THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET REQUEST FOR ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(110–95)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 7, 2008

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

40–695 PDF WASHINGTON : 2008

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota, *Chairman*

NICK J. RAHALL, II, West Virginia, *Vice Chair*
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
JERRY F. COSTELLO, Illinois
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JERROLD NADLER, New York
CORRINE BROWN, Florida
BOB FILNER, California
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania
BRIAN BAIRD, Washington
RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL E. CAPUANO, Massachusetts
JULIA CARSON, Indiana
TIMOTHY H. BISHOP, New York
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, Maine
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN T. SALAZAR, Colorado
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California
DANIEL LIPINSKI, Illinois
DORIS O. MATSUI, California
NICK LAMPSON, Texas
ZACHARY T. SPACE, Ohio
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
BRUCE L. BRALEY, Iowa
JASON ALTMIRE, Pennsylvania
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
HEATH SHULER, North Carolina
MICHAEL A. ACURI, New York
HARRY E. MITCHELL, Arizona
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania
JOHN J. HALL, New York
STEVE KAGEN, Wisconsin
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
JERRY MCNERNEY, California
LAURA A. RICHARDSON, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
DON YOUNG, Alaska
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
WAYNE T. GILCHREST, Maryland
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
GARY G. MILLER, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HENRY E. BROWN, JR., South Carolina
TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
JIM GERLACH, Pennsylvania
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
TED POE, Texas
DAVID G. REICHERT, Washington
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
LYNN A WESTMORELAND, Georgia
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR., Louisiana
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
THELMA D. DRAKE, Virginia
MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
VERN BUCHANAN, Florida
VACANCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Texas, *Chairwoman*

GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
BRIAN BAIRD, Washington
DORIS O. MATSUI, California
JERRY F. COSTELLO, Illinois
TIMOTHY H. BISHOP, New York
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN T. SALAZAR, Colorado
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
HEATH SHULER, North Carolina
HARRY E. MITCHELL, Arizaon
JOHN J. HALL, New York
STEVE KAGEN, Wisconsin
JERRY MCNERNEY, California, *Vice Chair*
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
BOB FILNER, California
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
MICHAEL E. CAPUANO, Massachusetts
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California
MICHAEL A ARCURI, New York
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
(Ex Officio)

JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
WAYNE T. GILCHREST, Maryland
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
GARY G. MILLER, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HENRY E. BROWN, JR., South Carolina
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR., Louisiana
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
THELMA D. DRAKE, Virginia
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
(Ex Officio)
VACANCY

CONTENTS

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Washington, DC 20515

James L. Oberstar
Chairman

David Heymsfeld, Chief of Staff
Ward W. McCarragher, Chief Counsel

February 6, 2008

John L. Mica
Ranking Republican Member

James W. Coon II, Republican Chief of Staff

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER

TO: Members of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment

FROM: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment Staff

SUBJECT: Hearing on the President's Fiscal Year 2009 budget request for Army Corps of Engineers and Environmental Protection Agency

PURPOSE OF THE HEARING

The Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment will hold a hearing on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2009 on Thursday, February 7, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., in 2167 Rayburn House Office Building. Testimony will be received from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") and the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") on their proposed budgets for FY 2009.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The administration's FY 2009 budget request for the Environmental Protection Agency totals $7.1 billion, including $2.6 billion for State and Tribal Assistance Grants, $2.3 billion for Environmental Programs and Management, and $1.3 billion for the Hazardous Substance Superfund program.

The FY 2009 budget request cuts EPA funding by more than $300 million from the FY 2008 appropriations of $7.5 billion. Funding levels between the FY 2009 request and FY 2008 are similar for Environmental Programs and Management ($2.3 billion for both years) and Superfund ($1.3 billion for both years). The FY 2009 request for State and Tribal Assistance Grants is approximately $300 million less than the FY 2008 appropriations.

Clean Water

EPA's water programs are designed to provide improvements in the quality of surface waters and drinking water. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction over programs aimed at protecting the nation's water quality. EPA, through its own programs and in combination with states and tribes, seeks to improve water quality in rivers, lakes, and coastal waters through investment in wastewater infrastructure, water quality standards, permitting programs, water quality monitoring, and research, among other activities. EPA's Office of Water operates EPA's water quality protection programs.

Overall FY 2009 requested funding for EPA water programs is $2.5 billion. The FY 2009 budget request is $323 million less than the FY 2008 appropriations.

EPA's states FY 2009 water program priorities are:

- Develop sustainable solutions for water infrastructure;
- Restore and protect America's wetlands and watersheds;
- Improve monitoring and measuring for clean, safe, and secure water; and
- Advance regional and coastal collaborations.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund: The FY 2009 budget request provides $555 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund ("CWSRF"). This request is a reduction of $134 million, compared to the FY 2008 appropriations. The CWSRF is the primary federal vehicle for funding wastewater infrastructure programs throughout the nation. CWSRF funds are used for capitalization grants for State Clean Water programs and infrastructure.

Other Wastewater Infrastructure Funding: The FY 2008 appropriations contained funding for 250 targeted wastewater infrastructure projects. The administration cuts funding for $146 million for these projects in the FY 2009 budget request because they were included in the FY 2008 appropriations report language. The administration justifies eliminating those projects because the projects are contained in the report language and "circumvent normal allocation and priority setting processes."

The administration is requesting $10 million for water infrastructure along the U.S.-Mexico border in its FY 2009 request. This request is a $10 million reduction from the FY 2008 appropriations. The administration justifies this reduction because of "the program's slow rate of project development over the last 10 years." Water infrastructure assistance for Alaska Native Villages is also reduced in the FY 2009 budget request.

Nonpoint Source Water Pollution: The FY 2009 budget request provides $185 million for Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Grants. This request is a reduction of $16 million from the FY 2008 appropriations.

Regional Programs: Regional programs are highlighted by the administration as opportunities to target regionally specific environmental problems and to work closely with state and local partners. In its FY 2009 budget request the administration has increased funding over the FY 2008 appropriations for the Great Lakes Program and the cleanup of contaminated sediment

through the Great Lakes Legacy Act. Funding was reduced for the Chesapeake Bay and Gulf of Mexico, compared to the FY 2008 approriations. Funding for the San Francisco Bay program[1] contained in the FY 2008 appropriations was terminated. Funding for the Puget Sound program was reduced by $19 million, to $1 million, in the FY 2009 budget request.

The administration is requesting $17.2 million for the National Estuaries Program in its FY 2009 budget request. This is a $10 million reduction from FY 2008 appropriations. The National Estuary Program consists of 28 individual estuary programs located across the country.

Other Water Programs: EPA's Clean Water Act Section 106 Water Pollution Control grant program increases by $4 million, the Tribal General Assistance Program ("GAP") grants increase by $2 million, and Wetlands Program Development grants and Beaches Protection program grants marginally increase over the FY 2008 appropriations.

In its FY 2009 budget request, the administration terminates its Targeted Watersheds Grants Program. This program was funded at $9.8 million in the FY 2008 appropriations. The Targeted Watersheds Grant Program is intended to promote "community-based approaches and management techniques to protect and restore the nation's waters...by providing assistance to watershed groups and service provider organizations working to protect and restore watersheds...."

Superfund and Brownfields

Superfund Program: The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act established the Superfund program in 1980. Superfund is the Federal government's program to cleanup the Nation's uncontrolled and/or abandoned hazardous waste sites. EPA addresses the highest priority sites by listing them on the Superfund National Priorities List ("NPL"). EPA's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response ("OSWER") runs the Superfund program.

The administration's stated FY 2009 priorities for the Superfund program include:

- Continued remediation at the most highly contaminated hazardous waste sites;
- Funding projects that are ready to begin construction;
- Continue to fund large and complex ongoing construction projects;
- Devote more resources toward post-construction activities, including long-term remedial actions, reuse, and five-year reviews;
- Complete remedy construction at 35 Superfund sites;
- Make 30 Superfund sites ready for anticipated use site-wide; and
- Undertake 195 Superfund-lead removals and oversee the completion of 125 voluntary removal actions.

The administration's FY 2009 budget request for Superfund totals $1.3 billion. This amount is consistent with the FY 2008 appropriations. Of this amount, $193.9 million is for Superfund

[1] The San Francisco Bay program and the Puget Sound program are not free-standing program offices with the Environmental Protection Agency, but are part of the larger National Estuaries Program (Section 320 of the Clean Water Act).

removal actions, $586.1 million is for Superfund remedial actions, and $163.7 million is for Superfund enforcement activities.

Brownfields Program: Brownfields consist of property for which the expansion, redevelopment or reuse may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant. These sites can consist, for example, of former industrial properties, gas stations, or dry cleaners, amongst others. Estimates of the number of brownfields sites, nationally, range from 450,000 to one million. EPA established the Brownfields Initiative in 1995 to better enable the Federal government, states, and communities to work together to address, cleanup, and reuse brownfields sites. The Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act authorized increased funding for EPA to award brownfields assessment, cleanup, and revolving loan fund grants. EPA's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) runs the Brownfields program.

The administration's brownfields program priorities for FY 2009 include:

- Providing funding for assessment, cleanup, Revolving Loan Fund, and job training grants;
- Assessing brownfields properties;
- Cleanups of brownfields properties; and
- Funding for assessment and cleanup of abandoned underground storage tanks and other petroleum contamination found on brownfields properties.

The administration's FY 2009 budget request for Brownfields totals $165.8 million. This is an increase over both the administration's FY 2008 budget request of $162.2 million, and FY 2008 level of $164.3 million. Of this number, the administration's budget requests $93.6 million for brownfields site assessment and cleanup grants, $49.5 million for State voluntary cleanup programs, and $22.7 million for EPA's administration of the brownfields program.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") provides water resources development projects for the nation, usually through cost-shared partnerships with nonfederal sponsors. Activities include navigation, flood control, shoreline protection, hydropower, dam safety, water supply, recreation, environmental restoration and protection, and disaster response and recovery.

The water infrastructure and programs of the Corps support vital economic and environmental needs of this nation. These projects provide for continued economic growth, job creation, and economic stability while protecting human lives, ensuring reliable waterborne transport of goods, and important environmental restoration of valuable natural resources. The administration is requesting significant cuts in the Corps budget totaling $845 million (-16 percent from FY 2008 appropriations). These cuts will significantly affect the ability of the agency to provide and maintain necessary water infrastructure, and to protect human health and the environment.

The construction projects are 27 percent less than FY 2008 appropriations, and the investigations account is 46 percent below FY 2008 appropriations. In addition, these low funding

levels continue to exacerbate problems by failing to fund the construction backlog, and preventing the study and development of solutions to current water resources challenges. Not only is the administration's budget below the FY 2008 appropriations, but it is also far below the capability levels of the Corps to invest in navigation, flood damage reduction, and environmental restoration projects.

Investigations: The administration's FY 2009 budget request proposes to cut the investigations account to $91 million, a decline of $76 million (-46 percent) from FY 2008 appropriations. The administration proposes this low budget request to limit development of new projects because, in the administration's view, the current construction backlog precludes the need for new feasibility studies.

The investigations account is used to fund the study of potential projects related to river and harbor navigation, flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration, and related purposes. This account also funds the restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction. The administration's FY 2009 budget proposes only one new project study, funded under the Mississippi River and Tributaries account (Atchafalaya Basin Floodway Land Study).

In the investigations account, no new project studies are included; instead, the focus is on completing ongoing studies. In addition, little funding is provided for projects that have completed the feasibility study phase and are ready for preconstruction, engineering, and design. This would halt the seamless funding of projects that has been the standard practice of the Corps. If enacted at the levels proposed, the FY 2009 general investigations budget would have a significant effect on staffing levels of Corps district offices because the salaries of Corps employees are paid from project funds, and in part from funds for project studies. In addition, the need for new projects is increasing and it is critical to maintain and enhance the capability of the Corps planning mission.

Construction: The construction account continues to decline under the administration's FY 2009 budget request of $1.4 billion, a reduction of $887 million (-27 percent) from the appropriation for FY 2008. These funds are used for the construction of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, environmental restoration, and related projects specifically authorized or made available for selection by law.

The administration has assembled its budget under "construction budgeting principles" which directs funding to the highest performing projects while addressing human safety concerns. Typically, more than 240 projects are in some state of construction in any given fiscal year. The FY 2009 budget request contains funding for only 80 construction projects. While this funding level does not address the backlog of uncompleted projects, it does focus the Corps on completing a number of ongoing projects. Under the administration's budget proposal, 12 projects should be completed in FY 2009. The administration's principles require a benefit cost-ratio better than 1.5 for a project to be considered, and over 3.0 to receive full funding. Environmental restoration projects are reviewed based on cost-effectiveness and national significance. There is a consideration for flood damage reduction projects to address projects that pose a significant risk of human safety.

The administration budget again provides no funding for beach renourishment. This continues the administration's policy of funding initial beach replenishment only and for ongoing mitigation of Federal navigation of effects.

The administration's FY 2009 budget request for the construction account includes only two projects authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. These two projects are Picayune Strand, Florida, and modifications to the Folsom Dam elements of the American River project, California.

Operations and Maintenance: The administration's fiscal year 2009 budget decreases funding in the Operations and Maintenance ("O&M") from FY 2008 appropriations by $44 million (-2 percent).[2] These funds are necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and related projects. The request level continues to neglect operations and maintenance needs and fails to ensure the reliable and efficient operations of our nation's vast water infrastructure. Maintenance will continue to be deferred on many projects.

The administration again proposes to shift several former Construction General responsibilities to the O&M account. The new projects/programs include: infrastructure rehabilitation for work that is not large enough to be considered a replacement; Endangered Species Act compliance where the Corps is implementing an alternative set forth in a biological opinion; the construction of facilities, projects or features (including islands and wetlands) using materials dredged during Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities; and the mitigation of shoreline impacts resulting from Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities.

Recreation: The Corps is the largest Federal provider of outdoor recreation services. It manages 4,300 recreation areas at 456 Corps' sites in 43 states. Many of the Corps' facilities were built 30-40 years ago, and were designed to meet the recreation needs of the public at that time. Today, Corps facilities serve millions of people per year. The administration is proposing to spend $270 million on recreation activities in FY 2009.

Water Trust Funds: The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is supported by an *ad valorem* tax paid by the shippers (not including exporters) of cargo loaded or unloaded at a U.S. port. The funds are used to do maintenance dredging of harbors and to provide for disposal facilities for dredged material. The budget would use only $729 million from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund resulting in an increase in the balance of the trust fund to $5.41 billion at the end of FY 2009. The balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has been growing significantly in recent years.

The Inland Waterways Trust Fund is supported by a 20-cent per gallon tax on commercial fuel used on specified inland waterways. The fund is used to pay for half of the federal cost of constructing navigation improvements on those waterways; the remaining half is paid from general revenues. In recent years the Corps has been steadily spending down the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The administration's budget request assumes enactment of an undefined administration proposal for the creation of new fees to replace the existing fuel tax for funding the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Should this proposal be forthcoming, and be enacted, the budget proposes

[2] The administration's budget request proposes $2.475 billion for the Operation and Maintenance account; however, this level includes a programmatic shift of $275 million for activities that Congress has traditionally funded out of the Construction account. For purposes of comparison with the FY2008 appropriations level ($2.244 billion), this $275 million must be removed from the O&M request – resulting in a $44 million decrease in the FY 2009 O&M request level compared to the FY2008 appropriations.

to transfer $167 million from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to the Construction/O&M accounts, resulting in a $40 million balance in the Trust Fund at the end of FY 2009. If this proposal were not enacted, there would be insufficient funds in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to meet the funding needs for the projects contained in the administration's request for the Construction/O&M accounts.

Regulatory Program: The administration's budget request for the Corps' Regulatory Program is $180 million. This is the same as last year's request and amount appropriated for FY 2008. This program administers the laws pertaining to the regulation of activities affecting the waters of the United States, including wetlands, in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act, and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. Again, this amount does not provide enough funding to cover additional work as a result of the *Rapanos* and *Carabell* Supreme Court decisions from last year.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program ("FUSRAP"): The administration's budget requests $130 million, down $10 million (-8.6 percent) from FY 2008. This program funds the cleanup of certain low-level radioactive materials and mixed wastes, located mostly at sites contaminated as a result of the nation's early efforts to develop atomic weapons.

Mississippi River and Tributaries ("MR&T"): The administration's request of $240 million is a significant cut of $147 million (-38 percent) from FY 2008 appropriations. The MR&T account provides for the planning, construction, and operation and maintenance activities associated with Mississippi River and Tributaries water resources projects located in the lower Mississippi River Valley from Cape Girardeau, Missouri to the Gulf of Mexico.

Administration Proposals: The administration budget request for FY 2009 contains five legislative proposals.

1) Reprogramming Rules: Proposal reaffirms the reprogramming rules contained in the FY 2008 Energy and Water Appropriations bill. This provision limits reprogramming to $3 million for programs, projects or activities; and limits studies to 25 percent of base amount.

2) Convert Continuing Contracts to Multi-year contracts: Proposal amends the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1922 to convert the Corps use of continuing contracts to multi-year contracts. The authorization is required for contracts over $100 million with a notification and waiting period for any contingent liability over $20 million.

3) Authorization for Louisiana Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction project: Proposed section will authorize the Corps to complete the Louisiana protection system to a 100 year level of protection. The post-Hurricane Katrina emergency funds authorized the Corps to repair/replace the preexisting levels of protections which in many cases was less than 100 year protection. The budget also includes a proposed $5.7 billion for implementation of the federal share of the project.

4) Inland Waterways Trust Fund: The budget raises the prospect of eliminating the current fuel tax which funds the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and replacing the revenue with a lockage fee or some other use based fee. The budget, however, does not contain a final legislative proposal.

5) Recreation Fees: The administration's budget calls for the Corps to resubmit its FY 2008 request for the Corps to collect new fees at recreation sites. This proposal permits the Corps to retain entrance fees collections in excess of $37 million and is modeled on fee collection programs currently used by National Park Service and the Forest Service. Beginning in FY 2009, the Corps would be authorized to finance a portion of the cost of maintaining and upgrading recreational facilities through the collection of additional user fees, and from new planning, management, and financing arrangements with state and local government park authorities, and private sector concessionaires.

HEARING ON THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET REQUEST FOR ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Thursday, February 7, 2008

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:00 p.m., in Room 2167, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Ms. JOHNSON. The Committee will come to order.

I would like to welcome our witnesses from EPA and the Corps. From the EPA, Assistant Administrator Benjamin Grumbles and Susan Bodine will testify. I would like to welcome John Paul Woodley, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works and Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp, Chief of Engineers for the Corps of Engineers.

As is becoming more and more apparent, the Nation is in economic distress, and yet the President's budget cuts programs and projects that put Americans to work on projects that will benefit Americans. Enhanced funding of EPA water infrastructure and Corps projects provide direct benefits to the economy while at the same time supporting the Nation's priorities of enhanced human health and safety and environmental restoration and protection.

Simply put, this budget is not adequate to meet the Nation's needs. The Administration fails to recognize that continued investment in water-related infrastructure is a key element for stimulating and improving the U.S. economy, an economy built on the investments of our predecessors.

States and local communities have warned that reduced funding for wastewater infrastructure programs make it difficult to respond to failing wastewater infrastructure and can force the delay of essential upgrades to improve water quality.

The President's budget for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program does nothing to reassure the public on this front. Given the needs of communities, rich and poor, to deal with toxic, hazardous waste sites, the Superfund budget does little more to address their concerns. Since this Administration came into office, the President's budget has almost halved the annual number of Superfund cleanups achieved by the Clinton Administration.

Unfortunately, the Army Corps of Engineers does not fare any better in this proposed budget. It continues cuts that affect the ability of the agency to carry out its mission.

The budget also fails to fund any of the important projects that were authorized by the WRDA 2007 bill which passed with overwhelmingly bipartisan support. For example, in my own district, the President's budget fails to adequately fund the recently authorized Dallas Floodway Extension Project.

This flood control project along the Trinity River provides critical flood protection for downtown Dallas and the neighborhoods of Oak Cliff and West Dallas, raising the level of flood protection and protecting the lives and livelihood of some 12,500 homes and businesses in Dallas. The city estimates that this project will prevent an excess of $8 billion in flood damages and provides additional recreational opportunities for those visiting the Dallas metropolitan area.

I am certain that every Member of this Committee could identify similar important projects that are targeted for elimination or reduction in this budget.

I am also concerned about the impact of this budget on the Corps' ability to vital operations and maintenance activities for both navigation and flood control projects. The passage of time has taken a toll and has created the real possibility of catastrophic failure of essential transportation linkages or flood protection projects. As the Nation learned in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, poorly constructed or maintain flood control structures can result in tremendous economic and personal hardship and loss of life.

This budget forces the Corps to do more with less money. It bets the continued reliability of our infrastructure on the hope that it will hold together for just a few more years. We cannot under-invest in the Nation's infrastructure or its environment. We have an obligation to future generations to provide a cleaner, safer and more secure world for them to live.

I welcome our witnesses here, and I look forward to today's testimony.

I now recognize Mr. Duncan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

I am filling in once again until a new Ranking Member is named in place of Mr. Baker, and I certainly am familiar with the importance of the Trinity River project to your district because you had me down there when I chaired this Subcommittee.

Let me begin by saying that I support the President's efforts to control Federal spending. However, the agency programs that we are examining today are truly investments in America. These are important programs that benefit our economy and improve the quality of life for our citizens.

While I believe we must be diligent in our oversight of these agencies to be sure that programs are run effectively and efficiently, I do not support cutting programs that have a proven record of providing economic benefits. In fact, as part of the economic stimulus program, we should increase our investment in programs such as those that both produce jobs, American jobs, and deliver economic benefits.

The Administration's budget for fiscal year 2009 continues a trend of under-investing in our water resources. As a result, the general condition of our flood protection and navigation infrastructure has declined. Investing in flood damage reduction projects protects the people and businesses in cities and towns all over the Nation. It makes good economic sense to protect existing development rather than have to pay for the losses and cleanup that come from hurricanes or floods.

In the global economy, the Nation's farmers and businesses must compete with their counterparts overseas for customers all over the world. The importance of modern waterways and ports has never been more critical to the Nation's economic well being as it is right now.

Yet, the Administration's budget cuts the Corps of Engineers' construction budget by nearly $900 million compared what it was enacted for fiscal year 2008. If we follow this lead, projects will take longer to complete and cost more and have the benefits delayed.

In addition, the budget cuts funds for feasibility studies by 46 percent compared to what Congress appropriated this year. These studies are necessary to produce the modern and beneficial projects that we need in the future.

There is very little from previous budget requests for the Corps' operations and maintenance account. After many years of inadequate funding resulting in deferred maintenance, the funding level is still too low.

The chronic problem of deferred maintenance is impacting the navigability of many of our waterways and causing ships to leave certain ports only partially loaded or, in some cases, to divert to foreign ports. This has a huge impact on the reliability of this important mode of transportation.

In the Environmental Protection Agency's budget, those of us on this Committee are disappointed that the Administration continues to inadequately fund the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program. This is a highly effective and very important program.

The Superfund and brownfields programs are budgeted at a flat rate compared to previous funding levels. These are important programs that make contaminated areas fit for redevelopment. Many of the smaller and easier cleanup projects have already been done, so the remaining work tends to be more complex and more expensive to complete. We will have to invest more in these programs if we want to release properties for redevelopment at the same pace. Those are general comments.

Two or three things more specific that I am interested in: It is my understanding the Corps is now conducting a study that compares different projects and how they have been completed. I am told that the study is called the Good, Bad and the Ugly, and this sounds like a very worthwhile effort to me. I suspect that my colleagues on this Committee, as well as other Committees, will be very interested in the results of this study, and I would like to hear the status of that.

In addition to that, the Olmsted Locks and Dams project on the Ohio River was authorized by Congress in WRDA 1988 at an esti-

mated construction cost of $775 million. Its construction began in 1991 and was supposed to have been completed years ago.

Today, so far, we have spent $900 million on the project. It is now estimated completion cost is just under $2 billion, and its completion date is now sometime in 2015. I think the Subcommittee should receive a report on that.

Finally, for more than 30 years, the Corps budget has identified project specific amounts in the operations and maintenance portion of the Corps budget.

This year in the fiscal year 2009 proposed budget for the Corps' civil works program, for the first time, this program is divided into O&M funding, into 54 river subsystems without providing the project specific amount for the individual projects within each subsystem. I think we need to know about that as well.

With those comments, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Duncan.

The Chair now recognizes Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Today, we are examining the President's budget request for the EPA Superfund program, a program that has been very much on the minds of my constituents of late. They, like me, are concerned about the North Indian Bend Wash Superfund site in Scottsdale which last month experienced a terrible failure.

On January 16th, without warning, residents were confronted with a three-day tap water ban. Worse, as water customers began lining up for bottled water and our local businesses began scrambling for ice, we learned that for as much as 16 to 24 hours prior to the implementation of the tap water ban, residents had been exposed to water containing more than 4 times the permissible concentration of trichloroethylene or TCE, a suspected cancer-causing chemical.

Investigations are ongoing, but it appears, at least initially, that a mechanical failure at the Miller Road water treatment facility is at least partially responsible. Alarming, this is the same facility that was found to have emitted impermissibly high levels of TCE for a period of eight days in October.

When news of the October TCE incident became public, which frankly is a whole disturbing story in itself, I asked the EPA to find out what was going on at that facility. I was assured and reassured, both by letter and by phone, that steps were being taken to guard against TCE emissions at Miller Road. However, when I turned on the local news a couple weeks later, there was the same plant, only this time it was having a bigger TCE emission problem.

And so, I come here today with a lot of questions for the EPA, questions about why a plant that had already experienced TCE emission problems wasn't fixed, about why a machine responsible for protecting the public from TCE emissions was left unattended and why no one discovered the machine had failed for up to 16 hours, about why the reverse 911 system activated by the water company to notify customers about the tap water ban failed to reach so many of the company's customers and why the system relied on an estimation of customer contact information instead of the actual customer contact information the company had on file.

I believe my constituents are entitled to some answers, and I hope we can get at least some of them here today.

Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back the rest of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Ms. Matsui.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank the panel for being here today. You are doing very important work throughout the Country and especially in my district of Sacramento. As you all know, Sacramento has significant flood issues. I know the President recognizes the flood concern in the capital of California as well.

Since coming to Congress, I have fought aggressively to bring vital Federal funding to my district to ensure that my constituents are protected. Unfortunately, while the President has recognized the need for flood mitigation efforts, the Administration has not provided the funds that we need to ensure these efforts are realized.

As a result, States like California often front the funding on flood projects. This is certainly the case in the Sacramento region where State and local flood control organizations are aggressively pursuing needed project improvements.

I feel that the Country needs to update the current funding process to encourage States and locals to move quickly to protect our constituents. They should not question whether the Federal Government will support their efforts to move quickly to build necessary and oftentimes vital projects. I hope the Administration will be there to provide the necessary support to our local and State Governments.

We have been working most recently in the Sacramento region on the joint Federal project and funding for the watershed. I know that the Administration has taken note of these projects, and I look forward to talking about them with you today.

Another issue that I am sure you are aware of is in the Natomas Region in Sacramento. Last week, the Army Corps of Engineers and FEMA received a copy of the letter that Chairman Oberstar, Subcommittee Chairwoman Norton and I sent. The letter announced an upcoming hearing on the Corps' levee certification and FEMA's flood zone designation processes.

We can all agree that with flood protection, the public safety always comes first. With that in mind, I am supportive of exploring additional ways to fast-track the locals' already aggressively construction schedule for the Natomas Basin and would expect that the Federal Government would provide the necessary assistance.

Next week, I want to hear how the Corps and FEMA procedures are changing and how they expect to implement these changes in the future in my district and throughout the Country.

Once again, I thank you all for being here. I look forward to discussing the Corps' budget priorities.

I yield back the balance of my time. Thank you.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Dr. Boustany.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

After Hurricane Rita, I was able to get authorized and appropriated monies for the first ever hurricane and flood protection

study in southwest Louisiana, and I have worked closely with the New Orleans Corps Office to move forward on this project. The reconnaissance study was completed, I believe this past May, and the project has moved to feasibility. I was able to secure additional money in the fiscal year 2008 budget in the omnibus bill to make sure that the project doesn't stall.

In addition, Congress directed the Corps to expedite completion of the feasibility aspect of this in WRDA, and yet the President's budget proposes no funding for the southwest Louisiana ongoing study in fiscal year 2009. So I hope to hear from you two gentlemen on this issue as we hear your testimony and get into the questions.

Additionally, the Louisiana delegation has worked to secure authorization for the Morganza to Gulf Hurricane Project in WRDA. We have worked with the Corps to make sure that WRDA contained adequate language to enable the Corps to move swiftly forward on this project, and there is some concern now that despite this hard-fought authorization there are additional hurdles that will stall the project. And so, I hope again this can be addressed.

Then, finally, in the operations and maintenance part of the budget, I have a little concern about the dredging funds for the Calcasieu ship channel which is very important as we look at the import of liquified natural gas into this Country. This ship channel is critically important. It is going to be the point of inflow for liquified natural gas into the Country.

So I see that keeping this channel dredged is of strategic importance, not just for Louisiana but for the Country, and so I hope we can perhaps have some discussion on this as well.

I thank you all for being here and look forward to the testimony.

I yield back.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank you for holding this hearing.

I also would like to thank today's panelists for appearing before us, and I want to express my appreciation for their efforts on behalf of their agencies. I particularly want to express my appreciation to the Army Corps of Engineers for the really inspired work that they do in my district and how responsive they have been to many of the issues that we have raised with the Corps.

However, let me say that once again I am distressed to see that the President's budget proposals sacrifice the long term health of our environment and the protection of our coastal communities for short term and essentially insignificant reductions in our deficit. The Administration's continuing retreat from the protection of our environmental resources under the pretense of expanding economic growth is very distressing and essentially an eight-year pattern.

I think we can all agree that the economy is ailing, but as someone who represents over 300 miles of coastline and numerous communities that depend on tourism and a pristine local environment, I find it difficult to see a correlation between damaging our shoreline and growing the economy.

For 2009, the Administration's budget cuts EPA funding by 4.4 percent from the 2008 enacted levels. Much of this decrease is attributed to large cuts on grants to States.

The budget cuts heavily the EPA Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a 19.4 percent reduction from this year's enacted budget and an astounding 58.8 percent reduction since President Bush took office. These cuts directly affect my constituents on Long Island and constituents all over the Country by preventing much-needed improvements to wastewater infrastructure.

Sadly, it seems as if the President is determined to leave as his legacy nearly a decade of misguided environmental policies, and so I look forward to hearing from the panelists, how we can best make sense of what has been proposed and how we can hopefully effect it positively so that we can all truly protect our environment and, in my case, preserve our shoreline.

I thank the Chairwoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank the panel for coming in and being part of this process.

The Corps supports activities of critical importance to my district including the Ports of Charleston and Georgetown, as well as the Atlantic and the coastal waterway.

Additionally, since the First District is a coastal district, almost every construction project brings with it some concerns over wetlands. After the Corps, the EPA and the White House issued long awaited wetlands guidance last summer, I am glad to report that the Charleston district has been one of the most aggressive in moving to process outstanding and new wetlands permits. I thank you all for that.

I do, however, have concerns over the funding level provided to the Corps' regulatory program in this budget and look forward to discussing that with our witnesses.

Overall, I am disappointed and, unlike last year, I cannot praise the Administration for making the Army Corps a priority in this budget. Sadly, comparing requests year to year, the Corps' budget is reduced this year.

While there is a lot of focus on the calculations made in determining which construction projects are funded, there is little attention paid to the maintenance needs of so many Corps projects that go unaddressed year after year.

Unfortunately, under the current environment, Congress ensuring that the Corps has funding to maintain a lock or dredge in the harbor to keep ships coming in is painted in a bad light while the maintenance needs continue to mount with little or no attention from the press and public. Investments in these facilities are not just economic stimulus. They are economic security.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today about this and many other issues facing our Nation's water infrastructure.

I yield back the balance of my time and thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Brown.

Mr. Shuler.

Mr. SHULER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

As a former real estate developer, I am very familiar with the infrastructure requirements for a new development.

I know firsthand how geosynthetics can support long-lasting, newly constructed roads, waterways and improve in erosion sediment control. The performance of roads built with geosynthetics was always superior to those built without them. Geosynthetics are also better for the environment by improving drainage roadways.

My personal experience with geosynthetics is a big reason why I am advocating for the expanse in use of geosynthetic products and materials. They will help the government and businesses to save money on projects of all sizes.

In the late 1980s, the Bureau of Reclamation concluded a series of tests and investigations to evaluate the use of geosynthetic systems lining canals throughout the western United States. The report concluded that geosynthetics led to a 90 percent reduction in leakage and a 50-year increase in the life span of canals.

In the early 1980s, the EPA mandated the uses of HDPE liners as subsurface barrier layers in the Nation's landfills and waste storage facilities. This resulted in the American Society of Civil Engineers offering the highest grade given to areas of solid waste management in their report card of America's infrastructure.

The evidence suggests that requiring the lining of canals, pipelines, reservoirs and dams for water conveyances with geosynthetic materials will improve the life spans of these infrastructure projects while reducing waste and saving taxpayers' monies.

I hope that this Committee will strongly consider taking steps to promote the use of geosynthetics in the Water Resource Development Act of 2008.

Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

We will go now to our witnesses. We are pleased to have the distinguished panel of witnesses this afternoon, and we have Assistant Administrator Benjamin Grumbles from the Environmental Protection Agency Office of Water and the Assistant Administrator Susan Bodine from the EPA's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

Then Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, the Honorable John Paul Woodley will testify following them, and our panel will conclude with testimony from Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp from the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

We are pleased that all of you are here this afternoon.

Mr. Grumbles.

Your full statements can be placed in the record. So we would ask if you could limit your testimony to five minutes and proceed as one finishes.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE BENJAMIN H. GRUMBLES, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR WATER, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; THE HONORABLE SUSAN PARKER BODINE, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; THE HONORABLE JOHN PAUL WOODLEY, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR CIVIL WORKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY; AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT VAN ANTWERP, CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. GRUMBLES. Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the Subcommittee. It is always an honor to appear before the Subcommittee and have the opportunity to discuss the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request as it relates to water programs for the U.S. EPA.

The request constitutes $2.5 billion which is 35 percent of the Agency's overall budget, and the request will allow us, with our State, tribal and local partners, to continue to make progress in ensuring America's waters are clean, safe and secure and, above all, sustainable. The key that we are focusing on and continuing to emphasize in our budget request is sustainability, particularly with infrastructure but also on holistic and integrated watershed approaches.

Infrastructure financing: Water infrastructure is a lifeline for community health and prosperity. EPA is committed to developing innovative, sustainable and market-based approaches and solutions for managing and financing infrastructure with public and private partners.

We will continue to build on our well established Four Pillars of Sustainable Infrastructure, focused on improved asset management and management of utilities, secondly, full cost pricing, thirdly, water efficiency, and fourthly, an integrated watershed approach.

The Clean Water State Revolving Fund program provides funds to capitalize state revolving loan funds. In this budget request, EPA will be on track to meet its total capitalization target of $6.8 billion for the periods from 2004 through 2011. At this funding level, the Clean Water SRF will provide an average of $3.4 billion in loans annually.

We believe that the seed money that goes into the state revolving fund is a very important tool. It is not the only tool, and we are committed to working with you on additional tools and practices and revenue sources and mechanisms to continue to meet the infrastructure needs.

The drinking water infrastructure funds, the SRF, the Administration is requesting a slight increase above what was enacted. It is $842 million.

A very important, an innovative part to meeting water infrastructure needs is Water Enterprise Bonds. The Administration continues to request that Congress move on a Water Enterprise Bond proposal that would be to amend the tax code to remove the artificial cap, the barrier. It is called the Unified State Volume Cap on the use of public-private partnerships for water and wastewater infrastructure. We think that can lead to new money, new revenues of up to $5 billion a year.

Another important component of sustainability for water is the WaterSense program and advancing concepts of water efficiency at every turn. More than 125 different models of high efficiency toilets and 30 bathroom faucets have earned the EPA label, and almost 600 manufacturers, retailers and utilities have joined the program.

By promoting this easily recognizable, consistent national brand, EPA believes WaterSense will make water efficient products the clear and preferred choice among consumers, and this is good news for the whole Country, particularly for areas of the Country that are experiencing water restrictions and drought.

Homeland security is a theme that continues to be a high priority for the Administration, and it remains that in this budget request. EPA is seeking over $35 million for strengthening the Nation's water and wastewater infrastructure systems. Primarily, that focuses on drinking water, but it also involves partnerships with wastewater utilities.

For wetlands, one of the Nation's most critical natural resources, a part of our natural heritage, we are seeking $39 million in this budget request. That is to carry out our regulatory responsibilities and also advance the President's vision of cooperative conservation through stewardship so that we can meet the overall gain of wetlands goal that the President has articulated.

Two key activities will be implementing the 2006 decision of the Supreme Court in Rapanos and working with our Federal agency partners to accelerate the completion of the digital wetlands data layer in the National Spatial Data Inventory. What this means is working with the Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies. We are all making progress to have better maps, more accurate maps, more comprehensive maps for wetlands across the Country.

Watershed protection is a theme and a priority that runs throughout the budget and the U.S. EPA strategic plan. We launched a green infrastructure strategy in January of this year to reduce sewer overflows and stormwater runoff, and we look forward to working with the Committee and others to advance this strategy that emphasizes not just the gray infrastructure but the green infrastructure to control overflows and manage stormwater.

For the Great Lakes, a unique and extraordinary resource, the agency is requesting $57 million. Thirty-five of that is for the Great Lakes Legacy Act to clean up contaminated sediments. It is a very important part of our budget and a priority as the Interagency Taskforce.

