

Table of Contents
Appendix

Report	Page
Table of Contents.....	Appendix-1
Benefit Cost Ratios as of October 1, 2003	Appendix-2
Land Certification	Appendix-5
Obligations by Function for Operating Projects	
Pacific Northwest Region	Appendix-8
Mid-Pacific Region.....	Appendix-10
Lower Colorado Region.....	Appendix-13
Upper Colorado Region	Appendix-15
Great Plains Region.....	Appendix-20
Project Repayment FY 2004.....	Appendix-25
Status of NEPA Compliance	Appendix-33
Status of Water Service and Repayment Contracts.....	Appendix-39
Summary of Irrigation Investment	Appendix-43

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2003

Project	Direct Benefits	Comment
Animas-La Plata		No benefit-cost ratio was requested by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Central Arizona Project	1.3	The ratio was computed by using the authorized interest rate of 3.25 percent. The benefit-cost ratio remained the same as in the FY 2003 Budget Justifications.
Central Valley Project American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division Miscellaneous Project Programs Sacramento River Division San Felipe Division San Joaquin Division Shasta Division West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit Trinity River Division Trinity River Restoration		<p>A benefit-cost ratio is no longer available for the Central Valley Project or any of its divisions and units. Benefit estimates submitted in support of the authorization of the original project features are out of date. Continued indexing of these estimates is inappropriate, and can be misleading. Benefit data for the in-service facilities are not available due to the high cost of collecting data. Recent additions to the list of authorized program activities have been justified on the basis of environmental goals rather than economic benefits. For that reason, benefit-cost ratios do not exist for fish and wildlife restoration and improvement activities authorized since the enactment of the Trinity River Restoration Act (P.L. 98-541, October 24, 1984).</p> <p>For the San Joaquin Division - Benefit-cost ratios are not required for activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, P.L. 102-575.</p>
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I		Assessment of full beneficial impact of improving water quality as a result of this authorized project has not been made. Agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 authorizing Title I and Title II activities are based upon social and political justifications.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2003

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Title II - Basinwide Program		Previous agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 are based upon social and political justifications. P.L. 98-569 required construction preference be given to those projects that reduced salinity at the least cost.
Columbia/Snake River Salmon Recovery Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Endangered Species Conservation/Recovery Projects		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Lewis and Clark Rural Water Supply		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-246.
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 102-575.
Minidoka Northside Drain Water Management Project		Not Applicable. Action provides for environmental compliance on an existing project.
Mni Wiconi Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 100-516.
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2003

Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit		Benefit-cost ratio has not been calculated since the passage of the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
San Gabriel Basin Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Animas-La Plata	1/19/82	The Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000 authorizes the construction of only those facilities necessary to divert and store water for municipal and industrial uses. Construction of any other project features authorized under P.L. 90-537 (such as irrigation) shall not be commenced without further express authorization from Congress.
Central Arizona Project	4/16/73	The projectwide land certification was completed on April 16, 1973. During project construction, supplemental land certifications were completed on lands not included in the original projectwide certification. As of July 20, 1998, sufficient land has been certified on the Gila River Reservation to satisfy the requirement for delivery of CAP water. Final land classification on San Xavier Existing Farm Rehabilitation extension is now scheduled for completion in 2005 as a result of a delay in the design work. Final land classification for the San Carlos Apache system is now planned for FY 2005 due to an extension in the completion of planning work. Land certifications for the remaining Indian reservation will be scheduled as required.
Central Valley Project American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division	7/20/67 7/20/67 7/23/82	<p>Land Classification Certification includes Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Foresthill, and Sly Park Unit.</p> <p>Land Classification Certification includes Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, Broadview Water District, Contra Costa County Water District, Laguna Water District, Patterson Water District, Plain View Water District, Solado Water Districts (05/19/95), Sunflower Water District (05/19/95), and West Stanislaus Water District (11/8/96). In Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, field work is completed; the report was completed and certified on 04/99. Patterson Water District was completed in 08/97 and certified 08/99. Del Puerto Irrigation District field work is completed; the report was completed and certified in 07/01.</p> <p>Mendota Districts: Coehlo Family Trust field work completed 03/02; Eagle Field Water District projected initial field work to be completed 05/03; Fresno Slough field work completed 04/02; James Irrigation District field work completed in 2002; Laguna Water District projected initial field work 05/03; Traction Ranch, Melvin Hughes (Mendota Pool) field work completed 04/02;</p>

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Central Valley Project (Cont.) Delta Division (Cont.) East Side Division Friant Division	Various dates (Beginning with 1/13/50 and going to May 1996)	Mercy Springs Water District No. 1606 field work completed 07/02; Tranquility Irrigation District field work completed 04/02; and Widren Water District projected field work 2003. New Melones Land Classification Certification includes Atwell Island Water District, Cross Valley Canal, Globe Water District, Hills Valley Irrigation District, Tri-Valley Irrigation District, Friant-Kern Canal, Madera Irrigation District (01/94), Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District, Exeter Irrigation District (7/29/91), Fresno Irrigation District (12/23/94), Garfield Water District, Lewis Creek Unit, Ivanhoe Irrigation District (10/90), Kern-Tulare Water District (01/96), Lindmore Irrigation District (03/91), Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District, Orange Cove Irrigation District, Pixley Irrigation District (08/94), Porterville Irrigation District, Saucelito Irrigation District, Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District, Stone Coral Irrigation District (07/91), Tea Pot Dome Water District (01/96), Terra Bella Irrigation District, Chowchilla Water District (10/91) and Reclassified (07/98), LaBranza Water District, Gravelly Ford Water District (09/95), International (12/95), Lower Tule River Irrigation District (08/95), Rag Gulch Water District (09/95), and Tulare Irrigation District (12/95).
Miscellaneous Project Programs Sacramento River Division San Felipe Division Trinity River Division West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit	6/4/82 5/3/56 8/20/75 7/24/64 5/11/62	Extended Service Area 12/22/80. Land Classification Certification includes Feather Water District, Upper Stony Creek, Stony Creek, Glenn Valley Water District, Glide Water District, Westside Water District, Tehama-Colusa Canal, Kanawha Water District, and Orland-Artois Water District, Yolo-Zamore and Dunnigan area (10/90). Hollister and Santa Clara in 1975 and Watsonville on 1/19/79. Land Certification includes Watsonville Subarea and Hollister and Santa Clara Subareas. Land Classification Certification includes Bella Vista Water District (12/90), Clear Creek South Unit (07/64), and Cow Creek Unit (07/62). Above Elevation 470 - 2/14/79. Land classification Certification includes San Luis Water District, Westlands Water District (10/91), Panoche Water District, and Pleasant Valley Water District.

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Columbia Basin Project	8/11/52 & 4/7/76	
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	3/66	Lands included in the 250,000-acre plan were certified for gravity irrigation in March 1966. Recertification is required on those lands that are a part of the 75,000 acre plan because of change from gravity to sprinkler irrigation. The 5,000 acres for the Oakes Test Area were recertified in April 1981. Further progress on land certification is on hold as a result of the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000, except for the 2,380 acres on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation and for a few existing irrigated areas which are seeking preferred power.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act	6/28/90	Final land classification on San Xavier Existing Farm Rehabilitation extension is now scheduled for completion in 2005 as a result of a delay in the design work.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

Revised 01/31/03

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004			
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004							
Boise Project	1,686	1,842	9,781	7,881	1,136	1,041	0	0	219	388	692	653	804	687	2,098	2,188	100	0	16,516	14,680			
Federal	732	756	543	1,251	1,136	1,041			193	388	543	443	804	687	1,937	2,118	100		5,988	6,684	82	5,906	6,684
Water Users	954	1,086							26		149	210			161	70			1,290	1,366			
Other Agencies			9,238	6,630															9,238	6,630			
Columbia Basin-Total	4,314	4,398	75,456	66,294	1,547	1,395	8	8	968	630	400	756	529	320	4,955	3,598	300	542	88,477	77,941			
Federal	0	0	2,534	2,152	1,547	1,395	8	8	851	585	380	432	415	270	4,955	3,598	300	542	10,990	8,982	159	10,831	8,982
Water Users	4,314	4,398	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,314	4,398			
Other Agencies	0	0	72,922	64,142	0	0	0	0	117	45	20	324	114	50	0	0	0	0	73,173	64,561			
Columbia Basin-Coulee	2,776	2,860	75,456	66,294	1,467	1,315	8	8	510	510	0	0	0	0	561	556	0	0	80,778	71,543			
Federal			2,534	2,152	1,467	1,315	8	8	510	510					561	556			5,080	4,541	79	5,001	4,541
Water Users	2,776	2,860																	2,776	2,860			
Other Agencies			72,922	64,142															72,922	64,142			
Columbia Basin-Ephrata	1,538	1,538	0	0	80	80	0	0	458	120	400	756	529	320	4,394	3,042	300	542	7,699	6,398			
Federal					80	80			341	75	380	432	415	270	4,394	3,042	300	542	5,910	4,441	80	5,830	4,441
Water Users	1,538	1,538																	1,538	1,538			
Other Agencies									117	45	20	324	114	50					251	419			
Crooked River	0	0	0	0	199	95	0	0	0	0	129	156	323	421	252	93	0	0	903	765			
Federal					199	95					93	104	323	385	252	93			867	677	20	847	677
Water Users											36	52			36				36	88			
Deschutes Project	0	0	0	0	82	69	0	0	222	127	326	495	68	69	26	26	65	0	789	786			
Federal					82	69			111	127	200	282	68	69	26	26	65		552	573	18	534	573
Water Users									111		126	213							237	213			
Eastern Oregon Projects	0	0	0	0	134	158	0	0	0	451	235	334	162	93	151	122	0	0	682	1,158			
Federal					134	158				451	186	237	132	93	151	122			603	1,061	20	583	1,061
Water Users										49	97	30							79	97			
Hungry Horse	0	0	4,466	6,176	245	390	0	0	45	70	0	0	45	71	0	0	0	0	4,801	6,707			
Federal				525	245	390			45	70			45	71					335	1,056	35	300	1,056
Water Users																			0	0			
Other Agencies			4,466	5,651															4,466	5,651			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

