The Honorable Jennifer Granholm  
Secretary of Energy  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Ave., Southwest  
Washington, D.C. 20585  

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF 21ST CENTURY DAMS ACT- EPACT SECTION 247  
PROVISION INCLUDED IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT AND JOBS ACT

Dear Secretary Granholm,

Thank you for your efforts to secure passage of President Biden’s Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). The undersigned organizations- dam safety groups, river conservation organizations, and hydropower industry appreciate that the final law incorporated key elements of the proposed 21st Century Dams Act (21st CDA) (H.R. 4375 and its Senate companion bills, S.2356 and S.2306). Specifically, we are thrilled that the bill creates a new Department of Energy (DOE) grant program under EPAct Section 247 to encourage hydropower facilities to make further investments in environmental, dam safety, and grid resiliency enhancements.

Together, we supported inclusion in the IIJA of $2.3 billion for various programs, an important “down payment” on the true needs of the nation’s 90,000 dams. This will accelerate retrofit, removal, and rehabilitation (“the 3Rs”) to address the nation’s 90,000 dams. This will enhance public safety, the clean energy and electricity storage benefits of hydropower, and the environmental, safety, and economic benefits of healthy rivers.

Originally intended as a tax credit but recrafted in the IIJA as a grant program, Section 247 is designed to support environmental, dam safety, and grid resiliency investments. None of the areas have prioritization over the others. Most importantly, the language was carefully crafted to ensure that the funds would:

- Be awarded to all three areas;
- Not discriminate between type of owner or operator, such that private entities, public utilities, municipalities, and nonprofits are all equally eligible;
- Provide certainty that facilities that make qualifying investments will receive the full value of the grant (e.g., avoid pre-approval application processes that would deter and delay such investments); and
- Balance the various needs of the grid, rivers, and stakeholder priorities, as intended.
In many cases, property that improves one area may also improve another area. In implementing this program, DOE should not impose priority judgements over the types of property but should instead facilitate the execution of as many projects as possible with the available funding. As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded this provision through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as DOE begins its implementation process.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Gravity Renewables
Great River Hydro
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
Rye Development
Trout Unlimited
The Nature Conservancy
Union of Concerned Scientists
Ms. Deanne Criswell
FEMA Administrator
500 C Street, Southwest
Washington, DC 20472

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A 21ST CENTURY DAMS PROGRAM

Dear Administrator Criswell,

The passage of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (the Act) includes an unprecedented injection of funding for national dam safety programs. Passage of the Act also demonstrates extraordinary support by Congress and hard work and commitment by several national non-profit and industry organizations to encourage its passage. These organizations, including those listed here and collectively known as the Uncommon Dialogue Coalition (the Coalition\textsuperscript{1}), collaborated to find balanced solutions for dam rehabilitation, dam removal, and retrofit of dams for hydropower and worked directly with champions in Congress to secure this funding.

If used as envisioned by the Coalition, this funding will undoubtedly improve the safety of many dams across the country and create stronger State and Federal dam safety programs. And, when passed, the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Dams Act, will add additional direction and funding to dam safety and rehabilitation programs, dam removal goals and hydropower improvements and retrofit concepts.

As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded these sections of the Act through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as FEMA begins the important implementation process.

We offer the attached detailed thoughts and recommendations. In summary:

\begin{itemize}
  \item It is extremely important to work with the State Dam Safety Programs and others working “in the field” on implementation and on reimagining the National Dam Safety Program. It is recommended that a series of listening sessions and implementation workshops be conducted and a new strategic plan for the National Dam Safety Program be written and deployed in conjunction with the Association of State Dam Safety Officials and others within the dam safety community.
  \item A senior leadership level position should be created within FEMA to head the NDSP. This will allow the program to get the oversight as intended in the 1996 Dam Safety Act and envisioned currently.
  \item Due to the much larger dollar amounts going into the State Assistance Grant Program, we encourage FEMA to be as flexible as possible in defining the reasonable cost of implementing the state program and the funds committed by the state to implement dam safety activities.
  \item We strongly encourage FEMA to decrease the level of burdensome paperwork and streamline the application and management processes for the High-Hazard Potential Dam Rehabilitation Program (HHPD) to be more in line with its other FEMA grant programs and those in other agencies such as the EPA CWSRF.
\end{itemize}
It is recommended that unnecessary strict definitions of eligibility criteria for dams to qualify for the HHPD that FEMA is using and burdensome requirements that States are being asked to use to determine dam eligibility be removed and that additional review of all application criteria be performed considering the direction by Congress that a percentage of these funds go toward dam removal projects.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
The Nature Conservancy
Union of Concerned Scientists
Implementation Recommendations

Reimagining a 21st Century National Dam Safety Program

For the FEMA National Dam Safety Program (NDSP), $800 million has been appropriated. This once-in-a-generation funding opportunity should be used to reimagine what a 21st century National Dam Safety Program could be. To accomplish this challenging task please consider the following:

Engagement with the primary recipients of this funding, State Dam Safety Programs, is critical. Close coordination with State Dam Safety Programs is needed during development of spending and implementation plans to ensure States can effectively utilize this funding to make needed improvements for dam safety nationwide. The Association of State Dam Safety Officials (ASDSO) is well positioned to assist FEMA in these efforts and should be consulted as these plans are being developed.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that a series of listening sessions and implementation workshops be conducted and a new strategic plan for the National Dam Safety Program be written and deployed.

The National Dam Safety Program will receive $67 million over 5 years for Operations and Support.

Recommendations:

A senior leadership level position should be created within FEMA to head the NDSP. This will allow the program to get the oversight as intended in the 1996 Dam Safety Act.

Additional staffing support should be placed, not only at the headquarters level, but in all FEMA regions, consistent with regional support levels currently provided for other FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) programs. These personnel should have dam safety experience or be provided with adequate training to coordinate and assist the State Dam Safety Programs.

A 21st century NDSP should provide for consistency between FEMA Regions on management of the State Assistance Grants. All State participants should be required to meet the same criteria and expectations and communications between FEMA Regions and State participants should be consistent.

FEMA should devote enough funds to review and update its important national guidance documents and consider additional manuals as determined by the NDSRB with input from the DHS Dams Sector Specific Agency, the States, and the NGOs devoted to dam safety.

Create a comprehensive and coordinated approach to carry out the public outreach, training and research elements of the NDSP, with guidance and participation from the States, the NGOs, the NDSRB, universities, the national research labs and other relevant players.

Funding should go toward a National Academy of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) national Extreme Precipitation Study to include evaluation of Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) and NOAA Atlas 14 Precipitation Frequency estimating tools and methodologies. Federal tools and methods to estimate PMP and NOAA Atlas 14 precipitation frequency rainfall have become outdated. We recommend that FEMA support NOAA’s effort to both assess and update these data, methods, and tools for use in the design of spillways at high-hazard potential dams and to model flood risk through FEMA’s Risk MAP program.

The State Assistance Grant Program will receive $148 million over 5 years.

The NDSP was established to improve dam safety nationwide and coordinate the state and federal entities regulating dams. The NDSP authorizes FEMA to provide direct assistance grants to support and strengthen state dam safety programs focusing on improving capacity to effectively inspect, regulate,
and ensure proper oversight of state-regulated dams. Recent dam failures and incidents have shown that traditional visual inspection practices are not sufficient to prevent dam safety incidents. Expanding the assistance to states is intended to provide additional resources to each state for more comprehensive dam safety evaluations, risk assessments, and enforcement. This will allow regulatory follow-up to mitigate the identified risks of dam failure for the nation’s nearly 22,000 state-regulated high- and significant-hazard potential dams.