For the Chesapeake Bay, we are requesting $29 million. We are committed to accelerating restoration of the bay's aquatic habitat and achieving the pollution reduction targets for 2010.

For the Gulf of Mexico, the agency is requesting $4.5 million. We will continue to support efforts with the States in the Gulf Region to reduce nutrient loadings to watersheds and reduce the size of the hypoxic zone by identifying the top 100 nutrient-contributing watersheds in the entire Mississippi River Basin and using a computer mode to determine where the major sources of nitrogen and phosphorus are located and where to target reduction efforts.

Madam Chair, in conclusion, I would say that we appreciate the opportunity to highlight key components of the budget request.

Water is a public trust, and EPA's Office of Water takes this responsibility very seriously. We are committed to working with you on not only sustaining the core programs under the Clean Water Act but also on developing innovative tools and approaches to meet the needs of the 21st Century.

Thank you.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Ms. Bodine.

Ms. BODINE. Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the Subcommittee. I, too, would like to say that it is a pleasure to be back here in 2167 Rayburn. I have spent a lot of hours here.

I am very pleased to appear before the Subcommittee to talk about the President's fiscal year 2009 request for the brownfields and Superfund programs as well as other programs that fall within this Subcommittee's jurisdiction.

The President's fiscal year 2009 budget request provides the necessary funds for EPA to carry out our mission efficiently and effectively, to protect human health and safeguard the environment. This budget request continues strong support for the brownfields program. It maintains funding for further progress in cleaning up Superfund sites and continues an emphasis on homeland security and emergency response efforts.

The President's budget requests $165.7 million for the brownfields program. Of that amount, $93.6 million is for assessment, revolving loan fund and cleanup grants. It is estimated that with the 2009 funding, that we will produce 1,000 brownfields property assessments, clean up 60 properties, leverage 5,000 jobs and leverage $900 million in cleanup and redevelopment funding.

EPA will continue its land revitalization efforts which cut across all of our cleanup programs as well as working with partners in all levels of government and the private sector and nonprofit sectors. The goal of land revitalization is to restore our Nation's contaminated land resources so that will allow Americans' communities to safely return these properties to productive use.

In addition, by incorporating green and sustainable approaches into our brownfields redevelopment program, we can further increase the environmental benefits from land revitalization.

Now I know that in today's tight budget climate, EPA faces challenges. Our Superfund program continues to address large, complex sites, but I want to assure you we are managing that challenge. The President's request of $1.264 billion for the Superfund program maintains steady funding for cleanup.

We also have other sources of funding in addition to current year appropriations. Through aggressive management of our contracts, since 2001, we have been able to de-obligate more than $840 million of excess funding that was in closed out contracts.

Through our enforcement efforts, we have been able to collect settlement dollars from responsible parties that is used toward site cleanup. In fiscal year 2007, we received commitments from responsible parties to provide over a billion dollars worth of cleanup work and funding.

As you know, when we settle with responsible parties, we can settle either for work or for cash, and when we settle for cash we put that funding into special accounts. We currently have more

than one billion dollars in special accounts that are dedicated toward cleanup of specific sites.

At the end of fiscal year 2007, cleanup construction had been completed at 1,030 Superfund sites. That is 66 percent of the National Priorities List. Building upon the 24 sites where construction was completed in 2007, the 30 that we expect to complete in 2008 and the 35 that are our goal for 2009, we are on track to meet the target in our strategic plan.

Construction completion is one way of assessing Superfund program progress. It was developed about a decade ago as a measure of interim progress. But it is important for you to understand that it is not a measure of long term protection.

To better address long term protection, in 2007, we adopted a new measure called Site-Wide Ready for Anticipated Use, and this is a measure of progress after construction is complete. To be ready for anticipated use, all of the cleanup levels for productive use of the land have to be met and all of the institutional controls that ensure that the land is used safely into the future have to be in place.

Last year, we had a goal of 30 sites. It was the first year we had that measure in place. We achieved 64. The goal is still 30 for 2008 and 2009. In the future, though, as we make progress in this, I expect that we will adjust that goal to raise it higher. Obviously, it has been very successful.

But I want to stress the importance of this measure because, without it, we didn't have a measure to ensure that all the institutional controls are in place that are part of the remedy, because they are a part of the remedy that get STET implemented after construction is complete.

The President's budget request will also fund our removal and emergency response programs. To date, EPA has completed more than 9,700 removals at hazardous waste sites, and those removals address immediate threats to human health and the environment.

The budget request also includes $55.8 million for the Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness and Response program.

Now that request is $12 million above the fiscal year 2008 request, and I want to explain that those additional resources are going to strengthen EPA's ability to respond to multiple incidents of national significance that might occur. We expect that if something happens, if a terrorist act happens, it is probably not going to be just one. It will probably be multiple incidents.

So, we are seeking that funding to expand our laboratory capacity, including additional mobile labs. We want to provide for additional training and exercises and additional equipment including a second airplane that we use for aerial monitoring to detect releases.

In addition, our 2009 budget requests funds for our oil spill program at $13.9 million. Now this program focuses on preventing oil spills, reducing risk to people and the environment, and responding to oil spills. Every year, EPA evaluates thousands of spills to determine if Federal assistance is required, and we manage actions to oversee private party response at about 250 to 300 sites per year.

That concludes my statement, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Assistant Secretary Woodley.

Mr. WOODLEY. Madam Chairwoman, distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today with General Van Antwerp, the 52nd Chief of Engineers, to present the President's fiscal year 2009 budget for the Civil Works Program in the Army Corps of Engineers.

The Civil Works budget provides funding for development and restoration of the Nation's water and related resources primarily within the three main program areas of commercial navigation, flood and coastal storm damage reduction and aquatic ecosystem restoration.

The budget also supports hydropower, recreation, environmental stewardship and water supply storage at existing Corps projects.

Finally, the Civil Works budget provides for protection of waters and wetlands, cleanup of sites contaminated as a result of the Nation's efforts to develop atomic weapons and emergency preparedness.

The budget for the fiscal year 2009 annual Civil Works program is $4.74 billion. In addition, the President's budget requests $5.761 billion in fiscal year 2009 emergency appropriations for the Federal share of the additional funds needed to reduce the risk to the greater New Orleans, Louisiana area from storm surge that have a 1 percent annual chance of reoccurring.

The fiscal year 2009 budget includes $1 million in the Investigations account for independent peer review requirements of Section 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. The Investigations account also includes $2 million for a high priority study, authorized by Section 2032(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, of the vulnerability of the U.S. to damage from flooding.

The budget again proposes performance criteria to allocate funds among construction projects. These criteria give priority for funding to the projects that yield the greatest returns to the Nation based upon objective performance criteria.

The budget allocates funding among ongoing construction projects based primarily on benefit to cost ratio. Priority is also accorded to projects that reduce significant risk to human safety and to dam safety assurance, seepage control and static instability correction projects.

For operations and maintenance of Civil Works projects, the fiscal year 2009 budget provides nearly $2.6 billion in the O&M account and $163 million in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account. The total is $16 million higher than the fiscal year 2008 budget for comparable activities which, by the way, in turn, provided a substantial increase itself over prior years' O&M levels.

The budget provides $729 million to be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for operations and maintenance of commercial navigation channels and harbors. The growth of the trust fund balance and ways to address this balance are being discussed within the Administration. We will continue to work within the Administration to develop policies to effectively use the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Like the budgets of the past two years, the fiscal year 2009 budget proposes to allocate operations and maintenance funding on a regional basis. The budget proposes to allocate operations and maintenance funding among 54 areas based on the USGS subwatersheds. This approach will improve the overall performance of Civil Works assets because managers in the field will be better able to properly maintain key infrastructure, adapt to uncertainties and address emergencies and other changed conditions over the course of the fiscal year.

As anticipated at this time last year, the fiscal year 2009 budget is based on enactment of proposed legislation to establish a lockage-based barge user fee and to phase out the existing fuel tax. The proposed legislation will be transmitted to Congress after the Executive Branch interagency review of the proposal is completed.

Prompt enactment of such legislation is needed to address a declining balance in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund which otherwise will run out of funds around the end of the 2008 calendar year and to support ongoing and future inland waterway projects.

The budget provides $185 million for the Corps of Engineers share of the South Florida Everglades Ecosystem Restoration program which is the most ever budgeted or appropriated for the Corps in one year for these activities. This level of funding for the Corps is an increase of $54 million or 41 percent compared to the fiscal year 2008 enacted level.

The budget also includes $20 million for the Louisiana coastal restoration effort including $10 for its important science program.

The budget provides $180 million for the Corps Regulatory Program to protect wetlands and other waters of the United States. This is the same amount as in the budget and appropriations for fiscal year 2008 and represents a $55 million increase since 2001.

The fiscal year 2009 budget proposes to authorize the New Orleans Area Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System to be constructed with the State of Louisiana as the single non-Federal cost-sharing partner and subsequently maintained and operated by the State.

Pre-Katrina, risk reduction for the greater New Orleans area was built as a collection of separately authorized projects, designed with differing standards, subject to differing requirements for non-Federal cost-sharing and managed by different local entities.

Based on statutory language proposed in the budget, the non-Federal sponsor would provide $1.5 billion for the non-Federal share of this work. The New Orleans area system will be not only higher but also stronger than the pre-Hurricane Katrina system.

Upon passage of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, Madam Chairman, the Chief of Engineers and I established a joint team to oversee its implementation. I meet biweekly with this joint WRDA implementation team to establish policy, issue implementing guidance and assess progress.

Priority for implementation guidance is being given to national policy provisions, most of which are in Title II, and to those project and program provisions for which funds are currently appropriated.

In summary, Madam Chairman, this budget does not include funding for all the good things the Corps of Engineers Civil Works program could do in fiscal year 2009. However, at $4.74 billion, it

does provide the resources the Civil Works program needs to pursue investments that will yield very good returns for the Nation in the future.

This is the last time I will have the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee to present the Army Civil Works budget on behalf of President Bush.

I would be remiss if I didn't especially thank the Chairwoman and the Members for their many courtesies during my tenure and especially for your courtesy in forgiving me last year for not appearing because of my inability to get out of my neighborhood because of the inclement weather. I am delighted that my principal deputy, Mr. Dunlop, was able to appear in my stead, but I would like to especially mention that as something that I appreciate the Committee having done for me.

Perhaps this is the least of the many, many courtesies and many opportunities I have had to learn from each of you, to visit with many of you in your districts and in your offices and to learn to appreciate the very significant water resource needs of the Nation that you are responsible for authorizing.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you so very much. Don't celebrate yet. We might criticize you before you leave.

[Laughter.]

Ms. JOHNSON. Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp.

General VAN ANTWERP. Thank you, Madam Chair.

It is my honor to appear before you and Members of the Subcommittee. This is my first time before this Committee. I was appointed in May of last year, and I look forward to building and growing relationships with this Committee and working with you over time.

I am committed to at least four years. So, while this might be Mr. Woodley's last, this is my first, and I look forward to a long association.

It was a real busy year in 2007. We have a military program, and that isn't what this is about, but it is the largest we have ever had since World War II. We are growing the Army. We are restationing the Army. We are doing base realignment and closure, and it is an awesome thing to see out there at our installations, many of which are in your districts.

As part of that business, Civil Works completed over 10 navigation projects last year that we are very proud of, restored over 5,000 acres of wetlands ecosystem restoration, dredged 175 channels in some of our Nation's biggest ports, going to 50 feet to really enhance the economy of this Country.

We had 368 million visitor days out to our 4,490 parks and recreation areas, a place where we really are able to touch the American people.

We supported FEMA in response to 10 national emergencies, and I am glad to report that none of those were hurricanes that hit southeast Louisiana. We were thankful because that is the one thing we don't need now as we are in the restoration process.

We processed over 87,000 permits, a big load and a challenge for us.

We instituted several initiatives to improve our cost estimates, and one was covered in WRDA. It is in the 2009 budget. That is

for independent review. We think it is very important. We are doing both external and internal independent review to make sure that we get our project recommendations right.

This fiscal year 2009 budget is performance-based, focusing on the highest economic and environmental returns. That is how we stacked up 79 projects for construction, 11 dam safety, 16 life safety, 52 ongoing and completing 12 projects in 2009.

We have learned a lot of lessons from the Gulf that have helped the whole Country, that have helped in levees and other things in California and other places. I think this is important to the Country. It would be a crime to have gone through that and not have gotten better as a result. So that is what we are committed to.

Life cycle management, inspections, the Good, Bad and the Ugly that was discussed here is really our project review and program assessment that we intend to report out this summer.

I want to just mention as you look behind me here, many members in uniform, the Army Corps of Engineers is an expeditionary force. What you can't see are members in civilian clothes here that have also deployed, many of them behind me. Today, we have 800 members of the Corps of Engineers, mostly civilians, deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan, 4 districts doing 4,300 projects and making our Nation proud and I would say giving both those countries a start.

It is our commitment in the Corps for continuous improvement, and we count on you and accept what you say and work with you to make sure that happens. We want to deliver quality. We are absolutely committed to teamwork with our cost-sharing partners in your districts and good stewardship of every dollar that is appropriated.

This concludes my statement. I look forward to your questions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, General.

We will now hear questions from the Subcommittee for the panel.

Mr. Boustany, do you want to begin?

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Before I yield to Mr. LoBiondo because he has a meeting to attend to, I just want to say thank you all for begin here today. I want to particularly thank Secretary Woodley for his service. It has been a very challenging time on the Gulf Coast for us all, and, General Van Antwerp, I am glad that you are up to the challenge.

So with that, I will yield to Mr. LoBiondo and then follow up later with questions.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I thank my colleague very much and, Madam Chair, thank you for holding this important hearing. I appreciate our panel being here today.

General, let me tell you that in my involvement with the Corps over the years, I can't find the right vocabulary to say what a great job your folks are doing, continue to do with energy, enthusiasm, focus, cost in mind. Everything that we would want and expect, I have seen at least in my district, above and beyond the call of duty, not just once but time and time and time again. They deserve a great big thank you, and we owe them a debt of gratitude for the outstanding job they were doing.

But having said that, Secretary Woodley, I am just absolutely astonished. It is just totally unbelievable to me, and I am outraged that OMB continues to zero out these projects.

It is my understanding that Federal law dictates the policy of the United States to promote beach nourishment and periodic beach replenishment, and these are projects that are fully vetted by Congress. The project agreements have been signed with the local sponsors to share the costs. All of the Ts were crossed and Is were dotted. They are cost-effective, and yet we continue to receive zero dollars.

I can't believe how shortsighted OMB can be in understanding the math that if we have a hurricane or a disaster along our coast, you are willing to come in with Federal Government resources and hundreds of millions or billions of dollars, but yet we are denied the ability to secure life and property for basically a few million dollars in each and every one of our communities. I just don't understand this rationale. It is different than the way it was when I first got here.

These communities are at risk tremendously. I know in my district, the Second District of New Jersey, the estimates differ on how overdue we are for a category three, four or five. The law of averages at some point is going to catch up to this. The communities are doing everything they can to make sure the protections are there, first of all, for the safety of the residents and, secondly, for the property.

I would just like you to help me understand how these decisions are made and how we are all left out of the equation.

Mr. WOODLEY. Sir, thank you so much for sharing your views on this. This is something that has been a matter of discussion between the Committee and the Congress and the Administration, not just this Administration, but I believe administrations in the past.

But the policy we are advocating is that we will support the project and do support numerous projects in the initial construction phase and that in the renourishment phase, we are advocating a policy under which, with certain fairly substantial exceptions, the renourishment phase is a local or State responsibility.

I understand that there are reasonable minds that differ on the wisdom of that policy, but the Administration is suggesting that in this way we leverage our scarce Federal resources and that it would provide for, in the long run, a more balanced approach to maintaining these beach types of storm protection.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I understand. Mr. Secretary, you do understand you are dooming these communities just as surely as if the Federal formula had been flipped to 35 percent Federal share. You are dooming most of the communities to not being able to do this because they just don't have the resources. They can partner to do the resources.

I think this is very shortsighted because if that disaster hits, you are going to be there and you are going to be there to the tune of a factor of hundreds of times more than it would be right now.

Madam Chair, thank you very much.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I want to thank you, Assistant Administrator Grumbles and Assistant Administrator Bodine, for being here today.

I will try to get through as many questions as I can, but since I know our time is limited I will be following up with you after the hearing with some additional questions in writing.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the North Indian Bend Wash Superfund site in Scottsdale, Arizona has had some serious problems of late with which the most serious problem has been with excess TCE emissions.

EPA is currently conducting a full investigation of these problems. My question is do you know when we can expect the final results of an EPA investigation?

Ms. BODINE. Congressman, let me take that question. I spoke with the regional administrator, Wayne Nastri, about this yesterday. I didn't ask your question, and I apologize that I didn't and I will ask and get back to you immediately.

I do know, though, that his staff are working very aggressively and diligently on that. In fact, what they are working on is coming up not just with an investigation of what happened but, even more importantly, what are we going to do to take the steps that we know we have to take to restore confidence in this system and to restore your confidence and the confidence of your constituents. We also know that that is a very high bar.

Mr. MITCHELL. You don't know the time?

Ms. BODINE. I failed to ask that question. I will get back to you on that immediately.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

The Miller Road water treatment facility which serves the North Indian Bend Wash Superfund site in Scottsdale now has had two TCE emission episodes in a period of three months. In your experience, is this common for Superfund site water treatment facilities?

Ms. BODINE. No, not at all.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you aware of any other facilities that have had multiple episodes such as this in such a short period of time?

Ms. BODINE. No, I am not aware of any other facilities.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the only one that you have?

Ms. BODINE. Yes. This situation is one that we haven't encountered before and one that we have to be very aggressive about addressing.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears that at least part of the problem at the Miller Road treatment facility was due to a blower that malfunctioned shortly after the operator left for the day at approximately 2:30 p.m. The blower's malfunction was not discovered until 6:30 a.m. the following day.

Does it seem reasonable to you that the blower which is responsible for protecting the public drinking water from dangerous levels of TCE was left unattended for 16 hours?

Ms. BODINE. As part of investigating what went wrong and, more importantly, looking forward to how to fix it in the future, we are going to be looking and the Region 9 staff are going to be looking at what needs to be done in the future, again to make sure this cannot happen again.

All alternatives are being looked at, including redundant systems, including requirements for monitoring, including requirements for operator attendance. They are looking at all of that to put together a plan which I will ask them to share with you, again, because we know we have to restore the confidence of your constituents in this system. And so, we want to make sure that our plan meets that standard.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that the EPA issued a draft risk assessment in 2001 entitled TCE Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterizations. Did the EPA ever take any subsequent action on that report?

Ms. BODINE. The TCE risk assessment was reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences, and the NAS issued a report about a year ago—I don't remember the exact date—that recommended that the Agency use different studies to develop a TCE risk number.

Our Office of Research and Development is looking at that matter, and continues to look at that in responding to those recommendations. If our Office of Research and Development used the data, what the NAS committee was recommending, that would result in allowable exposures to TCE that were 70 times higher. As you can imagine, they are looking very seriously at that.

Mr. MITCHELL. This report came out in 2001. It is now 2008. Was there ever a final version of this report that you know of?

Ms. BODINE. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. And no final recommendations at all?

Ms. BODINE. No. That's the issue. It had gone to the National Academy, and the National Academy came out with a report, and our Office of Research and Development is reviewing that and determining how to proceed and how to go forward.

Mr. MITCHELL. When do you expect that to come out?

Ms. BODINE. I would have to get back to you for the record on that and inquire, again, because that work is being done in a different office.

Mr. MITCHELL. We are talking about the standards of TCE, what is acceptable in water, right?

Ms. BODINE. No. Oh, no. I'm sorry.

Ben, do you want to respond?

Mr. GRUMBLES. The question about risk assessments and ARARs, the research office in the agency has been working on TCE. It is relevant to the water office. It is relevant to the Superfund office. In the meantime, we have in place a current standard for TCE.

Of course, we want to gather the information, the scientific information continuously to look at existing contaminant maximum concentration levels to see if they need to be revised. So the research office is working on that through the risk assessment, updating it.

Mr. MITCHELL. But EPA had done a draft risk assessment, and they have done nothing since then. Is that right?

Mr. GRUMBLES. Continue to review the issue. It has been under review based on the input from the National Academy of Sciences, and that work continues.

Ms. JOHNSON. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Madam Chair. I will, again, submit some other questions

Ms. JOHNSON. Mr. Boustany.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I mentioned at the outset several concerns I had and one being the southwest Louisiana study which we completed the reconnaissance study, had some additional money for the feasibility study, and then in WRDA we have it as expedited or it is under the expedited area in WRDA to move forward, and yet the fiscal year 2009 budget basically has nothing for this.

Secretary Woodley, General Van Antwerp, are we ignoring this aspect of WRDA or when do you anticipate going forward on southwest Louisiana?

Mr. WOODLEY. No, sir, we are certainly not ignoring any aspect of WRDA.

The bill was enacted somewhat late in the calendar year, as you recall. By that time, our budget is pretty well built, and we were able to put a few things in from WRDA that I discussed, that we were able to get in. But, generally speaking, we are looking for, as we build the 2010 submission to look toward the things that were put into WRDA to request funding in that process.

I can ask, if I could, the Chief to respond to the level or the current status of the planning efforts for all of south Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I appreciate that because that would help us in planning to secure the local cost-share funding that is going to be necessary to proceed. I have meetings back home with local officials and State officials on this, and so I just want to make sure we keep the ball rolling on this and don't lose the momentum.

Likewise with the Morganza to the Gulf project, again, if you could make sure that we have good contact back and forth as to what is going on because this is a massive undertaking, recognizing it is going to be multiple years in the works. But I want to make sure that we don't lose time needlessly because of poor communication going forward. So if you will work with my office on these two issues, I would be greatly appreciative.

On the operations and maintenance part of the budget, I saw the $14 million for the Calcasieu Channel which is not quite enough to take care of things. I know we have some issues with beneficial use of the dredge material we need to work out, but I am very concerned about this because we need to keep that channel dredged at the fully authorized depth and width because of the LNG activity that is anticipated with two new facilities under construction and scheduled to go online fairly soon plus the expansion of a third.

I think this is critical beyond just Louisiana, as I mentioned earlier, and so again I want to urge that this should be a priority to make sure that we have adequate dredging funds available and also a plan for the use of that dredge material.

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you.

We thank you for the $5.761 billion for the levees in New Orleans. It is critically important for safety.

We are concerned about the $1.8 billion that the State is going to have to put up in cost share. We are still trying to recover from these hurricanes. Do you have any ideas? Short of getting that

cost-share level changed statutorily, are there any other flexibilities that you are prepared to mention today that I could bring back home to the State of Louisiana with regard to that?

Mr. WOODLEY. We will be working very closely with the State. I am committed. The law does provide the Secretary a pretty wide latitude on exactly when to require payments and, while I don't want to set bad precedents anywhere in the Country, I will be looking to use those flexibilities and to work closely with the State.

When the Federal Government—well, we feel that there is a really strong partnership going on now with the Federal Government and the State of Louisiana, and so that is something that we are going to foster. You can tell them that to expect us to work closely with them, to use our available authorities to minimize what we understand is a very heavy burden.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate that and let me again say thank you on behalf of the State of Louisiana for the great work that the Corps is doing. It has been a very good partnership as we face some significant challenges. The Corps officials on the ground have done a magnificent job with the resources they have been given, and we are certainly appreciative.

Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

To the Lieutenant General, under the operations and maintenance account, the fiscal year 2009 budget is a 2 percent of $44 million decrease from fiscal year 2008, and the budget provides no detail as to how this operations and maintenance will be spent.

There is a list of systems and the O&M need for the system but no detail within the system budget, and this impedes the Congress' ability to provide adequate oversight of the budget process. Why isn't there some detail as to how this budget will be spent?

General VAN ANTWERP. Well, ma'am, thank you for the question.

We did divide this into 54 subwatersheds to look at systems and look at what would be required. There are efficiencies that you gain. For instance, if you have a holding basin upstream, you may not need levees downstream. If you have multiple locks within that reach or that subwatershed, there could be exchanges of parts and other things to keep the system operating.

We do have working documents. We have been in conversation with OMB, and the current time we have put this out in broad categories of those 54 subwatershed systems.

Ms. JOHNSON. Can you provide with detail of that budget for each of the systems? I don't mean at this moment.

Mr. WOODLEY. I think that as long as we are able to do so in a way that is not misleading, we would be delighted to do so at the appropriate time.

Ms. JOHNSON. Okay. The Committee request a complete and detailed O&M budget for fiscal year 2009 including the capability of each project. That gives us an idea as to how we will proceed with requests as well. Thank you.

Administrator Bodine, a few weeks ago, the publication, Inside EPA, ran an article suggesting that the U.S. Department of Defense was again considering a push to limit their environmental cleanup and management responsibilities under the Superfund law and other environmental statutes.

As you know, in 2003, the then Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency testified before the Senate of her concern with exempting the Department of Defense from compliance with the Nation's environmental laws and her belief that contrary to the opinion of the Department of Defense, she was unaware that these laws had in any way affected military readiness.

The Inside EPA article suggested that instead of statutory changes, DOD was pursuing administrative relief from Superfund and other environmental statutes. Are you aware of any effort by DoD to administratively limit its responsibilities under these laws?

Ms. BODINE. No, Congresswoman, I am not, and I didn't see that Inside EPA article either. I certainly would have inquired, and I will inquire now.

Ms. JOHNSON. What is the position of EPA with respect to the DoD statutory responsibilities under the Superfund?

Ms. BODINE. DoD has extensive responsibilities under Superfund. Section 120 of the statute spells those out. When a site is on the NPL, we enter into a Federal facility agreement with DoD that puts in enforceable requirements on DoD to ensure that those responsibilities are carried out.

Ms. JOHNSON. Okay. I would request that you ensure that this Committee is kept informed of any administrative or legislative proposal of DoD to limit its statutory responsibilities under the Nation's environmental laws in the name of readiness.

Ms. BODINE. Okay.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much.

I have to go to the floor, and I am going to ask Ms. Matsui if she will take the Chair.

Ms. MATSUI. [Presiding] We will yield time now to Mr. Boozman for questions.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I will yield to Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Ms. Chair.

Mr. Woodley, in Charleston, we have the Port of Georgetown and the Port of Charleston, and I noticed every year we have to really negotiate the budget for Georgetown because there is never enough appropriated and we have to go back to the appropriators to get the money.

You know all the bad words we have now with earmarks which is basically I am having to get earmarks, number one, to keep the harbor open at Georgetown. Is there anything that we might be able to do particularly in light of the new earmark restrictions that we are going to be probably facing?

Mr. WOODLEY. Congressman, I will have to look into that and get back to you. I certainly hope so because I have been an advocate for navigation in South Carolina and along the entire Atlantic seaboard and I would hate to see anything done that would degrade our capability, given the fact that there is so much commerce that is taking place and such an engine of prosperity for that region and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. BROWN. I appreciate you doing that because I know I have just have the last year, but it has been kind of a cumulative thing since I have been a Member of Congress, that the Georgetown Harbor last year was actually allocated about $2 million, but it took

$6 million to make it work. So we had to go to the appropriators to get the additional $4 million.

I have a letter from the Corps, not from the Corps but from the port, saying that they could focus, they could actually send more cargo into the Georgetown Harbor if it was better set up to make it work. And so, my question would be if we could be a little bit more proactive rather than reactive.

I know that you have some guidance based on tonnage. I believe it is what? Is it a million tons or something? What is your cutoff?

Mr. WOODLEY. You are correct.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, one million tons for budget navigation projects. Who set that number?

Mr. WOODLEY. That is a number that is set within the Administration. Obviously, it is rather arbitrary, but it is intended to give us a dividing line on which we can make decisions.

But I think that we have some ability to look beyond that, and I would like to look into Georgetown which is one I have not had an opportunity to really study and see what we can do.

Mr. BROWN. Okay. Well, I appreciate that because I think if we could focus more shipments into Georgetown, we probably could take some transportation off the highways by using barges and other mechanisms there.

Another problem we always deal with every year is the deepening of the Intracoastal Waterway, the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. I know last year about $800,000 was appropriated through the budget, and we had to go to the appropriators for another $1.3 million.

I know this year $724,000 is being asked. Just to get back to where we were last year is going to require $1.4 million. But you know and I know it is probably along the whole Intracoastal Waterway. It is probably about $20 million deferred maintenance on dredging that to keep it open.

To give you idea, back to the Georgetown Harbor, this year's request is $690,000. You know $690,000 wouldn't hardly do anything if there is a $6 million need. I believe it is an additional 2.1 this year, but anyway if you could look at that because it is a continuing problem.

Like I said, we are having to use earmarks chargeable to me in order to keep that port open and certainly the commerce there. We have the steel mill and the paper mill and some other items that we need to continue to keep going. If we don't keep that harbor open, those industries won't be able to continue. So I appreciate your looking into that.

Mr. WOODLEY. I apologize. I have been to Georgetown Harbor. I know what you are talking about. I am sorry. I just caught it to mind. It has been a couple years now, but I will certainly look into that. That is a very fine harbor and a very fine operation they are running down there, and I would be very concerned to learn that we were not able to maintain their channels.

Mr. BROWN. Okay, because like I said, in light of the new earmark concerns, I am not so sure what kind of flexibility we might have in this year's appropriations. Thank you very much.

Thank you all for being here. Ms. Bodine, good seeing you again.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Woodley, I thank you very much and, General Van Antwerp and all of you, for being here. I want to thank you, especially Secretary Woodley, for your kind attention to Sacramento. We do have a lot of flood control problems.

I have a question regarding I am happy that the President's budget requested funding for the Joint Federal Project, which you know is a joint project between the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, to capability in fiscal year 2009 of $9 million. Now the bureau has already begun excavation, and I believe the Corps will be ready for their part of the construction, fiscal year 2010. However, this will require a greater commitment of funds.

Now, does your budget reflect the necessary commitments to funding for this project in fiscal year 2010 and beyond so construction can proceed?

As you know, we have a target date of completion of about 2015 and every additional year would add somewhere around thirty or forty million dollars to the project, and we would like to get this done as quickly as possible.

Mr. WOODLEY. Ma'am, I will not be here next year.

Ms. MATSUI. I realize that.

Mr. WOODLEY. As long as I am here, that project will have the highest priority within the Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers that I am capable of giving it.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you.

I am looking ahead, though, because I think this is something that should be put out there that these projects are multi-year. They need to have the capabilities every year.

I have a question probably for you, Secretary Woodley, and maybe General Van Antwerp. I understand the Corps is supportive of watershed approaches to flood protection, and I support this approach as well. However, as you know, it has been very difficult to justify projects within your current rules unless there is a favorable benefit to cost ratio, which does not adequately take into consideration the value of human life and devastating consequences of major catastrophic flooding.

Oftentimes, nonstructural watershed approach projects don't have a BCR because it is not a dam, a levee or a weir. It might provide open space for high water events and ecosystem restoration, wastewater management, et cetera.

I would like to see the Corps work on a method of providing better tools for analyzing all categories of project benefits, not just easily quantifiable ones, so that we can give OMB, you and Congress what we need for these types of projects and approaches. Are you currently actively working on that?

Mr. WOODLEY. I believe that concept is among those requirements that are mandated and called for by WRDA 2007, and we are indeed actively working on the new set of metrics and new analytical tools that will allow us to address the WRDA provisions. It will not be easy. It is not a short term effort, but I believe we have seen what the Committee has put forth and what the Congress has put forth, and we endorse it and are going to seek to embrace it.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you.

As you know, in Sacramento, we have been on the leading edge of levee work. Next to New Orleans, we are the most at-risk river

city. So, therefore, we have been dealing with strengthening our levees, and we have been working on this for quite a long time, feeling that we have met the standards.

After Katrina, we are reassessing, obviously. We are on the leading edge, and we find out that our levees don't meet the so-called standards.

Now we want, obviously, safety first. That is very important to us. However, as we move forward, I think nationwide we are going to be finding that this is going to be happening across the board.

Now Congress authorized a new National Levee Safety program in WRDA 2007 with annual funding of $20 million, and this program is designed to continue the ongoing levee inventory but also to create a committee that is to report back to Congress within the 180 days with recommendations for a new National Levee Safety program and a strategic plan for implementation.

This budget only provides $10 million for levee inventory. Is this adequate to conduct the levee inventory and create the committee?

The justification sheets seem to indicate that the committee will be formed but does not indicate that the program recommendations will be completed. So, if you would follow up on that, is that accurate and why is the Corps not going to complete this important policy component in a timely manner?

I realize this is all wrapped up in a compound question, but it is something that we are all concerned about as we move forward. We need to get a handle on how we deal with some of these levee questions, knowing that there are regional differences certainly in California and the Midwest. So, if you could just answer, that would be great.

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, ma'am. We were able to address only a limited number of the WRDA initiatives in our 2009 submission, and that is one of them. We have addressed that in the levee inventory line item, and we have begun it at what I would have to describe as a low initial level of funding sufficient to establish the committee.

I think the 180-day deadline is probably not going to be met.

Ms. MATSUI. Just to follow up, it is just so important as we move forward. I think everyone here who has levees is worried about the situation, and this is going to be an ongoing situation. So I encourage you to look at this and perhaps more emphasis on this.

So, thank you.

Mr. Boozman.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Grumbles, as you know better than any of us, the Nation's infrastructure as far as the wastewater, things like that, is just wearing out. Many of our communities, I have communities that literally it is the same pipes, the same whatever that were there when the community started.

As you all get more aggressive, which you should, in an effort to continue to protect the environment and things like that, it is really very difficult for them to come up with the resources to get things fixed. The Clean Water State Revolving Funds, you are proposing that we actually not do what we have done in the past even, much less than increase that.

So I think we are kind of putting these places in a catch-22 situation. I mean we are getting aggressive. We are asking them to do things that they need to do and yet are reluctant to help with the funding. Yet, I understand that there is a limited amount of funding.

But many of these, they have exhausted their ability as far as municipal bonds. They are trying to do the right thing. They go into the open market, and it is so much more expensive. So there is a less amount that can be done if they can even do that.

Can you comment on that and kind of give us some guidance as far as the agency's thinking?

Mr. GRUMBLES. I certainly can, Congressman, and I can tell you that one of the Administrator's highest priorities this year is to focus in on water and wastewater infrastructure and to use technology, innovation and partnerships to have a more sustainable approach for the future because, as you point out, the needs grow as the pipes get older, the plants age, the water quality standards and requirements continue to increase, which I think the American public supports and EPA certainly does, and also as population pressures increase.

So the vision for us, that is also part of this budget request is to continue to deliver on the commitment of the $6.8 billion through 2011 for Federal seed money for capitalization of those SRFs which continue to grow, but it is also to work with our State and local and tribal partners, particularly at the utility level, on attributes of effective management.

What that means is working together using technologies and improved, more cost-effective ways to monitor the health of the infrastructure which is often out of sight and out of mind, these buried assets that are community assets, to be able to monitor their replacement and repair and rehab and find more cost-effective ways of doing that. Our research office has been working on that, and we are committed to it as well.

It is also coming up with innovative approaches which is what the Water Enterprise Bonds are all about. We want to increase local choice and opportunity so that if a community wants to issue a bond that has substantial involvement by the private sector, they are not confronted with a barrier under the current U.S. Tax Code. We think that is one important, innovative tool to add to the toolbox.

The other one, though, Congressman, is the more we increase the awareness and the importance of water and wastewater infrastructure and work with elected officials at the local level the more we will continue to see a move towards full cost pricing, water rates that reflect the true value of the services and the need to invest over time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. No, and I agree, and I think that is great as you go forward with some of the technology and things. It is difficult for the communities, the older communities in good faith of trying to do things right, and it just costs an awful lot of money.

I guess I am for aggressively doing our best to protect the environment and clean things up, but unless we provide additional funding with the additional requirements, then basically we have an unfunded mandate, and so I would just really encourage you all.

Also, I want to thank all of you. I have worked with all of you very closely, and I do appreciate the hard work, and I know where your hearts are at in this. Again, we are all struggling. We wish that we could just snap our fingers and give you all the money you needed, but I do appreciate you.

I wish you really would look at that and fight for all you can get because each year there is a lot of this stuff if you let stuff go. Right now there is a lot of stuff, and I see this with so many things. You have the ability to fix it now, but if you let it go a little longer, then it becomes irreparable and then you have to rip it out and then it becomes much more expensive.

So if we can help by giving that encouragement and giving, not giving but working with our communities, which you are trying to, like I say, it would be much appreciated.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you.

Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have some questions I think for you, Mr. Woodley or for the General. I just want to go over some numbers. I want to make sure I have them right, and then I would ask you to help me understand them.

In fiscal year 2007, the Corps budget for the Westhampton beach nourishment project, which is a court ordered project, was $3.4 million. Pardon me, in fiscal year 2008, that number is. In fiscal year 2009, the request is $1.25 million.

For the west of Shinnecock project, a project designed to prevent a breach in the event of a serious nor'easter or a serious stuff, the fiscal year 2008 number is $2.5 million. The fiscal year 2009 number is $400,000.

The Fire Island to Montauk Point reformulation study, fiscal year 2008, we are budgeting a million dollars. Fiscal year 2009, the President's budget requests $500,000.

So, A, my question is do I have these numbers right, and B, if I do have them right, how do you suggest that that shoreline be protected in the two areas that are the most vulnerable, the Westhampton dune area and the west of Shinnecock area?

Mr. WOODLEY. Mr. Bishop, those numbers don't immediately correlate to the numbers that I had previous been provided. So I am going to have to take the matter you raise for the record and get back to you on it to give you the exact numbers on it. I thought the figures were somewhat higher.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. I would appreciate it if you would do that.

Mr. WOODLEY. I hope they are.

Mr. BISHOP. I hope your memory is correct also because these are two very important projects and, as I said at the outset, I think the Corps has done great work in our district and I would hate to see us backslide because we are not providing appropriate resources for the Corps to do its work.