Revised 01/31/03

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	
Minidoka Projects	1,467	1,210	8,701	7,659	1,010	801	119	153	1,018	1,195	1,086	1,049	941	547	1,809	1,729	125	125	16,276	14,468			
Federal			293	383	1,010	801			939	1,170	749	780	760	547	1,727	1,694	125	125	5,603	5,500	127	5,476	5,500
Water Users	1,467	1,210					119	153	79	25	337	269	181		82	35			2,265	1,692			
Other Agencies			8,408	7,276															8,408	7,276			
Rogue River	0	0	1,089	798	159	156	0	0	112	70	465	650	134	98	98	93	0	0	2,057	1,865			
Federal					159	156			56	70	269	358	62	49	98	93			644	726	21	623	726
Water Users									56		196	292	72	49					324	341			
Other Agencies			1,089	798															1,089	798			
Tualatin Project	67	70	0	0	63	44	77	79	73	94	95	129	156	158	132	114	0	0	663	688			
Federal					63	44			49	94	40	56	104	106	132	114			388	414	25	363	414
Water Users	67	70					77	79	24		55	73	52	52					275	274			
Umatilla Project	132	136	0	0	66	43	0	0	1,929	1,653	458	723	7	5	437	400	0	0	3,029	2,960			
Federal					66	43			1,929	1,653	408	601	7	5	437	400			2,847	2,702	76	2,771	2,702
Water Users	132	136																	132	136			
Other Agencies											50	122							50	122			
Yakima Project	1,182	1,261	2,461	2,517	875	946	0	0	5,849	5,795	608	517	83	91	18	118	167	125	11,243	11,370			
Federal			21	112	875	946			5,490	5,548	331	305	83	91	18	118	167	125	6,985	7,245	231	6,754	7,245
Water Users	807	879							100	65	277	212							1,184	1,156			
Other Agencies	375	382	2,440	2,405					259	182									3,074	2,969			
Exam Of Existing Structu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,591	1,615	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,591	1,615			
Federal											1,591	1,615							1,591	1,615	7	1,584	1,615
Water Users																			0	0			
Misc. Flood Control	0	0	0	0	98	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	130			
Federal					98	130													98	130	1	97	130
Water Users																			0	0			
Total Obligations	8,848	8,917	101,954	91,325	5,614	5,268	204	240	10,435	10,473	6,085	7,077	3,252	2,560	9,976	8,481	757	792	147,125	135,133			
Total Appropriated	732	756	3,391	4,423	5,614	5,268	8	8	9,663	10,156	4,790	5,213	2,803	2,373	9,733	8,376	757	792	37,491	37,365	822	36,669	37,365
Total Water Users	7,741	7,779	0	0	0	0	196	232	396	90	1,225	1,418	335	137	243	105	0	0	10,136	9,761			
Total Other	375	382	98,563	86,902	0	0	0	0	376	227	70	446	114	50	0	0	0	0	99,498	88,007			
% of Apprp. Funds	2.0%	2.0%	9.2%	11.8%	15.3%	14.1%	0.0%	0.0%	26.4%	27.2%	13.1%	14.0%	7.6%	6.4%	26.5%	22.4%	2.1%	2.1%	102.2%	100.0%			

1/ Non-operating expenses includes items under the Science and Technology Program.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2003	2004	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2003	2004	2003	2003	2004
CVP Improvement Act	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0
Water Users																								
CVP Rax Program	7,284	10,925	3,610	5,414	1,309	1,963	827	1,241	2,719	4,078	26	38	227	341	0	0	3	0	16,005	24,000				
Federal	7,284	10,925	3,610	5,414	1,309	1,963	827	1,241	2,719	4,078	26	38	227	341	0	0	3	0	16,005	24,000	5	16,000	24,000	
Water Users																								
Total Central Valley:																								
Federal	43,416	47,405	21,517	23,494	7,802	8,519	4,931	5,384	16,205	17,693	153	167	1,354	1,479	0	0	32,932	59,824	128,309	163,964	1,304	127,005	163,964	
Water Users	0	396	2,084	10,873	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000	4,000	27,084	15,269		0	0	
Cachuma Project	543	551	0	0	465	449	200	108	38	24	0	0	0	0	170	203	0	0	1,411	1,416				
Federal	543	551			465	449	200	108	38	24					170	203	0	0	1,411	1,416	76	1,335	1,416	
Water Users																			0	0				
Klamath Project	1,126	1,428	0	0	0	0	207	263	8,867	11,511	0	0	0	0	1,079	1,400	3,178	5,851	14,457	20,452				
Federal	1,012	1,314					186	242	8,867	11,511					0	0	3,178	5,851	14,322	20,317	55	14,267	20,317	
Water Users	114	114					21	21							1,079	1,400	3,178	5,851	135	135				
Orland Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486	486	0	0	39	0	525	486				
Federal													486	486			39	0	525	486	56	469	486	
Water Users																			0	0				
Solano Project	893	1,364	0	0	34	52	14	22	84	128	0	0	1,361	2,077	375	572	110	0	2,871	4,215				
Federal	893	1,364			34	52	14	22	84	128			1,361	2,077	375	572	110	0	2,871	4,215	110	2,761	4,215	
Water Users																			0	0				
Lahontan Basin Projects	451	320	793	563	0	0	2,336	1,658	920	653	0	0	49	35	5,062	3,593	(917)	2,092	8,693	8,913				
Federal	451	320	793	563	0	0	2,336	1,658	920	653	0	0	49	35	5,062	3,593	(917)	2,092	8,693	8,913	139	8,554	8,913	
Water Users																			0	0				
Exam of Existing Structures	1,188	1,230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,188	1,230				
Federal	1,188	1,230																	1,188	1,230	2	1,186	1,230	
Water Users																			0	0				
Land Resources Managmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,183	815	7	0	1,190	815				
Federal															1,183	815	7	0	1,190	815	7	1,183	815	
Water Users																			0	0				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2003	2004	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2003	2004	2003	2004	
Reclamation Law Admin	1,531	1,578	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1,532	1,578				
Federal	1,531	1,578															1	0	1,532	1,578	1	1,531	1,578	
Water Users																			0	0				
Site Security - Antiterrorism	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	71	70				
Federal	70	70															1	0	71	70	1	70	70	
Water Users																			0	0				
Soil & Moisture Conserv	162	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	100				
Federal	162	100															0	0	162	100		162	100	
Water Users																			0	0				
Wtr Mgmt/Conservation	61	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	62	64				
Federal	61	64															1	0	62	64	1	61	64	
Water Users																			0	0				
Total Obligations	49,440	54,504	24,394	34,930	8,301	9,020	7,689	7,435	26,113	30,009	153	167	3,250	4,077	7,868	6,583	60,352	71,767	187,555	218,572				
Total Appropriated	49,326	53,994	22,310	24,057	8,301	9,020	7,668	7,414	26,113	30,009	153	167	3,250	4,077	7,868	6,583	35,352	67,767	160,336	203,168	1,752	158,584	203,168	
Total Water Users	114	510	2,084	10,873	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000	4,000	27,219	15,404	0			
Total Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
% of Appropriated Funds	30.8%	26.6%	13.9%	11.8%	5.2%	4.4%	4.8%	3.6%	16.3%	14.8%	0.1%	0.1%	2.0%	2.0%	4.9%	3.2%	22.0%	33.4%	100.0%	100.0%				

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004				
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004				
Parker-Davis Project			6,079	6,675	1,755	3,550											0	0	7,834	10,225				
Federal			0	0	0	0											0	0	0	0			0	0
Water Users			6,079	6,675	1,755	3,550											0	0	7,834	10,225			0	0
Yuma Area Projects	2,358	2,142			16,679	19,000			701	351	0	0	66	66	1,011	1,163	0	0	20,815	22,722				
Federal	2,358	2,142			16,629	18,950			701	351	0	0	66	66	1,011	1,163	0	0	20,765	22,672	0		20,765	22,672
Water Users					50	50											0	0	50	50				
Title 1, CRBSCP	731	751			0	0			134	134	10,206	10,465			0	0	0	0	11,071	11,350				
Federal	731	751			0	0			134	134	10,106	10,365			0	0	0	0	10,971	11,250	0		10,971	11,250
Water Users					0	0					100	100					0	0	100	100				
Salt River Project															139	187			139	187				
Federal															39	87			39	87			39	87
Water Users															100	100			100	100				
Ak Chin Water Rts Stl	6,200	5,743															0	0	6,200	5,743				
Federal	6,200	5,743															0	0	6,200	5,743	0		6,200	5,743
Water Users	0	0															0	0	0	0				
Lower Colorado R. Opertns					0	0			10,393	12,783	6,248	6,074					0	0	16,641	18,857				
Federal					0	0			6,893	7,748	5,528	6,074					0	0	12,421	13,822	0		12,421	13,822
Water Users					0	0			3,500	5,035	720	0					0	0	4,220	5,035				
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586	467	0	0	0	0	108	83	0	0	694	550				
Federal									586	467					108	83			694	550	0		694	550
Water Users																			0	0				
Exam of Exist Struct	109	96	89	109	22	123	90	30	0	0	158	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	468	578				
Federal	101	96	89	109	22	123	90	30	0	0	158	220	0	0	0	0	0	0	460	578	0		460	578
Water Users	8	0																	8	0				
CAP Distribut Sys O&	126	115	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	118				
Federal	73	77					1	1			0								74	78	0		74	78
Water Users	53	38					2	2											55	40				
Land Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,265	2,265	0	0	2,265	2,265				
Federal															2,265	2,265			2,265	2,265	0		2,265	2,265
Water Users																			0	0				
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	87				
Federal							83	87											83	87	0		83	87
Water Users																			0	0				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004			
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004			
Reclam Law Admin	708	690	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	708	690			
Federal	700	682																	700	682	0	700	
Water Users	8	8																	8	8			
Rec & F&WL Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,074	2,227	0	0	0	0	142	30	0	0	2,216	2,257			
Federal									1,024	1,080					142	30			1,166	1,110	0	1,166	
Water Users									1,050	1,147									1,050	1,147			
Site Security-Antiterrorism			130	201	0	0			0	0	0	0					0	0	130	201			
Federal			130	201	0	0			0	0	0	0					0	0	130	201	0	130	
Water Users			0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0					0	0	0	0			
Water Mgmt & Cons	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,524	1,482	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,524	1,482			
Federal											1,524	1,482							1,524	1,482	0	1,524	
Water Users											0	0							0	0			
Total Obligations	10,232	9,537	6,298	6,985	18,456	22,673	176	120	13,888	15,962	18,136	18,241	66	66	3,526	3,541	0	0	70,778	77,125			
Total Appropriated	10,163	9,491	219	310	16,651	19,073	174	118	9,338	9,780	17,316	18,141	66	66	3,526	3,541	0	0	57,453	60,520			
Total Water Users	69	46	6,079	6,675	1,805	3,600	2	2	4,550	6,182	820	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,325	16,605			
% of Appropriated Fur	17.7	15.7	0.4	0.5	29.0	31.5	0.3	0.2	16.3	16.2	30.1	30.0	0.1	0.1	6.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	100	100			
Revenue O&M Program																							
So Arizona Wtr Rights	4,825	4,017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,825	4,017			
Federal	4,825	4,017	0	0	0	0													4,825	4,017	0	4,825	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0													0	0			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Central Arizona Project	24,387	24,342	29,111	29,111	32,483	32,393	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85,981	85,846			
Federal	24,387	24,342	29,111	29,111	32,483	32,393													85,981	85,846			
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0													0	0			
Total Revenue O&M Progra	24,387	24,342	29,111	29,111	32,483	32,393	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85,981	85,846	0	0	
Permanent O&M																							
Boulder Canyon Project			79,037	78,660													0	0	79,037	78,660			
Federal			79,037	78,660													0	0	79,037	78,660	0	79,037	
Water Users			0	0													0	0	0	0			
Permanent O&M Appropriations			79,037	78,660	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79,037	78,660			
Grand Totals LC Region O&M	34,550	33,833	108,367	108,081	49,134	51,466	174	118	9,338	9,780	17,316	18,141	66	66	3,526	3,541	0	0	222,471	225,026	0	222,471	

