

Table of Contents
Appendix

Report	Page
Table of Contents	Appendix-1
Benefit Cost Ratios as of October 1, 2007.....	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-19
Project Repayment FY 2008.....	Appendix-24
Status of NEPA Compliance.....	Appendix-32
Status of Water Service and Repayment Contracts	Appendix-40
Summary of Irrigation Investment.....	Appendix-45

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2007

Project	Direct Benefits	Comment
Animas-La Plata		No benefit-cost ratio was requested by the Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 2000.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Central Arizona Project	1.3	The ratio was computed by using the authorized interest rate of 3.25 percent. The benefit-cost ratio remained the same as in the FY 2007 Budget Justifications.
Central Valley Projects (CVP): 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 Benefit estimates submitted in support of the authorization of the original project features are out of date.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>
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I		Assessment of full beneficial impact of improving water quality as a result of this authorized project has not been made. Agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 authorizing Title I and Title II activities are based upon social and political justifications.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2007

Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Title II - Basinwide Program		Previous agreements with the Mexican Government concerning salinity control in the Colorado River and P.L. 93-320 are based upon social and political justifications. P.L. 98-569 required construction preference be given to those projects that reduced salinity at the least cost.
Columbia/Snake River Salmon Recovery Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Endangered Species Conservation/Recovery Projects		Not applicable since benefits are intangible.
Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-382.
Lewis and Clark Rural Water Supply		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 106-246.
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Long Beach Desalination Research and Development Project		No benefit-cost ratio was required during authorization of the project.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 102-575.
Minidoka Northside Drain Water Management Project		Not Applicable. Action provides for environmental compliance on an existing project.
Mni Wiconi Project		Not required under authorizing legislation, P.L. 100-516.

BENEFIT COST RATIOS AS OF OCTOBER 1, 2007

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

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 delayed until FY 2009 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; Traction Ranch, Melvin Hughes (Mendota Pool) field work completed 04/02; Mercy Springs</p>
Central Valley Projects (Cont.)		

LAND CERTIFICATION

Project	Original Certification	Additional Information
Delta Division (Cont.)		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).
Central Valley Projects (Cont.)		

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 PROJECT

(\$ In Thousands)

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008		
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008								
Boise Area Projects	2,152	2,165	4,644	4,438	604	800	0	0	315	546	525	523	1,306	1,303	2,041	1,689	0	0	11,587	11,464				
Federal	516	360	0	0	604	800			315	546	465	465	1,306	1,303	2,041	1,689			5,247	5,163	18	5,229	5,163	
Water Users	1,636	1,805									60	58							1,696	1,863				
Other Agencies			4,644	4,438															4,644	4,438				
Columbia Basin-Total	5,250	5,834	77,927	83,290	1,772	1,923	8	10	415	508	736	764	304	493	3,234	2,640	768	1,162	90,414	96,624				
Federal	0	0	3,359	4,457	1,772	1,923	8	10	415	508	466	764	304	493	3,234	2,640	768	1,162	10,326	11,957	172	10,154	11,957	
Water Users	5,250	5,834	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,520	5,834				
Other Agencies	0	0	74,568	78,833	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74,568	78,833				
Columbia Basin-Grand Coulee	3,150	3,245	77,927	83,290	1,346	1,725	8	10	390	483	0	0	0	0	309	198	0	0	83,130	88,951				
Federal			3,359	4,457	1,346	1,725	8	10	390	483					309	198			5,412	6,873	113	5,299	6,873	
Water Users	3,150	3,245																	3,150	3,245				
Other Agencies			74,568	78,833															74,568	78,833				
Columbia Basin-Ephrata	2,100	2,589	0	0	426	198	0	0	25	25	736	956	304	493	2,925	2,442	768	1,162	7,284	7,865				
Federal					426	198			25	25	466	764	304	493	2,925	2,442	768	1,162	4,914	5,084	59	4,855	5,084	
Water Users	2,100	2,589									270	192							2,370	2,781				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Crooked River Project	0	0	0	0	128	121	0	0	99	119	138	127	548	609	156	161	0	0	1,069	1,137				
Federal					128	121			99	119	88	81	488	492	156	161			959	974	18	941	974	
Water Users											50	46	60	117					110	163				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Deschutes Project	0	0	0	0	55	62	0	0	89	35	327	267	160	93	67	76	0	0	698	533				
Federal					55	62			89	35	202	170	160	93	67	76			573	436	12	561	436	
Water Users											125	97							125	97				
Eastern Oregon Projects	0	0	0	0	150	174	0	0	182	150	321	281	352	168	213	137	0	0	1,218	910				
Federal					150	174			182	150	221	181	279	168	213	137			1,045	810	19	1,026	810	
Water Users											100	100	73	0					173	100				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Hungry Horse Project	0	0	4,977	8,316	415	371	0	0	75	67	0	0	75	67	0	0	0	0	5,542	8,821				
Federal			442	408	415	371			75	67			75	67					1,007	913	17	990	913	
Water Users																			0	0				
Other Agencies			4,535	7,908															4,535	7,908				
Lewiston Orchards Project	0	0	0	0	21	17	0	0	175	270	100	416	23	5	110	95	0	0	429	803				
Federal					21	17			175	270	50	216	14	5	110	95			370	603	0	370	603	
Water Users											50	200	9	0					59	200				
Other Agencies																			0	0				
Minidoka Area Projects	2,541	2,459	8,228	7,199	626	883	0	0	1,048	1,064	1,335	915	422	710	1,948	1,597	0	0	16,148	14,827				
Federal	781	487	267	273	626	883			1,048	1,064	1,220	775	422	710	1,879	1,557			6,243	5,749	39	6,204	5,749	
Water Users	1,760	1,972									115	140			69	40			1,944	2,152				
Other Agencies			7,961	6,926															7,961	6,926				
Rogue River, Talent Division	0	0	1,272	2,386	271	269	0	0	144	287	654	532	325	505	146	113	0	0	2,812	4,092				
Federal					271	269			144	287	379	317	249	355	146	113			1,189	1,341	15	1,174	1,341	
Water Users											275	215	76	150					351	365				
Other Agencies			1,272	2,386									0						1,272	2,386				
Tualatin Project	86	87	0	0	48	50	86	90	99	114	71	61	173	87	102	106	0	0	665	595				
Federal					0	0			99	114	66	61	128	87	102	106			395	368	14	381	368	
Water Users	86	87			48	50	86	90			5	0	45	0					270	227				
Other Agencies													0						0	0				
Umatilla Project	338	317	0	0	112	97	0	0	2,528	2,241	392	639	12	11	537	486	0	0	3,919	3,791				
Federal	226	197			112	97			2,528	2,241	342	614	12	11	537	486			3,757	3,646	30	3,727	3,646	
Water Users	112	120									50	25							162	145				
Other Agencies																			0	0				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECT¹

(\$ In Thousands)

PN REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008
Washington Area Projects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	94	82	5	10	112	92			
Federal											10	0			94	82	5	10	109	92	0	109	92
Water Users											3	0							3	0			0
Other Agencies																			0	0			0
Yakima Project	1,556	2,042	4,767	6,186	1,191	1,537	0	0	7,395	5,227	686	620	114	149	112	594	0	0	15,821	16,355			
Federal			123	122	1,191	1,537	0	0	7,169	5,097	541	445	114	149	112	594	0	0	9,250	7,944	93	9,157	7,944
Water Users	1,052	1,370							0	0	0	0							1,052	1,370			
Other Agencies	504	672	4,644	6,064					226	130	145	175							5,519	7,041			
Exam Of Existing Structures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,565	1,645	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,565	1,645			
Federal											1,565	1,645							1,565	1,645	38	1,527	1,645
Water Users																			0	0			0
Misc. Flood Control Operations	0	0	0	0	151	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	135			
Federal					151	135													151	135	5	146	135
Water Users																			0	0			0
Total Obligations	11,923	12,904	101,815	111,815	5,544	6,439	94	100	12,564	10,628	6,863	6,982	3,814	4,200	8,760	7,776	773	1,172	152,150	162,016			
Total Appropriated	1,523	1,044	4,191	5,260	5,496	6,389	8	10	12,338	10,498	5,615	5,734	3,551	3,933	8,691	7,736	773	1,172	42,186	41,776	490	41,696	41,776
Total Water Users	9,896	11,188	0	0	48	50	86	90	0	0	1,103	1,073	263	267	69	40	0	0	11,465	12,708			
Total Other Agencies	504	672	97,624	106,555	0	0	0	0	226	130	145	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	98,499	107,532			
% of Apprp. Funds	3.7%	2.5%	10.1%	12.6%	13.2%	15.3%	0.0%	0.0%	29.6%	25.1%	13.5%	13.7%	8.5%	9.4%	20.8%	18.5%	1.9%	2.8%	100.0%	100.0%			

