

**Table of Contents
Appendix**

Report	Page
Table of Contents	Appendix-1
Benefit Cost Ratios as of October 1, 2003.....	Appendix-2
Consolidated Appraisal Function.....	Appendix-5
Land Certification.....	Appendix-7
Obligations by Function for Operating Projects	
Pacific Northwest Region	Appendix-10
Mid-Pacific Region.....	Appendix-12
Lower Colorado Region	Appendix-14
Upper Colorado Region.....	Appendix-16
Great Plains Region.....	Appendix-21
Project Repayment FY 2004	Appendix-26
Status of NEPA Compliance.....	Appendix-34
Status of Water Service and Repayment Contracts.....	Appendix-41
Summary of Irrigation Investment.....	Appendix-46

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2005

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 Benefit estimates submitted in support of the authorization of the original project features are out of date.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, 2005

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, 2005

Perkins County		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-136.
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.

Consolidated Appraisal Function

Bureau of Reclamation - Water & Related Resources Account:

	2003 Actual	2004 Estimate	Uncontroll. Changes	Program Changes	2005 Request
(\$000)	1,146	1,182	+36	-	1,182
FTE	11.5	11.5	-	-	11.5

Reason for increase in FY 2004: Inflation

Detail of FY 2004 Funding for the Consolidated Appraisal Function

	Bureau	NBC
(\$000)		
<u>Appraisal Costs</u>		
Salaries and benefits:		
Appraisers		816
Other Staff Support	86	
Contracted Appraisals	150	
Travel and Transportation, Rent, Communications, Other Contracts, Training, Supplies & Materials, etc.	70	
Support Costs including Personnel, Finance, and Other Servcg/Overhead	60	
FY 2004 Total = 1,182	366	816

Detail of FY 2005 Funding for the Consolidated Appraisal Function

	Bureau	NBC
(\$000)		
<u>Appraisal Costs</u>		
Salaries and benefits:		
Appraisers		816
Other Staff Support		86
Contracted Appraisals		150
Travel and Transportation, Rent, Communications, Other Contracts, Training, Supplies & Materials, etc.		70
Support Costs including Personnel, Finance, and Other Servcg/Overhead		60
FY 2005 Total = 1,182		1,182

Workload Information

Number of Appraisals Completed/Requested	<u>FY 2003</u>	<u>FY 2004</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>
By staff	587	587	587
By contract *	125	325	125

* The “by contract” number of appraisals includes customer-funded appraisals which do not impact Federal appropriations. The total cost of the “by contract” appraisals is not reflected in the dollars showing under “contracted appraisals” in the tables above. Also, the large increase in the FY 2004 number of appraisals requested by contract is the result of one project in Utah for which 200 appraisals are scheduled for FY 2004. There is an additional \$750,000 in third party appraisals that will be billed by NBC in a fee for service agreement.

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 2004, as a result of acceleration in the completion of 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	7/20/67	Land Classification Certification includes Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Foresthill, and Sly Park Unit.
Folsom Dam Gate Repairs	7/20/67	
Delta Division	7/23/82	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.
		Mendota Districts: Coehlo Family Trust field work completed 03/02; Eagle Field Water District projected initial field work to be completed 10/03; Fresno Slough field work completed 04/02; James Irrigation District field work completed in 2002; Laguna Water District projected initial field work 10/03; Traction Ranch, Melvin Hughes (Mendota Pool) field work completed 04/02;

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 10/03. 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 2004, as a result of acceleration in the completion of design work.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

Revised Jan.22, 2004

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Boise Project	1,637	1,510	8,771	4,857	1,024	662	0	0	474	549	935	786	1,133	1,301	1,852	1,921	0	0	15,826	11,586				
Federal	992	626	540	0	1,024	662			474	546	725	571	1,133	1,301	1,802	1,821			6,690	5,527	97	6,554	5,527	
Water Users	645	884								3	210	215			50	100			905	1,202				
Other Agencies			8,231	4,857															8,231	4,857				
Columbia Basin-Total	4,398	4,402	76,838	76,518	1,357	2,067	8	11	808	510	661	515	312	520	3,278	3,188	362	433	88,022	88,164				
Federal	0	0	2,356	8,225	1,357	2,067	8	11	763	510	337	314	262	520	3,278	3,188	362	433	8,723	15,268	267	8,406	15,268	
Water Users	4,398	4,402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,398	4,402				
Other Agencies	0	0	74,482	68,293	0	0	0	0	45	0	324	201	50	0	0	0	0	0	74,901	68,494				
Columbia Basin-Coulee	2,860	2,916	76,838	76,518	1,277	1,956	8	11	495	510	0	0	0	0	540	201	0	0	82,018	82,112				
Federal			2,356	8,225	1,277	1,956	8	11	495	510					540	201			4,676	10,903	267	4,383	10,903	
Water Users	2,860	2,916																	2,860	2,916				
Other Agencies			74,482	68,293															74,482	68,293				
Columbia Basin-Ephrata	1,538	1,486	0	0	80	111	0	0	313	0	661	515	312	520	2,738	2,987	362	433	6,004	6,052				
Federal					80	111			268	0	337	314	262	520	2,738	2,987	362	433	4,047	4,365	0	4,023	4,365	
Water Users	1,538	1,486																	1,538	1,486				
Other Agencies									45	0	324	201	50	0					419	201				
Crooked River	0	0	0	0	92	95	0	0	124	0	164	221	409	407	231	196	0	0	1,020	919				
Federal					92	95			124		112	138	373	332	231	196			932	761	285	643	761	
Water Users									52	83	36	75							88	158				
Deschutes Project	0	0	0	0	76	59	0	0	124	165	475	364	64	186	44	13	0	0	783	787				
Federal					76	59			124	165	262	218	64	136	44	13			570	591	40	527	591	
Water Users									213	146				50					213	196				
Eastern Oregon Projects	0	0	0	0	148	140	0	0	408	150	321	281	141	488	59	284	0	0	1,077	1,343				
Federal					148	140			408	150	224	219	141	379	59	284			980	1,172	0	974	1,172	
Water Users									97	62				109					97	171				
Hungry Horse	0	0	7,140	4,001	382	275	0	0	69	50	0	0	69	50	0	15	0	0	7,660	4,391				
Federal			515	131	382	275			69	50			69	50		15			1,035	521	0	1,029	521	
Water Users																			0	0				
Other Agencies			6,625	3,870															6,625	3,870				
Minidoka Projects	1,511	1,905	6,383	6,237	823	810	112	0	1,100	895	812	907	495	447	1,582	1,928	0	0	12,818	13,129				
Federal	148	594	383	494	823	810	112		1,100	895	543	537	470	439	1,547	1,708			5,126	5,477	0	5,096	5,477	
Water Users	1,363	1,311									269	370	25	8	35	220			1,692	1,909				
Other Agencies			6,000	5,743															6,000	5,743				
Rogue River	0	0	1,271	2,178	224	156	0	0	66	155	636	269	95	528	152	256	0	0	2,444	3,542				
Federal					224	156			66	155	344	169	46	265	152	256			832	1,001	163	665	1,001	
Water Users											292	100	49	263					341	363				
Other Agencies			1,271	2,178															1,271	2,178				
Tualatin Project	70	61	0	0	41	41	79	73	119	182	135	127	151	50	119	10	0	0	714	544				
Federal					41	41			119	182	62	57	99	50	119	10			440	340	56	382	340	
Water Users	70	61					79	73			73	70	52						274	204				
Umatilla Project	205	230	0	0	41	44	0	0	1,630	1,969	567	598	5	5	385	464	0	0	2,833	3,310				
Federal	82	140			41	44			1,630	1,969	458	453	5	5	385	464			2,601	3,075		2,586	3,075	
Water Users	123	90									109	145							232	235				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Yakima Project	1,719	1,825	2,691	2,766	946	1,161	0	0	6,273	6,956	620	801	91	141	118	142	125	150	12,583	13,942				
Federal			112	438	946	1,161			5,982	6,657	305	366	91	141	118	142	125	150	7,679	9,055	672	6,966	9,055	
Water Users	1,309	1,372							96	94	315	435							1,720	1,901				
Other Agencies	410	453	2,579	2,328					195	205									3,184	2,986				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