Mr. WOODLEY. I am particularly interested in the one where we are discharging obligations pursuant to the court.

Mr. BISHOP. The West Hampton dunes beach nourishment project, yes.

Mr. WOODLEY. I will take your matter for the record if I may and get back to you as soon as possible.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

My second question is for Mr. Grumbles. The history of the EPA budget over the course of the Bush Presidency has been an unfortunate one. Each year, we lament the fact that the budget is cut from the previous year. In my opening statement, I cited, for example, the eight-year decline in the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund.

I just heard your response to Mr. Boozman's question. It continues to seem to me, and I heard you say the State Clean Water Revolving Fund is a very high priority for the Administrator, but I have a hard time squaring that with a one-year reduction of almost 20 percent and an eight-year reduction of almost 60 percent.

Also, the other problem that I have is I think we all have an obligation to be fiscally responsible. I read in the New York Times that Mr. Nussle, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, says that in sheer dollar terms the deficit doesn't mean anything. We have had Vice President Cheney say that deficits don't matter.

If those are assertions are correct, if deficits don't matter, if the sheer dollar amount of the deficit means nothing, why is it that we are not more vigilant about seeing to it that the environment receives its fair share of the Federal budget?

I mean the numbers that we are talking about in the context of a $3.1 trillion budget are not daunting numbers.

I guess my question is why is there not the commitment, at least in the area of water projects, that I think most reasonable people would think that this Nation ought to be putting forth, particularly given the fact that we have a crumbling infrastructure and particularly given the fact that our environment has such an intimate relationship with our economic well being?

Mr. GRUMBLES. Congressman, our view is that $2.5 billion is a substantial and reasonable investment in the context of the Federal EPA budget. What we are focused on doing is building more sustainable approaches, particularly in the water arena that I am familiar with.

We know that earmarks and unrealistic authorizations are not going to get the job done. We know that more needs to be done, and it needs to be done through innovative approaches. The investments in this budget for infrastructure and for the watershed programs and for standards setting will keep us on course for making progress, but we know that to accelerate the progress, it require innovative approaches.

State programs continue to mature. They, in most cases, are carrying out the Clean Water Act regulatory programs, and so we have an oversight responsibility and ensuring that sound science is part of that. So we believe that this budget will continue to make progress, and we are also committed to using new tools.

Congressman, you have a lot to be proud of in the Long Island Sound area, the concept of innovative market-based approaches for nutrients, nutrient loadings to the Sound.

For us, we view the wave of the future is through water quality trading.

We can do more with less, with less Federal taxpayer dollars, get more environmental results. The way to do that is by working with States and with the private sector and with the utilities. It includes

using innovative approaches and clean water reg permits. That doesn't translate necessarily into an increase in our EPA budget, but we think it is going to translate into improved environmental results.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Bishop, could you submit the rest in writing, the rest of the questions?

Mr. BISHOP. I would be happy to.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you very much.

Mr. Boustany.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Grumbles, the EPA's gap analysis assumes that municipalities can borrow below market rates. But if they have to borrow at market rates to make up for the shortfall in available capital in the State Revolving Funds, how much more money is it going to take to finance the needed infrastructure improvements at market rates?

Mr. GRUMBLES. Congressman, the gap analysis laid out various assumptions and different approaches to this important question. What we found was that over a 20-year period for clean water capitalization needs, that if you made an assumption of an increase in revenues of 3 percent above inflation, that the capital infrastructure gap would be $21 billion over a 20-year period.

If you don't assume an increase in the revenues, then it would be a higher number, $45 billion. I am sorry. It would be a higher number. It would be approximately $270 billion. [Subsequent to hearing, edited to read: approximately $122 billion.]

So what we recognize in the gap analysis is we need to have these pillars of sustainability where we are finding and helping find more cost-effective approaches to capitalization as well as the maintenance of infrastructure systems.

We think the Water Enterprise Bonds, now is the time for those because there is a willingness in the private sector to invest in water and wastewater projects. These are community assets. It is a community decision whether or not to have some private sector involvement in it.

And so, what our proposal is to help accelerate the progress on narrowing the gap between needs and revenue sources. We want to remove the barriers in the tax code to investment by the private sector through the use of private activity bonds if and only if the community wants to go down that road.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you.

Secretary Woodley, we are starting to see demand for water outstripping supply, and now we are seeing disputes among the States both in the eastern part of the Country and the western part of the Country. What do you see the role of the Corps being in helping to ensure an adequate water supply and working through these disputes?

Mr. WOODLEY. Congressman, I see the role of the Corps as the Federal Government's and, indeed, the Nation's engineer in that context.

I think the Corps of Engineers should support the efforts of States to resolve any disputes among themselves with expert advice as to what the capabilities are of the currently existing infrastructure, how that infrastructure itself and its operations can be

modified to support the goals of the States and the needs of their communities, and what options may exist for additional measures, which may run the whole gamut of measures from conservation to new construction that can be done in an environmentally sustainable way to meet the needs of the future.

I do not, emphatically do not see the Corps of Engineers as having a role as a referee among the States or as an arbiter among the States or as a determiner of winners and losers in water resource negotiations. I would reject any attempt to place the Corps of Engineers in that role, but these issues cannot be resolved in many cases without the participation of the Corps of Engineers along with many other Federal agencies in an effort to inform decision-makers of their options and to inform them of consequences of various courses of action that may be proposed.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Thank you.

General Van Antwerp, in looking at the operations and maintenance budget request, it is only slightly above what the President requested for fiscal year 2008.

There is concern that expected maintenance may not be met and there will be again more deferred maintenance. What do you think the dollar amount is at this time for current maintenance backlog and is this backlog growing?

General VAN ANTWERP. I would say that the backlog is growing. I don't have a figure. We can try and pull that together.

What we really looked at is we have emphasized performance and we have emphasized criticality to safety and those other things. So, for instance, let's take the dams. We are going after those high priority dams and the levees, part of the levee inventory is to get at those that are most important to be done right now.

There is, I would say, a huge backlog without giving you a number, but we are prioritizing that so that we are looking definitely at the health and safety and welfare first. We use what we call a risk-based approach, and that is how we prioritize these projects.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I think it would be useful for the Committee to be able to track that backlog year in and year out and have a number that the Corps provides, using some kind of consistent methodology because it may give us some insights into how we might change the way we are doing things, working with you guys.

So, I thank you, and I yield back.

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you, Mr. Boustany.

Mr. Hall.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thanks to all of our witnesses. I am grateful for the Corps for many, many things especially for your help in the 19th District of New York where we have suffered from three 50-year floods in the last four years.

I was in Los Angeles, two weekends ago and was told just before I landed that there had been a tornado that touched down in Hollywood. This past Tuesday morning, my wife and I were awakened in Dover Plains, New York, in upstate northeastern New York, by a February 5th thunderstorm. Little did we know that later that same evening, storms would hit across several States in the South that would kill 50 people at last count.

With this in mind and with climate change appearing to be underway, I wanted to ask Administrator Grumbles about a memo-

randum you issued last March 1st, stating, "The National Water Program and its partners should take prudent steps now to assess emerging information, evaluate potential impacts of climate change on water programs and identify appropriate response actions," and laid out a schedule leading to the finalization of that strategy in late 2007.

Could you tell us what is the current state of that document? Where is it in the approval and vetting process and when can we expect for it to be finalized and published?

Mr. GRUMBLES. Thank you, Congressman.

You are referring to a draft National Water Program Climate Change Strategy. I have talked to Chairwoman Napolitano about it as well and others.

It is going through internal review. We are also coordinating with other agencies. We recognize that water is such a critical component of successfully confronting climate change. So, in terms of a timetable, the one that I laid out in that memorandum was an aggressive and ambitious one, but I am certainly committed to making progress on it.

I can tell you, Congressman, as folks are reviewing the document, we are also thinking of real-time issues that are arising. Utilities, wastewater, water utilities, State water and drinking water agencies are also giving us their views on climate change and the range of issues. I am very pleased with the progress we have had so far on draft and getting comments on it and look forward to finalizing it in the coming weeks.

Mr. HALL. Excuse me. I only have a short time. Can you give us a guess as to the date when we may see this document?

Mr. GRUMBLES. My goal would be to put it out for public comment in the coming weeks.

Mr. HALL. Okay, thank you.

According to EPA, the Superfund budget request for this year is $1.264 billion which is just about flat from last year's levels. EPA claims that this will allow them to complete remedies at 35 sites even though last year only 24 sites were completed in fiscal year 2007 with about the same funding levels. How do we expect to do more remediation this year with roughly the same resources?

Ms. Bodine, do you want to answer that?

Ms. BODINE. Yes. Yes, thank you very much.

The number of sites that we expect to clean up in 2008 and then in 2009 under this budget is up. It is based on where sites are in the cleanup process.

So we have 35 sites that have gone through the study phase and the phase for selecting the remedy and designing the remedy. So we expect that those sites then will proceed to the completion of cleanup, using the resources in the 2009 budget.

Mr. HALL. Okay.

Ms. BODINE. So those numbers are based on where the sites are.

Mr. HALL. There are different degrees of effort and scope or scale?

Ms. BODINE. Cleaning up a site is not a one-year process. It is a multiple year process. When the construction of a site is completed, it is based on all the work that was done in the years before, and we identify the number of sites that we expect to be

cleaned up in a year based on the ones that we see coming and moving through the process.

Mr. HALL. Okay. If I could ask a couple of questions and if we don't have time, maybe I could get the answers in writing.

Ms. BODINE. Sure.

Mr. HALL. One is does the budget including any funding to update the human health standard for TCE? I have a TCE Superfund site in my district as well as Mr. Mitchell does in his.

Ms. BODINE. Right.

Mr. HALL. How does the ready for anticipated use differ from construction complete, the tradition measure of a Superfund cleanup?

If at the end of fiscal year 2009 you expect roughly 100 construction completes but only 64 ready for anticipated use sites, what do we make of the protective measures of the remaining 1,000 NPL sites?

That is a lot of questions in a row but if you could.

Ms. BODINE. On the amount of the Office of Research and Development budget that is going towards the TCE risk number, I would have to ask them to answer that for the record.

On the ready for anticipated use measure that we have that is under the Superfund program, I would dispute that construction completion should be considered the traditional measure of Superfund progress. It is an interim measure. It means that the construction of the remedy is complete, but it doesn't mean that we have met all of the cleanup standards and it doesn't meant that we have controls in place.

If you have cleaned up to one level, when it is residential, then you don't need controls. But if you have a commercial or industrial cleanup standard, you have to put controls in place to make sure that the property is only used for those purposes, and that is how you ensure long term protectiveness.

So, the ready for reuse measure then goes beyond construction complete and makes sure that the land is ready for reuse and that the institutional controls are in place.

The low numbers that you were citing do not reflect this. We are doing much. We are doing well with this. Because it was a new measure, we had a target of 30. We are doing very well with it.

The issue that this measure is intended to address is the fact that we haven't done a good job in the past of getting our institutional controls in place, and we are aggressively going after that issue, and this measure is a way for us to put management attention and management pressure on that issue.

Mr. HALL. Thank you. I will ask more questions in writing.

I yield back.

Ms. BODINE. Thank you.

Mr. KAGEN. [Presiding.] Mr. Boustany, do you have any other questions?

Mr. BOUSTANY. No, I don't.

Mr. KAGEN. In that case, having no questions, I will recognize myself. Thank you for coming before us.

I think I am the next in order unless you would like to go first, Mrs. Napolitano. You can start the clock now.

It is interesting that where I come from in the real world, there is a lot of teamwork where we identify a common goal, a common problem and we work together to try and solve that problem, and I have to admire the EPA and the Corps for working together as a team.

What I am astonished about as a newcomer to this place is that the President of the United States would sign an executive order, making certain that everyone understands he values and treasures the quality of the water of the Great Lakes, and yet he doesn't invest in his budget proposal in cleaning up those Great Lakes. So allow me to ask you a question.

Are you aware that cleaning up the hot spots in the Great Lakes will have a very beneficial effect on businesses and on human health, Mr. Grumbles? It is a yes or no.

Mr. GRUMBLES. Congressman, there is a half a billion dollars investment in the Great Lakes. I would just say that there is a recognition that the Great Lakes are a treasure and it is important for the Federal Government to invest. So there is an investment in this budget as in previous budgets.

On the areas of concern——

Mr. KAGEN. Let me interrupt because in the Great Lakes Legacy Act, you wanted to spend $34 million or $35 million dollars, and yet appropriated was an amount of $50 million. So there is a disconnect between what you say you are for and what you are willing to spend your money on.

Where I come from in Wisconsin, it is really a reflection of your values as to how you spend your money. So maybe you can explain to me why there is a difference of $35 million to $50 million or $54 million.

Mr. GRUMBLES. Congressman, we have consistently requested more funding for the Great Lakes Legacy Act than has been appropriated by Congress. The $50 million that you are referring to is the authorized level.

We have, in the past, sought full funding. Right now, what we are focused on is requesting $35 million.

We share your view that investing in the accelerated cleanup of those hot spots brings environmental and economic progress. So we are committed to working with the Congress on that, and that is a priority, one of the priority areas for the EPA when it comes to the Great Lakes.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Grumbles, are you aware that the water levels of Lake Michigan and Lake Superior appear to be declining rather rapidly?

Mr. GRUMBLES. I have heard about that. I understand that that is an area of concern, a growing concern.

Mr. KAGEN. In your budget, how much money have you budgeted for study that issue?

Mr. GRUMBLES. EPA takes very seriously our proper roles and responsibilities under the law, whether it is WRDA or the Clean Water Act. So we, as an agency, do not get in water quantity or water allocation or water levels for the Great Lakes.

We do have in our budget request, $22 million for the Great Lakes National Program Office who partners with other agencies

that are studying lake levels and effects, climate-related or other effects.

Mr. KAGEN. Let me direct that question to the Army Corps.

General VAN ANTWERP. Well, Congressman, as we look at the budget from 2008 to 2009 and get into details—and this concerns dredging primarily—it was $92 million in 2008, $89 million in 2009 but more dredging in 2009.

There are non-dredging items in there to include studies of water quality and quantity and different ports and their subsistence levels and all of that. So there is more dredging in the 2009 budget than there was in the 2008 for the Great Lakes.

Mr. KAGEN. I appreciate that.

In April of this year, I believe on April 18th, we are going to have a field hearing, a Congressional hearing in Green Bay, and I look forward to hearing in greater detail and greater length your testimony and findings as to what your reasoning might be for the decline in water level in Lake Michigan and Lake Superior. We will take a look at that.

Which of your agencies is primarily responsible for eliminating the invasive species that now predominate the Great Lakes, Mr. Grumbles?

Mr. GRUMBLES. One of the priority issues for the taskforce that the President set up in the executive order in May of 2004, the interagency taskforce which EPA chairs, one of the priority issues is invasive species. We have a role. Army Corps of Engineers has a significant role in it, as Mr. Woodley can testify to.

Mr. KAGEN. Are you able to give me a dollar amount as to what you have requested in funding to study and remediate the invasive species issue?

Mr. GRUMBLES. I think the question should be posed also to the Coast Guard and to NOAA and to USGS.

In terms of the EPA, we have as part of that $22 million. I am just saying as part of that $22 million for the Great Lakes National Program Office, we are working on invasive species, the rapid response plans that we have developed. But we are not the primary agency in terms of either regulatory or funding for invasives, but it is a priority issue, Congressman.

Mr. KAGEN. I look forward to covering that in some detail on April 18th in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

I yield my time.

Mrs. Napolitano.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I didn't mean to cut you off. I thought you were going to close the meeting, and I still have many questions. I will submit them for the record.

But first, I want to tell my colleagues that EPA and the Army Corps have been great supporters in the California area that I represent. I have worked extensively on many projects, and I really thank for the support that we have been getting whether it is in my Subcommittee or in dealing with you.

I have questions that I am going to have for the record but more importantly, as I was listening to the answer to Ms. Matsui's question in regard to the Federal Government, the Department of Defense limiting the environmental law under the Superfund, I have a Superfund site in my area in the tank farm that has JP4 and

JP5 operated by the Air Force with subcontracting to Kinder Morgan. It has been under cleanup for many years.

Now, as I am finding, I think it is more than just us in California. The Department of Defense is probably going to sell off properties without finishing the cleanup.

That sets a lot of questions in my mind about whether or not the developer that is going to be purchasing that property will be able to do it to the extent that is required or find additional contaminants that might then cause that project to fold and then it goes back to the community as a generation of funds for the general fund and, of course, the contaminations in those areas.

So I am going to put a question in writing to both the EPA and to the Army Corps, and we have talked extensively with EPA on the water quality.

The other questions have to do with the Army Corps on the Whittier Narrows Dam which is a high risk designation. There are issues there again that it is owned and operated by the Corps on the San Gabriel River. It is kind of a holding of runoff so it doesn't go into the ocean.

Apparently, in the past, there had been a question as to whether or not they could raise the amount of water because it surrounded by communities all around it, raise the amount of water it could hold. But because there were oil rigs in the area, oil operations, they were concerned that it would flood those wells.

Now they are gone. The wells are no longer operable, and so we are asking the Corps to take a look at being able to increase the captivity of that runoff to be able to provide more water for the settling ponds to go into the aquifers. That is another one.

Let's see. I would like to sit down and work and possibly get a commitment on being able to work on that as soon as possible since we are into the rainy season and being able to capture as much of that rainwater for the benefit of that whole area.

In my mind, I am hearing you talk about invasive species up in the Great Lakes. We have invasive species in Texas in the canals. We have invasive species in many other areas.

We need to ensure that whatever your findings are, that those invasive species, that you find how to address them, how to be able to go in, what is the research and development coming up with because those are taking up a lot of the water. We need to understand that if we don't take proactive steps, we are going to be in a world of hurt. We need all the water we can get.

Another question for Mr. Grumbles. In the U.S.-Mexico border infrastructure, apparently, there are a lot of issues with the U.S. and Mexico with treated drinking water. Both sides are affected, especially with the wastewater. The untreated sewage flows from Mexico into the U.S. basically, and so the issues are health issues.

There is $209 million in unspent funds that have been obligated to the water infrastructure projects remaining in NADBank. The Administration is cutting significant funding from its Mexico border water infrastructure assistance program due to the program's slow rate of project development over the last 10 years.

What agency in the Federal Government has responsibility to ensure that the border infrastructure funding of $209 million is spent promptly, prudently and effectively and why has this large amount

of money not been allowed to be utilized or why has it gone unspent?

Then what agency in the Federal Government has responsibility to ensure that the project development does not occur at a slow rate and, given the needs of both borders, why has the project taken such a long time?

And there you have it, five minutes worth of questions.

Mr. GRUMBLES. I will go first.

On the invasive species front, you are absolutely right. It is a growing national challenge, environmentally and economically, and there is growing investment in the solutions.

Prevention and detection and rapid response are the keys. Ballast water, we are working with the other agencies on cost-effective treatment technologies and different types of response regimes, and the Coast Guard is a key component of that.

We know that it is various and different types of species. In the Great Lakes, for instance, it is 160 new species that are in the Great Lakes, non-native invasive species.

On the U.S.-Mexico border, the border environmental infrastructure——

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Grumbles, let me interrupt. Could you please answer her in writing for us in the interest of time?

Mr. GRUMBLES. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Don't worry. I'll be in touch. Thank you.

Mr. KAGEN. I now recognize my good friend, Gene Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize for the inconvenience to Mrs. Napolitano.

Mr. Woodley, how much money is in the President's budget request for the mandatory buy-out of properties for people whose homes were either destroyed or damaged during Hurricane Katrina? The key word there is mandatory.

Mr. WOODLEY. I heard that word. I don't know of any money in the President's budget for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Could I get that in writing from you?

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. The reason I say that is I am glad this meeting is now and not last fall because I have had about six weeks to calm down.

When the word appeared in the local newspapers in south Mississippi to folks who had lost their homes, been screwed by their insurance companies, borrowed to the hilt to rebuild their homes, that the Corps of Engineers was going to come take their houses away, you can imagine the reaction. It came to the Corps' words versus mine.

Again, so I am normally, 99 percent of the time, a huge fan of the Corps, but I cannot begin to tell you how poorly your agency handled that entire situation. Just as a word of advice to other Corps employees, again folks who know they have a job a year from now, don't ever make that mistake again.

I am sure that people went to the hospital over this. They were so upset.

You normally do, your agency normally does better. They handled that very poorly. I will say it as politely as I can. Six weeks ago, I wouldn't have been so polite.

The second thing, recently, one of the counties affected by Hurricane Katrina that had chosen to do its own debris removal and, more specifically, take care of what were called hangers and leaners. These are the trees that died as a result of the storm. They were still hanging on and they were leaning over rights of way for roads. They were a public safety menace and, therefore, removed.

There was a problem with FEMA reimbursing those counties. We had asked the Corps that had the responsibilities for some coastal counties for that exact same problem, that they had contractors to do the exact same thing, to release those numbers. How much did they pay for this exact same procedure so that this county could justify their expenditures to FEMA? The Corps refused to release those numbers.

Now I am on the Armed Services Committee. I can get the cost of a cruise missile. I can get the cost of a next generation of aircraft carriers. Why on Earth should something as simple as debris removal be considered proprietary information?

That is silly, and it caused a great deal of heartburn to the largest county in my Congressional district. Again, it is just uncalled for, and you need to do better.

The third thing is a continual frustration with the Corps on the desire of south Mississippi to do beneficial use with our dredge material. We lost a heck of a lot of coastal marshes during the storm. We lost large portions of our barrier islands.

The Corps has several publicly maintained channels, Federally maintained channels that have periodic dredging and periodic need to dispose of that material, and yet it seems like every time I am not looking. I will be driving around south Mississippi. I will see a dredge. I will see a discharge, and there is open water disposal when you have all these needs that are going unmet.

Again, it shouldn't take the local Congressman hounding the local Corps office. It if is the policy of this Nation, it ought to be the policy of this Nation every time and not just when I am looking.

Again, I would very much request in writing an answer to the first. I would like to hear your answer for the second and third because, again, I am a big fan of the Corps. I defend you at my public meetings, but those three actions aren't defendable.

So let's start with why did anyone in your agency think it should be proprietary information to embargo the cost per cubic yard of moving debris or removing dead trees?

Mr. WOODLEY. The answer, I don't know the answer to that question.

Mr. TAYLOR. We contacted your agency. We gave your agency a number of opportunities to answer that question.

The contractor, who did the work, gladly gave us the information. The last guy we thought would give it to us gave it to us.

The question is that is public money. That ought to be publicly available. Again, it should have been a no-brainer.

The third one, okay, beneficial use of dredge material.

Mr. WOODLEY. We support the beneficial use of dredge material. Unless there is some cost issue associated with where the concept of beneficially using it is cost-prohibitive, then I would say we

should be using it in every case. There is a cost issue involved, so we would have to look at each individual situation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, if I may, this goes back at least six years where I have even been asking for the designation of sites ahead of time, working with the State of Mississippi which owns all the bottom lands. This will be our site when we dredge this channel. This is going to be our site when we dredge this channel.

Six years later, those negotiations haven't taken place. I mean in the General's aid, I have great respect for the General, but this is what the Army calls a slow roll. I think I am going to outlive the folks who are slow-rolling me, but I shouldn't have to.

Mr. WOODLEY. Let me just ask. Are these observations in the portion of your district that is managed by the Mobile District?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODLEY. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. Okay. Again, the sooner you can get me the letter about no mandatory buy-outs, today would not be too soon. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KAGEN. Very good.

I just had one more question for both agencies. If you could please provide the Committee with the report on your existing personnel and who is ready to retire and how you are planning to replace those people, we would certainly appreciate it, so we can understand your needs a little bit better.

Any other questions at all?

There being no other questions, I will ask for an adjournment. How does that sound?

Thank you very much for being here.

[Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

OPENING STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE RUSS CARNAHAN (MO-3)
WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Hearing on
Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY2009

#####

Chairwoman Johnson and Ranking Member Boustany, thank you for holding this hearing on the President's FY09 budget proposal for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency. I applaud your dedication to examining the President's FY09 budget proposal as we begin to work on the FY09 budget resolution.

I would like to focus my comments on the President's proposed budget for the Army Corps of Engineers. I am disappointed to see the President has proposed a budget that is sixteen percent lower than the FY08 enacted level. Specifically, I disappointed the President has called for deep cuts in the investigations account, which is used to fund the study of potential and authorized of projects related to flood control, with the intention of limiting development of new projects because the current backlog precludes the need for new feasibility studies. I believe this approach to future water infrastructure projects is fundamentally flawed.

Additionally, last year Congress worked together to override the President's veto of the Water Resources Development Act, to provide critical assistance communities across the county to upgrade their water infrastructure systems. Although, WRDA authorized many critical water infrastructure projects nationwide, including several important projects in my district, the President's budget request for the Corps construction account only includes funding for two of these authorized projects. I find this deeply troubling as last year was the first time in seven year Congress passed a WRDA bill. As you know, typically a WRDA bill is passed every two years to authorize critical water infrastructure programs all across the country.

In closing I would like to thank our witnesses for joining us today to discuss the President's FY09 budget priorities for both the Crops and the EPA. However, I would like to reiterate my concern that the President's budget fails to include funding in the construction account for many of the important water infrastructure projects authorized by WRDA last year.

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE JERRY F. COSTELLO
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
HEARING ON THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2009 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
THURSDAY FEBRUARY 7, 2008

Thank you, Madame Chairwoman, for holding today's hearing on the President's FY09 budget for the Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA. The witnesses before the Subcommittee today will have a difficult time convincing me that this budget is adequate to meet our Nation's needs for water infrastructure and clean water protection.

The Bush Administration consistently neglects our transportation infrastructure – that includes not just waterways, but highways, airports, and rail. By failing to invest in and modernize our transportation system we affect commerce and the economy.

For FY 2009, the Bush Administration proposes a reduction of $845 million from the FY 2008 funding level for the Army Corps of Engineers. The Administration continues to under fund much needed construction of critical water infrastructure as well as properly fund general investigation which lead to new projects.

The proposed funding in FY09 for new studies is 46 percent below the FY08 appropriated level. This substantial cut was designed to limit development of new projects and in the process could affect the safety of our constituents and their property and limits our ability to improve navigation.

Further, the proposed funding for construction is 27 percent below the FY08 appropriated levels, which could increase costs to complete projects and further delay much needed flood control and environmental restoration projects.

Finally, the proposed Operations and Maintenance funding is cut by 2 percent compared with the FY08 appropriated level. This cut hurts our ability to improve efficiency and maintain proper operations for our water infrastructure. I do have concerns with the administration again proposing to shift several construction general responsibilities to the O&M account and the affects that has on projects in my district.

In my district alone, dredging and sediment removal cannot be done at various locations, including the Kaskaskia River; structural and

mechanical repairs cannot be made at the Melvin Price Lock and Dam; and the Wood River Levee was provided limited funding even though we have major deficiencies with that levee.

Madame Chairwoman, the Bush Administration continues to under invest in our Nation's infrastructure and the environment jeopardizing a better, cleaner, and safer environment for current and future generations.

I look forward to today's testimony.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN
HEARING ON
"Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2009"
WATER RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
February 7, 2008

- Let me begin by saying that I support the President's efforts to control federal spending; however, the agency programs that we are examining today are truly investments in America. These are important programs that benefit our economy and improve the quality of life for our citizens.

- While I believe we must be diligent in our oversight of these agencies to be sure that programs are run effectively and efficiently, I do not support cutting programs that have a proven record of providing economic benefits. In fact, as part of the economic stimulus program, we should increase our investment in programs such as those that both produce jobs and deliver economic benefits.

- The Administration's budget proposal for FY 2009 continues a long trend of under-investing in our water resources. As a result, the general condition of our flood protection and navigation infrastructure has declined.

- Investing in flood damage reduction projects protects the people and businesses in cities and towns all over the nation. It makes good economic sense to protect existing development rather than have to pay for the losses and cleanup that come from hurricanes or floods. Every $1 invested in flood damage reduction provides protection for more than $6 worth of infrastructure.

- In the global economy, the nation's farmers and businesses must compete with their counterparts overseas for customers all over the world. The importance of modern waterways and ports has never been more critical to the nation's economic well-being as it is right now.

- Yet the Administration's budget cuts the Corps of Engineers construction budget by nearly $900 million compared to what was enacted for FY 2008. If we follow the Administration's lead, projects will take longer to complete, cost more, and have the benefits delayed.

- In addition, the budget cuts funds for feasibility studies by 46% compared to what Congress appropriated this year. These studies are necessary to produce the modern and beneficial projects that we need in the future.

- There is very little change from previous budget requests for the Corps' Operation and Maintenance Account. After many years of inadequate funding, resulting in deferred maintenance, the funding level is still too low. The chronic problem of deferred maintenance is impacting the navigability of many of our waterways and causing ships to enter and leave certain ports only partially loaded or, in some cases, divert to foreign ports. This has a huge impact on the reliability of this important mode of transportation.

- In the Environmental Protection Agency's budget I am disappointed the Administration continues to inadequately fund the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program. This is a highly effective program that provides low interest loans to communities so that they can construct and improve their wastewater treatment infrastructure. For every federal dollar invested, more than two dollars is made available for water quality improvement.

- The Superfund and Brownfields programs are budgeted at a flat rate compared to previous funding levels. These are important programs that make contaminated areas fit for redevelopment. Many of the smaller and easier cleanup projects have already been done, so the remaining work tends to be more complex and more expensive to complete. We will have to invest more in those programs if we want to release properties for redevelopment at the same pace.

- I thank all our witnesses for being here and I look forward to your testimony.

Opening Statement
Congressman John T. Salazar
T&I Subcommittee on Water Resources
Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2009
February 7, 2008

Thank you, Madame Chair.

As we look towards budget priorities for Fiscal Year 2009, I again ask that we keep in mind the needs of rural communities throughout America.

I am deeply concerned about the proposed budget's impact on the EPA and its ability to do an effective job.

Local water quality is dramatically impacted by existing water infrastructure.

By cutting funding for programs like the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, we make it harder for rural communities, to invest in infrastructure improvements.

I hear from the wastewater managers around my district—everyone is concerned with this budget proposal.

The executive branch is increasing the regulatory burden on municipal treatment plants

with tougher water quality standards for nutrients.

But at the same time, decreasing the major funding mechanism that makes attainment of those new standards possible for many communities.

The message seems inconsistent.

I understand that this budget requests only $555 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund program.

This funding is being reduced for the second consecutive year, at a time when wastewater infrastructure nationwide is already under-funded by between $400 billion and $600 billion a year.

My friends on the committee have heard me say it before--water is the lifeblood of our rural, farming communities.

Whether it is for drinking or irrigation needs, we must do what we can to protect our natural resources.

Madame Chair, I know we will be hearing from the agencies shortly and will have an opportunity to ask questions.

I just want to reemphasize my concern about proposed cuts to programs that are so important at the state and local level.

At a time when our nation is struggling to avoid a recession, and many of our small communities are struggling to maintain their infrastructure, it is irresponsible for the administration to cut such critical programs.

With that, I thank the Chairwoman, I thank the witnesses for being here, and I look forward to today's hearing.

STATEMENT OF
SUSAN PARKER BODINE
ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR
OFFICE OF SOLID WASTE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 7, 2008

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Susan Parker Bodine, Assistant Administrator of the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Also appearing today is Mr. Ben Grumbles, Assistant Administrator for EPA's Office of Water. We are pleased to be here to discuss President Bush's budget request for EPA and our views on Clean Water Act programs, Superfund, brownfields, and other programs that fall within the Agency's Offices of Water and Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

The President's budget provides the necessary funds for EPA to carry out our mission efficiently and effectively - to protect human health and safeguard the environment. The fiscal year (FY) 2009 budget request is $7.1 billion, which continues strong support for the brownfields program, maintains funding for further Superfund cleanup progress, and continues an emphasis on homeland security and emergency response efforts.

The President's 2009 budget for EPA protects the environment, advances economic competitiveness and strengthens the security of our homeland, while contributing to the Administration's effort to control federal spending.

Brownfields and Land Revitalization

Brownfields cleanup and redevelopment continues to be one of the Administration's top environmental priorities. The President's FY 2009 budget request provides $165.7 million for the brownfields program, including $93.6 million to fund brownfields program assessment, cleanup, revolving loan fund, and job training grants. The budget request will fund 129 assessment grants, 96 cleanup grants, 7 revolving loan fund grants, and 12 job training grants. In FY 2009, brownfields grantees are expected to assess 1,000 properties, clean up 60 properties, leverage 5,000 cleanup and redevelopment jobs, and leverage $900 million in cleanup and redevelopment funding.

EPA will continue its land revitalization initiative which includes all of EPA's cleanup programs as well as partners at all levels of government and in the private and non-profit sectors. The goal of land revitalization is to restore our nation's contaminated land resources and enable America's communities to safely return these properties to beneficial economic, ecological, and societal uses. EPA is ensuring that cleanup programs protect public health, welfare, and the environment; and also is ensuring that the anticipated future uses of these lands are fully considered in cleanup decisions.

Experience has taught us that one of the best ways to clean up contaminated sites and to address blighted properties in communities is to expressly consider the future uses of this land. The country has accepted the economic and ecological importance of recycling various consumer products – and our understanding of sound resource management must now also embrace the recycling of contaminated properties. In addition, by incorporating "green" and sustainable approaches into brownfields redevelopment, we can further increase the environmental benefits from land revitalization.

Superfund

The Superfund program protects human health and the environment by requiring clean up of hazardous waste sites and short-term actions to mitigate immediate threats to human health. This program also works with both public and private partners to encourage reuse and redevelopment of Superfund sites. The President's budget provides $1.264 billion for the Superfund program to continue the progress we are making cleaning up contaminated sites. The budget request maintains Superfund cleanup funding at essentially the same level as enacted in FY 2008.

In general, before or during long-term remedial action, the Superfund program often completes short-term removal actions to mitigate immediate health threats at sites prior to completion of investigations and the start of long-term cleanup construction. For example, where EPA determines that existing water supplies are unsafe due to releases from contaminated sites, we provide alternative sources of drinking water. To date, EPA has provided more than two million people near these sites with alternative sources of drinking water. Similarly, through short-term actions, the Superfund program controls exposure to hazardous substances so human health is protected while long-term clean up is underway. The Superfund removal and emergency response program conducted 351 emergency response and removal cleanup actions in FY 2007, and to date has completed more than 9,400 removals at hazardous waste sites to reduce the immediate threat to human health and the environment.

Protecting human health and the environment in the long-term is an important goal of the Superfund program. EPA's construction completion measure was developed more than a decade ago to measure interim progress in the Superfund program. As of the end of FY 2007, cleanup construction had been completed at 1,030 of the National Priorities List (NPL) sites,

which represents 66% of the sites listed on the NPL. Building upon the 24 sites where construction was completed in FY 2007 and the completion goal of 30 sites in FY 2008, the goal of completing construction at 35 sites in 2009 keeps EPA on track to complete construction at 165 sites during the FY 2007 to FY 2011 time period, the goal established in the Agency's FY 2006 to FY 2011 Strategic Plan.

While it continues to be a measure by which to assess program progress, construction completion does not mark the achievement of long-term protection. As the Superfund program has continued to mature and evolve, EPA has looked for additional ways to assess program progress beyond construction completion and help keep the public informed about site cleanup milestones.

To better measure long-term progress, in 2007 the program adopted a Site-Wide Ready for Anticipated Use measure. This measure tracks the number of NPL sites where the remedy is constructed (construction complete) and all of the controls are in place to ensure that the land is protective for reasonably anticipated uses over the long term. Those anticipated uses and needed controls are outlined in the site Record of Decision (ROD). EPA expects to make at least 30 sites ready for anticipated use in 2009. In 2007, EPA exceeded its goal of 30 sites, making 64 Superfund sites ready for anticipated use, and EPA expects to meet or exceed its goal of 30 sites in FY 2008.

Finally, EPA has continued its effort to efficiently utilize every dollar and resource available to clean up contaminated sites and to protect human health. In FY 2007, EPA obligated more than $380 million of appropriated, state cost-share, and responsible party funding to conduct cleanup construction and post-construction work at Superfund sites, which included more than $82 million to begin construction at 19 new Superfund projects.

Homeland Security

EPA's Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness and Response program will continue to develop and maintain an Agency-wide capability to respond to incidents of national significance with emphasis on those that may involve Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). EPA is the lead federal agency under the National Response Framework for Emergency Support Function (ESF) #10, which addresses Oil and Hazardous Materials, and works with other agencies to provide support for a number of other Emergency Support Functions, including ESF #3, which addresses Public Works and Engineering.

The $55.8 million FY 2009 budget request for the OSWER Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness and Response program is $12 million above the FY 2008 request. The additional resources requested will strengthen EPA's capability to respond to multiple incidents of national significance. The Homeland Security Environmental Lab Response Network (eLRN) initiative is increased by $3.5 million to a total of $9.6 million to improve coordination among existing laboratory networks and to expand a laboratory chemical warfare agent quality assurance and calibration surety program at the Federal and state levels. Funding for training and exercises for Response Support Corps and Incident Management Team volunteers as well as the base response workforce is increased by $4.4 million. An additional $3 million is requested to purchase an airplane that will increase real-time monitoring capabilities that will help reduce EPA response time during incidents of national significance. An additional $1.1 million is requested for enhanced data management and secure equipment.

Oil Spill Program

EPA's oil spill prevention program requires protection of inland waterways through oil spill prevention, preparedness, and enforcement activities associated with the more than 600,000 non-transportation related oil storage facilities that EPA regulates.

The President's budget request provides $13.9 million for the OSWER's portion of EPA's oil spill program. Our oil spill program focuses on preventing oil spills from occurring, reducing the risk of hazardous exposure to people and the environment, and responding to spills when necessary. EPA and the U.S. Coast Guard evaluate thousands of spills annually to determine if assistance is required. On average, EPA either manages the oil spill response or oversees response efforts of private parties at approximately 250 to 300 sites per year.