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

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECT

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating		TOTAL		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		Expenses 1/		OBLIGATIONS				
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008			
Cachuma Project	811	878	0	0	0	0	769	833	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505	0	2,085	1,711			
Federal	811	878			0	0	769	833	0	0							505	0	2,085	1,711	6	2,079	1,711
Water Users																			0	0			
Central Valley Projects (CVP):																							
CVP, American River Division	4,085	4,383	6,327	7,094	734	788	464	498	1,525	1,636	14	15	127	137	0	0	5	0	13,281	14,550			
Federal	4,085	4,383	2,024	2,172	734	788	464	498	1,525	1,636	14	15	127	137			5	0	8,978	9,628	5	8,973	9,628
Water Users			4,303	4,922															4,303	4,922			
CVP, Delta Division	4,429	4,537	2,195	2,249	796	815	503	515	1,653	1,694	16	16	138	142	0	0	6,942	7,680	16,672	17,648			
Federal	4,429	4,537	2,195	2,249	796	815	503	515	1,653	1,694	16	16	138	142			6,942	7,680	16,672	17,648	13	16,659	17,648
Water Users																	0	0	0	0			
CVP, East Side Division	1,874	2,027	2,227	2,632	337	364	213	230	699	757	7	7	58	63	0	0	10	0	5,424	6,081			
Federal	1,874	2,027	929	1,005	337	364	213	230	699	757	7	7	58	63			10	0	4,126	4,454	5	4,121	4,454
Water Users			1,298	1,627															1,298	1,627			
CVP, Friant Division	2,558	2,702	1,268	1,339	460	485	291	307	955	1,008	9	9	80	84	0	0	97	12	5,716	5,947			
Federal	2,558	2,702	1,268	1,339	460	485	291	307	955	1,008	9	9	80	84			97	12	5,716	5,947	8	5,708	5,947
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, Misc. Proj. Programs	6,271	5,953	3,108	2,950	1,127	1,070	712	676	2,341	2,222	22	21	196	186	0	0	1,283	702	15,059	13,780			
Federal	6,271	5,953	3,108	2,950	1,127	1,070	712	676	2,341	2,222	22	21	196	186			1,283	702	15,059	13,780	142	14,917	13,780
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP RAX Program	8,337	8,835	4,132	4,379	1,498	1,588	947	1,003	3,112	3,298	29	31	260	276	0	0	0	0	18,316	19,410			
Federal	8,337	8,835	4,132	4,379	1,498	1,588	947	1,003	3,112	3,298	29	31	260	276			0	0	18,316	19,410	1	18,315	19,410
Water Users																							
CVP, Sacramento Rvr. Div.	1,173	971	581	481	211	175	133	110	438	363	4	3	37	30	0	0	3,563	5,894	6,140	8,028			
Federal	1,173	971	581	481	211	175	133	110	438	363	4	3	37	30			3,563	5,894	6,140	8,028	5	6,135	8,028
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, San Felipe Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	117	161	0	0	0	0	75	81	831	649	1,023	920			
Federal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	117	161	0	0	0	0	75	81	831	649	1,023	920	8	1,015	920
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, San Luis Unit West SJD	3,836	3,671	1,901	1,819	689	660	436	417	1,432	1,370	13	13	120	115	0	0	2,494	1,900	10,921	9,964			
Federal	3,836	3,671	1,901	1,819	689	660	436	417	1,432	1,370	13	13	120	115			2,494	1,900	10,921	9,964	8	10,913	9,964
Water Users																			0	0			
CVP, Shasta Division	3,780	3,842	7,457	8,579	679	690	429	436	1,411	1,434	13	14	118	120	0	0	138	100	14,026	15,216			
Federal	3,780	3,842	1,873	1,904	679	690	429	436	1,411	1,434	13	14	118	120			138	100	8,442	8,541	15	8,427	8,541
Water Users			5,584	6,675															5,584	6,675			
CVP, Trinity River Division	1,683	1,574	5,250	3,819	302	283	191	179	628	587	6	6	52	49	0	0	9,002	7,005	17,115	13,501			
Federal	1,683	1,574	834	780	302	283	191	179	628	587	6	6	52	49			9,002	7,005	12,699	10,462	2	12,697	10,462
Water Users	0	0	4,416	3,039															4,416	3,039			
CVP, Wtr & Power Opertn.	5,067	4,680	5,191	4,342	911	841	576	532	1,891	1,747	18	16	158	146	0	0	7	0	13,819	12,304			
Federal	5,067	4,680	2,511	2,319	911	841	576	532	1,891	1,747	18	16	158	146			7	0	11,139	10,281	8	11,131	10,281
Water Users			2,680	2,023															2,680	2,023			
Total Central Valley Projects:																							

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECT

(\$ In Thousands)

MP REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008		FY 2007	FY 2008
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	
Federal	43,092	43,176	21,357	21,398	7,744	7,759	4,894	4,933	16,201	16,276	151	152	1,344	1,347	75	81	24,372	23,942	119,231	119,063	220	119,011	119,063
Water Users	0	0	18,281	18,286	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,281	18,286	0	0	0
Endangered Species Recovery	2,268	2,321	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,268	2,321			
Federal	2,268	2,321																	2,268	2,321	14	2,254	2,321
Water Users																			0	0			
Exam of Existing Structures	1,518	1,517	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,518	1,517			
Federal	1,518	1,517																	1,518	1,517	0	1,518	1,517
Water Users																			0	0			
Klamath Project	1,400	1,347	0	0	0	0	257	248	11,266	10,805	0	0	0	0	1,371	1,314	12,309	11,421	26,603	25,135			
Federal	1,286	1,233					236	227	11,266	10,805			0	0	1,371	1,314	12,309	11,421	26,468	25,000	1,718	24,750	25,000
Water Users	114	114					21	21											135	135			
Lahontan Basin Projects	289	324	509	570	0	0	1,499	1,680	590	661	0	0	31	35	3,248	3,639	1,624	1,670	7,790	8,579			
Federal	289	324	509	570	0	0	1,499	1,680	590	661	0	0	31	35	3,248	3,639	1,624	1,670	7,790	8,579	1	7,789	8,579
Water Users																			0	0			
Land Resources Managmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687	728	0	0	687	728			
Federal															687	728	0	0	687	728	2	685	728
Water Users																			0	0			
Orland Project	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	689	702	0	0	0	0	704	717			
Federal	15	15											689	702					704	717	16	688	717
Water Users																			0	0			
Reclamation Law Admin	599	616	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	599	616			
Federal	599	616																	599	616	1	598	616
Water Users		0																	0	0			
Solano Project	1,244	1,289	0	0	48	49	20	21	117	121	0	0	1,895	1,964	522	541	13	0	3,858	3,985			
Federal	1,244	1,289			48	49	20	21	117	121			1,895	1,964	522	541	13	0	3,858	3,985	13	3,845	3,985
Water Users																			0	0			
Ventura River Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	827	458	0	0	827	458			
Federal															827	458			827	458	3	824	458
Water Users																			0	0			
Total Obligations	51,236	51,483	40,147	40,254	7,791	7,808	7,440	7,714	28,174	27,863	151	152	3,960	4,048	6,729	6,761	38,823	37,033	184,451	183,116			
Total Appropriated	51,122	51,369	21,866	21,968	7,791	7,808	7,419	7,693	28,174	27,863	151	152	3,960	4,048	6,729	6,761	38,823	37,033	166,035	164,695	1,994	164,041	164,695
Total Water Users	114	114	18,281	18,286	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18,416	18,421	0	0	0
Total Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
% of Appropriated Funds	30.8%	31.2%	13.2%	13.3%	4.7%	4.7%	4.5%	4.7%	17.0%	16.9%	0.1%	0.1%	2.4%	2.5%	4.1%	4.1%	23.4%	22.5%	100.0%	100.0%			

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

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008				
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008				
Ak Chin Water Rts Stmnt	7,921	8,700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,921	8,700				
Federal	7,921	8,700																	7,921	8,700	1	7,920	8,700	
Water Users	0	0																	0	0				
CAP Distrib Sys O&M	193	258	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	258				
Federal	153	218																	153	218	0	153	218	
Water Users	40	40																	40	40				
CRBSCP, Title 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,678	9,541	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,678	9,541				
Federal	0	0									10,578	9,441							10,578	9,441	12	10,566	9,441	
Water Users	0	0									100	100							100	100				
Lower CO Rvr Ops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,208	15,964	7,525	7,530	0	0	0	0	0	0	26,733	23,494				
Federal									9,605	7,982	7,431	7,436							17,036	15,418	8	17,028	15,418	
Water Users									9,603	7,982	94	94							9,697	8,076				
Parker-Davis Project	0	0	11,904	14,701	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,904	14,701				
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			11,904	14,701	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,904	14,701				
Salt River Project	0	240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	300	443	462	0	0	651	1,002				
Federal		240											104	150	193	210			297	600	0	297	600	
Water Users		0											104	150	250	252			354	402				
So Arizona Wtr Rights	5,769	6,232	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,769	6,232				
Federal																			0	0	0	0	0	
Water Users																			0	0				
Other Federal	5,769	6,232																	5,769	6,232				
Yuma Area Projects	2,522	2,522	0	0	18,189	18,279	0	0	1,147	1,344	0	0	0	0	950	814	0	0	22,808	22,959				
Federal	2,522	2,522			18,139	18,229			1,147	1,344					950	814			22,758	22,909	26	22,732	22,909	
Water Users					50	50													0	50				
Environ Prog Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	319	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	319				
Federal									400	319									400	319	4	396	319	
Water Users																			0	0				
Exam of Exist Struct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	735	850	0	0	0	0	0	0	735	850				
Federal											735	850							735	850	8	727	850	
Water Users											0	0							0	0				
Land Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,132	2,350	0	0	2,132	2,350				
Federal															2,132	2,350			2,132	2,350	12	2,120	2,350	
Water Users															0	0			0	0				
Misc Flood Control	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	31				
Federal							31	31											31	31	0	31	31	
Water Users																			0	0				
Reclaim Law Admin	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