Revised Jan.22, 2004

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005	
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Exam Of Existing Structures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,581	1,621	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,581	1,621				
Federal											1,581	1,621							1,581	1,621			1,572	1,621
Water Users																			0	0				
Misc. Flood Control	0	0	0	0	127	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	137				
Federal					127	137													127	137			126	137
Water Users																			0	0				
Total Obligations	9,540	9,933	103,094	96,557	5,281	5,647	199	84	11,195	11,581	6,907	6,490	2,965	4,123	7,820	8,417	487	583	147,488	143,415				
Total Appropriated	1,222	1,360	3,906	9,288	5,281	5,647	120	11	10,859	11,279	4,953	4,663	2,753	3,618	7,735	8,097	487	583	37,316	44,546	1,580		35,526	44,546
Total Water Users	7,908	8,120	0	0	0	0	79	73	96	97	1,630	1,626	162	505	85	320	0	0	9,960	10,741				
Total Other	410	453	99,188	87,269	0	0	0	0	240	205	324	201	50	0	0	0	0	0	100,212	88,128				
% of Apprp. Funds	3.4%	3.1%	11.0%	20.9%	14.9%	12.7%	0.3%	0.0%	30.6%	25.3%	13.9%	10.5%	7.7%	8.1%	21.8%	18.2%	1.4%	1.3%	105.0%	100.0%				

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

2/ FY04 Total Obligations include Underfinancing and Rescission.

FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS					
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY2004	FY2005	FY2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY2004	FY 2004	FY 2005	
Central Valley Project:																								
American River Division	3,946	4,263	6,368	5,081	709	766	448	484	1,473	1,591	14	15	123	133	0	0	301	0	13,381	12,334				
Federal	3,946	4,263	1,956	2,113	709	766	448	484	1,473	1,591	14	15	123	133			301	0	8,969	9,366	304	8,665	9,366	
Water Users			4,412	2,968															4,412	2,968				
CVP, Misc. Proj. Programs	7,085	6,226	3,511	3,086	1,273	1,119	805	707	2,644	2,324	25	22	221	194	0	0	4,712	856	20,277	14,534				
Federal	7,085	6,226	3,511	3,086	1,273	1,119	805	707	2,644	2,324	25	22	221	194			4,712	856	20,277	14,534	60	20,217	14,534	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, Friant Division	2,671	2,697	1,324	1,337	480	485	303	306	997	1,007	9	9	83	84	0	0	1,397	0	7,265	5,925				
Federal	2,671	2,697	1,324	1,337	480	485	303	306	997	1,007	9	9	83	84			1,397	0	7,265	5,925	41	7,224	5,925	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, Wtr & Power Opertn.	5,679	5,291	2,815	4,104	1,021	951	645	601	2,120	1,975	20	19	177	165	0	0	0	0	12,476	13,106				
Federal	5,679	5,291	2,815	2,622	1,021	951	645	601	2,120	1,975	20	19	177	165			0	0	12,476	11,624	1	12,475	11,624	
Water Users				1,482															0	1,482				
CVP, Delta Division	3,971	3,800	1,968	1,883	714	683	451	432	1,482	1,418	14	13	124	119	0	0	29,135	8,687	37,858	17,034				
Federal	3,971	3,800	1,968	1,883	714	683	451	432	1,482	1,418	14	13	124	119			8,535	5,287	17,258	13,634	5	17,253	13,634	
Water Users																	20,600	3,400	20,600	3,400				
CVP, East Side Division	1,694	1,822	4,390	2,431	304	327	192	207	632	680	6	6	53	57	0	0	4	0	7,276	5,531				
Federal	1,694	1,822	840	903	304	327	192	207	632	680	6	6	53	57			4	0	3,726	4,003	2	3,724	4,003	
Water Users			3,550	1,528															3,550	1,528				
CVP, Sacramento Rvr. Div.	1,744	1,468	864	728	313	264	198	167	651	548	6	5	54	46	0	0	5,873	1,800	9,704	5,026				
Federal	1,744	1,468	864	728	313	264	198	167	651	548	6	5	54	46			5,873	1,800	9,704	5,026	1,003	8,701	5,026	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, San Luis Unit	3,312	4,202	1,641	2,083	595	755	376	477	1,236	1,568	12	15	103	131	0	0	5,861	40,019	13,137	49,250				
Federal	3,312	4,202	1,641	2,083	595	755	376	477	1,236	1,568	12	15	103	131			5,861	40,019	13,137	49,250	10	13,127	49,250	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, Shasta Division	3,501	3,592	5,768	7,792	629	645	398	408	1,307	1,341	12	13	109	112	0	0	935	390	12,660	14,293				
Federal	3,501	3,592	1,735	1,780	629	645	398	408	1,307	1,341	12	13	109	112			935	390	8,627	8,281	211	8,416	8,281	
Water Users			4,033	6,012															4,033	6,012				
CVP, Trinity River Division	2,608	2,809	3,475	3,361	398	442	251	279	826	918	8	9	69	77	0	0	5,360	4,335	12,995	12,230				
Federal	2,212	2,461	1,096	1,220	398	442	251	279	826	918	8	9	69	77			5,360	4,335	10,220	9,741	425	9,795	9,741	
Water Users	396	348	2,379	2,141															2,775	2,489				
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
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP RAX Program	6,241	10,561	3,093	5,234	1,122	1,898	709	1,199	2,329	3,942	22	37	195	329	0	0	2	0	13,713	23,200				
Federal	6,241	10,561	3,093	5,234	1,122	1,898	709	1,199	2,329	3,942	22	37	195	329			2	0	13,713	23,200	2	13,711	23,200	
Water Users																			0	0				
Total Central Valley:																								
Federal	42,057	46,384	20,844	22,988	7,558	8,335	4,777	5,268	15,697	17,312	148	163	1,312	1,447	0	0	32,980	52,687	125,372	154,584	2,064	123,308	154,584	
Water Users	396	348	14,374	14,131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,600	3,400	35,370	17,879		0	0	