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES														Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		
Balmoreha Project										71								71				
Federal										71								71			71	
Water Users																						
Bonneville Unit,CUP					35	21				491	519	38	15	365	432	3,092	3,550	4,021	4,537			
Federal					35	21				491	519	38	15	365	432	3,092	3,550	4,021	4,537	1,092	2,929	4,537
Water Users																						
Bostwick Park Project										168	201							168	237			
Federal										168	201							168	237		168	237
Water Users																						
Carlsbad Project					1,447	1,235			1,383	1,632	401	609		161	205			3,392	3,681			
Federal					825	646			1,383	1,632	401	609		161	205			2,770	3,092		2,770	3,092
Water Users					622	589												622	589			
Collbran Project			1,212	1,513						88	124			34	135			1,334	1,772			
Federal			1,212	1,513						88	124			34	60			1,334	1,697		1,334	1,697
Water Users															75				75			
Dallas Creek Project					36	40				245	142			24	61	42		347	458			
Federal					36	40				245	142			24	61	42		347	353		347	353
Water Users													110						105			
Dolores Project			423	423						647	690			38	23			1,108	1,136			
Federal										507	552			38	23			545	575		545	575
Water Users																						
Other Agencies			423	423						140	138							563	561			
Eden Project										29	32	48	47	200	84			277	163			
Federal										29	32	48	47	200	84			277	163		277	163
Water Users																						
Emery County Project										206	138	46	92	147	82			399	312			
Federal										206	138	46	92	147	82			399	312		399	312
Water Users																						
Florida Project					37	36				74	104			20	23			131	163			
Federal					37	36				74	104			20	23			131	163		131	163
Water Users																						
Fruitgrowers Dam Project										154	164			5	50			159	214			
Federal										154	164			5	50			159	214		159	214
Water Users																						

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED					
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004							
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004											
Grand Valley, CRBSCP											1,068	978			84	58			1,152	1,036							
Federal											806	694			84	58			890	752	54		836	752			
Water Users																											
Other Agencies											262	284							262	284							
Hammond Project											52	54			49	57			101	111							
Federal											52	54			49	57			101	111			101	111			
Water Users																											
Hyrum Project											48	82	16	27	80	81			144	190							
Federal											48	82	16	27	80	81			144	190			144	190			
Water Users																											
Jensen Unit, CUP											67	89	17	15	128	123			212	227							
Federal											67	89	17	15	128	123			212	227			212	227			
Water Users																											
Lyman Project											29	48	2	22	4	7			35	77							
Federal											29	48	2	22	4	7			35	77			35	77			
Water Users																											
Mancos Project											70	82			50	8	63			78	145						
Federal											70	82				8	63			78	145			78	145		
Water Users															50												
Middle Rio Grande Project	2,860	1,650									5,779	6,438	9,340	10,437			240	375	142	165	18,361	19,065					
Federal											5,779	6,438	9,340	10,437			240	375	142	165	15,501	17,415	38		15,463	17,415	
Water Users	2,860	1,650																		2,860	1,650						
Moon Lake Project											82	44	7	7	7	9			96	60							
Federal											82	44	7	7	7	9			96	60			96	60			
Water Users																											
Navajo Unit, CRSP															464	310			464	381							
Federal															71	276	103		276	174			276	174			
Water Users																											
Non-Federal															188	207			188	207							
Other Agencies																											
Newton Project											8	24	52	38	13	23			73	85							
Federal											8	24	52	38	13	23			73	85			73	85			
Water Users																											
Ogden River Project											69	147	14	15	311	251			394	413							
Federal											69	147	14	15	311	251			394	413			394	413			
Water Users																											

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004								
Paonia Project					36	27					161	150	44	43	12	103			253	323				
Federal					36	27					161	150			12	103			231	301			231	301
Water Users																			22	22				
Non-Federal																								
Other Agencies																								
Paradox Unit, CRBSCP											2,674	2,785							2,674	2,785				
Federal											2,018	2,102							2,018	2,102			2,018	2,102
Water Users																								
Other Agencies											656	683							656	683				
Pecos River Basin Water Sal											177	250							177	250				
Federal											27	100							27	100			27	100
Water Users											150	150							150	150				
Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.					41	26					51	168			31	60			123	254				
Federal					41	26					51	168			31	60			123	254			123	254
Water Users																								
Other Agencies																								
Provo River Project			174	190					1,076	1,285	516	575	16	18	258				2,040	2,068				
Federal			174	190					206	415	516	575	16	18	258				1,170	1,198			1,170	1,198
Water Users																								
Other Agencies									870	870									870	870				
Rio Grande Project	601	512	1,444	1,514							1,832	2,052	150		581	416			4,608	4,494				
Federal			1,444	1,514							1,832	2,052	150		581	416			4,007	3,982			4,007	3,982
Water Users	601	512																	601	512				
San Juan-Chama Project	354						1,358	1,257			338	287			120	14			2,170	1,558				
Federal											338	287			120	14			458	301			458	301
Water Users	354						1,358	1,257											1,712	1,257				
San Luis Valley, Closed Basin									287	290	4,071	4,222			96	66			4,454	4,578				
Federal									287	290	4,071	4,222			96	66			4,454	4,578			4,454	4,578
Water Users																								
San Luis Valley, Conejos	3	3			11	15													14	18				
Federal					11	15													11	15			11	15
Water Users	3	3																	3	3				
Scofield Project											27	86	33	34	64	67			124	187				
Federal											27	86	33	34	64	67			124	187			124	187
Water Users																								

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES														Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED				
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004			
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004								
Silt Project											194	332	4,132	2,510	175	48			4,501	2,890				
Federal											194	332	2,162	1,170	175	48			2,531	1,550			2,531	1,550
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													1,970	1,340					1,970	1,340				
Other Agencies																								
Smith Fork Project											183	239	439	205		51			622	495				
Federal											183	239	239			51			422	290			422	290
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													200	205					200	205				
Other Agencies																								
Strawberry Valley Project											33	70	10	10	71	125			114	205				
Federal											33	70	10	10	71	125			114	205			114	205
Water Users																								
Tucumcari															19	108			19	108			19	108
Federal															19	108			19	108			19	108
Water Users																								
Uncompahgre Project											155	161	2	3	99	141			256	305				
Federal											155	161	2	3	99	141			256	305			256	305
Water Users																								
Vernal Unit, CUP											79	33	16	21	47	220			142	274				
Federal											79	33	16	21	47	220			142	274			142	274
Water Users																								
Weber Basin Project											736	768	1,671	1,790	219	523			2,626	3,081				
Federal											736	768	921	790	219	523			1,876	2,081	22		1,854	2,081
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													750	1,000					750	1,000				
Other Agencies																								
Weber River Project											62	83	15	25	46	42			123	150				
Federal											62	83	15	25	46	42			123	150			123	150
Water Users																								
Exam of Existing Structures											334	334							334	334			334	334
Federal											334	334							334	334			334	334
Water Users																								
Land Res Management Prog															657	818			657	818			657	818
Federal															657	818			657	818			657	818
Water Users																								

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004				
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004								
Neg/Admin of Water Marketing											156	160							156	160				
Federal											156	160							156	160			156	160
Water Users																								
Public Access/ Safety Prog											118	127							118	127			118	127
Federal											118	127							118	127			118	127
Water Users																								
Reclamation Law Admin	411	327																	411	327			411	327
Federal	411	327																	411	327			411	327
Water Users																								
Rec & Fish/Wildlife Prog Admin									259	220			15	20					274	240			274	240
Federal									259	220			15	20					274	240			274	240
Water Users																								
Site Security			64	64															64	64			64	64
Federal			64	64															64	64			64	64
Water Users																								
Water Mgmt Conserv Program											1,646	1,280							1,646	1,280			1,646	1,280
Federal											1,646	1,280							1,646	1,280			1,646	1,280
Water Users																								
Total Obligations	4,229	2,492	3,317	3,704	1,643	1,400	1,358	1,257	8,784	9,865	26,950	28,870	7,247	5,317	4,394	4,872	3,276	3,715	61,198	61,728				
Total Appropriated	411	327	2,894	3,281	1,021	811			7,914	8,995	25,742	27,686	4,117	2,603	4,394	4,797	3,276	3,715	49,769	52,215	1,206		48,563	52,215
Total Water Users	3,818	2,165			622	589	1,358	1,257			150	150	22	177		75			5,970	4,363				
Total Non-Federal			423	423					870	870	1,058	1,105	3,108	2,752					5,459	5,150				
Total Other	7,857	4,472	5,016	5,704	3,286	2,800	2,716	2,514	16,492	18,445	48,108	51,415	13,762	10,288	7,490	8,913	6,552	7,430	111,279	112,453				
% of Appropriated Funds	0.8%	0.6%	5.8%	6.3%	2.1%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	15.9%	17.2%	51.7%	53.0%	8.3%	5.0%	8.8%	9.2%	6.6%	7.1%	100.0%	100.0%				

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O FY2003	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004			
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004			
Arbuckle Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	193	205	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	205		193	205
Canadian River Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	63	68	0	0	46	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	117		109	117
Colorado-Big Thompson Federal Water Users	622	622	10,255	12,111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,877	12,733		10,277	10,210
Fry-Ark Project Federal Water Users	1,090	947	3,085	2,895	101	83	1,102	900	1,212	990	0	0	0	0	505	413	0	0	7,095	6,228		6,785	5,443
Kendrick Project Federal Water Users	90	130	2,268	3,576	9	14	0	0	16	25	0	0	45	71	164	258	0	0	2,592	4,074		2,572	4,054
Leadville Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,552	1,838	582	593	2,134	2,431		2,134	2,431
Mid-Dakota Rural Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	2,000	10,040	2,015		10,040	2,015
McGee Creek Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	68	69	0	0	186	189	0	0	159	162	39	40	0	0	452	460		452	460
Milk River Federal Water Users	800	1,012	0	0	290	406	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	267	354	495	0	0	1,635	2,180		1,146	1,603
Mirage Flat Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	28	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	37	0	0	78	58		78	58
Mni Wiconi Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,228	6,254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23,492	6,917	31,720	13,171		31,520	12,971
Mountain Park Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	109	95	0	0	104	91	0	0	38	33	55	48	0	0	306	267		306	267
Norman Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	87	86	0	0	6	6	0	0	40	39	300	295	0	0	433	426		433	426
North Platte Federal Water Users	613	550	733	576	33	26	0	0	14	11	0	0	97	76	161	126	0	0	1,651	1,365		1,334	1,048