LC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES															Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS 2/		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007		FY 2008		
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008							
Federal Water Users	50																	50	0	50	0	0	
Rec & F&WL Admin Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,304	1,175	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,304	1,175	6	673	550	
WCFSP Federal Water Users	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,781	3,628	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,781	3,628	51	2,697	2,850	
Total Obligations	16,505	17,952	11,904	14,701	18,189	18,279	31	31	22,059	18,802	22,719	21,549	208	300	3,525	3,626	0	0	95,140	95,240			
Total Appropriated	10,646	11,680	0	0	18,139	18,229	31	31	11,831	10,195	21,492	20,577	104	150	3,275	3,374	0	0	65,518	64,236	178	65,340	64,236
Total Other Federal	5,769	6,232	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,769	6,232				
Total Water Users	90	40	11,904	14,701	50	50	0	0	10,228	8,607	1,227	972	104	150	250	252	0	0	23,853	24,772			
% of Appropriated Funds	16.2	18.2	0.0	0.0	27.7	28.4	0.0	0.0	18.1	15.9	32.8	32.0	0.2	0.2	5.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	100	100			
Permanent O&M Boulder Canyon Proj Federal Water Users			83,309	95,669													0	0	83,309	95,669	0	83,309	95,669
Permanent O&M Appropriations	0	0	83,309	95,669	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Grand Totals LC Region O&M	10,646	11,680	83,309	95,669	18,139	18,229	31	31	11,831	10,195	21,492	20,577	104	150	3,275	3,374	0	0	65,518	64,236	178	65,340	64,236
1/ Reflects O&M during Construction, Safety of Dams, etc.																							
LC Region O&M	16	18	0	0	28	28	0	0	18	16	33	32	0	0	5	5	0	0	100	100	0	0	0

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

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008		FY 2007	FY 2008	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008								
Balmerhea Project									26	41	16	17							42	58				
Federal									26	41	16	17							42	58			42	58
Water Users																								
Bonneville Unit,CUP					66	24					7	572	823	37	38	380	386	300	1,360	1,278				
Federal					66	24					5	572	823	37	38	380	386	300	1,360	1,278			1,360	1,278
Water Users																								
Bostwick Park Project												171	230			51	27		222	257				
Federal												171	230			51	27		222	257			222	257
Water Users																								
Carlsbad Project					2,868	552			1,495	1,745	953	277			357	367	179	5,300	2,941					
Federal					651	502			1,495	1,745	953	277			357	367	179	3,635	2,891		15	3,620	2,891	
Water Users					1,665	50												1,665	50					
Collbran Project			468	482							973	911			99	100		1,540	1,493					
Federal			468	482							973	911			99	100		1,540	1,493				1,540	1,493
Water Users																								
Dallas Creek Project					40	46					251	281			97	44		388	371					
Federal					40	46					251	281			97	44		388	371				388	371
Water Users																								
Dolores Project			436	436							901	950			93	69		1,430	1,455					
Federal											732	767			93	69		825	836		177	648	836	
Water Users																								
Other Agencies			436	436							169	183						605	619					
Eden Project											29	31	28	28	114	76		171	135					
Federal											29	31	28	28	114	76		171	135				171	135
Water Users																								
Emery County Project											78	79	15	15	31	32		124	126					
Federal											78	79	15	15	31	32		124	126				124	126
Water Users																								
Florida Project					39	41					117	135			54	30		210	206					
Federal					39	41					117	135			54	30		210	206				210	206
Water Users																								
Fruitgrowers Dam Project											158	165			67	43		225	208					
Federal											158	165			67	43		225	208				225	208
Water Users																								
Grand Valley, CRBSCP									398	506	881	850			103	79		1,382	1,435					
Federal									398	506	548	573			103	79		1,049	1,158				1,049	1,158
Water Users																								
Other Agencies											333	277						333	277					
Hammond Project											66	75			70	52		136	127					

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008		FY 2007	FY 2008	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008								
Federal Water Users											66	75				70	52			136	127		136	127
Hyrum Project Federal Water Users											52	59	18	18	81	76			151	153			151	153
Jensen Unit, CUP Federal Water Users					35	35					86	117	11	10	116	114			248	276			248	276
Lyman Project Federal Water Users											52	54			3	3			55	57			55	57
Mancos Project Federal Water Users											103	119			32	33			135	152			135	152
Middle Rio Grande Project Federal Water Users	1,120	1,130							16,407	11,623	8,986	11,900			312	321			26,825	24,974				
									14,462	11,004	8,986	11,900			312	321			23,760	23,225			23,760	23,225
	1,120	1,130							1,945	619									3,065	1,749				
Moon Lake Project Federal Water Users											29	29	2		1	3			32	32			32	32
Navajo Unit, CRSP Federal Water Users Non-Federal Other Agencies											100	49	374	547		5			474	601				
											100	49	96	292		5			196	346			196	346
													278	255					278	255				
Newton Project Federal Water Users											25	25	48	45	7	9			80	79			80	79
											25	25	48	45	7	9			80	79			80	79
Ogden River Project Federal Water Users											70	92	6	8	193	152			269	252			269	252
											70	92	6	8	193	152			269	252			269	252
Paonia Project Federal Water Users Non-Federal Other Agencies					46	47					209	190	6	9	87	63			348	309				
					46	47					209	190	0	0	87	63			342	300			342	300
													6	9					6	9				
Paradox Unit, CRBSCP Federal Water Users Other Agencies											2,815	3,388			12	13			2,827	3,401				
											2,115	2,550			12	13			2,127	2,563			2,127	2,563
											700	838							700	838				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED				
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008				
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008				
Pecos River Basin Water Sal Federal Water Users											339	347							339	347			189	197		
Pine River Federal Water Users Other Agencies					40	49					83	125	64	69	120	26			307	269			307	269		
Provo River Project Federal Water Users Non-Federal			190						1,294	207	360	277	33	34	112	114			1,989	1,737			1,119	867		
Rio Grande Project Federal Water Users	600	620	1,734							137	91	2,303	2,187			350	423			5,124	5,136			4,524	4,516	
San Juan-Chama Project Federal Water Users								1,371	1,635			19	313	440		35	36			1,719	2,130			348	495	
San Luis Valley, Closed Basin Federal Water Users										250	229	5,082	4,704			38	39			5,370	4,972			5,370	4,972	
San Luis Valley, Conejos Federal Water Users												59	11			4	4			63	15			63	15	
Scofield Project Federal Water Users												5	33	37	18	18	44	33			105	93			105	93
Seedskadee Unit Federal Water Users																82	85			82	85			82	85	
Silt Project Federal Water Users Non-Federal Other Agencies											157	165	278	320	85	61			520	546			386	391		
Smith Fork Project Federal Water Users Non-Federal Other Agencies											148	156	254	338	78	54			480	548			356	382		

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008				
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008								
Strawberry Valley Project											89	94			124	126			213	220				
Federal											89	94			124	126			213	220			213	220
Water Users																								
Tucumcari											26	23			10	10			36	33				
Federal											26	23			10	10			36	33			36	33
Water Users																								
Uncompahgre Project											193	164			97	76			290	240				
Federal											193	164			97	76			290	240			290	240
Water Users																								
Vernal Unit, CUP											43	46	12	12	102	98			157	156				
Federal											43	46	12	12	102	98			157	156			157	156
Water Users																								
Weber Basin Project											677	699	1,171	2,027	229	110			2,077	2,903				
Federal											677	699	621	1,158	229	110			1,527	1,967			1,527	1,967
Water Users																								
Non-Federal													550	869					550	936				
Other Agencies																								
Weber River Project											66	69	33	35	13	13			112	117				
Federal											66	69	33	35	13	13			112	117			112	117
Water Users																								
Exam of Existing Structures											426	448							426	448			426	448
Federal											426	448							426	448			426	448
Water Users																								
Land Res Management Prog															682	690			682	690				
Federal															682	690			682	690			682	690
Water Users																								
Neg/Admin of Water Marketing											158	165							158	165			158	165
Federal											158	165							158	165			158	165
Water Users																								
Public Access/ Safety Prog											134	500							134	500			134	500
Federal											134	500							134	500			134	500
Water Users																								
Reclamation Law Admin	221	249																	221	249				
Federal	221	249																	221	249			221	249
Water Users																								
Rec & Fish/Wildlife Prog Admin									99	100									99	100				
Federal									99	100									99	100			99	100
Water Users																								
Water Cons Field Svcs											1,246	1,329							1,246	1,329				