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY2004	FY2005	FY2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY2004	FY 2004	FY 2005
Cachuma Project	494	622	0	0	482	772	194	50	43	30	0	0	0	0	162	287	0	0	1,375	1,761			
Federal	494	622			482	772	194	50	43	30					162	287	0	0	1,375	1,761	45	1,330	1,761
Water Users																			0	0			
Klamath Project	1,863	1,949	0	0	0	0	343	359	15,328	16,083	0	0	0	0	1,865	1,957	4,031	4,787	23,429	25,135			
Federal	1,749	1,835					322	338	15,328	16,083					1,865	1,957	4,031	4,787	23,294	25,000	61	23,233	25,000
Water Users	114	114					21	21											135	135			
Orland Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477	587	0	0	0	0	477	587			
Federal													477	587					477	587	4	473	587
Water Users																			0	0			
Solano Project	1,298	1,376	0	0	50	53	21	22	122	129	0	0	1,977	2,096	544	577	3	0	4,015	4,253			
Federal	1,298	1,376			50	53	21	22	122	129			1,977	2,096	544	577	3	0	4,015	4,253	2	4,013	4,253
Water Users																			0	0			
Lahontan Basin Projects	284	292	499	514	0	0	1,471	1,516	579	597	0	0	31	32	3,187	3,284	2,428	2,084	8,479	8,319			
Federal	284	292	499	514	0	0	1,471	1,516	579	597	0	0	31	32	3,187	3,284	2,428	2,084	8,479	8,319	236	8,243	8,319
Water Users																			0	0			
Exam of Existing Structures	1,206	1,426	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,206	1,426			
Federal	1,206	1,426																	0	0	1	1,205	1,426
Water Users																			0	0			
Land Resources Managmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	737	737	2	0	739	737			
Federal															737	737	2	0	739	737	2	737	737
Water Users																			0	0			
Reclamation Law Admin	1,578	1,108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,427	1,108			
Federal	1,578	1,108																	0	0	0	1,427	1,108
Water Users																			0	0			
Site Security - Antiterrorism	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	73	0			
Federal	69	0															4	0	73	0	4	69	0
Water Users																			0	0			
Soil & Moisture Conserv	90	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	91	115			
Federal	90	115															1	0	91	115	1	90	115
Water Users																			0	0			
Wtr Mgmt/Conservation	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	59	69			
Federal	58	69															1	0	59	69	1	58	69
Water Users																			0	0			
Total Obligations	49,393	53,689	35,717	37,633	8,089	9,160	6,805	7,214	31,769	34,152	148	163	3,797	4,162	6,495	6,842	60,050	62,958	202,112	215,973			
Total Appropriated	48,883	53,227	21,343	23,502	8,089	9,160	6,784	7,193	31,769	34,152	148	163	3,797	4,162	6,495	6,842	39,450	59,558	166,607	197,959	2,421	164,186	197,959
Total Water Users	510	462	14,374	14,131	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,600	3,400	35,505	18,014	0		
Total Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
% of Appropriated Funds	29.3%	26.9%	12.8%	11.9%	4.9%	4.6%	4.1%	3.6%	19.1%	17.3%	0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	2.1%	3.9%	3.5%	23.7%	30.1%	100.0%	100.0%			

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc. (Provide detail by project)

2/ FY04 Total Obligations include Underfinancing, but not Rescission

FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Parker-Davis Project			6,675	5,794	3,550	2,468											0	0	10,225	8,262				
Federal			0	0	0	0											0	0	0	0			0	0
Water Users			6,675	5,794	3,550	2,468											0	0	10,225	8,262				
Yuma Area Projects	2,115	2,290			18,342	19,057			534	444	0	0	0	0	1,057	952	0	0	22,048	22,743				
Federal	2,115	2,290			18,292	19,007			534	444	0	0	0	0	1,057	952	0	0	21,998	22,693	40	21,958	22,693	
Water Users					50	50											0	0	50	50				
Title 1, CRBSCP	688	781			0	0			0	0	10,327	10,688			0	0	0	0	11,015	11,469				
Federal	688	781			0	0			0	0	10,227	10,588			0	0	0	0	10,915	11,369	18	10,897	11,369	
Water Users					0	0					100	100					0	0	100	100				
Salt River Project															181	753			181	753				
Federal															81	498			81	498	2	79	498	
Water Users															100	255			100	255				
Ak Chin Water Rts St	5,594	6,893															0	0	5,594	6,893				
Federal	5,594	6,893															0	0	5,594	6,893	2	5,592	6,893	
Water Users	0	0															0	0	0	0				
Lower Colorado R. Opertns					0	0			12,028	16,361	5,488	6,389					0	0	17,516	22,750				
Federal					0	0			6,993	9,027	5,488	6,295					0	0	12,481	15,322	59	12,422	15,322	
Water Users					0	0			5,035	7,334	0	94					0	0	5,035	7,428				
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	425	0	0	0	0	0	84	0	0	0	509	0				
Federal									425	0	0	0	0	0	84	0	0	0	509	0	14	495	0	
Water Users																			0	0				
Exam of Exist Struct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	719	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	719				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	689	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	689	27	563	689	
Other Federal																			0	0			0	0
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				30							0	30				
CAP Distribut Sys O&	118	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	134				
Federal	78	94							0	0	0	0							78	94	2	76	94	
Water Users	40	40							0	0									40	40				
Land Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,045	1,963	0	0	2,045	1,963				
Federal															2,045	1,963			2,045	1,963	9	2,036	1,963	
Water Users																			0	0				
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	86				
Federal							88	86											88	86	4	84	86	
Water Users																			0	0				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005	
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		
Reclam Law Admin	624	690	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	624	690				
Federal	616	682																	616	682	3	613	682	
Water Users	8	8																	8	8				
Rec & F&WL Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,126	1,042	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	2,154	1,042				
Federal									979	842					28	0			1,007	842	10	997	842	
Water Users									1,147	200									1,147	200				
So Arizona Wtr Rights	776	1,571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776	1,571				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Other Federal	776	1,571																	776	1,571				
Site Security-Antiterrorism 2/			196	0	0	0			0	0	0	0						0	0	196	0			
Federal			196	0	0	0			0	0	0	0						0	0	196	0	0	196	0
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	1,351	1,562	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,351	1,562				
Federal											1,351	1,562							1,351	1,562	19	1,332	1,562	
Water Users											0	0							0	0				
Total Obligations	9,915	12,359	6,871	5,794	21,892	21,525	88	86	15,113	17,847	17,756	19,358	0	0	3,395	3,668	0	0	75,030	80,637				
Total Appropriated	9,091	10,740	196	0	18,292	19,007	88	86	8,931	10,313	17,656	19,134	0	0	3,295	3,413	0	0	57,549	62,693	209	57,340	62,693	
Total Other Federal	776	1,571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776	1,571				
Total Water Users	48	48	6,675	5,794	3,600	2,518	0	0	6,182	7,534	100	224	0	0	100	255	0	0	16,705	16,373				
% of Appropriated Fu	15.8	17.1	0.3	0.0	31.8	30.3	0.2	0.1	15.5	16.5	30.7	30.5	0.0	0.0	5.7	5.4	0.0	0.0	100	100				
Permanent O&M																								
Boulder Canyon Project			78,731	79,688														0	0	78,731	79,688			
Federal			78,731	79,688														0	0	78,731	79,688	8,755	69,976	79,688
Water Users			0	0														0	0	0	0			
Permanent O&M Appropriations			78,731	79,688	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78,731	79,688	8,755	69,976	79,688	
Grand Totals																								
LC Region O&M	9,091	10,740	78,927	79,688	18,292	19,007	88	86	8,931	10,313	17,656	19,134	0	0	3,295	3,413	0	0	136,280	142,381	8,964	127,316	142,381	