Conclusion

EPA will continue to protect human health and the environment by requiring responsible parties to clean up hazardous waste sites and looking for ways to improve Superfund and brownfields program efficiency and effectiveness. I look forward to continuing to work with the Committee to address the Superfund and brownfields programs, and other programs entrusted to the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. The President's budget request for EPA will help ensure that we are able to accomplish the Agency's important mission - - to protect human health and the environment.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

MAR 1 7 2008

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Honorable Harry E. Mitchell
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Mitchell:

Thank you for your letter of February 11, 2008, providing follow-up questions to the February 7, 2008, hearing before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. Please find enclosed documents from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that are responsive to your request.

Please note that several of the emails responsive to this request have attachments containing confidential business information associated with the laboratory. EPA is providing the emails. However, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Part 2, Subpart B, EPA is unable to provide the attachments because they were claimed as confidential business information.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact me or your staff may contact Amy Hayden in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-0555.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Bliley
Associate Administrator

Enclosures

cc: Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chairwoman, w/o enclosures
Representative John Boozman, Ranking Member, w/o enclosures

Questions to the Environmental Protection Agency
From Rep. Harry Mitchell
Following Hearing by House Transportation and Infrastructure's
Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment
February 7, 2008

1. All documents referring or relating to requests received by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to approve a second lab in Arizona, other than Transwest Geochem, to analyze water samples taken from North Indian Bend Wash (NIBW), including but not limited to any requests by the NIBW Participating Companies to approve a back-up lab in November 2006.

Answer: Enclosed please find documents responsive to Question 1. Please note that the request for approval for using a second lab was initiated in November 2006 with the final approval of the use of the secondary lab issued by EPA on February 8, 2008.

Additionally, two emails responsive to this request have attachments containing confidential business information associated with the laboratory. EPA is providing the two emails. However, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Section 2.209(b) [see http://www.epa.gov/foia/2209.htm] EPA is unable to provide the two attachments because they contain confidential business information.

2. All documents referring or relating to an alleged 2001 equipment failure at the NIBW Miller Road Treatment Facility (MRTF), including but not limited to any correspondence between the EPA, the NIBW Participating Companies and Arizona American Water.

Answer: Enclosed please find documents responsive to Question 2. Please note that equipment failures occurred on February 8, 2001, and February 26, 2001, that were the result of an earlier, wide-spread power outage in the Scottsdale area

3. All documents referring or relating to an alleged under-effectiveness of a reverse 9-1-1 system activated by American Water, or its subsidiary, in New Jersey in which the system failed to reach a portion of the water customers impacted by the incident that resulted in the reverse 9-1-1 system's activation, on or before January 15, 2008, including any correspondence between EPA, participating companies, if any, American Water and/or its subsidiary.

Answer: EPA has no documents responsive to this request.

4. A copy of the EPA's 2001 draft risk assessment entitled "Trichloroethylene Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterization," as well as all documents referring or relating to any subsequent actions taken by the EPA as a result of such assessment.

Answer: Below please find URLs to the documents responsive to this question. Enclosed please find the draft 2001 risk assessment entitled, "Trichloroethylene (TCE) Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterization", as well as four issue papers that EPA's National

Center for Environmental Assessment (NCEA) provided to the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for its peer consultation. The issue papers also respond in part to Question 5.

External Review Draft - TCE Health Risk Assessment
http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=23249

TCE Issue Papers (1-4)
http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=117502#moj

5. All documents referring or relating to a finding by the National Academy of Sciences that the evidence on carcinogenic risk and other health hazards from exposure to trichloroethylene has strengthened since 2001.

Answer: Below please find URLs to the documents responsive to this question. The URLs provide documents from the February 26-27, 2004 NCEA public symposium that was conducted to gather information on recently published scientific research for use by EPA in assessing the human health risks of TCE and to hear from the scientists who are at the forefront of TCE research. The meeting was announced in the Federal Register and open to the public. The URLs below provide the meeting transcripts and the agenda, as well as the Science Advisory Board's 2002 review report of its review of the draft 2001 TCE assessment.

Symposium on New Scientific Research Related to the Health Effects of Trichloroethylene
http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/cfm/recordisplay.cfm?deid=75934

December 2002: EPA Science Advisory Board Review of Draft Trichloroethylene Health Risk Assessment: Synthesis and Characterization
http://yosemite.epa.gov/sab%5Csabproduct.nsf/D14C306CF5482E41852571CE00697543/$File/ehc03002.pdf

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

APR 17 2008

OFFICE OF
WATER

The Honorable James L. Oberstar
Chairman
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Oberstar:

Enclosed, for insertion in the hearing record, are the Environmental Protection Agency's responses to the questions that you forwarded to us following the February 7, 2008, hearing regarding "Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2009."

If you have any questions about the enclosed, please do not hesitate to contact me or have your staff call Greg Spraul in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-0255.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Benjamin H. Grumbles
Assistant Administrator

Enclosure

EPA Response to Questions
From Representative James L. Oberstar
House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
Hearing on Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY09
February, 2008

1. **Question**: The water quality and wildlife habitat restoration goals for the Chesapeake Bay have had difficulty in being met, yet in the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request, funding for the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program has been reduced compared to last year's enacted levels. What will the implications of this cut be for achieving the goals for rehabilitating the Chesapeake? What is the role of nonpoint source pollution in not achieving these goals? What impact will the reduction in Section 319 [nonpoint source pollution] grants have on the Chesapeake Bay?

   Answer: The Chesapeake Bay Program FY09 budget request is $29.0 million which is the highest request in the history of the program. The President's budget is lower than the FY 2008 enacted budget because it does not include $1.969 million for the Chesapeake Bay Small Watershed Grants Program which Congress added in the FY 2008 enacted budget. EPA projects that the elimination of the Small Watershed Grants will have no measurable impact on program performance goals in FY 2009.

   Nonpoint source pollution, primarily from agriculture and stormwater runoff from developed and developing lands, is the primary source of nutrient and sediment pollution to the Bay, with agriculture accounting for approximately 40% of the total nutrient loads to the Bay. Point sources account for approximately 20% of the nutrient loads to the Bay, and through the efforts of EPA and its state partners, the point source reduction goals for phosphorus will be met by 2010, and 95% of the point source nitrogen goal will be met by 2010. To address slower progress in achieving the nonpoint source nutrient and sediment reduction goals, the President's budget request for FY09 contains $8 million for an Innovative Nonpoint Source Reduction grants program.

   The reduction to the Section 319 grants program will be applied proportionally to all states and, for Bay states, will be offset by the Innovative Nonpoint Source Reduction grants program, created in FY08.

2. **Question**: The Watershed Approach is one of EPA's "4 Pillars of Sustainable Infrastructure." What are the implications of the administration's zeroing out the Targeted Watershed Grants budget on EPA's commitment to a watershed approach?

   Answer: EPA remains committed to the watershed approach as the most effective framework to address water resource challenges. Established as a special initiative in 2003, the Targeted Watershed Grants (TWG) Program was not intended to be a permanent and ongoing program, but rather as a means for local watershed groups to implement on-the-ground restoration and protection activities while also developing

efforts that would lead to self-sustainable practices. Reports from the TWG grant recipients, as well as some preliminary results of a TWG program evaluation, indicate a strong need for more training and capacity building activities for watershed groups. In response, the Agency included in the last year's TWG Request for Proposals (RFP) a separate request specific to capacity building projects to take into consideration these issues -- and thus continue to meet the watershed organizations' needs by providing necessary training and education that will lead to self-sustaining practices.

3. **Question**: In your response to the 2005 EPA Office of the Inspector General's Watersheds evaluation, you note EPA's support for watershed plans through the use of Section 319 funds, and EPA's support for watershed priorities through the use of Clean Water SRF funds. Yet, in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2009, the administration proposes to significantly reduce both of these funding sources from not only current funding levels, but also from previous presidential request levels. What are the implications of these funding cuts for restoring watersheds, and supporting watershed plans and priorities, and is this consistent with your response to the 2005 OIG report?

   Answer: EPA will continue to provide strong support for States' development and implementation of watershed plans and watershed projects to maintain and restore our nation's water quality.

   Since the program's inception in 1988, EPA has invested about $26 billion in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF), more than three times the original authorized level of $8.4 billion. The original funding authorization for the program expired in 1994. The Federal seed money has enabled the States to establish a permanent funding source for addressing their critical water quality needs. When combined with the Federal funds, the inflow of monies from state contributions, bond proceeds, the recycling of loan repayments into new loans and other sources has generated $65 billion in funds available to communities to restore watersheds and support watershed plans and priorities. In 2007 alone, CWSRFs provided $5.3 billion to important water quality projects. The President's FY 2009 budget request affirms the Administration's commitment to provide $6.8 billion in federal funding to the CWSRF from 2004 through 2011. EPA continues to encourage states as they make their funding decisions to give greater consideration for high priority water quality projects, and green infrastructure in particular.

   The national nonpoint source program remains strongly focused on the development and implementation of watershed-based plans to solve water quality problems and thereby restore the health of impaired waters. EPA will work with states to ensure continued focus on high priority activities to restore impaired waters. Specifically, EPA and the state nonpoint source agencies will continue to devote $100 million annually to the development and implementation of watershed-based plans that are focused on restoring waterbodies that are currently on the states' impaired waters lists. EPA also notes that it expects that the states will continue to meet their targets for sediment and nutrient reductions as set forth in EPA's strategic plan.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

APR 7 2008

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL AND
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Honorable James L. Oberstar
Chairman
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Oberstar:

Thank you for your letter of February 19, 2008, containing Congresswoman Napolitano's question for the record from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. Please find enclosed responses from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to Congresswoman Napolitano's question pursuant to the February 7, 2008, hearing titled, "Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2009." Also included are EPA's responses to questions asked during the hearing from Congressman Mitchell and Congressman Hall.

If you have further questions, please contact me, or your staff may contact Amy Hayden in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at (202) 564-0555.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Bliley
Associate Administrator

cc: Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chairwoman
Subcommittee on Water, Resources and Environment

John Boozman, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Water, Resources and Environment

Follow Up Questions for Written Submission
House Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure Committee
Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment
Hearing on "Agency Budgets and Priorities for FY 2009"
February 7, 2008

Questions from Congressman Mitchell

Question: When will EPA complete its investigation into TCE contamination associated with the North Indian Bend Wash Superfund Site?

Answer: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is treating the trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination incident associated with the North Indian Bend Wash Superfund Site (site) as a very high priority incident. EPA's investigation is on-going. EPA is continuing to work closely with the Responsible Parties associated with the site, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), and Maricopa County to determine the cause of the failure and recommend both interim and long-term measures to prevent any future incidents.

During the period of investigation, the Miller Road Treatment Facility (MRTF) remains shut down. EPA required the Responsible Parties to provide: 1) a work plan to increase plume monitoring; 2) a plan for implementing interim actions to contain the plume while long-term options can be evaluated; and 3) a work plan for incident investigation, engineering evaluation of the MRTF and evaluation of long-term options. All of the work plans have been submitted to EPA. The Responsible Parties will submit their full investigation results to EPA in April 2008. Prior to completion of long-term remedy options, interim containment measures will proceed, which include plans to restart the MRTF in April 2008. During the interim period, the water from PCX-1, which is the well with the highest TCE contamination at 70 parts per billion (ppb), will not be utilized as drinking water. The water will be treated to the Safe Drinking Water Act maximum contaminant level, or MCL, and discharged to the Salt River Project Canal. After receipt of the investigation results in April, EPA will evaluate the results and recommend long-term remedy option by summer 2008.

Question: What is the timing of the TCE risk assessment?

Answer: Since EPA's 2001 draft TCE health assessment, there have been many scientific issues raised by expert review panels and various stakeholders. EPA is considering all of the scientific advice we received as we move forward with the development of the final TCE health assessment. Specifically, EPA is committed to addressing the scientific comments and recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council (NAS/NRC) review and developing a rigorous, objective scientific assessment. The TCE assessment is a top priority for EPA's chemical assessment program.

EPA has allocated the necessary staff and funds to move this forward as quickly as possible. EPA expects to release the draft assessment for interagency review in December 2008. Because the TCE assessment is informed by the NAS review and report released in 2006, EPA is uncertain how extensive further review will need to be.

Question from Congressman Hall

Question: Does the budget include funding to update the human health standard for TCE?

Answer: EPA does not track risk assessment spending by individual chemical since much of the work is done on multiple chemicals simultaneously, such as for physiologically-based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling and mode of action analysis. While funding could be identified for some TCE-specific contracts, such as literature searches, such information only would represent a small part of the costs associated with the risk assessment for TCE. The TCE assessment is being completed under the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) program. The recent funding for this program is noted below.

Fiscal Year	$ (in millions)
2006 enacted	$8.4
2007 enacted	$9.6
2008 enacted	$9.2
2009 President's Request	$9.4

Questions from Congresswoman Napolitano

Question: Administrator Bodine, there is a closed Air Force Fuel Supply Depot in my Congressional District in Norwalk, CA called the Norwalk Tank Farm. It contains petroleum contamination and it also contains hazardous material contamination that was on the EPA's Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket in 1988 and was checked in the CERCLA Section 103 category for action that need to be taken. In 1992, a Federal Register notice listed the Norwalk facility as No Further Response Action Planned. Can you please find out what action was taken in order for this facility to receive a No Further Response Action Planned designation?

Answer: Based upon information supplied by EPA Region 9, on September 4, 1990, EPA completed a review of the Preliminary Assessment (PA) submitted by the Defense Logistics Agency and, based upon the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) factors for the site, determined that no further Federal response was planned.

The Defense Fuel Support Point, Norwalk (site) is a fuel tank farm which receives, stores, and transports fuel to Department of Defense facilities in the western United States. Hazardous substances exist at two areas of the facility. In the southwest area of the facility, there is approximately 3,800 cubic yards of waste oil and soil which is contaminated with monochlorobenzene and buried under approximately four feet of clean soil. In the southcentral area of the facility, soil gas samples covering an area of approximately four acres contain trichloroethane, trichloroethene, and perchloroethene contamination.

The significant factors of the proposed revised Hazard Ranking System pertaining to Defense Fuel Support Point, Norwalk are:

- Small likelihood for a release of hazardous substances into a drinking water aquifer;
- Small number of on-site workers; and
- Surface water near the site is not used as drinking water.

The California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) referred the site to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) because it was petroleum contamination. The RWQCB is overseeing the investigation and clean up of the site under California's Water Code. The clean up is expected to be completed in the next five years.

Question: Administrator Bodine, the Air Force is trying to sell and auction off the contaminated Norwalk Tank Farm property so that they can pass on the cleanup to the buyer. Do you feel that since petroleum contamination is excluded from CERCLA regulations, petroleum polluters get off a lot easier than hazardous waste polluters? Why is the federal government able to get rid of petroleum contaminated property with less regulation or plan for cleanup compared to hazardous waste polluters?

Answer: The Federal authorities for cleaning up petroleum contaminated and hazardous waste contaminated sites are derived from different statutes. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) excludes from its definition of "hazardous substance," petroleum, including crude oil or any fraction thereof which is not

otherwise specifically listed or designated as a hazardous substance. The same exclusion is included in the definition of the term "pollutant or contaminant." Section 104 of CERCLA limits the Federal government's authority for response to "hazardous substances" and "pollutants or contaminants," while section 107 of CERCLA limits liability to "hazardous substances." Because CERCLA does not provide the Agency with any regulatory authority to change statutory definitions, response authorities or liability, the Federal government is unable to propose regulations that can take advantage of CERCLA authorities in cases of petroleum contamination. In this instance, the RWQCB is overseeing the investigation and cleanup of the site under California's Water Code. The clean up is expected to be completed in the next five years.

TESTIMONY OF

BENJAMIN H. GRUMBLES

ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

OFFICE OF WATER

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITEE ON WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 7, 2008

Madam Chair and members of the Subcommittee, I am Benjamin H. Grumbles, Assistant Administrator for Water at the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the President's Fiscal Year 2009 budget request for EPA's National Water Program. The request is over $ 2.5 billion or 35 percent of the Agency's overall budget, and will allow us, along with our State, Tribal and local partners, to make continued progress in ensuring America's waters are clean, safe and secure.

Over the past year, EPA's Office of Water has made considerable progress in protecting and improving water quality and advancing sustainability in water infrastructure. EPA continues to work with our State partners to monitor surface water quality and strengthen water quality standards, develop and/or approve discharge permits, and reduce pollution from diffuse or non-point sources. Our activities have helped to restore polluted waters across the country. EPA's National Water Program is committed to promoting innovative, cost-effective practices, such as water quality trading

and permitting on a watershed basis to accelerate the pace of environmental protection while maintaining our country's economic competitiveness.

This budget supports EPA's continuing commitment to policies and programs that advance environmental protection as well as economic prosperity. In particular, this budget will help EPA to:

- restore and maintain waters across the country through State and Tribal CWA programs,
- continue to improve the health of the country's major coastal ecosystems,
- achieve a net increase of wetlands
- increase the population served by systems providing water that complies with drinking water standards, and
- implement a total of five water security infrastructure pilots.

Infrastructure Financing

Water infrastructure is a life-line for community health and prosperity. EPA remains committed to developing innovative, sustainable and market-based solutions for managing and financing infrastructure with public and private partners. While progress has been achieved, as emphasized in the recently published survey on water infrastructure needs, substantial reinvestment is still needed to sustain current levels of service and meet increasing future public health and environmental protection needs. To help close the gap and meet the new needs, EPA will continue to build on our well-established "Four Pillars of Sustainable Infrastructure Strategy" focused on: (1) advanced facility management practices, (2) full cost pricing, (3) water efficiency, and (4) a watershed approach. Although local ratepayers ultimately fund most wastewater and drinking water infrastructure needs, two programs, the Clean Water State Revolving

Funds (CWSRF) and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (DWSRF), provide important mechanisms for helping State and local governments finance their water infrastructure needs.

The **Clean Water State Revolving Funds** (CWSRF) program provides funds to capitalize state revolving loan funds that finance infrastructure improvements for public wastewater systems and projects to improve water quality. State CWSRFs provide low interest loans to help finance wastewater treatment facilities and other water quality projects. Recognizing the substantial remaining need for wastewater infrastructure, with the $555 million budget request for FY 2009, EPA will be on track to meet its total capitalization target of $6.8 billion for 2004-2011. At this funding level, the CWSRF will provide an average of $3.4 billion in loans annually.

The **Drinking Water State Revolving Funds** (DWSRF) program supports states in helping public water systems fund infrastructure improvements needed to protect public health and achieve or maintain compliance with the SDWA. The DWSRFs offer low-interest loans and other assistance to water systems to help provide safe, reliable water service on a sustainable basis. For FY 2009, the budget request of $842 million for the DWSRF program will help to achieve the target of providing 445 additional infrastructure improvement projects to public water systems. The FY 2009 request also maintains the Administration's commitment to capitalize the DWSRF until 2018, resulting in a long-term annual revolving level of $1.2 billion.

In addition, the President's FY 2009 budget continues to support the **Water Enterprise Bond Initiative**. Under this initiative, Private Activity Bonds (PABs) used to finance wastewater and drinking water infrastructure are exempt from the private activity

bond unified state volume cap. We estimate this initiative will increase capital investment in the Nation's water infrastructure up to $5 billion per year over time through public-private partnerships. These bonds are intended to complement local efforts to move towards full-cost pricing for wastewater and drinking water services, helping localities become self-financing and minimizing the need for future Federal expenditures.

EPA works closely with partners to evaluate environmental needs and to facilitate the construction of environmental infrastructure along the **United States and Mexico Border**. In FY 2009, EPA will continue to support the construction of infrastructure that will connect and serve the homes of the border area residents with safe drinking water and wastewater treatment. We anticipate the FY 2009 investment of $10 million will fund 4 to 6 water infrastructure projects, which will benefit approximately 32,000 people, once completed.

Through the **Alaska Rural and Native Village Program**, EPA works with the State of Alaska to provide basic drinking water and sanitation infrastructure to communities in rural and Native Alaska communities. The FY 2009 investment of $15.5 million will leverage funding to provide an additional 500 to 900 homes in rural Alaska with wastewater service and drinking water that meets public health standards.

WaterSense

Launched in June 2006, EPA's WaterSense program will help to reduce water use across the country by creating an easy-to-identify label for water-efficient products that is backed by strict criteria and independent certification. In less than two years, WaterSense has become a national symbol for water efficiency among utilities, plumbing manufacturers, and consumers. More than 125 different models of high-efficiency toilets

and 30 bathroom faucets have earned the label and almost 600 manufacturers, retailers, utilities and professionals have joined the program as partners. The potential for preserving our water supply for future generations through this voluntary program is great, and in FY 2009 EPA will continue working on new product and program areas. Also in FY 2009, EPA will continue to work with utilities, retailers, distributors, and the media to educate consumers on the benefits of switching to water-efficient products. By promoting this easily recognizable, consistent national brand, EPA believes WaterSense will make water-efficient products the clear and preferred choice among consumers.

Homeland Security-Critical Infrastructure Protection

The security of our nation's water and wastewater infrastructure continues to be a top priority for the EPA and the National Water Program. In FY 2009, EPA is requesting over $35 million to:

- complete funding of the five Water Security Initiative Pilots,
- provide grants to states for coordination activities for critical water infrastructure security efforts,
- partner with the Water Information Sharing and Analysis Center (WaterISAC) to provide up-to-date security information for drinking water and wastewater utilities
- provide funds for the Water Lab Alliance, which establishes a network of labs by harnessing the range of existing lab resources from the local to the Federal levels,
- provide regional emergency response training, and
- support the Water Alliance for Threat Reduction, which will continue to conduct additional training sessions for drinking water systems serving over 100,000 people.

Wetlands, Watersheds and Oceans

Wetlands provide numerous ecological and economic services: they help to improve water quality; recharge water supplies; reduce flood risks; provide fish and wildlife habitat; offer sites for research and education; and support valuable fishing and shellfish industries. EPA's Wetlands Program works to improve the protection of our nation's wetland resources, in support of the Administration's goals to achieve "no net loss" of wetlands in the Sec. 404 regulatory program and an overall increase in wetland quantity and quality. In FY 2009, EPA will work with its state and Tribal partners to promote up-to-date wetlands mapping tied with GIS analysis, strengthen monitoring and assessment programs to report on wetlands condition, and improve data for managing wetlands within a watershed context. Two key activities will be implementing the 2006 decision of the Supreme Court in *Rapanos,* and working with our Federal agency partners to accelerate the completion of the digital Wetlands Data Layer in the National Spatial Data Inventory (NSDI). The NSDI will enable improved management of the Sec. 404 regulatory program, and voluntary/collaborative wetlands protection efforts.

Watershed protection runs through our budget and strategic plan as one of the overarching principles for clean and healthy communities. Our strategic plan, our daily activities and our proposed FY09 budget all reflect the importance of core regulatory and stewardship programs under the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act to prevent pollution and protect source waters. With our partners we launched a Green Infrastructure Strategy on January 17, 2008 to reduce sewer overflows and stormwater runoff. We also continue to urge Congress to enact targeted, bipartisan clean water legislation to encourage "Good Samaritan" cleanup of abandoned hard rock mines. This simple step will remove legal and bureaucratic obstacles, keep environmental safeguards, save tax payer dollars and help clean up watersheds.

We continue to place a high priority on improving states' ability to accurately characterize the condition of their waters. In 2009 we will continue our water quality monitoring initiative, by providing grant funding totaling over $18.5 million to states and tribes that participate in collecting statistically valid water monitoring data and implement enhancements in their water monitoring programs.

We will also continue our emphasis on protecting oceans and coasts under the President's Ocean Action Plan. Our request supports the National Estuary Program, under which we work with stakeholders to protect the estuarine and coastal waters that are among the most environmentally and economically valuable resources in the nation. The National Estuary Program continues to be an excellent return on our federal investment with over one million acres of habitat protected or restored since 2000. Since 2003, the 28 NEPs around the country have leveraged $85 million in federal funds to obtain $1.32 billion in additional resources – a ratio of 15.5 to 1.

I would also like to highlight a number of important regional collaborative efforts.

Great Lakes

The Great Lakes are a unique and extraordinary resource, providing drinking water, food, recreation and transportation to more than 35 million Americans. The EPA Great Lakes Program works with state, local and Tribal partners to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem. In FY 2009, EPA will give priority to working with states and local communities to achieve improvements in water quality, reducing the number of toxic Areas of Concern. These are areas with damaged fish and wildlife populations, contaminated bottom sediments and past or continuing loadings of toxic and bacterial pollutants. The remediation of

contaminated sediments pursuant to the Great Lakes Legacy Act is critical to the cleanup of the Areas of Concern.

Chesapeake Bay

The Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) is an important collaborative regional partnership that has led and directed the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay since 1983. In FY 2009, EPA is committed to substantially accelerating the restoration of the Bay's aquatic habitat and achieving the pollution reduction targets for 2010. EPA and the Bay area states are taking a number of steps to make the most cost-effective use of available regulatory, incentive, and partnership tools, including fully implementing base clean water programs in the Bay; supporting implementation of watershed permitting and nutrient trading programs; accelerating Bay cleanup by focusing on the most cost-effective nutrient-sediment control and key habitat restoration strategies; enhancing the use of monitoring, modeling and demonstration projects to target and assess the effectiveness of restoration actions; and strengthening accountability for implementation of restoration measures. We will continue to use the CBP Federal partnership for cooperative conservation to improve access to available financial and technical assistance programs, and link Federal programs to CBP's strategic priorities.

Gulf of Mexico

The Gulf of Mexico Program is another regional collaborative partnership which provides strategic geographic focus on the major environmental issues in another important water body. The Program has been characterized by the Joint Ocean Commission as a national model for State and Federal collaboration on complex coastal issues as a result of its progress in facilitating the aggressive implementation of the Gulf States Governors' Alliance's regional Action Plan.

In FY 2009, EPA will continue to support efforts to reduce nutrient loadings to watersheds and reduce the size of the Gulf of Mexico hypoxic zone by identifying the top 100 nutrient-contributing watersheds in the Mississippi River Basin and using a computer model determine where the major sources of nitrogen and phosphorus are located and where to target reduction efforts. Additionally, the EPA will continue to support the Gulf States allied efforts to manage Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) by implementing an integrated bi-national early-warning system and reduce contamination of seafood and local beaches through efforts to establish effective microbial source tracking methods and technologies to identify the sources of bacteria. In early 2009, the Mississippi River/ Gulf Hypoxia Task Force will revise the Hypoxia Action Plan to reflect new science and policy tools.

Conclusion

Madam Chair and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss the President's Fiscal Year 2009 budget request for EPA's National Water Program. America's water is a public trust and EPA's Office of Water takes the responsibility of protecting and improving the nation's waters very seriously. The FY 2009 President's Budget request emphasizes our firm resolve towards achieving our strategic goals of protecting and improving our nation's waters and protecting human health. We are committed to leading the nation in advancing innovative solutions to improve and protect water quality, promoting water efficiency and investing in financially and environmentally sustainable water and wastewater infrastructure.

We believe we can achieve the greatest impact and accomplish these strategic goals through sustained and meaningful collaboration with our federal, state, tribal, and

local partners and stakeholders. We look forward to continuing our work with this Subcommittee and to accomplishing these important national goals.

I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

COMPLETE STATEMENT

OF

LIEUTENANT GENERAL ROBERT VAN ANTWERP
CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

BEFORE

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

THE ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2009

February 7, 2008

Madam Chairwoman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee:

I am honored to be testifying before your subcommittee today, along with the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), the Honorable John Paul Woodley, Jr., on the President's Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) Budget for the United States Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program.

My statement covers the following 4 topics:

- Summary of FY09 Program Budget,
- Construction Program
- Cost Engineering Improvements, and,
- Value of the Civil Works Program to the Nation's Economy, and to the Nation's Defense

SUMMARY OF FY09 PROGRAM BUDGET

Introduction

The Fiscal Year 2009 Civil Works Budget is a performance-based budget, which reflects a focus on the projects and activities that provide the highest net economic and environmental returns on the Nation's investment or address significant risk to human safety. Direct Program funding totals $5.242 billion, consisting of discretionary funding of $4.741 billion and mandatory funding of $501 million. The Reimbursed Program funding is projected to involve an additional $2 billion to $3 billion. In addition, the Budget requests $5.761 billion of emergency funding for continuing efforts to improve storm protection for the greater New Orleans area.

Direct Program

The Budget reflects the Administration's commitment to continued sound development and management of the nation's water and related land resources. It proposes to give the Corps program managers more flexibility to properly maintain our key facilities. The Budget incorporates objective performance-based metrics for the construction program, funds the continued operation of commercial navigation and other water resource infrastructure, provides signigficant funding for the regulatory program to protect the Nation's waters and wetlands, and supports restoration of nationally and regionally significant aquatic ecosystems, with emphasis on the Florida Everglades and the Upper Mississippi River. It also would improve the quality of recreation services through an expanded fee structure and stronger partnerships, in support of modernization. Additionally, it emphasizes the basic need to fund emergency preparedness activities for the Corps as part of the regular budget process.

Reimbursed Program

Through the Interagency and Intergovernmental Services Program we help non-DOD Federal agencies, state, local, and tribal governments, and other countries with timely, cost-effective implementation of their programs. Rather than develop their own internal workforce to oversee large design and construction projects, these agencies rely on Corps of Engineers capabilities. Such intergovernmental cooperation is effective for agencies and the taxpayer by using the skills and talents that we bring to our Civil Works and Military Program missions. The work is principally technical oversight and management of engineering, environmental, and construction contracts performed by private sector firms, and is totally financed by the Agencies we service.

Currently, we provide reimbursable support for about 70 other Federal agencies and several state and local governments. Total reimbursement for such work in FY09 is projected to be $2.0 billion to $3.0 billion. The exact amount will depend on assignments received from the Agencies.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The goal of the construction program is to produce as much value as possible for the Nation from available funds. Our Fiscal Year 2009 Budget of $1.478 billion (including $76 million under the Mississippi River and Tributaries program) furthers this objective by giving priority to the continued construction and completion of those water resources projects that will provide the best net returns on the nation's investment for each dollar invested (Federal plus non-Federal) in the Corps primary mission areas. The Budget also gives priority to projects that address a significant risk to human safety, notwithstanding their economic performance. Under these guidelines, the Corps allocated funding to 79 construction projects, including 11 other dam safety assurance, seepage control, and static instability correction projects, 16 projects that address a significant risk to human safet, and 52 other projects.

The Budget uses objective performance measures to establish priorities among projects and, through a proposed statutory change in Corps contracting practices, would also increase control over future costs. The performance measures used include the benefit-to-cost ratios for projects with economic outputs; and, for aquatic ecosystem restoration projects, the extent to which the project cost-effectively contributes to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a Civil Works project or to an aquatic ecoystem restoration effort for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited. The selection process also gives priority to dam safety assurance, seepage control, static instability correction, and to projects that address a significant risk to human safety. Under each of these criterions, resources are allocated based on performance. This approach significantly improves the realization of benefits to the Nation from the Civil Works construction program and will improve overall program performance by allowing the Nation to realize the benefits of the projects with the best net returns (per dollar invested) sooner.

Maintenance Program

The facilities owned and operated by, or on behalf of, the Corps of Engineers are aging. As stewards of this infrastructure, we are working to ensure that its key features continue to provide an appropriate level of service to the Nation. Sustaining such service poses a technical challenge in some cases, and proper maintenance is becoming more expensive as this infrastructure ages.

The Operation and Maintenance (O&M) program for the FY09 Budget includes $2.638 billion (including $163 million under the Mississippi River and Tributaries program), with a focus on the maintenance of key commercial navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, hydropower, and other facilities. Specifically, the operation and maintenance program supports completed works owned or operated by the Corps of Engineers, including administrative buildings and laboratories. This program includes, for example, significant funding for our efforts in the Columbia River Basin and Missouri River Basin to support the continued operation of Corps of Engineers multi-purpose projects by meeting the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. Other work to be accomplished includes dredging, repair, aquatic plant control, removal of sunken vessels, monitoring of completed coastal projects, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in the various River and Harbor, Flood Control, and Water Resources Development Acts.

COST ENGINEERING IMPROVEMENTS

The Corps has implemented some cost engineering improvements in an effort to ensure the development of quality project estimates in support of our Civil Works customers and partners for the successful accomplishment of projects. Three initiatives have been implemented that will provide more reliable project recommendations at the feasibility phase of the project by developing project cost contingencies using a standard cost risk analysis program. Cost risk analysis is the process of identifying and measuring the cost impact of project uncertainties and risks on the estimated total project cost.

The first initiative mandates that the National Planning Centers of Expertise coordinate with the Cost Engineering Directory of Expertise at the Walla Walla District for independent review of cost estimates, and include contingencies in all decision documents requiring Congressional authorization. This approach will provide consistency in business practices and in the use of cost engineering tools.

The second initiative, which went in effect on October 1, 2007, requires that Corps project delivery teams conduct a cost risk analysis to develop contingencies for Civil Works total project cost estimates of all decision documents requiring Congressional authorization for projects exceeding $40 million.

The third initiative requires that project managers and their project delivery teams use project risk management principles and methods in developing a project risk

management plan that includes a risk assessment and analysis and a risk response plan to support the cost risk analysis. Together the project risk management plan along with the cost risk analysis will produce a defensible assessment of the Civil Works total project cost estimate. This gives the management team an effective tool to assist in managing the planning study and will assist decision makers in making project recommendations.

The Corps will be incorporating lessons learned into its cost estimating practices on an ongoing basis. Our goal is to improve the accuracy of our cost estimates much earlier in the development of a proposed project – at the project formulation stage – in order to provide greater asssurance in determining whether the alternatives that we are exploring are highly cost-effective.

VALUE OF THE CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM TO THE NATION'S ECONOMY AND DEFENSE

We are privileged to be part of an organization that directly supports the President's priorities of winning the global war on terror, securing the homeland and contributing to the economy.

The National Welfare

The way in which we manage our water resources can improve the quality of our citizens' lives. It has affected where and how people live and influenced the development of this country. The country today seeks economic development as well as the protection of environmental values.

Domestically, Corps of Engineers personnel from across the nation continue to respond to the call to help re-construct and improve the hurricane and storm damage reduction system for southeast Louisiana. The critical work they are doing will reduce the risk of damage from future storms to people and communities.

The Budget also includes a 2009 Emergency Appropriation in the amount of $5.761 billion for the Federal Share of additional funds needed to provide risk reduction from hurricane and storm surges for the greater New Orleans, Louisiana, area. These funds will be used to restore and complete construction of hurricane and storm damage risk reduction features into the Federal System. The Budget also proposes that the existing systems be authorized as a single, integrated project, and that cost-shares of this re-authorized project be made consistent with cost-shares that are applied nationally.

Research and Development

Civil Works Program research and development provides the nation with innovative engineering products, some of which can have applications in both civil and military infrastructure spheres. By creating products that improve the efficiency and

competitiveness of the nation's engineering and construction industry and providing more cost-effective ways to operate and maintain infrastructure, Civil Works program research and development contributes to the national economy.

The National Defense

Internationally, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers continues to support the mission to help Iraq and Afghanistan build foundations for democracy, freedom and prosperity.

I also want to recognize the many Corps of Engineers civilians – each of whom is a volunteer – and Soldiers who are providing engineering expertise, quality construction management, and program and project management in other nations. The often unsung efforts of these patriotic men and women contribute daily toward this nation's goals of restoring the economy, security and quality of life for all Iraqis and Afghans.

In Iraq, the Gulf Region Division has overseen the initiation of more than 4,300 reconstruction projects valued in excess of $6.5 billion. More than 500 projects valued at $2.6 billion are ongoing. These projects provide employment and hope for the Iraqi people.

In Afghanistan, the Corps is spearheading a comprehensive infrastructure program for the Afghan national army, and is also aiding in important public infrastructure projects.

CONCLUSION

The Corps of Engineers is committed to staying at the leading edge of service to the Nation. We're committed to change that ensures an open, transparent, and performance-based Civil Works Program.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee. This concludes my statement.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

COMPLETE STATEMENT

THE HONORABLE JOHN PAUL WOODLEY, JR.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (CIVIL WORKS)

BEFORE

WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2009

FEBRUARY 7, 2008

Madam Chairwoman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee, and to present the President's Budget for the Civil Works program of the Army Corps of Engineers for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009.

OVERVIEW

The FY 2009 Budget for Army Civil Works provides funding for development and restoration of the Nation's water and related resources within the 3 main Civil Works program areas, namely, commercial navigation, flood and coastal storm damage reduction, and aquatic ecosystem restoration. The Budget also supports hydropower, recreation, environmental stewardship, and water supply services at existing water resources projects owned or operated by the Corps. Finally, the Budget provides for protection of the Nation's regulated waters and wetlands; cleanup of sites contaminated as a result of the Nation's early efforts to develop atomic weapons; and emergency preparedness. The budget does not fund work that should be the responsibility of non-Federal interests or other Federal agencies, such as wastewater treatment and municipal and industrial water treatment and distribution.

Total discretionary funding for the FY 2009 annual program is $4.741 billion. This is $130 million less than the FY 2008 budget and $846 million less than Energy and Water Development appropriations for FY 2008. Within the total Civil Works budget, $2.475 billion is for activities funded in the operation and maintenance (O&M) account. This is slightly higher than the funding level for operation and maintenance proposed in the President's FY 2008 budget, which in turn was a substantial increase over prior budget or appropriation levels for comparable O&M activities.

The Budget also provides $5.761 billion in an FY 2009 emergency appropriations request for the Federal share of the additional funds needed to reduce the risk of storm surge damage to the greater New Orleans, Louisiana area. Based on statutory language proposed in the Budget, the non-federal sponsor would provide $1.527 billion for the non-Federal share of this work. This proposal is discussed further below.

