



CWCC

Clean Water Construction Coalition  
P.O. Box 728 \* Allenwood, NJ 08720  
(732) 292-4300 \* FAX: (732) 292-4310

December 8, 2016

### WRDA/WIIN & CONTINUING RESOLUTION STATUS UPDATE

- AGC of America
- AGC of Texas
- Alabama Utility Contractors Association
- Associated Pennsylvania Constructors
- Associated Utility Contractors Of Maryland \*
- Connecticut Construction Industries Association
- CIC of Westchester County & Hudson Valley \*
- Engineering Contractors Association
- General Contractors Association Of New York
- Indiana Construction Association
- Long Island Contractors Association
- Maryland Transportation Builders & Materials Association
- Michigan Infrastructure & Transportation Association
- Minnesota Utility Contractors Association\*
- National Rural Water Association
- Ohio Contractors Association
- Public Works Contractors Association of Maryland
- Southern California Contractors Association
- Tennessee Road Builders Association
- Underground Contractors Association of Illinois \*
- United Contractors \*
- UCA of Anne Arundel County
- Utility Contractors Association of New England \*
- Utility & Transportation Contractors Association of New Jersey \*
- Contractors Association Of West Virginia
- Wisconsin Underground Contractors Association

\* Steering Committee Member

**BREAKING:** Today, by a vote of 360-61, the House passed the “Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act,” (WIIN Act), which passed out of conference committee late last week. The bicameral negotiations rebranded and combined aspects of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2016 passed separately by both Houses earlier this year. However, support in the Senate is divided over the insertion of drought provisions and how the upper house will act remains uncertain. While the current Congressional session is officially scheduled to extend through December 16, reports indicate leadership may decide to recess as early as today.

In past years, the WRDA and WRRDA bills have been straightforward, projects-focused Army Corps authorizations. On the heels of the crisis in Flint, MI, however, concerns about safe drinking water led to the inclusion of specific funding for the SDW SRF and WIFIA. Early versions of the legislation looked promising for infrastructure construction funding (such as the voluntary fee/labeling trust fund program), but the text as released from conference has removed all but passing references to critical infrastructure funding owing to opposition from the House Transportation and Infrastructure Republicans who insisted on an “Army Corps-only” bill.

Note: Also today, by a vote of 326-96, the House passed the FY17 Continuing Appropriations Bill, which extends funding for federal programs and service through April 28, 2017 at currently enacted FY216 appropriations levels. It does not include controversial riders or major changes to existing federal policy.

Please see the breakdown of WIIN Act below.

- **Safe Drinking Water:** \$300 million for assistance to small and disadvantaged communities, \$300 million for reducing lead in drinking water, \$100 million for lead testing in schools and child care programs, \$50 million for innovative safe drinking water technologies, and \$100 million for the SDWSRF for public health threats regarding lead or other contaminants.
- **WIFIA:** expands eligibilities (for example, for drought projects and projects that address lead and other contaminants in drinking water systems), allows financing fees to be financed as part of the loan, allows credit for costs incurred before loan is made, and specifies that WIFIA appropriations should be in addition to robust funding for the SRF’s.
- **Corps Projects:** authorizes 30 new projects and modifies 8 existing projects based on reports submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Army and authorizes 39 feasibility studies. The projects address all the major missions of the Corps including flood risk management, navigation, hurricane and storm damage risk reduction, and environmental restoration. New projects are listed at the end of this update.

- Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water SRF Funding: specifies that Congress should provide robust funding for the CW and SDW SRFs capitalization grants but does not include reauthorization amounts for either SRF's.
  - Storage Projects: for western reclamation states, \$335 million in funding for storage and groundwater projects. For federally owned projects, 50% Federal share. For state-led projects, 25% Federal share. Feasibility determination required by Jan. 1, 2021. Secretary recommends project funding to Congress.
  - New Water Recycling and Reuse Projects: for western reclamation states, \$50 million for water recycling through a new grant program.
  - Desalination: reauthorizes the Water Desalination Act of 1996 through 2021 and specifies research and project priorities. For western reclamation states, \$30 million for design and construction of desalination projects with 25% Federal share.
  - WaterSMART: increases funding for WaterSMART by \$100 million (from \$350 million to \$450 million), including \$50 million for water supply and conservation activities on the Colorado River.
  - RIFIA Pilot Program: reportedly \$50 million for a water pilot project, still to be confirmed.
- The Clean Water Construction Coalition will send updates as the issue progresses.

