AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 110–1242

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET FOR THE CIVIL WORKS PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT (WRDA) OF 2007

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 11, 2008

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress.senate

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

85–524 PDF WASHINGTON : 2014

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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

BARBARA BOXER, California, *Chairman*

MAX BAUCUS, Montana
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
AMY KLOBUCHAR, Minnesota
SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Rhode Island

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri

BETTINA POIRIER, *Majority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ANDREW WHEELER, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

Page

MARCH 11, 2008

OPENING STATEMENTS

Boxer, Hon. Barbara, U.S. Senator from the State of California 1
Isakson, Hon. Johnny, U.S. Senator from the State of Georgia 2
Craig, Hon. Larry E., U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho 4
Klobuchar, Hon. Amy, U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota 5
Alaxander, Hon. Lamar, U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee 6
Vitter, Hon. David, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana 7
Bond, Hon. Christopher, U.S. Senator from the State of Missouri 8
Barrasso, Hon. John, U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming 9
Voinovich, Hon. George, U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio 10
Cardin, Hon. Benjamin L., U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland 76
Inhofe, Hon. James M., U.S. Senator from the State of Oklahoma, prepared statement 87
Lieberman, Hon. Joseph, U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut, prepared statement 88
Warner, Hon. John, U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia, prepared statement 89

WITNESSES

Woodley, Hon. John Paul Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Army 12
Prepared statement 14
Response to an additional question from Senator Bond 26
Responses to additional questions from:
Senator Boxer 26
Senator Inhofe 32
Senator Carper 33
Antwerp, Lieutenant General Robert Van, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 39
Prepared statement 39
Response to an additional question from Senator Warner 43
Responses to additional questions from Senator:
Senator Inhofe 43
Senator Voinovich 43
Senator Vitter 66
Senator Lieberman 69

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2009 BUDGET FOR THE CIVIL WORKS PROGRAMS OF THE U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT (WRDA) OF 2007

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2008

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC.

The full committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in room 406, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Barbara Boxer (chairman of the full committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Boxer, Cardin, Klobuchar, Voinovich, Isakson, Vitter, Craig, Alexander, Bond, Barrasso

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BARBARA BOXER, U. S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Senator BOXER. Good morning, everybody. We will call this hearing to order.

I am going to put my full statement into the record and we will give everybody 3 minutes for an opening statement.

Today the Committee meets to conduct oversight of the Corps' implementation of WRDA 2007. We will also review the 2009 budget of the Civil Works program and we are examining these issues together because it is the annual budget request that truly demonstrates the priorities of the Administration. And of course, in this case, the priorities of this Committee, which in most part has been very bipartisan when it has come to issues such as WRDA.

For me, I ask the question, are we committed to protecting lives, to enhancing the environment? Are we committed to growing the economy? As I look at this budget, it falls short, for me.

Last year, I was pleased to join with Senator Inhofe, the Ranking Member of the Committee, and all the members of this Committee, to lead the floor fight to overturn the veto of WRDA 2007. By a vote of 79 to 14, the Senate overwhelmingly told the President that there was more than one branch of Government in the Nation and that shoring up America's water infrastructure was long overdue and must be a priority.

Secretary Woodley and Chief Van Antwerp, welcome to both of you, and thank you for appearing before the Committee today. I work closely with both of you and I have great respect for both of

you. Your job is a tough one and very important one for the Nation. Your agency provides communities with flood protection. You restore ecosystems, such as the once vast wetlands of America. You do help grow the economy through more efficient navigation.

My home State of California has some of the Nation's most critical needs. Indeed, my State's capital, Sacramento, as you all well know, is four times as likely to see catastrophic flooding as New Orleans was in 2005. I am very pleased to see that the Sacramento area flood control was not ignored in this budget. I also appreciate that the budget includes more than $5 billion to complete the repair of levees in New Orleans. These emergency funds are an important step to rebuilding New Orleans and the Gulf Coast, but they certainly can't be the last step.

I will never forget the visit we made to New Orleans, many of us here on this Committee. I just think we must shore up our Nation's water and flood control infrastructure before catastrophe strikes, not after. And the President's budget request for civil works program is $4.741 billion, this is a decrease, a decrease of $851 million from the Fiscal Year 2008 enacted level of $5.592 billion. So it is shocking to me the proposed 2009 budget includes a 36 percent cut in construction for flood control projects authorized by Congress. I just don't see how we could go this way.

So I will put the rest of my statement into the record, because I have so many questions, I want to leave time for my other colleagues and their questions as well. I will call on Senator Isakson.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman. General Van Antwerp, welcome today, Secretary Woodley, glad to have you.

Two points I would like to make. No. 1, I was very disappointed that the Savannah River project money was not included in the 2009 budget. I had significant conversations both with Mr. Nussle at the White House as well as the Corps, and had hoped that would make it.