A budget Five Year Development Plan (FYDP) is under development and will be provided to the relevant Committees of Congress.

Enclosure 1 displays the current estimate for the distribution of new discretionary funding among 8 appropriation accounts; 8 program areas; supervision and general administration of the Civil Works program; policy direction and oversight by the Army Secretariat; and 5 funding sources, including the general fund of the Treasury and trust funds. Enclosure 2 is a crosscut between appropriation accounts and program areas.

PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING

The FY 2009 Budget reflects a continuing maturation of the Army's performance-based approach to budgeting. Competing investment opportunities for studies, design, construction, and operation and maintenance were evaluated using multiple metrics. Objective performance criteria guided the allocation of funds among construction projects (see below).

The Budget includes initiatives leading to the development of a more systematic, performance-based budget and improved asset management. For example, the Budget allocates operation and maintenance funding among 54 geographic areas based on USGS sub-watersheds. This approach will improve the overall performance of Civil Works assets by enabling managers within each of these regional areas to focus on their key facilities and address emerging needs.

The focus on Civil Works program performance has a number of foundations. First, the 2004-2009 Civil Works Strategic Plan provided goals, objectives, and performance measures that are specific to program areas as well as some that are crosscutting. A new Civil Works Strategic Plan is under development for 2009-2014. Second, each program area has been assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). Progress to improve the performance measures was made on several programs during the past year. Summaries of all completed civil works program assessments can be found on the Administration's new website, www.ExpectMore.gov. The Civil Works Strategic Plan and the PART-based program evaluations are works in progress and will continue to be updated.

HIGHLIGHTS – WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS

Studies and Design

The FY 2008 Budget provides $91 million for the Investigations account and $1 million for investigations in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account. The Budget funds 65 studies and preconstruction engineering and design (PED) activities. We selected these for funding based on their likely performance. For instance, the projects funded for PED were those with benefit-to-cost ratios (BCRs) of 3.0-to-1 or higher.

Within this $91 million, $10 million is for studies and PED under the Louisiana Coastal Area ecosystem restoration program and $10 million more is for the science program that supports, and is an integral component of, this Corps effort to help protect and rebuild the ecosystem. In addition, $21 million is for other project-specific studies and design, $17 million is for research and development, and $33 million is for other coordination, data collection, and study activities.

The Administration urges the Congress to support the President's Budget for the investigations program, which limits the number of proposed projects funded at the study or design stage. The Corps has a very large backlog of ongoing construction work. Adding to the number of projects heading for a construction start or to their funding will delay the completion of ongoing projects and realization of their benefits to the Nation. The enactment of WRDA 2007 has heightened this concern.

The Civil Works budget includes $1 million to comply with the independent peer review requirements of Section 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007). This covers only the studies funded in the Budget. If the Congress were to increase the number of studies or their funding, the Corps would likely need more than $1 million to comply with section 2034.

Independent review previously was funded through individual study line items as study costs shared with the non-Federal sponsor. Under WRDA 2007, the costs of independent review are now fully Federal. In future Budgets, we expect to include these costs under individual study line items after studies requiring Section 2034 independent review are identified and accounting codes are set up to distinguish the fully Federal independent review costs from the other study costs, which the non-Federal sponsor will share.

The FY 2009 Budget includes 2 new studies: The Investigations account includes $2 million for a high-priority study of the vulnerability of the U.S. to damage from flooding, including an assessment of the comparative risks faced by different regions of the U.S. This study will provide background for a subsequent effort by policy officials to develop recommendations to improve existing Federal programs, authorities, and roles. The other new study is the Atchafalaya Basin Land Study in the Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries account, for which the Administration has repeatedly requested funding. I urge you to fund this study. It has a high priority because land acquisition is an important component of the overall flood damage reduction plan for this watershed. The FY 2009 Budget also specifically identifies $100,000 for Corps support to the efforts of the inter-agency Committee on the Marine Transportation System, established by the President in the 2004 Ocean Action Plan. Costs to support the Committee previously were included in the Coordination with Other Agencies allocation in the Investigations account.

Construction Program

The Budget provides $1.402 billion in the Construction account and $76 million for construction projects in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account.

Many more construction projects have been authorized, initiated, and continued than can be constructed efficiently at any one time. The funding of projects with low economic and environmental returns and of projects that are not within Civil Works main mission areas has led to the postponement of benefits from the most worthy projects, and has significantly reduced overall program performance.

To remedy this situation and to achieve greater value to the Nation from the Civil Works construction program, the Budget again proposes performance guidelines to allocate funds among construction projects. The guidelines give priority for funding to the projects that yield the greatest returns to the Nation, based upon objective performance criteria. The FY 2009 guidelines mirror those for FY 2008, except that priority also is accorded to projects that can be completed in FY 2009.

Under the guidelines, the Budget allocates funds among construction projects based primarily on these criteria: BCRs; contribution to reducing significant risk to human safety or to dam safety assurance, seepage control, or static instability correction concerns; capability of high performing projects to be completed in FY 2009 in order to bring significant benefits online; and the extent to which projects cost-effectively contribute to the restoration of nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystems that have become degraded as a result of Civil Works projects, or to a restoration effort for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited. The construction guidelines are provided in Enclosure 3.

The 79 construction projects funded in the Budget consist of: 11 dam safety assurance, seepage control and static instability correction rehabilitation projects; 16 projects funded to address a significant risk to human safety (including 2 new deficiency correction projects); and 52 other projects (including 5 in the Mississippi River and Tributaries program).

Operation and Maintenance Program

The FY 2009 Budget proposes $2.475 billion for the Operation and Maintenance account and $163 million for maintenance activities in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account. The total amount is $16 million higher than the FY 2008 Budget for comparable activities.

The Budget emphasizes performance of existing projects by focusing on the maintenance of key commercial navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, hydropower, and other facilities. The proposed funding would enable the Army Corps of Engineers to carry out priority maintenance, repairs, and rehabilitations, and priority initiatives such as the development of asset management systems.

As in the FY 2007 and 2008 Budgets, the operation and maintenance program includes 4 activities that are directly related to the operation and maintenance of Corps projects, but previously were funded in the Construction program – compliance with the Endangered Species Act at operating projects; rehabilitation of existing projects; replacement of sand due to the operation and maintenance of Federal navigation projects; and construction of facilities, projects, or features (including islands and wetlands) to use materials dredged during Federal navigation operation and maintenance activities. The Budget transfers responsibility for these activities to improve investment decisions on

project operation and maintenance and better provide accountability and oversight for those decisions. For the inland navigation rehabilitation projects budgeted in the Operation and Maintenance account, one-half of the project funding would be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Construction, replacement, and expansion of inland waterways projects continue to be budgeted in the Construction account.

Like the Budgets for the past 2 years, the FY 2009 Budget proposes to allocate operation and maintenance funding on a regional basis. Last year, the Budget proposed allocation of funding by 21 watersheds identified by the U.S. Geological Survey's watershed and sub-watershed identification system. This year, in order to more clearly identify the systems among which funding is allocated, the Budget proposes to allocate funding among 54 systems. Within these 54 systems, the justification materials allocate funding for illustrative purposes to flood and coastal storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, hydropower, stewardship, recreation, and water supply program areas. Funding operation and maintenance using this framework will increase efficiency in the operation and maintenance of Civil Works projects. Managers in the field will be better able to properly maintain key infrastructure, adapt to uncertainties, and address emergencies, as well as other changed conditions over the course of the fiscal year, while complying with congressional direction for the appropriations.

HIGHLIGHTS -- PROGRAM AREAS

The Army Civil Works program includes 8 program areas; commercial navigation, flood and coastal storm damage reduction, environment, recreation, hydropower, water supply, emergency management, and the regulatory program. The Budget also funds the supervision and general administration of the Civil Works program in the Corps headquarters and the eight division offices; and the policy direction and oversight for the program by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). Budget proposals for all areas are discussed below.

Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, and Emergency Management

The FY 2009 Budget provides $1.322 billion for flood and coastal storm damage reduction and $58 million for emergency management

Among the 79 construction projects funded in the FY 2009 budget, 50 are for flood and coastal storm damage reduction, including 11 dam safety and seepage control and static instability correction rehabilitations, 2 deficiency correction projects at St. Louis Flood Protection, Missouri and Wood River Levee, Illinois; and 29 other projects that address a significant risk to human safety or were selected based on their benefit-to-cost ratios.

The Budget for the emergency management program includes $40 million in the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account to fund preparedness for flood and coastal emergencies and other natural disasters. This funding is needed in FY 2009 to maintain and improve the Corps of Engineers ability to respond to disasters. Specifically, this funding would cover review and updating of emergency response plans, periodic exercises to test

and evaluate plans, training, procurement of critical supplies and equipment, and pre-disaster coordination with state and local governments and other federal agencies. The FY 2009 Budget reflects the strong belief of the Army in the importance of providing regular funding for emergency preparedness, rather than relying on supplemental appropriations to finance emergency preparedness. The emergency management program also includes $6 million for the National Emergency Preparedness Program and $12 million for facility protection, both of which are funded in the Operation and Maintenance account. We continue to fund facility protection as a remaining item in the operation and maintenance account. In the past, we allocated these costs among the 8 program areas. This year, we included these costs instead under the emergency management program area.

The Budget includes $14 million in multiple accounts for Actions for Change – a set of actions identified by the Chief of Engineers to aggressively incorporate the lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita into the way the Corps plans, designs, constructs, and maintains its infrastructure. The program is being executed by 4 national teams. All actions are interrelated, but each of the 4 teams has one of the following focus areas: comprehensive systems approaches; risk-informed decision making; risk communications; and professional and technical expertise. A common theme throughout the program is increased accountability for public safety. The Corps is working toward the goal of making these changes self-sustaining.

The FY 2009 Operation and Maintenance account includes $10 million for the National Levee Inventory/Inspection and Levee Safety Program. These funds will be used to continue the national levee inventory, assessment, and database development that were begun with emergency supplemental appropriations of $30 million in FY 2006. Funds also will be used for administrative and travel costs of the National Levee Safety Committee established pursuant to Title IX of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. Title IX broadened the authority under which the Corps conducts the levee inventory program and is being implemented under the ongoing levee inventory and inspection program. The national levee inventory is an interagency effort to improve management of the Nation's flood and storm damage reduction infrastructure. The results of the national project inventory and risk-based project assessments will be linked to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's ongoing flood mapping program, as well as to the Corps levee rehabilitation and inspection program.

The Budget provides funding for all work currently planned to remedy the most serious (Action Class I and II) dam safety, seepage, and static instability problems at Corps dams. The planning, design, and construction of these projects are funded at the maximum amount that the Corps estimates that it can use efficiently and effectively.

The Budget continues to support Federal participation in initial construction, but not in re-nourishment, at beach nourishment projects that provide storm damage reduction or ecosystem restoration outputs.

Commercial Navigation

The FY 2009 Budget provides a total of $1.892 billion for the commercial navigation program area.

The amount budgeted for inland waterway construction projects (construction, replacements, and expansions in the Construction Account, and rehabilitations in the Operation and Maintenance account) is about $326 million, which includes funding to continue 14 inland waterway projects; 3 seepage and static instability correction rehabilitation projects; completion of 5 projects; and continuation of construction on 5 other projects. Half of the funding for these inland waterways investments, about $167 million, would be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, reflecting both concurrent financing of 50% of construction costs on most projects and rebalancing of the proportion where prior expenditures from the general fund of the Treasury exceeded 50%.

The FY 2009 Budget is based on enactment of proposed legislation to establish a lockage-based barge user fee and to phase out the existing diesel fuel tax for the inland waterways. The prompt enactment of such legislation is needed to address the declining balance in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which otherwise will run out of funds around the end of the 2008 calendar year, and to support ongoing and future inland waterways projects. The funding in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, which comes from the diesel fuel tax, will not be sufficient after FY 2008 to support needed levels of investment in these waterways.

Enactment of the Administration's legislative proposal would ensure that the commercial users of the Corps locks continue to cover their share of project costs. The amount of the user fee would be tied to the level of spending for inland waterways construction, replacement, expansion and rehabilitation work. The proposed legislation will be transmitted to Congress shortly.

The Budget includes $170 million to construct channel and harbor projects.

The Budget focuses navigation operation and maintenance funding of $1.375 billion on those waterway segments and commercial harbors that support high volumes of commercial traffic, such as the heavily-used Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and the Illinois Waterway. The Budget also funds maintenance of harbors that support significant commercial fishing, subsistence, safety, harbor of refuge, national security, or public transportation benefits.

The Corps continues development of techniques to identify and compare the marginal impacts on the Nation's waterborne commerce of varying maintenance levels for coastal channels and harbors. The FY 2009 Budget provides for $729 million to be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for operation and maintenance. The growth of the trust fund balance and ways to address this balance are being discussed within the Administration. We will continue to work within the Administration to develop policies to effectively use the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

The Budget continues the policy of funding beach replenishment, including periodic re-nourishment, where the operation and maintenance of Federal navigation projects is the reason for the sand loss on shorelines.

Environment

The FY 2008 Budget provides $511 million for environmental activities overall, including $286 million for aquatic ecosystem restoration. The costs of compliance with Biological Opinions at existing projects are not included in the above figures. The Budget includes these costs as part of the joint operation and maintenance costs of the affected projects and allocates these costs among the program areas served by the projects.

Within the $286 million for aquatic ecosystem restoration, $185 million is for the Corps of Engineers share of the South Florida Everglades Ecosystem Restoration Program, which is the most ever budgeted or appropriated for the Corps in one year for these activities. This level of funding for the Corps is an increase of $54 million, or 41%, compared to the FY 2008 enacted level. The increase reflects the program's priorities for 2009 – which include more funding for the Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park (Mod Waters) project, a key element of this effort that both the National Park Service and the Corps are funding (+$40 million); and funding to restore a 90 square mile area west of the Everglades known as Picayune Strand, which will provide habitat suitable for the endangered Florida panther and other species (+$24 million). The Budget for this program also emphasizes continued construction of the Kissimmee River restoration effort; and studies and design work under the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan, or CERP. Finally, the Budget also continues construction of the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration "Critical Projects," and the South Dade County (C-111) and West Palm Beach Canal (C-51 & STA 1-E) Central and Southern Florida (C&SF) projects.

The Budget provides $20 million for the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program and $20 million for the Louisiana Coastal Area restoration effort, including $10 million for its important Science Program, which will assist the State and Federal managers of the LCA Ecosystem Restoration Program by providing science support aimed at improving implementation. The Science Program will inform and guide the program by reducing uncertainties and insuring that effective tools and processes are available for use by the project delivery team.

The Budget includes $95 million for environmental stewardship. The Corps administers lands and waters covering 11 million acres, an area equal in size to the States of Vermont and New Hampshire. Funded activities include shoreline management, protection of natural resources, support for endangered species, continuation of mitigation activities, and protection of cultural and historic resources.

The Budget provides $130 million for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) to clean up contamination at sites resulting largely from the early atomic weapons program. This funding will enable completion of remedial action at one site (Linde Air Products Soil operable unit) and support continued progress toward completion of remedial actions at a number of other FUSRAP sites.

Regulatory Program

The FY 2009 Budget provides $180 million for the Corps Regulatory Program to protect wetlands and other waters of the United States. This is the same as the amount in both the Budget and appropriations for FY 2008, and represents a $55 million increase since 2001. The funding will be used for permit processing, enforcement and compliance actions, and jurisdictional determinations, including the significant additional field documentation, coordination and evaluation work associated with the Supreme Court's Carabell and Rapanos decisions.

Investing in the Regulatory Program has a win-win result, since it protects valuable aquatic resources while enabling over $225 billion in economic development to proceed annually. The Corps will also use the requested funding to develop and implement improvements such as electronic permit applications and data sharing with other agencies and the public, consistent with Sections 2017 and 2040 of WRDA 2007.

Recreation

The FY 2009 Budget provides $270 million for recreation operations and related maintenance. The Budget re-proposes the Corps of Engineers recreation modernization initiative, which first was developed as part of the FY 06 and FY 07 budgets. This initiative, which requires legislation to implement, would allow the Corps to upgrade and modernize its recreation facilities through an expansion of the current fee structure. It would also enable the Corps, working at the national, state, and local levels, to pursue voluntary public/private partnerships and other means to help finance the recreation program.

Hydropower

Hydropower is a renewable source of energy. The Civil Works program is the Nation's largest producer of hydroelectric energy. The Corps provides one quarter of the Nation's hydroelectric power generation capacity and satisfies 3% of the Nation's total energy needs.

The FY 2009 Budget provides $319 million for hydropower. This investment will help to reduce the forced outage rate, which remains well above the industry average. In addition, the 4 ongoing replacement projects, once completed, will produce enough power to electrify 37,000 homes and reduce carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere by 190,000 metric tons.

Water Supply

On average, Civil Works projects provide 4 billion gallons of water per day to meet the needs of municipal and commercial users across the country. The Budget includes $6 million for this program under the operation and maintenance account. These costs can be broken into 5 categories: costs to manage water supply contracts and to operate and maintain specific water supply facilities; ongoing water reallocation studies; the National Portfolio assessment of water reallocation possibilities; the allocated share of costs for

compliance with the Endangered Species Act; and the allocated share of other project joint costs. The water supply program manages 307 water supply agreements that cover 7.2 million acre-feet of storage space in 136 of the Corps' multiple purpose reservoir projects. This storage space has an assigned repayment value of $9.8 billion. These costs are repaid directly to the U.S. Treasury by the water users. The opportunities that are being identified through the National Portfolio assessment to reallocate storage space in existing reservoirs can assist in addressing unmet demand for municipal and industrial water supply without building additional projects.

Management Expenses of the Army Corps of Engineers

The FY 2009 budget provides $177 million for the Expenses account to cover the costs of the Army Corps of Engineers Headquarters, Major Subordinate Commands or Divisions, and national support Corps offices such as the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Institute for Water Resources, and the Finance Center.

Army Secretariat Policy Direction and Oversight

The FY 2009 Budget includes $6 million for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works). The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) has oversight responsibility on behalf of the Secretary of the Army for all aspects of the Civil Works program of the Army Corps of Engineers; for the Army Cemeterial Expenses budget and program for Arlington National Cemetery and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery; for reimbursable support by the Army Corps of Engineers for other domestic agencies; and for all international activities of the Army Corps of Engineers except those directly in support of U.S. forces overseas. This account finances the personnel and other direct costs of the Assistant Secretary's office in the energy and water development appropriation, consistent with recently enacted appropriations for this office.

PROTECTION OF THE METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA

In addition to FY 2009 regular appropriations for the Civil Works program, the FY 2009 Budget recommends enactment of FY 2009 emergency appropriations of $5.761 billion for the remaining Federal share of the New Orleans Area Hurricane and Storm Damage and Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), which is designed to reduce the risk to the greater New Orleans, Louisiana, area from storm surges that have a 1% annual chance of occurring and to improve internal drainage; to restore and complete construction of hurricane and storm damage reduction features in surrounding areas to previously authorized levels of protection; and to incorporate certain non-Federal levees into the Federal system. The FY 2009 Budget also proposes to authorize the HSDRRS to be constructed with the State of Louisiana as the single non-Federal cost-sharing partner and subsequently maintained and operated by the State. Pre-Katrina, the HSDRRS was built as a collection of separately authorized projects, designed with differing standards, subject to differing requirements for non-Federal cost-sharing, and managed by different local entities.

The new HSDRRS system will be not only higher, but also stronger than the pre-Hurricane Katrina system. Armoring of critical elements will improve resilience during storm events. New pump stations, water control structures, and floodgates will add perimeter protection to reduce the threat of storm surges from outfall canals and navigation channels. Completing the Southeast Louisiana urban drainage project within the geographic perimeter of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity and West Bank and Vicinity projects will enhance the effectiveness of interior drainage systems.

Based on the proposed statutory language included in the President's Budget, local entities would be responsible for 35% of the cost of the Southeast Louisiana project located within the geographic perimeter of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity and West Bank and Vicinity projects, and for 35% of the increment of levee raises and other enhancements needed to the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity and West Bank and Vicinity projects above currently authorized levels to reduce the risk to the greater New Orleans area from storm surges that have a 1% annual chance of occurring. Local entities would also be responsible for 100% of the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation cost.

OTHER BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

General Provisions

The Budget includes proposed statutory language to authorize continuation of limits on reprogramming with certain proposed changes; to replace the continuing contract authority of the Corps with multi-year contracting authority patterned after the authority available to other Federal agencies; and to prohibit committing funds for ongoing and new contracts beyond the appropriated amounts available, including reprogramming.

Improved Cost Estimating

With my full support, the Chief of Engineers is undertaking several initiatives to strengthen the Corps performance in project cost estimating. The Chief will discuss these initiatives in detail in his statement.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2007

Upon passage of WRDA 2007 on November 7, 2007, the Chief of Engineers and I established a joint team to oversee the implementation of this lengthy, complex, and costly Act. We have designated a senior Corps policy analyst to lead our joint efforts. I meet at least bi-weekly with the joint WRDA implementation team to review and approve guidance for major policy and project provisions of WRDA.

The purpose of implementation guidance is to ensure a common understanding of the policies and procedures that will be used to meet the requirements of the law. Provisions that require development of implementation guidance are being identified and prioritized, and the writing of the guidance is underway. Implementation guidance for those provisions directly affecting work within the Divisions and Districts is being developed in

consultation with the appropriate District, Division, and Headquarters Regional Integration Team. Due to the large number of provisions in the law, it will take time to issue guidance on each of the provisions. Priority for implementation guidance is being given to national policy provisions (mostly in Title II) and to those project and program provisions where funds are currently appropriated.

Following are some examples of WRDA provisions receiving priority for implementation guidance:

Section 2003 - Written Agreements for water resources projects
Section 2027 – Fiscal Transparency Report
Section 2031 – Water Resources principles and guidelines
Section 2032 – Water Resources priorities report
Section 2033 – Planning
Section 2034 – Independent Peer Review
Section 2035 – Safety Assurance Review
Section 2036 – Mitigation for fish and wildlife and wetlands losses
Title VI – Florida Everglades
Title VII – Louisiana Coastal Area
Title IX – National Levee Safety Program

Working through the joint implementation team, we are making excellent progress in implementation strategies for the significant policy provisions and numerous individual project provisions.

PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT AGENDA

The Army Civil Works program is pursuing 5 government-wide management initiatives, as are other Federal agencies, plus a 6th initiative on real property asset management. "Scorecards" for the Army Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies can be found at the following website:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/results/agenda/scorecard.html.

For the first quarter of the 2008 fiscal year, the scorecard rates the Corps status as red on one initiative, yellow on 4, and green on one. I am pleased that the Corps is rated green on progress on all 6 initiatives. The Corps has worked diligently to achieve these ratings, and I am proud of their efforts. The Army is hopeful that the Corps of Engineers will receive an audit opinion in the very near future from the Inspector General of the Department of Defense for its FY 2006 and 2007 Civil Works financial statements. This would be the first time ever that a major component of the Defense Department has received an audit opinion. The opinion is expected to be qualified, and it is anticipated that the auditors will recommend a number of areas that need improvement. With a qualified opinion in hand and this guidance from the DoD Inspector General, the Army has every expectation that the Corps can achieve an unqualified audit opinion on its FY 2008 financial statements.

CONCLUSION

In developing this Budget, the Administration made explicit choices based on performance. The sustained level of O&M funding, transfer of activities from construction to O&M, emphasis on construction projects based on their returns, and focus on preparedness for flood, hurricane, and other natural disasters, for example, all reflect a performance-based approach.

At $4.741 billion, the FY 2009 Army Civil Works annual budget provides the resources for the Civil Works program to pursue investments that will yield good returns for the Nation in the future. With the proposed $5.761 billion in FY 2009 emergency appropriations, the Corps can also complete the Federal share of work necessary to significantly reduce the risk of storm surge damage to the greater New Orleans area.

This Budget represents the wise use of funding to advance worthy, mission-based objectives. I am proud to present it.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Subcommittee, for this opportunity to testify on the President's Fiscal Year 2009 Budget for the Civil Works program of the Army Corps of Engineers. This is the last time I will appear before this Subcommittee to present the Civil Works budget on behalf of President Bush. It has been my pleasure working with this Subcommittee.

ENCLOSURE 1
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS – CIVIL WORKS ANNUAL BUDGET, FY 2009
SUMMARY

Requested New Appropriations for Annual Program by Account:		
Investigations		91,000,000
Construction		1,402,000,000
Operation and Maintenance		2,475,000,000
Regulatory Program		180,000,000
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries		240,000,000
Expenses		177,000,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)		6,000,000
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies		40,000,000
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program		130,000,000
TOTAL		4,741,000,000
Requested New Appropriations by Program Area:		
Commercial Navigation		1892,000,000
(Inland and Intracoastal Waterways)	(931,000,000)	
(Channels and Harbors)	(961,000,000)	
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction		1,322,000,000
(Flood Damage Reduction)	(1,295,000,000)	
(Coastal Storm Damage Reduction)	(27,000,000)	
Environment		511,000,000
(Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration)	(286,000,000)	
(FUSRAP)	(130,000,000)	
(Stewardship)	(95,000,000)	
Hydropower		319,000,000
Recreation		270,000,000
Water Supply		6,000,000
Emergency Management		58,000,000
(Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies)	(40,000,000)	
(National Emergency Preparedness)	(6,000,000)	
(Remaining Items Operation and Maintenance)	(12,000,000)	
Regulatory Program		180,000,000
Oversight and Management		183,000,000
TOTAL		4,741,000,000
Sources of New Appropriations:		
General Fund		3,844,000,000
Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund		729,000,000
Inland Waterways Trust Fund		167,000,000
Disposal Facilities User Fees		1,000,000
TOTAL		4,741,000,000
Additional New Resources:		
Rivers and Harbors Contributed Funds		400,000,000
Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund		84,000,000
Permanent Appropriations		17,000,000
TOTAL		501,000,000

ENCLOSURE 2
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS – CIVIL WORKS ANNUAL BUDGET, FY 2009

CROSSCUT BETWEEN APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS AND PROGRAM AREAS

	Navi-gation	Flood/ Storm	Recre-ation	Aq. Ec. Restor.	Stew-ardshp.	FUS-RAP	Hydro-power	Water Supply	Emerg. Mgmt.	Regul. Prog.	Ovrsgt/ Mgmt	TOT
Investigations	20	36		35								91
Construction	487	627		245			43					1402
Operation & Maint.	1346	482	255	2	90		276	6	18			2475
MR&T – I		1										1
MR&T – C	10	62		4								76
MR&T – O&M	29	114	15		5							163
FUSRAP						130						130
FC&CE									40			40
Regulatory										180		180
Expenses											177	177
Office of the ASA(CW)											6	6
TOTAL	1892	1322	270	286	95	130	319	6	58	180	183	4741

ENCLOSURE 3

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS – CIVIL WORKS BUDGET
FY 2009 CONSTRUCTION PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES

1. *Project rankings.* All ongoing specifically authorized construction projects, including projects funded in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account, will be assigned based upon their primary purpose to one of the main mission areas of the Corps (flood and storm damage reduction; commercial navigation; aquatic ecosystem restoration) or to hydropower. Flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, and hydropower projects will be ranked by their total benefits divided by their total costs (BCR), calculated at a 7 percent real discount rate. Aquatic ecosystem restoration projects will be ranked by the extent to which they cost-effectively contribute to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a civil works project, or to a restoration effort for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited (e.g., because the solution requires complex alterations to the hydrology and hydraulics of a river system).

2. *Projects funded on the basis of their economic and environmental returns.* Ongoing flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, and hydropower construction projects with a BCR of 1.5 or higher and ongoing aquatic ecosystem restoration construction projects that are cost-effective in contributing to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a civil works project or to a restoration effort for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited will receive at least the amount needed to pay estimated contractor earnings required under ongoing contracts and related costs. In allocating funds among these projects, priority will be given to those with the highest economic and environmental returns and to projects where the Corps can complete physical construction of the project and/or related administrative activities in the budget year.

3. *Projects funded to address significant risk to human safety.* Flood and storm damage reduction projects that are funded to address significant risk to human safety will receive sufficient funding to support an uninterrupted effort during the budget year.

4. *Projects with low economic and environmental returns.* Ongoing flood and storm damage reduction, commercial navigation, and hydropower construction projects with a BCR below 1.5 will be considered for deferral, except for flood and storm damage reduction projects that are funded to address significant risk to human safety. Likewise, ongoing aquatic ecosystem restoration construction projects that do not cost-

effectively contribute to the restoration of a nationally or regionally significant aquatic ecosystem that has become degraded as a result of a civil works project, and do not cost-effectively address a problem for which the Corps is otherwise uniquely well-suited, will be considered for deferral.

5. *New starts and resumptions.* The budget could include funds to start up new construction projects, or to resume work on ongoing construction projects on which the Corps has not performed any physical work under a construction contract during the past 3 consecutive fiscal years, only if the project would be ranked that year in the top 20 percent of the ongoing construction projects in its mission area. The term "physical work under a construction contract" does not include activities related to project planning, engineering and design, relocation, or the acquisition of lands, easements, or rights-of-way. For non-structural flood damage reduction projects, construction begins in the first fiscal year in which the Corps acquires lands, easements, or rights-of-way primarily to relocate structures, or performs physical work under a construction contract for non-structural project-related measures. For aquatic ecosystem restoration projects, construction begins in the first fiscal year in which the Corps acquires lands, easements, or rights-of-way primarily to facilitate the restoration of degraded aquatic ecosystems including wetlands, riparian areas, and adjacent floodplains, or performs physical work under a construction contract to modify existing project facilities primarily to restore the aquatic ecosystem. For all other projects, construction begins in the first fiscal year in which the Corps performs physical work under a construction contract.

6. *Other cases.* Projects will receive the amount needed to ensure that they comply with treaties and with biological opinions pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, and meet authorized mitigation requirements. Dam safety assurance, seepage control, and static instability correction projects that are funded in the construction program will receive the maximum level of funding that the Corps can efficiently and effectively spend in each year.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
CIVIL WORKS
108 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0108

JUN 27 2008

Honorable James L. Oberstar
Chairman
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Chairman Oberstar:

I am providing a final response to your letter of February 15, 2008, to Lieutenant General Robert Van Antwerp and your letter of February 19, 2008, to me providing questions for written responses for the record of the February 7 hearing at which Lieutenant General Van Antwerp and I testified before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment. I apologize for the delay in responding to your letters.

I am enclosing answers to your questions and those of Representative Napolitano. I have also enclosed answers to additional questions from Representatives Boustany, Brown, and Duncan that were provided electronically by the Subcommittee staff.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment on the President's Fiscal Year 2009 Budget for the Civil Works program of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Very truly yours,

John Paul Woodley, Jr.

John Paul Woodley, Jr.
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Civil Works)

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing
Questions by Rep. Duncan
February 7, 2008

Mr. Duncan. General Van Antwerp: It is my understanding the Corps is now conducting a study that compares different projects and how they have been completed. I am told this study is called the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. Can you indicate what the current status is of this effort and when you will have the study completed? Also, what information are you gathering about each project, and how do you expect to use the information to better manage the Corps?

General Van Antwerp. Sir, the draft report "Inland Navigation Construction Selected Case Studies" is undergoing a peer review and will be revised to address the review comments. The report is planned to be completed by the end of the summer of this year. The paper includes three case studies and evaluates several factors that can affect the length of time to construct a project and its cost. The information is expected to provide insights on what can be done to improve construction methods and reduce costs.

Mr. Duncan. General Van Antwerp: The Olmsted Locks and Dams project on the Ohio River was authorized by Congress in WRDA 88 at an estimated construction cost of $775 million. Its construction began in 1991 and was supposed to be completed years ago. Today, so far, we have spent $900 million on the project. Its new estimated completion cost is just under $2 billion and its completion date is now projected to be sometime in 2015. Please provide the Committee with an explanation of why the project is taking so much longer to construct and costing so much more than the Corps projected.

General Van Antwerp. Sir, the changes in schedule and cost are due to a variety of factors, including items omitted in the original estimate, design and construction changes, and differing site conditions. At the time of the feasibility report, which formed the basis for the authorization, the Corps estimated that construction would take about 7.5 years. By the start of construction, based on additional work and other information identified during pre-construction engineering and design, we had revised this estimate to roughly 12 years. There were also changes made during construction. Moreover, cost estimates in feasibility reports reflect the value of a dollar in a specified single year; dollars expended always appear to be larger due to the impact of inflation.

At this time, we estimate that the current phase of work, which involves constructing the new locks and dam at the Olmsted site, will be completed in early FY 2015. We have added approximately two years of contingency beyond then to cover river conditions and/or other factors. From that point, once the Olmsted site becomes operational, it will take about 2 more years to demolish locks and dams 52 and 53.

Mr. Duncan. General Van Antwerp: For more than 30 years, the Corps budget has identified project-specific amounts in the operations and maintenance portion of the Corps budget. This year, the budget proposed O&M funding into 54 river sub-systems without providing the project-specific amount for the individual projects within each subsystem. Please provide the Committee with the project specific-amounts you are suggesting.

General Van Antwerp. Sir, we are not suggesting any project-specific amounts. However, an illustrative distribution of the FY09 O&M budget by project is shown in the attached table. One reason that these amounts only represent an illustrative distribution of funding is that they will change as operation and maintenance needs adjust. Therefore, they should not be considered to be our budget estimates.

