

**Table of Contents**  
**Appendix**

<b>Report</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table of Contents.....	Appendix-1
Benefit Cost Ratios as of October 1, 2006.....	Appendix-2
Land Certification .....	Appendix-5
Obligations by Function for Operating Projects	
Pacific Northwest Region .....	Appendix-8
Mid-Pacific Region .....	Appendix-10
Lower Colorado Region .....	Appendix-12
Upper Colorado Region .....	Appendix-14
Great Plains Region .....	Appendix-18
Project Repayment FY 2007 .....	Appendix-23
Status of NEPA Compliance.....	Appendix-31
Status of Water Service and Repayment Contracts.....	Appendix-38
Summary of Irrigation Investment.....	Appendix-43

**BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2006**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Direct Benefits</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Animas-La Plata</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was requested by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.
<b>Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
<b>Central Arizona Project</b>	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 2006 Budget Justifications.
<b>Central Valley Projects (CVP):</b> 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 Trinity River Division Trinity River Restoration West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit		<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 Benefit estimates submitted in support of the authorization of the original project features are out of date.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>
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I</b>		<p>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.</p>

**BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2006**

<p><b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II</b> Title II - Basinwide Program</p>		<p>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.</p>
<p><b>Columbia/Snake River Salmon Recovery Project</b></p>		<p>Not applicable since benefits are intangible.</p>
<p><b>Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project</b></p>		<p>Not applicable since benefits are intangible.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Conservation/Recovery Projects</b></p>		<p>Not applicable since benefits are intangible.</p>
<p><b>Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System</b></p>		<p>Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-382.</p>
<p><b>Lewis and Clark Rural Water Supply</b></p>		<p>Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-246.</p>
<p><b>Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project</b></p>		<p>No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.</p>
<p><b>Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project</b></p>		<p>Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 102-575.</p>
<p><b>Minidoka Northside Drain Water Management Project</b></p>		<p>Not Applicable. Action provides for environmental compliance on an existing project.</p>
<p><b>Mni Wiconi Project</b></p>		<p>Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 100-516.</p>
<p><b>North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project</b></p>		<p>No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.</p>

**BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2006**

<b>Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
<b>Perkins County</b>		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-136.
<b>Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit</b>		Benefit-cost ratio has not been calculated since the passage of the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.
<b>San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
<b>San Gabriel Basin Project</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
<b>San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
<b>Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project</b>		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.

## LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Animas-La Plata	1/19/82	The Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000 authorizes the construction of only those facilities necessary to divert and store water for municipal and industrial uses. Construction of any other project features authorized under P.L. 90-537 (such as irrigation) shall not be commenced without further express authorization from Congress.
Central Arizona Project	4/16/73	The projectwide land certification was completed on April 16, 1973. During project construction, supplemental land certifications were completed on lands not included in the original projectwide certification. As of July 20, 1998, sufficient land has been certified on the Gila River Reservation to satisfy the requirement for delivery of Central Arizona Project (CAP) water. Final land certification on San Xavier Existing Farm Rehabilitation was completed in 1990 and the Existing Farm Extension was completed in 2005. Final land classification for the San Carlos Apache system is now planned for FY 2007 due to an extension in the completion of planning work. Land certifications for the remaining Indian reservation will be scheduled as required.
Central Valley Projects (CVP): American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit  Folsom Dam Gate Repairs  Delta Division	7/20/67  7/20/67  7/23/82	<p>Land Classification Certification includes Auburn-Folsom South Unit, Foresthill, and Sly Park Unit.</p> <p>Land Classification Certification includes Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, Broadview Water District, Contra Costa County Water District, Laguna Water District, Patterson Water District, Plain View Water District, Solado Water Districts (05/19/95), Sunflower Water District (05/19/95), and West Stanislaus Water District (11/8/96). In Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, field work is completed; the report was completed and certified on 04/99. Patterson Water District was completed in 08/97 and certified 08/99. Del Puerto Irrigation District field work is completed; the report was completed and certified in 07/01.</p> <p>Mendota Districts: Coehlo Family Trust field work completed 03/02; Eagle Field Water District field work completed 06/04; Fresno Slough field work completed 04/02; James Irrigation District field work completed in 2002; Laguna Water District field work completed 06/04;</p>

## LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Central Valley Projects (Cont.) Delta Division (Cont.)		Traction Ranch, Melvin Hughes (Mendota Pool) field work completed 04/02; Mercy Springs Water District No. 1606 field work completed 07/02; Tranquility Irrigation District field work completed 04/02; Widren Water District field work completed 06/04; and Oro Loma Water District field work completed 06/04.
East Side Division		New Melones
Friant Division	Various dates (Beginning with 1/13/50 and going to May 1996)	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	6/4/82	
Sacramento River Division	5/3/56	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).
San Felipe Division	8/20/75	Hollister and Santa Clara in 1975 and Watsonville on 1/19/79. Land Certification includes Watsonville Subarea and Hollister and Santa Clara Subareas.
Trinity River Division	7/24/64	Land Classification Certification includes Bella Vista Water District (12/90), Clear Creek South Unit (07/64), and Cow Creek Unit (07/62).

## LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit	5/11/62	Above Elevation 470 - 2/14/79. Land classification Certification includes San Luis Water Dist., Westlands Water District (10/91), Panoche Water District, and Pleasant Valley Water District.
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 and certification on San Xavier Existing Farm Extension was completed in 2005.

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		PROJECT TOTAL		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS		C/O	APPROPRIATED	
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2006	FY 2007
Boise Area Projects	1,924	2,152	4,524	4,543	615	604	0	0	348	311	712	523	1,210	1,298	1,686	2,037	0	0	11,019	11,468			
Federal	385	516	0		615	604			348	311	562	463	1,210	1,298	1,686	2,037			4,806	5,229	69	4,737	5,229
Water Users	1,539	1,636									150	60							1,689	1,696			
Other Agencies			4,524	4,543															4,524	4,543			
Columbia Basin-Total	5,135	5,250	82,475	87,477	1,431	1,669	7	7	334	415	731	736	301	304	2,968	3,166	689	768	94,071	99,792			
Federal	0	0	5,809	3,359	1,431	1,669	7	7	334	415	461	466	301	304	2,968	3,166	689	768	12,000	10,154	950	11,050	10,154
Water Users	5,135	5,250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,405	5,520			
Other Agencies	0	0	76,666	84,118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76,666	84,118			
Columbia Basin-Grand Coulee	3,035	3,150	82,475	87,477	1,255	1,243	7	7	330	390	0	0	0	0	139	300	0	0	87,241	92,567			
Federal			5,809	3,359	1,255	1,243	7	7	330	390					139	300			7,540	5,299	856	6,684	5,299
Water Users	3,035	3,150																	3,035	3,150			
Other Agencies			76,666	84,118															76,666	84,118			
Columbia Basin-Ephrata	2,100	2,100	0	0	176	426	0	0	4	25	731	736	301	304	2,829	2,866	689	768	6,830	7,225			
Federal					176	426			4	25	461	466	301	304	2,829	2,866	689	768	4,460	4,855	94	4,366	4,855
Water Users	2,100	2,100									270	270							2,370	2,370			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Crooked River Project	0	0	0	0	105	112	0	0	102	92	124	135	1,057	560	100	152	0	0	1,488	1,051			
Federal					105	112			102	92	74	85	682	500	100	152			1,063	941	14	1,049	941
Water Users										50	50	375	60						425	110			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Deschutes Project	0	0	0	0	57	61	0	0	105	85	262	324	85	152	32	64	0	0	541	686			
Federal					57	61			105	85	162	199	85	152	32	64			441	561	16	425	561
Water Users										100	125								100	125			
Eastern Oregon Projects	0	0	0	0	154	150	0	0	125	175	296	319	247	343	146	212	0	0	968	1,199			
Federal					154	150			125	175	196	219	247	270	146	212			868	1,026	10	858	1,026
Water Users										100	100			73					100	173			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Hungry Horse Project	0	0	5,499	5,143	203	402	0	0	38	73	0	0	38	73	0	0	0	0	5,778	5,691			
Federal			158	442	203	402			38	73			38	73					437	990	123	314	990
Water Users																			0	0			
Other Agencies			5,341	4,701															5,341	4,701			
Lewiston Orchards Project	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	175	0	100	0	23	0	0	0	110	0	429			
Federal						21				175		50		14			110		0	370	0		370
Water Users												50		9					0	59			
Other Agencies																			0	0			
Minidoka Area Projects	2,559	2,533	6,823	7,168	565	622	0	0	949	1,044	1,257	1,332	372	409	1,769	1,941	0	0	14,294	15,049			
Federal	694	773	243	267	565	622			949	1,044	1,070	1,217	372	409	1,694	1,872			5,587	6,204	83	5,504	6,204
Water Users	1,865	1,760									187	115			75	69			2,127	1,944			
Other Agencies			6,580	6,901															6,580	6,901			
Rogue River, Talent Division	0	0	1,191	1,137	159	283	0	0	301	137	636	652	80	311	100	142	0	0	2,467	2,662			
Federal					159	283			301	137	361	377	80	235	100	142			1,001	1,174	52	949	1,174
Water Users											275	275			76				275	351			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