As you know, the 1999 WRDA Act authorized the deepening of the Savannah Channel, subject to environmental studies, from 42 to 48 feet. As you probably also are aware, the Port of Savannah is now the second largest port on the eastern seaboard of the United States in terms of tonnage. The State of Georgia had pledged $50 million a year to match the $78 million that we had asked for from the Feds.

Timing is of the essence in this. The Panama Canal expansion and the new PanaMex ships will be coming through, I believe in 2014 is the date I remember. It is going to be essential to maintain our competition with those types of ships coming through, that the Port of Savannah be able to have that channel widening and deepening. So I would appreciate hearing from you in your remarks about that particular subject.

Equally important to our State, obviously, has been what is termed by many the water wars between Georgia, Tennessee and Alabama. But in fact, it is not really a war as much as it is a complex problem that must be dealt with. I am very appreciative that Secretary General of the Corps made the announcement that they

would begin the work on the water control manuals for the ACF and the ACT. We are operating one of the largest metropolitan areas in the United States of America and the waterway that serves it based on water control manuals that are over 20 years old. It is impossible to be able to do that, so I am very happy to hear that both the ACF and the ATC manuals are in place. I am hoping you will be able to confirm for me that the funding in this budget is sufficient for you to carry out the completion of those two projects.

I know that Secretary of the Interior Kempthorne is very supportive. As you know, he recently wrote to the Governors of Georgia, Florida and Alabama that he is going to take over implementing the operation of that watershed, since the Governors were unable to reach a final agreement. In the end, I hope the Governors will, but I commend Secretary Kempthorne for what he is doing. I commend the Corps for its commitment of the water control manuals, and I hope this hearing will get us a confirmation that the money is in fact included to ensure that will go forward without abatement and we will be able to complete it hopefully within the next 2 years.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Isakson follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Thank you Madam Chairman. These types of hearings are a good opportunity for us to learn about the Army Corps' priorities, and about what we can do as partners with the Corps to ensure it meets its goals in a fiscally responsible manner. We require the Corps to do a number of things in the best interests of our Nation, and I have a number of issues I am eager to hear from the Corps on. I am interested in hearing whether they believe their fiscal year budget request, a decrease from fiscal year levels, provides adequate funding for civil works projects. To be candid, I do not believe it does. I am also interested in hearing in what the Corps is doing to reduce its backlog of projects, as well as to improve its business practices.

On the local level, I am very disappointed that the Corps failed to realize the strategic importance of the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project (SHEP). This is a project that has been under review by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in various stages for a decade, and was authorized in the Water Resources and Development Act of 1999 (WRDA 1999) to deepen the channel from 42 to as much as 48 feet, subject to completion of environmental and cost benefit studies.

These studies are nearing completion, and I anticipate that they will show an extraordinary combination of high benefits versus costs. I also believe that they will reflect the most transparent, rigorous, and accurate compilation of environmental and economic analysis of any river and harbor project in the Nation.

Since the initial authorization in WRDA, the Port of Savannah has become the fastest growing container port in the United States, and is now the second largest container port on the East Coast. Cargo volume has more than doubled in the past 10 years, Savannah is now responsible for moving more than 16 percent of the East Coast's overseas container cargo, and both the State of Georgia and private companies have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in land-side facilities to increase efficiency. However, the ability of the port to continue to expand and accommodate the economic growth of business activity throughout the East Coast and Midwest will be dramatically weakened if the port cannot be expanded to accommodate the larger "Panamax" vessels that will shortly dominate ocean commerce.

It was vital for this effort that the President's budget request for fiscal year included sufficient funds to begin the first year of the estimated 4 years of construction required for the project. Release of the funds would have been subject to completion of the required environmental resource and administrative approvals. Senior officials of the Corps, from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works on down, assured me this project would be included. I am looking for answers from the witnesses as to their views of this project's strategic importance, as well as why it was not included when all indications were that it would be.

As many of you know, for 17 years now the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, have been negotiating over how to share the resources of water in the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa (ACT) and Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) river basins. Late last year, the Governors of the three states as well as the Interior Secretary and the Army Corps of Engineers sat down to continue their talks over how to resolve the 17-year-old water dispute. The Governors emerged from the meeting saying they were hopeful they will reach an agreement by March.

On March 2, Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne and Council on Environmental Quality Chairman Jim Connaughton sent a letter to the Governors of Alabama, Georgia and Florida. While acknowledging that more progress has been made over the last few months than in the previous 18 years, Secretary Kempthorne and Chairman Connaughton said the Governors have been unable to cross the finish line with an agreement.

In the letter, Secretary Kempthorne and Chairman Connaughton told the Governors that the Federal Government will now begin a process to review interim operations that will replace the current program before it expires on June 1, 2008. Federal agencies may subsequently issue further revisions as may be warranted by Federal law, changing hydrological conditions and new information. Any future changes in interim operations will be necessary only until the water control plans and manuals are revised.

Secretary Kempthorne and Chairman Connaughton express disappointment with the states' continued course of legal action against one another. If the states refuse to work with one another, Kempthorne and Connaughton State that the revised operational decisions will integrate important information and perspectives gained from the negotiations, but regrettably, it will necessarily be a solution being directed to the States instead of their much hoped for solution coming from the States.