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

2/ FY04 Total Obligations include Underfinancing and Rescission.

FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

4/ Funding for SSA is in Bureauwide Security Budget in FY 2005 (\$210,000).

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED					
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2004	FY 2005			
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005											
Grand Valley, CRBSCP										953	914					52	41			1,005	955						
Federal										669	675					52	41			721	716					721	716
Water Users																											
Other Agencies										284	239									284	239						
Hammond Project																											
Federal										51	48					52	29			103	77					103	77
Water Users										51	48					52	29			103	77						
Hyrum Project																											
Federal										79	44	17	27		81	107			177	178							
Water Users										79	44	17	27		81	107			177	178					177	178	
Jensen Unit, CUP																											
Federal										87	80	15	13		110	295			212	388							
Water Users										87	80	15	13		110	295			212	388					212	388	
Lyman Project																											
Federal										47	25	22	5	4	5			73	35								
Water Users										47	25	22	5	4	5			73	35					73	35		
Mancos Project																											
Federal										79	161				57	71			136	232							
Water Users										79	161				57	71			136	232					136	232	
Middle Rio Grande Project	1,650	1,221								13,893	5,895	18,148	12,244		339	249	165		34,195	19,609							
Federal										13,893	5,895	18,148	12,244		339	249	165	0	32,545	18,388	15		32,530	18,388			
Water Users	1,650	1,221																	1,650	1,221							
Moon Lake Project																											
Federal										41	22	7	16	8	10			56	48								
Water Users										41	22	7	16	8	10			56	48					56	48		
Navajo Unit, CRSP																											
Federal										57	88	299	198		10			356	296								
Water Users										57	88	92	103		10			149	201					149	201		
Non-Federal														207	95			207	95								
Other Agencies																											
Newton Project																											
Federal										24	19	38	39	17	23			79	81								
Water Users										24	19	38	39	17	23			79	81					79	81		
Ogden River Project																											
Federal										137	81	15	6	224	254			376	341								
Water Users										137	81	15	6	224	254			376	341					376	341		

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Paonia Project					27	27					143	181	43	1	93	59			306	268				
Federal					27	27					143	181	21	0	93	59			284	267			284	267
Water Users													22	1					22	1				
Non-Federal																								
Other Agencies																								
Paradox Unit, CRBSCP											2,738	2,813				15			2,738	2,828				
Federal											2,055	2,106				15			2,055	2,121			2,055	2,121
Water Users																								
Other Agencies											683	707							683	707				
Pecos River Basin Water Sal											470	181							470	181				
Federal											320	31							320	31			320	31
Water Users											150	150							150	150				
Pine River					26	37					158	99			54	70			238	206				
Federal					26	37					158	99			54	70			238	206			238	206
Water Users																								
Other Agencies																								
Provo River Project			168	244					1,245	1,288	549	230	18	17		288			1,980	2,067				
Federal			168	244					375	418	549	230	18	17		288			1,110	1,197			1,110	1,197
Water Users																								
Other Agencies									870	870									870	870				
Rio Grande Project	512	589	1,514	1,711							1,950	2,284			376	478			4,352	5,062				
Federal			1,514	1,711							1,950	2,284			376	478			3,840	4,473			3,840	4,473
Water Users	512	589																	512	589				
San Juan-Chama Project								1,257	1,521		309	337			9				1,575	1,858				
Federal											309	337			9	0			318	337	30		288	337
Water Users								1,257	1,521										1,257	1,521				
San Luis Valley, Closed Basin										262	235	4,135	5,262		60	44			4,457	5,541				
Federal										262	235	4,135	5,262		60	44			4,457	5,541			4,457	5,541
Water Users																								
San Luis Valley, Conejos	3				30	9													33	9				
Federal					30	9													30	9	15		15	9
Water Users	3	0																	3					
Scofield Project											83	22	29	33	62	76			174	131				
Federal											83	22	29	33	62	76			174	131			174	131
Water Users																								

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Silt Project											319	268	2,393	2,272	48	59			2,760	2,599				
Federal											319	268	1,053	472	48	59			1,420	799			1,420	799
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													1,340	1,800					1,340	1,800				
Other Agencies																								
Smith Fork Project											231	291	205	160	46	46			482	497				
Federal											231	291			46	46			277	337			277	337
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													205	160					205	160				
Other Agencies																								
Strawberry Valley Project											64	97	10	5	112	112			186	201				
Federal											64	84	10	5	112	112			186	201			186	201
Water Users																								
Tucumcari															173	0			173	13				
Federal															173	0			173	13	75		98	13
Water Users																								
Uncompahgre Project											155	189	3	3	127	163			285	355				
Federal											155	189	3	3	127	163			285	355			285	355
Water Users																								
Vernal Unit, CUP											32	75	21	14	197	123			250	212				
Federal											32	75	21	14	197	123			250	212			250	212
Water Users																								
Weber Basin Project											742	590	1,649	2,567	523	470			2,914	3,627				
Federal											742	590	649	1,317	523	470			1,914	2,377			1,914	2,377
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													1,000	1,250					1,000	1,250				
Other Agencies																								
Weber River Project											80	127	25	25	36	26			141	178				
Federal											80	127	25	25	36	26			141	178			141	178
Water Users																								
Exam of Existing Structures											327	405							327	405				
Federal											327	405							327	405			327	405
Water Users																								
Land Res Management Prog															740	930			740	930				
Federal															740	930			740	930			740	930
Water Users																								