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004	
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004	
Nueces River Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	7	10	0	0	242	330	0	0	92	126	51	70	0	0	392	536			392	536
					7	10			242	330			92	126	51	70			392	536			392	536
																			0	0				
PS Ainsworth Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357	387	0	0	368	399			368	399
					11	12			0	0			0	0	357	387			368	399			368	399
																			0	0				
PS Almena Unit Federal Water Users	4	4	0	0	37	41	3	3	88	98	0	0	88	98	111	125	0	0	331	369			331	369
	4	4			37	41	3	3	88	98			88	98	111	125			331	369			331	369
																			0	0				
PS Angostura Unit Federal Water Users	917	847	0	0	351	325	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	53	49	0	0	1,346	1,245			1,340	1,239
	917	847			351	325			0	0			19	18	53	49			1,340	1,239			1,340	1,239
													6	6					6	6				
PS Armel Unit Federal Water Users	20	20	0	0	291	300	6	6	88	91	0	0	57	59	60	62	0	0	522	538			522	538
	20	20			291	300	6	6	88	91			57	59	60	62			522	538			522	538
																			0	0				
PS Belle Fourche Unit Federal Water Users	204	227	0	0	12	14	0	0	16	18	0	0	36	41	76	86	0	0	344	386			314	356
	174	197			12	14			16	18			36	41	76	86			314	356			314	356
	30	30																	30	30			30	30
PS Bostwick Unit Federal Water Users	83	202	0	0	376	572	0	0	91	220	0	0	144	350	42	102	0	0	736	1,446			497	1,207
	83	202			137	333			91	220			144	350	42	102			497	1,207			497	1,207
					239	239													239	239				
PS Boysen Unit Federal Water Users	15	15	957	945	241	238	0	0	11	11	15	15	52	51	118	117	0	0	1,409	1,392			1,401	1,384
	7	7	957	945	241	238			11	11	15	15	52	51	118	117			1,401	1,384			1,401	1,384
	8	8																	8	8				
PS Buffalo Bill Dam Mod. Federal Water Users	0	0	1,645	2,104	84	107	0	0	18	23	0	0	102	130	88	112	0	0	1,937	2,476			1,937	2,476
			1,645	2,104	84	107			18	23			102	130	88	112			1,937	2,476			1,937	2,476
																			0	0				
PS Canyon Ferry Unit Federal Water Users	119	140	4,565	6,005	316	416	2	3	0	0	0	0	737	970	155	204	0	0	5,894	7,738			5,858	7,707
	83	109	4,565	6,005	316	416	2	3					737	970	155	204			5,858	7,707			5,858	7,707
	36	31																	36	31				
PS Cedar Bluff Unit Federal Water Users	16	13	0	0	234	195	5	4	62	51	0	0	5	4	96	80	0	0	418	347			418	347
	16	13			234	195	5	4	62	51			5	4	96	80			418	347			418	347
																			0	0				
PS Dickinson Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	13	12	96	116	38	36	0	0	44	42	190	179	0	0	381	385			366	345
					13	12	81	76	38	36			44	42	190	179			366	345			366	345
							15	40											15	40				
PS East Bench Unit Federal Reflects O&M during	214	260	0	0	104	128	1	1	37	46	0	0	284	351	65	81	0	0	705	867			535	661
	44	54			104	128	1	1	37	46			284	351	65	81			535	661			535	661
	170	206																	170	206				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004	
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004	
PS Oahe Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	130	93	133	267	380				
Federal							82	117							92	130	93	133	267	380			267	380
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Owl Creek Unit	28	31	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	16	23	26	0	0	74	83				
Federal	28	31			9	10							14	16	23	26			74	83			74	83
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Rapid Valley - Pactola	0	0	0	0	91	94	90	93	18	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	200	206				
Federal					91	94	90	93	18	18					1	1			200	206			200	206
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Riverton Unit	0	0	189	184	117	114	0	0	4	4	4	4	24	23	403	392	0	0	741	721				
Federal			189	184	117	114			4	4	4	4	24	23	403	392			741	721			741	721
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Sargent Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0
Federal																			0	0			0	0
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Shadehill Unit	0	0	0	0	238	187	0	0	33	26	0	0	35	27	81	64	0	0	387	304				
Federal					238	187			33	26			35	27	81	64			387	304			387	304
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Webster Unit	31	35	0	0	254	272	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	118	0	0	329	425				
Federal	31	35			254	272									44	118			329	425			329	425
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
PS Yellowtail Unit	0	0	4,814	3,851	177	142	8	6	21	17	0	0	0	0	26	21	0	0	5,046	4,037				
Federal			4,814	3,851	177	142	8	6	21	17					26	21			5,046	4,037			5,046	4,037
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
Rapid Valley	35	36	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	48	49				
Federal	14	15			12	12									1	1			27	28			27	28
Water Users	21	21																	21	21				
San Angelo	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	147	132	0	0	102	92	51	46	0	0	307	276				
Federal					7	6			147	132			102	92	51	46			307	276			307	276
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
Shoshone	156	152	559	541	256	248	0	0	7	7	10	10	122	118	165	160	0	0	1,275	1,236				
Federal	123	119	559	541	256	248			7	7	10	10	122	118	165	160			1,242	1,203			1,242	1,203
Water Users	33	33																	33	33			33	33
WC Austin	0	0	0	0	175	187	0	0	13	14	0	0	26	28	79	85	0	0	293	314				
Federal					175	187			13	14			26	28	79	85			293	314			293	314
Water Users																			0	0			0	0
Washita	0	0	0	0	606	724	0	0	24	29	0	0	25	30	87	104	0	0	742	887				
Federal					606	724			24	29			25	30	87	104			742	887			742	887
Water Users																			0	0			0	0

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004		FY 2003	FY 2004
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2003	FY 2004							
Wichita Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	0	16	12	0	0	57	43	205	155	0	0	285	215		285	215
Environ Prog Admin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	977	913	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	977	913		937	856
Exam of Exist Struct Federal Water Users	1,357	1,385	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,357	1,385		1,265	1,374
Land Resource Mgmt Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,619	3,405	0	0	2,619	3,405		2,619	3,405
Misc Flood Control Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	414	422	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414	422		414	422
Nego & Admin of Wtr Federal Water Users	1,140	1,534	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,140	1,534		1,029	1,411
Public Access & Sfty Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	300	0	0	0	0	206	300		206	300
Rec & F&WL Admin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	220	0	0	182	150	0	0	0	0	442	370		437	370
Reclam Law Admin Federal Water Users	775	807	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	775	807		775	807
Site Security Federal Water Users	325	475	348	475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673	950	23	650	950
Water Mgmt & Cons Federal Water Users	1,497	2,395	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,497	2,395		1,432	1,980
Total Obligations	10,532	12,348	34,893	37,343	7,258	8,523	13,865	10,568	4,479	4,663	29	29	4,295	5,418	12,196	14,961	55,243	27,180	142,790	121,033			
Total Appropriated	8,052	9,418	34,893	34,945	7,019	8,284	13,850	10,528	4,434	4,606	29	29	4,289	5,412	12,196	14,961	54,943	23,480	139,705	111,663	448	139,257	111,663
Total Water Users	2,480	2,930	0	2,398	239	239	15	40	45	57	0	0	6	6	0	0	300	3,700	3,085	9,370			
% of Appropriated Fu	5.8%	8.4%	25.0%	31.3%	5.0%	7.4%	9.9%	9.4%	3.2%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	4.8%	8.7%	13.4%	39.3%	21.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2004
(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal Share	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Animas-La Plata 1/	22,703	Unknown	43,259	Unknown	210,242	1/	0	0	61,696	337,900
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project 2/	0	0	0	0	0	71,157	0	0	20,000	91,157
Central Arizona Project 3/	31,468	720,655	1,105,485	0	240,293	397,344	997,187	404,602	1,332,554	5,234,477
Central Valley Project										
Auburn-Folsom South 4/	1,681,349	465,485	253,523	0	0	8,374	0	2,425	376,108	2,787,264
AmericanRiver Division Folsom Dam 5/	121,680	33,687	18,348	0	0	100	0	0	30,650	204,465
Delta Division 6/	120,406	33,334	18,155	0	0	91,236	0	0	282,217	545,348
Miscellaneous Project Programs 7/	187,456	51,897	28,266	0	0	137,017	0	0	438,055	842,691
Sacramento River Division 8/	237,588	65,777	35,825	0	0	28,645	0	54,450	110,268	532,553
San Felipe Division 9/	87,329	0	263,129	0	0	447	0	0	38,979	389,884
San Joaquin Division 10/	0	0	0	0	0	108,313	0	0	724,969	833,282
Shasta Division 11/	113,897	31,533	17,174	0	0	35,428	0	0	114,566	312,598
Trinity River Restoration 12/	162,009	44,853	24,429	0	0	4,863	0	0	139,151	375,305
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit 13/	1,140,274	0	188,071	0	0	238,032	0	0	383,873	1,950,250
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project										
Title I Division 14/	16,190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	436,330	452,520
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II										
Basinwide Program 15/	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	175,000	250,000

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2004
(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal Share	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Lewis & Clark RWS <u>16/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	77,425	0	0	281,104	358,529
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project <u>17/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	51,290	0	0	17,097	68,387
Mid-Dakota Rural Water <u>18/</u>	0	0	20,821	0	0	9,670	0	0	121,704	152,195
Mni Wiconi Project <u>19/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	17,182	0	0	399,450	416,632
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project <u>20/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,645	0	0	20,000	80,645
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I <u>21/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	412,480	0	0	20,000	432,480
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project <u>22/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0	20,000	80,000
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin										
Garrison Diversion Unit <u>23/</u>	102,430	37	565,268	0	0	152,258	12,570	0	926,436	1,758,999
San Diego Area Water <u>24/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	517,770	0	0	172,590	690,360
San Gabriel Basin <u>25/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	114,270	0	0	38,090	152,360
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act <u>26/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64,983	64,983

1/ Based on Interim Cost Allocation: "Irrigators" includes irrigation feature related sunk costs expended prior to FY 1999 that are set aside and \$4.6 million in sunk costs deemed non-reimbursable; "Other" includes Indian M&I for three tribes; "Non-Federal Share" is \$43,259,320 which is non-Indian and shown in the M&I column; "Non-reimbursable" includes recreation and cultural resources, fish and wildlife mitigation.

2/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$71,157,000 from Calleguas Municipal Water District.

Non-reimbursable: \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.

3/ **Irrigators, Power, Municipal and Industrial Water, Ad Valorem (\$1,857,607,034):** This total includes \$1,603,953,000 repayment obligation of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (an additional \$46,047,000 will be met through performance of in-kind services as shown below under Non-Federal Share), a projected \$86,462,034 repayment of Tucson Terminal Storage, net interim revenues of \$146,692,000 from the sale of energy and water from 1974 through 1993, and prepayment for repayment delay of \$20,500,000 made in 1992.

Other (\$240,292,622): Amounts consist of reimbursable costs to be repaid by entities other than the Central Arizona Water Conservation District and Navajo Layoff Contracts: Non-Indian Distribution Systems, \$238,573,310 which includes the Harquahala Valley and Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage Districts. Harquahala's repayment debt was extinguished by relinquishing their water rights in December 1992. Hohokam's was reassigned to the central Arizona cities to satisfy their Cliff Dam replacement water in December 1993; Arizona's central cities will pay \$1,719,312 under the Plan 6 Upfront Funding agreement for the increased hydrogeneration resulting from the additional storage space in T. Roosevelt Reservoir.