It is my hope that the three Governors will come back to the table so the states can take advantage of the productive talks and agree on a resolution. Key to any agreement between the States is an update of the nearly 20-year-old water control manuals for the ACT and ACF River Basins. Army Secretary Pete Geren showed real leadership when he announced that the update of these manuals would go forward. I am interested in hearing from the witnesses whether the Corps had budgeted in this budget the necessary funds to begin these updates.

With that Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much, Senator.

This is the order of arrival. It is Isakson, Craig, Alexander, Vitter and Bond. So Senator Craig, you are next.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. LARRY E. CRAIG, U. S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator CRAIG. Thank you, Madam Chairman. And again, thank you for your due diligence in having this hearing. It is important for all of us.

Because I think what we will hear today, from us to you, General, and to you, Mr. Secretary, are, while we may think in broad terms, we become very parochial when the issue is water and watersheds and flooding and ports. Most people don't appreciate the fact that Idaho has one of the furthest inland seaports of the Nation because of the slack waters of the Columbia and Snake River system.

And so I am constantly on point as it relates to that system and how it operates, that we maintain our dredging to maintain our depths. And of course, as you know, completion of the project from the Port of Portland out to the ocean improves the whole system because of the size of the freighters that can move into the Port of Portland, the locks at the John Day Dam, they become critically important to all of us. I will be asking you questions about that.

I think that the Chairman mentioned Sacramento and flooding. And of course, the Sierras, especially the Northern Sierras, have seen unprecedented snowfalls this winter. It is also true in northern Idaho in several of our watersheds up there as it relates to the

Kootenai and the St. Joe Rivers. In fact, at one point, we had a historic depth of snow on ground in the valleys in the Coeur d'Alene area. And of course, everybody watches closely, to date, our fingers crossed, have allowed reasonable warmth and settling of that snow. But we all know that certain events can trigger substantial flooding beyond the capacity of those watersheds to handle it. It is certainly true in the Sierras, it is also true in that region of Idaho. So I will be looking forward to any comments there.

Again, thank you both for being here. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much.

Senator KLOBUCHAR.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. AMY KLOBUCHAR, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, for holding this important hearing, and thank you for being here.

It is important to have these hearings, because the budget is more than just numbers, it is also an expression of the value of our Country. The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 authorized $23 million for projects around the Country, projects that protect State environments, economies and basic needs, such as drinking water. I am disappointed that the President's budget provided almost no funding for these projects.

Just to give you a few examples from my own State of Minnesota, these projects would help communities like Roseau, Minnesota, which suffered massive flooding just a few years ago, build a flood mitigation system to prevent future devastation, or help the city of Willmar build a wastewater treatment plant, or fund navigational improvements in the Port of Duluth, where lake levels are at record lows because of climate change. These projects would provide for continued economic growth, job creation and economic stability while protecting human lives and ensuring reliable transportation of goods.

I was proud to join 78 of my colleagues in casting my vote to override the President's veto of WRDA last year. The overwhelming bipartisan nature of that override speaks volumes about the critical nature of these projects.

I firmly believe that we need to change priorities in this Country. I am a believer in rolling back some of the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest, people making over $200,000 a year. Maybe that's because a bridge fell down in the middle of our State and we understand more poignantly than many the need to invest in infrastructure proactively. Investing in our national infrastructure is one of the most efficient means of creating jobs and stimulating the economy. Each billion dollars invested in infrastructure creates upwards of 47,000 new jobs and up to $6 billion in additional revenues.

That is why I am very concerned that the Corps' construction account and the Corps' investigation account were dramatically reduced below what Congress appropriated in 2008. These low funding levels continue to exacerbate problems in our infrastructure while doing nothing to stimulate our economy.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming months to start filling this serious investment gap in our Nation's

infrastructure, a gap whose filling will mean so much more for our safety and for our economy.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much, Senator Klobuchar.

Senator ALEXANDER.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. LAMAR ALEXANDER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

General Van Antwerp and Secretary Woodley, thank you for being here. As you know, there is strong support in this Committee on both sides of the aisle for roads and bridges and airports and locks and infrastructure that helps our Country grow new jobs. I appreciate the priority that the Corps has tried to put, for example, on the Chickamauga Lock near Chattanooga, which is badly in need of repair and which, when it is finished, would take 100,000 big trucks off I–75 every day, helping us with clean air, with climate change, with transportation costs and dependence on foreign oil, all those things. So there is an example of how investment in infrastructure helps.

There is one other area I would like to call to your attention, and that is the Center Hill Dam in Tennessee, which I believe should be considered, repairs to the Center Hill Dam should be considered necessary for dam safety. Like Wolf Creek Dam in Kentucky, not far away, both Center Hill and Wolf sit on a kind of limestone which erode over time and creates instability. I assume dam safety is the reason why the Center Hill Lake has been lowered, the water level has been lowered, and repairs are underway. If that is the case, I think that it should be designated as dam safety. That has a great effect on ratepayers in Tennessee, and it has an effect on other Tennesseans as well. If it is not designated for dam safety, then the ratepayers have to fork over $300 million of extra money on their electric bills to pay for the repair.