S:\CECW-ID\FY 09 Budget\O&M_and_Mf

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (O&M)							
AKS	POA	POD	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	AK	0	17,601	17,601
AKS	POA	POD	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	AK	63	0	63
AKS	POA	POD	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	AK	1,638	524	2,162
AKS	POA	POD	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	AK	0	840	840
AKS	POA	POD	HOMER HARBOR, AK	AK	0	620	620
AKS	POA	POD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	AK	1,058	0	1,058
AKS	POA	POD	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	AK	0	350	350
AKS	POA	POD	NOME HARBOR, AK	AK	0	780	780
AKS	POA	POD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	AK	0	550	550
AMR	SAM	SAD	ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	AL	375	0	375
AMR	SAM	SAD	ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	AL	7,600	8,072	15,672
AMR	SAM	SAD	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	AL	8,938	13,253	22,191
EGC	SAM	SAD	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	AL	630	4,600	5,230
TCR	LRN	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	AL	5	0	5
AMR	SAM	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	AL	55	0	55
EGC	SAM	SAD	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	AL	510	21,052	21,562
EGC	SAM	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	AL	100	0	100
AMR	SAM	SAD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	AL	94	0	94
AMR	SAM	SAD	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, A	AL	2,350	0	2,350
AMR	SAM	SAD	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	AL	12,654	9,355	22,009
ACF	SAM	SAD	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	AL	3,825	4,592	8,417
EGC	SAM	SAD	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, AL	AL	120	0	120
WHT	SWL	SWD	BEAVER LAKE, AR	AR	4,714	556	5,270
OBL	MVK	MVD	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	AR	5,541	2,843	8,384
ARK	SWL	SWD	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	AR	1,318	109	1,427
WHT	SWL	SWD	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	AR	5,539	1,828	7,367
ARK	SWL	SWD	DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM, AR	AR	6,334	2,157	8,491
OBL	MVK	MVD	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	AR	5,132	1,186	6,317
RED	SWL	SWD	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	AR	1,059	227	1,286
RED	SWL	SWD	DIERKS LAKE, AR	AR	1,162	192	1,354
RED	SWL	SWD	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	AR	886	270	1,156
WHT	SWL	SWD	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	AR	5,183	1,678	6,861
LMS	MVM	MVD	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	AR	50	40	90
LMS	MVK	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	AR	209	0	209
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	AR	173	0	173
ARK	SWL	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	AR	126	0	126
ARK	SWL	SWD	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	AR	18,841	9,554	28,395
RED	SWL	SWD	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	AR	1,657	417	2,074
OBL	MVK	MVD	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	AR	3,863	727	4,591
ARK	SWL	SWD	NIMROD LAKE, AR	AR	1,459	150	1,609
WHT	SWL	SWD	NORFORK LAKE, AR	AR	3,298	622	3,920
LMS	MVM	MVD	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	AR	6	8	14
OBL	MVK	MVD	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	AR	6,372	2,137	8,509
ARK	SWL	SWD	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	AR	4,118	1,169	5,287
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	AR	8	0	8
WHT	MVM	MVD	WHITE RIVER, AR	AR	26	26	52
LMS	MVK	MVD	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	AR	2	1	3
LCO	SPL	SPD	ALAMO LAKE, AZ & CA	AZ	1,438	147	1,585
LCO	SPL	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	AZ	98	0	98
LCO	SPL	SPD	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	AZ	1,058	148	1,206
LCO	SPL	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	AZ	39	0	39
LCO	SPL	SPD	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	AZ	114	57	171
NCA	SPK	SPD	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	CA	1,529	425	1,954
NCA	SPK	SPD	BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	CA	1,681	139	1,820
SCA	SPL	SPD	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	CA	0	5,360	5,360
NCA	SPN	SPD	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	CA	2,597	787	3,384
NCA	SPN	SPD	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL, CA	CA	3,980	1,087	5,067
NCA	SPK	SPD	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	CA	323	120	443

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
NCA	SPK	SPD	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	CA	1,689	97	1,786
NCA	SPN	SPD	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	CA	0	5,144	5,144
NCA	SPK	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	CA	1,586	0	1,586
SCA	SPL	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	CA	859	0	859
NCA	SPN	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	CA	1,377	0	1,377
SCA	SPK	SPD	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	CA	1,377	27	1,404
SCA	SPL	SPD	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	CA	2,486	1,510	3,996
SCA	SPL	SPD	MARINA DEL REY, CA	CA	0	2,499	2,499
NCA	SPK	SPD	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, CA & NV	CA	561	176	737
NCA	SPK	SPD	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	CA	229	10	239
SCA	SPL	SPD	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	CA	211	74	285
SCA	SPL	SPD	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	CA	0	1,630	1,630
NCA	SPK	SPD	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	CA	1,707	408	2,115
NCA	SPK	SPD	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	CA	1,227	503	1,730
NCA	SPN	SPD	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	CA	0	7,445	7,445
SCA	SPL	SPD	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	CA	0	1,620	1,620
SCA	SPK	SPD	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	CA	2,099	755	2,854
SCA	SPL	SPD	PORT HUENEME, CA	CA	0	4,029	4,029
SCA	SPL	SPD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	CA	1,047	0	1,047
NCA	SPN	SPD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	CA	1,375	0	1,375
NCA	SPN	SPD	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	CA	0	6,950	6,950
NCA	SPK	SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	CA	82	5,500	5,582
NCA	SPK	SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	CA	1,066	500	1,566
NCA	SPK	SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	CA	175	0	175
NCA	SPN	SPD	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	CA	1,091	15	1,106
NCA	SPN	SPD	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	CA	0	2,805	2,805
NCA	SPN	SPD	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	CA	0	2,514	2,514
NCA	SPK	SPD	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	CA	11	5,400	5,411
NCA	SPN	SPD	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	CA	0	1,140	1,140
SCA	SPL	SPD	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	CA	2,259	888	3,148
SCA	SPL	SPD	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	CA	0	2,090	2,090
NCA	SPK	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	CA	1,299	0	1,299
SCA	SPL	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	CA	274	0	274
NCA	SPN	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	CA	58	8	66
SCA	SPK	SPD	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	CA	1,533	258	1,791
NCA	SPN	SPD	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	CA	0	2,982	2,982
SCA	SPK	SPD	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	CA	1,502	410	1,912
SCA	SPL	SPD	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	CA	0	3,095	3,095
NCA	SPK	SPD	YUBA RIVER, CA	CA	129	0	129
MOR	NWO	NWD	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	CO	325	7	332
MOR	NWO	NWD	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	CO	1,164	12	1,176
MOR	NWO	NWD	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	CO	860	10	870
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	CO	34	0	34
UAR	SPA	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	CO	340	0	340
UCO	SPK	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	CO	83	0	83
ARK	SPA	SPD	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	CO	1,696	722	2,418
RGR	SPA	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	CO	155	0	155
UCO	SPK	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	CO	565	0	565
ARK	SPA	SPD	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	CO	818	138	956
SNE	NAE	NAD	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	CT	357	59	416
SNE	NAE	NAD	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	CT	445	102	547
SNE	NAE	NAD	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	CT	266	72	338
SNE	NAE	NAD	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	CT	798	121	919
SNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	CT	251	0	251
SNE	NAN	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	CT	65	0	65
SNE	NAE	NAD	LONG ISLAND SOUND DMMP, CT	CT	1,000	0	1,000
SNE	NAE	NAD	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	CT	314	179	493
SNE	NAE	NAD	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	CT	308	77	385
SNE	NAE	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	CT	1,100	0	1,100
SNE	NAE	NAD	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	CT	261	113	374
SNE	NAE	NAD	THOMASTON DAM, CT	CT	515	100	615

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
SNE	NAE	NAD	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	CT	388	180	568
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	DC	62	0	62
SPR	NAB	NAD	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS, DC (DRIFT REMOVAL)	DC	0	805	805
SPR	NAB	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	DC	28	0	28
SPR	NAB	NAD	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	DC	0	25	25
LDR	NAP	NAD	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET TO LEWES BEA	DE	0	350	350
LDR	NAP	NAD	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BA	DE	2,425	11,640	14,065
LDR	NAP	NAD	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BA	DE	0	40	40
LDR	NAP	NAD	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	DE	0	30	30
LDR	NAP	NAD	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	DE	0	30	30
UCB	NAB	SPD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	DE	37	0	37
LDR	NAP	SPD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	DE	110	0	110
LDR	NAP	NAD	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	DE	295	2,455	2,750
SEC	SAJ	SAD	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	FL	904	3,500	4,404
FLB	SAJ	SAD	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	FL	6,901	6,333	13,234
EGC	SAM	SAD	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	FL	25	0	25
SEC	SAJ	SAD	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	FL	0	400	400
SEC	SAJ	SAD	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	FL	150	1,875	2,025
FLB	SAJ	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	FL	300	0	300
SEC	SAJ	SAD	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	FL	325	0	325
SEC	SAJ	SAD	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	FL	150	5,850	6,000
ACF	SAM	SAD	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	FL	4,257	4,909	9,165
EGC	SAJ	SAD	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	FL	100	2,575	2,675
SEC	SAJ	SAD	MIAMI RIVER, FL	FL	0	10,820	10,820
FLB	SAJ	SAD	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	FL	1,779	2,751	4,530
SEC	SAJ	SAD	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	FL	100	2,285	2,385
EGC	SAM	SAD	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	FL	55	0	55
EGC	SAM	SAD	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	FL	67	0	67
SEC	SAJ	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	FL	1,090	0	1,090
EGC	SAM	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	FL	175	0	175
FLB	SAJ	SAD	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	FL	3,650	770	4,420
SEC	SAJ	SAD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	FL	30	0	30
FLB	SAJ	SAD	SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	FL	0	357	357
EGC	SAJ	SAD	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	FL	270	4,280	4,550
SEC	SAJ	SAD	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	FL	375	0	375
EGC	SAM	SAD	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, FL	FL	30	0	30
AMR	SAM	SAD	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	GA	2,991	3,025	6,016
ACF	SAM	SAD	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	GA	3,044	374	3,418
SEC	SAS	SAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	GA	257	0	257
SEC	SAS	SAD	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	GA	1,217	4,328	5,545
ACF	SAM	SAD	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	GA	5,330	2,616	7,946
AMR	SAM	SAD	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	GA	3,177	4,525	7,703
GSB	SAS	SAD	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	GA	5,383	6,805	12,188
GSB	SAS	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	GA	63	0	63
GSB	SAS	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	GA	142	0	142
GSB	SAS	SAD	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	GA	4,654	6,412	11,066
SEC	SAS	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, GA	GA	162	0	162
GSB	SAS	SAD	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	GA	4,067	4,319	8,386
SEC	SAS	SAD	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	GA	1,120	18,050	19,170
GSB	SAS	SAD	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	GA	120	63	183
ACF	SAM	SAD	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	GA	3,468	3,977	7,446
HAS	POH	POD	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	HI	200	0	200
HAS	POH	POD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	HI	659	0	659
HAS	POH	POD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	HI	537	0	537
UMS	MVR	MVD	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	IA	2,232	655	2,887
UMS	MVP	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	IA	57	0	57
UMS	MVR	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	IA	660	0	660
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	IA	466	0	466
UMS	MVR	MVD	LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	IA	0	2,750	2,750
MOR	NWO	NWD	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	IA	108	2,058	2,166
MOR	NWK	NWD	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA,KS,MO & NE	IA	1,211	31,895	33,106

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
MOR	NWO	NWD	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA,KS,MO & NE	IA	1,530	22,030	23,560
MOR	NWK	NWD	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	IA	2,047	167	2,214
UMS	MVR	MVD	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	IA	2,956	322	3,278
UMS	MVR	MVD	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	IA	3,663	245	3,908
COL	NWS	NWD	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	ID	736	803	1,539
COL	NWW	NWD	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	ID	1,869	535	2,404
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	ID	334	0	334
COL	NWW	NWD	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	ID	1,582	219	1,801
COL	NWW	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	ID	469	0	469
GLS	LRC	LRD	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	IL	650	4,130	4,780
KAS	MVS	MVD	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	IL	3,488	667	4,155
GLS	LRC	LRD	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	IL	1,785	230	2,015
GLS	LRC	LRD	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	IL	475	0	475
ILW	MVR	MVD	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	IL	0	203	203
ILW	MVS	MVD	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	IL	428	1,406	1,834
ILW	MVR	MVD	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	IL	18,496	17,791	36,287
UMS	MVR	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	IL	65	0	65
GLS	LRC	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	85	0	85
OHI	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	88	0	88
WAB	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	44	0	44
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	60	0	60
ILW	MVR	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	1,142	0	1,142
UMS	MVS	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	923	0	923
KAS	MVS	MVD	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	IL	1,593	310	1,903
GLS	LRC	LRD	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	IL	860	0	860
KAS	MVS	MVD	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	IL	3,472	1,289	4,761
UMS	MVS	MVD	LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	IL	0	2,598	2,598
UMS	MVR	MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION	IL	29,148	34,059	63,207
UMS	MVS	MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION	IL	7,331	12,673	20,004
GLS	LRC	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	IL	104	0	104
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	IL	7	0	7
KAS	MVS	MVD	REND LAKE, IL	IL	3,630	940	4,570
GLS	LRC	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	IL	130	0	130
GLS	LRD	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	IL	435	0	435
GLS	LRC	LRD	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	IL	83	1,016	1,099
OHI	LRL	LRD	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	IN	755	894	1,649
GLS	LRC	LRD	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	IN	160	0	160
WAB	LRL	LRD	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	IN	851	1,202	2,053
WAB	LRL	LRD	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	IN	940	287	1,226
GLS	LRC	LRD	INDIANA HARBOR, CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN	IN	0	8,385	8,385
GLS	LRC	LRD	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	IN	2,550	588	3,138
GLS	LRC	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	IN	225	0	225
GLS	LRE	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	IN	42	0	42
OHI	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	IN	120	0	120
WAB	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	IN	248	0	248
WAB	LRL	LRD	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	IN	947	1,895	2,842
WAB	LRL	LRD	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	IN	938	113	1,051
WAB	LRL	LRD	MONROE LAKE, IN	IN	953	373	1,326
WAB	LRL	LRD	PATOKA LAKE, IN	IN	864	286	1,150
GLS	LRC	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	IN	185	0	185
WAB	LRL	LRD	ROUSH RIVER MAJOR REHAB REPORT, IN	IN	0	300	300
WAB	LRL	LRD	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	IN	841	385	1,226
GLS	LRC	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	IN	32	0	32
GLS	LRE	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	IN	59	0	59
MOR	NWK	NWD	CLINTON LAKE, KS	KS	1,386	589	1,975
UAR	SWT	SWD	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	KS	1,094	234	1,328
UAR	SWT	SWD	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	KS	489	80	569
UAR	SWT	SWD	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	KS	635	99	734
UAR	SWT	SWD	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	KS	1,126	158	1,284
MOR	NWK	NWD	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	KS	609	113	722
URR	SWT	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	KS	177	0	177

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
UAR	SWT	SWD	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	KS	945	97	1,042
MOR	NWK	NWD	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	KS	900	430	1,330
UAR	SWT	SWD	MARION LAKE, KS	KS	1,298	206	1,504
MOR	NWK	NWD	MELVERN LAKE, KS	KS	1,580	455	2,035
MOR	NWK	NWD	MILFORD LAKE, KS	KS	1,482	594	2,076
UAR	SWT	SWD	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	KS	1,003	45	1,048
MOR	NWK	NWD	PERRY LAKE, KS	KS	1,947	505	2,452
MOR	NWK	NWD	POMONA LAKE, KS	KS	1,267	647	1,914
URR	SWT	SWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	KS	30	0	30
UAR	SWT	SWD	TORONTO LAKE, KS	KS	478	57	535
MOR	NWK	NWD	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	KS	1,339	721	2,060
MOR	NWK	NWD	WILSON LAKE, KS	KS	1,144	433	1,577
TCR	LRN	LRD	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	KY	5,343	4,912	10,255
GRB	LRL	LRD	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	KY	2,296	1,673	3,969
BSG	LRH	LRD	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	KY	0	1,250	1,250
OHI	LRL	LRD	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	KY	1,599	834	2,433
OHI	LRL	LRD	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	KY	1,664	134	1,797
OHI	LRL	LRD	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	KY	891	207	1,098
BSG	LRH	LRD	DEWEY LAKE, KY	KY	1,661	107	1,768
LMS	MVM	MVD	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	KY	25	0	25
BSG	LRH	LRD	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	KY	1,817	13	1,830
OHI	LRH	LRD	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	KY	1,436	9	1,445
GRB	LRL	LRD	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	KY	1,759	939	2,698
GRB	LRL	LRD	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	KY	1,885	3,057	4,942
BSG	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	76	0	76
GRB	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	25	0	25
OHI	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	25	0	25
OHI	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	306	0	306
TCR	LRN	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	100	0	100
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	22	0	22
OHI	LRL	LRD	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	KY	10	0	10
TCR	LRN	LRD	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	KY	902	847	1,748
OHI	LRL	LRD	MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN (MAJOR REHAB)	KY	0	10,600	10,600
TCR	LRN	LRD	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	KY	682	380	1,062
TCR	LRN	LRD	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	KY	86	16	102
GRB	LRL	LRD	NOLIN LAKE, KY	KY	2,194	1,143	3,337
OHI	LRL	LRD	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	KY	19,294	20,125	39,419
OHI	LRL	LRD	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	KY	0	4,485	4,485
BSG	LRH	LRD	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	KY	925	29	954
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	KY	7	0	7
GRB	LRL	LRD	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	KY	2,325	508	2,832
OHI	LRL	LRD	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	KY	1,171	141	1,312
TCR	LRN	LRD	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	KY	4,346	3,488	7,834
BSG	LRH	LRD	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	KY	1,152	28	1,180
LMS	MVN	MVD	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	LA	546	8,447	8,993
LGC	MVN	MVD	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	LA	156	770	926
RED	MVK	MVD	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	LA	788	21	809
LGC	MVN	MVD	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	LA	84	640	724
RED	MVK	MVD	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	LA	0	18	18
LGC	MVN	MVD	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	LA	63	258	321
LGC	MVN	MVD	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	LA	4	10	14
LMS	MVN	MVD	BAYOU TECHE, LA	LA	110	99	209
RED	MVK	MVD	CADDO LAKE, LA	LA	181	0	181
LGC	MVN	MVD	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	LA	1,525	13,443	14,968
LGC	MVN	MVD	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	LA	1,760	88	1,848
LGC	MVN	MVD	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	LA	10,897	6,872	17,769
LGC	MVN	MVD	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	LA	336	326	662
LMS	MVK	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	LA	720	0	720
LMS	MVN	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	LA	1,094	0	1,094
RED	MVK	MVD	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	LA	8,531	2,025	10,555
LMS	MVK	MVD	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	LA	12	5	17

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
LMS	MVK	MVD	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	LA	1	4	5
LGC	MVN	MVD	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	LA	1,430	539	1,969
LMS	MVN	MVD	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	LA	196	2,940	3,136
LMS	MVN	MVD	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, L	LA	4,456	50,869	55,325
LMS	MVN	MVD	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	LA	0	1,500	1,500
RED	MVK	MVD	WALLACE LAKE, LA	LA	200	0	200
LGC	MVN	MVD	WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	LA	32	0	32
LGC	MVN	MVD	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	LA	31	208	239
SNE	NAE	NAD	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	MA	456	124	580
SNE	NAE	NAD	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	MA	438	136	574
SNE	NAE	NAD	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	MA	0	6,000	6,000
SNE	NAE	NAD	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	MA	338	177	515
SNE	NAE	NAD	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	MA	6,212	5,334	11,546
SNE	NAE	NAD	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	MA	265	26	291
SNE	NAE	NAD	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	MA	127	105	232
SNE	NAE	NAD	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	MA	269	129	398
SNE	NAE	NAD	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	MA	333	170	503
SNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	MA	381	0	381
SNE	NAE	NAD	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	MA	421	105	526
SNE	NAE	NAD	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	MA	413	76	489
SNE	NAE	NAD	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRI	MA	134	138	272
SNE	NAE	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	MA	1,200	0	1,200
SNE	NAE	NAD	TULLY LAKE, MA	MA	387	156	543
SNE	NAE	NAD	WEST HILL DAM, MA	MA	457	217	674
SNE	NAE	NAD	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	MA	319	178	497
UCB	NAB	NAD	ASSATEAGUE, MD	MD	0	500	500
UCB	NAB	NAD	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	MD	1,801	14,392	16,193
UCB	NAB	NAD	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	MD	0	338	338
SPR	NAB	NAD	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	MD	98	0	98
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	MD	89	0	89
SPR	NAB	NAD	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	MD	1,296	417	1,713
UCB	NAB	NAD	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	MD	0	450	450
UCB	NAB	NAD	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	MD	0	9,185	9,185
UCB	NAB	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	MD	376	0	376
SPR	NAB	NAD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	MD	64	0	64
UCB	NAB	NAD	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	MD	0	135	135
UCB	NAB	NAD	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	MD	0	1,400	1,400
NNE	NAE	NAD	DISPOSAL AREA MONITORING, ME	ME	1,200	0	1,200
NNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	ME	29	0	29
NNE	NAE	NAD	PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	ME	0	100	100
NNE	NAE	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	ME	750	0	750
NNE	NAE	NAD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	ME	17	0	17
GLS	LRE	LRD	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	MI	156	0	156
GLS	LRE	LRD	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	MI	44	153	197
GLS	LRE	LRD	DETROIT RIVER, MI	MI	947	4,380	5,327
GLS	LRE	LRD	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	MI	198	1,114	1,312
GLS	LRE	LRD	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	MI	0	180	180
GLS	LRE	LRD	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	MI	138	450	588
GLS	LRE	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	MI	230	0	230
GLS	LRE	LRD	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	MI	75	0	75
GLS	LRE	LRD	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	MI	0	11	11
GLS	LRE	LRD	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	MI	92	350	442
GLS	LRE	LRD	MONROE HARBOR, MI	MI	92	926	1,018
GLS	LRE	LRD	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	MI	0	350	350
GLS	LRE	LRD	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	MI	70	585	655
GLS	LRE	LRD	PRESQUE ISLE HABROR, MI	MI	0	312	312
GLS	LRE	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	MI	276	0	276
GLS	LRE	LRD	ROUGE RIVER, MI	MI	105	1,216	1,321
GLS	LRE	LRD	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	MI	309	3,489	3,798
GLS	LRE	LRD	SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	MI	0	75	75
GLS	LRE	LRD	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	MI	175	1,616	1,791

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
GLS	LRE	LRD	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	MI	170	425	595
GLS	LRE	LRD	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	MI	60	0	60
GLS	LRE	LRD	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	MI	8,680	10,096	18,776
GLS	LRE	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	MI	2,444	0	2,444
UMS	MVP	MVD	BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	MN	172	0	172
GLS	LRE	LRD	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	MN	809	4,120	4,929
GLS	LRE	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	MN	24	0	24
UMS	MVP	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	MN	599	0	599
UMS	MVP	MVD	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	MN	369	62	431
UMS	MVP	MVD	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	MN	18	182	200
UMS	MVP	MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION	MN	22,067	22,837	44,904
UMS	MVP	MVD	ORWELL LAKE, MN	MN	256	0	256
GLS	LRE	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	MN	72	0	72
UMS	MVP	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	MN	23	0	23
UMS	MVP	MVD	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	MN	81	3	84
UMS	MVP	MVD	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	MN	3,046	124	3,170
GLS	LRE	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	MN	228	0	228
UMS	MVP	MVD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	MN	95	0	95
GLS	LRE	LRD	TWO HARBORS, MN	MN	0	300	300
LMS	MVM	MVD	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	MO	10	0	10
UMS	MVS	MVD	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	MO	4,613	1,836	6,449
WHT	SWL	SWD	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	MO	2,506	319	2,825
MOR	NWK	NWD	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	MO	3,418	5,110	8,528
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	126	0	126
UMS	MVR	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	171	0	171
UMS	MVS	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	718	0	718
MOR	NWK	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	666	0	666
WHT	SWL	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	7	0	7
MOR	NWK	NWD	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	MO	788	97	885
MOR	NWK	NWD	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	MO	807	250	1,057
UMS	MVS	MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), M	MO	4,268	21,091	25,359
LMS	MVM	MVD	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	MO	21	131	152
MOR	NWK	NWD	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	MO	1,366	690	2,056
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	MO	14	0	14
MOR	NWK	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	MO	327	0	327
MOR	NWK	NWD	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	MO	967	195	1,162
UMS	MVS	MVD	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	MO	8	0	8
MOR	NWK	NWD	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	MO	1,883	1,438	3,320
WHT	SWL	SWD	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	MO	6,082	585	6,667
UMS	MVS	MVD	UNION LAKE, MO	MO	10	0	10
LMS	MVK	MVD	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	MS	1	0	1
AMR	SAM	SAD	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	MS	0	135	135
EGC	SAM	SAD	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	MS	90	3,625	3,715
LMS	MVK	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	MS	108	0	108
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	MS	60	0	60
AMR	SAM	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	MS	55	0	55
LMS	MVK	MVD	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	MS	0	30	30
AMR	SAM	SAD	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	MS	849	668	1,517
EGC	SAM	SAD	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	MS	630	3,500	4,130
PEL	MVK	MVD	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	MS	193	0	193
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	MS	7	0	7
EGC	SAM	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	MS	75	0	75
LMS	MVK	MVD	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	MS	11	0	11
EGC	SAM	SAD	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, MS	MS	30	0	30
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO RIVER, MS	MS	26	0	26
MOR	NWO	NWD	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	MT	3,540	1,430	4,970
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	MT	54	0	54
MOR	NWO	NWD	INTAKE DAM YELLOWSTONE RIVER, MT	MT	0	15,000	15,000
COL	NWS	NWD	LIBBY DAM, MT	MT	1,545	167	1,712
MOR	NWO	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	MT	88	0	88
NCB	SAW	SAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	NC	900	0	900

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
NCB	SAW	SAD	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	NC	1,238	395	1,633
NCB	SAW	SAD	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	NC	669	49	718
NCB	SAW	SAD	FALLS LAKE, NC	NC	1,258	425	1,683
NCB	SAW	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	NC	250	0	250
NCB	SAW	SAD	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	NC	1,100	3,000	4,100
NCB	SAW	SAD	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	NC	65	300	365
NCB	SAW	SAD	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	NC	0	5,000	5,000
NCB	SAW	SAD	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	NC	0	800	800
NCB	SAW	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	NC	675	0	675
NCB	SAW	SAD	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	NC	150	0	150
NCB	SAW	SAD	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	NC	150	250	400
NCB	SAW	SAD	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	NC	1,894	1,083	2,977
NCB	SAW	SAD	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	NC	0	13,000	13,000
MOR	NWO	NWD	BOWMAN HALEY, ND	ND	152	1	153
MOR	NWO	NWD	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	ND	35	0	35
MOR	NWO	NWD	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	ND	7,053	3,547	10,600
UMS	MVP	MVD	HOMME LAKE, ND	ND	151	0	151
UMS	MVP	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	ND	341	0	341
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	ND	19	0	19
UMS	MVP	MVD	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	ND	981	36	1,017
MOR	NWO	NWD	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	ND	562	10	572
MOR	NWO	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ND	ND	119	0	119
UMS	MVP	MVD	SOURIS RIVER, ND	ND	213	67	280
UMS	MVP	MVD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	ND	24	0	24
MOR	NWO	NWD	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	NE	4,502	5,633	10,135
MOR	NWK	NWD	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	NE	1,174	547	1,721
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	NE	508	0	508
MOR	NWO	NWD	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	NE	0	3,500	3,500
MOR	NWO	NWD	PAPILLION CREEK, NE	NE	474	57	531
MOR	NWO	NWD	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	NE	702	0	702
NNE	NAE	NAD	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	NH	445	122	567
NNE	NAE	NAD	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	NH	405	109	514
NNE	NAE	NAD	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	NH	517	102	619
NNE	NAE	NAD	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	NH	900	181	1,081
NNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	NH	37	0	37
SNE	NAE	NAD	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	NH	384	214	598
NNE	NAE	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	NH	300	0	300
SNE	NAE	NAD	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	NH	402	194	596
LDR	NAP	NAD	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	NJ	0	225	225
LDR	NAP	NAD	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	NJ	0	2,500	2,500
LDR	NAP	NAD	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	NJ	0	243	243
LDR	NAP	NAD	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	NJ	15	0	15
LDR	NAP	NAD	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	NJ	2,150	16,628	18,778
LDR	NAP	NAD	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	NJ	750	0	750
UDR	NAN	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	NJ	218	0	218
LDR	NAP	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	NJ	35	0	35
LDR	NAP	NAD	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	NJ	0	150	150
LDR	NAP	NAD	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	NJ	0	160	160
LDR	NAP	NAD	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	NJ	0	250	250
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	NJ	0	300	300
UDR	NAN	NAD	PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	NJ	254	0	254
LHL	NAN	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	NJ	0	1,363	1,363
LHL	NAN	NAD	RARITAN AND SANDY HOOKS BAYS, LEONARD, NJ	NJ	0	40	40
LHL	NAN	NAD	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	NJ	0	200	200
LHL	NAN	NAD	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	NJ	0	220	220
LDR	NAP	NAD	SALEM RIVER, NJ	NJ	0	70	70
LHL	NAN	NAD	SHARK RIVER, NJ	NJ	0	775	775
LHL	NAN	NAD	SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	NJ	0	300	300
LHL	NAN	NAD	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	NJ	0	120	120
RGR	SPA	SPD	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	NM	2,069	151	2,220
RGR	SPA	SPD	COCHITI LAKE, NM	NM	2,128	264	2,392

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
ARK	SPA	SPD	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	NM	1,082	39	1,121
RGR	SPA	SPD	GALISTEO DAM, NM	NM	405	18	423
RGR	SPA	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	NM	811	0	811
RGR	SPA	SPD	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	NM	562	122	684
RGR	SPA	SPD	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	NM	762	178	940
RGR	SPA	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	NM	502	0	502
RGR	SPA	SPD	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	NM	389	63	452
RGR	SPA	SPD	UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL STUDY, NM	NM	1,201	0	1,201
GBS	SPK	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	NV	75	0	75
GBS	SPL	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	NV	52	0	52
GBS	SPL	SPD	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	NV	135	69	204
SPR	NAB	NAD	ALMOND LAKE, NY	NY	324	100	424
SPR	NAB	NAD	ARKPORT DAM, NY	NY	165	60	225
GLS	LRB	LRD	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	NY	835	400	1,235
LHL	NAN	NAD	BRONX RIVER, NY	NY	0	250	250
GLS	LRB	LRD	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	NY	50	0	50
LHL	NAN	NAD	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	NY	0	220	220
LHL	NAN	NAD	EAST RIVER, NY	NY	0	500	500
LHL	NAN	NAD	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	NY	0	4,220	4,220
SPR	NAB	NAD	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	NY	383	90	473
LHL	NAN	NAD	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	NY	0	180	180
LHL	NAN	NAD	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	NY	0	500	500
LHL	NAN	NAD	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	NY	0	380	380
LHL	NAN	NAD	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	NY	0	80	80
LHL	NAN	NAD	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	NY	0	500	500
UHL	NAN	NAD	HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	NY	0	1,125	1,125
UHL	NAN	NAD	HUDSON RIVER, NY (O & C)	NY	1,325	200	1,525
GLS	LRB	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	NY	325	0	325
AMS	LRP	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	NY	76	0	76
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	NY	335	0	335
LHL	NAN	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	NY	295	0	295
LHL	NAN	NAD	JAMAICA BAY, NY	NY	0	250	250
LHL	NAN	NAD	JONES INLET, NY	NY	0	350	350
LHL	NAN	NAD	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	NY	0	700	700
GLS	LRB	LRD	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	NY	10	0	10
LHL	NAN	NAD	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	NY	0	200	200
LHL	NAN	NAD	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	NY	0	20	20
LHL	NAN	NAD	MORICHES INLET, NY	NY	0	2,050	2,050
GLS	LRB	LRD	MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	NY	1,742	3,097	4,839
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	NY	0	6,750	6,750
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	NY	0	4,000	4,000
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	NY	0	6,300	6,300
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE D	NY	950	0	950
LHL	NAN	NAD	NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	NY	0	220	220
LHL	NAN	NAD	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	NY	0	150	150
GLS	LRB	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	NY	370	0	370
LHL	NAN	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	NY	0	1,460	1,460
GLS	LRB	LRD	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	NY	45	1,560	1,605
LHL	NAN	NAD	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	NY	0	200	200
SPR	NAB	NAD	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	NY	421	418	839
GLS	LRB	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	NY	551	0	551
LHL	NAN	NAD	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	NY	0	250	250
SPR	NAB	NAD	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	NY	416	137	553
OHI	LRH	LRD	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	1,356	83	1,439
GLS	LRB	LRD	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	OH	290	1,560	1,850
OHI	LRP	LRD	BERLIN LAKE, OH	OH	2,321	2,546	4,867
OHI	LRL	LRD	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	1,450	699	2,149
OHI	LRL	LRD	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	OH	1,008	1,511	2,520
GLS	LRB	LRD	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	OH	65	6,645	6,710
GLS	LRB	LRD	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	OH	0	350	350
OHI	LRH	LRD	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	1,359	0	1,359

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
OHI	LRH	LRD	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	OH	1,411	34	1,445
MUS	LRH	LRD	DILLON LAKE, OH	OH	1,454	0	1,454
GLS	LRB	LRD	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	OH	26	2,000	2,026
GLS	LRB	LRD	HURON HARBOR, OH	OH	30	1,500	1,530
GLS	LRB	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	OH	232	0	232
MUS	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	OH	90	0	90
OHI	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	OH	79	0	79
OHI	LRL	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	OH	12	0	12
OHI	LRP	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	OH	39	0	39
GLS	LRB	LRD	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	OH	253	2,170	2,423
MUS	LRH	LRD	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	OH	24	0	24
OHI	LRP	LRD	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	OH	1,169	854	2,023
OHI	LRP	LRD	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	973	410	1,383
MUS	LRH	LRD	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	OH	7,233	1,042	8,275
MUS	LRH	LRD	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	OH	421	172	593
OHI	LRD	LRD	OHIO-MISSISSIPPI FLOOD CONTROL, OH	OH	1,089	0	1,089
OHI	LRH	LRD	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	1,149	158	1,307
GLS	LRB	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	OH	295	0	295
MUS	LRH	LRD	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	OH	35	0	35
GLS	LRB	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	OH	223	0	223
GLS	LRB	LRD	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	OH	125	4,576	4,701
OHI	LRH	LRD	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	OH	776	15	791
OHI	LRL	LRD	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	OH	692	174	865
OHI	LRL	LRD	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	OH	942	895	1,837
URR	SWT	SWD	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	OK	417	55	472
UAR	SWT	SWD	BIRCH LAKE, OK	OK	583	65	648
URR	SWT	SWD	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	OK	973	930	1,903
URR	SWT	SWD	CANTON LAKE, OK	OK	1,439	268	1,707
UAR	SWT	SWD	COPAN LAKE, OK	OK	842	95	937
URR	SWT	SWD	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	OK	2,923	2,425	5,348
UAR	SWT	SWD	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	OK	3,246	6,972	10,218
URR	SWT	SWD	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	OK	619	123	742
UAR	SWT	SWD	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	OK	225	31	256
ARK	SWT	SWD	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	OK	514	41	555
URR	SWT	SWD	HUGO LAKE, OK	OK	1,427	66	1,493
UAR	SWT	SWD	HULAH LAKE, OK	OK	476	0	476
URR	SWT	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	OK	177	0	177
UAR	SWT	SWD	KAW LAKE, OK	OK	1,575	999	2,574
UAR	SWT	SWD	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	OK	2,649	3,424	6,073
ARK	SWT	SWD	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	OK	3,637	2,182	5,819
UAR	SWT	SWD	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	OK	1,441	482	1,923
URR	SWT	SWD	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	OK	146	18	164
UAR	SWT	SWD	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	OK	113	6	119
URR	SWT	SWD	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	OK	1,019	80	1,099
UAR	SWT	SWD	ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	OK	3,223	3,377	6,599
URR	SWT	SWD	SARDIS LAKE, OK	OK	847	65	912
URR	SWT	SWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	OK	520	0	520
UAR	SWT	SWD	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	OK	1,294	24	1,318
UAR	SWT	SWD	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	OK	2,414	1,380	3,794
URR	SWT	SWD	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	OK	1,053	40	1,093
ARK	SWT	SWD	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	OK	2,463	2,232	4,695
ARK	SWT	SWD	WISTER LAKE, OK	OK	476	33	509
ARK	SWT	SWD	WISTER LAKE, OK	OK	169	0	169
PNW	NWP	NWD	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	OR	845	59	904
COL	NWP	NWD	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	OR	406	21	427
COL	NWP	NWD	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	OR	4,200	12,697	16,897
PNW	NWP	NWD	CHETCO RIVER, OR	OR	36	538	574
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & POR	OR	2,036	22,937	24,973
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	OR	1,420	13,705	15,125
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES	OR	196	444	640
PNW	NWP	NWD	COOS BAY, OR	OR	572	4,197	4,769

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
PNW	NWP	NWD	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	OR	42	265	307
COL	NWP	NWD	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	OR	848	143	991
COL	NWP	NWD	COUGAR LAKE, OR	OR	1,318	4,062	5,380
PNW	NWP	NWD	DEPOE BAY, OR	OR	3	0	3
COL	NWP	NWD	DETROIT LAKE, OR	OR	854	1,710	2,564
COL	NWP	NWD	DORENA LAKE, OR	OR	699	132	831
COL	NWP	NWD	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	821	597	1,418
COL	NWP	NWD	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	OR	1,278	155	1,433
COL	NWP	NWD	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	OR	1,634	689	2,323
COL	NWP	NWD	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	748	544	1,292
COL	NWP	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	OR	33	0	33
COL	NWP	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	OR	393	0	393
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	OR	20	0	20
COL	NWP	NWD	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	OR	3,145	20,815	23,960
COL	NWP	NWD	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	OR	1,959	802	2,761
PNW	NWP	NWD	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	3,284	276	3,560
COL	NWW	NWD	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	OR	3,118	11,476	14,594
PNW	NWP	NWD	PORT ORFORD, OR	OR	7	0	7
COL	NWP	NWD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	OR	220	0	220
PNW	NWP	NWD	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	OR	22	565	587
COL	NWP	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	OR	82	0	82
PNW	NWP	NWD	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	OR	71	512	583
COL	NWP	NWD	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	OR	5	0	5
COL	NWD	NWD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	OR	10,400	0	10,400
PNW	NWP	NWD	TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	OR	35	0	35
PNW	NWP	NWD	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	OR	66	569	635
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	OR	75	135	210
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	OR	62	0	62
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	517	93	610
PNW	NWP	NWD	YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	OR	62	1,420	1,482
AMS	LRP	LRD	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	PA	5,717	861	6,578
SPR	NAB	NAD	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	PA	451	140	591
SPR	NAB	NAD	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	PA	158	57	215
UDR	NAP	NAD	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	PA	1,311	0	1,311
LDR	NAP	NAD	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	PA	2,627	109	2,736
AMS	LRP	LRD	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	PA	1,071	663	1,734
SPR	NAB	NAD	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	PA	1,717	130	1,847
AMS	LRP	LRD	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	PA	1,490	1,040	2,530
SPR	NAB	NAD	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	PA	505	120	625
AMS	LRP	LRD	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	PA	1,157	1,022	2,179
SPR	NAB	NAD	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	PA	523	110	633
UDR	NAP	NAD	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	PA	774	0	774
UDR	NAP	NAD	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	PA	228	0	228
GLS	LRB	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	PA	15	0	15
AMS	LRP	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	PA	187	0	187
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	PA	325	0	325
LDR	NAP	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	PA	65	0	65
AMS	LRP	LRD	JOHNSTOWN, PA	PA	33	2,222	2,255
AMS	LRP	LRD	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	PA	1,377	1,116	2,493
AMS	LRP	LRD	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	PA	1,127	1,753	2,880
AMS	LRP	LRD	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	PA	1,275	548	1,823
AMS	LRP	LRD	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	PA	11,018	1,374	12,392
OHI	LRP	LRD	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	PA	13,306	11,490	24,796
OHI	LRP	LRD	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	PA	0	509	509
GLS	LRB	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	PA	70	0	70
UDR	NAP	NAD	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	PA	505	0	505
AMS	LRP	LRD	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	PA	20	0	20
SPR	NAB	NAD	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	PA	2,142	1,170	3,312
SPR	NAB	NAD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	PA	46	0	46
LDR	NAP	NAD	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	PA	100	1,900	2,000
OHI	LRP	LRD	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	PA	2,366	0	2,366