Recommendations:

We encourage FEMA to be as flexible as possible in defining the reasonable cost of implementing the state program and the funds committed by the state to implement dam safety activities. Current authority caps the amount of funds a state can receive from the NDSP at 50 percent of the reasonable cost of implementing the State dam safety program, and the funds may not exceed the amount of funds committed by the state to implement dam safety activities. These limitations could be problematic for some smaller state programs with the larger state assistance grant amounts provided for in the Act.

There are other requirements in the law that are sufficient to ensure that States will not eliminate State funding for dam safety if they receive a larger State assistance grant amount.

We further recommend that if a state has difficulty achieving the budget limitations in the early years of increased appropriations, that FEMA consider holding that state’s unclaimed funds for a future year. This could give the state time to increase its own budget and still benefit from the increased federal assistance.

The High-Hazard Potential Dam (HHPD) Rehabilitation Grant Program will receive $585 million over 5 years with no less than $75 million earmarked for removal projects.

The HHPD Program has the potential to effectively address the highest priority dam safety projects in the country. However, despite its potential, this program faces numerous challenges that limit its effectiveness. These include burdensome project eligibility criteria, an unnecessary amount of grant application and administrative paperwork, and lack of a cohesive, uniform communication system between FEMA Headquarters, FEMA Regions, and the State grant recipients. In three years since the program was launched, the number of applicants has decreased. There were 25 the first year, and 29 the second year, and only 15 States applied in 2021. States have communicated that this is due to the level of paperwork, lack of time to apply, and new criteria that cut out many if not all eligible dams in some States.

Language in current legislation should be clarified to address many of the implementation issues but it is strongly recommended that FEMA consider the following strategies within existing policy.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that FEMA discontinue the current interpretation of ‘eligibility criteria.’ Under the law, the eligibility criteria for the HHPD Grant Program says funds are reserved for dams classified as high-hazard potential with an Emergency Action Plan (EAP) in a State with an established dam safety program. Furthermore, a qualifying dam must also meet minimum State safety standards and pose “an unacceptable risk to the public,” as determined by FEMA. Under FEMA’s current interpretation of this criteria, most HHP dams must pose a risk to downstream populations of over 100 people and in some cases over 1000 people. The requirement that an eligible dam must be a High Hazard Potential dam and failure will result in probable loss of life implies that it is an unacceptable risk to the public and further restrictions based on how many lives must be at risk are not reasonable. This eliminates hundreds of deficient high-hazard potential dams (as determined by State dam safety programs) that present real danger to hundreds of people. With this type of restriction, many states have indicated that they will have zero or close to zero eligible dams and will not be able to participate in the program.
Do not implement a Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) requirement to determine eligible dams. The FEMA BCA system, applied to dams, typically removes many high-hazard potential dams in need of rehabilitation from eligibility.

It is recommended that FEMA provide the risk-based prioritizing tool to the States for project ranking purposes as it does for other FEMA grant projects like BRIC and HMGP where the State establishes the priority list rather than FEMA. States should rank eligible projects. The statute requiring this type of risk-based priority system for States to use in prioritizing multiple applications in a single year was written to assure that the highest risk dams are rehabilitated, as determined by the State. This program can be vastly improved by expanding these eligibility criteria and by providing a risk-based priority system that could be used by States in prioritizing multiple applications in a single year.

Allow more time for the NOFO to be available and the application process to be open. The current window has been one month while other grant programs at FEMA, including the BRIC program, have an application window of several months.

Review all current policies to determine if they should be required for dam removal projects and modify them as appropriate to encourage the use of grant funds for public-safety dam removal projects.

It is recommended that FEMA consider updating grant guidance to make it clear that the floodplain management plan is to specifically address the controlled or uncontrolled release from the dam or management of water levels in the area impacted by the dam. For dam removal, guidance should be written that clarifies that a plan for a dam removal project must be in place at the time of the grant award and that a communication plan for the dam removal project is acceptable as the floodplain management plan. The current law says that floodplain management plans are required to be in place for eligible projects. Some of the wording in the law is unclear on the purpose and extent of the plan and on the contents of a plan, specifically for a dam removal project.