Second, the delay in dam safety, in repairing Center Hill, means that water is not available downstream. Senator Isakson talked about the water problems in Georgia. We had them in Tennessee last year as well, lakes and streams dried up that have not ever dried up before. And with the Center Hill Lake at a lower level, the amount of water is not available downstream during a drought which is still a problem.

Finally, if it is not designated for dam safety, it will take longer to fix it, longer to repair it. And that means that people in the middle Tennessee area will be paying about $100 million more a year for their electric bill. So I would encourage you to consider Center Hill Dam's repair work as dam safety repair work, because it is the same kind of problem that Wolf Creek has, and Wolf Creek, repairs there are designated as, the repairs are necessary for dam safety.

Thank you very much.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much, Senator Alexander.

Senator VITTER.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID VITTER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for holding this very important hearing. I would like to thank our witnesses and the Corps of Engineers for all the important work that you are doing, particularly in the hurricane-ravaged Gulf Coast. Obviously your work is vital to our future.

In this hearing, I wanted to specifically focus on three big issues to the recovery and three big concerns. One is, the money and work for the completion of a new 100 year level of protection. First of all, I want to thank you and the President and the Administration for a major commitment of an additional $5.8 billion in Federal funds to complete that 100 year level of hurricane protection. Obviously that is a major commitment that is vital to the entire future of our area.

I do have two very strong and very specific concerns with that, however. One is the timing of that money coming to the Corps on the ground. As you know, the Administration has requested that in this Fiscal Year 2009 budget and has clearly made a decision not to request it in the context of the next supplemental spending bill, which will happen sooner. I believe this ensures, not maybe, I believe this ensures to back up completion of that crucial work and have us miss the 2011 deadline for completion of that work. And as you know, 2011 is in itself 1 year pushed back from the original 2010 deadline. Every additional hurricane season that passes with the present vulnerability of the Gulf Coast is a very high level of risk.

The second concern I have with that is that the proposed cost share for several of the programs involved specifically, like Pontchartrain vicinity and SELA, is well below the historic cost share. So I strongly disagree with that.

Second key issue is the outfall canals. The Corps has been studying the correct solution to reinforcing strengthening the outfall canals where the breaches happened which led to the flooding of probably 70 percent of the city of New Orleans. I want to know when that final recommendation is going to come to us and if it is going to be the recommendation which embodies the best alternative in terms of safety and engineering, not merely the least expensive, because I have strong concerns about that.

Also, I want to re-urge you to look at the pump to the river option as part of that work, which would add great reassurance and added protection to the people of the region.

Finally, the Morganza to the Gulf hurricane protection project. As you know, this vital project has been in the works for 15 years. It was 1992 when the Corps was first asked to look at the Federal interest in that project. In 2000, the project was actually authorized in the WRDA bill, contingent on a final Corps chief's report. Unfortunately, the Corps missed that deadline for the chief's report, so that entire authorization went away.

Finally, in this last WRDA, WRDA 2007, we include full authorization, 15 years after the start, for this vital hurricane and flood protection project. Yet after all of that, the Corps now takes the position that essentially, nothing substantial should move forward as the entire project is re-looked at with a brand new cost benefit

analysis. I have grave concerns that is foot-dragging of the highest order and true bad faith, since this was announced a few weeks after we passed the WRDA bill and the Corps never spoke before that point to advise us that we should include a higher authorization figure.

I will look forward to addressing all of these concerns in our discussion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BOND.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER BOND, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Senator BOND. Madam Chair, Secretary Woodley, General Van Antwerp, we thank you very much for this hearing today and for your testifying.

I am very disappointed, Madam Chair, that the Administration continues to undermine our efforts to modernize our water infrastructure. Despite overwhelming and bipartisan support for the Water Resources Development Act of 2007, or WRDA, the President's budget does not provide money to update the depression-era locks and dams on the Illinois and the Mississippi Rivers. Not only are we unable to update our locks and dams, this proposal provides a sure path to kill the most environmentally sound and cost-effective mode of transportation we have.

The Administration has stated they will propose a tax increase on our barges to replenish the Inland Waterway Trust Fund, which pays for our water infrastructure. They already pay a tax. This budget gimmick will do nothing to address our decaying waterway infrastructure. The proposal will raise the price of river transportation and thereby discourage river traffic. If these materials can't be shipped on the river, they will be on our roads and our railways.

Taking the materials from the most environmentally sound and efficient method and putting them on crowded highways that are already heavily over-used makes no sense. One barge tow carries the same amount of cargo as 870 trucks. How would you like the prospect of barge tows moving to highways with 870 trucks each time?

Now, my colleagues today have done a good job of pointing out and criticizing the lack of funding for extremely critical resources in their regions and their States. In the past, we have been able to change the budgets to reflect the priorities that come from the people we serve in our States, to whom we listen, to whom we turn for their support and to whom we owe our responsibilities. This has enabled us to overcome some bad decisions of OMB in the past.