PN 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 2006	FY 2007	
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006			FY 2007
Other Agencies			1,191	1,137															1,191	1,137				
Tualatin Project	61	86	0	0	44	48	73	86	430	96	55	72	123	171	15	92	0	0	801	651				
Federal					44	48			430	96	14	19	123	126	15	92			626	381	36		590	381
Water Users	61	86					73	86			41	53		45					175	270				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Umatilla Project	254	338	0	0	49	112	0	0	2,698	2,504	517	389	6	13	393	533	0	0	3,917	3,889				
Federal	129	226			49	112			2,698	2,504	467	339	6	13	393	533			3,742	3,727	19		3,723	3,727
Water Users	125	112									50	50							175	162				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Washington Area Projects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	94	0	5	0	112				
Federal												10				94		5	0	109			0	109
Water Users												3							0	3				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Yakima Project	1,368	1,533	4,400	4,724	1,002	1,136	0	0	5,952	7,214	858	831	99	112	113	112	0	0	13,792	15,662				
Federal	112		138	123	1,002	1,136	0	0	5,636	6,988	633	686	99	112	113	112	0	0	7,733	9,157	228		7,505	9,157
Water Users	850	1,029							100	100	225	145							1,175	1,274				
Other Agencies	406	504	4,262	4,601					216	126									4,884	5,231				
Exam Of Existing Structures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	1,527	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	1,527				
Federal											1,571	1,527							1,571	1,527	78		1,493	1,527
Water Users																			0	0				
Misc. Flood Control Operations	0	0	0	0	137	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	146				
Federal					137	146													137	146	5		132	146
Water Users																			0	0				
Total Obligations	11,301	11,892	104,912	110,192	4,521	5,366	80	93	11,382	12,321	7,019	6,953	3,618	3,769	7,322	8,545	689	883	150,844	160,014				
Total Appropriated	1,320	1,515	6,348	4,191	4,521	5,366	7	7	11,066	12,095	5,571	5,657	3,243	3,506	7,247	8,476	689	883	40,012	41,696	1,683		38,329	41,696
Total Water Users	9,575	9,873	0	0	0	0	73	86	100	100	1,448	1,296	375	263	75	69	0	0	11,646	11,687				
Total Other Agencies	406	504	98,564	106,001	0	0	0	0	216	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99,186	106,631				
% of Apprp. Funds	3.4%	3.6%	16.6%	10.1%	11.8%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	28.9%	29.0%	14.5%	13.6%	8.5%	8.4%	18.9%	20.3%	1.8%	2.1%	104.4%	100.0%				

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

**OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007								
Cachuma Project	573	607	0	0	538	558	296	0	37	40	0	0	0	0	336	374	6	0	1,786	1,579				
Federal	573	607			538	558	296	0	37	40					336	374	6	0	1,786	1,579	24	1,762	1,579	
Water Users																			0	0				
Central Valley Project:																								
CVP, American River Division	4,275	4,085	6,699	6,327	768	734	486	464	1,596	1,525	15	14	133	127	0	0	1,010	0	14,982	13,276				
Federal	4,275	4,085	2,119	2,024	768	734	486	464	1,596	1,525	15	14	133	127			1,010	0	10,402	8,973	10	10,392	8,973	
Water Users			4,580	4,303															4,580	4,303				
CVP, Delta Division	3,755	4,471	1,861	2,216	675	804	427	508	1,402	1,669	13	16	117	139	0	0	7,109	6,836	15,359	16,659				
Federal	3,755	4,471	1,861	2,216	675	804	427	508	1,402	1,669	13	16	117	139			7,109	6,836	15,359	16,659	17	15,342	16,659	
Water Users																	0	0	0	0				
CVP, East Side Division	1,813	1,876	2,400	2,228	326	337	206	213	677	700	6	7	57	59	0	0	22	0	5,506	5,419				
Federal	1,813	1,876	899	930	326	337	206	213	677	700	6	7	57	59			22	0	4,005	4,121	22	3,983	4,121	
Water Users			1,501	1,298															1,501	1,298				
CVP, Friant Division	2,508	2,598	1,243	1,288	451	467	285	295	936	970	9	9	78	81	0	0	414	0	5,923	5,708				
Federal	2,508	2,598	1,243	1,288	451	467	285	295	936	970	9	9	78	81			414	0	5,923	5,708	17	5,906	5,708	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, Misc. Proj. Programs	6,315	6,271	3,130	3,108	1,135	1,127	717	712	2,357	2,341	22	22	197	196	0	0	1,649	1,140	15,523	14,917				
Federal	6,315	6,271	3,130	3,108	1,135	1,127	717	712	2,357	2,341	22	22	197	196			1,649	1,140	15,523	14,917	39	15,484	14,917	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP RAX Program	10,004	8,337	4,958	4,132	1,798	1,498	1,136	947	3,734	3,112	35	29	312	260	0	0	4	0	21,982	18,315				
Federal	10,004	8,337	4,958	4,132	1,798	1,498	1,136	947	3,734	3,112	35	29	312	260			4	0	21,982	18,315	2	21,980	18,315	
Water Users																								
CVP, Sacramento Rvr. Div.	1,170	1,173	580	581	210	211	133	133	437	438	4	4	36	37	0	0	1,396	1,608	3,966	4,185				
Federal	1,170	1,173	580	581	210	211	133	133	437	438	4	4	36	37			1,396	1,608	3,966	4,185	7	3,959	4,185	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, San Felipe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	99	0	0	0	0	71	93	648	823	824	1,015				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	99	0	0	0	0	71	93	648	823	824	1,015	22	802	1,015	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, San Luis Unit	3,632	3,837	1,800	1,902	653	690	413	436	1,356	1,432	13	13	113	120	0	0	3,755	2,483	11,734	10,913				
Federal	3,632	3,837	1,800	1,902	653	690	413	436	1,356	1,432	13	13	113	120			3,755	2,483	11,734	10,913	45	11,689	10,913	
Water Users																			0	0				
CVP, Shasta Division	3,555	3,775	6,904	7,455	639	678	404	429	1,327	1,409	12	13	111	118	0	0	416	135	13,367	14,011				
Federal	3,555	3,775	1,762	1,871	639	678	404	429	1,327	1,409	12	13	111	118			416	135	8,225	8,427	24	8,201	8,427	
Water Users			5,142	5,584															5,142	5,584				
CVP, Trinity River Division	1,676	1,732	4,606	5,274	301	311	190	197	625	646	6	6	52	54	0	0	7,940	6,892	15,397	15,113				
Federal	1,676	1,732	830	858	301	311	190	197	625	646	6	6	52	54			7,940	6,892	11,621	10,697	15	11,606	10,697	
Water Users	0	0	3,776	4,416															3,776	4,416				
CVP, Wtr & Power Opertn.	5,141	5,067	4,903	5,191	924	911	584	575	1,919	1,891	18	18	160	158	0	0	22	0	13,670	13,811				
Federal	5,141	5,067	2,548	2,511	924	911	584	575	1,919	1,891	18	18	160	158			22	0	11,315	11,131	23	11,292	11,131	
Water Users			2,355	2,680															2,355	2,680				
Total Central Valley:																								
Federal	43,844	43,222	21,729	21,421	7,879	7,767	4,980	4,909	16,469	16,231	154	152	1,368	1,348	71	93	24,385	19,917	120,879	115,061	243	120,636	115,061	
Water Users	0	0	17,354	18,281	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,354	18,281	0	0	0	
Endangered Species Recovery	2,237	2,254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2,246	2,254				
Federal	2,237	2,254															9	0	2,246	2,254	9	2,237	2,254	
Water Users																			0	0				

**OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$ In Thousands)

MP 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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007								
Exam of Existing Structures	1,210	1,518	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,210	1,518				
Federal	1,210	1,518																	1,210	1,518	2	1,208	1,518	
Water Users																			0	0				
Klamath Project	994	1,246	0	0	0	0	183	229	7,708	9,918	0	0	0	0	938	1,207	12,190	12,285	22,012	24,885				
Federal	880	1,132					162	208	7,708	9,918					938	1,207	12,190	12,285	21,877	24,750	1,033	20,844	24,750	
Water Users	114	114					21	21											135	135				
Lahontan Basin Projects	212	300	373	528	0	0	1,101	1,556	433	613	0	0	23	33	2,384	3,372	2,849	1,387	7,376	7,789				
Federal	212	300	373	528	0	0	1,101	1,556	433	613	0	0	23	33	2,384	3,372	2,849	1,387	7,376	7,789	4	7,372	7,789	
Water Users																			0	0				
Land Resources Managmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	568	685	0	0	568	685				
Federal															568	685	0	0	568	685	1	567	685	
Water Users																			0	0				
Orland Project	39	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	879	674	0	0	0	0	918	688				
Federal	39	14											879	674					918	688	8	910	688	
Water Users																			0	0				
Reclamation Law Admin	761	598	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	761	598				
Federal	761	598																	761	598	1	760	598	
Water Users		0																	0	0				
Soil & Moisture Conserv	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	0				
Federal	107	0																	107	0	0	107	0	
Water Users																			0	0				
Solano Project	1,338	1,244	0	0	51	48	22	20	126	117	0	0	2,038	1,895	561	522	28	0	4,163	3,845				
Federal	1,338	1,244			51	48	22	20	126	117			2,038	1,895	561	522	28	0	4,163	3,845	28	4,135	3,845	
Water Users																			0	0				
Ventura River, Lake Casitas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	564	824	0	0	564	824				
Federal															564	824			564	824	0	564	824	
Water Users																			0	0				
WC Field Serv Program	334	229	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435	785	0	0	0	0	402	775	1,171	1,789				
Federal	334	229									435	785					402	775	736	1,004	0	736	1,004	
Water Users																			435	785				
<b>Total Obligations</b>	<b>51,649</b>	<b>51,232</b>	<b>39,457</b>	<b>40,230</b>	<b>8,468</b>	<b>8,373</b>	<b>6,580</b>	<b>6,715</b>	<b>24,773</b>	<b>26,919</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>937</b>	<b>4,308</b>	<b>3,950</b>	<b>5,422</b>	<b>7,076</b>	<b>39,869</b>	<b>34,364</b>	<b>181,115</b>	<b>179,796</b>				
<b>Total Appropriated</b>	<b>51,535</b>	<b>51,118</b>	<b>22,103</b>	<b>21,949</b>	<b>8,468</b>	<b>8,373</b>	<b>6,559</b>	<b>6,694</b>	<b>24,773</b>	<b>26,919</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>4,308</b>	<b>3,950</b>	<b>5,422</b>	<b>7,076</b>	<b>39,869</b>	<b>34,364</b>	<b>163,191</b>	<b>160,595</b>	<b>1,353</b>	<b>161,838</b>	<b>160,595</b>	
<b>Total Water Users</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>17,354</b>	<b>18,281</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17,924</b>	<b>19,201</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Total Other</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>				
<b>% of Appropriated Funds</b>	<b>31.6%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>16.8%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>				