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

UC REGION PROJECT	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008							
Federal Water Users											1,246	1,329							1,246	1,329		1,246	1,329
Total Obligations	1,941	1,999	2,828	918	3,134	794	1,371	1,635	20,106	14,573	29,602	32,809	2,408	3,571	4,473	4,000	479		65,805	63,286			
Total Appropriated	221	249	2,392	2,532	917	744			17,306	13,954	28,250	31,361	1,316	2,117	4,473	4,000	479		55,354	54,957	192	55,162	54,957
Total Water Users	1,720	1,750			1,665	50	1,371	1,635	1,945	619	150	150	6	9					6,857	4,213			
Total Non-Federal			436	436					870		1,202	1,298	1,086	1,445					3,594	4,116			
Total Other	3,282	3,378	3,732	1,836	6,268	1,588	2,742	3,270	38,755	28,807	52,781	58,811	4,420	6,662	7,979	7,054	958		119,843	114,460			
% of Appropriated Funds	0	0	0	4.6%	1.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	25.4%	51.4%	57.1%	2.4%	3.9%	8.1%	7.3%	0.9%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

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

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/
Arbuckle Project	-	-	-	-	30	28	-	-	150	167	-	-	-	-	14	1	-	-	194	196			
Federal	-	-	-	-	30	28	-	-	144	159	-	-	-	-	14	1	-	-	188	188		188	188
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	8			
Canadian River	-	-	-	-	80	70	-	-	65	72	-	-	14	15	8	2	-	-	167	159			
Federal	-	-	-	-	80	65	-	-	65	62	-	-	2	15	8	2	-	-	155	144		155	144
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	10	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	12	15			
Colo-Big Thompson	2,567	613	14,537	10,324	-	12	-	-	117	325	733	2,570	831	271	282	327	-	-	19,067	14,442			
Federal	2,332	558	12,257	8,749	-	12	-	-	117	325	733	1,522	831	196	282	327	-	-	16,552	11,689	1,357	15,195	11,689
Water Users	235	55	2,280	1,575	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,048	-	75	-	-	-	-	2,515	2,753			
Fry-Ark Project	769	276	4,643	5,300	332	110	618	144	744	221	-	2,807	458	220	404	410	-	-	7,968	9,488			
Federal	669	232	4,349	4,977	332	110	618	144	744	221	-	2,807	458	168	404	410	-	-	7,574	9,069	510	7,064	9,069
Water Users	100	44	294	323	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	-	-	-	-	394	419			
Kendrick Project	226	41	3,873	3,602	14	17	-	-	18	55	-	-	54	147	221	135	-	-	4,406	3,997			
Federal	226	41	3,841	3,564	14	17	-	-	18	55	-	-	54	135	221	135	-	-	4,374	3,947		4,374	3,947
Water Users	-	-	32	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	32	50			
Leadville Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,344	2,030	-	-	2,344	2,030			
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,344	2,030	-	-	2,344	2,030	300	2,044	2,030
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Mid-Dakota Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15			
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	15		15	15
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
McGee Creek	-	-	-	-	400	401	-	-	8	16	-	-	84	108	81	102	-	-	573	627			
Federal	-	-	-	-	398	391	-	-	8	16	-	-	84	101	81	102	-	-	571	610		571	610
Water Users	-	-	-	-	2	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	2	17			
Milk River	1,225	1,636	-	-	521	472	-	-	-	-	94	-	137	234	779	229	-	-	2,756	2,571			
Federal	525	791	-	-	499	472	-	-	-	-	94	-	137	234	425	229	-	-	1,680	1,726	94	1,586	1,726
Water Users	700	845	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	-	-	1,076	845				
Mirage Flat	-	-	-	-	42	35	-	-	-	-	-	39	-	19	83	57	-	-	125	150			
Federal	-	-	-	-	30	35	-	-	-	-	-	29	-	19	83	57	-	-	113	140		113	140
Water Users	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	10			
Mni Wiconi	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,362	6,526	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22,914	22,474	32,276	29,000			
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,362	6,526	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22,914	22,474	32,276	29,000	106	32,170	29,000
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Mountain Park	-	-	-	-	139	156	-	-	138	78	-	-	-	85	120	128	-	-	397	447			
Federal	-	-	-	-	118	146	-	-	138	78	-	-	-	63	120	128	-	-	376	415		376	415
Water Users	-	-	-	-	21	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	21	32			
Norman Project	-	-	-	-	144	141	-	-	100	16	-	-	138	156	51	148	-	-	433	461			
Federal	-	-	-	-	144	132	-	-	100	16	-	-	49	107	51	148	-	-	344	403		344	403
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	89	49	-	-	-	-	89	58			
North Platte	1,147	259	1,584	1,583	31	-	-	-	16	63	-	-	339	644	215	166	-	-	3,332	2,715			
Federal	1,122	259	1,084	1,027	31	-	-	-	16	63	-	-	306	624	215	166	-	-	2,774	2,139		2,774	2,139
Water Users	25	-	500	556	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33	20	-	-	-	558	576				
Nueces River	-	-	-	-	29	30	-	-	13	24	-	-	414	630	85	95	-	-	541	779			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/	
Federal	-	-	-	-	29	30	-	-	13	24	-	-	388	598	85	95	-	-	515	747	-	515	747
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	32	-	-	-	-	26	32	-	-	-
Ainsworth Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	48	-	64	557	234	-	-	557	351	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	48	-	64	505	187	-	-	505	304	-	505	304
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	47	-	-	52	47	-	-	-
Almena Unit	10	7	-	-	96	68	8	6	-	5	-	29	408	386	236	66	-	-	758	567	-	-	-
Federal	10	7	-	-	81	61	8	6	-	5	-	29	408	371	228	66	-	-	735	545	14	721	545
Water Users	-	-	-	-	15	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	8	-	-	-	23	22	-	-	-
Angostura Unit	19	16	-	-	117	67	-	-	42	85	-	-	886	975	136	147	-	-	1,200	1,290	-	-	-
Federal	19	16	-	-	12	4	-	-	42	85	-	-	886	905	136	147	-	-	1,095	1,157	-	1,095	1,157
Water Users	-	-	-	-	105	63	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	-	-	-	-	105	133	-	-	-
Armel Unit	81	92	-	-	263	297	-	-	-	-	-	6	294	215	37	13	-	-	675	623	-	-	-
Federal	81	92	-	-	263	297	-	-	-	-	-	6	225	140	37	13	-	-	606	548	100	506	548
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69	75	-	-	-	-	69	75	-	-	-
Belle Fourche Unit	334	520	-	-	15	-	-	-	50	105	-	-	141	206	105	167	230	-	875	998	-	-	-
Federal	334	370	-	-	15	-	-	-	50	105	-	-	141	142	105	167	-	-	645	784	-	645	784
Water Users	-	150	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64	-	-	230	-	230	214	-	-	-
Bostwick Unit	96	34	-	-	519	745	-	-	423	517	-	-	115	152	99	75	-	-	1,252	1,523	-	-	-
Federal	96	34	-	-	214	422	-	-	423	517	-	-	38	98	99	75	-	-	870	1,146	35	835	1,146
Water Users	-	-	-	-	305	323	-	-	-	-	-	-	77	54	-	-	-	-	382	377	-	-	-
Boysen Unit	20	13	1,456	1,325	313	171	-	-	13	53	69	125	171	343	184	156	-	-	2,226	2,186	-	-	-
Federal	20	13	1,438	1,312	313	171	-	-	13	53	29	82	111	280	184	156	-	-	2,108	2,067	-	2,108	2,067
Water Users	-	-	18	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	40	43	60	63	-	-	-	-	118	119	-	-	-
Buffalo Bill Dam Mod.	-	-	2,535	2,852	116	35	-	-	11	-	-	-	132	128	61	84	-	-	2,855	3,099	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	2,535	2,852	116	35	-	-	11	-	-	-	132	105	38	84	-	-	2,832	3,076	-	2,832	3,076
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23	23	-	-	-	23	23	-	-	-
Canyon Ferry Unit	143	107	3,539	2,945	379	283	3	2	-	-	-	-	434	1,274	242	204	-	-	4,740	4,815	-	-	-
Federal	143	107	3,520	2,914	379	283	3	2	-	-	-	-	434	1,274	236	203	-	-	4,715	4,783	-	4,715	4,783
Water Users	-	-	19	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	-	-	25	32	-	-	-
Cedar Bluff Unit	-	-	-	-	161	198	5	6	160	189	-	12	-	40	156	109	-	-	482	554	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	161	198	5	6	160	189	-	12	-	40	140	93	-	-	466	538	-	466	538
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	16	-	-	-	16	16	-	-	-
Dickinson Unit	-	-	-	-	63	63	-	-	293	268	-	-	48	250	81	83	-	-	485	664	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	48	48	-	-	268	268	-	-	48	150	81	83	-	-	445	549	-	445	549
Water Users	-	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	40	115	-	-	-
East Bench Unit	255	328	-	-	126	85	1	1	45	31	-	-	331	735	108	125	-	-	866	1,305	-	-	-
Federal	84	174	-	-	126	85	1	1	45	30	-	-	331	735	108	125	-	-	695	1,150	-	695	1,150
Water Users	171	154	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	171	155	-	-	-
Farwell Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Frenchman-Camb Unit	154	84	-	-	406	315	-	-	236	276	10	107	713	1,193	430	292	-	-	1,949	2,267	-	-	-
Federal	154	84	-	-	344	286	-	-	236	276	10	107	674	1,032	430	292	-	-	1,848	2,077	10	1,838	2,077