But I think we are all aware that there are major populist efforts to end all congressional changes, enhancement or additions to the President's budget. The populists say, well, we are costing money. We are not costing money, we use our power to determine better priorities. And we who serve the States from which we are elected have a much better idea of what those priorities are.

I would urge my colleagues to exercise great caution. There is a move going on in the Hill right now, seems to be popular, apparently all the Presidential candidates are getting behind it, to end congressional "interference" with their budget. I used to be an exec-

utive. I didn't like having Congress or having my general assembly interfere. But that is what members of a legislative body are supposed to do. We cannot turn over all the direction of spending, which we are empowered under Article 1 of the Constitution to authorize and to spend to a group of un-elected accountants in OMB, OMB which recommended vetoing of the WRDA bill.

Congress has its legislative priorities. They are focusing on appropriations now. Anybody who has served on this Committee knows how bad the budgets that we have gotten out of OMB in Republican and Democratic years have been. I frankly think that the Country would be far worse off if OMB, un-elected bureaucrats, were to be the ones to make all the spending decisions. If we are going to exercise our responsibility, we have to be able to change the budget requests. The President proposes, but we are the ones who dispose.

Madam Chair, this is serious, this and so many areas. I thank my colleagues for their consideration.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much, Senator.

Now we will go to Senator Barrasso, and if no other Democratic colleague shows up, we will go to Senator Voinovich, and then we will start the questions.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN BARRASSO, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I appreciate your holding this hearing.

I have been raising some issues with the Army Corps regarding TCE, trichloroethylene, which is a chemical that is contaminating the water in the city of Cheyenne in the wells at Belvar Ranch, which is west of Cheyenne, Wyoming. The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality believes that this contamination is directly linked to a former nuclear missile site known as Atlas IV. The cleanup is being done, the city of Cheyenne folks are paying for that now. Your department is aware of this TCE leakage from the site.

But in a recent letter to me, you stated that your information does not support the conclusion that the missile site is the cause of the water contamination. It is baffling, because the Army Corps believes that there is a 6.5 mile plume of TCE emanating from the Atlas missile site, no debate about that. The city of Cheyenne has tested their wells and found TCE eight and a half miles from the Atlas missile site in one of the city's wells. It only stands to reason that there is one big plume of TCE. But the Army Corps is suggesting that there are two plumes, one that is from the missile site and one that is from an unknown source.

The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, the city of Cheyenne and any of us who have been to these sites cannot fathom what other cause there can be for this TCE, given the terrain and the rural setting of the site. Anyone who goes out there to take a look, and I would be happy to go with you, would say this has to be one, not some other site.

So I am glad that you are willing to work and continue to study this, but this has been going on for a long time. It seems that there may be some ignoring of the reality of this situation. So I will look

forward to asking specific questions when it comes around to questions, Madam Chairman, of this situation.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much, Senator Barrasso. I can understand your concern.

Senator VOINOVICH.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE VOINOVICH, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I would just like to comment about Senator Bond's comments. I think all of us on this Committee ought to understand, until we do tax reform and entitlement reform, where we take in more money, we are never going to be able to do the job. We keep talking about extending the tax reductions. We need more money. We ought to get it through tax reform and not helter-skelter raising of dollars.

The sooner we wake up to the fact that we don't have enough money, that we are not getting the job done, the sooner we will be able to deal with some of the problems that these people have. Because when they go to OMB, OMB says, here is your number and come back with it. And you have to eat it, whether you like it or not, you eat it. And our infrastructure problems in this Country are overwhelming. They have been swept under the rug for too long and it is about time we said something about it.

The fact that we harass you and others that come before this Committee is partly our fault. Partly our fault, because we haven't faced up to it. This Country is in deep trouble today, a budget that is out of control, national debt, dollar that is going down and we just sit here like nothing is going on. We have a crisis in this Country and I am hoping the Presidential candidates have the guts to face up and tell the American people the truth. It is about time we faced up to the truth. Do you hear me? About time we faced up to the truth. We have been playing games around here for too long and I am fed up with it.

I am going to put my statement into the record and I would like you to respond to it. I will take care of the questions when they come up. Thank you, sir, thank you, Madam.

[The prepared statement of Senator Voinovich follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE VOINOVICH, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mrs. Chairman, thank you for calling this hearing on the budget of the Environmental Protection Agency. I would like to thank Administrator Johnson for being here.

As a former Governor and Mayor, I know firsthand the enormous challenges that you have to address when crafting a budget. This is a process that requires responsible prioritizing and fiscal discipline to avoid breaking the bank.

And this leads me to a point I've made time and time again: We must find a way to balance our nation's environmental, energy and economic policies. It might make us feel good to set lofty environmental goals, but those goals do little good when they are unachievable due to practical or economic considerations. They are even less good when they impose economic hardship to those who can't comply.