Non-Federal Share (\$397,343,863): Consists of State and other governmental entities contributions. The amount of allocated costs which have been contributed by non-Federal entities is Arizona, \$985,000; New Mexico, \$300,000; the Non-Indian Distribution Systems entities, \$59,433,863; Salt River Project for Roosevelt Dam Powerplant, \$638,478; City of Tucson for Tucson Pipeline, \$84,039; Central Arizona Water Conservation District for delay of the New River Siphon, \$98,645 and \$46,047,000 for repair of siphon and other deficiencies; Maricopa County for Castle Hot Springs Road, \$861,838; Maricopa County for recreation, \$11,129,000; in-kind services contributed for recreation associated with the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and Tucson Terminal Storage Reservoir, \$15,278,000; Plan 6 entities \$229,098,000 (contributed by Central Arizona Water Conservation District, \$175,000,000; Arizona cities, \$42,798,000; Maricopa County Flood Control District, \$11,300,000); and interest during construction credit for interest bearing functions of the Plan 6 Up Front Funding Agreement contributions, \$33,390,000.

Leavitt Act (\$997,187,016): The amount of costs allocated to Indian irrigation which is eligible for deferral under the Leavitt Act. The Leavitt Act permits repayment to be deferred as long as the land is in Indian ownership and repayment is within the land's repayment capability.

Deferred (\$404,602,163): Unallocated repayment costs includes \$350,261,000 for the Middle Gila Division and the Upper Gila Division which cannot be allocated unless the beneficiaries and repayment entities are identified and functions determined and \$54,341,163 for the Drainage Division. Construction for these features has been deferred indefinitely.

Non-reimbursable (\$1,332,554,065): Costs include Colorado River Division, \$900,277; Indian Distribution Division, \$631,429,000; recreation, \$144,982,447; flood control, \$123,674,283; Pima County flood and erosion control, \$3,500,000; cultural resources, \$40,674,511; contributed investigation costs, \$963,000, and siphon repair costs, \$55,555,500; and environmental enhancement costs, \$288,000. In addition, based on Reclamation's cost allocation methodology from prior years, the amount of costs over the repayment ceiling that were formerly considered reimbursable and challenged by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District but no longer are, is \$330,587,047. This is now determined to be non-reimbursable. The Department of Justice negotiated a Stipulated Settlement of the very complex repayment litigation between the United States and the Central Arizona Water Conservation District regarding operations and repayment of the Central Arizona Project. The judge issued an Order on May 9, 2000 staying litigation for three years to allow all conditions of the Stipulated Settlement to be met. Negotiations are underway to extend the stay of litigation until

2012. Many issues were at stake beyond the repayment amount. The Federal Government received non-monetary assets and benefits which, when added to the risk of continued litigation, are considered adequate compensation in exchange for these unrecoverable costs. These non-monetary assets and benefits include, but are not limited to, an increased allocation of Federal water of approximately 200,000 acre-feet which would be available to the Secretary to settle future Indian water right claims, agreement with Central Arizona Water Conservation District on the uses of project revenues and many operational issues including water delivery pricing to tribal water users, clarification of deficiency and completion items, establishment of a fixed interest bearing portion of repayment, and a means to terminate the lengthy and costly litigation. Reclamation considers classifying these costs "non-reimbursable" as the most accurate way to describe them. They have not been determined as non-reimbursable through the usual application of Reclamation law, but rather as a result of the Stipulated Settlement, which limits the repayment ceiling to \$1,650,000,000. Under the Stipulated Settlement, such costs may not be reimbursed to the U.S. Treasury unless future project revenues are sufficient, after meeting numerous other project purposes, to be returned to the Treasury. Therefore the amount of project costs that are reimbursable and non-reimbursable will depend on whether the Settlement conditions are met and the Settlement becomes finalized.

4/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$8,374,000 for State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation (50 percent of current estimate of cost of planned Auburn Lake recreation facilities).

Deferred Use (\$2,425,000): Actual cost of providing additional capacity in the completed portion of the Folsom South Canal (Reaches 1 and 2) to serve the planned Eastside Division service area as authorized under Section 1, P.L. 89-161.

Non-reimbursable (\$376,108,000): Includes recreation, \$15,526,000; fish and wildlife, \$238,814,000; flood control, \$113,593,000; and navigation, \$8,175,000.

5/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$100,000 for El Dorado Irrigation District's share of costs of recreation on facilities at Sly Park Reservoir.

Non-reimbursable (\$30,650,000): Includes \$100,000 for recreation facilities at Sly Park Reservoir, \$8,221,000 for flood control, \$592,000 for navigation, and \$21,737,000 for safety of dams program activities completed for Folsom Dam under the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978, November 2, 1978 (P.L. 95-578), as amended in 1984 by P.L. 98-404.

6/ **Non-Federal Share (\$91,236,000):** Includes \$91,131,000 for State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575); and \$105,000 for East Bay Regional Parks District share of costs of recreation facilities at Contra Loma Reservoir.

Non-reimbursable (\$282,217,000): Includes \$100,000 for recreation, \$273,397,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,135,000 for flood control, and \$585,000 for navigation.

7/ **Non-Federal Share (\$137,017,000):** Includes \$26,000 for County of Fresno share of costs of recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes; \$10,000 of contributions by non-Federal, local entities towards cost of preconstruction investigations completed for the Allen Camp Unit, Pit River Division; and

\$136,981,000 for State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575).

Non-reimbursable (\$438,055,000): Includes \$424,462,000 for fish and wildlife; \$28,000 for recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes in Fresno County, California; \$12,665,000 for flood control; and \$900,000 for navigation.

8/ **Power Users (\$65,777,000):** Current estimate of the total power revenue assistance requirement for 20 irrigation water service contractors located in the Black Butte Dam and Reservoir (Stony Creek), Corning Canal, and Tehama-Colusa Canal service areas. This estimate is based on the results of the Payment Capacity Analysis for Tehama-Colusa Water Users Association completed in October 1994. This ability to pay study will be updated every 5 years in accordance with Section 105 of the Act of October 27, 1986 (P.L. 99-546).

Non-Federal Share (\$28,645,000): Represents State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575), as follows: \$11,046,000 for fish screens and fish recovery facilities associated with the Hamilton City Pumping Plant (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), and \$17,599,000 for alternative fish passage facilities at Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

Deferred Use (\$54,450,000): Incremental cost of providing extra capacity and elevation in Tehama-Colusa Canal (Reaches 5-8A) to enable future water service to the planned West Sacramento Canal Unit service area, as authorized under Section 1 of the Act of August 19, 1967 (P.L. 90-65).

Non-reimbursable (\$110,268,000): Includes \$282,000 for recreation, \$92,765,000 for fish and wildlife, \$16,052,000 for flood control, \$1,155,000 for navigation, and \$14,000 for preservation of historical and archaeological data under the Act of June 27, 1960 (P.L. 86-23).

9/ **Non-Federal Share (Local Interests \$447,000):** Includes \$397,000 for non-Federal share of costs of recreation facilities to be repaid by the County of San Benito under Section 3 of P.L. 90-72, and \$50,000 for cash contribution by the San Felipe Committee for preconstruction studies.

Non-reimbursable (\$38,979,000): Includes \$19,341,000 for recreation, \$19,489,000 for fish and wildlife, \$-50,000 for preconstruction investigations, and \$199,000 for interest during construction.

10/ **Non-Federal Share (\$108,313,000):** Includes \$100,566,000 for water acquisition program and \$7,747,000 for San Joaquin Basin Action Plan.

Non-reimbursable: Includes \$724,969,000 for fish and wildlife.

11/ **Non-Federal Share (\$35,428,000):** Represents State of California share of costs of fish and wildlife activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (P.L. 102-575), as follows: \$21,436,000 for Shasta Temperature Control Device, \$4,300,000 for Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, \$9,244,000 for Clear Creek Restoration, and \$448,000 for spawning gravel.

Non-reimbursable (\$114,566,000): Includes \$106,317,000 for fish and wildlife, \$7,695,000 for flood control, and navigation for \$554,000.

12/ **Non-Federal Share (\$4,863,000):** The State of California and the counties of Humboldt and Trinity in California will pay to the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to 15 percent of the total amount of money that is expended for carrying out Grass Valley Creek activities, under Section 4(b) of the Act of October 24, 1984 (P.L. 98-541).

Non-reimbursable (\$139,151,000): Includes \$611,000 for recreation, \$126,807,000 for fish and wildlife, \$10,945,000 for flood control, and \$788,000 for navigation.

13/ **Non-Federal Share (\$238,032,000):** Includes \$3,943,000 for the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, share of the costs of recreation facilities at B.F. Sisk San Luis Reservoir, Los Banos Reservoir, San Luis Canal, and O'Neill Forebay; \$234,089,000 for the State of California, Department of Water Resources, share of the Joint State-Federal water facilities, under Section 10(b) of Federal-State Contract No. 14-06-200-9755, December 31, 1961, and Sections 9(d) and 30 of Contract No. 14-06-200-9755 Supplement No. 1.

Non-reimbursable (\$383,873,000): Includes \$3,226,000 for recreation; \$177,159,000 for fish and wildlife; \$84,267,000 for flood control; \$6,064,000 for navigation; \$4,767,000 for nonreimbursable portion of Safety of Dams costs at CVP, San Luis Unit; \$7,000 for preservation of historical and archaeological data under P.L. 86-523; \$1,383,000 for incremental costs of improving existing roads to higher standards required for project construction (P.L. 87-874); and \$107,000,000 for settlement costs (Sumner Peck Ranch, Inc., et al vs. Bureau of Reclamation, et al).

14/ **Irrigators (\$16,190,000):** A repayment contract with Coachella Valley Water District for \$45,938,000 was executed March 14, 1978 and validated June 30, 1978. The contract provides that for each year the United States receives the benefits of the water saved by the lining program because mainstream Colorado River water is delivered to California in the quantities requested under Section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, construction costs of \$1,148,000 (\$45.938 million divided by a 40-year life of the canal) will be considered non-reimbursable. The United States expects to receive these benefits for the foreseeable future. The \$16,190,000 represents Coachella Valley Water District's repayment obligation assuming the initial repayment installment by Coachella Valley Water District does not begin before October 1, 2006.

Non-reimbursable (\$436,330,000): Includes \$406,418,000 Mexican Treaty Measures, \$164,000 for nonreimbursable preauthorization investigation costs, and \$29,748,000 for nonreimbursable irrigation costs.

15/ **Other (\$75,000,000):** Reimbursable portion advanced from the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund per P.L. 104-127 for the Basinwide Salinity Program.

Non-reimbursable (\$175,000,000): P.L. 93-320, Section 205, states that 70 percent of the costs will be nonreimbursable. The remaining 30 percent is divided between the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund based on benefits derived by each Basin from the use of water of improved quality, causes of salinity, and availability of revenues, provided that costs allocated to the Upper Basin shall not exceed 15 percent of the costs allocated to the Upper and Lower Basin Funds. P.L. 104-127 authorizes the option of cost-sharing in lieu of repayment

for the salinity program. Cost-sharing funds are contributed by a surcharge to CRSP power users and collected in the Basin Funds.