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/	
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/			
Water Users	-	-	-	-	62	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	161	-	-	-	-	101	190	-	-	-	-
Garrison Diversion Unit	-	-	-	-	391	369	4,498	4,122	34	31	-	-	9	8	124	232	22,783	19,047	27,839	23,809	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	360	369	4,498	4,122	34	31	-	-	9	8	124	232	19,225	15,458	24,250	20,220	29	24,221	20,220	
Water Users	-	-	-	-	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,558	3,589	3,589	3,589	-	-	-	-
Glen Elder Unit	-	-	-	-	573	1,081	3	5	-	51	-	20	-	55	294	121	-	-	870	1,333	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	573	1,081	3	5	-	51	-	20	-	41	280	121	-	-	856	1,319	-	-	856	1,319
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	14	-	-	14	14	-	-	-	-	
Heart Butte Unit	136	37	-	-	238	76	-	-	51	280	338	-	-	527	355	430	-	-	1,118	1,350	-	-	-	-
Federal	136	37	-	-	213	64	-	-	51	280	338	-	-	527	355	430	-	-	1,093	1,338	-	-	1,093	1,338
Water Users	-	-	-	-	25	12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	12	-	-	-	-
Helena Valley Unit	164	161	-	-	-	-	18	9	16	8	-	-	-	-	52	18	-	-	250	196	-	-	-	-
Federal	81	88	-	-	-	-	18	9	16	8	-	-	-	-	52	18	-	-	167	123	-	-	167	123
Water Users	83	73	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83	73	-	-	-	-
Kansas River Area	8	-	-	-	60	-	-	-	20	-	44	-	45	-	56	-	-	-	233	-	-	-	-	-
Federal	8	-	-	-	60	-	-	-	20	-	44	-	45	-	56	-	-	-	233	-	44	189	-	-
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Keyhole Unit	65	43	-	-	269	183	1	1	191	284	-	-	75	468	123	171	269	-	993	1,150	-	-	-	-
Federal	65	43	-	-	269	183	1	1	191	284	-	-	75	191	123	171	-	-	724	873	-	-	724	873
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	277	-	-	269	-	269	277	-	-	-	-
Kirwin Unit	2	3	-	-	150	109	-	-	-	6	-	46	111	185	137	96	-	-	400	445	-	-	-	-
Federal	2	3	-	-	135	109	-	-	-	6	-	33	111	185	137	96	-	-	385	432	-	-	385	432
Water Users	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	13	-	-	-	-
Lower Marias Unit	-	-	-	-	736	1,362	-	-	56	93	-	-	361	456	244	204	-	-	1,397	2,115	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	736	1,362	-	-	56	93	-	-	361	456	244	204	-	-	1,397	2,115	50	1,347	2,115	-
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Missouri Basin Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,926	1,050	-	-	1,926	1,050	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,926	1,050	-	-	1,926	1,050	-	-	1,926	1,050
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Narrows Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	94	-	-	86	94	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86	94	-	-	86	94	-	-	86	94
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North Loup Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	81	-	36	336	216	-	-	336	342	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	72	-	36	326	216	-	-	326	333	20	306	333	-
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10	9	-	-	-	-
North Platte Area	-	12	7,479	4,903	275	140	-	-	21	-	-	-	360	555	172	180	-	-	8,307	5,790	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	12	7,449	4,879	275	140	-	-	21	-	-	-	223	408	172	180	-	-	8,140	5,619	20	8,120	5,619	-
Water Users	-	-	30	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	137	147	-	-	-	-	167	171	-	-	-	-
Oahe Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	160	-	-	-	-	-	-	66	89	-	-	133	249	-	-	-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	67	110	-	-	-	-	-	-	66	89	-	-	133	199	-	-	133	199
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-
Owl Creek Unit	48	77	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	38	33	32	-	-	126	147	-	-	-	-
Federal	48	77	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	38	33	32	-	-	126	147	-	-	126	147
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED	
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/		
Rapid Valley - Pactola	-	-	-	-	95	113	93	129	18	25	-	-	-	-	7	1	-	-	213	268			
Federal	-	-	-	-	95	113	93	129	18	25	-	-	-	-	7	1	-	-	213	268		213	268
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Riverton Unit	-	-	470	518	53	52	-	-	21	21	24	26	43	43	371	383	-	-	982	1,043			
Federal	-	-	470	518	53	52	-	-	21	21	14	16	43	43	371	383	-	-	972	1,033		972	1,033
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	10			
Sargent Unit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Shadehill Unit	-	-	-	-	323	238	-	-	55	85	-	-	42	163	105	117	73	-	598	603			
Federal	-	-	-	-	323	238	-	-	55	85	-	-	42	88	105	117	-	-	525	528		525	528
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75	-	-	73	-	73	75			
Webster Unit	8	18	-	-	222	464	-	-	-	4	-	37	354	997	126	72	-	-	710	1,592			
Federal	8	18	-	-	192	464	-	-	-	4	-	26	354	958	101	72	-	-	655	1,542		655	1,542
Water Users	-	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	39	25	-	-	-	55	50			
Yellowtail Unit	-	-	6,085	4,843	431	39	20	2	51	5	50	-	-	-	34	40	-	-	6,671	4,929			
Federal	-	-	6,085	4,843	431	39	20	2	51	5	50	-	-	-	34	40	-	-	6,671	4,929	50	6,621	4,929
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Rapid Valley	49	60	-	-	14	3	16	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	-	-	85	99			
Federal	18	35	-	-	14	3	16	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	1	-	-	54	74		54	74
Water Users	31	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	25			
San Angelo	-	-	-	-	29	28	-	-	168	155	-	-	71	97	117	75	-	-	385	355			
Federal	-	-	-	-	29	28	-	-	168	155	-	-	59	83	117	75	-	-	373	341		373	341
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	14	-	-	-	-	12	14			
Shoshone	56	49	409	590	46	82	-	-	11	18	104	97	98	115	183	174	-	-	907	1,125			
Federal	56	49	409	540	46	82	-	-	11	18	59	58	98	115	143	174	-	-	822	1,036		822	1,036
Water Users	-	-	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	45	39	-	-	40	-	-	-	85	89			
WC Austin	-	-	-	-	263	198	-	-	17	17	-	-	18	54	148	125	-	-	446	394			
Federal	-	-	-	-	263	198	-	-	17	17	-	-	4	35	148	125	-	-	432	375		432	375
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	19	-	-	-	-	14	19			
Washita	-	-	-	-	1,124	915	-	-	32	32	-	187	96	241	108	218	-	-	1,360	1,593			
Federal	-	-	-	-	1,024	915	-	-	32	32	-	174	96	154	108	218	-	-	1,260	1,493	63	1,197	1,493
Water Users	-	-	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	87	-	-	-	-	100	100			
Wichita	-	-	-	-	165	81	-	-	140	67	-	-	173	215	76	143	-	-	554	506			
Federal	-	-	-	-	165	75	-	-	140	67	-	-	70	142	76	143	-	-	451	427		451	427
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	103	73	-	-	-	-	103	79			
Environ Prog Admin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	464	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	464			
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	464	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	354	464		354	464
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Exam of Exist Struct	1,741	1,814	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,741	1,814			
Federal	1,741	1,814	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,741	1,814	149	1,592	1,814
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

OBLIGATIONS BY FUNCTION FOR OPERATING PROJECTS

(\$ In Thousands)

GP REGION PROJECTS	OPERATING EXPENSES																Non-Operating Expenses 1/		TOTAL OBLIGATIONS		C/O	PROJECT TOTAL APPROPRIATED		
	Irrigation		Power		Flood Control		M&I		F&W		Water Control		Recreation		LRM		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008		FY 2007	FY 2007	FY 2008 2/
	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2007	FY 2008								
Land Resource Mgmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,474	1,592	-	-	2,474	1,592				
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,474	1,592			2,474	1,592			2,474	1,592
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Misc Flood Control	-	-	-	-	476	509	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	476	509			476	509
Federal	-	-	-	-	476	509	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			476	509			476	509
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Nego & Admin of Wtr	1,334	1,432	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,334	1,432			1,334	1,432
Federal	1,334	1,432	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			1,334	1,432			1,334	1,432
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Public Access & Sfty	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	297	253	-	-	-	-	297	253			297	253	
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	297	253	-	-			297	253			297	253	
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-	
Rec & F&WL Admin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	168	141	-	-	122	169	-	-	-	-	290	310			290	310
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	168	141	-	-	122	169	-	-			290	310			290	310
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Reclam Law Admin	313	289	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	313	289			313	289
Federal	313	289	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			313	289			313	289
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Site Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-
Federal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Water Users	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-			-	-
Water Cons Field Svcs	1,198	1,256	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,198	1,256			1,198	1,256
Federal	1,137	1,226	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			1,137	1,226			1,137	1,226
Water Users	61	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			61	30			61	30
Total Obligations	12,168	9,277	46,610	38,785	10,288	9,841	14,713	11,148	4,081	4,382	1,466	6,237	8,443	13,165	14,878	11,459	46,269	41,521	158,916	145,815				
Total Appropriated	10,762	7,901	43,437	36,175	9,528	9,352	14,713	11,098	4,050	4,363	1,371	5,041	7,772	11,526	14,330	11,395	42,139	37,932	148,102	134,783	2,951	145,151	134,783	
Total Water Users	1,406	1,376	3,173	2,610	760	489	-	50	31	19	95	1,196	671	1,639	548	64	4,130	3,589	10,814	11,032				
% of Appropriated Funds	7.4%	5.9%	29.9%	26.8%	6.6%	6.9%	10.1%	8.2%	2.8%	3.2%	0.9%	3.7%	5.4%	8.6%	9.9%	8.5%	29.0%	28.1%	102.0%	100.0%				