The issue of unfunded mandates is a problem that is pervasive throughout government, but nowhere more so than in environmental regulation. At best, standards are set with little consideration as to how they will be met. At worst, standards are set without regard to the costs of compliance. The national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) and the Clean Water Act are prime examples of this disconnect between our policy objectives and a case study in unintended consequences.

Leaving a discussion of the standards setting process to another day, I will simply say that if we set environmental standards, we must be ready, as a government, to help communities meet those standards.

In regard to this year's budget proposal, I am concerned about funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA). DERA was designed to help meet our nation's air quality standards by reducing emissions from the nation's legacy fleet of over 11 million diesel engines. DERA authorized $1 billion over a 5-year period ($200 million annually). Properly funded, and leveraging match requirements for State and local governments at a ratio of $2 to $1, EPA estimated that DERA had the potential to contribute to a 70,000 ton reduction in PM emissions and generate $20 billion in economic and health benefits.

You have requested $49.2 million for fiscal year in what will be the third year of a 5-year program. I can't stress enough the need for increasing DERA funding as we begin the appropriations process. DERA is a well balanced policy to reduce air emissions and it would be a shame to let the program sunset before its benefits can be fully realized.

I am also disappointed to see that the administration's proposed funding for the Great Lakes Legacy Act is $35 million for fiscal year 9. This is a significant decrease from the $49.6 million that the administration proposed 2 years ago. This program shows results—hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of contaminated sediments have been removed from the Great Lakes—and I strongly encourage you to work to increase funding for this program.

Administrator, working with the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration, you have worked to make the restoration and protection of the lakes a priority at EPA. As co-chair of the Senate Great Lakes Task Force, I am eager to find ways to improve the Collaboration's efforts and ensure the Great Lakes programs, like the Legacy Act, receive the funding they need to be successful.

As a member of this Committee, I have sought to bring attention to the nation's wastewater infrastructure needs. But as with previous years, EPA's budget is woefully inadequate. In fact, your request represents the lowest funding level in the program's history!

Continued cuts to the SRF program—when EPA estimates the nation's need for wastewater treatment and collection at $193.5 billion—makes no sense. This especially concerns me because my State of Ohio has one of the largest needs in the Nation at $11.7 billion.

Here are a number of examples from Ohio alone: The city of Defiance, which has a population of 17,000 and recently lost 950 auto industry jobs, is required to spend $60 million over 20 years to fix the city's combined sewer overflow problems. In response, the city is being forced to double its rates. The city of Fostoria, population of 14,000, is facing a $35 million project. This city has lost 10 percent of its jobs over the past 2 years, in part due to their increasing water rates. They are being forced to increase their rates by $100 per year over the next 15 years. EPA is requiring the city of Fremont, population of 26,000 people (49 percent are considered low-income), to spend $63 million. Their rate increases will be 150 percent.

EPA is simply not stepping up to the plate to assist the thousands of communities across the country facing substantial costs to comply with EPA orders. I must tell you that from my experience as a former mayor, county commissioner, and Governor, I consider this to be an unfunded mandate.

Administrator, we are asking our communities to do the impossible. If the Federal Government is going to impose these costly mandates on struggling State and local governments, then it should provide funding and flexibility for compliance with those mandates.

Again, I would like to thank you for your attendance today, and I look forward to hearing your thoughts on these issues. Thank you, Mrs. Chairman.

Senator BOXER. Senator Voinovich, don't hold back.

[Laughter.]

Senator BOXER. I love it. I think it is good that you are speaking from the heart.

I did want to say, before we call on our panel, I know there are going to be disagreements from the Republican side and maybe even on our side, on the budget. But the budget does attempt to shake things up and change things, and does add back $1.2 billion to your budget. It does go to $300 million over last year, because our budget priorities are infrastructure, jobs and boosting the economy. So again, there will be a lot of debate on the floor over that,

but I hope colleagues will realize that we do our best in this budget to restore the funding and give it even $300 million over where we were last year.

Gentlemen, we are so happy you are here. Are you both going to speak to us today, or just one of the two of you, with prepared remarks?

Mr. WOODLEY. Chairman Boxer, I believe we are both prepared to.

Senator BOXER. That is good.

Mr. WOODLEY. But if you would prefer——

Senator BOXER. No, we would like to hear from both of you, actually. So 5 minutes each if you can.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN PAUL WOODLEY, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. WOODLEY. I will summarize the statement briefly and ask that the complete statement be included in the record.

Senator BOXER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. WOODLEY. 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 early 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 surges that have a 1 percent annual chance of occurring.

I would first like to talk about the annual civil works program. The 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, including assessment of comparative risks faced by different regions of the Country.

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 on objective performance criteria. The Fiscal Year 2009 construction performance criteria mirror those for Fiscal Year 2008, except that priorities accorded to projects that can be completed in Fiscal Year 2009. The budget allocates funding among ongoing construction projects based primarily on benefit to cost ratios. Priority is also accorded projects that reduce significant risks to human safety and to dam safety assurance, seepage control and static instability correction projects.

