999, Sec 560; Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001

LOCATION: Restoration of Abandoned Mine Sites (RAMS) Program is a regional, four-Division program established by the Corps in 1999. Southwestern Division has joined South Pacific, Pacific Ocean and Northwest Divisions in participating in the RAMS program.

DESCRIPTION: Provides assistance to non-Federal and nonprofit entities to develop, manage, and maintain a database of conventional and innovative, cost effective technologies for reclamation of abandoned and inactive non-coal mine sites. Implementation plan, program management, and technology database are 100% Federal cost. Scoping, preparing, and negotiation of agreements are cost shared 50/50; exception is Federally managed lands are 100% Federal.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 7,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	4,375
Cash	4,375
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$11,875
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 4,331
Allocations for FY 2004	575
Allocations for FY 2005	848
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,000
Allocation for FY 2006	1,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 746
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue program management activities & technical, planning and design assistance on 94 sites in Nevada, California, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Arizona, Minnesota, Alaska, Utah, Hawaii, Oregon & Idaho. Continuing technical training program to address abandoned mine lands. Perform demonstration project on Elder Creek.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would finalize on-going projects nationwide.

OTHER INFORMATION: Continued strong Congressional interest for reauthorization of program in Water Resources Development Act. Construction is not currently authorized.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators: Stevens (R) & Murkowski (R)- AK; Allard (R) -CO; Craig (R) & Crapo (R)-ID; Wyden (D) -OR; Burns (R) and Baucus (D)-MT; Inhofe (R)-OK; Bond (R)-MO; Reid (D)-NV. Representatives: AK-1, Young(R); CA-4, Doolittle (R); CA-41, Lewis (R); CO-7, Beauprez (R); ID-1, Otter (R); MT At Large, Rehberg (R); NM-2, Pearce (R); NV-2, Gibbons (R); NV-3, Porter (R); UT-1, Bishop (R); UT-2, Matheson (D); UT-3, Cannon (R)

DISTRICT: Sacramento District

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Central New Mexico (Section 593)

AUTHORIZATION: Section 593 of WRDA 1999 and Section 118 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (PL 109-103)

LOCATION: The counties of Bernalillo, Sandoval, and Valencia, New Mexico

DESCRIPTION: The program provides for design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests in the counties of Bernalillo, Sandoval, and Valencia, New Mexico, for publicly owned water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 50,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	16,700
Cash	(16,700)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$66,700
Allocation thru FY 2003	8,002
Allocation for FY 2004	3,863
Allocation for FY 2005	5,538
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete After FY06	27,647
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete construction of Belen Utility Infrastructure, Tijeras Phase III, Rio Rancho Industrial Loop and the Coors Vacuum Pump Station. Initiate construction of Rio Rancho Wells, and Black Mesa Phase I.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of Black Mesa Phase I, award of Black Mesa Phase II (Pump Station and Pond) contract, completion of Rio Rancho Wells, and initiation of construction of Bernalillo Waste Water Improvements and design for Tohajillee.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-103) increased the authorized limit of this project to \$50,000,000.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01; Pearce, NM-02; and Udall, NM-03

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: City of Santa Clarita (Perchlorate), California

AUTHORIZATION: Consolidated Appropriation Act, 2001 Section 111 (b)(3)(c)

LOCATION: The City of Santa Clarita, California, Santa Clarita Valley in the northern part of Los Angeles Co., California

DESCRIPTION: The project will characterize Perchlorate contamination in the study area aquifer system, perform engineering evaluations, define contaminant sources and migration pathways and develop alternatives for long-term solutions. The project has developed a Study Area Conceptual Site Model that describes contamination migration in the aquifer system.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 7,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	7,000
Cash	3,500
Other	3,500
Total Estimated Cost	\$14,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$2,735
Allocation for FY 2004	386
Allocation for FY 2005	156
Allocation for FY 2006	495
Conference Amount for FY 2006	500
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	3,228
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__ %)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Refine the Study Area Conceptual Site Model, develop contaminate mitigation strategies, continue the groundwater sampling program, and further development of the groundwater numerical model.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Feinstein, Boxer, Congresspersons **Miller** (CA-42), **Mc Keon** (CA-25)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Harbor/South Bay Water Recycling, California

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 219(f) as amended by WRDA 1999, Section 502(b) and amended by Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2001, Section 108(c)(6), WRDA 2002 Section 219 (c)

LOCATION: The project area is located in Gardena, Torrance, Lomita, Carson, Los Angeles, Compton, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Redondo Beach, Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills and Rancho Verde Estates, California.

DESCRIPTION: The project is part of the West Basin Municipal Water District's recycled water distribution system expansion, which will serve recycled wastewater to numerous local cities. The project will include the design and construction of over 30 miles of recycled water pipeline (broken into 12 laterals) and associated distribution/operational facilities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$35,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost:	11,700
Cash	(11,700)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$46,700
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 6,291
Allocation for FY 2004	456
Allocation for FY 2005	5,126
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,000
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	\$ 20,157
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue construction of Madrona Marsh Lateral (6A).

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: Customers for the recycled water would include the ARCO, Chevron and Mobil refineries, as well as the Wilmington/LA Harbor industrial area, the Palos Verdes Peninsula, and the LA International Airport/Westside area in LA County. Eventually, the project would be connected with the existing West Basin Water Recycling Project. The overall West Basin water-recycling program would develop up to 70,000 acre-feet of alternative water resources annually, provide a more reliable and drought-proof water supply for the Los Angeles Area and also directly reduce the amount of effluent discharge into the Santa Monica Bay, National Marine Estuary.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons Sanchez (CA-39), Napolitano (CA-38), Watson (CA-33), Royal-Allard (CA-34), **Waters** (CA-35), **Millender-McDonald** (CA-37), **Harman** (CA-36), **Rohrabacher** (CA-46)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Davis Lake Water Treatment Plant, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 133 of Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (amended Section 219 of WRDA 1992)

LOCATION: The project is located in Plumas County, California.

DESCRIPTION: The Corps will assist Plumas County with construction of the Davis Lake 1.5 MGD water treatment plant.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$2,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	800
Cash	800
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,300
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,500
Allocation for FY 2006	2,475
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	25
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute PCA, review design, and initiation construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would allow for construction completion in FY 08.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Corps will participate in technical, design and construction assistance through procurement of private services.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Doolittle (CA-4)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/ STUDY NAME: New Mexico Environmental Infrastructure (Section 595) (Idaho, Montana, Rural Nevada, New Mexico and Rural Utah).

AUTHORIZATION: Section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (PL 106-53) amended by FY 2004 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act (PL 108-137) to include the entire state of New Mexico

LOCATION: State of New Mexico.

DESCRIPTION: The program provides for design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests in New Mexico for publicly owned water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	<u>FY2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,300
Cash	(8,300)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 33,300
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	586
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	19,464
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Execute Project Cooperation Agreement and initiate construction contract for Pecos Wastewater Treatment, Miami Water Supply, Jal Water supply and Blue Hole Lake. Initiate construction contract for Eunice Water Supply,

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion of construction of Pecos Wastewater, Miami Water Supply, Jal Water Supply, Blue Hole Lake, and Eunice Water Supply. Initiate construction of Questa and Las Cruces projects.

OTHER INFORMATION: There are no economic requirements. The projects can be reimbursable. No additional authorization is needed to implement the request.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Wilson, NM-01; Pearce, NM-02; and Udall, NM-03

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Rio Salado Phoenix and Tempe Reaches, Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: Flood Control Act of 1938, Section 6 (Gila River & Tribes, AZ & NM), WRDA 1999, Section 101(a)(4)

LOCATION: Phoenix Reach is located along 5 miles of Salt River, from I-10 Bridge to 19th Avenue in the city of Phoenix, Arizona. Tempe Reach is located along 1.3 miles of Indian Bend Wash, from McKellips Road downstream to the confluence with Salt River, and includes two separate reaches of the Salt River upstream and downstream of Tempe Town Lake in the city of Tempe, Arizona.

DESCRIPTION: The project will restore the area with high quality native plant communities, riparian habitat, and recreation opportunities.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 74,450
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	41,550
Cash	(33,450)
Other	(8,100)
Total Estimated Cost	\$116,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 24,462
Allocation for FY 2004	19,237
Allocation for FY 2005	14,437
Allocation for FY 2006	7,920
Conference Amount for FY 2006	8,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	8,394
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete construction of Phase I & 2, water supply and maintenance roads, and initiate construction of Phase III for Phoenix. Complete construction of Phase I (Indian Bend Wash) and initiate construction of Phase II and complete Design of Phase III for Tempe.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen **Pastor** (AZ-2), **Hayworth** (AZ-6), Senator Kyl

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Section 595, Rural Nevada

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 99 (P.L. 106-377), Sec 595

LOCATION: Communities within the state of Nevada that meet program criteria

DESCRIPTION: WRDA 99, Sec 595 authority provides reimbursement for design and construction assistance for water supply, wastewater treatment, environmental restoration and surface water protection. Projects are to be cost shared 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal. Federal participation in the program is limited to \$100 million for Rural Nevada projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$100,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	33,300
Cash	0
Other	33,300
Total Estimated Cost	\$133,300
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 4,942
Allocations for FY 2004	7,576
Allocation for FY 2005	10,802
Conference Amount for FY 2006	20,000
Allocation for FY 2006	19,800
Balance to Complete after (FY06)	56,880
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate	NA
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	NA

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funding received will be used to provide reimbursement to existing Project Cooperation Agreements (PCA's) and for signing amended or new agreements. The following communities are anticipated to sign new or amended agreements: Douglas County Sewer Improvement District, Douglas County; McGill-Ruth Consolidated Sewer and Water General Improvement District, White Pine County; Battle Mountain, Lander County; Spanish Springs Valley Phase 1b, Washoe County; Lawton-Verdi Wastewater Project Phase 5, Washoe County; Huffaker Hills Water Conservation Project, Washoe County; and Round Hill General Improvement District, Douglas County.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Program limit of \$100M is anticipated to be reached prior to FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: Prior to FY 2006, \$20,358,000 has been reprogrammed out of this program and Federal funds of \$64,150,000 allocated to signed PCA's.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Berkley (NV-1); Gibbons (NV-2); Porter (NV-3); Senators Reid and Ensign

DISTRICT: Sacramento and Los Angeles Districts

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Section 595, Rural Utah Environmental Infrastructure and Resource Protection Program

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 99 (P.L. 106-377), Sec 595

LOCATION: Communities within the state of Utah that meet program criteria.

DESCRIPTION: WRDA 99, Sec 595 authority provides reimbursement for design and construction assistance for water supply, wastewater treatment, environmental restoration and surface water protection. Projects are to be cost shared 75% Federal and 25% non-Federal. The total program is limited to \$25M for Rural Utah projects.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,300
Cash	0
Other	8,300
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 33,300
Allocations through FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	64
Conference Amount for FY 2006	10,000
Allocation for FY 2006	9,900
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	15,036
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funding will be used to provide reimbursement to existing Project Cooperation Agreements and for signing amended or new agreements. The following communities are anticipated to sign new or amended agreements: Blanding, Logan City, Uintah County, Richmond City, Cedar City/Iron Counties, Summit County/Park City, Kane County, Park City, and Wide Hollow.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Bishop (UT-1); Matheson (UT-2); Cannon (UT-3); Senators Bennett and Hatch

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Sacramento Area, CA

AUTHORIZATION: Section 502 of Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) 1999 (amended Section 219 of WRDA 1992); Section 133 of Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2004 (amended Section 219 of WRDA 1992)

LOCATION: The project is located in Placer and El Dorado Counties and the San Juan Water District, California.