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

2/ Includes preliminary OMB Passbacks

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2008

(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Animas-La Plata <u>1/</u>	22,703	Unknown	48,480	0	374,778	1/	0	0	117,759	563,720
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project <u>2/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	93,990	0	0	20,000	113,990
Central Arizona Project <u>3/</u>	32,493	737,013	1,174,864	0	238,402	452,552	1,048,943	376,783	1,536,338	5,597,388
Central Valley Project:										
Auburn-Folsom South <u>4/</u>	2,055,502	594,471	225,116	0	0	8,374	0	2,425	488,111	3,373,999
American River Division Folsom Dam <u>5/</u>	108,806	31,468	11,918	0	0	0	0	0	30,072	182,264
Delta Division <u>6/</u>	145,164	41,983	15,898	0	0	59,614	0	0	189,712	452,371
Miscellaneous Project Programs <u>7/</u>	202,708	58,625	22,200	0	0	151,192	0	0	477,623	912,348
Sacramento River Division <u>8/</u>	253,085	73,195	27,718	0	0	30,950	0	54,450	119,299	558,697
San Felipe Division <u>9/</u>	76,606	0	272,782	0	0	447	0	0	38,963	388,798
San Joaquin Division <u>10/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	79,516	0	0	639,415	718,931
Shasta Division <u>11/</u>	115,334	33,356	12,632	0	0	37,255	0	0	113,129	311,706
Trinity River Restoration <u>12/</u>	164,753	47,648	18,044	0	0	4,863	0	0	202,479	437,787
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit <u>13/</u>	1,411,811	0	154,620	0	0	243,981	0	0	337,296	2,147,708
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title I Division <u>14/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453,790	453,790
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project, Title II Division: Basinwide Program <u>15/</u>	0	0	0	0	75,000	0	0	0	175,000	250,000
Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water system <u>16/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	23,493	0	0	252,061	275,554
Lewis & Clark RWS <u>17/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	96,006	0	0	345,529	441,535
Long Beach Area Water Reclamation Project <u>18/</u>	0	0	0	0	0	56,997	0	0	18,999	75,996

PROJECT REPAYMENT FY 2008

(\$ In Thousands)

Project	Irrigators	Power	M&I	Ad Valorem	Other	Non-Federal	Leavitt Act Deferred	Deferred	Non-Reimb	Total
Long Beach Desalination Research and Development Project 18a/	0	0	0	0	0	68,998	0	0	20,000	88,998
Mid-Dakota Rural Water 19/	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mni Wiconi Project 20/	0	0	0	0	0	17,456	0	0	446,967	464,423
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project 21/	0	0	0	0	0	64,587	0	0	20,000	84,587
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I 22/	0	0	0	0	0	412,600	0	0	20,000	432,600
Perkins County 23/						7,997			23,964	31,961
Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project 24/	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	0	0	20,000	80,000
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Garrison Diversion Unit 25/	100,165	37	461,374	0	0	314,758	12,570	0	1,232,360	2,121,264
San Diego Area Water 26/	0	0	0	0	0	517,770	0	0	172,590	690,360
San Gabriel Basin 27/	0	0	0	0	0	148,306	0	0	44,590	192,896
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act 28/	0	0	0	0	0	3,641	0	0	72,962	76,603

1/ Based on Interim Cost Allocation: "Irrigators" includes sunk costs expended prior to FY 1999 that are set aside as irrigation feature related or otherwise deemed non-reimbursable; "M&I" includes estimated non-Indian M&I repayment based on the interim cost allocation as limited by the provisions of P.L. 108-447 and P.L. 109-148; "Other" includes Indian M&I for three tribes; "Non-Federal Share" is estimated at \$48,480,000 which is non-Indian and shown in the M&I column; "Non-reimbursable" includes fish and wildlife enhancement, wetland, fish & wildlife mitigation, cultural resources mitigation, and non-Indian M&I included in the interim cost allocation which is over the limitation as provided in P.L. 108-447 and P.L. 109-148.

2/ **Non-Federal Share:** Includes \$93,990,000 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 (\$1,944,370,113):** 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 \$172,891,113 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.

Non-Federal Share (\$452,551,712): 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, \$12,396,911; in-kind services contributed for recreation associated with the Central Arizona Project aqueduct and Tucson Terminal Storage Reservoir, \$29,935,000; Plan 6 entities \$229,845,000 (contributed by Central Arizona Water Conservation District, \$175,000,000; Arizona cities, \$43,140,248; Maricopa County Flood Control District, \$9,966,000, Arizona 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.); interest during construction credit for interest bearing functions of the Plan 6 Up Front Funding Agreement contributions, \$33,390,000, and reimbursable recreation, \$38,869,938.

Leavitt Act (\$1,048,942,950): 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 (\$376,783,000): Unallocated repayment costs include \$306,813,000 for the Middle Gila Division which cannot be allocated unless the beneficiaries and repayment entities are identified and functions determined and \$69,970,000 for the Drainage Division. Construction of Middle Gila and Drainage divisions has been deferred indefinitely.

Non-reimbursable (\$1,536,337,825): Costs include Colorado River Division, \$900,277; Indian Distribution Division, \$735,064,000; recreation, \$123,700,971; flood control, \$122,643,916; Pima County flood and erosion control, \$3,500,000; cultural resources, \$47,035,065 contributed investigation costs, \$963,000, and siphon repair costs, \$50,911,629; and environmental enhancement costs, \$288,000. Also includes \$112,463,000 for construction of the Upper Gila Division which is non-reimbursable under provisions of Public Law 108-451. In addition, \$338,867,967 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 (\$488,111,000):** Includes recreation, \$10,467,000; fish and wildlife, \$320,708,000; flood control, \$146,359,000; and navigation, \$10,577,000.
- 5/ **Non-reimbursable (\$30,072,000):** Includes \$7,747,000 for flood control, \$560,000 for navigation, and \$21,765,000 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 (\$59,614,000):** Includes \$59,509,000 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 (\$189,712,000):** Includes \$100,000 for recreation, \$178,529,000 for fish and wildlife, \$10,336,000 for flood control, and \$747,000 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 (\$477,623,000):** Includes \$462,119,000 for fish and wildlife; \$28,000 for recreation facilities at Lake Woollomes in Fresno County, California; \$14,433,000 for flood control; and \$1,043,000 for navigation.
- 8/ **Power Users (\$73,195,000):** 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 (\$30,950,000): 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: \$13,167,000 for fish screens and fish recovery facilities associated with the Hamilton City Pumping Plant (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), and \$17,783,000 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 (\$119,299,000): Includes \$282,000 for recreation, \$99,681,000 for fish and wildlife, \$18,020 for flood control, \$1,302,000 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 (\$38,963,000): Includes \$19,280,000 for recreation, \$19,429,000 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 (\$79,516,000):** Includes \$65,181,000 for water acquisition program and \$14,335,000 for San Joaquin Basin Action Plan.

Non-reimbursable: Includes \$639,415,000 for fish and wildlife.

11/ **Non-Federal Share (\$37,255,000):** 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, \$10,421,000 for Clear Creek Restoration, and \$448,000 for spawning gravel.

Non-reimbursable (\$113,129,000): Includes \$104,324,000 for fish and wildlife, \$8,212,000 for flood control, and navigation for \$593,000.

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 (\$202,479,000): Includes \$611,000 for recreation, \$189,289,000 for fish and wildlife, \$11,731,000 for flood control, and \$848,000 for navigation.

13/ **Non-Federal Share (\$243,981,000):** Includes \$3,943,000 for the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, share of the costs of recreation

facilities at B.F. Sisk San Luis Reservoir, Los Banos Reservoir, San Luis Canal, and O'Neill Forebay; \$240,038,000 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 (\$337,296,000): Includes \$3,226,000 for recreation; \$220,277,000 for fish and wildlife; \$100,526,000 for flood control; \$7,265,000 for navigation; \$4,612,000 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 (\$23,493,000):** 24 percent is the non-Federal cost-share that is provided between State and local funds.