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

2/ FY06 Total Obligations include Rescission

**OBLIGATION BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$\$ In Thousands)

**OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$ In Thousands)

LC 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 2/	FY 2006	FY 2007		FY 2006	FY 2007	
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007								
Ak Chin Water Rts S	#REF!	#REF!	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#REF!	#REF!				
Federal	6,824	7,920																	6,824	7,920	3	6,821	7,920	
Water Users	0	0																	0	0				
CAP Distribut Sys O	#REF!	#REF!	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#REF!	#REF!				
Federal	104	153																	104	153	13	91	153	
Water Users	40	40																	40	40				
CRBSCP, Title I	#REF!	#REF!	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,212	10,666	0	0	0	0	0	0	#REF!	#REF!				
Federal	0	0									10,112	10,566							10,112	10,566	0	10,112	10,566	
Water Users	0	0									100	100							100	100				
Lower CO Rvr Ops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,749	19,206	8,694	7,519	0	0	0	0	0	0	27,443	26,725				
Federal									9,387	9,603	8,600	7,425							17,987	17,028	1,033	16,954	17,028	
Water Users									9,362	9,603	94	94							9,456	9,697				
Parker-Davis Project	0	0	6,740	8,049	2,545	3,855	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9,285	11,904				
Federal			0	0	0	0													0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users			6,740	8,049	2,545	3,855													9,285	11,904				
Salt River Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534	651	0	0	534	651				
Federal															284	297			284	297	0	284	297	
Water Users															250	354			250	354				
So Arizona Wtr Righ	1,571	5,769	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	5,769				
Federal																			0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users																			0	0				
Other Federal	1,571	5,769																	1,571	5,769				
Yuma Area Projects	2,452	2,502	0	0	17,173	18,183	0	0	1,176	1,147	0	0	0	0	1,048	950	0	0	21,849	22,782				
Federal	2,452	2,502			17,123	18,133			1,176	1,147					1,048	950			21,799	22,732	0	21,799	22,732	
Water Users					50	50													50	50				
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	396	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	396				
Federal									39	396									39	396	39	0	396	
Water Users																			0	0				
Exam of Exist Struct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	665	727	0	0	0	0	0	0	665	727				
Federal											665	727							665	727	2	663	727	
Water Users											0	0							0	0				
Land Resource Mgm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,503	2,120	0	0	1,503	2,120				
Federal															1,503	2,120			1,503	2,120	7	1,496	2,120	
Water Users																			0	0				
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	31				
Federal							81	31											81	31	3	78	31	
Water Users																			0	0				
Reclam Law Admin	332	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332	0				

**OBLIGATION BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$\$ In Thousands)

LC 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 2/			APPROPRIATED		
	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007		FY 2006	FY 2007	
Federal Water Users	332	0																	332	0	0	332	0	
Rec & F&WL Adm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,311	1,298	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,311	1,298				
Federal Water Users									686	673									686	673	23	663	673	
WCFSP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,085	3,730	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,085	3,730				
Federal Water Users									4,110	2,697									4,110	2,697	0	4,110	2,697	
										975		1,033							975	1,033				
Total Obligations	11,323	16,384	6,740	8,049	19,718	22,038	81	31	21,275	22,047	24,656	22,642	0	0	3,085	3,721	0	0	86,878	94,912				
Total Appropriated	9,712	10,575	0	0	17,123	18,133	81	31	11,288	11,819	23,487	21,415	0	0	2,835	3,367	0	0	64,526	65,340		63,403	65,340	
Total Other Federal	1,571	5,769	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,571	5,769				
Total Water Users	40	40	6,740	8,049	2,595	3,905	0	0	9,987	10,228	1,169	1,227	0	0	250	354	0	0	20,781	23,803				
% of Appropriated F	15.1	16.2	0.0	0.0	26.5	27.8	0.1	0.0	17.5	18.1	36.4	32.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	5.2	0.0	0.0	100	100				
Permanent O&M Boulder Canyon Project			80,974	83,309														0	0	80,974	83,309			
Federal Water Users			80,974	83,309														0	0	80,974	83,309	0	80,974	83,309
Permanent O&M Appropriations	0	0	80,974	83,309	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Grand Totals LC Region O&M	9,712	10,575	80,974	83,309	17,123	18,133	81	31	11,288	11,819	23,487	21,415	0	0	2,835	3,367	0	0	64,526	65,340	0	63,403	65,340	

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

2/ Funding for SSA is in Bureauwide Security Budget in FY 2006 (\$210,000).

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC 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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
Balmorhea Project									23	26		16							23	42				
Federal									23	26		16							23	42			23	42
Water Users																								
Bonneville Unit,CUP					22	66					5	498	572	36	37	273	380	4,191	300	5,020	1,360			
Federal					22	66					5	498	572	36	37	273	380	4,191	300	5,020	1,360	150	4,870	1,360
Water Users																								
Bostwick Park Project												203	171			36	51			239	222			
Federal												203	171			36	51			239	222		239	222
Water Users																								
Carlsbad Project					3,175	2,316					1,595	1,495	315	953		396	357			3,165	5,300			
Federal					697	651					1,595	1,495	315	953		396	357		179	3,003	3,635	48	2,955	3,635
Water Users					162	1,665														162	1,665			
Collbran Project			1,004	468								283	973			80	99			1,367	1,540			
Federal			1,004	468								283	973			80	99			1,367	1,540		1,367	1,540
Water Users																								
Dallas Creek Project					27	40						279	251			79	97			385	388			
Federal					27	40						279	251			79	97			385	388		385	388
Water Users																								
Dolores Project			436	498								954	901			77	93			1,467	1,492			
Federal												810	732			77	93			887	825		887	825
Water Users																								
Other Agencies			436	498								144	169							580	667			
Eden Project												32	29	25	28	61	114			118	171			
Federal												32	29	25	28	61	114			118	171		118	171
Water Users																								
Emery County Project												70	78		15	59	31			129	124			
Federal												70	78	0	15	59	31			129	124		129	124
Water Users																								
Florida Project					36	39						153	117				54			189	210			
Federal					36	39						153	117				54			189	210		189	210
Water Users																								
Fruitgrowers Dam Project												140	158				67			140	225			
Federal												140	158				67			140	225		140	225
Water Users																								
Grand Valley, CRBSCP											395	398	618	881		159	103			1,172	1,382			
Federal											395	398	348	548		159	103			902	1,049	41	861	1,049
Water Users																								
Other Agencies												270	333							270	333			
Hammond Project												63	66			56	70			119	136			
Federal												63	66			56	70			119	136		119	136
Water Users																								
Hyrum Project												51	52	17	18	80	81			148	151			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC 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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007			
Federal											51	52	17	18	80	81			148	151		148	151
Water Users																							
Jensen Unit, CUP					35	35					74	86	10	11	110	116			229	248			
Federal					35	35					74	86	10	11	110	116			229	248		229	248
Water Users																							
Lyman Project											48	52	5		4	3			57	55			
Federal											48	52	5	0	4	3			57	55		57	55
Water Users																							
Mancos Project											153	103			18	32			171	135			
Federal											153	103			18	32			171	135	7	164	135
Water Users																							
Middle Rio Grande Project	1,118	1,120							18,512	16,407	11,109	8,986			252	312			30,991	26,825			
Federal									16,434	14,462	11,109	8,986			252	312			27,795	23,760		27,795	23,760
Water Users	1,118	1,120							2,078	1,945									3,196	3,065			
Moon Lake Project											26	29	5	2	7	1			38	32			
Federal											26	29	5	2	7	1			38	32		38	32
Water Users																							
Navajo Unit, CRSP									36		59	100	210	374					305	474			
Federal									36		59	100	103	96					198	196	36	162	196
Water Users																							
Non-Federal													107	278					107	278			
Other Agencies																							
Newton Project											22	25	25	48	16	7			63	80			
Federal											22	25	25	48	16	7			63	80		63	80
Water Users																							
Ogden River Project											61	70	6	6	181	193			248	269			
Federal											61	70	6	6	181	193			248	269		248	269
Water Users																							
Paonia Project					38	46					155	209	23	6		87			216	348			
Federal					38	46					155	209	15	0		87			208	342		208	342
Water Users													8	6				8	6				
Non-Federal																							
Other Agencies																							
Paradox Unit, CRBSCP											2,650	2,815			7	12			2,657	2,827			
Federal											1,999	2,115			7	12			2,006	2,127		2,006	2,127
Water Users																							
Other Agencies											651	700							651	700			
Pecos River Basin Water Sal											321	339							321	339			
Federal											171	189							171	189		171	189
Water Users											150	150							150	150			
Pine River					38	40					229	83			84	120			349	307			
Federal					38	40					229	83		64	82	120			349	307	120	229	307