- 16/ **Non-Federal Share (\$77,425,000):** 50 percent of the non-Federal cost share would come from the three states of South Dakota, Minnesota, and Iowa. The other 50 percent would come from the Lewis & Clark RWS (22 member entities).
- Non-reimbursable (\$281,104,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-246 authorizes \$213,887,700 of Federal grant funds which has been indexed to \$281,104,000 and is 80 percent of the project costs for 21 of the 22 members and 50 percent of the incremental cost for the city of Sioux Falls.
- 17/ **Non-Federal Share (\$51,290,250):** Includes \$24,782,250 from the Water Replenishment District of Southern California; and \$26,508,000 from the City of Long Beach.
- Non-reimbursable:** Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$17,096,750 provided by the Federal government as cooperative agreements.
- 18/ **Non-Federal Share:** The State of South Dakota is contributing (grant funding) \$9,670,000.
- Non-reimbursable (\$121,704,000):** Includes \$118,804,000 for Mid-Dakota Federal grant which is 85 percent of the appropriation ceiling of \$139,769,000; \$2,756,000 for Wetlands Development; and \$144,000 for transfers, credits, and other expenditures.
- 19/ **Non-Federal Share (\$17,182,000):** The amount of non-Federal cost-share will be covered by cooperative agreements with non-Indian beneficiaries prior to expenditure of Federal funds. Federal contribution to the West River/Lyman-Jones Rural Water System may not exceed 80 percent of the total cost of these systems.
- Non-reimbursable (\$399,450,000):** All of the cost of the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System, Rosebud Sioux Rural Water System, Lower Brule Sioux Water System, and 80 percent of the cost of the West River/Lyman-Jones Water Supply Systems are nonreimbursable under provision of P.L. 100-516, as amended by P.L. 103-434.
- 20/ **Non-Federal Share (\$60,645,000):** Includes \$12,933,750 from San Elijo Joint Powers Authority; \$27,873,750 from Carlsbad Municipal Water District, \$8,761,500 by the Leucadia County Water District; and \$11,076,000 from Olivenhain Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 21/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$412,480,000 from Orange County Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.

- 22/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$60,000,000 from the City of Phoenix.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 23/ **Reimbursable (\$667,735,034):** The reimbursable costs are \$102,430,000 for irrigation (\$115,000,000 less \$12,570,000 for the Indian irrigation deferred indefinitely under the Leavitt Act); \$37,000 for power; and \$565,268,034 for municipal and industrial. The repayment (\$12,570,000) of the investment in the Indian portion of irrigation on the project, 2,380 acres on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, is deferred indefinitely under the Leavitt Act.
- Non-Federal Share (\$152,257,966):** Includes State municipal, rural and industrial (\$138,000,000); recreation (\$13,350,000); natural resources trust (\$700,000); and State contribution for headquarters building (\$207,966).
- Leavitt Act (\$12,570,000):** The amount of costs allocated to Indian irrigation which is eligible for deferral under the Leavitt Act.
- Non-reimbursable (\$926,436,000):** Includes Municipal, Rural and Industrial Grant Program (\$414,000,000); fish & wildlife (\$97,010,000); Sheyenne River Release (\$42,900,000); flood control (\$38,000,000); Indian Municipal, Rural, and Industrial (\$242,670,000); James River Comprehensive Study (\$13,385,000); recreation (\$16,650,000); Natural Resource Trust (\$27,001,000); highway improvement (\$4,650,000); cultural resources (\$5,170,000); and Wildlife Trust (\$25,000,000), as directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
- 24/ **Non-Federal Share (\$517,770,000):** Includes \$366,813,721 from the City of San Diego and Poway, Sweetwater Authority, Otay Water District, County of San Diego, and/or Tia Juana Valley County Water District; \$117,730,500 from the cities of Escondido, Poway, and/or San Diego; \$3,646,827 from the City of San Diego and/or San Diego County Water Authority; and \$29,578,952 from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$172,590,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.
- 25/ **Non-Federal Share (\$114,270,000):** Includes \$61,229,319 from the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, and/or other entities; \$36,295,500 from the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and \$16,745,181 from the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$38,090,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.
- 26/ **Non-reimbursable (\$64,983,000):** Reclamation is seeking legal advice to verify whether costs associated with delivery of water are non-reimbursable under the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act, or deferrable under the Leavitt Act.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Animas-La Plata Project	The Final Supplement to the 1980 Final Environmental Statement (FSFES) was filed with the EPA on April 26, 1996. In August 1998, the Secretary of the Interior presented an Administration Proposal that provided M&I water only for the tribes and non-Indian entities, and established a Water Acquisition Fund for the tribes to purchase the balance of their water rights. The Final Supplemental EIS was filed with EPA in July 2000 and Reclamation issued a Record of Decision on September 25, 2000.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project	A categorical exclusion for the Conejo Creek Diversion component was completed in July 2000. A FONSI for the Regional Brine Line was completed in September 2002.
Central Arizona Project (CAP)	Projectwide - Final filed September 26, 1972. Additional activity-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance documents were completed on all project activities prior to implementation. Current NEPA compliance activities include the draft environmental impact statement for Tucson Aqueduct Reliability, which was completed on April 18, 1995. The final was completed April 10, 1998, a delay of 2 ½ years due to local referendums that put Tucson Water's plans for taking and issuing its CAP water on hold. The draft programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Gila River Indian Community was filed on October 30, 1996, and the Record of Decision (ROD) was issued July 20, 1998. The completion of the final EIS and ROD for the San Carlos Apache system has been changed to FY 2005 as a result of a delay in the planning schedule. Environmental assessments for the Camp Verde, Tonto Apache, and Pascua Yaqui systems are not currently scheduled. NEPA compliance schedules for the remaining portions of the Indian Distribution Division will be determined as required. NEPA compliance for the Middle and Upper Gila River Divisions has been indefinitely deferred.
Central Valley Project American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit	A projectwide Final Environmental Statement (EIS) was filed with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) November 13, 1972. Supplement to final filed with CEQ August 6, 1973, Amendment to final filed with CEQ September 20, 1974. Supplemental No. 2 filed with EPA September 23, 1980. Foresthill Divide area FES was filed with the CEQ May 25, 1976. Reclamation and the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority wrote a draft EIS/Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the American River Water Resources Investigation in February 1996. Reclamation completed the Final EIS in November 1997 and issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in June 1998. The decision was to not take any action at this time, but Reclamation will cooperate with any local agency if there is potential Reclamation involvement. Placer County Water Agency American River Pump Station Project - Draft EIS/EIR released on September 13, 2001. Final was released June 14, 2002.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Folsom Dam Gate Repairs	El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.
American River Division Long Term Contract Renewal	Draft EIS due December 2002 and the final is due June 2003.
Delta Division	South Delta Barrier Program EIS/EIR was completed August 1996. This project has been incorporated into the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
Miscellaneous Project Programs	El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. NEPA compliance was not required for Friant-Kern Canal. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.
Sacramento River Division	Tehama-Colusa Canal, June 7, 1972; Tehama-Colusa Canal Supplemental, May 15, 1975.
Central Valley Project San Felipe Division	A projectwide FES was filed with the CEQ March 8, 1976. Negative determination for conveyance system modification signed March 20, 1978. Reclamation is preparing an EIS for Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency's (PVWMA) Basin Management Plan Update Project. The proposed action includes the connection of a pipeline to the Santa Clara Conduit, and the delivery to and the use of Central Valley Project (CVP) water in the Pajaro Valley.
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit	A projectwide environmental statement was filed with the CEQ October 4, 1972. A draft supplement to the final was filed with the CEQ July 30, 1979. A draft environmental statement for cleanup and closure of the San Luis Drain and Kesterson Reservoir was filed with the EPA April 30, 1986; final filed October 20, 1986. A draft Environmental Statement, as a result of the Barcellos Judgment, was filed with the EPA December 20, 1991. This plan was not accepted as complying with the Barcellos Judgment. Recent court decisions affirmed Interior's responsibility to address the drainage problem. In 2001, Reclamation began evaluating alternatives to provide long-term drainage service to the San Luis Unit. Proposed alternatives will be based on criteria consistent with the <u>Plan of Action</u> filed April 18, 2001, in <i>Sumner Peck Ranch, Inc., et al., v. Bureau of Reclamation, et al.</i>
San Luis Unit Long Term Contract Renewal	Draft EIS is due March 2003 and the final is due July 2003.
Shasta Division	Will be completed as required. The CALFED Program recommends enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir and Reclamation has begun this study.
Trinity River Restoration Program	Buckhorn Debris Dam FES was filed with the EPA August 18, 1986. A Categorical Exclusion checklist for the Trinity Fish Hatchery was completed on October 6, 1983. Final EIS for Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration released November 17, 2000. Record of Decision signed December 19, 2000. Implementation of decision delayed pending outcome of ongoing litigation and completion of supplemental EIS.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I Division	A projectwide final EIS was filed with the CEQ on June 18, 1975.
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Basinwide Program	All NEPA requirements will be complied with as needed.
Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project	Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before individual actions are undertaken.
Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project	Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before actions are undertaken.
Endangered Species Recovery Implementation PN Region	Individual NEPA compliance documents will be prepared before construction is initiated. Construction activities currently scheduled will be covered by categorical exclusions or environmental assessments.
Lewis and Clark RWS	A draft EA was issued June 17, 2002, with the comment period ending July 18, 2002. Final EA and response to comments are being evaluated. FONSI being reviewed with anticipated issue date of January 31, 2003.
Long Beach Area Water District Reclamation Project	A categorical exclusion for the Alamitos Barrier Reclaimed Water Project was completed in July 1999. A categorical exclusion for the City of Long Beach Recycled Water System Expansion Project was completed in January 1999.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project	A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document (i.e. FONSI) was completed March 10, 1994. A Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report was completed in conjunction with the NEPA compliance process. At the time that the EA and FONSI were prepared, the wetlands component of the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System was not prepared in sufficient detail to be fully covered by the EA and FONSI. Reclamation with assistance from the Interagency Mitigation Team, prepared a supplement to the EA for the wetland component., and a FONSI was issued December 7, 2001.
Minidoka North Side Drain Water Management Project	Programmatic NEPA compliance was accomplished in conjunction with development of the Framework Drain water Management Plan. Additional NEPA Documentation will be provided for site-specific actions.
Mni Wiconi Project	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was completed in October 1993. An amendment was signed in June 1995.
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project	A FONSI for the San Elijo Water Reclamation Project was completed July 1997. Categorical Exclusions for the Leucadia component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project and Olivenhain Water Reclamation