Non-reimbursable (\$252,061,000): 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 (\$96,006,000):** 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 (\$345,529,000): The legislation P.L. 106-246 authorizes \$213,887,700 of Federal grant funds which has been indexed to \$345,529,000 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 (\$57,228,000):** Includes \$30,675,000 from the Water Replenishment District of Southern California; and \$26,553,000 from the City of Long Beach.

Non-reimbursable: Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$19,076,000 provided by the Federal government as cooperative agreements.

18a/ **Non-Federal Share (\$68,998,000):** Includes \$68,998,000 from the City of Long Beach.

Non-reimbursable: Includes non-reimbursable costs of \$20,000,000 provided by the Federal government as cooperative agreements.

19/ Project scheduled to be completed in FY 2006.

20/ **Non-Federal Share (\$17,456,000):** 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 (\$446,967,000): 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 (\$64,587,000):** Includes \$13,073,750 from San Elijo Joint Powers Authority; \$36,379,000 from Carlsbad Municipal Water District, \$2,004,250 by the Leucadia Wastewater District; and \$13,130,000 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 \$7,997,000 from Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.

Non-reimbursable (\$23,964,000): 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 (\$574,146,000):** 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 \$461,374,000 for municipal, rural, and industrial water.

Non-Federal Share (\$314,757,966): Includes State municipal, rural and industrial (\$300,000,000); recreation (\$13,350,000); natural resources trust (\$1,200,000); and State contribution for headquarters building (\$207,966).

Non-reimbursable (\$1,232,360,034): Includes Municipal, Rural and Industrial Grant Program (\$450,880,000); fish & wildlife (\$57,276,000); Sheyenne River Release (\$50,640,000); flood control (\$67,849,000); Indian Municipal, Rural, and Industrial (\$294,790,000); 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 (\$123,507,034); and Wildlife Trust (\$25,000,000), as directed by the Dakota Water Resources Act of 2000.

26/ **Non-Federal Share (\$517,770,000):** Includes \$361,087,000 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; \$121,880,000 from the cities of Escondido, Poway, and/or San Diego; \$3,647,000 from the City of San Diego and/or San Diego County Water Authority; and \$31,156,000 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 (\$148,305,637):** Includes \$44,250,691 from the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority, Three Valleys Municipal Water District, and/or other entities; \$74,717,265 from the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and \$29,337,681 from the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District.

Non-reimbursable: \$44,590,000 is provided by the Federal government as grants and cooperative agreements.

28/ **Non-Federal Share (\$3,641,000):** Includes \$3,641,000 from the Pima County Flood Control District.

Non-reimbursable (\$72,962,000): 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
Animas-La Plata Project	The Final Supplement to the 1980 Final Environmental Statement (FSFES) was filed with the EPA on April 26, 1996. In August 1998, the Secretary of the Interior presented an Administration Proposal that provided M&I water only for the tribes and non-Indian entities, and established a Water Acquisition Fund for the tribes to purchase the balance of their water rights. The Final Supplemental EIS was filed with EPA in July 2000 and Reclamation issued a Record of Decision on September 25, 2000.
Cachuma Project	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. Resource Management Plan Draft EIS is under development. Completion expected summer 2007. South Central California Parallel Pipeline EIR/EIS initiated December 2006. Notice of Intention anticipated to be publicized in federal register spring 2007.
Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project	A categorical exclusion for the Conejo Creek Diversion component was completed in July 2000. A FONSI for the Regional Brine Line was completed in September 2002.
Central Arizona Project (CAP)	Projectwide - Final filed September 26, 1972. Additional activity-specific National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance documents were completed on all project activities prior to implementation. Current NEPA compliance activities include 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 2009 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 2009, delayed due to an extension in the completion of planning work. An environmental assessment for the Pascua Yaqui system is delayed until FY 2009 due to funding limitations. 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.
Central Valley Projects (CVP): 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

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<p>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.</p> <p>Placer County Water Agency American River Pump Station Project - Draft EIS/EIR released on September 13, 2001. Final was released June 14, 2002.</p>
<p>Central Valley Projects (Con't): Folsom Dam Gate Repairs</p> <p>American River Division Long-Term Contract Renewal</p>	<p>El Dorado Distribution System, May 22, 1974. Other NEPA compliance will be completed as required.</p> <p>Draft EIS was issued in March 2005 and the final was issued in July 2005. Awaiting final BO from FWS before issuing ROD. Completion expected 2007.</p>
<p>Delta Division</p> <p>Delta Long-Term Renewal Contracts</p> <p>Mercy Springs Water District Assignments to Westlands Water District, Santa Clara Valley Water District and Pajaro Valley Water District Long-Term Renewal Contract Portion.</p>	<p>South Delta Barrier Program EIS/EIR was completed August 1996. This project has been incorporated into the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.</p> <p>Final EA/FONSI completed on February 25, 2005.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Friant Division</p>	<p>Eastside to Westside Transfers and Exchanges. Preliminary Administrative Draft EA is under development. Final EA anticipated July of 2008.</p> <p>Millerton Lake Resource Management Plan and General Plan Programmatic Draft EIS/EIR being developed. Draft completion anticipated in 2007.</p> <p>Article 5 long-term EA and FONSI anticipated summer 2007. Five year Accelerated Water Transfer Program EA and FONSI completed March 2006. CVP to non-CVP EA awaiting completion of ESA consultation and public review period; final expected March 2007.</p> <p>Madera Irrigation District Madera Ranch Water Supply Enhancement Project EA project initiated December 2006.</p>

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
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 9, 2005; revised Natomas ROD May 5, 2005; and ROD for City of Redding and ACID signed July 1, 2005.
San Felipe Division	A projectwide FEIS 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 was completed in 2005; 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.
	San Justo Land Acquisition EA project initiated December 2006.
Central Valley Projects (Con't): Long-Term Renewal of CVP Contracts – San Felipe Unit	EA for San Felipe LTRC still in preparation, awaiting final negotiation of contract – completion schedule currently on hold pending re-consultation on OCAP.
	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.
West San Joaquin Division San Luis Unit	A projectwide environmental statement was filed with the CEQ October 4, 1972. A draft supplement to the final was filed with the CEQ July 30, 1979. A draft environmental statement for cleanup and closure of the San Luis Drain and Kesterson Reservoir was filed with the EPA April 30, 1986; final filed October 20, 1986. A draft Environmental Statement, as a result of the Barcellos Judgment, was filed with the EPA December 20, 1991. This plan was not accepted as complying with the Barcellos Judgment. Recent court decisions affirmed Interior's responsibility to address the drainage problem. In 2001, Reclamation began evaluating alternatives to provide long-term drainage service to the San Luis Unit. A Draft EIS was issued for public comment in May of 2005; a Final EIS was released in June 2006; the ROD is expected by the end of 2006.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
San Luis Unit Long-Term Contract Renewal	A public draft EIS was noticed in the Federal Register September 30, 2005. A Draft Supplement Information document to the EIS was released on February 23, 2006. The comment period ended April 10, 2006. The completion schedule for the EIS is currently on hold pending re-consultation on OCAP. Final EA for assignment of Broadview Water District contract to Westlands Water District was completed August 17, 2006.
San Luis Reservoir and Los Banos Creek State Recreation Area Joint General Plan and Resource Management Plan	Draft EIS/EIR is under development. Draft completion expected 2007.
Shasta Division	Will be completed as required. The CALFED Program recommends enlarging Shasta Dam and Reservoir and Reclamation has begun this study.
Trinity River Restoration Program	Buckhorn Debris Dam FES was filed with the EPA August 18, 1986. A Categorical Exclusion checklist for the Trinity Fish Hatchery was completed on October 6, 1983. Final EIS for Trinity River Mainstem Fishery Restoration released November 17, 2000. Record of Decision signed December 19, 2000. Implementation of decision delayed pending outcome of ongoing litigation and completion of supplemental EIS. Supplemental EIS was put on hold July 2004, appellate court ruled supplemental EIS does not have to be completed. ROD now being implemented.
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I Division	A project-wide final EIS was filed with the CEQ on June 18, 1975.
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title II Basinwide Program	All NEPA requirements will be complied with as needed.
Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project	Applicable NEPA documentation will be completed before individual actions are undertaken.
Endangered Species Recovery Implementation	Individual NEPA compliance documents will be prepared before construction is initiated. Construction activities currently scheduled will be covered by categorical exclusions or environmental assessments.
Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was signed October, 2002.
Lewis and Clark RWS	The Project sponsor has completed the Final Engineering Report (FER), Water Conservation Program Plan and the Environmental Assessment (EA). The FONSI was signed on March 5, 2003.