Attached is the list of new Army Corps authorizations.

(1) NAVIGATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. TX	Brazos Island Harbor	Nov. 3, 2014	Federal: \$121,023,000 Non-Federal: \$89,453,000 Total: \$210,476,000
2. LA	Calcasieu Lock	Dec. 2, 2014	Total: \$17,432,000 (to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund)
3. NH, ME	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River	Feb. 8, 2015	Federal: \$16,015,000 Non-Federal: \$5,338,000 Total: \$21,353,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
4. FL	Port Everglades	Jun. 25, 2015	Federal: \$229,770,000 Non-Federal: \$107,233,000 Total: \$337,003,000
5. AK	Little Diomedede Harbor	Aug. 10, 2015	Federal: \$26,394,000 Non-Federal: \$2,933,000 Total: \$29,327,000
6. SC	Charleston Harbor	Sep. 8, 2015	Federal: \$231,239,000 Non-Federal: \$271,454,000 Total: \$502,693,000
7. AK	Craig Harbor	Mar. 16, 2016	Federal: \$29,456,000 Non-Federal: \$3,299,000 Total: \$32,755,000
8. PA	Upper Ohio	Sep. 12, 2016	Total: \$2,691,600,000 (to be derived ½ from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund).

(2) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. TX	Leon Creek Watershed	Jun. 30, 2014	Federal: \$22,145,000 Non-Federal: \$11,925,000 Total: \$34,070,000
2. MO, KS	Armourdale and Central Industrial District Levee Units, Missouri River and Tributaries at Kansas Cities	Jan. 27, 2015	Federal: \$213,271,500 Non-Federal: \$114,838,500 Total: \$328,110,000
3. KS	City of Manhattan	Apr. 30, 2015	Federal: \$16,151,000 Non-Federal: \$8,697,000 Total: \$24,848,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
4. TN	Mill Creek	Oct. 16, 2015	Federal: \$17,950,000 Non-Federal: \$10,860,000 Total: \$28,810,000
5. KS	Upper Turkey Creek Basin	Dec. 22, 2015	Federal: \$25,610,000 Non-Federal: \$13,790,000 Total: \$39,400,000
6. NC	Princeville	Feb. 23, 2016	Federal: \$14,080,000 Non-Federal: \$7,582,000 Total: \$21,662,000
7. CA	American River Common Features	Apr. 26, 2016	Federal: \$890,046,900 Non-Federal: \$705,714,100 Total: \$1,595,761,000
8. CA	West Sacramento	Apr. 26, 2016	Federal: \$788,861,000 Non-Federal: \$424,772,000 Total: \$1,213,633,000.

(3) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Initial Costs and Estimated Renourishment Costs
1. SC	Colleton County	Sep. 5, 2014	Initial Federal: \$14,448,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$7,780,000 Initial Total: \$22,228,000 Renourishment Federal: \$17,491,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$17,491,000 Renourishment Total: \$34,982,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Initial Costs and Estimated Renourishment Costs
2. FL	Flagler County	Dec. 23, 2014	Initial Federal: \$9,561,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$5,149,000 Initial Total: \$14,710,000 Renourishment Federal: \$15,814,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$15,815,000 Renourishment Total: \$31,629,000
3. NC	Carteret County	Dec. 23, 2014	Initial Federal: \$25,468,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$13,714,000 Initial Total: \$39,182,000 Renourishment Federal: \$120,428,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$120,429,000 Renourishment Total: \$240,857,000
4. NJ	Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet, Cape May County	Jan. 23, 2015	Initial Federal: \$14,823,000 Initial Non-Federal: \$7,981,000 Initial Total: \$22,804,000 Renourishment Federal: \$43,501,000 Renourishment Non-Federal: \$43,501,000 Renourishment Total: \$87,002,000
5. LA	West Shore Lake Pontchartrain	Jun. 12, 2015	Federal: \$483,496,650 Non-Federal: \$260,344,350 Total: \$743,841,000
6. CA	San Diego County	Apr. 26, 2016	Initial Federal: \$20,953,000 Initial Non-Federal:

			\$11,282,000 Initial Total: \$32,235,000 Renourishment Federal:  \$70,785,000 Renourishment Non-Federal:  \$70,785,000 Renourishment Total:  \$141,570,000.
--	--	--	--

(4) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. FL	Central Everglades	Dec. 23, 2014	Federal: \$993,131,000 Non-Federal: \$991,544,000 Total: \$1,984,675,000
2. WA	Skokomish River	Dec. 14, 2015	Federal: \$13,168,000 Non-Federal: \$7,091,000 Total: \$20,259,000
3. WA	Puget Sound	Sep. 16, 2016	Federal: \$300,009,000 Non-Federal: \$161,543,000 Total: \$461,552,000.

(5) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT AND ECO- SYSTEM RESTORATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. IL, WI	Upper Des Plaines River and Tributaries	Jun. 8, 2015	Federal: \$204,860,000 Non-Federal: \$110,642,000 Total: \$315,502,000.

(6) FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, AND RECREATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. CA	South San Francisco Bay Shoreline	Dec. 18, 2015	Federal: \$70,511,000 Non-Federal: \$106,689,000 Total: \$177,200,000.

(7) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND RECREATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
1. OR	Willamette River	Dec. 14, 2015	Federal: \$19,531,000 Non-Federal: \$10,845,000 Total: \$30,376,000
2. CA	Los Angeles River	Dec. 18, 2015	Federal: \$373,413,500 Non-Federal: \$1,046,893,500 Total: \$1,420,307,000.

(8) HURRICANE AND STORM DAMAGE RISK REDUCTION AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Report of Chief of Engineers	D. Estimated Costs
----------	---------	---	--------------------

1. LA	Southwest Coastal Louisiana	Jul. 29, 2016	Federal: \$2,054,386,100 Non-Federal: \$1,106,207,900 Total: \$3,160,594,000.
-------	-----------------------------	---------------	--

(9) MODIFICATIONS AND OTHER PROJECTS

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
1. TX	Upper Trinity River	May 21, 2008	Federal: \$526,500,000 Non-Federal: \$283,500,000 Total: \$810,000,000
2. KS, MO	Turkey Creek Basin	May 13, 2016	Federal: \$101,491,650 Non-Federal: \$54,649,350 Total: \$156,141,000
3. KY	Ohio River Shore-line	May 13, 2016	Federal: \$20,309,900 Non-Federal: \$10,936,100 Total: \$31,246,000
4. MO	Blue River Basin	May 13, 2016	Federal: \$36,326,250 Non-Federal: \$12,108,750 Total: \$48,435,000

A. State	B. Name	C. Date of Decision Document	D. Estimated Costs
5. FL	Picayune Strand	Jul. 15, 2016	Federal: \$313,166,000 Non-Federal: \$313,166,000 Total: \$626,332,000
6. MO	Swope Park Industrial Area, Blue River	Jul. 15, 2016	Federal: \$21,033,350 Non-Federal: \$11,325,650 Total: \$32,359,000
7. AZ	Rio de Flag, Flag- staff	Sep. 21, 2016	Federal: \$66,844,900 Non-Federal: \$36,039,100 Total: \$102,884,000
8. TX	Houston Ship Channel	Nov. 4, 2016	Federal: \$381,773,000 Non-Federal: \$127,425,000 Total: \$509,198,000.

###