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
SPR	NAB	NAD	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	PA	265	66	331
GLS	LRB	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	PA	93	0	93
SPR	NAB	NAD	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	PA	1,940	273	2,213
AMS	LRP	LRD	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	PA	1,822	1,293	3,115
AMS	LRP	LRD	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	PA	482	535	1,017
AMS	LRP	LRD	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	PA	989	44	1,033
SPR	NAB	NAD	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	PA	371	100	471
AMS	LRP	LRD	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	PA	1,887	1,021	2,908
SEC	SAJ	SAD	ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	PR	0	100	100
SNE	NAE	NAD	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	RI	0	360	360
SNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	RI	43	0	43
SNE	NAE	NAD	POINT JUDITH HARBOR OF REUGE, RI	RI	0	1,250	1,250
SNE	NAE	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	RI	400	0	400
SEC	SAC	SAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	SC	215	509	724
SEC	SAC	SAD	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	SC	496	12,031	12,527
SEC	SAC	SAD	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	SC	3,685	1,000	4,685
SEC	SAC	SAD	FOLLY BEACH, SC	SC	0	35	35
SEC	SAC	SAD	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	SC	477	213	690
SEC	SAC	SAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	SC	65	0	65
SEC	SAC	SAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	SC	624	0	624
MOR	NWO	NWD	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	SD	4,904	2,895	7,799
MOR	NWO	NWD	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	SD	291	12	303
MOR	NWO	NWD	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	SD	207	16	223
MOR	NWO	NWD	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	SD	6,019	3,309	9,328
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	SD	49	0	49
UMS	MVP	MVD	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	SD	403	0	403
MOR	NWO	NWD	MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN FT PECK DAM & GAVINS PT, SD, MT	SD	0	4,500	4,500
MOR	NWO	NWD	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	SD	6,668	4,109	10,777
MOR	NWO	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	SD	52	0	52
TCR	LRN	LRD	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	TN	3,847	3,174	7,021
TCR	LRN	LRD	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	TN	3,185	3,644	6,829
TCR	LRN	LRD	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	TN	0	1,200	1,200
TCR	LRN	LRD	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	TN	3,845	2,542	6,386
TCR	LRN	LRD	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	TN	3,928	2,334	6,262
TCR	LRN	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	TN	25	0	25
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	TN	60	0	60
TCR	LRN	LRD	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	TN	3,137	1,465	4,602
TCR	LRN	LRD	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	TN	4,609	5,236	9,845
LMS	MVM	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	TN	9	0	9
TCR	LRN	LRD	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	TN	6,681	13,538	20,219
LMS	MVM	MVD	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	TN	19	88	107
BRA	SWF	SWD	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	TX	692	662	1,354
URR	SWT	SWD	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	TX	1,415	0	1,415
TGC	SWG	SWD	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	1,417	1,417
TRI	SWF	SWD	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	TX	1,188	974	2,162
TGC	SWG	SWD	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	3,122	3,122
BRA	SWF	SWD	BELTON LAKE, TX	TX	2,271	1,296	3,567
TRI	SWF	SWD	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	TX	1,699	603	2,302
TGC	SWG	SWD	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	TX	0	3,259	3,259
TGC	SWG	SWD	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES, TX	TX	1,463	260	1,723
TGC	SWF	SWD	CANYON LAKE, TX	TX	2,603	1,083	3,686
TGC	SWG	SWD	CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	TX	0	348	348
TGC	SWG	SWD	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	3,398	3,398
URR	SWT	SWD	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	TX	4,680	1,713	6,393
URR	SWT	SWD	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	TX	38	0	38
URR	SWF	SWD	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	TX	2,085	2,094	4,179
TGC	SWG	SWD	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	TX	0	7,020	7,020
TGC	SWG	SWD	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	6,022	6,022
TGC	SWG	SWD	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	TX	0	2,706	2,706
TGC	SWG	SWD	GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	TX	0	2,926	2,926
BRA	SWF	SWD	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	TX	1,684	541	2,225

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
TRI	SWF	SWD	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	TX	2,429	471	2,900
TGC	SWG	SWD	GREENS BAYOU, TX	TX	0	850	850
TGC	SWG	SWD	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	TX	3,690	28,184	31,874
CRS	SWF	SWD	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	TX	1,169	310	1,479
TGC	SWG	SWD	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	15,354	15,354
RGR	SPA	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	TX	536	0	536
TRI	SWF	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	TX	218	0	218
TGC	SWG	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	TX	1,085	0	1,085
URR	SWT	SWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	TX	97	0	97
URR	SWF	SWD	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	TX	1,408	593	2,001
TRI	SWF	SWD	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	TX	647	1,124	1,771
URR	SWT	SWD	LAKE KEMP, TX	TX	144	70	214
TRI	SWF	SWD	LAVON LAKE, TX	TX	1,966	1,099	3,065
TRI	SWF	SWD	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	TX	2,842	1,268	4,110
TGC	SWG	SWD	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	6,173	6,173
TRI	SWF	SWD	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	TX	1,548	1,994	3,542
BRA	SWF	SWD	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	TX	1,635	431	2,066
CRS	SWF	SWD	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	TX	537	370	907
URR	SWT	SWD	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	TX	984	21	1,005
BRA	SWF	SWD	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	TX	1,881	274	2,155
TGC	SWG	SWD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	TX	0	304	304
TRI	SWF	SWD	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	TX	803	653	1,456
TGC	SWG	SWD	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	TX	387	8,435	8,822
NEC	SWF	SWD	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	TX	3,225	2,595	5,820
TRI	SWF	SWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	TX	79	0	79
URR	SWT	SWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	TX	22	0	22
BRA	SWF	SWD	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	TX	2,352	805	3,157
BRA	SWF	SWD	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	TX	1,628	582	2,210
TGC	SWG	SWD	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	TX	0	1,482	1,482
BRA	SWF	SWD	TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT, TX	TX	100	0	100
NEC	SWF	SWD	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	TX	561	844	1,405
NEC	SWF	SWD	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	TX	817	513	1,330
BRA	SWF	SWD	WACO LAKE, TX	TX	2,201	889	3,090
TRI	SWG	SWD	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	TX	1,247	500	1,747
BRA	SWF	SWD	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	TX	4,585	3,974	8,559
URR	SWF	SWD	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	TX	2,316	2,217	4,532
GBS	SPK	SPD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	UT	75	0	75
GBS	SPK	SPD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	UT	598	0	598
LCB	NAO	NAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	VA	1,823	0	1,823
LCB	NAO	NAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	VA	967	0	967
LCB	NAO	NAD	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	VA	0	266	266
LCB	NAO	NAD	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	VA	0	207	207
JAM	NAO	NAD	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	VA	2,022	0	2,022
LCB	NAO	NAD	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT R	VA	0	1,108	1,108
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	VA	59	0	59
LCB	NAO	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	VA	167	0	167
JAM	NAO	NAD	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	VA	178	3,489	3,667
NCB	SAW	SAD	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	VA	5,807	5,764	11,571
BSG	LRH	LRD	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	VA	1,920	18	1,938
LCB	NAO	NAD	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	VA	0	1,058	1,058
LCB	NAO	NAD	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	VA	457	9,615	10,072
BSG	LRH	LRD	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	VA	649	7	656
NCB	SAW	SAD	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	VA	2,530	4,431	6,961
SPR	NAB	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	VA	70	0	70
LCB	NAO	NAD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	VA	800	0	800
LCB	NAO	NAD	RUDEE INLET, VA	VA	0	370	370
LCB	NAO	NAD	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA	VA	0	54	54
LCB	NAO	NAD	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	VA	150	110	260
LCB	NAO	NAD	YORK RIVER, VA	VA	0	250	250
SNE	NAE	NAD	BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	VT	478	241	719
SNE	NAE	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	VT	12	0	12

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
NNE	NAN	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	VT	58	0	58
UHL	NAN	NAD	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	VT	0	80	80
SNE	NAE	NAD	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	VT	391	244	635
SNE	NAE	NAD	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	VT	412	335	747
SNE	NAE	NAD	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	VT	434	247	681
SNE	NAE	NAD	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	VT	391	187	578
COL	NWS	NWD	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	WA	320	6,965	7,285
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	WA	3	0	3
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	WA	6	0	6
PNW	NWS	NWD	EDIZ HOOK, WA	WA	13	50	63
PNW	NWS	NWD	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	WA	59	1,234	1,293
PNW	NWS	NWD	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	WA	349	8,831	9,180
PNW	NWS	NWD	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	WA	2,227	15,400	17,627
COL	NWW	NWD	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	2,379	9,197	11,576
PNW	NWS	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	WA	70	0	70
PNW	NWS	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	WA	590	0	590
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	WA	33	0	33
PNW	NWS	NWD	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	WA	6,974	266	7,240
PNW	NWS	NWD	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	WA	314	0	314
COL	NWW	NWD	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	899	10,171	11,070
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	1,587	19,102	20,689
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER MONUMENT LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	1,056	12,112	13,168
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OI	WA	0	1,500	1,500
COL	NWW	NWD	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	WA	1,544	893	2,437
COL	NWP	NWD	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	WA	239	18	257
PNW	NWS	NWD	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	WA	2,491	753	3,244
PNW	NWS	NWD	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	WA	27	0	27
PNW	NWS	NWD	NEAH BAY, WA	WA	39	269	308
PNW	NWS	NWD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	WA	338	0	338
PNW	NWS	NWD	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	WA	0	997	997
PNW	NWS	NWD	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	WA	72	1,500	1,572
PNW	NWS	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	WA	506	0	506
PNW	NWS	NWD	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	WA	59	854	913
PNW	NWS	NWD	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	WA	248	0	248
PNW	NWS	NWD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	WA	53	0	53
PNW	NWS	NWD	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	WA	120	0	120
COL	NWP	NWD	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	WA	2,118	32,260	34,378
PNW	NWS	NWD	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	WA	34	0	34
UMS	MVP	MVD	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	WI	559	52	611
GLS	LRE	LRD	FOX RIVER, WI	WI	1,610	165	1,775
GLS	LRE	LRD	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	WI	320	4,024	4,344
GLS	LRE	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	WI	33	0	33
UMS	MVP	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	WI	92	0	92
GLS	LRE	LRD	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	WI	0	650	650
GLS	LRE	LRD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	WI	155	0	155
UMS	MVP	MVD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	WI	5	0	5
GLS	LRE	LRD	STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	WI	16	0	16
GLS	LRE	LRD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	WI	498	0	498
OHI	LRH	LRD	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	WV	1,459	14	1,473
KAW	LRH	LRD	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	WV	1,490	18	1,508
OHI	LRH	LRD	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	WV	1,973	0	1,973
OHI	LRH	LRD	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	WV	2,029	15	2,044
AMS	LRP	LRD	ELKINS, WV	WV	14	0	14
BSG	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	WV	81	0	81
KAW	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	WV	31	0	31
OHI	LRH	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	WV	61	0	61
AMS	LRP	LRD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	WV	5	0	5
SPR	NAB	NAD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	WV	77	0	77
KAW	LRH	LRD	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	WV	7,310	2,070	9,380
OHI	LRH	LRD	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	WV	13,958	16,334	30,292
OHI	LRH	LRD	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	WV	0	2,700	2,700

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
BSG	LRH	LRD	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	WV	2,129	707	2,836
AMS	LRP	LRD	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	WV	1,010	29	1,039
KAW	LRH	LRD	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	WV	2,035	9	2,044
KAW	LRH	LRD	SUTTON LAKE, WV	WV	1,844	366	2,210
AMS	LRP	LRD	TYGART LAKE, WV	WV	1,090	401	1,491
AMS	LRP	LRD	TYGART LAKE, WV	WV	30	0	30
MOR	NWO	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	WY	24	0	24
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WY	WY	10	0	10
COL	NWW	NWD	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	WY	88	238	326
MOR	NWO	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	WY	87	0	87
					954,840	**1,393,760**	**2,348,593**
			Remaining Items				**126,140**
			Rounding				267
			Total Operation and Maintenance Appropriation				**2,475,000**

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL WORKS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MAINTENANCE)
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009 Operation	Maintenance	Total
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MR&T)							
LMS	MVM	MVD	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	AR	47	81	128
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	AR	249	0	249
LMS	MVK	MVD	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	AR	0	256	256
LMS	MVK	MVD	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	AR	0	161	161
WHT	MVM	MVD	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	AR	603	436	1,039
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	IL	135	0	135
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	KY	93	0	93
LMS	MVN	MVD	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	LA	1,672	445	2,117
LMS	MVN	MVD	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	LA	7,670	949	8,619
LMS	MVN	MVD	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	LA	17	145	162
LMS	MVN	MVD	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	LA	42	0	42
LGC	MVN	MVD	BONNET CARRE, LA	LA	573	130	703
LMS	MVN	MVD	BONNET CARRE, LA	LA	1,098	545	1,643
LMS	MVN	MVD	DREDGING	LA	65	655	720
LMS	MVK	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	LA	752	0	752
LMS	MVN	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	LA	975	0	975
OBL	MVK	MVD	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	LA	0	53	53
LMS	MVN	MVD	MAPPING	LA	590	0	590
LMS	MVN	MVD	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA	LA	398	180	578
LMS	MVN	MVD	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	LA	256	4,199	4,455
LMS	MVN	MVD	OLD RIVER, LA	LA	4,066	9,816	13,882
LMS	MVN	MVD	REVETMENTS	LA	0	18,200	18,200
OBL	MVK	MVD	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	LA	1,880	0	1,880
OBL	MVK	MVD	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	LA	2,501	0	2,501
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	MO	185	0	185
LMS	MVM	MVD	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	MO	1,486	7,721	9,207
LMS	MVM	MVD	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	MO	2,231	2,214	4,445
LMS	MVS	MVD	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	MO	4,021	546	4,567
LMS	MVK	MVD	DREDGING	MS	2,066	3,083	5,149
LMS	MVK	MVD	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	MS	7	429	436
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	MS	101	0	101
LMS	MVK	MVD	MAPPING	MS	425	0	425
LMS	MVK	MVD	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	MS	411	1,800	2,211
LMS	MVK	MVD	REVETMENTS	MS	402	11,088	11,490
LMS	MVK	MVD	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	MS	9	415	424
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	MS	6,248	0	6,248
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	MS	171	0	171
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, ENID LAKE, MS	MS	6,368	20	6,388
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, GREENWOOD, MS	MS	1,650	0	1,650
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, GRENADA LAKE, MS	MS	6,234	0	6,234
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS	MS	1,128	0	1,128
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, SARDIS LAKE, MS	MS	6,971	0	6,971
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	MS	690	4	694
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	MS	272	0	272
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	MS	393	0	393
LMS	MVK	MVD	YAZOO BASIN, YAZOO CITY, MS	MS	534	0	534
LMS	MVM	MVD	DIKES	TN	360	931	1,290
LMS	MVM	MVD	DREDGING	TN	2,613	8,387	11,000
LMS	MVM	MVD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	TN	81	0	81
LMS	MVM	MVD	MAPPING	TN	473	0	473
LMS	MVM	MVD	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	TN	1,643	1,640	3,283
LMS	MVM	MVD	REVETMENTS	TN	10,423	6,939	17,362
			Total MR&T Maintenance including Mapping		**81,278**	**81,468**	**162,745**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing
Questions by Chairman Oberstar
February 7, 2008

Chairman Oberstar. Corps of Engineers' projects are an essential piece of the nation's water infrastructure that have helped spur and maintain the viability of our nation as an economic leader. The value of these projects to the nation was demonstrated last June during the incredible floods that we experienced across Texas. In the Dallas area, the Corps projects prevented close to $3.4 billion of damages. Texas is the leading State for waterborne commerce. More foreign goods enter our country through Texas ports than any other State. However, I understand that throughout the nation, maintenance dredging projects not being funded at the level required to fully maintain authorized project depths. While these existing projects continually demonstrate their value to the nation, over the last 10 years, the Corps' Operation & Maintenance (O&M) funding has essentially remained flat, while the costs for maintaining these projects has continually risen. The President's FY2009 O&M budget request has once again been constrained. What is the goal behind constraining funding to our nation's infrastructure?

Secretary Woodley.
The FY 2009 O&M budget was increased by $16 M ($4M regular and $12M MR&T O&M) from that in the FY 2008 budget which in turn was increased $200 M over the FY 2007 budget. Essential operation and maintenance work and those items needed to meet legal mandates or safety requirements are funded, including basic costs that must be incurred to keep projects operational in FY 2009. For navigation, hydropower, and flood control facilities, funded work pertained to the minimum operational requirements of the projects. For natural resources management and environmental stewardship, funding was provided to sustain natural resources management, cultural and historic resource protection, and master planning requirements.

Criteria reviewed in the O&M budget include: long term average operation and maintenance costs, the percent of time a project is available as designed, current and 5 year commercial ton movements (for navigation projects), legal mandates, and safety or relative risk of failure. The Corps asset management program will advance risk and reliability factors, as well as focus on economic factors or proxies for economic factors, to strengthen the prioritization of future budgets.

Chairman Oberstar. In 2001, Lt. General Flowers, the then-Chief of Engineers testified that one result of funding the Corps' Construction account below Corps' capability is that the overall costs of individual projects increase - due, in part, to longer construction periods. In 2001, General Flowers estimated that, over ten years (2002-2012), the Corps would forego approximately $5.8 billion in project benefits and would face an additional $500 million in project costs, simply from funding the Corps at below capability numbers. Please provide the Committee with the Corps' current estimates for project benefits foregone, and potential project cost increases over the FY2009-2019 period, as a result of funding the Construction account below Corps capability.

Secretary Woodley. Funding the 79 projects in the construction account in the FY 2009 budget at the current funding level rather than the FY 2009 capability level would delay projects coming on line that would accrue annualized benefits of $1.2 billion upon completion and result in increases related to annual management cost over longer periods of time, economic cost associated with interest during construction and cost associated with loss of efficiencies of scale.

Chairman Oberstar. The President's budget request for FY 2009 for the regulatory program was $180 million, which is consistent with last year's request and appropriated levels. However, the Corps estimates that the July 2006 *Carabell-Rapanos* decision of the U.S. Supreme Court and the accompanying Corps/EPA guidance requires an approximate 15 percent increase in total workload for the program due to the need to conduct additional site visits and documentation of "significant nexus." This increased workload has had a demonstrable downward effect on the Corps achieving its annual performance measures for permit compliance, review, and enforcement. In addition, the Committee is aware that as a result of the *Carabell-Rapanos* decision, individual districts are experiencing a delay in the processing of individual and general permits, when compared to the pre- *Carabell-Rapanos* time period. At what funding level for the regulatory program would the Corps expect to meet its annual performance measures, as well as return to the average period of time for permit review prior to the *Carabell-Rapanos* decision? If these are different budget targets, please provide both budget levels.

Secretary Woodley. In order to meet the performance levels prior to the promulgation of the Carabell-Rapanos guidance, the Regulatory program would require an additional $20 M over FY 2008 appropriations, for a total funding level of $200 M. This accounts for additional personnel over and above that affordable within the additional $20 M received in FY 2008, as well as funds to account for inflation. Full accomplishment of Corps annual performance measures also would involve additional funds. The program is able to provide differing levels of performance based on levels of funding, from the basic level of performance achieved at FY 2008 funding through full performance of all performance targets that could be achieved at a funding level of approximately $267 million. Various intermediate funding levels can be identified, and the increased funding can be targeted to one or more of the 8 performance measures to achieve desired outcomes. Intermediate performance levels that have been identified include one that provides for permit measures to reach target levels at a funding level of approximately $242 million. At this level of funding, the program would be able to make permit decisions on 75% of Individual Permits in 120 days or less and on 90% of General Permits in 60 days or less. In summary, the program would require approximately $200 million to maintain pre-Carabell-Rapanos performance and $242 million to reach full performance for permitting.

Chairman Oberstar. In the FY 2009 President's budget request, the Corps' O&M budget item for the Columbia River System is larger than any other O&M item. Please provide a breakdown of the O&M request for the Columbia River System, including any

specific funding that is dedicated for salmon recovery efforts. Please describe the salmon recovery measures proposed for FY 2009, including any potential changes over previous years' recovery efforts.

Secretary Woodley. Inserted below is a breakdown of the Columbia River System operating projects and numbers that represent an illustrative distribution of operation and maintenance funding. Amounts are subject to revision during the course of the fiscal year and individual project estimates should not be considered budget amounts. The portion of the project amounts that would be used for salmon recovery is estimated in the right hand column.

09 COL System Hip
Systems w-ESA breal

In the Columbia River, funds will be used to continue ongoing improvements and evaluations, including continued construction of spillway improvements at the Dalles Dam; spillway and sluiceway improvements at Bonneville Dam; a spillway weir at Little Goose will be completed; design work for Lower Granite bypass improvements; continued surface bypass evaluations at Lower Monumental, McNary and John Day projects; and continued studies and improvements for bypass, turbine and estuary survival, lamprey and delayed mortality studies and, tern relocation habitat measures. At the Chief Joseph Dam, funding will be used to conduct final contract actions, testing and hydraulic modeling for operation optimization and project documentation for final operation of the flow deflectors.

In the Lower Snake River, funds will be used to continue restoration of woody wetland riparian habitat.

In the Willamette River, feasibility level evaluations for Willamette River projects and design for construction of the Minto fish collection facility will continue and at Cougar Dam, funding will be used to continue required fisheries monitoring and award of a contract for construction of the fish trap and haul facility.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CIVIL
COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATING PROJECTS
ILLUSTRATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING
Fiscal Year 2009 Project List
(Dollars in Thousands)

System Code	Dis.	MSC	Project Name	State	Fiscal Year 2009			Salmon Recovery Portion of Total O&M
Operation	Maintena	Total			Operation	Maintenanc	Total	
NOTICE: These numbers represent an illustrative distribution of Operation and Maintenance activities subject to revision during the course of the year, and therefore individual project estimates should not be considered as budget amounts.								
COL	NWS	NWD	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	ID	736	803	1,539	
COL	NWP	NWD	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	OR	406	21	427	
COL	NWP	NWD	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & W	OR	4,200	12,697	16,897	5196
COL	NWS	NWD	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	WA	320	6,965	7,285	6500
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BL	OR	2,036	22,937	24,973	
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA	WA	3	0	3	
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OF	OR	1,420	13,705	15,125	
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOO	WA	6	0	6	
COL	NWP	NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOU	OR	196	444	640	
COL	NWP	NWD	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	OR	848	143	991	
COL	NWP	NWD	COUGAR LAKE, OR	OR	1,318	4,062	5,380	500
COL	NWP	NWD	DETROIT LAKE, OR	OR	854	1,710	2,564	500
COL	NWP	NWD	DORENA LAKE, OR	OR	699	132	831	
COL	NWW	NWD	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	ID	1,869	535	2,404	
COL	NWP	NWD	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	821	597	1,418	500
COL	NWP	NWD	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	OR	1,278	155	1,433	
COL	NWP	NWD	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	OR	1,634	689	2,323	500
COL	NWP	NWD	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	748	544	1,292	500
COL	NWW	NWD	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	2,379	9,197	11,576	6594
COL	NWP	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED ENVIRC	OR	33	0	33	
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	ID	334	0	334	
COL	NWP	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	OR	393	0	393	
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	OR	20	0	20	
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	WA	33	0	33	
COL	NWW	NWD	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	WY	10	0	10	
COL	NWW	NWD	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	WY	88	238	326	
COL	NWP	NWD	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	OR	3,145	20,815	23,960	16911
COL	NWS	NWD	LIBBY DAM, MT	MT	1,545	167	1,712	
COL	NWW	NWD	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	WA	899	10,171	11,070	8710
COL	NWP	NWD	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	OR	1,959	802	2,761	500
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, W	WA	1,587	19,102	20,689	13815
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER MONUMENT LOCK AND DAM,	WA	1,056	12,112	13,168	5381
COL	NWW	NWD	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLI	WA	0	1,500	1,500	4831
COL	NWW	NWD	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	ID	1,582	219	1,801	
COL	NWW	NWD	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	OR	3,118	11,476	14,594	9411
COL	NWW	NWD	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	WA	1,544	893	2,437	
COL	NWP	NWD	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL	WA	239	18	257	
COL	NWP	NWD	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	OR	220	0	220	
COL	NWW	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIO	ID	469	0	469	
COL	NWP	NWD	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIO	OR	82	0	82	
COL	NWP	NWD	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	OR	5	0	5	
COL	NWD	NWD	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUN	OR	10,400	0	10,400	
COL	NWP	NWD	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & C	WA	2,118	32,260	34,378	26682
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE	OR	75	135	210	
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTI	OR	62	0	62	
COL	NWP	NWD	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	OR	517	93	610	
			Totals		53,304	185,337	238,641	107,031

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing
Questions by Rep. Grace F. Napolitano
February 7, 2008

Ms. Napolitano. Secretary Woodley, the Corps owns and operates the Whittier Narrows Dam in my Congressional district which is on the San Gabriel and Rio Hondo Rivers. This dam was recently reviewed by the Corps and assigned a high risk mainly due to the large population living downstream and the high groundwater observed immediately downstream of the dam. Will this Dam continue to have a high risk ranking even if it has a good performance record and is regularly maintained and inspected? What does the high risk ranking mean? How is a high risk dam treated differently from a low risk dam?

Secretary Woodley. The dam will maintain its high risk ranking until a seepage study is complete and any remedial measures deemed necessary for safety are implemented or constructed. The seepage study will evaluate the dam's Central and East Embankment sections to assess safety of the embankments, with respect to underseepage erosion and piping, with a reservoir pool corresponding to a flood that has a .1% (1 out of 1000) chance of occurring in a given year. The seepage study is funded in FY 2008 and is scheduled to complete by July 2008. At that time we will determine what additional measures are needed, if any.

The high risk ranking means the dam has been characterized by the Army Corps of Engineers as having confirmed or unconfirmed dam safety issues and the likelihood of failure under unusual or extreme flooding events is almost certain or too high to assure public safety. Water was detected on the downstream side of the Central embankment after an impoundment in the winter of 2004-2005. Further information was collected and presented to a Corps cadre of experts, and a Dam Safety Action Classification II was assigned to the dam, primarily because of the dense population downstream.

Corps dams are screened by Corps experts to develop relative rankings for life and economic risk as a tool to shape budget decisions. Dams classified as high risk have funding priority to study and remediate safety issues and are required to have an Interim Risk Reduction Measures Plan as a short-term approach to reduce risk. Low risk dams do not require such a plan. For Whittier Narrows Dam, the Corps has implemented risk reduction measures that include limiting the period of time water is stored above elevation 195 ft for water conservation. Elevation 195 ft was the top of the water conservation pool until 1978 when it was raised to the current elevation of 201.6 ft. In order to minimize the potential for seepage, support for water conservation activities above the top of the old water conservation pool (El. 195 ft) will be determined on a case by case basis. This restriction will remain until completion of the seepage study and implementation of any remedial measures. Dam monitoring by conducting physical inspections and measuring groundwater levels is also a key part of the risk reduction plan.

Ms. Napolitano. Secretary Woodley, you know there is a water supply crisis in California and that it is important for us to conserve as much stormwater as safely

possible behind the Whittier Narrows Dam in LA County. The Corps and the Water Replenishment District and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works must work together to maintain the 201.6 foot elevation during the safety review period. The Corps should also temporarily increase the elevation pool level by an additional 2 feet (to 203.6 feet) during this year's rainy season in order to capture more stormwater at a time when imported supply is curtailed. Can I have your commitment that you and California Army Corps officials will work immediately with the Water Replenishment District and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to temporarily increase the elevation pool to capture more stormwater during this year's rainy season?

Secretary Woodley. We understand the importance of water storage to California. The Corps continues to work closely with the Los Angels County Department of Public Works to maximize the conservation of water at Whittier Narrows Dam. This includes unrestricted support for water conservation activities below the top of the original water conservation pool (El. 195 ft). However, until the results of our seepage study are known, the Corps must maintain the risk reduction measures that include limiting the period of time water is stored above elevation 195 ft in support of water conservation. During and following each storm, the Corps will evaluate the dam to determine if additional water can be stored for extended periods between elevation 195 ft and the top of the water conservation pool (currently El. 201.6 ft)

Once the study is complete and remedial measures, if any, deemed necessary for safety are implemented or constructed, the Dam Safety Action Classification II will be removed from the dam and the current restrictions on water conservation activities between elevations 195 ft and 201.6 ft will be relaxed.

Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers completed and conditionally approved a feasibility study about 5 years ago that would allow for raising the water conservation pool at Whittier Narrows Dam to elevation 209 ft for a period of 2 weeks, up to two times a flood season. The recommended plan in the feasibility report is based on "flood forecasting" that allows for release of stored water if another large storm is eminent within 48 hours. With such a forecast, the water level could be drawn down to provide sufficient storage space for anticipated inflow into the flood control basin. However, before that plan can be implemented, to complete the feasibility study process, the Corps must prepare a supplement to the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, prepare a water control manual to implement the recommended plan, and prepare a draft Memorandum of Agreement between the Corps of Engineers and the non-Federal Sponsor, and then execute the Record of Decision for the feasibility report.

An alternate process, based on the concept of increasing the water conservation pool would be for the local sponsor to formally request a "deviation" from the existing water conservation pool elevation of 201.6 ft for one year. This could be approved at the Corps of Engineers division office in San Francisco, CA. This would still require a National Environmental Policy Act document, most likely an Environmental Assessment.

Ms. Napolitano. Secretary Woodley, the City of Pico Rivera, CA in my district is currently working with the Corps of Engineers to use Corps Property at the Whittier Narrows Recreation Area adjacent to the San Gabriel River to build soccer fields, continue the operation of a sports arena, create a nature area, and some other park facilities. What is the status of this project? How does the Corps work with Cities and Counties to allow the use of Corps property for public benefit?

Secretary Woodley. The Whittier Narrows Dam and Recreational Area consists of roughly 1,400 acres. These areas are leased to Los Angeles County (approximately 1,258 acres) and the City of Pico Rivera (approximately 120.44 acres) for Public Park and Recreational Purposes. These lease agreements are valid until 2036 and 2034, respectfully. The project receives nearly 2 million visitors annually (nearly 1.3 million - County and 700,000 -City). The Corps will continue to work with the County and the City of Pico Rivera so they may provide the communities with recreation resources at this project.

The Corps is working with its lessees and other public agencies on an update to the master plan for the Whittier Narrows Dam and Recreational Area. In advance of the master plan update, and in light of the availability of Proposition 84 funds to address local needs, agencies interested in both project and program development of the basin have decided to provide input in a formal planning document. It is an innovative process with a high level of collaboration amongst federal, state, local governments and non-profit organizations.

The last master plan for the area was completed in 1996. Since that time, however, population has grown; demands for additional parkland and regional trails connectivity have grown; and the restoration of native habitat has become more significant as people have become sensitized to environmental resources that were lost. In light of these issues, an updated master plan that identifies specific, multiple-benefit projects is viewed as critical by the partners involved in operating and maintaining projects in the basin. The new master plan will provide both a long-range vision and specific implementation steps to provide suitable and sustainable stewardship for this basin for generations to come.

Ms. Napolitano. Secretary Woodley, what is the number of Army Corps personnel who are nearing retirement in the next 10 years? What is the Army Corps doing to recruit enough personnel to adequately continue its mission?

Secretary Woodley. The Corps uses a 5 year retirement projection for workforce analysis and planning. Agency-wide, including the Corps of Engineers workforce for both Civil Works and assigned military programs, approximately 15,000 Corps employees will be eligible to retire within the next 5 years. This represents approximately 45% of the workforce. Projections for FY 2007 through FY 2011 range from 25 – 35%, respectively, based on an average on board strength of approximately 32,000 employees. However, many Corps employees choose to work for several years past the time they are eligible to retire. Although the data suggests a huge exodus, actual

retirements have averaged 4% per year for the last 5 years versus a potential rate of 37% for FY 2007.

The Corps uses the full range of tools to recruit enough personnel to adequately continue its mission. Hiring authorities and flexibilities used include Veterans' Recruitment Authority, Veterans' Employment Opportunity Act, Student Career Experience and Student Temporary Program appointing authorities, recruitment, retention, and relocation bonuses, and other pay setting flexibilities for new hires. Centrally, the Corps participates in five national outreach career fairs to recruit entry level engineers and scientists to replace personnel projected to retire. Seeking to maintain its competitive edge, the Corps makes job offers, competing with private firms for the best and the brightest talent available at these events. A recent Corps initiative included regional hiring at these fairs versus hiring for each individual location to leverage the Corps ability to not only recruit and retain the best and the brightest, but also to provide challenging job assignments to grow and maintain technical competency. Currently, there are 230 interns on board at the Corps. For FY 2008, 245 work years have been authorized to continue the intern program.

Other recruiting successes include voluntary civilian deployment to overseas assignments and use of re-employed annuitants. The Corps has recruited and deployed approximately 4000 employees to support Global War on Terror efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. In advance of the 2005 hurricane season, the Corps established a cadre of re-employed annuitants for rapid deployment to support natural disasters and emergency operations. That cadre now has grown to approximately 1000 employees. These retirees are also serving as coaches and mentors, sharing and transferring knowledge to develop and sustain technical competency.

The Corps' strategic human capital plan emphasizes people as the foundation of the Corps. The "people" portion of the plan addresses strategic work force planning as well as a focus on learning and developing leaders at all levels. A leadership strengths assessment is a key element of the Corps' centralized senior leader selection process for recruiting leaders at the GS-13 through the Senior Executive Service level. The Corps uses talent management tools to identify and maximize the use of employee talent. The recent conversion to the National Security Personnel System strengthens the Corps linkage of pay for performance to execute assigned missions.

The Corps staffs its organization based on workload to execute assigned missions. There is a national Corps team responsible for updating the Corps strategy to recruit and maintain a technically competent workforce. This team is assessing business processes, workload forecasting and distribution, and workforce analysis and succession planning to design and recommend national strategies to continue the Corps' success in recruiting and maintaining a technically capable workforce. Overall, the Corps successfully recruits personnel to adequately continue its mission.

Ms. Napolitano. Secretary Woodley, how much funding is there in the Army's budget for hydro-electric projects?

Secretary Woodley. The FY 2009 budget contains $319M for the Corps' hydropower program. The $319M includes $276M for routine operation and maintenance activities and $43M from the Construction account for replacements and other work at five hydropower plants.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing
Questions by Rep. Brown
February 7, 2008

Mr. Brown. It is my understanding that the $180 million provided to the Regulatory program in this budget is insufficient to cover the needs related to the wetlands guidance issued last summer. Can you comment on this?

General Van Antwerp.
Sir, the Corps and EPA have jointly developed guidance based on the Supreme Court decision in the Carabell and Raponos cases. This guidance has been implemented in June 2007. The Corps has completed more than 18,000 jurisdictional determinations using this guidance and has requested comments on the guidance, specifically on how things can be improved. We received more than 60,000 comments on the guidance and are completing a formal review of all comments. The Corps and EPA are evaluating options for reissuing, revising, or revoking the guidance.

The Corps received $180 million for FY 2008, and the Administration budgeted $180 million for FY 2009. This level of funding will allow the Corps to process permits, but there may be delays with conducting jurisdictional determinations under the Carabell-Rapanos Supreme Court decision. The increase in funding from FY 2007 ($159M) to FY 2008 ($180M) allowed the Corps to increase efforts on jurisdictional determinations, but the Corps was not able to decrease permit processing times.

Mr. Brown. Is it true that the costs related to this guidance, because the Corps and EPA are conducting more work to ensure you get wetlands determinations right, are the reason that the increased funding included in the FY08 appropriation did not result in faster determinations? What funding level would be required to see a 25% increase in the Corps' capability, based on your performance measures?

General Van Antwerp. Yes, sir, the increased funding provided in the FY 2008 appropriation is being used to hire personnel to handle the additional workload associated with implementation of the guidance.

The Corps has developed 8 measures to track program performance and maintain permit processing times. It is difficult and complicated to link a 25% increase in capability across all 8 measures, but we can provide an estimate based on a potential 25% increase in program performance for the two performance measures that track permit processing times. In order to see this 25% increase in the Corps' capability based on a reduction in permit processing times, the program estimates that an increase of approximately $40M over and above that appropriated for FY 2008 and budgeted for FY 2009 would be needed at a funding level of approximately $220M for FY 2009.

Mr. Brown. The Port of Georgetown could see 2 million tons in new cargo if maintenance were done on its harbor and the Intracoastal Waterway, yet potential traffic is not calculated when the Corps budgets for navigation maintenance. Am I correct and

do we ignore this calculation? If so, given estimates of 70% increases in freight volume by 2020, shouldn't we start focusing on them? Doesn't ignoring this problem count as an emergency?

General Van Antwerp. Sir, potential cargo is usually not considered when evaluating projects for proposed funding since there is no guarantee that the cargo will materialize after critical resources are invested in the project. Due to funding constraints and the keen competition for funding, emphasis is placed on ports, harbors, channels, and waterways that are already carrying higher volumes of cargo. The potential for future traffic to call on a port would not be considered an emergency.

Mr. Brown. The Corps' focuses on 1 million tons for budgeting navigation projects. Did Congress set that number, or is that a Corps number? How was it determined?

General Van Antwerp. Sir, the Corps of Engineers, in consultation with the Office of Management and Budget developed the 1-million ton metric as a screening tool to segregate those projects that provide higher National economic benefits from those that provide lower economic benefits. The number was determined by sorting all navigation projects by tonnage and determining a logical break point given the constrained funding availability.

Mr. Brown. The Energy Bill passed last year created a program at the DOT to encourage use of Short Sea Shipping. Such a program has great potential to reduce highway congestion. Is the Corps doing anything to work with DOT on this program or examine Short Sea Shipping opportunities on its own, outside of the proposed Inland Transportation User Fee?

General Van Antwerp. Sir, the Corps of Engineers is interested and has offered to assist the Maritime Administration in looking into the feasibility of short sea shipping. The Corps of Engineers is also an active participant on the Committee on the Marine Transportation System, which is interested in investigating the potential for short sea shipping.

Mr. Brown. Your budget asks for over $5 billion in emergency funding for New Orleans levees. How much funding is still available for this project out of past appropriations? Aren't these projects the same type of projects that are critical to dozens of communities and Congressional districts across the country? Why aren't they given the same attention?

General Van Antwerp. Sir, of the $7.1 billion appropriated for repairing and improving the Greater New Orleans hurricane and storm damage reduction system, approximately $5.1 billion is available from past appropriations. The FY 2009 President's Budget emphasizes critical Corps activities around the country including the construction of coastal storm and damage reduction projects. The FY 2009 emergency appropriations of $5.761 billion represents the Federal share of the New Orleans Area Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS), which is designed to reduce the risk to the

greater New Orleans, Louisiana, area from storm surges that have a 1% annual chance of occurring and to improve internal drainage; to restore and complete construction of hurricane and storm damage reduction features in surrounding areas to previously authorized levels of protection; and to incorporate certain non-Federal levees into the Federal system. This budget supports the commitment by the Federal government to rebuild the levee system by 2011 and is vital to helping the Greater New Orleans area recover from the effects of Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

In formulating the FY 2009 Budget, projects that included risk elements, but did not successfully compete on the basis of economic benefits, competed for funds instead based on a calculated risk value. The risk and consequence evaluation methodology was based on the evaluation of the Corps facility condition (risk) against the consequence of failure (structural failure or failure to perform as designed) within a Relative Risk Matrix. Use of a Relative Risk Matrix provides a consistent approach to risk/consequence and assists in the prioritization of work and prioritization of projects for budgeting purposes. The matrix includes risk-based, economic and life safety measures for all flood damage reduction, navigation and hydropower projects in the construction program including dam safety assurance projects, dam and levee seepage control projects, static instability correction projects, and deficiency correction, as well as new construction projects for these business lines. The goal is to use the same method to compare flood damage reduction, navigation and hydropower construction projects based on benefits and risk.