For operation and maintenance of the civil works projects, the Fiscal Year 2009 budget provides nearly $2.6 billion in the operation and maintenance account, and $163 million in the Mississippi River and Tributaries account, a total of $16 million higher than in the Fiscal Year 2008 budget for comparable activities, which in turn provided a substantial increase over prior O&M levels.

The budget also provides $729 million to be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for operation 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 for the last 2 years, the Fiscal Year 2009 budget proposes to allocate operation and maintenance funding on a regional basis. The budget proposes to allocate operation and maintenance funding among 54 areas based on USGS sub-watersheds. This approach will improve the overall performance of civil works assets. Managers in the field will be better able to maintain key infrastructure, adapt to uncertainties and address emergencies and other changed conditions over the course of the fiscal year.

As anticipated 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 phase out the existing fuel tax. The proposed legislation will be transmitted to Congress very soon after an executive branch inter-agency review of this proposal is completed. Prompt enactment of such legislation is needed to address the declining balance of 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 1 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 Area Restoration Effort, including $10 million for its science program.

The budget also provides $180 million for the Corps' regulatory program to protect wetlands and other waters of the United States. This is the same amount as both the budget and appropriation for Fiscal Year 2008, and, Madam Chair, represents a $55 million increase since 2001.

I'd like to turn to the proposed emergency appropriation, $5.76 billion. The Fiscal Year 2009 budget proposes to authorize the New Orleans Area Hurricane and Storm Damage and Risk Reduction System to be constructed with the State of Louisiana as the single non-Federal cost-sharing sponsor and subsequently maintained and operated by the State.

The pre-Katrina system for the Greater New Orleans area was built as a collection of separately authorized projects, designed with differing standards, subject to different requirements for non-Federal cost-sharing and managed by different local entities. Based on

the 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, the Chief of Engineers and I established a joint team to oversee its implementation. I meet bi-weekly with the 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, at $4.74 billion, the Fiscal Year 2009 Army Civil Works annual budget provides the resources for the civil works program to pursue investments that will yield very good returns for the Nation in the future. As in past years, this budget does not fund all the important work the Corps could do in Fiscal Year 2009. However, it represents wise use of funding to advance worthy mission-based objectives.

Chairman Boxer and members of the Committee, this is my last time to appear before you to present an Army Civil Works budget on behalf of President Bush. I want you to know that it has been a great pleasure and privilege to work with you, Senator Inhofe and all the other members of the Committee from time to time. I think it would be wrong of me not to mention that I believe this Committee is served by one of the most professional and knowledgeable staffs of any committee in any legislature anywhere in the world.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Mr. WOODLEY. We have a very complex program and they understand it and serve you very well, serve you and the people of the Country very well.

I want to also say that many of the efforts, as you will see in the coming year, represent a very, very substantial effort to implement the provisions of WRDA 2008. Much of our budget was developed and submitted in the early fall, well before WRDA 2007 was enacted. We were able to do some things late in the budget cycle to respond to the important initiatives of WRDA 2007. I appreciate the committee's disappointment that more was not done. But it really did come at a very late stage in our process. We would like to have done more and we will do more, I am confident we will do more in Fiscal Year 2009.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Woodley follows:]

STATEMENT OF JOHN PAUL WOODLEY, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Madam Chair and distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Committee, 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 fiscal year 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 hydro-

power, 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 fiscal year annual program is $4.741 billion. This is $130 million less than the fiscal year budget and $846 million less than Energy and Water Development appropriations for fiscal year 8. 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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-spe-

cific 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year guidelines mirror those for fiscal year 8, except that priority also is accorded to projects that can be completed in fiscal year 9.

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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 govern-

ments and other Federal agencies. The fiscal year 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 decisionmaking; 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 fiscal year 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 data base development that were begun with emergency supplemental appropriations of $30 million in fiscal year 6. 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 fiscal year 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 percent of construction costs on most projects and rebalancing of the proportion where prior expenditures from the general fund of the Treasury exceeded 50 percent.

The fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 1 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 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 8, and represents a $55 million increase since 2001. The funding will be used for permit processing, en-

forcement 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year and fiscal year 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 percent of the Nation's total energy needs.

The fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 Sec-

retary'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 fiscal year regular appropriations for the Civil Works program, the fiscal year Budget recommends enactment of fiscal year 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 percent 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 fiscal year 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 percent 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 percent 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 percent annual chance of occurring. Local entities would also be responsible for 100 percent 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 fiscal year 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 Chair and members of the Committee, 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 Committee to present the Civil Works budget on behalf of President Bush. It has been my pleasure working with this Committee.

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 startup 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 floodplain, 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.

RESPONSES BY JOHN PAUL WOODLEY JR. TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BOND

Question 1. In regards to the drainage deficiencies at the L–385 levee at Riverside MO. There was a flood on the Missouri River in May 2007; following this flood the levee district inspected the gate wall pipes as part of their routine maintenance. Problems were noted in several locations. The Corps has planned to install seals where the joints have failed and are due to be installed prior to April 1, 2008. The local sponsor has objected that they should not be responsible for the cost of the repair because they have already paid for the design and construction. However, the Corps concluded that the repair is subject to cost share even if it is determined to be a design or construction deficiency. What time table has the Corps set to determine the cause of the pipe failures? If it is deemed a design deficiencYt why will the non-Federal investor be penalized for a Corps mistake? I also request that the Corps do a complete evaluation of the entire project to see if any other features are not working properly prior to the local sponsor taking over the operation and maintenance of this important flood control project.