DESCRIPTION: This region participated in a Water Forum to provide a safe and reliable water supply while preserving the fishery, wildlife, and recreational values of the lower American River. Regional efforts have developed a master plan including conservation and recycling measures to meet water needs while protecting environmental and aesthetic resources. The project identifies water conservation and recycling opportunities for existing water supplies through water and wastewater projects, programs, and infrastructures.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 70,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	23,000
Cash	23,000
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 93,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 221
Allocations for FY 2004	1,729
Allocations for FY 2005	6,554
Conference Amount for FY 2006	6,000
Allocation for FY 2006	5,940
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	55,556
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue water meters purchase, water meters installation, water treatment plant construction, waterline construction, and water use efficiency studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: The Corps will participate in technical, design and construction assistance through procurement of private services.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Doolittle (CA-4)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Ramon Valley Recycled Water, CA

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1999, Section 502, b(42)

LOCATION: Project is located in the San Ramon Valley, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties, approximately 25 miles east of San Francisco. It runs from Danville south to Dublin.

DESCRIPTION: The project would include design and construction of 8 pump stations, 8 storage reservoirs, and 135 miles of pipeline. The Corps will assist with the design of one pump station and 6,500 feet of pipeline. The project will provide approximately 8,200-acre feet of recycled water annually for landscape irrigation and conserve high quality drinking water for 12,000 families.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 15,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	135,000
Cash	5,000
Other	130,000
Total Estimated Cost	\$150,000
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 231
Allocation for FY 2004	210
Allocation for FY 2005	304
Conference Amount for FY 2006	3,000
Allocation for FY 2006	2,970
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	11,285
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (___%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design and plans and specifications of pump station and pipeline, and award construction contract for pump station pipeline in June 06.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: Local interests have invested over \$2 million in planning costs since 1990. The Corps executed a Design Agreement on November 18, 2002 with the project sponsor to assist with the design of one pump station and 6,500 feet of pipeline along Bollinger Canyon Road in San Ramon.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Miller CA-7, Lee CA- 9, Tauscher CA-10, Pombo CA-11

DISTRICT: San Francisco

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tahoe Basin Restoration, CA & NV

AUTHORIZATION: Section 108, Title I, Division C of the Consolidation Appropriations Act, 2005 (H. R. 4818)

LOCATION: The 2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act includes language creating a new program to provide environmental assistance to non-Federal interests in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

DESCRIPTION: 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 including urban stormwater conveyance, treatment and related facilities; watershed planning, science and research; environmental restoration; and surface water resources protection and development.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$25,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	8,300
Cash	8,300
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$33,300
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY2005	0
Conference Amount for FY2006	3,600
Allocation for FY 2006	3,564
Balance to Complete after FY2006	21,436
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Initiate planning and design and initiate construction.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Currently unscheduled.

OTHER INFORMATION: This program, while essentially an environmental infrastructure program, is more narrowly focused on providing direct support to the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). The EIP is a very technically advanced watershed restoration effort in year 6 of a 15 year plan. This program provides the maximum flexibility for the Corps to provide assistance to projects.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gibbons (NV-2); Doolittle (CA-4); Senators Reid and Ensign (NV); Senator Feinstein (CA)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tahoe Basin Tribal Partnerships, CA & NV

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 2000, Sec 203

LOCATION: Lake Tahoe Basin watershed is in the Sierra Nevada Mountains straddling the border of California and Nevada approximately 50 miles southwest of Reno, NV.

DESCRIPTION: The Lake Tahoe Basin land was traditionally occupied by the Washoe Tribe. Habitats and pre-Columbian conditions have been substantially altered through construction and development activities. While extensive physical watershed restoration effort is currently underway, little attention has been paid to cultural watershed restoration outside of individual project mitigation. The purpose of this study is to initiate a watershed style report detailing specific prioritized activities that contribute to cultural restoration.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006 Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 550
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	100
Cash	100
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 650
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocations for FY 2004	0
Allocations for FY 2005	48
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	300
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	202
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Project close out. Local interests strongly desire a Tahoe Basin cultural resource restoration effort. Reconnaissance failed to identify a viable project.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: N/A

OTHER INFORMATION: No viable project identified.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gibbons (NV-2); Doolittle (CA-4)

DISTRICT: Sacramento

6 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tres Rios, Arizona

AUTHORIZATION: WRDA 1992, Section 321; WRDA 1996, Section 301(b)(2); WRDA 2000, Section 101(b)(4)

LOCATION: Tres Rios is located at the confluence of Salt, Gila, and Agua Fria Rivers southwest of the metropolitan area for Phoenix, Arizona.

DESCRIPTION: Focus will be on flood control and the use of treated effluent from a regional wastewater treatment facility to restore and sustain fish and wildlife habitat and other purposes in project area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 75,350
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	45,450
Cash	(5,450)
Other	(40,000)
Total Estimated Cost	\$120,800
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 2,303
Allocation for FY 2004	2,419
Allocation for FY 2005	3,104
Allocation for FY 2006	4,455
Conference Amount for FY 2006	4,500
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	63,069
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue and complete Phase 1A Flood Control Levee construction. Complete In-House Design of Phase 1B Control Levee and continue A/E continuing contract for design of Pump Station and Wetlands.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable construction completion in FY 2010.

OTHER INFORMATION: Two separate Project Cooperation Agreements (PCA) will be utilized for Tres Rios. The first PCA was signed May 2004 by the Corps and City of Phoenix, and covers features not on Gila River Indian Community (GRIC) lands. The second PCA would be signed by the Corps in FY 2007, City and GRIC and would cover features on tribal land.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congressmen **Franks** (AZ-2), **Pastor** (AZ-4), **Grijalva** (AZ-7), and Senator Kyl.

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tribal Partnership Program

AUTHORIZATION: Section 203, WRDA 2000.

LOCATION: The Tribal Partnership Program covers the state of New Mexico, Southern Colorado, and western Texas. The proposed studies are located on the Tribal Lands of the Pueblos of Isleta, 10 miles south of Albuquerque; Zuni, 150 miles west of Albuquerque; Santa Ana, 15 miles north of Albuquerque; San Ildefonso Pueblo, 90 miles north of Albuquerque; and the Navajo Nation (Tohajiilee Chapter), 50 miles west of Albuquerque.

DESCRIPTION: Section 203 is a broad mandate wherein the Corps may determine the feasibility of water and other resource development projects that substantially benefit Indian Tribes and are primarily located in Indian country. Such studies may address flood damage reduction, environmental restoration and protection, and the preservation of cultural and natural resources.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY2006 (\$000)</u> <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	3,000
Cash	(3,000)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Project Cost	\$ 6,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	133
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	2,570
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue to develop scopes, execute feasibility cost share agreements and initiate feasibility studies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable execution of feasibility cost share agreements and initiation of feasibility studies for Isleta, Zuni, Santa Ana, San Ildefonso, and the Navajo Nation (Tohajiilee Chapter) in FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Pueblos have numerous water, natural, and cultural resource challenges, including persistent flooding within their historic and culturally significant ancestral villages, management and operational problems with several aging dams and reservoirs, degradation of significant cultural and environmentally sensitive areas, drought planning and management.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Udall, NM-03

DISTRICT: Albuquerque

6 February 2006

channels. Maintenance dredging is required for FY2006 to remove hazardous shoals within Newport Bay harbor. Sediment traps constructed in Upper Newport Bay as part of the ecosystem restoration project could capture material before it migrates to the Lower Bay, decreasing the Federal maintenance dredging cycle at Newport Bay Harbor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons **Cox** (CA-48), **Sanchez** (CA-47)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Upper Newport Bay Ecosystem Restoration, California

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 99-662, Water Resources Development Act 1986, Section 841, Water Resources Development Act 2000, Section 101(b)(9)

LOCATION: The project is located approximately 40 miles SE of Los Angeles, containing a mix of marina and residential development in the lower reach and an 800-acre ecological reserve in the upper bay.

DESCRIPTION: The Upper Newport Bay Ecological Reserve (UNBER) plays a role in providing habitat for a variety of endangered species. Sedimentation has rapidly increased due to urbanization of the watershed affecting the upper reach and the existing federal navigation channel in the lower bay. The project includes dredging of the access channels and two sediment basins to provide restoration measures to the degraded habitat areas and re-establishing wetland and wildlife habitat areas.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 25,500
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	13,700
Cash	(13,000)
Other	(700)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 39,200
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 1,165
Allocation for FY 2004	451
Allocation for FY 2005	889
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	18,045
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (__%)	
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete design, ITR, plans and specifications. Initiate Construction of base contract and options 1 & 2.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Optimal funding would enable completion in 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: The draft PCA reflects advance funding may be received from the local sponsor. This will allow us to undertake construction of discrete components of the project this fiscal year and maintain project schedule. Orange Co. and the CA Dept. of Fish & Game will act as the Sponsors with the CA Coastal Conservancy providing grants in an amount of \$13,000,000 to Orange Co. to fund the non-Fed cash requirement for the project. OMB believes the cause of the Upper Newport Bay degradation is a result of the locals not maintaining the Bay from sedimentation. Therefore OMB cleared the project as a low priority item. The sponsors do not concur and have attempted to have OMB reclassify the project as a higher priority. Sediments from Upper Newport Bay migrate to Lower Newport Bay, shoaling in the federal navigation

channels. Maintenance dredging is required for FY2006 to remove hazardous shoals within Newport Bay harbor. Sediment traps constructed in Upper Newport Bay as part of the ecosystem restoration project could capture material before it migrates to the Lower Bay, decreasing the Federal maintenance dredging cycle at Newport Bay Harbor.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Congresspersons **Cox** (CA-48), **Sanchez** (CA-47)

DISTRICT: Los Angeles District

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
(CONSTRUCTION)
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River Chloride Control Project (Area VI, Elm Fork Basin), Oklahoma

AUTHORIZATION: The project was authorized in Section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1966 modified by Section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, and Section 1107 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

LOCATION: Area VI is located on the Elm Fork of the North Fork of the Red River in Harmon County, in southwestern Oklahoma. The three major chloride sources at Area VI are in Salton, Robinson, and Kaiser Canyons along the south bank of the Elm Fork.

DESCRIPTION: The U.S. Public Health Service initiated a study in 1957 to locate the natural chloride sources and determine the contribution of chlorides from individual areas to the Arkansas and Red River. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), entered the study in 1959 and recommended measures to control the 15 natural chloride sources identified. The Arkansas and Red River "studies" were split by legislation. Area VI contributes 510 tons per day of the total 4,400 tons per day of chlorides in the Red River Basin.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 50,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 50,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	375
Allocation for FY 2006	375
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	49,625
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funding in FY 2006 will be used to initiate general reevaluation studies for the Elm Fork Basin, OK element of the Red River Chloride Control Project. Activities will include initial data collection.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion of the general reevaluation study is FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The current policy requires identification of a non-Federal sponsor willing to assume operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement (OMRR&R) for the project prior to initiation of construction. Sufficient design has been completed for initiation

of real estate acquisition and award of the first construction contract. However, until a non-Federal sponsor is identified, construction can not proceed. Current non-Federal interests are working to obtain a modification to the existing project authorization to require the Federal government assume full responsibility for OMRR&R.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Nickles and Inhofe (OK), Hutchison and Cornyn (TX), Landrieu (LA), and Pryor (AR); Congressmen Thornberry (TX-13), Sandlin (TX-), Hall (TX-4), McCrery (LA-4), and Ross (AR-4)

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environmental Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Lawton, Oklahoma, Waste Water Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project

AUTHORIZATION: Section 219(f)(40), Water Resources Development Act of 1992 as amended.

LOCATION: City of Lawton, Oklahoma

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of constructing wastewater infrastructure for the City of Lawton, Oklahoma.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,700
Cash	(0)
Other	(1,700)
Total Estimated Cost	6,700
Allocations thru FY 2003	55
Allocation for FY 2004	48
Allocation for FY 2005	533
Conference Amount for FY 2006	38
Allocation for FY 2006	38
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	\$ 4,859
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds provided in FY 2006 will be used to complete all environmental compliance activities required for construction, and to initiate negotiations on the Project Cooperation Agreement.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion of project construction is FY 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: None.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe, OK; and Congressman Cole, OK-4.