It is recommended that FEMA consider how current cost shares and other restrictions on which projects receive funding should be considered within its larger interest in equity and accessibility to assistance by underserved communities. Clearly, there are legislative updates that would have to be made to change the non-federal 35 percent cost share overall, but, in a general sense, there is support among State Dam Safety officials for considering equity during the implementation process. While cost sharing mechanisms are important to ensure adequate funding for many projects and for maximizing overall financial impact of the grant, many communities are not in a position to assume such a cost-share. Many of these communities own a dam in need of repair and often their own community falls in the downstream failure inundation area from the dam. If grant funds are not available for rehabilitation of these dams, not only could these communities face the devastating consequences of dam failure, but recovery assistance costs from other federal grant programs could prove to be higher than assuming the full cost of a HHPD grant. It is recommended that FEMA consider a policy to allow exemptions to this rule and allow an applicant defined as a “Small Underserved Community,” which reflects communities that own or could be significantly impacted by a dam failure and do not have sufficient resources to afford the required match. This exemption would relax the 35 percent non-federal cost sharing requirement for these communities. These changes will help ensure that small, disadvantaged communities are not placed at greater risk of disaster from a failing dam.

---

1 The Uncommon Dialogue Coalition includes: American Rivers, Association of State Dam Safety Officials, American Society of Civil Engineers, Gravity Renewables, Great River Hydro, Hydropower Foundation, Hydropower Reform Coalition, National Hydropower Association, Low Impact Hydropower Institute, Rye Development, The Nature Conservancy, Trout Unlimited, Union of Concerned Scientists, United States Society on Dams, World Wildlife Fund
January 14, 2022

Randy Moore
Chief, USDA Forest Service
U.S. Forest Service
1400 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20520

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY DAMS ACT PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

Dear Chief Moore,

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (the Act) includes a critical injection of funding to programs that support dam removals. Passage of the Act also demonstrates extraordinary support by Congress and hard work by a collaboration of dam safety groups, river conservation organizations, the hydropower industry, and civil engineers to include dam removal in the Act. These organizations collaborated to find balanced solutions for dam rehabilitation, dam removal, and retrofit of dams for hydropower and worked directly with champions in Congress to secure this funding.

Dam removal, with consent of the owner, can be a cost-effective approach to managing a significant portion of our nation’s aging dam infrastructure. Dam removals can improve public safety, restore the natural functions of rivers, help extirpated and endangered fish species, create jobs, protect important environmental and cultural resources, and increase the climate resilience of U.S. rivers.

If used as envisioned, this funding will improve the environmental, safety, and economic benefits of healthy rivers across the country through dam removal, while advancing dam safety and the benefits of hydropower. Together, we supported inclusion of several Twenty-First Century Dams Act provisions in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act totaling $2.3 billion in various programs, an important “down payment” on the true needs of the nation’s more than 90,000 dams. The bipartisan, bicameral Twenty-First Century Dams Act (H.R. 4375 and its Senate companion bills, S.2356 and S.2306) includes important qualifying language for use of the funds. Some of the relevant language includes:

- A dam removal project means a project to permanently remove the full vertical extent of a dam structure to a minimum horizontal width needed to protect public safety, restore natural river function, and reconnect aquatic species passage, unless site conditions prevent that removal width.
- Funds should be used to remove non-federal dams, or to remove federal non-powered dams where removal is authorized by Congress, where applicable.
- Dams will be removed only with dam owner consent.
- Funds should be used to support any project steps including, but not limited to: engineering, scientific assessment, economic analysis, construction, project management, technical assistance,
acquisition, liability insurance, monitoring, regulatory compliance, updating flood hazard mapping as needed for project implementation, project administration, infrastructure protection, and sediment management.

- Funds should be used for federal, state, tribal, and non-federal dam removal technical assistance programs to identify projects, complete initial project stages, train project managers and others involved in dam removal projects, and provide project-based technical assistance.

- Ensure that funds provide for adequate staffing not only for funding administration, but also for regulatory permit development/review and project management.