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC 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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007		FY 2006	FY 2007	
Water Users																								
Other Agencies																								
Provo River Project			244	190					1,262	1,294	322	360	17	33	222	112			2,067	1,989				
Federal			244	190					392	424	322	360	17	33	222	112			1,197	1,119	48	1,149	1,119	
Water Users									870	870									870	870				
Other Agencies																								
Rio Grande Project	600	605	1,683	1,734					77	137	2,180	2,303			514	350			5,054	5,129				
Federal			1,683	1,734					77	137	2,180	2,303			514	350			4,454	4,524		4,454	4,524	
Water Users	600	605																	600	605				
San Juan-Chama Project							1,412	1,371			299	313			47	35			1,758	1,719				
Federal											299	313			47	35	0		346	348		346	348	
Water Users							1,412	1,371											1,412	1,371				
San Luis Valley, Closed Basin									225	250	5,189	5,082			38	38			5,452	5,370				
Federal									225	250	5,189	5,082			38	38			5,452	5,370		5,452	5,370	
Water Users																								
San Luis Valley, Conejos					10							59			4	4			14	63				
Federal					10	0						59			4	4			14	63		14	63	
Water Users																								
Scotfield Project										10	26	33	15	18	66	44			107	105				
Federal										10	26	33	15	18	66	44			107	105		107	105	
Water Users																								
Seedskaadee Unit													45	82					45	82				
Federal													45	82					45	82		45	82	
Water Users																								
Silt Project											171	157	274	278	71	85			516	520				
Federal											171	157	140	144	71	85			382	386		382	386	
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													134	134					134	134				
Other Agencies																								
Smith Fork Project											127	278	312	124		78			439	480				
Federal											127	278	159	0		78			286	356		286	356	
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													153	124					153	124				
Other Agencies																								
Strawberry Valley Project											83	89	5		87	124			175	213				
Federal											83	89	5	0	87	124			175	213		175	213	
Water Users																								
Tucumcari											20	26			40	10			60	36				
Federal											20	26			40	10			60	36		60	36	
Water Users																								
Uncompahgre Project											201	193			82	97			283	290				
Federal											201	193			82	97			283	290		283	290	



OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION	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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
Arbuckle Project	0	0	0	0	29	30	0	0	150	150	0	0	0	0	10	14	0	0	189	194				
Federal	0	0	0	0	29	30	0	0	150	144	0	0	0	0	10	14			189	188			189	188
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	6				
Canadian River	0	0	0	0	32	80	0	0	75	65	0	0	68	14	10	8	0	0	185	167				
Federal	0	0	0	0	32	80	0	0	75	65	0	0	40	2	10	8			157	155			157	155
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	12	0	0			28	12				
Colorado-Big Thompson	2,807	2,567	14,290	13,537	0	0	0	0	110	117	685	733	394	474	374	282	0	0	18,660	17,710				
Federal	2574	2332	11580	11257	0	0	0	0	110	117	685	733	394	474	374	282			15,717	15,195			15,717	15,195
Water Users	233	235	2710	2280	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			2,943	2,515				
Fry-Ark Project	886	769	5,481	4,643	382	332	697	508	858	744	0	0	90	58	425	404	0	0	8,819	7,458				
Federal	781	669	5171	4349	382	332	697	508	858	744	0	0	90	58	425	404			8,404	7,064	112		8,292	7,064
Water Users	105	100	310	294	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			415	394				
Kendrick Project	150	226	3,418	3,873	22	14	0	0	16.5	18	0	0	154.5	54	118	221	0	0	3,879	4,406				
Federal	150	226	3398	3841	22	14	0	0	16.5	18	0	0	142.5	54	118	221			3,847	4,374			3,847	4,374
Water Users	0	0	20	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0			32	32				
Leadville Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,044	0	0	2,500	2,044				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,500	2,044			2,500	2,044	300		2,200	2,044
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0				
Mid-Dakota Rural	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	396	0	410	15				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	396	0	410	15			410	15
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
McGee Creek	0	0	0	0	355	400	0	0	8	8	0	0	104	84	73	81	0	0	540	573				
Federal	0	0	0	0	355	398	0	0	8	8	0	0	87	84	73	81			523	571			523	571
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0			17	2				
Milk River	936	1,225	0	0	386	521	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	137	549	779	0	0	2,008	2,662				
Federal	292	525	0	0	320	499	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	137	489	425			1,238	1,586			1,238	1,586
Water Users	644	700	0	0	66	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	354			770	1,076				
Mirage Flat	0	0	0	0	21	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	83	0	0	91	125				
Federal	0	0	0	0	9	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	83			79	113			79	113
Water Users	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			12	12				
Mni Wiconi	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,682	9,256	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22,615	22,914	29,297	32,170				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,682	9,256	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22,579	22,914	29,261	32,170			29,261	32,170
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36		36	0				
Mountain Park	0	0	0	0	117	139	0	0	79	138	0	0	92	0	73	120	0	0	361	397				
Federal	0	0	0	0	117	118	0	0	79	138	0	0	67	0	73	120			336	376			336	376
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0			25	21				
Norman Project	0	0	0	0	112	144	0	0	98	100	0	0	195	138	58	51	0	0	463	433				
Federal	0	0	0	0	112	144	0	0	98	100	0	0	111	49	58	51			379	344			379	344
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	89	0	0			84	89				
North Platte	515	1,147	1,115	1,584	31	31	0	0	14	16	0	0	382	339	312	215	0	0	2,369	3,332				
Federal	500	1,122	578	1,084	31	31	0	0	14	16	0	0	362	306	312	215			1,797	2,774			1,797	2,774
Water Users	15	25	537	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33	0	0			572	558				
Nueces River	0	0	0	0	9	29	0	0	13	13	0	0	451	414	80	85	0	0	553	541				
Federal	0	0	0	0	9	29	0	0	13	13	0	0	408	388	80	85			510	515			510	515
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	26	0	0			43	26				
Ainsworth Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453	557	0	0	453	557				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION	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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399	505			399	505		399	505
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	52			54	52			
Almena Unit	6	10	0	0	59	82	5	8	0	0	0	0	233	408	265	236	0	0	568	744				
Federal	6	10	0	0	49	67	5	8	0	0	0	0	233	408	249	228			542	721	184	358	721	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8			26	23				
Angostura Unit	17	22	0	0	1,050	959	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	42	128	135	0	0	1,195	1,200				
Federal	17	22	0	0	977	854	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	42	128	135			1,122	1,095		1,122	1,095	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	73	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			73	105				
Armel Unit	83	81	0	0	259	263	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	194	11	37	0	0	548	575				
Federal	83	81	0	0	259	263	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	125	11	37			473	506		473	506	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	69	0	0			75	69				
Belle Fourche Unit	383	527	0	0	0	15	0	0	41	50	0	0	129	141	103	105	0	0	656	838				
Federal	219	334	0	0	0	15	0	0	41	50	0	0	129	141	103	105			492	645		492	645	
Water Users	164	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			164	193				
Bostwick Unit	9	96	0	0	367	519	0	0	514	388	0	0	149	115	0	99	0	0	1,039	1,217				
Federal	9	96	0	0	22	214	0	0	514	388	0	0	98	38	0	99			643	835		643	835	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	345	305	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	77	0	0			396	382				
Boysen Unit	15	20	1,289	1,456	247	313	0	0	12	13	74	69	381	171	153	184	0	0	2,171	2,226				
Federal	15	20	1,275	1,438	247	313	0	0	12	13	44	29	318	111	153	184			2,064	2,108		2,064	2,108	
Water Users	0	0	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	63	60	0	0			107	118				
Buffalo Bill Dam Mod.	0	0	2,881	2,535	119	116	0	0	11	11	0	0	130	132	128	61	0	0	3,269	2,855				
Federal	0	0	2,881	2,535	119	116	0	0	11	11	0	0	130	132	105	38			3,246	2,832		3,246	2,832	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	23			23	23				
Canyon Ferry Unit	63	143	2,808	3,539	168	379	1	3	0	0	0	0	1,458	434	143	242	0	0	4,641	4,740				
Federal	63	143	2,790	3,520	168	379	1	3	0	0	0	0	1,458	434	135	236			4,615	4,715		4,615	4,715	
Water Users	0	0	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6			26	25				
Cedar Bluff Unit	0	0	0	0	158	161	5	5	155	160	0	0	0	0	72	156	0	0	390	482				
Federal	0	0	0	0	158	161	5	5	155	160	0	0	0	0	56	140			374	466		374	466	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16			16	16				
Dickinson Unit	0	0	0	0	36	63	0	0	293	293	0	0	0	48	147	81	0	0	476	485				
Federal	0	0	0	0	21	48	0	0	268	268	0	0	0	48	147	81			436	445		436	445	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0			40	40				
East Bench Unit	269	255	0	0	131	126	1	1	47	45	0	0	329	331	76	108	0	0	853	866				
Federal	56	84	0	0	131	126	1	1	47	45	0	0	329	331	76	108			640	695		640	695	
Reflects O&M during Construct	213	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			213	171				
Farwell Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Frenchman-Camb Unit	123	154	0	0	341	406	0	0	356	236	0	0	866	713	185	430	0	0	1,871	1,939				
Federal	123	154	0	0	287	344	0	0	356	236	0	0	712	674	185	430			1,663	1,838		1,663	1,838	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	54	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	39	0	0			208	101				
Garrison Diversion Unit	0	0	0	0	378	391	3,523	4,469	33	34	0	0	9	9	118	124	26,872	22,783	30,933	27,810				
Federal	0	0	0	0	323	360	3523	4469	33	34	0	0	9	9	118	124	23315	19225	27,321	24,221		27,321	24,221	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	55	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3557	3558	3,612	3,589				
Glen Elder Unit	3	0	0	0	584	573	3	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	129	294	0	0	742	870				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION	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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007			
Federal	3	0	0	0	584	573	3	3	23	0	0	0	0	0	113	280			726	856		726	856
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14			16	14			
Heart Butte Unit	95	136	0	0	185	238	0	0	35	51	373	338	0	0	316	355	0	0	1,004	1,118			
Federal	95	136	0	0	172	213	0	0	35	51	373	338	0	0	316	355			991	1,093		991	1,093
Water Users	0	0	0	0	13	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			13	25			
Helena Valley Unit	131	164	0	0	0	0	14	18	12	16	0	0	0	0	40	52	0	0	197	250			
Federal	55	81	0	0	0	0	14	18	12	16	0	0	0	0	40	52	0	0	121	167		121	167
Water Users	76	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	83			
Kansas River Area	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	0	139	0	0
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Keyhole Unit	122	107	0	0	482	425	3	2	255	249	0	0	0	75	119	123	0	0	981	981			
Federal	122	107	0	0	221	191	3	2	255	249	0	0	0	75	96	100			697	724		697	724
Water Users	0	0	0	0	261	234	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	23			284	257			
Kirwin Unit	3	2	0	0	135	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	111	9	137	0	0	290	400			
Federal	3	2	0	0	117	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	111	9	137			272	385		272	385
Water Users	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			18	15			
Lower Marias Unit	0	0	0	0	687	736	0	0	53	56	0	0	774	311	162	244	0	0	1,676	1,347			
Federal	0	0	0	0	687	736	0	0	53	56	0	0	774	311	162	244			1,676	1,347		1,676	1,347
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
Missouri Basin Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,866	1,926	0	0	1,866	1,926			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,866	1,926			1,866	1,926		1,866	1,926
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
Narrows Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	86	0	0	84	86			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	86			84	86		84	86
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
North Loup Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399	316	0	0	399	316			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	306			387	306	156	231	306
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10			12	10			
North Platte Area	26	0	7,011	7,479	399	275	0	0	10.5	21	0	0	558.5	340	154	172	0	0	8,159	8,287			
Federal	26	0	6986	7449	399	275	0	0	10.5	21	0	0	428.5	203	154	172			8,004	8,120		8,004	8,120
Water Users	0	0	25	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	137	0	0			155	167			
Oahe Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	66	0	0	168	133			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	66			168	133		168	133
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
Owl Creek Unit	43	48	0	0	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	26	32	33	0	0	118	126			
Federal	43	48	0	0	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	26	32	33			118	126		118	126
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
Rapid Valley - Pactola	0	0	0	0	96	89	106	97	21	19	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	224	213			
Federal	0	0	0	0	96	89	106	97	21	19	0	0	0	0	1	8			224	213		224	213
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0			
Riverton Unit	0	0	360	470	45	53	0	0	18.5	21	24	24	38.5	43	345	371	0	0	831	982			
Federal	0	0	360	470	45	53	0	0	18.5	21	14	14	38.5	43	345	371			821	972		821	972
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0			10	10			
Sargent Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			



**OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS**

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION	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 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2007				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	297	0	0			297	297		297	297	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0				
Rec & F&WL Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	168	0	0	374	122	0	0	0	0	606	290			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	168	0	0	374	122	0	0			606	290	606	290	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0				
Reclam Law Admin	441	313	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	441	313				
Federal	441	313	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		441	313	441	313		
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0				
Site Security	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0				
Water Mgmt & Cons	2,372	1,198	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,372	1,198				
Federal	2,079	1,137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			2,079	1,137	2,079	1,137		
Water Users	293	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			293	61				
<b>Total Obligations</b>	<b>12,551</b>	<b>12,252</b>	<b>44,842</b>	<b>45,610</b>	<b>10,111</b>	<b>11,269</b>	<b>11,294</b>	<b>14,477</b>	<b>4,832</b>	<b>4,085</b>	<b>1,270</b>	<b>1,268</b>	<b>9,158</b>	<b>6,564</b>	<b>14,036</b>	<b>14,502</b>		<b>45,697</b>	<b>157,976</b>	<b>155,724</b>				
<b>Total Appropriated</b>	<b>10,704</b>	<b>10,653</b>	<b>41,208</b>	<b>42,437</b>	<b>8,996</b>	<b>10,205</b>	<b>11,294</b>	<b>14,477</b>	<b>4,807</b>	<b>4,054</b>	<b>1,178</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>8,333</b>	<b>5,893</b>	<b>13,742</b>	<b>13,931</b>		<b>42,139</b>	<b>146,551</b>	<b>144,962</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>145,660</b>	<b>144,962</b>	
<b>Total Water Users</b>	<b>1,847</b>	<b>1,599</b>	<b>3,634</b>	<b>3,173</b>	<b>1,115</b>	<b>1,064</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>571</b>		<b>3,558</b>	<b>11,425</b>	<b>10,762</b>				
<b>% of Appropriated Funds</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>29.3%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>		<b>0.0%</b>	<b>29.1%</b>	<b>100.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>			

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

**PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2007**

(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
<b>Animas-La Plata</b> <u>1/</u>	1/	1/	1/	N/A	1/	1/	0	0	1/	\$552,004
<b>Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project</b> <u>2/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	70,775	0	0	20,000	90,775
<b>Central Arizona Project</b> <u>3/</u>	32,493	744,145	1,152,574	0	238,402	402,120	1,029,692	347,409	1,572,127	5,518,962
<b>Central Valley Project:</b>										
Auburn-Folsom South <u>4/</u>	1,920,036	557,104	206,191	0	0	8,374	0	2,425	450,429	3,144,559
American River Division Folsom Dam <u>5/</u>	108,999	31,626	11,705	0	0	0	0	0	29,814	182,144
Delta Division <u>6/</u>	141,499	41,056	15,196	0	0	64,288	0	0	203,185	465,224
Miscellaneous Project Programs <u>7/</u>	203,105	58,932	21,811	0	0	151,192	0	0	477,269	912,308
Sacramento River Division <u>8/</u>	249,945	72,522	26,841	0	0	30,003	0	54,450	115,752	549,513
San Felipe Division <u>9/</u>	85,155	0	263,074	0	0	447	0	0	38,832	387,508
San Joaquin Division <u>10/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	75,311	0	0	626,524	701,835
Shasta Division <u>11/</u>	115,573	33,534	12,411	0	0	36,787	0	0	112,464	310,769
Trinity River Restoration <u>12/</u>	165,094	47,903	17,729	0	0	4,863	0	0	186,576	422,165
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit <u>13/</u>	1,426,035	0	153,141	0	0	241,673	0	0	336,215	2,157,064
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I Division</b> <u>14/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453,790	453,790
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title II Division: Basinwide Program</b> <u>15/</u>	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	175,000	250,000
<b>Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water system</b> <u>16/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	22,575	0	0	241,018	263,593
<b>Lewis &amp; Clark RWS</b> <u>17/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	90,843	0	0	332,355	423,198
<b>Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project</b> <u>18/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	56,997	0	0	18,999	75,996
<b>Mid-Dalota Rural Water</b> <u>19/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2007										
(\$ In Thousands)										
Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Mni Wiconi Project <u>20/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	17,443	0	0	436,873	454,316
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project <u>21/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	64,442	0	0	20,000	84,442
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I <u>22/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	412,600	0	0	20,000	432,600
Perkins County <u>23/</u>						7,768			23,248	31,016
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project <u>24/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0	20,000	80,000
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Garrison Diversion Unit <u>25/</u>	100,165	37	452,144	0	0	161,838	12,570	0	1,199,602	1,926,356
San Diego Area Water <u>26/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	517,770	0	0	172,590	690,360
San Gabriel Basin <u>27/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	114,270	0	0	38,090	152,360
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act <u>28/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68,331	68,331

1/ P.L. 109-148, December 30, 2005, amended the nontribal repayment language of P.L. 108-447, by providing a technical correction. Following consultation with repayment entities, as required by P.O. 106-554, the construction cost allocation will be provided at a later date. "Total" column cost represents the \$500,000,000, January 2003 Construction Cost Estimate indexed to the October 2006 level of \$552,004,000.

2/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$70,775,000 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 (\$1,929,212,381):** 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 \$157,733,381 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 (\$238,402,310):** 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, \$238,402,310 which includes the Harquahala Valley and Hohokam Irrigation and Drainage Districts. Harquahala's repayment debt was extinguished by relinquishing their water rights in December 1992. Hohokam's was reassigned to the central Arizona cities to satisfy their Cliff Dam replacement water in December 1993; Arizona's central cities will pay \$1,738,752 under the Plan 6

Upfront Funding agreement for the increased hydrogeneration resulting from the additional storage space in T. Roosevelt Reservoir.