DISTRICT: Tulsa

Date: 24 February 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT NAME: North Padre Island, Packery Channel, Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1999, Section 556.

DESCRIPTION: The project provides for a jettied entrance, a channel through North Padre Island along the existing Packery Channel, located north and adjacent to the John F. Kennedy Causeway, and joining the main channel of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at mile 553.0.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA</u>	<u>FY 2006 (\$000) CONSTRUCTION</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$22,121
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	12,928
Cash	(11,401)
Other	(510)
Betterments	(1,017)
Total Estimated Project Cost	35,049
Allocation thru FY 2003	5,527
Allocation for FY 2004	5,627
Allocation for FY 2005	4,388
Conference Amount for FY 2006	4,079
Allocation for FY 2006	4,038
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,541
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable Rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY06 funds are being used to continue the construction contract awarded in July 2003.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: Construction was scheduled to be completed in January 2006. However, due to the damages to the project caused by Hurricanes Emily and Rita, additional time and funds will be required. An additional amount of \$2,541,000 in Federal funds, plus cost shared non-Federal funds, will be required to complete the repair work, and is included in the revised project cost estimate. The additional Federal funds are required to complete this FY. BCR/RBCR is "N/A" because project authorization does not require economic justification.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Hutchison (TX); Congressman Ortiz (TX-27)

DATE: February 24, 2006

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Red River Chloride Control Project (Wichita River Basin), Texas

AUTHORIZATION: Section 1107, of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) 1986.

LOCATION: Wichita River Basin in northwest Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The project is designed to control natural chloride brine emissions at three major source areas to improve water quality for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use. Improvements include construction of a low flow dams, pump stations, and diversion pipelines to Truscott Brine Dam.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000) <u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 70,562
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	
Other	
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 70,562
Allocation thru FY 2003	\$ 8,986
Allocation for FY 2004	1,159
Allocation for FY 2005	1,332
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,125
Allocation for FY 2006	1,125
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	57,960
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue environmental monitoring efforts, complete plans and specifications for Area X and initiate P&S for Area VII.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion of construction is FY 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: The current policy requires identification of a non-Federal sponsor willing to assume operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement (OMRR&R) for the project prior to initiation of construction. Sufficient design has been completed for initiation of real estate acquisition and award of the first construction contract. However, until a non-Federal sponsor is identified, construction can not proceed. Current non-Federal interests are working to obtain a modification to the existing project authorization to require the Federal government assume full responsibility for OMRR&R.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senators Inhofe and Coburn, OK, Hutchison and Cornyn, TX, Landrieu, LA, and Pryor, AR; and Congressmen Thornberry, TX-13, Sandlin, TX-1, Hall, TX-4, McCrery, LA-4, and Ross, AR-4.

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: San Antonio Channel Improvement, TX

AUTHORIZATION: FCA 1954 (P.L. 780-83); Section 103, WRDA 1976 (P.L. 94-587); Section 224, WRDA 1996 (P.L. 104-303); Section 335, WRDA 2000 (P.L. 106-541).

LOCATION: The project is located in the city of San Antonio (Bexar County), Texas.

DESCRIPTION: The project includes local protection features including channels, levees and two diversion tunnels and ecosystem restoration and recreation features. The originally authorized project for flood damage reduction is complete. The remaining project for ecosystem restoration and recreation includes the creation of 113 acres of aquatic and 320 acres of riparian habitat and 55,800 feet of multi-purpose recreation trails. Improvements considered for the Woodlawn area will consist of channel modifications, detention dams and buyouts.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 221,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	104,000
Cash	28,600
Other	75,400
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 325,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 156,275
Allocation for FY 2004	2,705
Allocation for FY 2005	1,333
Conference Amount for FY 2006	2,730
Allocation for FY 2006	2,457
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	58,230
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (2-1/2%)	4.7
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	7.0

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue development of the Design Documentation Report and initiate development of plans and specifications; finalize negotiations and execute the Project Cooperation Agreement for the ecosystem restoration features in the Mission Reach, complete floodplain mapping of the tributaries, and identify a recommended plan for the Woodlawn area.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion date for construction of the environmental restoration and recreation features is 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: The lack of continued funding will impact non-Federal construction activities that, while not part of the Federal project, are integral to its completeness; i.e. infrastructure and recreation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Gonzalez, TX-20; Smith, TX-21; Bonilla, TX-23; Cuellar, TX-28.

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Environment Infrastructure

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Tar Creek Cleanup (Restoration of Tar Creek and Vicinity), Oklahoma

AUTHORIZATION: Section 111, Energy and Water Development Appropriation Act of 2004 (PL 108-137).

LOCATION: Tar Creek is located in Ottawa County, Oklahoma

DESCRIPTION: The authorization for Tar Creek provides technical, planning, design and construction assistance to non-Federal interests to remedy adverse environmental and human health impacts in Ottawa County, Oklahoma. In providing assistance, the Secretary shall coordinate with the State, Tribal and local interests. The Secretary may undertake implementation of such activities as the Secretary determines to be necessary or advisable to demonstrate practicable alternatives, such activities shall include measures to address lead exposure and other environmental problems related to historical mining activities in the area.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$15,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Project Cost	15,000
Allocation thru FY 2003	0
Allocation for FY 2004	4,966
Allocation for FY2005	1,332
Conference for FY 2006	3,750
Allocation for FY 2006	3,750
Balance to Complete After FY 2006	4,952
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue contracts for environmental remediation and mine shaft closures

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: The earliest attainable completion date is FY 2007.

OTHER INFORMATION: Section 111 provides authority to the Corps to implement projects determined by the Secretary to be necessary to address lead exposure, and other environmental problems related to historical mining activities in the area. Non-Federal interests are responsible for providing any necessary lands, easements or rights-of-way and are responsible for operating and maintaining any restoration alternatives constructed. All other costs shall be borne by the Federal Government.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senator Inhofe (OK)

Table of Contents
 Fiscal Year 2006
 Enacted Fact Sheets

Recreation.....	680
Investigations.....	681
Great Lakes and Ohio River Division.....	682
Northern Kentucky Riverfront Commons, KY.....	683
Ohio Riverfront, Cincinnati, OH (Central Riverfront Park)	684
Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park, WV.....	685
Mississippi Valley Division	686
West Baton Rouge Parish, LA.....	687
Construction.....	688
Mississippi Valley Division	689
Des Moines Recreation River & Greenbelt, IA.....	690
Water Supply.....	691
Investigations.....	692
Mississippi Valley Division	693
Cross Lake, LA Water Supply Improvements	694
Mississippi River and Tributaries	695
Bayou Meto, AR	696
Southwestern Division.....	697
Middle Brazos River, TX.....	698
Construction.....	700
Mississippi River and Tributaries	701
Grand Prairie, AR	702
Other	703
Investigations.....	704
Northwestern Division	705
Chatfield, Cherry Creek and Bear Creek Reservoirs, CO.....	706

RECREATION

INVESTIGATIONS

GREAT LAKES
AND
OHIO RIVER
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Recreation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Northern Kentucky Riverfront Commons, Kentucky

AUTHORIZATION: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, United States House of Representatives, Resolution No. 2517, dated May 7, 1997.

LOCATION: The communities of Covington, Newport, Bellevue and Dayton, Kentucky, are located on the Ohio River, directly across from the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, at river mile 470.0.

DESCRIPTION: The effort will address interface with federally constructed flood damage prevention structures and commercial navigation features along the Ohio River. The communities seek Corps direction and performance of this effort to assure that future development is compatible with existing Federal infrastructure development. The program is the preparation of a comprehensive development master plan with preliminary schematics for the communities of Covington, Newport, Bellevue and Dayton, Kentucky.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Recon</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 100.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 100.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	100.0
Allocation for FY 2006	99.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	1.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: FY 2006 funds of \$99,000 will be used to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: This study is a Congressional Add. Member requested \$2,000,000 for a master implementation plan for riverfront development to include preliminary design, environmental impact statement, economic justification, and financial feasibility. By policy directive, the initial Federal involvement is limited to a reconnaissance study.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Inconsistent. The Administration does not support Civil Works participation in recreation development.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: McConnell (KY), Bunning (KY), Davis (KY-4)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Recreation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Ohio Riverfront, Cincinnati, Ohio (Central Riverfront Park)

AUTHORIZATION: Division H, Section 118 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (PL 108-199).

LOCATION: The City of Cincinnati is located in southwest Ohio on the Ohio River at river mile 470.0.

DESCRIPTION: The project objective is to enhance public access to the central riverfront. Project features include an amphitheater, pedestrian walkways, grass terraces, festival areas, landscaping, fountains and lighting.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000):</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 5,625.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,875.0
Cash	0
Other	1,875.0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 7,500.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 0
Allocation for FY 2004	177.0
Allocation for FY 2005	1,119.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	250.0
Allocation for FY 2006	247.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	4,082.0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.625%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Scheduled FY05 carryover funds of \$955,000 will be used to complete schematic design of the project and the FY 2006 Conference amount of \$250,000 will be used to initiate plans and specifications for Phase 1.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2007

OTHER INFORMATION: Prior to FY 2006, a net amount of \$562,000 was reprogrammed from this project and of this date, has not been restored. Continuing appropriations (General Investigations) will need to be available during the fiscal year (2nd quarter) in order to continue design.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Inconsistent with Administration policy. Recreation development is a low budget priority.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS: Voinovich (OH), DeWine (OH), Chabot (OH-1), Schmidt (OH-2), Hobson (OH-7)

DISTRICT: Louisville District

Date: 24 January 2006

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Recreation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Parkersburg/Vienna Riverfront Park, WV

AUTHORIZATION: Public Law 106-53, WRDA 99, Section 557 (1).

LOCATION: Parkersburg is located at River Mile 184.5 on the Ohio River in Wood County, WV.

DESCRIPTION: The project consists of an expanded excursion boat landing, a 1200-foot long riverwall with a 20-foot wide esplanade, 59 car parking lot, restrooms, open seating areas, picnic areas, a handicap accessible fishing pier, and a walking trail. A PED Cost Sharing Agreement was executed in August 2004.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 573.0
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	191.0
Cash	191.0
Other	0
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 764.0
Allocation thru 2003	\$ 360.0
Allocation for FY 2004	0
Allocation for FY 2005	15.0
Conference Amount for FY 2006	200.0
Allocation for FY 2006	198.0
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5 3/8%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete PED including completing DDR, initiating Plans and Specifications, and coordinating the PCA.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Complete PED in FY 2006

OTHER INFORMATION: The Limited Reevaluation Report, the decision document, is complete but not approved.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION: Inconsistent with Administration policy.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Mollohan (WV-01)

DISTRICT: Huntington District

Date: 23 January 2006

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Recreation

STUDY NAME: West Baton Rouge Parish, LA

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2570, 23 Jul 98, and WRDA 99, Sec 517(5)

LOCATION: City of Port Allen, Louisiana in West Baton Rouge Parish

DESCRIPTION: The project is located in West Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana with specific interest towards improvements along the Mississippi River Levee in the City of Port Allen. The improvements would provide for an array of recreational, interpretive and educational opportunities through the provision of multiuse areas, playing fields, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and other recreational type improvements.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>PED</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 607
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	0
Cash	(0)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 607
Allocations thru FY 2003	427
Allocation for FY 2004	66
Allocation for FY 2005	40
Conference Amount for FY 2006	75
Allocation for FY 2006	\$ 74
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	0
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	2.3
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue reconnaissance efforts to negotiate and execute a feasibility cost sharing agreement (FCSA) with the local sponsor, the City of Port Allen.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2006.

OTHER INFORMATION: The project justification is based on NED recreational benefits with a benefit cost ratio of approximately 2.3 to 1.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Melancon (LA-3), Baker (LA-6), and Senate: Landrieu and Vitter (LA).