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005			
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005							
Neg/Admin of Water Marketing Federal Water Users											171	160							171	160	26	145	160
Public Access/ Safety Prog Federal Water Users											115	172							115	172		115	172
Reclamation Law Admin Federal Water Users	327	339																	296	339		296	339
Rec & Fish/Wildlife Prog Admin Federal Water Users									199	140			18	32					217	172		217	172
Site Security Federal Water Users			63	0															63			63	
Water Mgmt Conserv Program Federal Water Users											1,157	1,521							1,157	1,521		1,157	1,521
Total Obligations	2,492	2,149	3,650	3,386	2,518	1,282	1,257	1,521	17,075	7,794	36,467	32,436	4,981	5,588	4,431	5,524	3,610	5,369	75,393	65,251			
Total Appropriated	327	339	3,227	2,963	827	781			16,205	6,924	35,212	31,189	2,317	2,392	4,366	5,424	3,610	5,369	66,060	55,381	569	65,491	55,381
Total Water Users	2,165	1,810			589	501	1,257	1,521			150	150	127	106	75	100			4,183	4,188			
Total Non-Federal			423	423					870	870	1,105	1,084	2,752	3,305					5,150	5,682			
Total Other	4,472	3,709	5,618	4,817	5,036	2,564	2,514	3,042	32,905	14,300	66,591	58,555	9,616	10,866	8,198	9,780	7,220	10,738	139,984	118,801			
% of Appropriated Funds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			

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

2/ FY04 Total Obligations include Underfinancing, but not Rescission

FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005							
Arbuckle Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	205	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	181		205	181
Canadian River Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	68	104	0	0	49	90	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	117	208		117	180
Colo-Big Thompson Federal Water Users	1,424	1,231	11,298	14,557	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	361	0	0	0	447	0	0	12,733	16,607		10,210	10,961
Fry-Ark Project Federal Water Users	947	594	6,358	4,761	83	57	900	732	990	763	0	0	0	0	413	0	0	0	9,691	6,907	163	5,643	5,307
Kendrick Project Federal Water Users	130	166	3,576	3,389	14	14	0	0	25	38	0	0	71	91	258	130	0	0	4,074	3,828		4,054	3,793
Leadville Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,838	2,771	593	0	2,431	2,771		2,431	2,771
Mid-Dakota Rural Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,000	17,000	15,015	17,015		15,015	17,015
McGee Creek Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	69	76	0	0	189	217	0	0	162	188	40	25	0	0	460	506		460	489
Milk River Federal Water Users	1,012	800	0	0	406	773	0	0	0	0	0	0	267	106	495	351	0	0	2,180	2,030		1,603	1,347
Mirage Flat Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	21	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	82	0	0	58	115		58	103
Mni Wiconi Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,269	6,254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,293	18,315	31,562	24,569	22	31,471	24,500
Mountain Park Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	95	152	0	0	91	173	0	0	33	55	48	0	0	0	267	380		267	344
Norman Project Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	86	393	0	0	6	1	0	0	39	6	295	0	0	0	426	400		426	316
North Platte Federal Water Users	550	586	576	1,021	26	3	0	0	11	14	0	0	76	184	126	235	0	0	1,365	2,043		1,048	1,711

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005	
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Nueces River Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	330	604	0	0	126	79	70	0	0	0	536	683			536	640
					10				330	561			126	79	70				536	640				
										43								0	43					
PS Ainsworth Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	12	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	419	0	0	399	509			399	456
					12	90									387	366			399	456				
																53		0	53					
PS Almena Unit Federal Water Users	4	9	0	0	41	96	3	7	98	190	0	0	98	206	125	0	0	0	369	508			369	482
	4	9			41	70	3	7	98	190			98	206	125	0			369	482				
						26												0	26					
PS Angostura Unit Federal Water Users	847	361	0	0	325	147	0	0	0	37	0	0	24	77	49	121	0	0	1,245	743				
	847	291			325	147				0			18	77	49	121			1,239	673			1,239	673
		70											6					6	70					
PS Arnel Unit Federal Water Users	20	32	0	0	300	460	6	9	91	126	0	0	59	180	62	11	0	0	538	818				
	20	32			300	460	6	9	91	126			59	105	62	11			538	743			538	743
														75				0	75					
PS Belle Fourche Unit Federal Water Users	227	209	0	0	14	9	0	0	18	190	0	0	41	294	86	99	0	0	386	801				
	197	109			14	9			18	190			41	164	86	99			356	571			356	571
	30	100											130					30	230					
PS Bostwick Unit Federal Water Users	202	10	0	0	572	409	0	0	220	289	0	0	350	450	102	0	0	0	1,446	1,158				
	202	10			333	45			220	289			350	450	102	0			1,207	794			1,207	794
					239	364												239	364					
PS Boyesen Unit Federal Water Users	15	23	945	1,114	238	244	0	0	11	11	15	24	51	211	117	172	0	0	1,392	1,799				
	7	15	945	1,114	238	244			11	11	15	24	51	133	117	172			1,384	1,713			1,384	1,713
	8	8												78				8	86					
PS Buffalo Bill Dam Mod. Federal Water Users	0	0	2,104	3,145	107	121	0	0	23	14	0	0	130	135	112	116	0	0	2,476	3,531				
			2,104	3,145	107	121			23	14			130	119	112	116			2,476	3,515			2,476	3,515
														16				0	16					
PS Canyon Ferry Unit Federal Water Users	140	44	6,005	2,578	416	118	3	1	0	0	0	0	970	1,033	204	145	0	0	7,738	3,919				
	109	44	6,005	2,556	416	118	3	1					970	1,033	204	145			7,707	3,897			7,707	3,897
	31	0		22														31	22					
PS Cedar Bluff Unit Federal Water Users	13	17	0	0	195	245	4	5	51	65	0	0	4	43	80	6	0	0	347	381				
	13	17			195	229	4	5	51	65			4	43	80	6			347	365			347	365
						16												0	16					
PS Dickinson Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	12	42	116	205	36	82	0	0	42	71	179	205	0	0	385	605				
					12	42	76	131	36	82			42	71	179	205			345	531			345	531
							40	74										40	74					
PS East Bench Unit Federal Reflects O&M during	260	325	0	0	128	159	1	1	46	56	0	0	351	470	81	148	0	0	867	1,159				
	54	34			128	159	1	1	46	56			351	470	81	148			661	868			661	868
	206	291																206	291					