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	Project were completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Carlsbad component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project was completed in February 2002. The NEPA for the Carlsbad component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project was completed in February 2002. The NEPA for San Dieguito Groundwater Project is scheduled to be completed in September 2003.
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I	The Record of Decision was completed August 14, 2000.
Phoenix Metro Water Reclamation and Reuse Project	The NEPA is scheduled for completion in September 2004.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	Projectwide Financial Environmental Statement (FES) on the 250,000-acre plan was filed with the CEQ January 10, 1974. Supplemental Fish and Wildlife filed with the CEQ on May 3, 1974. Final comprehensive supplemental to FES filed with EPA on March 7, 1979. The Final Supplemental Environmental Statement on features for initial development of 85,000 acres on the 250,000-acre plan was filed with the EPA on July 15, 1983. A draft environmental statement addressing the Garrison Commission recommendations was filed with the EPA on March 6, 1986. A draft supplement to the Draft Environmental Statement was filed with the EPA on December 30, 1986. The reformulated project FES will not be pursued further due to deferral of work associated with non-Indian irrigation. In the interim, all project activities will comply with NEPA requirements as necessary. The Dakota Water Resources Act requires an EIS be completed for the Red River Valley Water Supply feature. The Draft EIS is scheduled for February 2006.
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program	The San Diego Water Reclamation Project consists of several components, each of which requires NEPA compliance. A categorical exclusion for preconstruction activities for the North/Central Distribution System was completed in January 1995 while the FONSI for the construction was completed in December 1995. Categorical exclusions for the North City Water Reclamation Plant Demineralization Facility were completed in April 1997 for the temporary facility and in December 2000 for the permanent facility. A FONSI for Phase I of the Sweetwater Authority Water Reclamation Project was completed in September 1996. A FONSI for Phase II of the Sweetwater Authority Water Reclamation Project was completed in September 1997. Categorical exclusions for Phase I of the Otay Water Reclamation Project were completed in September 1996 and June 1997. NEPA completion for Phase II of the Otay Water Reclamation Project is scheduled for completion in August 2003. A categorical exclusion for groundwater exploration for the Tijuana River Basin Groundwater Management Program was completed in January 1996. A categorical exclusion was completed for the South Poway Distribution system in July 1999. A FONSI was completed for the South Bay Water Reclamation Plant and Dairy Mart Road Bridge Pipeline in May, 1997. A FONSI for the South Bay Sewer

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<p>and Pump Station was completed in March 2000. A FONSI for the Otay River Pump Station and Conveyance System was completed in July 2001. A categorical exclusion for the first phase of the South Bay Distribution System was completed in September 2002.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Escondido Water Reclamation Project was completed in April 1995. A categorical exclusion for the planning study for the San Pasqual component of the Escondido Project was completed in July 1995. A Categorical Exclusion was completed for the San Pasqual Storage Tank in May 2001.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for the planning studies for the San Diego Water Repurification Project was completed in January 1995. In 1999, the city of San Diego stopped work on this project.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Reclamation Project was completed in May 1995.</p>
San Gabriel Basin Project	<p>Categorical exclusions for preconstruction activities were completed in September 1994 and January 1996. A FONSI for the San Gabriel Demonstration Project was completed in March 1997. A Categorical Exclusion for the La Puente Treatability Study was completed July 1999. A Categorical Exclusion for Design Activities for the El Monte, South El Monte, and Puente Valley Operable Units was completed July 2000. A Categorical Exclusion for the San Gabriel Valley Water Company Plant No. 8 Treatment Facility was completed in September 2000. Categorical exclusions for the Monterey Park Treatment Facility were completed in June and September 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the California Domestic Water Company Well 14 Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company San Gabriel Plant Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company Encinita Plant Treatment Facility was completed in June 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Suburban Water Systems Extraction Wells and Pipeline was completed in April 2002.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Rio Hondo Water Recycling Program was completed in June 1994.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for preconstruction activities was completed in April 1994. A FONSI for the San Gabriel Valley Water Reclamation Program was completed in September 1998.</p>
San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program	Completed for Phase I only.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act	The Tohono O'Odham Nation's San Xavier District FES was issued November 2, 1989, and Schuk Toak was covered by a FONSI March 21, 1989. A Record of Decision was never finalized on the San Xavier New Farm Development. The San Xavier New Farm Development has been delayed indefinitely pending further negotiation.
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project	A programmatic EIS has been prepared to evaluate the basinwide environmental impacts/benefits of the water enhancement facilities. A Record of Decision was issued on March 10, 1999.

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p>Animas-La Plata Project</p>	<p>The downsizing of the Animas-La Plata Project to an all M&I project and the provision in P.L. 106-554 allowing up-front cost-sharing of non-tribal payment obligations necessitate the modification or replacement of existing repayment contracts with the non-tribal entities. Appropriate agreements were executed in November 2001 with the San Juan Water Commission, New Mexico and the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority to allow the up-front cost sharing. Additional repayment contracts will be negotiated prior to project water delivery.</p>
<p>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</p>	<p>A repayment contract with the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) was executed on December 15, 1972, and validated on May 24, 1983. An amended contract with the CAWCD was executed on December 1, 1988, and validated on January 7, 1991. The water supply system stage of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) was placed into repayment status in October 1993, followed by the regulatory storage stage, in October 1996. Following months of unsuccessful formal negotiations between the Bureau of Reclamation and CAWCD over a variety of CAP repayment contract and operation and maintenance issues, CAWCD filed suit against the U.S. on July 10, 1995. The U.S. filed a countersuit on August 18, 1995 in the U.S. District Court. On September 20, 1995, the complaints were consolidated in the U.S. District Court with the CAWCD suit as the complaint and the U.S. suit as a counter claim. For the court proceedings, the issues in dispute were divided into six phases: (1) Repayment Ceiling; (2) Cost Allocation; (3) Development Fund Administration; (4) Water Delivery Issues; (5) Construction Defects and Miscellaneous Claims; and (6) Billing Disputes. The Court heard phase 1 in August of 1998 and on November 3, 1998, issued a phase 1 order, ruling in favor of the CAWCD. The ruling determined that the 1988 amended repayment contract limits CAWCD's repayment obligation for stages 1 and 2 to \$1.781 billion unless a further amendment to the contract is executed changing that obligation. The United States was also enjoined from barring CAWCD from utilizing CAP facilities. Phase 2 of the trial was conducted in November of 1998. Shortly after the phase 2 court proceedings, negotiations were initiated to reach a settlement outside of the courts. The court, in deference to negotiations, did not issue a phase 2 ruling. Department of Justice successfully negotiated a Stipulated Settlement that contains a number of conditions that must be achieved within three years to allow final settlement of the case. The Court issued an order on May 9, 2000, staying litigation for three years to allow the conditions of the Stipulated Settlement to be achieved. Legislation is currently being prepared to resolve these issues.</p> <p>Repayment contracts with the Indian communities must be executed before they are eligible for deferment under the Leavitt Act. The Gila River Indian Community divided its obligation into phases to expedite construction. The repayment contract for Sacaton Ranch was executed March 15, 1995; the master contract for the remaining Gila River Indian Community facilities was executed July 20, 1998. A temporary waiver was granted by the Commissioner on September 5, 1997, to the Tohono O'odham Nation for the pipeline from the CAP aqueduct to the Schuk Toak New Farm. This waiver was granted until such time as an opinion is issued by the Field Solicitor on repayment obligation under the Southern Arizona Water Right Settlement Act. The repayment contracts for the remaining Indian Distribution System will be executed as required.</p> <p>Construction of the Non-Indian Distribution System was accomplished under Section 9(d), Reclamation Act of 1939. Ten non-Indian distribution system repayment contracts have been executed and validated. The repayment contracts for Maricopa-Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District, Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District, and New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District were executed on November 21, 1983, and validated on November 23, 1983. The Harquahala Valley Irrigation District contract was executed January 6, 1984, and validated on April 26, 1984; Chaparral City Water Company contract was executed December 6, 1984, and validated on March 25, 1985; Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District contract was executed on April 4, 1985, and validated August 13, 1985; Chandler Heights Citrus, San Tan and Queen Creek Irrigation Districts contracts were executed December 30, 1985, and validated February 14, 1986; Tonopah Irrigation District contract was executed April 8, 1985, and validated July 24, 1985.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

<p>Central Arizona Project (CAP) (Continued)</p>	<p>On December 3, 1992, the distribution system repayment contract with the Harquahala Valley Irrigation District was extinguished under authority of P. L. 101-628. The contract was amended to discharge Harquahala Valley Irrigation District's repayment obligation. The 13,933 acre-feet of Harquahala Valley Irrigation District's water was committed for the Fort McDowell Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. The remaining 19,318 acre-feet may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for other purposes including Indian water rights settlements.</p> <p>On December 21, 1993, the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District signed an agreement with the cities of Chandler, Mesa, Phoenix, and Scottsdale; Central Arizona Water Conservation District; and Reclamation to assign its Central Arizona Project agricultural water to these cities. This fulfilled the United States obligations to secure Cliff Dam replacement water for the cities as required by congressional actions on Plan 6. The agreement also requires the cities to pay for the Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage District distribution system Federal indebtedness.</p> <p>On January 18, 1994, the New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District declared Chapter 9 bankruptcy after Reclamation rejected the District's proposal to restructure the District's repayment obligation for construction of its Central Arizona Project water distribution system. The U. S. Bankruptcy Court issued a confirmation order on June 21, 1995, directing Reclamation to amend New Magma's repayment contract and restructure its repayment terms. Contract was amended November 22, 1996.</p> <p>The Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District failed to make its February 1, 1994, distribution system payment. On August 12, 1994, Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District filed Chapter 9 bankruptcy to reorganize its debts. Agreement was reached in bankruptcy court in 1996. An amended repayment contract was scheduled for April 1997; however, it was delayed in order to reorganize the debt. On March 4, 1999, the repayment debt and schedule were determined and discussions continue with the District as to whether an amendment to the repayment contract is necessary.</p> <p>On May 19, 1995, Maricopa-Stanfield Irrigation and Drainage District requested deferment of its semi-annual payments due August 1995 and February 1996. They also requested a deferment contract for restructuring its repayment debt to avoid petitioning for Chapter 9 bankruptcy. Reclamation awarded the deferment contract. An agreement signed June 28, 1996, changed the payout schedule from 26 to 39 years, allowing the district to meet the full repayment obligation.</p>
<p>Central Valley Project <u>American River Division</u> Auburn-Folsom South Unit</p>	<p>To date, eleven water service contracts and one water rights settlement contract have been executed with entities within the American River watershed. Of the eleven water service contracts, three are interim renewal contracts, two are new 25-year long-term contracts and one is an amendatory contract, all subject to Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA)). In addition, one repayment contract for construction of a conveyance system has been executed.</p>
<p><u>Delta Division</u></p>	<p>To date, sixteen water service contracts with various entities have been executed (13 of the 16 contracts are currently interim renewal contracts and are subject to CVPIA). Two of the sixteen contracts (with the State of California) have been suspended and were superseded by a 25-year long-term water service contract (see Delta-Mendota Canal and San Luis Unit). Contracts have also been executed for the construction of two distribution systems with Contra Costa and Plain View Water Districts (these contracts are a combination of repayment and water supply contracts).</p> <p>To date, the Region has negotiated nine water rights settlement contracts (includes Patterson Irrigation District, an interim renewal contract), most of which provide for diversion of project water as water service and prior water rights claimed settlement water. The water right component is accomplished through an exchange of waters.</p>
<p><u>East Side Division</u> New Melones Unit</p>	<p>To date, two water service contracts have been executed with Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District and Stockton-East Water District. The United States is anticipating to begin negotiations with Tuolumne Utilities District pursuant to Subsection 3404(b) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act for new Central Valley Project water supplies.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