DISTRICT: New Orleans District

DATE: 6 February 2006

CONSTRUCTION

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Recreation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Des Moines Recreation River and Greenbelt, IA

AUTHORIZATION: SAA 85, Chapter IV, 99 Stat. 312-313; Sec 203, FCA 58; Sec 111, WRDA 76.

LOCATION: The authorized project is for development, operations, and maintenance of a recreational and greenbelt area ranging from Fort Dodge, Iowa to 50 miles southeast of Des Moines, Iowa, along the Des Moines & Raccoon Rivers. The project boundary includes Saylorville Reservoir and Lake Red Rock, as well as portions of the cities of Des Moines, Fort Dodge, Webster City, Boone, West Des Moines, Knoxville, and Pella.

DESCRIPTION: The Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt (Greenbelt) is being implemented in coordination with an Advisory Committee consisting of 47 local, state, and Federal officials. Since the project was authorized for construction in 1985, 14 projects have been completed. Five projects in three locations have been identified by the Advisory Committee as priority projects for implementation: Fort Dodge Riverfront and Trails, Des Moines Riverwalk, Des Moines Downtown Amphitheater Modifications, Cordova Center at Lake Red Rock, and Red Rock Trail 4B. Work on these projects has been underway since 2003.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$53,740
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	43,660
Cash	(33,660)
Other	(10,000)
Total Estimated Cost	\$97,400
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$14,086
Allocation for FY 2004	1,911
Allocation for FY 2005	2,869
Conference Amount for FY 2006	5,000
Allocation for FY 2006	4,950
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	29,924
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to continue coordination with the Greenbelt Advisory Committee; complete engineering reports and plans and specifications for the Des Moines Riverwalk; continue preconstruction engineering and design activities for Fort Dodge Riverfront Development and Trails and Cordova Center at Lake Red Rock; complete construction of Des Moines Amphitheater ADA Modifications; and continue construction of Red Rock Trail Segment 4B.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: The Greenbelt projects at Des Moines and Fort Dodge require a 50% local cost share. The Cordova Center and Trail Segment 4B at Lake Red Rock are being implemented at Federal expense since they are located on Federal lands. Following execution of cost sharing agreements, planning, design and construction work performed by the sponsor, or others on behalf of the sponsor, may be credited up to \$10 million towards the sponsor's share of the cost of Greenbelt projects in accordance with the Consolidated Development Appropriations Resolution, 2003. Benefit cost analysis are prepared for each recreation project. The information is not yet available.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Boswell (IA-3), Latham (IA-4); Sen: Grassley & Harkin (IA).

DISTRICT: Rock Island District

DATE: 6 February 2006

WATER SUPPLY

INVESTIGATIONS

MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY
DIVISION

FACT SHEET
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Water Supply

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Cross Lake, LA, Water Supply Improvements

AUTHORIZATION: HR, Docket 2648, 26 July 2000.

LOCATION: Cross Lake is located northwest of Shreveport, LA.

DESCRIPTION: Cross Lake has served as a municipal and industrial (M&I) water supply source for the city of Shreveport since the 1920s. The lake is about 14 square miles in surface area. The watershed draining into the lake consists of about 260 square miles. The holding capacity of the already shallow lake (8.5 feet) is decreasing due to siltation, contributing to increasing difficulty in managing it as a water supply source. The feasibility study will evaluate options including additional pumping capacity on Cross Lake at lower elevations as well as new pumping stations and water treatment facilities on the Red River.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	590
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	400
Cash	(200)
Other	(200)
Total Estimated Cost	990
Allocations thru FY 03	0
Allocation for FY 04	65
Allocation for FY 05	159
Conference Amount for FY 06	100
Allocation for FY 06	99
Balance to Complete after FY 06	267
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (____%)	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%)	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Funds are being used to complete the project management plan, negotiate the feasibility cost-sharing agreement (FCSA), and initiate feasibility studies. The FCSA is scheduled to be signed in March 2006.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Recently developed data suggest that the siltation rate of the lake ranges from 0.33 inch to almost 1 inch per year. As the holding capacity of the lake decreases and the city population continues to grow, the lake becomes more difficult to manage as a municipal and industrial (M&I) water supply reservoir. Also, access to the lake by neighboring homeowners becomes increasingly difficult as the shallow areas near the shore recede due to siltation.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Senate: Vitter and Landrieu (LA); House: McCrery (LA-04).

DISTRICT: Vicksburg District

DATE: 6 February 2006

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Water Supply

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Bayou Meto Basin, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Authorized by Section 363 of WRDA 1996, subject to the Secretary's determination of implementability.

LOCATION: This project is located in Lonoke, Prairie, Pulaski, Jefferson, and Arkansas Counties in east-central Arkansas.

DESCRIPTION: Project features include diversion of excess water from the Arkansas River with delivery through a system of pump stations, new canals, existing streams, and pipelines to the water depleted areas; channel improvements, control structures, and a pumping station to provide for reduced flooding and water management; waterfowl conservation and management measures; and other ecosystem restoration and enhancement features.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 18,665
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	550
Cash	(550)
Other	(0)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 19,215
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 14,325
Allocation for FY 2004	630
Allocation for FY 2005	1,533
Conference Amount for FY 2006	1,640
Allocation for FY 2006	1,624
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	553
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate (5.375%):	1.13
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Current year funds are being used to complete the general reevaluation report and initiate plans and specifications for the first item of work. The draft General Reevaluation Report/EIS was released for public review in December 05. The final General Reevaluation Report/EIS is scheduled for June 06 with a ROD signed in August 06. It is anticipated that the Secretary could approve the waterfowl and water supply components of the project for construction in August 06, pursuant to Section 363 of WRDA 1996. The flood control component is within the discretionary authority of the Chief of Engineers to approve and this approval is expected to occur at this same time. Flood damage prevention and waterfowl management, (Corps high priority outputs), provide significant project benefits.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: To be determined.

OTHER INFORMATION: Project has not been included in the President's Budget request and is dependent on congressional adds.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Berry (AR-1), Ross (AR-4). Senate: Lincoln and Pryor (AR).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
INVESTIGATIONS
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Water Supply

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Middle Brazos River Basin, TX

AUTHORIZATION: House and Senate Resolutions (7 June 1945 thru 3 November 1970)

LOCATION: The study area is located within the middle portion of the Brazos River Basin, which is bounded on the northwest by the Clear Fork of the Brazos River and on the southeast by Yegua Creek, and includes all or part of 32 counties.

DESCRIPTION: The Middle Brazos River basin has experienced a variety of water resource problems including flooding, water supply, and environmental and water quality degradation. The Systems Assessment Interim Feasibility Study provides a comprehensive assessment of Federal reservoir operations to determine if more optimal uses of existing water resources are possible.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Study</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 3,228
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	2,647
Cash	2,002
Other	645
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 5,875
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 893
Allocation for FY 2004	-38
Allocation for FY 2005	-11
Conference Amount for FY 2006	300
Allocation for FY 2006	297
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	2,087
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Conduct Phase I of the study. This includes, but is not limited to: estimating critical yield for existing top of conservation pool at each of the nine Corps reservoirs within the basin; develop an estimate of critical yield for four alternative pool elevations for eight of the reservoirs; conduct an overview assessment of cultural and environmental resources; review the economics associated with each project; and recommend projects to be further evaluated.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Based on optimal funding beginning in FY07, the earliest attainable completion date for this feasibility study is 2009.

OTHER INFORMATION: The recent drought in north and central Texas (the worst in over 50 years) has raised the criticality of completing this study.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: McCaul, TX-10; Conaway, TX-11; Granger, TX-12;

Thornberry, TX-13; Edwards, TX-17; Neugebauer, TX-19; Carter, TX-31.

DISTRICT: Fort Worth

Date: 24 February 2006

CONSTRUCTION

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

FACT SHEET
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CONSTRUCTION
Enacted Studies and Projects

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Water Supply

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Grand Prairie Region, AR

AUTHORIZATION: Sec 204, FCA 1950 (construction authorized); Sec 1001(b), WRDA 1986 (deauthorized); Sec 363, WRDA 1996 (reauthorized construction, expanding the scope to include groundwater protection and conservation, agricultural water supply, and waterfowl management, if the Secretary determines the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economic).

LOCATION: The Grand Prairie portion of the Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas, Project is primarily located in Arkansas and Prairie Counties and a small portion in Lonoke and Monroe Counties.

DESCRIPTION: This project will provide for agricultural water supply, ground water protection, and fish and wildlife restoration and enhancement.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	FY 2006 (\$000)
	<u>Construction</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$ 208,000
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	111,000
Cash	(61,336)
Other	(49,664)
Total Estimated Cost	\$ 319,000
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$ 48,257
Allocation for FY 2004	1,253
Allocation for FY 2005	4,506
Conference Amount for FY 2006	9,000
Allocation for FY 2006	8,910
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	145,074
Benefit to Cost Ratio Applicable rate:	N/A
Remaining Benefits Remaining Costs Ratio (7%):	N/A

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Continue construction of the pumping station at DeValls Bluff, AR, - awarded March 05, and continue the design for future items of work.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: Original construction phase schedule was based on a 7-year program. Assuming funding is at the capability level, the earliest attainable completion for the construction phase would be FY 2012.

OTHER INFORMATION: The sponsors are the State of Arkansas and the White River Regional Irrigation Water Distribution District. The Alluvial Aquifer is predicted to be depleted by the year 2015. The Sparta Aquifer, used primarily for municipal and industrial water supply cannot sustain irrigated agriculture. Without the project, an annual decrease of \$46,000,000 in farm receipts is expected. Along with protecting the Sparta & Alluvial aquifers, the project will also provide an added environmental benefit of 12 million duck-use days for the project area.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: House: Berry (AR-1) and Ross (AR-4). Sen: Lincoln and Pryor (AR).

DISTRICT: Memphis

DATE: 6 February 2006

OTHER PROGRAMS

INVESTIGATIONS

NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

FACT SHEET
General Investigations

BUSINESS PROGRAM: Water Reallocation

PROJECT/STUDY NAME: Chatfield, Cherry Creek and Bear Creek Reservoirs, Colorado

AUTHORIZATION: Section 216, 1970 Flood Control Act, Section 808, WRDA 1986

LOCATION: The study area originally included the three Corps of Engineers projects (Tri-Lakes) located in the Denver metropolitan area. It has now been reduced to one reservoir, Chatfield. Because of the potential impacts that may be identified during the study, the study area also includes the South Platte and Platte Rivers downstream from the Corps projects.

DESCRIPTION: The primary purpose is to study the potential for shifting a portion of the storage from flood control to water supply.

<u>SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA (\$000)</u>	<u>FY 2006</u> <u>Feasibility</u>
Estimated Federal Cost	\$1,746
Estimated Non-Federal Cost	1,746
Cash	1,168
Other	578
Total Estimated Cost	\$3,492
Allocations thru FY 2003	\$901
Allocation for FY 2004	244
Allocation for FY 2005	285
Conference Amount for FY 2006	135
Allocation for 2006	134
Balance to Complete after FY 2006	182

FY 2006 ACTIVITIES: Complete operational analysis associated with reallocation, including the Antecedent Flood Condition Study. Initiate identification of impacts that the operational changes will have on flood control, environmental, water quality, recreation and other resources, and initiate NEPA process. Prepare preliminary draft Feasibility Report/EIS document, conduct public meetings, and submit document for review by cooperating agencies.

EARLIEST ATTAINABLE COMPLETION FY FOR PHASE: FY 2008.

OTHER INFORMATION: N/A.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST: Representatives Diana DeGette (CO-1), Mark Udall (CO-2), Marilyn Musgrave (CO-4), Joel Hefley (CO-5), Tom Tancredo (CO-6) and Robert Beauprez (CO-7). Senator Ken Salazar (CO).