**Non-Federal Share (\$402,119,863):** 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, \$12,155,000; in-kind services contributed for recreation associated with the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and Tucson Terminal Storage Reservoir, \$18,966,000; Plan 6 entities \$229,494,000 (contributed by Central Arizona Water Conservation District, \$175,000,000; Arizona cities, \$42,802,000; Maricopa County Flood Control District, \$9,966,000, Arizona central cities will pay \$1,726,000 under the Plan 6 Upfront Funding agreement for the increased hydrogeneration resulting from the additional storage space in T. Roosevelt Reservoir.); and interest during construction credit for interest bearing functions of the Plan 6 Up Front Funding Agreement contributions, \$33,390,000.

**Leavitt Act (\$1,029,692,123):** 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 (\$347,409,163):** Unallocated repayment costs include \$282,589,000 for the Middle Gila Division which cannot be allocated unless the beneficiaries and repayment entities are identified and functions determined and \$64,820,163 for the Drainage Division. Construction of Middle Gila and Drainage divisions has been deferred indefinitely.

**Non-reimbursable (\$1,572,126,911):** Costs include Colorado River Division, \$900,277; Indian Distribution Division, \$699,944,000; recreation, \$134,546,462; flood control, \$122,176,565; Pima County flood and erosion control, \$3,500,000; cultural resources, \$41,552,967 contributed investigation costs, \$963,000, and siphon repair costs, \$50,920,000; and environmental enhancement costs, \$288,000. Also includes \$125,292,000 for construction of the Upper Gila Division which is non-reimbursable under provisions of Public Law 108-451. In addition, \$392,043,640 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 "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 (\$450,429,000):** Includes recreation, \$10,382,000; fish and wildlife, \$297,042,000; flood control, \$133,404,000; and navigation, \$9,601,000.

5/ **Non-reimbursable (\$29,814,000):** Includes \$7,573,000 for flood control, \$545,000 for navigation, and \$21,696,000 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 (\$64,288,000):** Includes \$64,183,000 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 (\$203,185,000):** Includes \$100,000 for recreation, \$192,546,000 for fish and wildlife, \$9,831,000 for flood control, and \$708,000 for navigation.

7/ **Non-Federal Share (\$151,192,000):** 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 \$151,156,000 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 (\$477,769,000):** Includes \$462,113,000 for fish and wildlife; \$28,000 for recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes in Fresno County, California; \$14,112,000 for flood control; and \$1,016,000 for navigation.

8/ **Power Users (\$72,522,000):** 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 (\$30,003,000):** 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: \$12,928,000 for fish screens and fish recovery facilities associated with the Hamilton City

Pumping Plant (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), and \$17,075,000 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 (\$115,752,000):** Includes \$282,000 for recreation, \$96,839,000 for fish and wildlife, \$17,366,000 for flood control, \$1,251,000 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 (\$38,832,000):** Includes \$19,214,000 for recreation, \$19,364,000 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 (\$75,311,000):** Includes \$61,982,000 for water acquisition program and \$13,329,000 for San Joaquin Basin Action Plan.

**Non-reimbursable:** Includes \$621,748,000 for fish and wildlife.

11/ **Non-Federal Share (\$36,787,000):** 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: \$22,087,000 for Shasta Temperature Control Device, \$4,299,000 for Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, \$9,953,000 for Clear Creek Restoration, and \$448,000 for spawning gravel.

**Non-reimbursable (\$112,464,000):** Includes \$103,856,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,030,000 for flood control, and navigation for \$578,000.

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 (\$186,576,000):** Includes \$611,000 for recreation, \$173,668,000 for fish and wildlife, \$11,471,000 for flood control, and \$826,000 for navigation.

13/ **Non-Federal Share (\$241,673,000):** 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; \$237,730,000 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 (\$336,215,000):** Includes \$3,226,000 for recreation; \$220,617,000 for fish and wildlife; \$99,081,000 for flood control; \$7,131,000 for navigation; \$4,770,000 for non-reimbursable 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).

14/ **Non-reimbursable (\$453,790,000):** Includes \$407,688,000 Mexican Treaty Measures, \$164,000 for non-reimbursable preauthorization investigation costs, and \$45,938,000 for non-reimbursable irrigation costs. A repayment contract with Coachella Valley Water District for \$45,938,000 was executed March 14, 1978 and validated June 30, 1978. The contract provided 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. In October 2003, the contract was amended to add provisions of Title II of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act. These provisions made the repayment non-reimbursable during the planning, design and construction of works associated with the settlement act and during the period that the Indian Water Authority and the local entities (as defined in Section 102 of the settlement act) receive up to 16,000 acre-feet of water conserved by the works. As a result of these provisions, all of the repayment by Coachella Valley Water District is expected to be non-reimbursable.

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 non-reimbursable. The remaining 30 percent is divided between the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund and the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund 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 (\$22,575,000):** 24 percent is the non-Federal cost-share that is provided between State and local funds.

**Non-reimbursable (\$241,018,000):** 100 percent of the project is non-reimbursable. Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes Water system (76 percent) and Dry Prairie Rural Water Authority Water System (24 percent).

17/ **Non-Federal Share (\$90,843,000):** 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 (20 member entities).

**Non-reimbursable (\$332,355,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-246 authorizes \$213,887,700 of Federal grant funds which has been indexed to \$332,355,000 and is 80 percent of the project costs for 19 of the 20 members and 50 percent of the incremental cost for the city of Sioux Falls.

- 18/ **Non-Federal Share (\$56,997,000):** Includes \$30,436,500 from the Water Replenishment District of Southern California; and \$26,560,500 from the City of Long Beach.
- Non-reimbursable:** Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$18,999,000 provided by the Federal government as cooperative agreements.
- 19/ Project scheduled to be completed in FY 2006.
- 20/ **Non-Federal Share (\$17,443,000):** 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 (\$436,873,000):** 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 non-reimbursable under provision of P.L. 100-516, as amended by P.L. 103-434, and P.L. 107-367.
- 21/ **Non-Federal Share (\$64,442,000):** Includes \$12,982,500 from San Elijo Joint Powers Authority; \$36,333,000 from Carlsbad Municipal Water District, \$2,004,500 by the Leucadia Wastewater District; and \$13,122,000 from Olivenhain Municipal Water District.
- Non-reimbursable:** \$20,000,000 is provided by the Federal government as a cooperative agreement.
- 22/ **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.
- 23/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$7,768,000 from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- Non-reimbursable (\$23,248,000):** The legislation P.L. 106-136 authorized \$15 million of Federal grant funds, which have been indexed to \$23,248,000. 75 percent of the project is Federal grants; 25 percent of the project cost will come from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.
- 24/ **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.
- 25/ **Reimbursable (\$564,916,000):** The reimbursable costs are \$100,165,000 for non-Indian irrigation; \$12,570,000 for Indian irrigation, which is deferred indefinitely under the Leavitt Act; \$37,000 for power; and \$452,144,000 for municipal, rural, and industrial water.
- Non-Federal Share (\$161,838,000):** Includes State municipal, rural and industrial (\$147,080,000); recreation (\$13,350,000); natural resources trust

(\$1,200,000); and State contribution for headquarters building (\$207,966).

**Non-reimbursable (\$1,199,602,000):** Includes Municipal, Rural and Industrial Grant Program (\$441,230,000); fish & wildlife (\$57,276,000); Sheyenne River Release (\$48,720,000); flood control (\$67,849,000); Indian Municipal, Rural, and Industrial (\$284,260,000); recreation (\$17,585,000); Natural Resource Trust (\$37,000,000); highway improvement (\$4,650,000); cultural resources (\$5,170,000); de-authorized facilities (\$98,013,000); OM&R of completed facilities (\$112,849,000); and Wildlife Trust (\$25,000,000), as directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.

26/ **Non-Federal Share (\$517,770,000):** Includes \$361,086,033 from the cities of San Diego and Poway, Sweetwater Authority, Otay Water District, County of San Diego, and/or Tia Juana Valley County Water District; \$121,883,188 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.

27/ **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.

28/ **Non-reimbursable (\$68,331,000):** Repayment is non-reimbursable under Section 309(g)(7) and Section 314 of the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act as amended in Title III of the Arizona Water Settlement Act.