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005	
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
PS Oahe Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	170	133	0	380	266			380	266
PS Owl Creek Unit Federal Water Users	31	57	0	0	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	22	26	29	0	0	83	132			83	132
PS Rapid Valley - Pactola Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	94	90	93	92	18	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	206	201			206	201
PS Riverton Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	184	298	114	45	0	0	4	19	4	14	23	39	392	393	0	0	721	808			721	808
PS Sargent Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0
PS Shadehill Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	187	157	0	0	26	35	0	0	27	38	64	76	0	0	304	306			304	306
PS Webster Unit Federal Water Users	35	113	0	0	272	959	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	74	0	0	425	1,146			425	1,089
PS Yellowtail Unit Federal Water Users	0	0	3,851	4,060	142	132	6	6	17	16	0	0	0	0	21	34	0	0	4,037	4,248			4,037	4,248
Rapid Valley Federal Water Users	36	27	0	0	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	49	37			28	16
San Angelo Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	132	301	0	0	92	108	46	0	0	0	276	409			276	396
Shoshone Federal Water Users	152	207	541	753	248	152	0	0	7	7	10	20	118	107	160	161	0	0	1,236	1,407			1,203	1,374
WC Austin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	187	344	0	0	14	1	0	0	28	202	85	0	0	0	314	547			314	537
Washita Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	724	1,197	0	0	29	0	0	0	30	0	104	0	0	0	887	1,197			887	1,066

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005		FY 2004	FY 2005	
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2005								
Wichita Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	43	0	155	702	0	0	215	702			215	578
Environ Prog Admin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	913	802	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	913	802			856	802
Exam of Exist Struct Federal Water Users	1,385	1,578	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,385	1,578			1,374	1,572
Land Resource Mgmt Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,405	3,399	0	0	3,405	3,399			3,405	3,399
Misc Flood Control Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	422	403	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422	403			422	403
Nego & Admin of Wtr Federal Water Users	1,534	1,556	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,534	1,556			1,411	1,539
Public Access & Sfty Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	286	0	0	0	0	300	286			300	286
Rec & F&WL Admin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220	222	0	0	150	379	0	0	0	0	370	601			370	601
Reclam Law Admin Federal Water Users	807	896	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	807	896			807	896
Site Security Federal Water Users	475	0	475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	950	0			950	0
Water Mgmt & Cons Federal Water Users	2,395	1,466	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,395	1,466			1,771	1,343
Total Obligations	13,150	10,824	39,993	42,824	8,523	10,833	10,586	10,455	4,674	5,550	29	419	5,418	8,339	14,961	14,597	68,628	57,440	165,753	161,281				
Total Appropriated	10,220	8,071	34,495	36,402	8,284	9,782	10,546	10,381	4,617	5,507	29	419	5,412	7,322	14,961	14,392	65,059	53,871	153,414	146,147	188	153,226	146,147	
Total Water Users	2,930	2,753	5,498	6,422	239	1,051	40	74	57	43	0	0	6	1,017	0	205	3,569	3,569	12,339	15,134				
% of Appropriated Fu	7.0%	5.5%	23.6%	24.9%	5.7%	6.7%	7.2%	7.1%	3.2%	3.8%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	5.0%	10.2%	9.8%	44.5%	36.9%	105.0%	100.0%				

1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.
 2/ FY04 Total Obligations do not include Underfinancing or Rescission
 FY05 Totals reflect OMB Passbacks.

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2005

(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Animas-La Plata <u>1/</u>	\$22,700	unknown	\$69,234	N/A	\$341,697	1/	0	0	\$84,142	\$517,773
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project <u>2/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	70,795	0	0	20,000	90,795
Central Arizona Project <u>3/</u>	31,468	718,525	1,109,724	0	240,158	394,888	993,519	413,612	1,344,522	5,246,416
Central Valley Project:										
Auburn-Folsom South <u>4/</u>	1,731,156	484,496	261,957	0	0	8,374	0	2,425	407,115	2,895,523
American River Division Folsom Dam <u>5/</u>	122,545	34,297	18,544	0	0	100	0	0	30,619	206,105
Delta Division <u>6/</u>	119,990	33,581	18,157	0	0	86,681	0	0	268,538	526,947
Miscellaneous Project Programs <u>7/</u>	191,049	53,469	28,909	0	0	145,609	0	0	460,179	879,215
Sacramento River Division <u>8/</u>	239,375	66,993	36,222	0	0	28,643	0	54,450	110,427	536,110
San Felipe Division <u>9/</u>	86,070	0	263,611	0	0	447	0	0	38,995	389,123
San Joaquin Division <u>10/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	110,996	0	0	733,013	844,009
Shasta Division <u>11/</u>	113,617	31,798	17,192	0	0	35,611	0	0	114,915	313,133
Trinity River Restoration <u>12/</u>	161,611	45,230	24,455	0	0	4,863	0	0	142,599	378,758
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit <u>13/</u>	1,101,555	0	176,823	0	0	244,393	0	0	340,701	1,863,472
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I Division <u>14/</u>	15,042	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438,748	453,790
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title II Division: Basinwide Program <u>15/</u>	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	175,000	250,000
Lewis & Clark RWS <u>16/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	81,363	0	0	295,403	376,766
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project <u>17/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	56,208	0	0	18,736	74,944
Mid-Dakota Rural Water <u>18/</u>	0	0	21,274	0	0	9,670	0	0	123,453	154,397
Mni Wiconi Project <u>19/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	17,218	0	0	404,907	422,125
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project <u>20/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,215	0	0	20,000	80,215

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2005

(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I <u>21/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	412,600	0	0	20,000	432,600
Perkins County <u>22/</u>						6,582			20,330	26,912
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project <u>23/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0	20,000	80,000
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Garrison Diversion Unit <u>24/</u>	115,000	37	587,047	0	0	154,258	12,570	0	939,466	1,808,378
San Diego Area Water <u>25/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	517,770	0	0	172,590	690,360
San Gabriel Basin <u>26/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	114,270	0	0	38,090	152,360
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act <u>27/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68,331	68,331

1/ Based on October 2004 (FY 2005) Interim Cost Allocation: "Irrigators" includes irrigation feature related sunk costs expended prior to FY 1999 that are set aside and 5.175 million in sunk costs deemed non-reimbursable; "Other" includes Indian M&I for three tribes; "Non-Federal Share" is \$69,234 which is non-Indian and shown in the M&I column; "Non-reimbursable" includes cultural resources, wetlands and fish wildlife mitigation, fish and wildlife enhancement, and fishery mitigation and enhancement.