DISTRICT: Omaha

6 February 2006

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities**

SUMMARY PAGE:

UNDERLYING PRINCIPLE. Statement of Managers (H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 109-275) page 110 states that centralized management of project funds is efficient and is allowed under current guidelines for certain activities. Significant cost savings can be realized from funding these activities centrally by withholding the necessary amounts from the affected projects' appropriations prior to allocation. It is critical that cost efficient management strategies be employed by the Corps in accomplishing its mission at least cost, when such strategies support the appropriated program. The costs of these activities are summarized in the table below and described in the in justification sheets that follow.

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Natural Resources activities:

National Natural Resources Management Activities	\$ 3,773,000
RecreationOneStop (R1S)- National Recreation Reservation Service (NRRS)	\$ 900,000

Navigation activities:

National Coastal Mapping	\$ 2,384,000
Optimization Tools for the Navigation Program	\$ 250,000

Dam Safety activities:

Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	\$ 4,211,000
--	--------------

AFFECTED PROJECTS FROM WHICH NECESSARY FUNDS WERE WITHHELD. A list of the projects from which necessary funds were provided is attached. Funds for the Natural resources activities were funded from those projects within the Recreation business line within all program activities. Funds for the navigation activities were funded from those projects within the Channels and harbors program activity. Funds for the Dam Safety activities were funded from projects within the Locks and dams, Reservoirs, and Multiple-purpose power program activities.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

National (Multiple Project) Natural Resources Management Activities

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Estimated Annual Cost for Continuing Program	\$4,000,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (From centrally funded activities)	3,773,000

AUTHORIZATION: This program is conducted under the general authority of PL 78-534, the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

JUSTIFICATION: On December 10, 1996, House and Senate appropriations subcommittee staff determined it was appropriate to allocate a portion of Civil Works projects appropriated funds to conduct certain, specified operations and maintenance activities that benefit all or a majority of operating Civil Works projects. This determination was re-evaluated in 2005 and formalized in appropriations report language for Fiscal Year (FY) 06. Funding these multiple project activities as single entities, rather than on a project-by-project basis, is efficient and cost effective, reducing administration costs and providing for efficient management and oversight. An example of such an activity is the procurement of park ranger uniforms through a contract administered by the National Park Service. Providing a nationwide funding source for centralized procurement of these items used by all operating projects having a natural resources management program precludes the need for funds to be transferred by each project or district to a single procurement agent, a savings of from 60 to 300 transactions a year.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2006:

Nationwide (multiple-project) activities that will be accomplished in FY 2006 with these funds include the following and similar activities:

1. Career Assignment Program (CAP) (\$60K). Two 5 month assignments in HQUSACE provide direct support to field activities, while providing opportunities for assignees to work in the HQs environment.
2. Career Assignment Program for Operations Project Managers (OPMs) (\$50K). Similar to the CAP program, this provides opportunities for 2 or 3 OPMs to obtain experience at other projects with different programs in varying locations.
3. Challenge Partnership Seed Funds (\$125K). Projects compete for funds for specific activities under the Challenge Partnership Program. Under this program, partners provide funds, equipment, materials and/or labor to assist the Corps in accomplishing recreation or natural resources management work on the projects. A 9:1 return on investment has historically been realized from this program.
4. Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) Program (82K). CISM is an established program used by other federal agencies and private companies to support employees suffering from traumatic work-related events. Project personnel are frequently involved in traumatic situations such as response to public drownings or other fatalities on the project, as well as response to natural disasters such as hurricanes.
5. Environmental Management System (EMS) Implementation (\$150K). E.O 13148 requires federal agencies to implement EMS at all appropriate agency facilities, under specific timelines for implementation and reporting to EPA. The EMS is scheduled for implementation at various projects in FY06 as part of the Corps ongoing compliance with the EO requirements.
6. Natural Resources Management Awards (\$29K). The Chief of Engineers annual awards program recognizes individuals who have achieved excellence in recreation, environment stewardship, interpretation, and environmental compliance, as well as one project annually that has exhibited overall excellence.
7. Natural Resources Management Career Development/Training Support and Material Development (\$250K). Funds are used to address training and career development issues for the Natural Resources Management Community. Training and career development support is provided to 2,000 NRM field staff in the Corps are served through the development of various products, including exportable training courses to meet established training requirements.

National (Multiple Project) Natural Resources Management Activities (continued)

8. Operations Community of Practice Gateway (\$250K). This knowledge management tool (website) serves the entire Operations Community by providing accurate, consistent, and current information to managers at all levels. It facilitates synergy among manager, sharing of job knowledge, lessons learned, best management practices and maintenance of the corporate knowledge base.
9. Park Ranger/Manager Uniforms (\$800K). The Corps purchases uniforms for field personnel through an inter-agency contract administered by the National Park Service. Significant economies of scale have been achieved through this arrangement since 1984. Costs include the authorized employee allowances for uniforms, NPS contract administration costs, and the purchase of required emblems.
10. Partnership Committee (\$28K). A committee composed of field level personnel serves as liaison between HQs and operating projects, interpreting policy and guidance for field use, and raising and addressing field concerns for HQs consideration and action.
11. Printing and Publishing (\$169K)- Printing of forms, brochures, and similar materials used by all or most Corps projects reduces administrative and procurement costs. Materials include Annual Day Use Passes and Golden Age and Access Passports and Brochures. Printed materials are stored at the Corps Publications Depot for distribution to all projects upon request.
12. Property Protection Program (\$200K). Commonly called Corps Watch, this program was authorized by Congress in WRDA 2000 to reduce property damage at Corps projects.
13. RecBEST Coach, Assist and Train Team (\$80K). The Recreation Budget Evaluation System has been used for 2 years for data entry and analysis in developing a performance based budget for the Recreation Business Program. The Team provides peer level technical support and training to field users to improve understanding of the performance based concept and to facilitate use of the system.
14. Recreation Facilities and Customer Service Standards National Operations Center (NOC) (\$50K). Revised standards were published in 2004 for all new and renovated recreation sites and facilities and for assuring consistently excellent service to our visitors. The NOC provides technical assistance to Corps field personnel, as well as entities external to Corps (public recreation agencies, academia, etc) for interpretation and application of the guidelines.
15. Sign Standards MCX Operation (\$100K). A Mandatory Center of Expertise provides technical support and assistance to all projects in the operation of the Corps Sign Standards Program, through the maintenance of the Sign Standards Program Manual and software and providing technical assistance to field users.
16. Stewardship Support Program (SSP) (\$500K). Established in FY 02, this program provides broad support to the Environment Stewardship function at operating projects the identification of national needs, strategic planning, the identification and prioritization of research needs and the recommendation of funding priorities. A leadership team of representatives from all organizational levels provides oversight for the SSP.
17. Visitor Center Initiative/Corps Story (\$90K). An exportable interactive audiovisual exhibit is being developed for easy integration into all existing visitor centers at minimal cost to each project. The objective is to communicate the role of the Corps in improving the lives of Americans to visitors.
18. Volunteer Clearinghouse Operation (\$141K). The Volunteer Clearinghouse is operated under contract with Goodwill Industries to support volunteer efforts at all Corps projects. A website and toll free phone number provide information about volunteer opportunities at Corps projects and information exchange opportunities among projects. Promotional materials are provided for distribution to all Corps projects. In 2004, nearly 80,000 volunteers and their community partners contributed services valued at \$11 million.
19. Water Safety Products (\$620K). The Corps Water Safety National Operations Center produces and distributes water safety products and programs to all Corps projects to educate and inform visitors of the dangers associated with water-oriented recreation. Drownings and associated lawsuits have been reduced significantly since the implementation of this program in the mid 1980's.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

RecreationOneStop (R1S)– National Recreation Reservation Service (NRRS)

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Estimated Annual Cost for Continuing Program	\$1,000,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (From centrally funded activities)	900,000

AUTHORIZATION: This program is conducted under the general authority of PL 78-534, the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

JUSTIFICATION: RecreationOneStop is a priority Egov initiative on the President's Management Agenda. A 2002 letter from the Office of Management and Budget, issued under authority of the Clinger/Cohen Act, required the Corps to cooperate in the development and implementation of this initiative. The Corps participates with other Federal land management agencies to provide one-stop-shopping for information about public recreation opportunities on Federal lands. The National Recreation Reservation Service provides public trip planning and reservation services for recreation sites and facilities as part of the RecreationOneStop initiative. RecreationOneStop services are provided through a contract administered by the Forest Service. The Department of Interior serves as the Managing Partner for RecreationOneStop.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY 2006 AND PRIOR YEARS: The NRRS has been providing reservation services for the Corps and the Forest Service since 1999. Upon direction from OMB, the other Federal agencies were included in the NRRS under the umbrella of R1S. Accordingly, the USDA Forest Service advertised and awarded a comprehensive contract to provide such services to all Federal agencies. Implementation activities for the new contract are scheduled for FY 06, pending the outcome of an award protest.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

National Coastal Mapping Program

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Estimated Annual Cost of Continuing Program	\$7,500,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (From centrally funded activities)	2,384,000

AUTHORIZATION: These efforts are essential to providing data for efficient and effective management of critically important National water resources. Regional Sediment Management (RSM) activities are authorized by Section 516 of WRDA 96.

JUSTIFICATION: This is the only Federal coastal mapping program that produces operational, physical and environmental data along the coast on a recurring basis. Regional Sediment Management requires regional measuring and monitoring to provide data and information for decision makers and managers. There are approximately 7,500 miles of sandy coastline in the continental US and no other program in the Corps (or other Federal agencies) provides consistent, recurring, regional data to measure and monitor physical and environmental conditions. It is the quantification of regional conditions and changes that will lead to improved management practices of entire regions and projects within those regions. Without these data, the Corps cannot fulfill its goal of a systems approach to coastal management, including navigation and coastal flood damage reduction projects.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY 2006 AND PRIOR YEARS: : In the first year of the Corps regional coastal mapping effort, the Corps South Atlantic Division's sandy beaches were mapped (approx 1,300 miles) to support Regional Sediment Management practices using an airborne lidar and photogrammetry systems. A total of 1,300 miles of the sandy coasts of Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina were surveyed. The Corps coordinated with other Federal agencies (Navy, NASA, USGS, and NOAA) to eliminate duplication and leverage programs to maximize survey coverage. The survey covered from the waterline landward 500 m using topographic lidar and from the waterline seaward using hydrographic lidar. The same area was covered concurrently with very high resolution imagery. Products included seamless digital elevations of the coastal zone, orthorectified imagery, a shoreline position vector, and metadata. These data were distributed to the Corps Wilmington, Charleston, Savannah, Jacksonville, and Mobile Districts. Data were also provided to several States, academia, and industry and to USGS and NOAA where it remains available for download through the NOAA lidar database. The mapping effort was completed six weeks prior to the first storm of the 2004 hurricane season. These data provided the most complete regional data ever collected, including Federal navigation and shore protection projects, immediately prior to four major hurricanes striking Florida and Alabama. As a result of the multi-agency coordination that resulted in the pre-storm surveys, post-storms surveys were coordinated with Navy, NASA and USGS to eliminate duplication. These data were used to assess regional and project hurricane impacts and provided necessary data for planning, engineering, construction and operations. Approximately \$200 million was spent reconstructing shore protection projects based on results determined from these regional coastal mapping data. State, local, industry and academic organizations are using these data for many coastal management applications, projects and programs.

In 2005 approximately 1,000 miles of the sandy beaches bordering the Atlantic Ocean were mapped, including Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia with the same approach, producing a variety of digital elevation products for regional sediment management actions in the Corps Norfolk, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and New England Districts.