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
<b>Animas-La Plata Project</b>	The Final Supplement to the 1980 Final Environmental Statement (FSFES) was filed with the EPA on April 26, 1996. In August 1998, the Secretary of the Interior presented an Administration Proposal that provided M&I water only for the tribes and non-Indian entities, and established a Water Acquisition Fund for the tribes to purchase the balance of their water rights. The Final Supplemental EIS was filed with EPA in July 2000 and Reclamation issued a Record of Decision on September 25, 2000.
<b>Cachuma Project</b>	Final Program and Project specific EIS/EIR – Lower Santa Ynez River Fish Management Plan and Cachuma Project Biological Opinion for southern steelhead trout ROD signed on October 25, 2004. Ongoing actions relating to steelhead recovery largely covered, but some project specific NEPA will be required as projects are developed.
<b>Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project</b>	A categorical exclusion for the Conejo Creek Diversion component was completed in July 2000. A FONSI for the Regional Brine Line was completed in September 2002.
<b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b>	Projectwide - Final filed September 26, 1972. Additional activity-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance documents were completed on all project activities prior to implementation. Current NEPA compliance activities include final environmental impact statement for Tucson Aqueduct Reliability, which was completed on April 10, 1998. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the Gila River Indian Community was issued July 20, 1998. An environmental assessment for Tohono O’Odham Nation’s San Xavier District farm rehabilitation project was completed and FONSI was issued August 1, 2005. An environmental impact statement on the San Xavier farm extension project has now been delayed until 2008 as a result of funding limitations which have delayed the start of the NEPA process. The completion of the final EIS and ROD for the San Carlos Apache system is scheduled for FY 2008, delayed due to an extension in the completion of planning work. An environmental assessment for the Pascua Yaqui system is scheduled for FY 2007. Environmental assessments for the Camp Verde and Tonto Apache systems are not currently scheduled. NEPA compliance schedules for the remaining portions of the Indian Distribution Division will be determined as required.
<b>Central Valley Projects (CVP):</b> American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Unit	A projectwide Final Environmental Statement (EIS) was filed with Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) November 13, 1972. Supplement to final filed with CEQ August 6, 1973. Amendment to final filed with CEQ September 20, 1974. Supplemental No. 2 filed with EPA September 23, 1980. Foresthill Divide area FES was filed with the CEQ May 25, 1976. Reclamation and the Sacramento Metropolitan Water Authority wrote a draft EIS/Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the American River Water Resources Investigation in February 1996. Reclamation completed the Final EIS in November 1997 and issued a Record of Decision (ROD) in June 1998. The decision was to not take any action at this time, but Reclamation will cooperate with any local agency if there is potential Reclamation involvement.

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Central Valley Projects (Con't): Folsom Dam Gate Repairs	Placer County Water Agency American River Pump Station Project - Draft EIS/EIR released on September 13, 2001. Final was released June 14, 2002.
American River Division Long-Term Contract Renewal	El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.
Delta Division	Draft EIS was issued in March 2005 and the final was issued in July 2005.
Delta Long-Term Renewal Contracts	South Delta Barrier Program EIS/EIR was completed August 1996. This project has been incorporated into the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
Westlands Mercy Springs Water District Assignments to Water District, Santa Clara Valley Water District and Pajaro Valley Water District Long-Term Renewal Contract Portion.	Final EA/FONSI completed on February 25, 2005.
Friant Division	Public draft EA was circulated in January 2005. The environment analysis was separated from the larger Delta Division Long-Term Renewal Contract assessments. Final EA is due with completion of EIS for LTCR of San Luis Unit.
	Eastside to Westside Transfers and Exchanges. Preliminary Administrative Draft EA is under development. Final EA due January of 2006.
	Millerton Lake Resource Management Plan and General Plan Programmatic EIS/EIR under development.
	CVP to non-CVP, Article 5, and Accelerated Water Transfer Program (all dealing with transfers and exchanges) EAs in process. Article 5 and AWTP EAs and FONSI expected in early 2006. CVP to non-CVP EA awaiting completion of ESA consultation; final expected in May/June of 2006.
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 out to the public on October 1, 2004. Final EIS out to the public on December 17, 2004. Record of Decision (ROD) signed. February 28, 2005. ROD for Natomas Mutual Water Co. signed March

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
San Felipe Division	<p>9, 2005; revised Natomas ROD May 5, 2005; and ROD for City of Redding and ACID signed July 1, 2005.</p> <p>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 in August 2004; construction of the pipeline on indefinite hold pending PVWMA initiation. 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. A public draft EA is due September 12, 2005.</p>
<p>Central Valley Projects (Con't): Long-Term Renewal of CVP Contracts – San Felipe Unit</p> <p>West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit</p> <p>San Luis Unit Long-Term Contract Renewal</p> <p>San Luis Reservoir and Los Banos Creek State Recreation Area Joint General Plan and Resource Management Plan</p> <p>Shasta Division</p>	<p>EA for San Felipe LTRC still in preparation, awaiting final negotiation of contract – estimated date of availability approximately late January, 2006.</p> <p>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.</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. A Draft EIS was issued for public comment in May of 2005; a Final EIS and ROD are expected on July 1, 2006.</p> <p>A public draft EIS was noticed in the Federal Register September 30, 2005. The comment period will end January 17, 2006. A final EIS will be noticed in the Federal Register on January 20, 2006 and the ROD will be ready for signature on June 1, 2006. EA for assignment of Broadview Water district contract to Westlands Water District out for public review December of 2005; final EA and FONSI expected with completion of the San Luis LTRC EIS.</p> <p>Draft EIS is under development.</p> <p>Will be completed as required. The CALFED Program recommends enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir</p>

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Trinity River Restoration Program	and Reclamation has begun this study.  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. Supplemental EIS was put on hold July 2004, appellate court ruled supplemental EIS does not have to be completed. ROD now being implemented.
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I Division</b>	A project-wide final EIS was filed with the CEQ on June 18, 1975.
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Basinwide Program</b>	All NEPA requirements will be complied with as needed.
<b>Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project</b>	Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before individual actions are undertaken.
<b>Endangered Species Recovery Implementation</b>	Individual NEPA compliance documents will be prepared before construction is initiated. Construction activities currently scheduled will be covered by categorical exclusions or environmental assessments.
<b>Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System</b>	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was signed October, 2002.
<b>Lewis and Clark RWS</b>	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.
<b>Long Beach Area Water District Reclamation Project</b>	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.
<b>Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project</b>	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.

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
<b>Minidoka North Side Drain Water Management Project</b>	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.
<b>Mni Wiconi Project</b>	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was completed in October 1993. An amendment was signed in June 1995.
<b>North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project</b>	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 Olivenhain Northwest Quadrant Project was completed in August 2005.
<b>Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I</b>	The Record of Decision was completed August 14, 2000.
<b>Perkins County</b>	The FONSI was signed February 3, 2003.
<b>Phoenix Metro Water Reclamation and Reuse Project</b>	Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement has begun. Public scoping was conducted between August 18 and October 6, 2004. The EIS is scheduled for completion in September 2006.
<b>Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project</b> 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 December 2005.
<b>San Carlos Water Settlement Act</b>	NEPA compliance schedule will be determined as required.

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
<b>San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program</b>	<p>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. NEPA completion for the North City Reclamation System Phase 2 is scheduled for completion in January 2006. 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. A FONSI was completed for Phase II of the Otay Water Reclamation Project in August 2005. 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.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Escondido Water Reclamation Project was completed in April 1995. A categorical exclusion for the planning study for the San Pasqual component of the Escondido Project was completed in July 1995. A Categorical Exclusion was completed for the San Pasqual Storage Tank in May 2001.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for the planning studies for the San Diego Water Repurification Project was completed in January 1995. In 1999, the city of San Diego stopped work on this project.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Reclamation Project was completed in May 1995.</p>
<b>San Gabriel Basin Project</b>	<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</p>

## STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<p>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. A Categorical Exclusion for the El Monte Operable Unit Westside Shallow and Northwest Deep Remedies was completed in January 2005.</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. A supplemental FONSI covering additional distribution pipelines was completed in January 2005.</p>
<b>San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program</b>	Completed for Phase I only.
<b>Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act</b>	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 was completed and a FONSI was issued August 1, 2005. An environmental impact statement on the San Xavier farm extension project has now been delayed until 2008 as a result of funding limitations which have delayed the start of the NEPA process.
<b>Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project</b>	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><b>Animas-La Plata Project</b></p>	<p>The downsizing of the Animas-La Plata Project to an all M&amp;I project and the provision in P.L. 106-554 allowing up-front cost-sharing of non-tribal payment obligations required 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.L. 108-447, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 limits the nontribal repayment obligation to \$43 million, plus interest during construction for those parties not utilizing the up-front payment option of the first \$500 million (January 2003 price level) of the total project costs. P.L. 109-148, December 30, 2005, amended the nontribal repayment language of P.L. 108-447, by providing a technical correction. Consultations with repayment entities, as required by P.L. 106-554, are in progress.</p>
<p><b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b></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. On December 10, 2004, the President signed PL 108-451, the Arizona Water Settlements Act. The Act, when fully effective, resolves the disputed project repayment issues.</p> <p>Under the revised plan for the third stage of repayment, Tucson Reliability, the northwestern entities and San Xavier District each have reliability features. Final plans for the remaining entities, the City of Tucson, Sif Oidak, Schuk Toak and Pascua Yaqui Tribes have not been developed, however estimates for the Black Wash reservoir were revised to reflect the reduced capacity requirement. The Black Wash feature, while re-estimated, is still tentative and may not be further developed if the current planning efforts of entities and Reclamation results in more cost effective reliability options. The sum of the current cost estimates for these three reliability features exceeds the Stage III repayment ceiling. Negotiations have started, as required under the Stipulated Settlement, to address repayment of the third stage prior to initiating construction activities for the northwest entities. Repayment is non-reimbursable under the Arizona Water Settlements Act for the San Xavier District feature.</p> <p>Except for Indian Tribes with water approved right settlements, repayment contracts with the Indian communities must be executed before initiation of construction. 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. The Arizona Water Settlements Act subsequently eliminated any repayment requirement for the Gila River Indian Community and the Tohono O'Odham Nation. The repayment contracts for the remaining Indian Distribution System will be executed as required.</p>

## STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p><b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b> (Continued)</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). Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District, Chandler Heights Citrus Irrigation District, Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation &amp; Drainage District, New Magma Irrigation and Drainage District, Queen Creek Irrigation District, San Tan Irrigation District and Tonopah Irrigation District requested and received extensions of the repayment debts for 2004. It is expected that these districts will continue to seek annual extensions. The Arizona Water Settlements Act provides for continued annual extensions prior to January 1, 2008. That Act also makes \$73.6 million of the 9(d) remaining debt non-reimbursable. The repayment contracts with irrigation districts having 9(d) debt must be amended to make a portion of the debt non-reimbursable and to assign repayment of the remaining portion of the debt to the Central Arizona Water Conservation District.</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. Most of this remaining water is committed to the Gila River Indian Community under the Arizona Water Settlements Act. Title to the Harquahala Valley Irrigation District distribution system was transferred to the District on July 21, 2004.</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.</p>

## STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p><b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b> (Continued)</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 granted 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>The repayment allocations recalculations for joint works were recalculated in 2004 resulting in an amended repayment contract for the San Tan Irrigation District. The amendment was executed in February 2005.</p>
<p><b>Central Valley Project</b></p>	<p>We are currently in various stages of negotiating long-term water service renewal contracts with entities/individuals that have Central Valley Project (CVP) water service contracts. Below shows the status of CVP water service contracts as of December 9, 2005.</p>
<p><u>American River Division</u> Auburn-Folsom South Unit</p>	<p>There are 7 contracts with entities in this unit. Six of the long-term water service renewal contracts have undergone the 60-day public review and comment period and can be executed upon completion of environmental documentation. Negotiations are ongoing with Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). SMUD's existing contract does not expire until 2012.</p>
<p><u>Delta Division</u></p>	<p>There were originally 24 contracts in this unit. Two contracts (Centinella and Widren) have been assigned to a contractor in the San Luis Unit. Portions of a third contract (Mercy Springs) have been assigned to contractors in the San Luis and San Felipe Units, leaving 22 contracts in this unit at the present time. Twenty one contracts have been executed and 1 (City of Tracy) remains to be negotiated.</p>
<p><u>East Side Division</u> New Melones Unit</p>	<p>There are 2 contracts with entities in this unit. These 2 contracts do not expire until 2022. There have been no contract negotiations for a long-term water service renewal contract with the 2 entities. In addition to the 2 existing contracts, subsection 3404(b) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) provides that the United States is authorized to enter into a long-term water service contract with Tuloume Utilities District, an entity located in this unit.</p>
<p><u>Friant Division</u></p>	<p>There are 27 existing long-term water service renewal contracts with entities in this division for Class I and/or Class II CVP water. These contracts were executed in January or February 2001. These 27 contracts are for a term of 25 years and are subject to CVPIA. Additionally, 2 of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system. Three additional contracts with entities in this division were executed in 2005.</p>
<p><u>Friant Division (Cross Valley Canal)</u></p>	<p>There are 8 contracts with entities in this Division. All 8 long-term water service renewal contracts have been negotiated and the public review and comment period has been completed. The contracts will be executed upon receipt of environmental documentation and finalization of conveyance issues with the State of California.</p>
<p><u>Sacramento River Division</u> Black Butte Dam and Lake</p>	<p>There are 6 contracts with entities in this unit. One of the 6, Elk Creek Community Services District, does not intend to renew its contract. Long-term renewal contracts have been executed with the remaining 5 contractors.</p>
<p>Corning/Tehama-Colusa Canals</p>	<p>There are 16 contracts with entities in this unit. All 16 long-term renewal contracts have been executed. Four entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p>
<p>Sacramento River Settlement</p>	<p>There are 141 contracts with individuals/entities in this unit. One hundred twenty eight contracts have been signed; 13 contractors are either not renewing, in arrears on payments, or have not made a decision whether to renew.</p>
<p></p>	<p>There are 7 contracts with entities in this unit. Six of the long-term water service renewal contracts have undergone the 60-day public review and comment period and can be executed upon completion of environmental documentation. Negotiations are ongoing with Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). SMUD's existing contract does not expire until 2012.</p>

## STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p><b>Central Valley Project</b> (Continued)</p>	<p>There were originally 24 contracts in this unit. Two contracts (Centinella and Widren) have been assigned to a contractor in the San Luis Unit. Portions of a third contract (Mercy Springs) have been assigned to contractors in the San Luis and San Felipe Unites, leaving 22 contracts in this unit at the present time. Twenty-one contracts have been executed and one (City of Tracy) remains to be negotiated.</p> <p>There are 2 contracts with entities in this unit. These 2 contracts do not expire until 2022. There have been no contract negotiations for a long-term water service renewal contract with the 2 entities. In addition to the 2 existing contracts, subsection 3404(b) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) provides that the United States is authorized to enter into a long-term water service contract with Tuolumne Utilities District, an entity located in this unit.</p> <p>There are 27 existing long-term water service renewal contracts with entities in this division for Class I and/or Class II CVP water. These contracts were executed in January or February 2001. These 27 contracts are for a term of 25 years and are subject to CVPIA. Additionally, two of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system. Three additional contracts with entities in this Division were executed in 2005.</p> <p>There are 8 contracts with entities in this Division. All 8 long-term water service renewal contracts have been negotiated and the public review and comment period has been completed. The contracts will be executed upon receipt of environmental documentation and finalization of conveyance issues with the State of California.</p>
<p><u>San Felipe Division</u></p>	<p>There are 2 contracts with entities in this unit. These contracts do not expire until 2027. Negotiations for long-term water service renewal contracts are ongoing.</p>
<p><u>Shasta Division</u></p>	<p>There are 6 contracts with entities in this unit. All 6 long-term renewal contracts have been executed.</p>
<p><u>Trinity River Division</u></p>	<p>There are 4 contracts with entities in this unit. All 4 contracts have been executed. One entity has an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p>
<p><u>West San Joaquin Division</u> Delta-Mendota Canal</p>	<p>There are 3 contracts with entities in this unit. Sixty day public review has been completed and the contracts will be executed upon receipt of environmental documentation which is expected in June 2006.</p>
<p>San Luis Unit</p>	<p>There are 5 contracts with entities in this unit. Public review and comment have been completed and the contracts will be executed upon receipt of environmental documentation which is expected in June 2006. Additionally, 2 of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.</p>
<p><u>Other</u></p>	<p>There are a total of 254 contracts identified about of which 86 are interim renewal contracts. Interim renewal contracts are subject to the provisions of CVPIA and the acreage limitations of the Reclamation Reform Act.</p>
<p><u>General</u></p>	

## STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I</b>	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. Amendments to the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act changed the provisions of the Coachella Valley Water District Contract from reimbursable to non-reimbursable.
<b>Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System</b>	Cooperative Agreement was signed December 19, 2002, with Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes. Cooperative Agreement was signed July 15, 2002, with Dry Prairie Rural Water Authority; no repayment is required.
<b>Lewis and Clark Rural Water System</b>	Cooperative Agreement was signed June 29, 2001, with the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
<b>Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project</b>	Repayment contract was signed May 2, 1995, with the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System, Incorporated. Obligation may be met with FY 2006 funding. Although Mid Dakota was not included in the President's FY 2006 budget, the Senate mark-up requested \$4 million. Repayment will begin in FY 2007.
<b>Mni Wiconi Project</b>	No repayment contracts are anticipated. Cooperative agreements providing for work and commitment of non-Federal funds were executed prior to construction.
<b>Perkins County Rural Water System</b>	Cooperative Agreement was signed August 12, 2002, with Perkins County Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
<b>Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit</b>	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.
<b>Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Project</b>	Repayment is non-reimbursable under Section 309(g)(7) of the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act as amended in Title III of the Arizona Water Settlements Act.

		Summary of Irrigation Investment									Annual Charges Per Acre		
Project	Total Irrigation Investment 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
<b>Central Arizona Project</b>	3548.33	77.78	1005.83					2464.72			81.00	2.00	79.00
<b>Central Valley Project 1/</b> 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													
<b>Colorado River Storage Project</b>					2/								
<b>Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I</b>	585.00	0.00 3/									N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project</b> Garrison 4/	6220.00								2.00		32.01	N/A	55.22
<b>Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Prj</b>	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:

<b>Summary of Irrigation Investment</b>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Acres</u>	
Total irrigation investment per acre	\$390	1,205,177,688		<u>A/</u>
Less repayment of irrigation investment per acre by:				
Irrigators	-45	140,127,803		<u>A/</u>
Capital Relief	-8	<u>23,655,913</u>		<u>A/</u>
Unpaid Capital per Acre	\$337	1,041,393,972		
 Payment capacity per acre-foot	 \$2.63 to \$15.35			 <u>B/</u>
Annual rates per acre-foot:				
Construction	\$0 to \$20.25			<u>C/</u>
Operation and maintenance	\$6.61 to \$22.44			<u>C/</u>
Deficit	.00 to \$13.39			<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 2005 water rates for the period through September 2003.

B/ Based on the 2005 irrigation water rates.

C/ Irrigation water rates are 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 2005 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	\$ 66,892,000
Non-Reimbursable	8,998,000
CRDF & Contributions	60,070,000
Indian Irrigation Deferral	5,670,000
<u>UCRBF Revenue</u> <u>A/</u>	<u>761,030,000</u>
Total	\$ 902,660,000

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 2004 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 2004 annual interest rate of 5.04 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 \$279,185,000 and the present value of a straight-line amortization is estimated to be \$352,954,000.

- 3/ Based on 78,530 acres of agricultural land in the Coachella Valley taken from 1996 crop census. All of the irrigation investment is non-reimbursable since Reclamation is using the facilities to meet salinity requirements under the Mexican Water Treaty and provisions of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act.
- 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.