2/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$70,795,000 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 (\$1,859,716,435):** This total includes \$1,604,287,000 repayment obligation of the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (an additional \$45,713,000 will be met through performance of in-kind services as shown below under Non-Federal Share), a projected \$88,237,435 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 (\$240,158,370): 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, \$238,437,470 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 \$1,720,900 under the Plan 6 Upfront Funding agreement for the increased hydrogeneration resulting from the additional storage space in T. Roosevelt Reservoir.

Non-Federal Share (\$394,887,863): 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 \$45,713,000 for repair of siphon and other deficiencies; Maricopa County for Castle Hot Springs Road, \$861,838; Maricopa County for recreation, \$11,350,000; in-kind services contributed for recreation associated with the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and Tucson Terminal Storage Reservoir, \$14,388,000; Plan 6 entities \$227,645,000 (contributed by Central Arizona Water Conservation District, \$175,000,000; Arizona cities, \$42,679,000; Maricopa County Flood Control District, \$9,966,000); and interest during construction credit for interest bearing functions of the Plan 6 Up Front Funding Agreement contributions, \$33,390,000.

Leavitt Act (\$993,519,350): 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 (\$413,612,163): Unallocated repayment costs include \$356,956,000 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 \$56,656,163 for the Drainage Division. Construction for these features has been deferred indefinitely.

Non-reimbursable (\$1,344,521,688): Costs include Colorado River Division, \$900,277; Indian Distribution Division, \$652,387,000; recreation, \$135,835,826; flood control, \$122,787,807; Pima County flood and erosion control, \$3,500,000; cultural resources, \$42,378,564; contributed investigation costs, \$963,000, and siphon repair costs, \$50,920,351; and environmental enhancement costs, \$288,000. In addition, \$334,560,863 is determined to be non-reimbursable as a result of the Stipulated Settlement negotiated by the Department of Justice. Historically, based on Reclamation's cost allocation methodology, these costs exceeded the repayment ceiling and were considered reimbursable. That was challenged by the Central Arizona Water Conservation District. 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. On April 9, 2003 CAWCD and the United States agreed to extend the date to complete these conditions. A revised Stipulation was approved by the court on April 24, 2003, which extends the date for meeting the conditions and requirements to May 9, 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 as 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 (\$407,115,000):** Includes recreation, \$15,526,000; fish and wildlife, \$265,964,000; flood control, \$117,190,000; and navigation, \$8,435,000.
- 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 (\$30,619,000):** Includes \$100,000 for recreation facilities at Sly Park Reservoir, \$8,296,000 for flood control, \$597,000 for navigation, and \$21,626,000 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 (\$86,681,000):** Includes \$86,576,000 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 (\$268,538,000):** Includes \$100,000 for recreation, \$259,730,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,123,000 for flood control, and \$585,000 for navigation.
- 7/ **Non-Federal Share (\$145,609,000):** 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 \$145,573,000 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 (\$460,179,000):** Includes \$446,297,000 for fish and wildlife; \$28,000 for recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes in Fresno County, California; \$12,933,000 for flood control; and \$921,000 for navigation.
- 8/ **Power Users (\$66,993,000):** 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 (\$28,643,000): 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 \$17,597,000 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 (\$110,427,000): Includes \$282,000 for recreation, \$92,761,000 for fish and wildlife, \$16,204,000 for flood control, \$1,166,000 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 (\$38,995,000): Includes \$19,296,000 for recreation, \$19,445,000 for fish and wildlife, \$-50,000 for preconstruction investigations, \$199,000 for interest during construction, and \$105,000 for archeological, cultural and historical resources.

10/ **Non-Federal Share (\$110,996,000):** Includes \$100,561,000 for water acquisition program and \$10,435,000 for San Joaquin Basin Action Plan.

Non-reimbursable: Includes \$733,013,000 for fish and wildlife.

11/ **Non-Federal Share (\$35,611,000):** 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: \$22,082,000 for Shasta Temperature Control Device, \$4,299,000 for Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, \$8,782,000 for Clear Creek Restoration, and \$448,000 for spawning gravel.

Non-reimbursable (\$114,915,000): Includes \$106,670,000 for fish and wildlife, \$7,691,000 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 (\$142,599,000): Includes \$611,000 for recreation, \$130,261,000 for fish and wildlife, \$10,940,000 for flood control, and \$787,000 for navigation.

13/ **Non-Federal Share (\$244,393,000):** 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; \$240,450,000 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 (\$340,701,000): Includes \$3,226,000 for recreation; \$179,528,000 for fish and wildlife; \$79,104,000 for flood control; \$5,693,000 for navigation; \$4,770,000 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; and \$1,383,000 for incremental costs of improving existing roads to higher standards required for project construction (P.L. 87-874); and \$66,990,000 for settlement costs (Sumner Peck Ranch, Inc., et al vs. Bureau of Reclamation, et al).

14/ **Irrigators (\$15,042,000):** 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 \$15,042,000 represents Coachella Valley Water District's repayment obligation assuming the initial repayment installment by Coachella Valley Water District does not begin before October 1, 2007.

Non-reimbursable (\$438,748,000): Includes \$407,688,000 Mexican Treaty Measures, \$164,000 for nonreimbursable preauthorization investigation costs, and \$30,896,000 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 (\$81,363,000):** 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 (\$295,403,000): The legislation P.L. 106-246 authorizes \$213,887,700 of Federal grant funds which has been indexed to \$295,403,000 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 (\$56,208,000):** Includes \$29,640,000 from the Water Replenishment District of Southern California; and \$26,568,000 from the City of Long Beach.
- Non-reimbursable:** Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$18,736,000 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 (\$123,453,000):** Includes \$120,553,000 for Mid-Dakota Federal grant which is 85 percent of the appropriation ceiling of \$141,827,000; \$2,756,000 for Wetlands Development; and \$144,000 for transfers, credits, and other expenditures.
- 19/ **Non-Federal Share (\$17,218,000):** 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 (\$404,907,000):** 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, and P.L. 107-367.
- 20/ **Non-Federal Share (\$60,215,000):** Includes \$12,941,250 from San Elijo Joint Powers Authority; \$27,735,000 from Carlsbad Municipal Water District, \$8,769,000 by the Leucadia County Water District; and \$10,769,750 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 \$412,600,000 from Orange County Water District and/or Orange County Sanitation District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 22/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$6,582,000 from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- Non-reimbursable (\$20,330,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-136 authorized \$15 million of Federal grant funds, which have been indexed to \$20,330,000. 75 percent of the project is Federal grants; 25 percent of the project cost will come from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- 23/ **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.

24/ **Reimbursable (\$702,084,034):** The reimbursable costs are \$115,000,000 for irrigation (includes \$12,570,000 for Indian irrigation which is deferred indefinitely under the Leavitt Act); \$37,000 for power; and \$587,047,034 for municipal, rural, and industrial water.