In 2006 approximately 1,000 miles of open lake coasts will be mapped with the same approach used in prior years, producing the same standardized products and information for regional sediment management actions. The surveys will cover Lake Ontario and the New York shore; Lake Erie and the Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan shores; Lakes St. Clair and Huron; and about 200 miles into Lake Michigan and additional Michigan shore. In addition to the physical conditions previously described, new techniques are being developed by teaming with USGS, NOAA, industry, and academia that yield information about the environment. For the first time, a hyperspectral imager will be used operationally to quantify wetlands, submerged aquatic vegetation, sea-bottom type, and land use. This will be the first years where standardized environmental products will be produced for measuring and monitoring regional environmental impacts and changes from our regional sediment management practices.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

Optimization Tools for the Navigation Program

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Estimated Annual Cost of Continuing Program	\$ 250,000
Allocation for FY 2006 (from centrally funded activities)	250,000

AUTHORIZATION: This effort is necessary to provide quantitative predictive tools and data for reducing the cost of dredging of Federal navigation projects, leveraging channel design criteria among Corps laboratories and between the Corps, the Navy and other government and academic institutions. These efforts are essential to providing data for efficient and effective management of Congressionally authorized critically important national navigation infrastructure, as well as to respond to P.L. 95-269.

JUSTIFICATION: To maintain the Nation's Federal navigable waterways, approximately 270 million cubic yards of material are dredged in the United States annually. In addition, the national "2020" plan for deeper and wider channels to accommodate the next class of vessels brings great uncertainty in prediction of maintenance requirements. Political, engineering, and demographic factors may increase costs. Technological change and emerging vessel hull configurations in the shipping industry require ongoing efforts to adequately plan for future maintenance dredging activities. Channel dredging requirements associated with underkeel clearance and other safety features have been based on dated physical models. New technologies for more precise measurements suggest that channel design guidance may be overstating vessel clearance needs, resulting in costly and unneeded additional dredging. The Corps is conducting a vessel hull modeling activity through IWR, jointly with ERDC and the USNA, in conjunction with the CADET program, using advanced technologies to compile new physical and numerical data sets to more accurately determine channel dimension requirements associated with the latest vessel configurations. This vessel hull modeling effort will generate essential data on hull designs, vessel dynamics and channel configuration in order to optimize and minimize ongoing and future maintenance dredging requirements. An additional component of this effort is being conducted in conjunction with the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center. This component will use foreign trade data to determine and analyze the loaded drafts of vessels of all vessel calls for individual harbors and channels within those harbors. This assessment will offer the potential to optimize maintenance dredging requirements for individual channel reaches.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY 2006 AND PRIOR YEARS: Funds in FY 05 and FY 06 were used to initiate the vessel hull modeling effort in conjunction with ERDC, the Naval Academy and NAVSEA-CARDEROC. FY 05 and FY 06 activities included scoping the effort, agreement on task delegation among participants, securing funding and participation from the Navy, evaluating physical model basin requirements and preparation by ERDC, and initiation of model vessel hull construction in conjunction with the computerized application known as CADET. Work was also initiated by the Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center to develop bridging software programs to link foreign trade databases with vessel characteristics databases. This effort was interrupted in late FY05 by the impacts of Hurricane Katrina on WCSC staff and ongoing activities.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

Portfolio Risk Assessment (National Dam Safety Program)

SUMMARIZED FINANCIAL DATA:

Estimated Annual Cost for Continuing Program	\$6,300,000
Appropriation in FY 2006 (from Remaining Items National Dam Safety Program and centrally funded activities)	4,458,000 1/

1/ Includes \$247,000 appropriated under Remaining Items National Dam Safety Program and \$4,211,000 funded as a centrally funded activity.

AUTHORIZATION: Dam safety legislation PL 92-367 and PL 99-662, and the National Dam Safety Program Act (Section 215 of PL 104-303) and the Dam Safety and Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107 – 310).

JUSTIFICATION: The *Federal Guidelines for Dam Safety* provides a framework for safe construction, operation, and maintenance of Corps dams. Dams in the United States must be constructed, operated, and maintained in accordance with sound engineering practices to prevent failure and avoid potential loss of life and destruction of property. This National Dam Safety Program (NDSP) account consists of two parts: (1) the operation of the NDSP including participation with other agencies; and (2) implementation of a portfolio risk analysis program for all 623 of the Corps dams.

(1) The NDSP was established to enhance national dam safety. These funds support the activities under the NDSP, in the interests of the Corps and the citizens of the Nation. The National Dam Safety Program Act strengthens the NDSP, whose purpose is to reduce risks to life and property from dam failure in the United States. The Act also codified the Interagency Committee of Dam Safety (ICODS) to coordinate the Federal actions under the NDSP. The Chief, Engineering and Construction, Directorate of Civil Works (USACE, Dam Safety Officer), or his representative, represents the Department of Defense as a member of ICODS. The Corps also provides a representative to the National Dam Safety Review Board for the Secretary of Defense. The National Dam Safety Program Act expanded the scope of previous dam safety legislation and the requirements for ICODS participation with various states to improve dam safety in the United States. Through ICODS, the NDSP provides support in development of federal guidelines for dam safety, promotion of public awareness programs, publications, training materials, and workshops. The Act also provides for archival research that is supported by Federal dam owning agencies through ICODS and the National Performance of Dams Program. The Dam Safety and Security Act of 2002 extended the National Dam Safety Program Act appropriation authorization for 5 years.

(2) While no Corps dams are in imminent danger of failure, many of them have a high dam-safety risk due to the likelihood of extremely large floods, seismic events, seepage and piping problems, and other damages and/or deterioration problems. Limited budgets require that the Corps uses risk assessment as a central part of the decision-making process to direct funding to those dam safety issues presenting the greatest risk and to those rehabilitation actions that result in the greatest risk reduction for their cost. For each dam in the portfolio, the risk assessment provides estimates of the probability of failure and consequences by each initiating event. In addition, risk reduction measures are formulated and their cost and effectiveness estimated. The results arrayed by risk level and risk reduction cost effectiveness provide a risk ranking for the portfolio of dams. The values of the portfolio risk assessment (PRA) have been demonstrated in two Corps districts as a part of the on-going R&D efforts. In order to expedite the deployment of Corps-wide portfolio risk assessment and to ensure that the results of the regional and districts portfolio provide a consistent basis for setting national priorities, three USACE PRA cadres have been conducting a screening level PRA during fiscal year 2005. The requested funding is to support the activities to complete the screening level PRA and move forward with an in-depth portfolio analysis of the dams that present the greatest risk.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

Portfolio Risk Assessment (National Dam Safety Program) (continued)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY 2006 AND PRIOR YEARS:

(1) The NDSP account provided Corps presentations at the United States Society of Dams (USSD) conference and the Association of State Dam Safety Officials (ASDSO) during FY05 and FY06. This account also supported the Corps response to the 9-11 events in the safety of dams area. The NDSP program account provided field participation in preparing responses to the recommendations of the Corps Peer Review of the Dam Safety Program. Additional funds provide for continued development of the Dam Safety Program Management Tools (DSPMT) and the Dam Safety Program Performance Measures (DSPPM). Both programs are being developed along with the Interagency Committee on Dam Safety (ICODS) to improve both Federal and State safety of dams programs.

(2) While the Portfolio Risk Assessment portion of this account is new this year, initial work has been accomplished during FY05 and FY06 as a centrally funded activity. This work included the selection and training of the PRA cadres and the initial screening of 20 percent of the Corps dams. The results of this work are already being used in prioritizing the remediation of dams.