<p>Central Valley Project (continued) <u>Friant Division</u></p>	<p>To date, twenty-seven water service contracts for Class I and Class II water were executed in January and February 2001. These twenty-seven contracts are for 25 year terms and are subject to CVPIA. Included within these twenty-seven contracts are twelve which provide for the construction of a distribution system. In turn, eight of these twelve contracts are combination water supply/repayment contracts and seven of the contractors have repaid the repayment portion of the contracts.</p>
<p><u>Sacramento River Division</u> Black Butte Dam and Lake</p>	<p>To date, six contracts for water service have been executed (County of Colusa [Stony], 4-E Water District, Elk Creek Community Services District, U. S. Forest Service, Stony Creek Water District, and Whitney Construction Company).</p>
<p>Corning/Tehama-Colusa Canals</p>	<p>To date, thirteen water service contracts have been executed. All are thirteen interim renewal contracts and subject to CVPIA. Of the thirteen contracts, four contracts include repayment of a distribution system and two of these four are combination repayment/water supply contracts.</p>
<p>Sacramento River Settlement</p>	<p>To date, 145 contracts providing for agreement on diversion of base supply and project water supplies (Sacramento River Settlement Contracts) have been executed with various entities in the Sacramento River Basin.</p> <p>The Region has negotiated replacement water supply contracts with the Feather Water District and the Colusa Basin Drain Mutual Water Company. The Feather Water District water supply is provided pursuant to an interim renewal contract and is subject to CVPIA.</p>
<p><u>San Felipe Division</u></p>	<p>To date, two contracts dated June 7, 1977, and April 15, 1978, for water service have been executed with Santa Clara Valley Water District and San Benito County Water Conservation and Flood Control District, respectively.</p>
<p><u>Shasta Division</u></p>	<p>To date, five contracts for water service have been executed (City of Shasta Lake, U.S. Forest Service, Mountain Gate Community Services District, City of Redding, and Shasta County Water Agency). Of these five contracts, one contract (City of Shasta Lake) is an interim renewal contract and subject to CVPIA.</p>
<p><u>Trinity River Division</u></p>	<p>To date, four contracts for water service have been executed (Bella Vista Water District, Clear Creek Community Services District, Shasta Community Services District, and County of Shasta, Service Area No. 25 - Keswick). Two of these contracts (Bella Vista Water District and Clear Creek Community Services District) are interim renewal contracts subject to CVPIA and also provide for repayment of distribution systems</p>
<p><u>West San Joaquin Division</u> Delta-Mendota Canal</p>	<p>To date, three contracts for water service have been executed (Pacheco Water District, Panoche Water District, and San Luis Water District). In addition, a conveyance contract with Pacheco Water District for agriculture and municipal and industrial water has also been executed. A 25-year long-term water service contract has been executed with the California Fish and Game for wildlife refuges.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

<p>Central Valley Project (continued) <u>West San Joaquin</u> Division(cont) San Luis Unit</p>	<p>To date, five contracts for water service have been executed (City of Avenal, California Department of Fish and Game, City of Coalinga, City of Huron, and Westlands Water District). Repayment contracts with City of Huron and Westlands Water District were executed for construction of distribution systems. The City of Huron is a combination repayment and water supply contract. A contract for transportation of municipal and industrial water was executed with Dos Palos Joint Water Authority.</p>
<p><u>Other</u></p>	<p>To date, ten contracts for water service have been executed. Eight of the ten contracts are currently interim renewal contracts, subject to CVPIA. Two contracts are new 25 year long-term contracts executed in February 2001 with Chowchilla Water District (Buchanan Unit) and Madera Irrigation District (Hidden Unit).</p>
<p><u>General</u></p>	<p>With the exception of the Sacramento River Contracts ^{1/}, 87 CVP water service contracts remain to be renewed. Forty-three of the 87 contracts are subject to early renewal pursuant to a binding agreement and may be renewed following completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and associated documentation.</p> <p>^{1/} Pursuant to legal settlement, it has been determined that the Sacramento River Contracts are not subject to the early renewal provisions of Section 3404(c)(3) of CVPIA.</p>
<p>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I</p>	<p>Repayment contract with the Coachella Valley Water District for lining of the Coachella Canal was executed March 14, 1978, and validated June 30, 1978. The cost of the Desalting Complex is non-reimbursable except for costs associated with other beneficiaries. Costs for the Coachella Canal replacement will be shared by the United States and the Coachella Valley Water District. Costs associated with the Protective and Regulatory Pumping Unit, including delivery of water to Mexico, will be non-reimbursable, except for water used in the United States.</p>
<p>Lewis and Clark Rural Water System</p>	<p>Cooperative Agreement was signed June 29, 2001, with the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required..</p>
<p>Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project</p>	<p>Repayment contract was signed May 2, 1995, with the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System, Incorporated.</p>
<p>Mni Wiconi Project</p>	<p>No repayment contracts are anticipated. Cooperative agreements providing for work and commitment of non-Federal funds were executed prior to construction.</p>
<p>Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit</p>	<p>Execution of the master contract with Garrison Diversion Conservancy District and three-way contracts between Reclamation, Conservancy District, and Irrigation Districts, containing approximately 113,000 acres of irrigable land, was completed March 16, 1966. Court validation was completed July 26, 1966, and confirmed August 10, 1966. Renegotiation to conform to the reformulation legislation must occur prior to construction activity in irrigation areas. Cooperative Agreement for municipal, rural, and industrial water was executed November 19, 1986. Grant Agreement for North Dakota Wetlands Trust was executed on December 18, 1986. A supplementary agreement for the State cost-share was executed on February 14, 1991, as required by the 1986 Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act. A renegotiated repayment contract with Garrison Diversion Conservancy District has not been completed. Renegotiation of a repayment contract is being deferred pending the outcome of the Red River Valley Water Supply Study which was directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.</p>

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
SUMMARY OF IRRIGATION INVESTMENT**

Project	Total Irrigation Investment Per Acre	Repayment of Irrigation Investment By									Annual Charges Per Acre		
		Irrigators	Power Rev.	Cost Share Agric.	UCRBF Rev.	Ad Valorem Tax	CRDF & Cont. Funds	Indian Irr. Defer.	Non-Fed Contribution	Settlement Land Sales	Annual Charge	Investment Costs	Operations
Central Arizona Project	3432.67	68.48	988.23					2375.96			81.00	2.00	79.00
Central Valley Project 1/ American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division Miscellaneous Projects Sacramento Division San Felipe Division San Joaquin Division West San Joaquin Division- San Luis Unit Shasta Division Trinity River													
Colorado River Storage Project				<u>2/</u>									
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I	585.00	278.00 ^{3/}									N/A	N/A	N/A
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison 4/	6220.00								2.00		32.01	N/A	55.22
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Prj	4960.53							4960.53			N/A	N/A	N/A

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
SUMMARY OF IRRIGATION INVESTMENT**

1/ Irrigation investment is to be repaid from water and power revenues collected at the project level in compliance with the operationally and financially integrated project provision included in the project authorization. Each division and unit is part of the total project; some divisions develop water supplies and other divisions and units deliver those water supplies. Irrigation investment data for the total authorized Central Valley Project are shown below.

Summary of Irrigation Investment	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Acres</u>
Total irrigation investment per acre	\$393	1,216,915,717	<u>A/</u>
Less repayment of irrigation investment per acre by:			
Irrigators	-34	105,859,282	<u>A/</u>
Capital Relief	-5	15,861,810	<u>A/</u>
Unpaid Capital per Acre	354		
Payment capacity per acre-foot	\$10.53 to \$16.44		<u>B/</u>
Annual rates per acre-foot:			
Construction	\$0 to \$18.20		<u>C/</u>
Operation and maintenance	\$5.66 to \$19.29		<u>C/</u>
Deficit	.00 to \$10.81		<u>C/</u>

A/ Based on 3,096,290 acres in the project service area that were irrigated with water supplied by the Central Valley Project in 1993, as reported in Reclamation's 1993 Crop Production Report, and the irrigation plant investment repayment, and capital relief are included in the 2002 water rates of 9/30/00.

B/ Range of irrigators' ability to pay estimates for lands that are irrigated with water supplied by the Central Valley Project. Payment capacity depends on the value of the crops grown, productivity of the soils, and length of the growing season. Because these factors improve as one moves from north to south, the irrigators' ability to pay improves as one moves from the northern portion to the southern and coastal portions of the project service area. Coincidentally, the cost of delivering project water supplies developed in the north increases as the water is moved southward to irrigators located in the southern and coastal portions of the project service area.

C/ Irrigation water rates are based on budgeted costs and expressed in terms of dollars per acre-foot scheduled for delivery during the current year. Cost of service rates for all the individual contractors are adjusted annually to reflect changes in project costs and available water supplies. Annual charges shown above are the lowest and highest cost of service rates calculated for the individual contractors in Reclamation's 2001 CVP Irrigation Water Rates. Out-of-basin facility rates are not included above but the out-of-basin capital rates developed are in the mid-\$40 range.

**BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
SUMMARY OF IRRIGATION INVESTMENT**

2/ The irrigation investment for Colorado River Storage Project (CRSP) Participating Projects is to be repaid from irrigators, miscellaneous contributions, and power revenues from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (UCRBF). A summary of irrigation repayment estimates for the CRSP Participating Projects is shown below:

Repayment by Irrigators	\$ 113,487,000
CRDF & Contributions	195,047,000
Indian Irrigation Deferral	11,992,000
<u>UCRBF Revenue A/</u>	<u>1,479,088,000</u>
Total	\$1,799,614,000

A/ Amount shows the sum of the UCRBF revenues under the existing repayment schedules, within the 50-year repayment period of any irrigation repayment block, and based on the FY 2000 power repayment study. The Inspector General's Audit, Recovery of Irrigation Investment Costs, Audit No. BOR 98-I-150 requested that information should be provided annually showing the present value of UCRBF revenues to assist irrigation repayment under existing schedules, and the present value of a straight-line amortization of UCRBF revenue payments. The 2000 annual interest rate of 5.94 percent for 30-year Treasury constant maturities was used to calculate these present values. The present value for the current schedule of UCRBF revenues to assist irrigation repayment is estimated to be \$257,664,000 and the present value of a straight-line amortization is estimated to be \$395,579,000.

3/ Based on 78,530 acres of agricultural land in the Coachella Valley taken from 1996 crop census. Balance of irrigation investment is non-reimbursable since Reclamation is using the facilities to meet salinity requirements under the Mexican Water Treaty.

4/ The annual operation and maintenance cost exceeds payment capacity under the current allocation. Federal funds were not included for irrigation development in the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.

(This page intentionally left black)