Non-Federal Share (\$154,257,966): Includes State municipal, rural and industrial (\$140,000,000); 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 (\$939,466,000): Includes Municipal, Rural and Industrial Grant Program (\$418,600,000); fish & wildlife (\$97,010,000); Sheyenne River Release (\$44,200,000); flood control (\$38,000,000); Indian Municipal, Rural, and Industrial (\$249,800,000); 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.

25/ **Non-Federal Share (\$517,770,000):** Includes \$360,236,714 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; \$122,732,507 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 \$31,153,952 from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District.

Non-reimbursable: \$172,590,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.

26/ **Non-Federal Share (\$114,270,000):** Includes \$61,199,319 from the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, and/or other entities; \$36,310,500 from the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and \$16,760,181 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.

27/ **Non-reimbursable (\$68,331,000):** 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
American River Division Long Term Contract Renewal	Draft EIS due April 2004 and the final is due July 2004.
Delta Division	South Delta Barrier Program EIS/EIR was completed August 1996. This project has been incorporated into the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
Delta Long-Term Renewal Contracts	Draft EA due August 7, 2003. Final due January 14, 2004.
Mercy Springs Water District Assignments to Westlands Water District, Santa Clara Valley Water District and Pajaro Valley Water District Long-Term Renewal Contract Portion.	Administration Draft EA is preliminary and under development. The environment analysis was separated from the larger Delta Division Long-Term Renewal Contract assessments.
Friant Division	Eastside to Westside Transfers and Exchanges. Preliminary Administrative Draft EA is under development Millerton Lake Resource Management Plan and General Plan Programmatic EIS/EIR under development.
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.
Sacramento River Settlement Contracts	Draft EIS and BA is due October 1, 2003. Final EIS is due January 15, 2004. Record of decision is due February 15, 2004.
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. Notice of Availability has been submitted to publish in the Federal Register. Waiting on dates to begin public comment period.
Long-Term Renewal of CVP Contracts – San Felipe Unit	Draft Environmental Document due December 2003. San Luis Reservoir Low Point EIS to provide better water quality to Districts serviced by the Pacheco Tunnel (in the San Felipe Division) and Low Point in San Luis Reservoir. Notice of Intent published July 17, 2002.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
<p>West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>San Luis Unit Long Term Contract Renewal</p>	<p>Draft EIS is delayed due to possible renegotiations of contract and updates to analysis using new model. Draft due date is January 2004 and the final due date is August 2004.</p>
<p>San Luis Reservoir and Los Banos Creek State Recreation Area Joint General Plan and Resource Management Plan</p>	<p>Second public scoping meeting held February 20, 2003. Draft EIS is under development.</p>
<p>Shasta Division</p>	<p>Will be completed as required. The CALFED Program recommends enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir and Reclamation has begun this study.</p>
<p>Trinity River Restoration Program</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I Division</p>	<p>A projectwide final EIS was filed with the CEQ on June 18, 1975.</p>
<p>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Basinwide Program</p>	<p>All NEPA requirements will be complied with as needed.</p>
<p>Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project</p>	<p>Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before individual actions are undertaken.</p>

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
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	The Project sponsor has completed the Final Engineering Report (FER), Water Conservation Program Plan and the Environmental Assessment (EA). The FONSI was signed on March 5, 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 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 San Dieguito Groundwater Project is scheduled to be completed in September 2004.
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I	The Record of Decision was completed August 14, 2000.
Perkins County	The draft EA was sent out for public comment on November 8, 2002. The public comment period ended December 9, 2002. The FONSI was signed February 3, 2003.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Phoenix Metro Water Reclamation and Reuse Project	The NEPA is scheduled for completion in September 2006. The delay is because the City of Phoenix has decided to move more slowly with this project because of effluent availability and quality issues.
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. A FONSI for the North City Reclamation System Phase 1 was completed in April 2003. Categorical exclusions for the State Route 56 and Mira Sorrento Reclaimed Water Pipelines were completed in July and September 2003. 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 March 2004, based on revised schedule from the district. 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 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.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<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.
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. An environmental assessment for Tohono O'odham Nation's San Xavier District farm rehabilitation project is scheduled for completion in FY 2004 and an environmental impact statement on the San Xavier farm extension project is scheduled for completion in FY 2005.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
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. On April 9, 2003, CAWCD and the United States agreed to extend the date to complete these conditions. A revised Stipulation was approved by the court on April 24, 2003, which extends the date for meeting the conditions and requirements to May 9, 2012. 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 ranted 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. To facilitate Indian water right settlements in Arizona, Congress granted the Secretary authority to extend, on an annual basis, the repayment schedule of debts incurred under Section 9(d) of the Act of August 2, 1939 (43 USC 485h(d)) by irrigation districts which have contracts for water delivery from the Central Arizona Project. This authority was provided in the FY 2004 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, P.L. 108-137, Sec. 216(1).</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<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. The Harquahala Valley Irrigation District has applied to transfer the title of the distribution system from the United States to the District.</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><u>Delta Division</u></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 two are amendatory contracts, 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>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>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p>Central Valley Project (continued)</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>
<p><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 nine 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>Coming/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, two contracts (City of Shasta Lake and Mountain Gate CSD) are interim renewal contracts 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

Project	Status
<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>Perkins County Rural Water System</p>	<p>Cooperative Agreement was signed August 12, 2002, with Perkins County Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.</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>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Project	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.

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	3435.57	75.32	982.12					2378.13			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					2/								
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	5216.11							5216.11			N/A	N/A	N/A

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	\$396	1,227,295,406		<u>A/</u>
Less repayment of irrigation investment per acre by:				
Irrigators	-36	112,883,245		<u>A/</u>
Capital Relief	<u>-6</u>	18,269,536		<u>A/</u>
Unpaid Capital per Acre	354			
Payment capacity per acre-foot	\$12.07 to \$20.06			<u>B/</u>
Annual rates per acre-foot:				
Construction	\$0 to \$19.30			<u>C/</u>
Operation and maintenance	\$6.28 to \$19.20			<u>C/</u>
Deficit	.00 to \$20.86			<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, the irrigation plant investment repayment and capital relief are included in the 2003 water rates of 9/30/01.

B/ Based on the 2003 irrigation water rates.

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 2003 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.

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	\$ 66,660,000
CRDF & Contributions	4,199,000
Indian Irrigation Deferral	5,670,000
<u>UCRBF Revenue</u> <u>A/</u>	<u>1,138,918,000</u>
Total	\$1,215,447,000

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 2001 power repayment study. The Inspector General's Audit No. BOR 98-I-150, "Recovery of Irrigation Investment Costs", 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 2001 annual interest rate of 5.63 percent for 20-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 \$263,496,000 and the present value of a straight-line amortization is estimated to be \$373,923,000.

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.