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Long Beach Area Water District Reclamation Project	A categorical exclusion for the Alamitos Barrier Reclaimed Water Project was completed in July 1999. A categorical exclusion for the City of Long Beach Recycled Water System Expansion Project was completed in January 1999.
Long Beach Desalination Research and Development Project	A categorical exclusion for the Long Beach Prototype Desalination Project was completed in June 2002. A supplemental categorical exclusion for the Under Ocean Floor Seawater Intake and Discharge Project was completed in December 2005.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project	A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision document (i.e. FONSI) was completed March 10, 1994. A Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report was completed in conjunction with the NEPA compliance process. At the time that the EA and FONSI were prepared, the wetlands component of the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System was not prepared in sufficient detail to be fully covered by the EA and FONSI. Reclamation with assistance from the Interagency Mitigation Team, prepared a supplement to the EA for the wetland component, and a FONSI was issued December 7, 2001.
Mni Wiconi Project	NEPA decision document (FONSI) was completed in October 1993. An amendment was signed in June 1995.
North San Diego County Area Water Recycling Project	A FONSI for the San Elijo Water Reclamation Project was completed July 1997. Categorical Exclusions for the Leucadia component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project and Olivenhain Water Reclamation Project were completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Carlsbad component of the Encina Basin Water Reclamation Project was completed in February 2002. A categorical exclusion for Olivenhain Northwest Quadrant Project was completed in August 2005.
Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, Phase I	The Record of Decision was completed August 14, 2000.
Perkins County	The FONSI was signed February 3, 2003.
Phoenix Metro Water Reclamation and Reuse Project	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 February 2008.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project	Projectwide Final Environmental Statement (FES) on the 250,000-acre plan was filed with the CEQ

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
Garrison Diversion Unit	<p>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 Fial EIS is scheduled for December 2006.</p>
San Carlos Water Settlement Act	<p>NEPA compliance schedule will be determined as required.</p>
San Diego Area Water Reclamation Program	<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. A categorical exclusion for the Los Penasquitos Canyon and Carmel Valley Pipelines, North City Reclamation System Phase 2, was completed in September 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</p>

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	<p>in July 1995. A Categorical Exclusion was completed for the San Pasqual Storage Tank in May 2001.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for the planning studies for the San Diego Water Repurification Project was completed in January 1995. In 1999, the city of San Diego stopped work on this project.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Padre Dam Municipal Water District Reclamation Project was completed in May 1995.</p>
San Gabriel Basin Project	<p>Categorical Exclusions for preconstruction activities were completed in September 1994 and January 1996. A FONSI for the San Gabriel Demonstration Project was completed in March 1997. A Categorical Exclusion for the La Puente Treatability Study was completed July 1999. A Categorical Exclusion for Design Activities for the El Monte, South El Monte, and Puente Valley Operable Units was completed July 2000. A Categorical Exclusion for the San Gabriel Valley Water Company Plant No. 8 Treatment Facility was completed in September 2000. Categorical exclusions for the Monterey Park Treatment Facility were completed in June and September 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the California Domestic Water Company Well 14 Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company San Gabriel Plant Treatment Facility was completed in May 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Southern California Water Company Encinita Plant Treatment Facility was completed in June 2001. A Categorical Exclusion for the Suburban Water Systems Extraction Wells and Pipeline was completed in April 2002. A Categorical Exclusion for the El Monte Operable Unit Westside Shallow and Northwest Deep Remedies was completed in January 2005.</p> <p>A categorical exclusion for the El Monte Operable Unit Eastside Shallow Remedy was completed in May 2006.</p> <p>A FONSI for the Rio Hondo Water Recycling Program was completed in June 1994. A categorical exclusion for Phase 2 of the Rio Hondo Program was completed in December 2006.</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>
San Jose Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Program	Completed for Phase I only.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act	The Tohono O’Odham Nation’s San Xavier District FES was issued November 2, 1989, and Schuk Toak was covered by a FONSI March 21, 1989. An environmental assessment for Tohono O’Odham Nation’s

STATUS OF NEPA COMPLIANCE

Project	Status
	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 2009 as a result of funding limitations which have delayed the start of the NEPA process.
Ventura River Project	Resource management Plan Draft EIS/EIR is under development for Lake Casitas. Draft completion expected mid 2008.
Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project	A programmatic EIS has been prepared to evaluate the basinwide environmental impacts/benefits of the water enhancement facilities. A Record of Decision was issued on March 10, 1999.

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
<p>Animas-La Plata Project</p>	<p>The downsizing of the Animas-La Plata Project to an all M&I project and the provision in P.L. 106-554 allowing up-front cost-sharing of non-tribal payment obligations 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. Through consultation with repayment entities, as required by P.L. 106-554, a method of addressing the administration of up-front payments within context of P.L. 108-147 and P.L. 109-148 has been formulated and implemented. Consultations with repayment entities will continue until final cost allocation.</p>
<p>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</p>	<p>A repayment contract with the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) was executed on December 15, 1972, and validated on May 24, 1983. An amended contract with the CAWCD was executed on December 1, 1988, and validated on January 7, 1991. The water supply system stage of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) was placed into repayment status in October 1993, followed by the regulatory storage stage, in October 1996. Following months of unsuccessful formal negotiations between the Bureau of Reclamation and CAWCD over a variety of CAP repayment contract and operation and maintenance issues, CAWCD filed suit against the U.S. on July 10, 1995. The U.S. filed a countersuit on August 18, 1995 in the U.S. District Court. On September 20, 1995, the complaints were consolidated in the U.S. District Court with the CAWCD suit as the complaint and the U.S. suit as a counter claim. For the court proceedings, the issues in dispute were divided into six phases: (1) Repayment Ceiling; (2) Cost Allocation; (3) Development Fund Administration; (4) Water Delivery Issues; (5) Construction Defects and Miscellaneous Claims; and (6) Billing Disputes. The Court heard phase 1 in August of 1998 and on November 3, 1998, issued a phase 1 order, ruling in favor of the CAWCD. The ruling determined that the 1988 amended repayment contract limits CAWCD's repayment obligation for stages 1 and 2 to \$1.781 billion unless a further amendment to the contract is executed changing that obligation. The United States was also enjoined from barring CAWCD from utilizing CAP facilities. Phase 2 of the trial was conducted in November of 1998. Shortly after the phase 2 court proceedings, negotiations were initiated to reach a settlement outside of the courts. The court, in deference to negotiations, did not issue a phase 2 ruling. Department of Justice successfully negotiated a Stipulated Settlement that contains a number of conditions that must be achieved within three years to allow final settlement of the case. The Court issued an order on May 9, 2000, staying litigation for three years to allow the conditions of the Stipulated Settlement to be achieved. On April 9, 2003, CAWCD and the United States agreed to extend the date to complete these conditions. 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>Central Arizona Project (CAP) (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 & 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>Central Arizona Project (CAP) (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>Central Valley Project</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 July 28, 2006.</p>
<p><u>American River Division</u> Auburn-Folsom South Unit</p>	<p>There are 7 contracts with entities in this unit. Three contracts have been executed; three 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 21 contracts in this unit at the present time. Twenty 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 Tulumne 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></p>	
<p>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, did not agree to renew its contract early. Long-term renewal contracts have been executed with the remaining 5 contractors. It is anticipated negotiations will be held during 2007 and the contracts will be executed no later than March 1, 2008.</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; 12 contractors did not renew and 1 contractor will renew upon an estate settlement.</p>

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Central Valley Project (Continued)	
<u>San Felipe Division</u>	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 complete; the contracts will be executed after the completion of the applicable environmental documentation.
<u>Shasta Division</u>	There are 6 contracts with entities in this unit. All 6 long-term renewal contracts have been executed.
<u>Trinity River Division</u>	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.
<u>West San Joaquin Division</u>	
Delta-Mendota Canal	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.
San Luis Unit	There are nine 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 to take an additional two years due to a re-consultation on OCAP. Additionally, 2 of the entities have an outstanding repayment obligation for a distribution system.
<u>Other</u>	There are a total of 254 contracts identified about of which 16 are interim renewal contracts. Interim renewal contracts are subject to the provisions of CVPIA and the acreage limitations of the Reclamation Reform Act.

STATUS OF WATER SERVICE AND REPAYMENT CONTRACTS

Project	Status
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I	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.
Fort Peck Reservation/Dry Prairie Rural Water System	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.
Lewis and Clark Rural Water System	Cooperative Agreement was signed June 29, 2001, with the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project	Repayment contract was signed May 2, 1995, with the Mid-Dakota Rural Water System, Incorporated. Obligation may be met with FY 2006 funding. Repayment will begin in FY 2007.
Mni Wiconi Project	No repayment contracts are anticipated. Cooperative agreements providing for work and commitment of non-Federal funds were executed prior to construction.
Perkins County Rural Water System	Cooperative Agreement was signed August 12, 2002, with Perkins County Rural Water System Incorporated; no repayment is required.
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison Diversion Unit	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.
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Project	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
Central Arizona Project	3607.55	75.32	1021.43					2510.80			81.00	2.00	79.00
Central Valley Project 1/ American River Division Auburn-Folsom South Folsom Dam Gate Repairs Delta Division Miscellaneous Projects Sacramento Division San Felipe Division San Joaquin Division West San Joaquin Division- San Luis Unit Shasta Division Trinity River													
Colorado River Storage Project					2/								
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Project - Title I	585.00	0.00 3/									N/A	N/A	N/A
Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Project Garrison 4/	6220.00								2.00		32.01	N/A	55.22
Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Prj	5847.55							5847.55			N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Summary of Irrigation Investment	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Acres</u>	
Total irrigation investment per acre	\$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	<u>-8</u>	<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.