The following funds in the infrastructure bill have been provided to the U.S. Forest Service for dam removal projects with additional key points in the language:

- The Act includes $10,000,000 for the removal of non-hydropower Federal dams. This money is intended to be used for all aspects of dam removal projects, including grants for technical assistance.

- The specific language of this funding can be found on page 981 of the Act signed into law on November 15, 2021. Below is a partial quote:
  - “$10,000,000 for the removal of non-hydropower Federal dams and for providing dam removal technical assistance”

As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded these sections of the Act through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as the U.S. Forest Service develops the important implementation process.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Whitewater
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
Rye Development
Trout Unlimited
Union of Concerned Scientists
World Wildlife Fund

Cc: Kelly Brom, National Program Manager for Dams
Cc: Nathaniel Gillespie, Assistant National Fisheries Program Leader
January 14, 2022

Dr. Richard Spinrad  
NOAA Administrator  
1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Room 5128  
Washington, DC 20230

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY DAMS ACT PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE  
BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

Dear Administrator Spinrad,

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (the Act) includes a critical injection of funding to programs that support dam removals. Passage of the Act also demonstrates extraordinary support by Congress and hard work by a collaboration of dam safety groups, river conservation organizations, the hydropower industry, and civil engineers to include dam removal in the Act. These organizations collaborated to find balanced solutions for dam rehabilitation, dam removal, and retrofit of dams for hydropower and worked directly with champions in Congress to secure this funding.

Dam removal, with consent of the owner, can be a cost-effective approach to managing a significant portion of our nation’s aging dam infrastructure. Dam removals can improve public safety, restore the natural functions of rivers, help extirpated and endangered fish species, create jobs, protect important environmental and cultural resources, and increase the climate resilience of U.S. rivers.

If used as envisioned, this funding will improve the environmental, safety, and economic benefits of healthy rivers across the country through dam removal, while advancing dam safety and the benefits of hydropower. Together, we supported inclusion of several Twenty-First Century Dams Act provisions in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act totaling $2.3 billion in various programs, an important “down payment” on the true needs of the nation’s more than 90,000 dams. The bipartisan, bicameral Twenty-First Century Dams Act (H.R. 4375 and its Senate companion bills, S.2356 and S.2306) includes important qualifying language for use of the funds. Some of the relevant language includes:

- A dam removal project means a project to permanently remove the full vertical extent of a dam structure to a minimum horizontal width needed to protect public safety, restore natural river function, and reconnect aquatic species passage, unless site conditions prevent that removal width.
- Funds should be used to remove non-federal dams, or to remove federal non-powered dams where removal is authorized by Congress, where applicable.
- Dams will be removed only with dam owner consent.
- Funds should be used to support any project steps including, but not limited to: engineering, scientific assessment, economic analysis, construction, project management, technical assistance, acquisition, liability insurance, monitoring, regulatory compliance, updating flood hazard mapping as
needed for project implementation, project administration, infrastructure protection, and sediment management.

- Funds should be used for federal, state, tribal, and non-federal dam removal technical assistance programs to identify projects, complete initial project stages, train project managers and others involved in dam removal projects, and provide project-based technical assistance.

The following funds in the infrastructure bill have been provided to NOAA for dam removal projects with additional key points in the language:

- The Act includes $400,000,000 for the NOAA Community-Based Restoration Program. This money is intended to be used for all aspects of dam removal projects, including grants for technical assistance. There is also a 15% set-aside for Tribes and Tribal partnerships to ensure equitable distribution of funds.