In the budget development process, the Corps is integrating a relative risk performance metric to assure the relatively higher risk projects receive budget consideration over relatively lower risk activities. This was integrated into the FY 2008 and 2009 Budgets and we plan to use a similar process in FY 2010. In the flood damage reduction budget, this involves considering risk to human safety in addition to economic losses. All Districts Corps-wide follow the same basic relative risk guidance. While there are some differences as we develop our methodology in how it is applied to new versus completed projects, we are working toward a better system of asset management and will incorporate its findings into our procedures. The goal is to use the same method to compare all projects across the Nation that are based on economic benefits and risk.

$30M in supplemental funds from FY 2006 was used in developing a GIS based levee inventory model and risk assessment models, as well as an initial survey of all 2,000 levees within USACE authorities and the detailed GIS inventory of the majority of the federally authorized levees that provide over 100 year level of protection (currently being finished). No appropriations were received for these activities in FY 2007 or FY 2008. The President's FY 2009 Budget includes $10M to further advance the inventory, risk assessments and begin implementation of the Levee Safety Committee portion of the 2007 WRDA Title IX (National Levee Safety Act). Once the inventory is completed and a screening level risk assessment is conducted in FY 2009, results will be used to prioritize potential levee rehabilitation projects.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing
Questions by Rep. Boustany
February 7, 2008

Dr. Boustany. General Van Antwerp: You stated at the hearing that the amount of deferred maintenance in the Corps of Engineer's Civil Works Program is growing. This is maintenance work that needs to be done but is not being done due to a shortage of O&M funds. Please provide the Committee with a list of the projects where maintenance is being deferred and what it would cost to address that deferred maintenance, by project and total.

General Van Antwerp.
Sir, the total FY 2009 deferred maintenance is $2,239.7 million; however, this deferred maintenance does not represent a prioritization of work either within the O&M account or among different accounts in the Corps. For instance, some of this deferred maintenance is relatively high priority whereas other work may be a lower priority relative to funding needs in other Corps areas and Corps mission criteria.

The following table is a list of FY 2009 deferred project maintenance:

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
AK	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	POD	$22,404.0
AK	BETHEL HARBOR, AK	POD	$125.0
AK	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	POD	$741.6
AK	CORDOVA HARBOR, AK	POD	$1,200.0
AK	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, BAR POINT, AK	POD	$200.0
AK	PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	POD	$200.0
AK	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	POD	$354.8
AK	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	POD	$180.0
AK	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	POD	$200.0
AL	ALABAMA RIVER LAKES, AL	SAD	$13,883.4
AL	BAYOU CODEN, AL	SAD	$790.0
AL	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	SAD	$5,570.0
AL	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	SAD	$9,182.1
AL	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	SAD	$750.0
AL	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	SAD	$1,270.0
AL	FLY CREEK, AL	SAD	$440.0
AL	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	SAD	$4,860.1
AL	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	SAD	$8,943.8
AL	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	SAD	$1,550.0
AR	BEAVER LAKE, AR	SWD	$7,276.6
AR	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	MVD	$1,699.8
AR	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	SWD	$2,903.7
AR	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	SWD	$12,600.8
AR	DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM, AR	SWD	$3,650.2
AR	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	MVD	$5,304.2
AR	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	SWD	$895.5
AR	DIERKS LAKE, AR	SWD	$810.6
AR	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	SWD	$1,127.5
AR	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	SWD	$20,100.7
AR	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	MVD	$430.5
AR	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	SWD	$35,800.3
AR	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	SWD	$6,864.3
AR	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	MVD	$2,450.5
AR	NIMROD LAKE, AR	SWD	$909.5
AR	NORFORK LAKE, AR	SWD	$11,443.1
AR	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	MVD	$1,863.8
AR	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	SWD	$3,513.5
AR	WHITE RIVER, AR	MVD	$3,153.2
AR	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	MVD	$157.8
AZ	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	SPD	$834.4
AZ	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	SPD	$71.2
AZ	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	SPD	$31.2
CA	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	SPD	$719.3
CA	BUCHANAN DAM, HV EASTMAN LAKE, CA	SPD	$1,498.4
CA	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	SPD	$2,230.0
CA	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	SPD	$2,242.1
CA	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	SPD	$1,750.0
CA	DANA POINT HARBOR, CA	SPD	$1,430.0
CA	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL, CA	SPD	$10,253.4
CA	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	SPD	$46.2
CA	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	SPD	$321.4
CA	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	SPD	$53.4
CA	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	SPD	$360.3
CA	JACK. D. MALTESTER CHANNEL (SAN LEANDRO MARINA), CA	SPD	$3,010.0
CA	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	SPD	$180.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
CA	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	SPD	$5,860.0
CA	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	SPD	$7,653.4
CA	MARINA DEL REY, CA	SPD	$5,441.0
CA	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	SPD	$226.4
CA	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	SPD	$41.3
CA	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	SPD	$35.3
CA	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	SPD	$5,240.0
CA	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	SPD	$2,090.0
CA	NAPA RIVER, CA	SPD	$3,380.0
CA	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	SPD	$1,022.6
CA	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	SPD	$1,097.8
CA	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	SPD	$10,505.0
CA	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	SPD	$1,557.0
CA	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	SPD	$5,005.7
CA	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	SPD	$3,817.0
CA	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	SPD	$6,721.0
CA	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	SPD	$2,785.0
CA	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	SPD	$1,093.5
CA	PORT SAN LUIS, CA	SPD	$3,430.0
CA	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	SPD	$4,840.0
CA	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	SPD	$2,154.9
CA	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	SPD	$30.4
CA	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	SPD	$826.0
CA	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	SPD	$0.1
CA	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	SPD	$400.0
CA	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	SPD	$7,095.0
CA	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	SPD	$469.1
CA	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY, CA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	SPD	$1,275.0
CA	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	SPD	$487.0
CA	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	SPD	$21.9
CA	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	SPD	$2,650.0
CA	SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	SPD	$6,500.0
CA	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	SPD	$4,688.8
CA	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	SPD	$517.6
CA	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	SPD	$3,049.1
CA	SUISUN CHANNEL (SLOUGH), CA	SPD	$2,525.0
CA	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	SPD	$467.1
CA	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	SPD	$1,160.0
CA	YUBA RIVER, CA	SPD	$694.3
CO	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	NWD	$2.7
CO	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	NWD	$1.9
CO	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	NWD	$1.6
CO	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	SPD	$5,065.1
CO	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	SPD	$645.6
CT	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	NAD	$49.1
CT	CLINTON HARBOR, CT	NAD	$1,500.0
CT	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	NAD	$47.0
CT	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	NAD	$39.4
CT	HOUSATONIC RIVER, CT	NAD	$100.0
CT	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	NAD	$96.3
CT	MIANUS RIVER, CT	NAD	$200.0
CT	MYSTIC RIVER, CT	NAD	$250.0
CT	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	NAD	$41.8
CT	NORWALK HARBOR, CT	NAD	$3,400.0
CT	PATCHOGUE RIVER, CT	NAD	$1,500.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
CT	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	NAD	$114.6
CT	THOMASTON DAM, CT	NAD	$29.1
CT	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	NAD	$152.6
CT	WESTPORT HARBOR & SAGATUCK RIVER, CT	NAD	$100.0
DC	POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS	NAD	$369.0
DC	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	NAD	$513.0
DE	CEDAR CREEK, DE	NAD	$515.0
DE	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	NAD	$2,502.3
DE	HARBOR OF REFUGE	NAD	$300.0
DE	INDIAN RIVER INLET & BAY, DE	NAD	$1,555.0
DE	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	NAD	$39,265.3
DE	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	NAD	$1,670.0
DE	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	NAD	$2,355.0
DE	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	NAD	$615.0
DE	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	NAD	$150.0
DE	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	NAD	$9,145.4
FL	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	SAD	$5,300.0
FL	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	SAD	$1,733.0
FL	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	SAD	$8,478.8
FL	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	SAD	$1,700.0
FL	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	SAD	$1,405.4
FL	FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	SAD	$1,800.0
FL	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	SAD	$350.0
FL	HORSESHOE COVE, FL	SAD	$2,650.0
FL	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R, FL	SAD	$3,650.0
FL	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	SAD	$17,036.0
FL	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	SAD	$9,233.7
FL	LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	SAD	$2,000.0
FL	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	SAD	$2,250.0
FL	MIAMI RIVER, FL	SAD	$10,680.0
FL	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	SAD	$350.0
FL	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	SAD	$2,416.5
FL	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	SAD	$85.0
FL	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	SAD	$628.6
FL	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	SAD	$1,946.5
FL	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	SAD	$3,233.3
FL	PLN-KEY WEST HARBOR, FL O&M	SAD	$1,800.0
FL	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	SAD	$6,000.0
FL	PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	SAD	$3,431.0
FL	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	SAD	$500.0
FL	ST JOHN'S COUNTY, FL	SAD	$350.0
FL	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	SAD	$7,960.0
FL	SUWANNEE RIVER, FL	SAD	$5,550.0
FL	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	SAD	$7,662.2
GA	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	SAD	$5,805.7
GA	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & FL	SAD	$3,969.5
GA	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	SAD	$14,456.4
GA	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	SAD	$1,687.7
GA	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	SAD	$2,299.6
GA	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	SAD	$6,627.5
GA	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	SAD	$20,229.1
GA	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	SAD	$4,363.8
GA	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	SAD	$6,631.8
GA	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	SAD	$4,919.3
GA	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	SAD	$16,208.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
GA	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	SAD	$24.3
GA	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	SAD	$3,837.5
GA	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	SAD	$3,535.7
HI	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	POD	$38.3
HI	HALEIWA SMALL BOAT HBR, OHAU, HI	POD	$1,514.0
HI	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	POD	$391.0
HI	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	POD	$1,514.0
IA	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	MVD	$688.0
IA	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO THE MOUTH, IA,KS,MO & NE	NWD	$4,445.9
IA	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	NWD	$367.6
IA	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	MVD	$1,138.1
IA	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	MVD	$745.6
ID	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	NWD	$961.8
ID	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	NWD	$722.0
ID	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	NWD	$3,165.3
ID	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	NWD	$4,379.0
ID	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	NWD	$386.9
IL	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	LRD	$2,768.3
IL	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	MVD	$4,934.3
IL	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	LRD	$5,452.2
IL	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	LRD	$300.0
IL	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	MVD	$172.3
IL	ILL WW OBRIEN L&D	MVD	$10,535.0
IL	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	MVD	$533.5
IL	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	MVD	$13,445.8
IL	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	MVD	$6,740.8
IL	LAGRANGE LOCK & DAM, ILWW, IL	MVD	$4,160.0
IL	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	MVD	$3,548.6
IL	LOCK AND DAM 27, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	MVD	$3,240.0
IL	MILL CREEK AND SOUTH SLOUGH MILAN, IL	MVD	$511.2
IL	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL	MVD	$18,680.6
IL	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	MVD	$3,768.5
IL	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	LRD	$2,233.0
IL	REND LAKE, IL	MVD	$1,261.2
IL	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	LRD	$1,689.1
IN	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	LRD	$2,290.3
IN	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	LRD	$984.8
IN	INDIANA HARBOR, CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY, IN	LRD	$10,350.0
IN	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	LRD	$2,500.0
IN	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	LRD	$1,149.3
IN	MONROE LAKE, IN	LRD	$45.2
KS	CLINTON LAKE, KS	NWD	$785.1
KS	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	SWD	$472.4
KS	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	SWD	$27.5
KS	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	SWD	$2,912.2
KS	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	SWD	$1,833.9
KS	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	NWD	$102.5
KS	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	SWD	$1,256.0
KS	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	NWD	$575.9
KS	MARION LAKE, KS	SWD	$995.3
KS	MILFORD LAKE, KS	NWD	$322.2
KS	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	SWD	$147.5
KS	PERRY LAKE, KS	NWD	$206.3
KS	TORONTO LAKE, KS	SWD	$1,023.9
KS	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	NWD	$236.1

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
KS	WILSON LAKE, KS	NWD	$216.6
KY	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	LRD	$8,316.8
KY	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	LRD	$1,168.0
KY	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	LRD	$250.0
KY	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	LRD	$104.4
KY	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	LRD	$34.1
KY	DEWEY LAKE, KY	LRD	$80.9
KY	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	MVD	$2,729.1
KY	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	LRD	$455.6
KY	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	LRD	$398.4
KY	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	LRD	$864.9
KY	JACKSON CO, KY TYNER SCHOOL	NWD	$900.0
KY	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	LRD	$2,873.0
KY	MARKLAND LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN (MAJOR REHAB)	LRD	$1,080.0
KY	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	LRD	$71.4
KY	NOLIN LAKE, KY	LRD	$542.9
KY	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	LRD	$2,180.0
KY	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	LRD	$335.5
KY	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	LRD	$309.6
KY	SMITHLAND LOCK MAJ REHAB	LRD	$100.0
KY	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	LRD	$5,695.3
KY	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	LRD	$140.9
LA	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK, LA	MVD	$37,581.3
LA	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	MVD	$2,080.4
LA	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	MVD	$1,198.5
LA	BAYOU LACOMBE, LA	MVD	$900.0
LA	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	MVD	$1,587.8
LA	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	MVD	$18.0
LA	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	MVD	$402.1
LA	BAYOU TECHE, LA	MVD	$7,984.2
LA	CADDO LAKE, LA	MVD	$28.5
LA	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	MVD	$11,535.0
LA	CHEFUNCTE RIVER & BOGUE FALIA, LA	MVD	$825.0
LA	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	MVD	$9,936.5
LA	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	MVD	$22,940.3
LA	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	MVD	$1,741.8
LA	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	MVD	$5,532.7
LA	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	MVD	$411.1
LA	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	MVD	$78.8
LA	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	MVD	$13,668.4
LA	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	MVD	$9,655.3
LA	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, LA	MVD	$52,903.6
LA	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	MVD	$5,440.5
LA	TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	MVD	$1,300.0
LA	WALLACE LAKE, LA	MVD	$28.2
LA	WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	MVD	$1,949.9
MA	ANDREWS RIVER, MA	NAD	$150.0
MA	ANNISQUAM RIVER, MA	NAD	$187.0
MA	AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA	NAD	$400.0
MA	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	NAD	$935.0
MA	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	NAD	$85.9
MA	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	NAD	$4,000.0
MA	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	NAD	$318.4
MA	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	NAD	$2,946.3
MA	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	NAD	$9.7

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
MA	CHATHAM (STAGE) HARBOR, MA	NAD	$230.0
MA	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	NAD	$162.4
MA	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	NAD	$109.3
MA	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	NAD	$95.7
MA	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	NAD	$260.1
MA	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	NAD	$319.0
MA	NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	NAD	$500.0
MA	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA	NAD	$259.3
MA	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	NAD	$1,000.0
MA	PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	NAD	$5,000.0
MA	SESUIT HARBOR, MA	NAD	$250.0
MA	TULLY LAKE, MA	NAD	$1,027.5
MA	WELLFLEET HARBOR, MA	NAD	$2,200.0
MA	WEST HILL DAM, MA	NAD	$26.9
MA	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	NAD	$87.6
MA	WEYMOUTH-FORE RIVER, MA	NAD	$400.0
MD	ASSATEAGUE, MD	NAD	$1,000.0
MD	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	NAD	$6,345.4
MD	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD (DRIFT REMOVAL)	NAD	$180.0
MD	CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	NAD	$140.0
MD	DUCK POINT COVE, MD	NAD	$130.0
MD	GOOSE CREEK, MD	NAD	$1,200.0
MD	HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD	NAD	$500.0
MD	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	NAD	$1,100.0
MD	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	NAD	$248.0
MD	LOWER THOROFARE, DEAL ISLAND, MD	NAD	$1,200.0
MD	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	NAD	$140.0
MD	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	NAD	$1,000.0
MD	PARISH CREEK, MD	NAD	$1,100.0
MD	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	NAD	$9,506.0
MD	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	NAD	$1,500.0
MD	SUSQUEHANNA-HAVRE DE GRACE, MD	NAD	$150.0
MD	TRED AVON RIVER, MD	NAD	$150.0
MD	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	NAD	$1,665.0
MD	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	NAD	$300.0
ME	BEALS HARBOR, ME	NAD	$100.0
ME	BUCKS HARBOR, ME O&M	NAD	$650.0
ME	CARVERS HARBOR, ME	NAD	$100.0
ME	KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	NAD	$400.0
ME	NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, MILBRIDGE, ME	NAD	$600.0
ME	PIG ISLAND GUT, ME	NAD	$100.0
ME	WELLS HARBOR, ME	NAD	$100.0
MI	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	LRD	$280.0
MI	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	LRD	$150.0
MI	BAY PORT HARBOR, MI	LRD	$1,102.0
MI	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	LRD	$255.0
MI	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	LRD	$860.1
MI	DETROIT RIVER, MI	LRD	$1,300.8
MI	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	LRD	$565.0
MI	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	LRD	$588.5
MI	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	LRD	$6,930.0
MI	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	LRD	$190.0
MI	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE, MI	LRD	$39.1
MI	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	LRD	$323.0
MI	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	LRD	$928.8

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
MI	INLAND ROUTE, MI	LRD	$637.3
MI	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	LRD	$1,734.2
MI	LAC LA BELLE, MI	LRD	$160.0
MI	LELAND HARBOR, MI	LRD	$183.0
MI	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	LRD	$305.0
MI	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	LRD	$352.3
MI	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	LRD	$345.0
MI	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	LRD	$326.0
MI	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	LRD	$183.5
MI	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	LRD	$554.5
MI	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	LRD	$157.0
MI	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	LRD	$462.0
MI	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	LRD	$420.0
MI	PRESQUE ISLE HABROR, MI	LRD	$18.2
MI	ROUGE RIVER, MI	LRD	$116.0
MI	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	LRD	$3,118.1
MI	SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	LRD	$727.0
MI	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	LRD	$228.6
MI	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	LRD	$1,208.6
MI	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	LRD	$13,263.8
MI	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	LRD	$298.8
MN	BIGSTONE LAKE - WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	MVD	$19.5
MN	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	LRD	$1,856.2
MN	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	LRD	$6,563.0
MN	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	MVD	$476.4
MN	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	MVD	$3,000.0
MN	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, MN	MVD	$17,760.9
MN	ORWELL LAKE, MN	MVD	$38.5
MN	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	MVD	$859.4
MN	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	MVD	$2,254.7
MN	TWO HARBORS, MN	LRD	$18.8
MN	WHITE ROCK DAM, LAKE TRAVERSE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	MVD	$174.6
MO	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	MVD	$1,113.7
MO	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	MVD	$1,990.0
MO	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	SWD	$4,002.7
MO	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	NWD	$356.3
MO	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	NWD	$44.7
MO	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION), IL	MVD	$25,700.0
MO	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	MVD	$775.7
MO	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	NWD	$414.1
MO	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	MVD	$259.2
MO	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	NWD	$182.8
MO	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR	SWD	$11,003.8
MS	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	SAD	$2,895.0
MS	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	MVD	$57.0
MS	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	SAD	$83.6
MS	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	SAD	$1,777.2
MS	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	MVD	$55.0
MS	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	SAD	$291.3
MS	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	SAD	$3,817.1
MS	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	MVD	$568.9
MS	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	SAD	$11,357.6
MT	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	NWD	$512.0
MT	LIBBY DAM, MT	NWD	$2,350.9
NC	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	SAD	$11,594.8

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NC	AVON HARBOR, NC	SAD	$1,600.0
NC	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	SAD	$667.7
NC	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	SAD	$750.0
NC	BELHAVEN HARBOR, NC	SAD	$500.0
NC	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	SAD	$2,420.0
NC	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	SAD	$2,961.3
NC	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	SAD	$1,230.0
NC	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	SAD	$1,100.0
NC	FALLS LAKE, NC	SAD	$682.9
NC	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	SAD	$10,090.7
NC	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	SAD	$2,370.0
NC	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	SAD	$14,518.7
NC	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	SAD	$2,642.7
NC	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	SAD	$7,658.8
NC	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	SAD	$2,800.0
NC	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	SAD	$1,450.0
NC	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	SAD	$220.0
NC	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	SAD	$180.0
NC	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	SAD	$384.6
NC	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	SAD	$416.7
NC	SMITHS CREEK, PAMLICO COUNTY, NC	SAD	$450.0
NC	STUMPY POINT BAY, NC	SAD	$1,500.0
NC	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	SAD	$4,826.5
NC	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	SAD	$4,000.0
ND	BOWMAN HALEY, ND	NWD	$0.1
ND	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	NWD	$1,584.3
ND	HOMME LAKE, ND	MVD	$60.5
ND	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	MVD	$197.1
ND	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	NWD	$10.5
ND	SOURIS RIVER, ND	MVD	$91.3
NE	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	NWD	$432.8
NE	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	NWD	$1.7
NE	PAPILLION CREEK, NE	NWD	$23.1
NH	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	NAD	$96.0
NH	COCHECO RIVER, NH	NAD	$1,500.0
NH	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	NAD	$63.5
NH	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	NAD	$601.6
NH	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	NAD	$201.2
NH	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	NAD	$1,026.3
NH	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	NAD	$586.8
NJ	ABSECON INLET, NJ	NAD	$200.0
NJ	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	NAD	$3,723.0
NJ	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	NAD	$1,602.0
NJ	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	NAD	$410.0
NJ	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	NAD	$8,912.0
NJ	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	NAD	$16,500.0
NJ	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	NAD	$5,000.0
NJ	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	NAD	$100.0
NJ	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	NAD	$8,750.0
NJ	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	NAD	$500.0
NJ	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	NAD	$6,620.0
NJ	SALEM RIVER, NJ	NAD	$2,180.8
NJ	SANDY HOOK BAY AT LEONARD, NJ	NAD	$3,825.0
NJ	SHARK RIVER, NJ	NAD	$5,870.0
NJ	SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	NAD	$9,610.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NJ	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	NAD	$2,550.0
NM	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	SPD	$5,716.6
NM	COCHITI LAKE, NM	SPD	$14,301.6
NM	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	SPD	$4,246.0
NM	GALISTEO DAM, NM	SPD	$954.8
NM	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	SPD	$13,748.5
NM	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	SPD	$502.2
NM	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	SPD	$184.7
NV	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	SPD	$51.0
NY	ALMOND LAKE, NY	NAD	$59.7
NY	ARKPORT DAM, NY	NAD	$23.7
NY	BARCELONA HARBOR, NY	LRD	$790.0
NY	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	NAD	$200.0
NY	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	LRD	$1,647.6
NY	BRONX RIVER, NY	NAD	$21,650.0
NY	BROWNS CREEK, NY	NAD	$50.0
NY	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	LRD	$2,915.0
NY	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	NAD	$1,720.0
NY	CAPE VINCENT HARBOR, NY	LRD	$620.0
NY	CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	LRD	$490.0
NY	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	LRD	$803.6
NY	EAST RIVER, NY	NAD	$2,000.0
NY	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	NAD	$200.0
NY	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	NAD	$45.6
NY	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	NAD	$7,555.0
NY	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	NAD	$11,500.0
NY	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	NAD	$18,085.0
NY	GORDONS LANDING, VT	NAD	$200.0
NY	GREAT KILLS HARBOR	NAD	$3,090.0
NY	GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	LRD	$208.3
NY	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	NAD	$7,880.0
NY	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	NAD	$13,000.0
NY	HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	NAD	$250.0
NY	JAMAICA BAY, NY	NAD	$2,800.0
NY	JONES INLET, NY	NAD	$7,120.0
NY	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	NAD	$100.0
NY	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	LRD	$620.2
NY	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	NAD	$2,300.0
NY	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	NAD	$470.0
NY	MORICHES INLET, NY	NAD	$800.0
NY	MOUNT MORRIS DAM, NY	LRD	$582.1
NY	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY & NJ (DRIFT REMOVAL)	NAD	$1,000.0
NY	NEWTOWN CREEK, NY	NAD	$48.0
NY	OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	LRD	$623.0
NY	OGDENSBURG HARBOR, NY	LRD	$450.0
NY	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	LRD	$525.0
NY	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	LRD	$292.2
NY	PLATTSBURGH HARBOR, NY	NAD	$2,450.0
NY	PORT ONTARIO HARBOR, NY	LRD	$875.0
NY	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	NAD	$4,025.0
NY	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	LRD	$148.0
NY	RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	NAD	$200.0
NY	SAUGERTIES HARBOR, NY	NAD	$850.0
NY	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	NAD	$5,990.0
NY	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	NAD	$59.3

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NY	STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	LRD	$20.0
NY	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	NAD	$11,200.0
NY	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	NAD	$62.4
NY	WILSON HARBOR, NY	LRD	$810.0
OH	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	LRD	$501.3
OH	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	LRD	$9,993.7
OH	BERLIN LAKE, OH	LRD	$1,429.4
OH	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	LRD	$1,944.6
OH	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	LRD	$304.8
OH	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	LRD	$9,698.3
OH	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	LRD	$1,382.8
OH	COOLEY CANAL, OH	LRD	$910.0
OH	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	LRD	$355.8
OH	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	LRD	$136.2
OH	DILLON LAKE, OH	LRD	$256.6
OH	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	LRD	$784.7
OH	HURON HARBOR, OH	LRD	$241.9
OH	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	LRD	$1,374.2
OH	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	LRD	$511.7
OH	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	LRD	$170.0
OH	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	LRD	$1,470.6
OH	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	LRD	$4.9
OH	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	LRD	$130.6
OH	PORT CLINTON HARBOR, OH	LRD	$820.0
OH	ROCKY RIVER, OH	LRD	$700.0
OH	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	LRD	$2,842.6
OH	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	LRD	$3,592.8
OH	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	LRD	$207.8
OH	TOUSSAINT RIVER, OH	LRD	$605.0
OH	VERMILION HARBOR, OH	LRD	$720.0
OH	WEST HARBOR, OH	LRD	$500.0
OH	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	LRD	$194.7
OK	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	SWD	$377.2
OK	BIRCH LAKE, OK	SWD	$380.4
OK	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	SWD	$933.5
OK	CANTON LAKE, OK	SWD	$2,845.7
OK	COPAN LAKE, OK	SWD	$2,008.2
OK	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	SWD	$10,600.5
OK	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	SWD	$5,507.5
OK	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,666.8
OK	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	SWD	$257.8
OK	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	SWD	$30.0
OK	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	SWD	$405.5
OK	HUGO LAKE, OK	SWD	$588.4
OK	HULAH LAKE, OK	SWD	$139.4
OK	KAW LAKE, OK	SWD	$606.9
OK	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,582.7
OK	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	SWD	$9,206.3
OK	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,600.0
OK	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	SWD	$10.4
OK	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	SWD	$935.2
OK	ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OK	SWD	$6,880.7
OK	SARDIS LAKE, OK	SWD	$125.9
OK	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	SWD	$624.6
OK	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,185.7

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
OK	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,727.0
OK	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	SWD	$8,267.8
OK	WISTER LAKE, OK	SWD	$182.6
OR	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	NWD	$571.5
OR	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	NWD	$754.0
OR	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	NWD	$6,582.0
OR	CHETCO RIVER, OR	NWD	$318.8
OR	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLAND, OR	NWD	$4,610.0
OR	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	NWD	$1,425.0
OR	COOS BAY, OR	NWD	$5,266.2
OR	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	NWD	$1,979.7
OR	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	NWD	$716.5
OR	COUGAR LAKE, OR	NWD	$95.9
OR	DEPOE BAY, OR	NWD	$107.3
OR	DETROIT LAKE, OR	NWD	$401.4
OR	DORENA LAKE, OR	NWD	$316.1
OR	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	NWD	$488.0
OR	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	NWD	$1,235.3
OR	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	NWD	$202.9
OR	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	NWD	$519.8
OR	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	NWD	$3,494.7
OR	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	NWD	$424.8
OR	PORT ORFORD, OR	NWD	$3,961.3
OR	ROGUE RIVER AT GOLD BEACH, OR	NWD	$1,034.0
OR	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	NWD	$1,976.8
OR	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	NWD	$169.0
OR	TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR, OR	NWD	$2,835.0
OR	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	NWD	$1,139.3
OR	WIILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	NWD	$6,580.0
OR	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	NWD	$573.9
OR	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	NWD	$941.6
OR	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	NWD	$297.5
OR	YAQUINA BAY & HARBOR, OR	NWD	$1,229.9
OR	YAQUINA RIVER, OR	NWD	$1,154.0
PA	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	LRD	$2,419.5
PA	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	NAD	$69.7
PA	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	NAD	$29.2
PA	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	NAD	$3,426.3
PA	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	NAD	$3,170.6
PA	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	LRD	$186.5
PA	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	NAD	$291.3
PA	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	LRD	$4,199.7
PA	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	NAD	$103.6
PA	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	NAD	$12,019.8
PA	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	LRD	$76.6
PA	ERIE HARBOR, PA	LRD	$1,925.0
PA	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	NAD	$84.7
PA	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	NAD	$6,492.2
PA	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	NAD	$779.7
PA	JOHNSTOWN, PA	LRD	$92.6
PA	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	LRD	$343.9
PA	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	LRD	$677.8
PA	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	LRD	$507.8
PA	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	LRD	$6,131.6
PA	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	LRD	$4,214.6

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
PA	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	NAD	$626.8
PA	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	NAD	$604.5
PA	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	NAD	$2,464.2
PA	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	LRD	$4,141.7
PA	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	NAD	$64.1
PA	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	NAD	$422.9
PA	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	LRD	$488.9
PA	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	LRD	$262.3
PA	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	LRD	$159.3
PA	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	NAD	$91.7
PA	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	LRD	$1,283.4
PR	ARECIBO HARBOR, PR	SAD	$4,000.0
RI	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	NAD	$1,100.0
RI	FOX POINT HURR BARRIER O&M	NAD	$87.5
RI	GREAT SALT POND, BLOCK ISLAND, RI	NAD	$210.0
RI	LITTLE NARRAGANSETT BAY, CT & RI	NAD	$100.0
RI	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH	NAD	$440.0
SC	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	SAD	$7,064.7
SC	CALABASH CREEK, BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC	SAD	$800.0
SC	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	SAD	$549.9
SC	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	SAD	$1,071.5
SC	FOLLY RIVER, SC	SAD	$1,080.6
SC	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	SAD	$3,551.0
SC	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	SAD	$3,200.0
SC	MURRELLS INLET, SC	SAD	$4,297.0
SC	TOWN CREEK, SC	SAD	$500.0
SD	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	NWD	$811.7
SD	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	NWD	$3,000.0
SD	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	NWD	$4.2
SD	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	NWD	$6.9
SD	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	NWD	$4,988.6
SD	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	NWD	$1,239.1
SD	MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT & ND	NWD	$1,700.0
SD	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	NWD	$1,430.9
TN	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	LRD	$9,671.4
TN	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	LRD	$4,900.8
TN	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	LRD	$2,685.5
TN	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	LRD	$11,561.3
TN	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	LRD	$2,427.7
TN	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	LRD	$5,213.9
TN	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	LRD	$11,524.5
TN	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	MVD	$646.4
TX	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	SWD	$1,511.8
TX	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,316.5
TX	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$1,889.0
TX	BELTON LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,610.7
TX	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	SWD	$5,434.9
TX	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	SWD	$10,021.0
TX	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES, TX	SWD	$2,330.0
TX	CANYON LAKE, TX	SWD	$13,349.0
TX	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	SWD	$200.0
TX	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	SWD	$5,265.0
TX	CHANNEL TO PORT BOLIVAR, TX	SWD	$185.0
TX	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	SWD	$2,890.0
TX	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$7,368.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
TX	DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	SWD	$1,010.0
TX	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	SWD	$8,349.9
TX	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$9,999.0
TX	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	SWD	$4,200.0
TX	GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	SWD	$100.0
TX	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	SWD	$7,292.8
TX	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,316.2
TX	GREENS BAYOU, TX	SWD	$2,750.0
TX	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	SWD	$9,518.3
TX	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	SWD	$2,441.5
TX	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$58,793.0
TX	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	SWD	$2,894.5
TX	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	SWD	$446.7
TX	LAKE KEMP, TX	SWD	$278.1
TX	LAVON LAKE, TX	SWD	$11,063.0
TX	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	SWD	$10,995.1
TX	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$6,865.0
TX	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	SWD	$21,608.0
TX	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,186.4
TX	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	SWD	$2,912.6
TX	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	SWD	$2,755.9
TX	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	SWD	$156.3
TX	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	SWD	$6,904.1
TX	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	SWD	$1,081.9
TX	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	SWD	$19,991.6
TX	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	SWD	$15,815.5
TX	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	SWD	$11,880.4
TX	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	SWD	$2,419.9
TX	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$1,815.0
TX	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,028.6
TX	TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	SWD	$2,165.0
TX	WACO LAKE, TX	SWD	$5,951.4
TX	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	SWD	$939.4
TX	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	SWD	$5,499.2
TX	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	SWD	$3,334.1
VA	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	NAD	$16,294.0
VA	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	NAD	$52.0
VA	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	NAD	$316.9
VA	BACK RIVER, MESSICK POINT, VIRGINIA	NAD	$554.0
VA	BROAD CREEK, VA	NAD	$900.0
VA	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	NAD	$328.0
VA	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	NAD	$894.0
VA	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	NAD	$25.9
VA	GREENVALE CREEK, VA	NAD	$450.0
VA	GUILFORD CREEK, VA	NAD	$591.0
VA	HAMPTON CREEK, VA	NAD	$868.0
VA	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REMOVAL)	NAD	$123.0
VA	HOSKINS CREEK, VA	NAD	$1,093.0
VA	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	NAD	$5,017.3
VA	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	LRD	$205.6
VA	LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA	NAD	$900.0
VA	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	NAD	$517.0
VA	NORFOLK HARBOR CRANEY, VA	NAD	$3,588.0
VA	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	NAD	$3,883.8
VA	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	LRD	$38.4

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
VA	ONANCOCK RIVER	NAD	$2,809.0
VA	PAGAN RIVER, VA	NAD	$900.0
VA	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	SAD	$5,202.5
VA	QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	NAD	$447.0
VA	QUINBY CREEK, VA	NAD	$700.0
VA	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	NAD	$206.0
VA	RUDEE INLET, VA	NAD	$773.0
VA	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	NAD	$579.0
VA	TYLERS BEACH, VA	NAD	$400.0
VA	WATER/ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION, VA	NAD	$100.0
VA	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	NAD	$1,394.8
VA	WINTER HARBOR, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	NAD	$1,190.0
VA	YORK RIVER, VA	NAD	$74.0
VT	BALL MOUNTAIN, VT	NAD	$276.9
VT	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	NAD	$76.4
VT	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	NAD	$998.3
VT	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	NAD	$98.2
WA	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	NWD	$149.4
WA	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	NWD	$772.3
WA	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	NWD	$621.7
WA	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	NWD	$674.2
WA	EDIZ HOOK, WA	NWD	$655.3
WA	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	NWD	$396.0
WA	FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	NWD	$110.4
WA	GRAYS HARBOR, WA	NWD	$901.3
WA	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	NWD	$4,362.5
WA	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	NWD	$660.5
WA	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	NWD	$3,406.3
WA	LOWER MONUMENT LOCK AND DAM, WA	NWD	$7,115.1
WA	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	NWD	$7,596.4
WA	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	NWD	$1,004.0
WA	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	NWD	$2.7
WA	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	NWD	$6,693.5
WA	NEAH BAY, WA	NWD	$2,129.0
WA	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	NWD	$1,635.5
WA	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	NWD	$412.3
WA	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	NWD	$801.3
WA	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	NWD	$629.0
WA	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	NWD	$2,824.0
WA	WATERWAY CONNECTING PORT TOWNSEND AND OAK BAY, WA	NWD	$693.4
WA	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	NWD	$388.4
WI	ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	LRD	$400.0
WI	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	LRD	$820.3
WI	BIG SUAMICO RIVER, WI	LRD	$500.0
WI	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	MVD	$1,036.3
WI	FOX RIVER, WI	LRD	$4,171.1
WI	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	LRD	$2,149.5
WI	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	LRD	$692.7
WI	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	LRD	$1,785.2
WI	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	LRD	$901.8
WI	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	LRD	$937.7
WI	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	LRD	$4,587.6
WI	OCONTO HARBOR, WI	LRD	$310.0
WI	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	LRD	$636.1
WI	SAXON HARBOR, WI	LRD	$310.0

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
WI	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	LRD	$6,157.5
WI	STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	LRD	$5,208.5
WI	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	LRD	$1,385.9
WV	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	LRD	$571.4
WV	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	LRD	$59.0
WV	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	LRD	$527.8
WV	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	LRD	$415.0
WV	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	LRD	$400.0
WV	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	LRD	$2,538.6
WV	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	LRD	$7,343.4
WV	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	LRD	$567.9
WV	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	LRD	$31.5
WV	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	LRD	$1,043.8
WV	SUTTON LAKE, WV	LRD	$1,361.1
WV	TYGART LAKE, WV	LRD	$176.3
	TOTAL		**$2,239,674**