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities

**OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES**

Withholding From Affected Projects
(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
SPA	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	6,000	12,000		18,000
SAJ	AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST. JOHNS RIVER, FL,GA,SC,NC,VA.			2,000	2,000
SAM	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	15,000	10,000		25,000
SPL	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,000	7,000		8,000
NWS	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	31,000	6,000		37,000
SAM	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	43,000	25,000		68,000
LRP	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	0	15,000		15,000
NAB	ALMOND LAKE, NY	0	2,000		2,000
LRE	ALPENA HARBOR, MI			1,000	1,000
LRH	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	4,000	3,000		7,000
NAB	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	0	2,000		2,000
POA	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK			44,000	44,000
SAM	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,000	9,000		14,000
NWP	APLEGATE LAKE, OR	0	2,000		2,000
NAO	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA			2,000	2,000
SWF	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	3,000	4,000		7,000
SWT	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	1,000	1,000		2,000
SWT	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	0	4,000		4,000
NAB	ARKPORT DAM, NY	0	1,000		1,000
LRE	ASHLAND HARBAR, WI			1,000	1,000
LRB	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH			4,000	4,000
MVN	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L			61,000	61,000
NAO	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA			6,000	6,000
NAO	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA			3,000	3,000
SAS	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA			1,000	1,000
SAW	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC			5,000	5,000
SAC	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC			8,000	8,000
NAE	AUNT LYDIA COVE, MA			1,000	1,000
NAB	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	0	1,000		1,000
SAW	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	12,000	6,000		18,000
NAE	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	3,000	3,000		6,000
NAB	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD			66,000	66,000
MVN	BARATARIA BAY, LA			4,000	4,000
POH	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	4,000		1,000	5,000
SWF	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	15,000	5,000		20,000
LRN	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	24,000	32,000		56,000
NAP	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ			2,000	2,000
NAE	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRL	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	12,000	10,000		22,000
MVK	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	6,000	5,000		11,000
MVN	BAYOU LACOMBE, LA			2,000	2,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
MVN	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA			3,000	3,000
MVN	BAYOU SEGNETTE, LA			5,000	5,000
MVN	BAYOU TECHE			3,000	3,000
SWG	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX			10,000	10,000
NOW	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	0	1,000		1,000
SWL	BEAVER LAKE, AR	51,000	19,000		70,000
LRH	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	9,000	3,000		12,000
SWF	BELTON LAKE, TX	31,000	10,000		41,000
NAP	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	0	3,000		3,000
SWF	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	25,000	7,000		32,000
NAO	BENNETTS CREEK, VA			1,000	1,000
LRP	BERLIN LAKE, OH	17,000	5,000		22,000
NOW	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	14,000	26,000		40,000
LRH	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY			4,000	4,000
MVP	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	0	1,000		1,000
NAE	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
SWT	BIRCH LAKE, OK	4,000	2,000		6,000
SPK	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	18,000	7,000		25,000
LRB	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	0	4,000		4,000
NAE	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAM	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	83,000	83,000		166,000
NAE	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	1,000	2,000		3,000
MVK	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	55,000	38,000		93,000
NAP	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	31,000	9,000		40,000
SWL	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	9,000	4,000		13,000
NWP	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	0	1,000		1,000
LRH	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	3,000	9,000		12,000
NWP	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,000	26,000	0	38,000
NAE	BOSTON HARBOR, MA			26,000	26,000
NOW	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	0	1,000		1,000
SWG	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX			6,000	6,000
NAE	BRIDGEPORT HARBOR, CT			5,000	5,000
SWT	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,000	5,000		6,000
LRL	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAS	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA			9,000	9,000
SPK	BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	16,000	6,000		22,000
LRL	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	7,000	4,000		11,000
SWG	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	0	10,000		10,000
LRB	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY			4,000	4,000
NAE	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAM	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	68,000	29,000		97,000
SWL	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	32,000	22,000		54,000
NAE	BULLOCKS POINT COVE, RI			2,000	2,000
LRC	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN			3,000	3,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Withholding From Affected Projects
 (Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
LRH	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	15,000	5,000		20,000
MVK	CADDO LAKE, LA	1,000	1,000		2,000
LRL	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	7,000	4,000		11,000
LRL	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	0	2,000		2,000
MVN	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA			35,000	35,000
LRC	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN			11,000	11,000
SAJ	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL			17,000	17,000
SWT	CANTON LAKE, OK	15,000	6,000		21,000
SWF	CANYON LAKE, TX	35,000	12,000		47,000
NAE	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	49,000		17,000	66,000
SAW	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	3,000	2,000		5,000
MVS	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	40,000	23,000		63,000
SAW	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC			2,000	2,000
LRL	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	12,000	6,000		18,000
SAM	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	32,000	36,000		68,000
MVM	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO			1,000	1,000
NAE	CARVERS HARBOR, ME			1,000	1,000
LRL	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	3,000	2,000		5,000
LRL	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	0	2,000		2,000
LRE	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI			2,000	2,000
LRN	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	21,000	20,000		41,000
SAJ	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	18,000	48,000		66,000
SPL	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA			1,000	1,000
LRE	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI			1,000	1,000
NAE	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	2,000	0		2,000
SAC	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC			38,000	38,000
NWO	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	9,000	6,000		15,000
LRN	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	11,000	19,000		30,000
POA	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	5,000	11,000		16,000
NWO	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	5,000	9,000		14,000
NWP	CHETCO RIVER, OR			1,000	1,000
LRC	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL			12,000	12,000
LRC	CHICAGO RIVER, IL			1,000	1,000
NWS	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	17,000	8,000		25,000
NAO	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA			3,000	3,000
SWG	CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX			7,000	7,000
MVS	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	43,000	21,000		64,000
LRL	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	2,000	3,000		5,000
SWL	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	17,000	9,000		26,000
LRB	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH			11,000	11,000
NAE	CLINTON HARBOR, CT			1,000	1,000
NWK	CLINTON LAKE, KS	16,000	7,000		23,000
NAE	COCHECO RIVER			7,000	7,000
SPA	COCHITI LAKE, NM	9,000	17,000		26,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects
 (Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
NWO	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	1,000	1,000		2,000
NAP	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ			3,000	3,000
NAE	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	1,000	2,000		3,000
NWP	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA			67,000	67,000
NWP	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA (PORT OF ILWACO)			2,000	2,000
NWP	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA			104,000	104,000
NWP	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND THE HEAD OF SAND			2,000	2,000
NWP	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O			1,000	1,000
NAE	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	1,000	1,000		2,000
SPA	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	3,000	10,000		13,000
LRP	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	2,000	4,000		6,000
LRB	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH			8,000	8,000
SAC	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	0	10,000	10,000	20,000
NWP	COOS BAY, OR			16,000	16,000
SWT	COPAN LAKE, OK	5,000	5,000		10,000
NWP	COQUILLE RIVER, OR			1,000	1,000
MVR	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	25,000	8,000		33,000
LRN	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	26,000	17,000		43,000
POA	CORDOVA HARBOR, AK			2,000	2,000
SWG	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX			13,000	13,000
NWP	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	5,000	3,000		8,000
NWO	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	1,000	1,000		2,000
NWP	COUGAR LAKE, OR	0	3,000		3,000
SWT	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	9,000	5,000		14,000
NAB	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	16,000	7,000		23,000
SPN	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	28,000	13,000		41,000
SPN	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR			2,000	2,000
LRP	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	9,000	4,000		13,000
NAB	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	0	2,000		2,000
LRN	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	21,000	21,000		42,000
SWL	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	33,000	22,000		55,000
LRH	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	4,000	3,000		7,000
MVK	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	61,000	23,000		84,000
LRH	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	3,000	3,000		6,000
NAP	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE			71,000	71,000
NAP	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ			2,000	2,000
SWT	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	49,000	19,000		68,000
NWP	DEPOE BAY, OR			1,000	1,000
SWL	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	10,000	4,000		14,000
NWP	DETROIT LAKE, OR	0	2,000		2,000
LRE	DETROIT RIVER, MI			15,000	15,000
LRH	DEWEY LAKE, KY	12,000	4,000		16,000
SWL	DIERKS LAKE, AR	9,000	4,000	719	13,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
POA	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK			2,000	2,000
LRH	DILLON LAKE, OH	2,000	6,000		8,000
NWP	DORENA LAKE, OR	4,000	2,000		6,000
SPN	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	41,000	22,000		63,000
LRE	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	10,000		21,000	31,000
NWW	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	23,000	9,000		32,000
LRP	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	5,000	3,000		8,000
NAE	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRH	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	15,000	6,000		21,000
NAN	EAST RIVER, NY			1,000	1,000
NAB	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	0	2,000		2,000
MVP	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	6,000	2,000		8,000
NAE	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	1,000	2,000		3,000
SWT	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	0	1,000		1,000
SWT	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	3,000	2,000		5,000
SAM	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL			3,000	3,000
SWT	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	35,000	18,000		53,000
NWS	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA			5,000	5,000
NWP	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	1,000	2,000		3,000
SWT	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	7,000	7,000		14,000
SAW	FALLS LAKE, NC	11,000	7,000		18,000
MVR	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	0	1,000		1,000
SPK	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	0	1,000		1,000
NWP	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	4,000	3,000		7,000
SAJ	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL			5,000	5,000
SWF	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	30,000	10,000		40,000
NAN	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY			1,000	1,000
LRH	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	9,000	5,000		14,000
NAN	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY			5,000	5,000
SAC	FOLLY RIVER, SC			3,000	3,000
SWT	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	35,000	17,000		52,000
NWO	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	3,000	33,000		36,000
SWT	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	6,000	2,000		8,000
NAB	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	0	3,000		3,000
LRE	FOX RIVER, WI	0	6,000		6,000
NAP	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	0	2,000		2,000
NAE	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	1,000	3,000		4,000
SWG	FREEMPORT HARBOR, TX			12,000	12,000
MVN	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA			5,000	5,000
NWO	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	22,000	18,000		40,000
SPA	GALISTEO DAM, NM	1,000	3,000		4,000
SWG	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX			27,000	27,000
NWO	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	18,000	50,000		68,000
NAO	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	0	7,000	720	7,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Withholding From Affected Projects
(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
NWO	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	19,000	26,000		45,000
NAP	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	0	1,000		1,000
SAC	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC			14,000	14,000
SWL	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	8,000	4,000		12,000
SWG	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX			24,000	24,000
LRE	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI			6,000	6,000
LRE	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI			6,000	6,000
SWF	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	17,000	7,000		24,000
SWF	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	30,000	13,000		43,000
NWS	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA			35,000	35,000
LRH	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	8,000	4,000		12,000
SWT	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	0	1,000		1,000
NAN	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY			1,000	1,000
LRL	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	0	4,000		4,000
LRE	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI			9,000	9,000
NAE	GREEN HARBOR, MA			1,000	1,000
NWP	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	4,000	4,000		8,000
LRL	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	12,000	6,000		18,000
SWL	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	57,000	19,000		76,000
SAM	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL			14,000	14,000
MVN	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	2,000		68,000	70,000
SWG	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX			50,000	50,000
SAM	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS			14,000	14,000
NAE	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRE	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI			2,000	2,000
NWK	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	14,000	6,000		20,000
NWK	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	46,000	27,000		73,000
SAS	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	114,000	56,000		170,000
MVM	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR			1,000	1,000
NAB	HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD			2,000	2,000
SWT	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	5,000	2,000		7,000
SPK	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	15,000	6,000		21,000
NWP	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	0	2,000		2,000
NWK	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	2,000	2,000		4,000
NAE	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRE	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI			5,000	5,000
POA	HOMER HARBOR, AK			1,000	1,000
MVP	HOMME LAKE, ND	0	1,000		1,000
NAE	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	6,000	3,000		9,000
NAE	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	3,000	4,000		7,000
SWF	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	13,000	6,000		19,000
MVN	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA			1,000	1,000
SWG	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX			54,000	54,000
NWS	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	0	6,000		6,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Withholding From Affected Projects
(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
NAN	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY			1,000	1,000
NAN	HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)			6,000	6,000
NAN	HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	0	4,000	4,000	8,000
SWT	HUGO LAKE, OK	12,000	5,000		17,000
SWT	HULAH LAKE, OK	0	3,000		3,000
SPN	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA			17,000	17,000
NWW	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	33,000	18,000		51,000
MVR	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	0	82,000		82,000
LRC	INDIANA HARBOR, IN			1,000	1,000
SAJ	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE TO ANCLOTE, FL			3,000	3,000
NAP	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D			46,000	46,000
SAJ	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL			14,000	14,000
SPK	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	0	7,000		7,000
MVK	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	23,000	44,000		67,000
LRL	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	0	2,000		2,000
LRN	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	37,000	14,000		51,000
SAS	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	88,000	37,000		125,000
SPN	JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL, CA (SAN LEANDRO)			3,000	3,000
SAJ	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL			14,000	14,000
NAO	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA			11,000	11,000
SPA	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	1,000	19,000		20,000
NAB	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	8,000	6,000		14,000
SWF	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	3,000	10,000		13,000
SAM	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	40,000	28,000		68,000
SWF	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	1,000	3,000		4,000
NWP	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	28,000	16,000		44,000
SAW	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	48,000	39,000		87,000
SPA	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,000	10,000		11,000
SWT	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	5,000	4,000		9,000
LRH	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	12,000	5,000		17,000
LRH	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	1,000	45,000		46,000
NWK	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	11,000	6,000		17,000
MVS	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	4,000	7,000		11,000
SWT	KAW LAKE, OK	17,000	8,000		25,000
NAE	KENNEBEC RIVER, ME			2,000	2,000
LRE	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI			1,000	1,000
LRE	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI			1,000	1,000
SWT	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	21,000	15,000		36,000
LRP	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	6,000	5,000		11,000
NAB	KNAPPS NARROWS, MD			2,000	2,000
NAE	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
MVP	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	1,000	1,000		2,000
MVP	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	7,000	4,000	722	11,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
NWS	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA			1,000	1,000
SWT	LAKE KEMP, TX	0	1,000		1,000
LRC	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL			2,000	2,000
MVK	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA			2,000	2,000
MVS	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	54,000	21,000		75,000
MVP	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	1,000	1,000		2,000
NWS	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	9,000	24,000		33,000
LRN	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	5,000	6,000		11,000
SWF	LAVON LAKE, TX	31,000	13,000		44,000
SWF	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	35,000	16,000		51,000
NWS	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	13,000	6,000		19,000
NWK	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	0	2,000		2,000
NWW	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	10,000	7,000		17,000
LRE	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI			1,000	1,000
NAE	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAW	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC			3,000	3,000
NWK	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	3,000	3,000		6,000
NAN	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY			1,000	1,000
NWP	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	3,000	4,000		7,000
LRB	LORAIN HARBOR, OH			2,000	2,000
SPL	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,000	15,000		18,000
NWP	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	7,000	9,000		16,000
NWW	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	25,000	8,000		33,000
NWW	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	13,000	7,000		20,000
SPN	LOWER PETALUMA RIVER, CA			3,000	3,000
LRP	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	3,000	3,000		6,000
NWW	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	13,000	6,000		19,000
LRE	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI			2,000	2,000
LRP	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	2,000	3,000		5,000
NAP	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ			2,000	2,000
SAJ	MANATEE HARBOR, FL			7,000	7,000
LRE	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI			2,000	2,000
NAE	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAW	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC			30,000	30,000
SPL	MARINA DEL REY, CA			3,000	3,000
SWT	MARION LAKE, KS	11,000	5,000		16,000
LRN	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	0	2,000		2,000
SPK	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	3,000	2,000		5,000
SAW	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC			13,000	13,000
SWG	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX			42,000	42,000
SWT	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	5,000	27,000		32,000
SWL	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	87,000	92,000		179,000
NWW	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	41,000	24,000	723	65,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
NWK	MELVERN LAKE, KS	17,000	6,000		23,000
LRE	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI			2,000	2,000
SPK	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	0	1,000		1,000
NAE	MERRIMACK RIVER, MA			1,000	1,000
SAJ	MIAMI HARBOR, FL			5,000	5,000
SAJ	MIAMI RIVER, FL			13,000	13,000
LRP	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRC	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN			2,000	2,000
NWK	MILFORD LAKE, KS	20,000	8,000		28,000
NWW	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	7,000	4,000		11,000
SAM	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM BILL 'DANNELLY'	26,000	28,000		54,000
SWL	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	15,000	6,000		21,000
LRE	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI			3,000	3,000
MVP	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	17,000	183,000		200,000
MVR	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	64,000	168,000		232,000
MVS	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	21,000	64,000		85,000
MVS	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	7,000		102,000	109,000
LRL	MISSISSINAWA LAKE, IN	1,000	3,000		4,000
MVN	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA			9,000	9,000
MVN	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,			186,000	186,000
NWP	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	1,000		22,000	23,000
NWO	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE			8,000	8,000
SAM	MOBILE HARBOR, AL			70,000	70,000
SPL	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	1,000	1,000		2,000
LRP	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	0	65,000		65,000
LRE	MONROE HARBOR, MI			2,000	2,000
LRL	MONROE LAKE, IN	1,000	2,000		3,000
SAW	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC			12,000	12,000
SPL	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA			6,000	6,000
LRP	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	2,000	2,000		4,000
SPN	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA			5,000	5,000
LRB	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	6,000	13,000		19,000
NWP	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	0	1,000		1,000
NWS	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	8,000	13,000		21,000
LRE	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI			2,000	2,000
LRH	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	9,000	23,000		32,000
NAB	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD			1,000	1,000
SPN	NAPA RIVER, CA			3,000	3,000
NAE	NARRAGAUGAS RIVER, MILBRIDGE, ME			7,000	7,000
MVK	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	40,000	15,000		55,000
SWF	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	19,000	8,000		27,000
NWS	NEAH BA, WA			3,000	3,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects
 (Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
SPK	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	20,000	7,000		27,000
NAP	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY			4,000	4,000
MVM	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO			1,000	1,000
SPK	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	20,000	6,000		26,000
SAW	NEW RIVER INLET, NC			4,000	4,000
SAW	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC			2,000	2,000
NAN	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY			25,000	25,000
NAN	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY			12,000	12,000
NAN	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ			28,000	28,000
SWL	NIMROD LAKE, AR	10,000	6,000		16,000
POA	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK			1,000	1,000
LRL	NOLIN LAKE, KY	12,000	6,000		18,000
POA	NOME HARBOR, AK			10,000	10,000
NAO	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA			51,000	51,000
SWL	NORFORK LAKE, AR	24,000	15,000		39,000
NAE	NORTH COVE HARBOR, CT			7,000	7,000
LRH	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	1,000	1,000		2,000
NAE	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	2,000	2,000		4,000
SWF	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	17,000	8,000		25,000
NAE	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	2,000	3,000		5,000
NAE	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	2,000	2,000		4,000
NAE	NORWALK FEDERAL NAVIGATION PROJECT, CT			3,000	3,000
SPN	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA			1,000	1,000
SWF	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,000	4,000		5,000
NWO	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	14,000	39,000		53,000
SPN	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA			21,000	21,000
NAB	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD			7,000	7,000
SPL	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA			4,000	4,000
LRL	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	0	121,000		121,000
LRP	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	0	69,000		69,000
LRH	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	6,000	74,000		80,000
SAM	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	10,000	9,000		19,000
SAJ	OKÉECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	13,000	7,000		20,000
LRN	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	24,000	24,000		48,000
NWS	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA			1,000	1,000
LRE	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI			1,000	1,000
SWT	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	16,000	7,000		23,000
MVP	ORWELL LAKE, MN	1,000	1,000		2,000
MVM	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR			1,000	1,000
NAE	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	2,000	3,000		5,000
MVK	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	33,000	52,000		85,000
SWL	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	23,000	17,000		40,000
LRH	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	3,000	2,000		5,000
SPL	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,000	4,000		5,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Withholding From Affected Projects
 (Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
LRH	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	3,000	3,000		6,000
SAJ	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL			4,000	4,000
SAM	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL			3,000	3,000
NWO	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	0	2,000		2,000
SAM	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS			18,000	18,000
SWT	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	10,000	4,000		14,000
LRL	PATOKA LAKE, IN	0	2,000		2,000
NAE	PAWTUXET COVE, RI			6,000	6,000
MVK	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	0	1,000		1,000
SWT	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	11,000	4,000		15,000
SAM	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL			5,000	5,000
NWK	PERRY LAKE, KS	21,000	7,000		28,000
SAW	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	43,000	18,000		61,000
SPN	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA			2,000	2,000
SPL	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	0	1,000		1,000
SWT	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	7,000	3,000		10,000
SPK	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	21,000	10,000		31,000
SPN	PINOLE SHOAL MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA			1,000	1,000
NWO	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	1,000	2,000		3,000
NWK	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	17,000	7,000		24,000
NWK	POMONA LAKE, KS	17,000	6,000		23,000
SPL	PORT HUENEME, CA			2,000	2,000
NWP	PORT ORFORD, OR			2,000	2,000
SPL	PORT SAN LUIS, CA			2,000	2,000
LRE	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI			1,000	1,000
NAE	PORTLAND HARBOR, ME			2,000	2,000
NAE	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR/PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH			2,000	2,000
SWF	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	18,000	8,000		26,000
NAP	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	0	2,000		2,000
NWS	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA			3,000	3,000
LRH	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	13,000	5,000		18,000
NAN	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ			1,000	1,000
NAN	RARITAN RIVER, NJ			9,000	9,000
NWK	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	19,000	7,000		26,000
SWF	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,000	4,000		5,000
NAB	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	45,000	18,000		63,000
MVP	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	0	1,000		1,000
MVR	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	24,000	11,000		35,000
SPN	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA			17,000	17,000
MVS	REND LAKE, IL	41,000	18,000		59,000
MVP	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	38,000	8,000		46,000
SAS	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	3,000	42,000		45,000
SPN	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA			27,000	27,000
SAM	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	29,000	24,000		53,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
SWT	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	7,000	15,000		22,000
NWP	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR			1,000	1,000
MVK	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS			2,000	2,000
POH	ROTA HARBOR, CNMI			11,000	11,000
LRE	ROUGE RIVER, MI			4,000	4,000
LRL	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	13,000	7,000		20,000
NAO	RUDEE INLET, VA			4,000	4,000
SWG	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX			70,000	70,000
SPK	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA			10,000	10,000
SPK	SACRAMENTO RIVER (BASULE BRIDGE), CA			3,000	3,000
SPK	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	15,000	4,000	4,000	23,000
LRE	SAGINAW RIVER, MI			9,000	9,000
LRL	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	1,000	2,000		3,000
NAP	SALEM RIVER, NJ			3,000	3,000
NWO	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	0	3,000		3,000
SWF	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	30,000	39,000		69,000
SPN	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	22,000		4,000	26,000
SPN	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA			9,000	9,000
SPN	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STUDY, CA			6,000	6,000
SPK	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA			10,000	10,000
SAJ	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR			6,000	6,000
SPN	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA			11,000	11,000
LRB	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH			3,000	3,000
NAN	SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARD, NJ			1,000	1,000
SPL	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	4,000	11,000		15,000
SPL	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA			5,000	5,000
SPA	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	2,000	4,000		6,000
SWT	SARDIS LAKE, OK	6,000	4,000		10,000
SAS	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA			47,000	47,000
MVR	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	33,000	15,000		48,000
NWS	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA			2,000	2,000
LRE	SEBEWAING RIVER, MI			1,000	1,000
NAN	SHARK RIVER, NJ			1,000	1,000
LRP	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	22,000	6,000		28,000
NAN	SHREWSBURY RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ			1,000	1,000
SAW	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC			5,000	5,000
NWP	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR			2,000	2,000
SWT	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	11,000	4,000		15,000
NWK	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	3,000	4,000		7,000
SWF	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	29,000	12,000		41,000
MVP	SOURIS RIVER, ND	0	1,000		1,000
MVS	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO			1,000	1,000
LRE	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI			3,000	3,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects
(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
LRE	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI			4,000	4,000
LRE	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	2,000	58,000		60,000
NAB	ST. JEROME CREEK, MD			3,000	3,000
SAJ	ST. PETERSBURG, FL			1,000	1,000
SWF	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	20,000	7,000		27,000
NAB	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	0	3,000		3,000
NWK	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	27,000	13,000		40,000
LRP	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRE	STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI			1,000	1,000
SPK	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	18,000	6,000		24,000
SPN	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA			18,000	18,000
LRH	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	12,000	6,000		18,000
NAE	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	2,000	2,000		4,000
LRH	SUTTON LAKE, WV	17,000	6,000		23,000
SAJ	SUWANNE RIVER, FL			2,000	2,000
SWL	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	39,000	28,000		67,000
SAJ	TAMPA HARBOR, FL			38,000	38,000
NAO	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA			2,000	2,000
LRL	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	0	4,000		4,000
SWT	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	25,000	10,000		35,000
SAM	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	0	8,000	0	8,000
SAM	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	109,000	90,000		199,000
SPK	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	14,000	6,000		20,000
SWG	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX			9,000	9,000
NWP	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	13,000	15,000		28,000
NAE	THOMASTON DAM, CT	2,000	3,000	0	5,000
NAB	TILGHMAN ISLAND HARBOR, MD			2,000	2,000
NWP	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR (PORT OF GARIBALDI)			5,000	5,000
NAB	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	20,000	9,000		29,000
LRP	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	14,000	5,000		19,000
LRB	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH			13,000	13,000
LRH	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	1,000	1,000		2,000
SWT	TORONTO LAKE, KS	0	1,000		1,000
SWF	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	12,000	14,000	0	26,000
SAC	TOWN CREEK, SC			2,000	2,000
NAE	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	2,000	3,000		5,000
SPA	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	1,000	6,000		7,000
NAE	TULLY LAKE, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
NWK	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	11,000	7,000		18,000
SPA	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	0	2,000		2,000
LRE	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI			1,000	1,000
LRP	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,000	10,000		11,000
NWP	UMPQUA RIVER, OR			2,000	2,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Withholding From Affected Projects

(Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
LRP	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	1,000	0		1,000
NAE	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	2,000	2,000		4,000
SPN	UPPER PETALUMA RIVER, CA			1,000	1,000
SPL	VENTURA HARBOR, CA			10,000	10,000
SAW	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	34,000	10,000		44,000
SWF	WACO LAKE, TX	24,000	11,000		35,000
MVK	WALLACE LAKE, LA	1,000	1,000		2,000
SWG	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	0	6,000		6,000
SAM	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	59,000	24,000		83,000
MVP	WARROAD HARBOR, MN			1,000	1,000
NAB	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC			2,000	2,000
MVN	WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA			1,000	1,000
MVN	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO BAYOU DULAC, LA			1,000	1,000
NAO	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA			1,000	1,000
LRC	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL			10,000	10,000
SWT	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	9,000	5,000		14,000
SWT	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	9,000	16,000		25,000
LRL	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	1,000	1,000		2,000
NAE	WEST HILL DAM, MA	2,000	3,000		5,000
SAM	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	56,000	39,000		95,000
NAE	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	2,000	2,000		4,000
NAE	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	1,000	2,000		3,000
NAE	WEYMOUTH-FORE RIVER, MA			13,000	13,000
MVM	WHITE RIVER, AR			3,000	3,000
SPL	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	0	1,000		1,000
SWF	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	36,000	26,000		62,000
NAB	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	0	2,000		2,000
NAB	WICOMICO RIVER, MD			2,000	2,000
NWS	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA			1,000	1,000
LRL	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	2,000	2,000		4,000
NWP	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	0	2,000		2,000
NAP	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE			13,000	13,000
SAW	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC			48,000	48,000
NWK	WILSON LAKE, KS	13,000	5,000		18,000
SWT	WISTER LAKE, OK	1,000	2,000		3,000
LRN	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	25,000	20,000		45,000
MVM	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN			2,000	2,000
LRP	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	4,000	2,000		6,000
SWF	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	32,000	12,000		44,000
NWP	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR			3,000	3,000
LRH	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	4,000	4,000		8,000
MVK	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR			1,000	1,000
NAB	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	0	2,000	729	2,000

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Operation and Maintenance -- Fiscal Year 2006 Centrally Funded Activities
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE APPROPRIATION
FY 2006 SOURCES FOR CENTRAL FUNDED ACTIVITIES
Withholding From Affected Projects
 (Amounts in Dollars)

Dist.	Project Name	Natural Resources activities	Portfolio Risk Assessment (Dam Safety)	Navigation activities:	Total withheld
LRP	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	14,000	5,000		19,000
	Totals	4,673,000	4,211,000	2,634,000	11,518,000