- The specific language of this funding can be found on page 928 of the Act signed into law on November 15, 2021. Below are partial quotes:
  o “$400,000,000 shall be for restoring fish passage by removing in-stream barriers and providing technical assistance pursuant to section 117 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 1891a), of which up to 15 percent shall be reserved for Indian Tribes or partnerships of Indian Tribes in conjunction with an institution of higher education, non-profit, commercial (for profit) organizations, U.S. territories, and state or local governments, and of which the remaining amount shall be for all eligible entities, including Indian Tribes and such partnerships of Indian Tribes”
  o “That nothing under this heading in this Act shall be construed as providing any new authority to remove, breach, or otherwise alter the operations of a Federal hydropower dam and dam removal projects shall include written consent of the dam owner, if ownership is established”

As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded these sections of the Act through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as NOAA develops the important implementation process.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Whitewater
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
Rye Development
Union of Concerned Scientists
World Wildlife Fund

Cc: Carrie Robinson, Director, Office of Habitat Conservation
Cc: Tisa Shostik, Deputy Chief, Office of Habitat Conservation, Restoration Center
January 14, 2022

The Honorable Mike Connor  
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
108 Army Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20310

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY DAMS ACT PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

Dear Assistant Secretary Connor,

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (the Act) includes a critical injection of funding to programs that support dam removals. Passage of the Act also demonstrates extraordinary support by Congress and hard work by a collaboration of dam safety groups, river conservation organizations, the hydropower industry, and civil engineers to include dam removal in the Act. These organizations collaborated to find balanced solutions for dam rehabilitation, dam removal, and retrofit of dams for hydropower and worked directly with champions in Congress to secure this funding.

Dam removal, with the consent of the owner, can be a cost-effective approach to managing a significant portion of our nation’s aging dam infrastructure. Dam removals can improve public safety, restore the natural functions of rivers, help extirpated and endangered fish species, create jobs, protect important environmental and cultural resources, and increase the climate resilience of U.S. rivers.

If used as envisioned, this funding will improve the environmental, safety, and economic benefits of healthy rivers across the country through dam removal, while advancing dam safety and the benefits of hydropower. Together, we supported inclusion of several Twenty-First Century Dams Act provisions in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act totaling $2.3 billion in various programs, an important “down payment” on the true needs of the nation’s more than 90,000 dams. The bipartisan, bicameral Twenty-First Century Dams Act (H.R. 4375 and its Senate companion bills, S.2356 and S.2306) includes important qualifying language for use of the funds. Some of the relevant language includes:

- A dam removal project means a project to permanently remove the full vertical extent of a dam structure to a minimum horizontal width needed to protect public safety, restore natural river function, and reconnect aquatic species passage, unless site conditions prevent that removal width.
- Funds should be used to remove non-federal dams, or to remove federal non-powered dams where removal is authorized by Congress, where applicable.
- Dams will be removed only with dam owner consent.
• Funds should be used to support any project steps including, but not limited to: engineering, scientific assessment, economic analysis, construction, project management, technical assistance, acquisition, liability insurance, monitoring, regulatory compliance, updating flood hazard mapping as needed for project implementation, project administration, infrastructure protection, and sediment management.

• Funds should be used for federal, state, tribal, and non-federal dam removal technical assistance programs to identify projects, complete initial project stages, train project managers and others involved in dam removal projects, and provide project-based technical assistance.

The following funds in the infrastructure bill have been provided to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for dam removal projects with additional key points in the language:

• The Act includes $115,000,000 for the Section 206 Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Program for the removal of dams. This money is intended to be used for all aspects of dam removal projects, including grants for technical assistance. The language says that the funds are to “restore fish and wildlife passage by removing in-stream barriers.” The intent of the funds is to remove the full vertical extent of dams, and as much of the horizontal extent as is feasible.

• The specific language of this funding can be found on page 932 of the Act signed into law on November 15, 2021. Below is a partial quote:
  o “$115,000,000, shall be used under the aquatic ecosystem restoration program under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330) to restore fish and wildlife passage by removing in-stream barriers and provide technical assistance to non-Federal interests carrying out such activities”

As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded these sections of the Act through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers develops the important implementation process.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Whitewater
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
Rye Development
The Nature Conservancy
Trout Unlimited
Union of Concerned Scientists
World Wildlife Fund

Cc: Lieutenant Colonel Steve Sattinger, Deputy District Commander for the United States Army Corps of Engineers
Cc: Mindy Simmons, Senior Environmental Policy Advisor, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration
January 14, 2022

Martha Williams
Principal Deputy Director
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
1849 C Street NW, Room 3042
Washington, DC 20240

RE: IMPLEMENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY DAMS ACT PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL

Dear Director Williams,

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (the Act) includes a critical injection of funding to programs that support dam removals. Passage of the Act also demonstrates extraordinary support by Congress and hard work by a collaboration of dam safety groups, river conservation organizations, the hydropower industry, and civil engineers to include dam removal in the Act. These organizations collaborated to find balanced solutions for dam rehabilitation, dam removal, and retrofit of dams for hydropower and worked directly with champions in Congress to secure this funding.

Dam removal, with consent of the owner, can be a cost-effective approach to managing a significant portion of our nation’s aging dam infrastructure. Dam removals can improve public safety, restore the natural functions of rivers, help extirpated and endangered fish species, create jobs, protect important environmental and cultural resources, and increase the climate resilience of U.S. rivers.

If used as envisioned, this funding will improve the environmental, safety, and economic benefits of healthy rivers across the country through dam removal, while advancing dam safety and the benefits of hydropower. Together, we supported inclusion of several Twenty-First Century Dams Act provisions in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act totaling $2.3 billion in various programs, an important “down payment” on the true needs of the nation’s more than 90,000 dams. The bipartisan, bicameral Twenty-First Century Dams Act (H.R. 4375 and its Senate companion bills, S.2356 and S.2306) includes important qualifying language for use of the funds. Some of the relevant language includes:

- A dam removal project means a project to permanently remove the full vertical extent of a dam structure to a minimum horizontal width needed to protect public safety, restore natural river function, and reconnect aquatic species passage, unless site conditions prevent that removal width.
- Funds should be used to remove non-federal dams, or to remove federal non-powered dams where removal is authorized by Congress, where applicable.
- Dams will be removed only with dam owner consent.
- Funds should be used to support any project steps including, but not limited to: engineering, scientific assessment, economic analysis, construction, project management, technical assistance, acquisition, liability insurance, monitoring, regulatory compliance, updating flood hazard mapping as
needed for project implementation, project administration, infrastructure protection, and sediment management.

• Funds should be used for federal, state, tribal, and non-federal dam removal technical assistance programs to identify projects, complete initial project stages, train project managers and others involved in dam removal projects, and provide project-based technical assistance.

The following funds in the Act have been provided to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for dam removal projects with additional key points in the language:

• The Act includes $200,000,000 for the National Fish Passage Program. This money is intended to be used for all aspects of dam removal projects, including grants for technical assistance. The language states that the funds are for “restoring fish and wildlife passage by removing in-stream barriers.” The intent of the funds is to remove the full vertical extent of dams, and as much of the horizontal extent as is feasible.

• The specific language of this funding can be found on page 961 of the Act signed into law on November 15, 2021. Below is a partial quote:
  - “$200,000,000 shall be for restoring fish and wildlife passage by removing in-stream barriers and providing technical assistance under the National Fish Passage Program”
  - “That nothing under this heading in this Act shall be construed as providing any new authority to remove, breach, or otherwise alter the operations of a Federal hydropower dam and dam removal projects shall include written consent of the dam owner, if ownership is established”

As the organizations that conceived of and shepherded these sections of the Act through Congress, we offer ourselves as a resource as the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service develops the important implementation process.

Sincerely,

American Rivers
American Whitewater
American Society of Civil Engineers
Association of State Dam Safety Officials
Hydropower Reform Coalition
Low Impact Hydropower Institute
National Hydropower Association
Rye Development
Union of Concerned Scientists
World Wildlife Fund

Cc: Eric MacMillan, Chief, Branch of Aquatic Habitat and Species Conservation
Cc: David Hoskins, Assistant Director for Fish and Aquatic Conservation
Cc: Dr. Michael Bailey, National Fish Passage and Aquatic Habitat Coordinator