Response. Seals have been installed at all the failed joints and the pipes are now fully functional. This effort was completed March 19. In addition the Corps has initiated a thorough investigation to determine the cause of these failures. The investigation will be conducted by an Architect Engineer (AE) firm and completed in September 2008. At that point the Corps will be able to determine whether it is a design construction or material deficiency and will take the appropriate follow-on action. If further corrective action is required the estimated cost for that action will also be available at that time.

I understand the sponsor's concern about sharing the cost of the repair. However this is a post-WRDA 86 cost shared project subject to the applicable cost-sharing provisions of the law. The Corps is required by law to follow the cost sharing requirements set forth therein.

With regard to a complete evaluation of the entire project the Corps and the sponsor have completed an inspection of all structures. All levee features are fully functional and no other deficiencies were found. Although the sponsor has not officially taken over the project, the sponsor has been operating and maintaining the project since 2005.

RESPONSES BY JOHN PAUL WOODLEY JR. TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BOXER

Question 1. Since WRDA 2007 became law on November 8, 2007, insufficient progress has been made on the programmatic changes known collectively as Corps Reform. While the law was enacted on November 8, the conference report was filed on August 31. The Corps and the Secretary's office have had over 7 months to know what the new requirements would look like. Two of the most significant of the programmatic changes, independent review and improvements in the mitigation program, became effective upon enactment and certainly came as no surprise since similar language was in both chambers' bills. How are you implementing the requirements to include specific mitigation plans in project study reports—requirements that include mitigation success criteria, monitoring responsibilities, a description of lands to be acquired, and contingency plans should initial mitigation efforts fail?

Response. The Corps of Engineers is conducting a gap analysis on Section 2036(a) of WRDA 2007 requirements; the new Regulatory Mitigation Rule, which was published in the Federal Register on April 10, 2008; and applicable Civil Works Planning policies to identify those areas where the Civil Works program may need modification to comply with the mitigation standards and policies of the regulatory program. Detailed implementation guidance to correct any deficiencies will be developed based on the identified gaps. The gap analysis is scheduled to be completed by May 23, 2008. The gap analysis will be used to develop implementation guidance. Implementation guidance will be developed based on the resulting recommendations and should be completed by July 31. Any significant issues identified may result in interim guidance until resolution.

Question 2. Has implementing guidance been issued? If not, when will it be? If so, please provide a copy.

Response. The implementing guidance has not been issued. Implementation guidance will be developed based on the recommendations arising from the gap analysis

and should be completed by July 31, 20008. Any significant issues identified may result in interim guidance until resolution. We will provide you a copy of the implementing guidance when completed.

Question 3. How many projects studies have been modified to reflect the new requirements? Specifically list each project and how it has been modified. If projects have not been modified, why not?

Response. The Corps of Engineers is currently gathering data from district offices on ongoing project studies that include or will include mitigation and whether or not the project studies have been modified to reflect the new requirements. Due to the effort required to respond, the comprehensive list will be provided as soon as possible.

Question 4. Are there studies that include mitigation that have been completed or noticed for public comment since WRDA 1907 was enacted? Please identify the studies. Have they complied with the new law?

Response. The Corps of Engineers is currently gathering data from district offices on ongoing project studies that include or will include mitigation. Due to the effort required to respond, the comprehensive list will be provided by the end ofJune.

Question 5. Section 2036(b) ofWRDA 1907 requires that a status report on mitigation be submitted concurrent with the submission of the budget request. Has that status report been submitted? When will it be?

Response. The Corps of Engineers is currently gathering data on the major elements ofSection 2036(b) including the status of mitigation for all projects under construction, all projects that have requested funding, and all, projects that have undergone construction or completed construction but not completed mitigation. An interim status report based on this data will be provided to you by the end of June 2008. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is developing a data base and protocols for data collection in order to submit a more detailed status report with the next budget.

Question 6. Section 2034 of WRDA 1907 requires independent review of projects meeting certain criteria, and it includes a look back to studies initiated up to 2 years ago. For what projects have you initiated independent reviews? What are your plans to initiate independent reviews?

Response. USACE has had independent peer review guidance for project feasibility studies formally in place since May, 2()05 (EC 1105–2–408), and a number of independent external reviews have been completed since that time. The Corps is currently in the process of consolidating and upgrading all of its Civil Works product review guidance with new policy to cover all work from feasibility studies through design, construction and operations and maintenance programs. The new review policy will comply with Section 2034 and Section 2035 of WRDA 2007; Section 515 ofPublic Law 106–554 (referred to as the "Data Quality Atoll); and the Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review by the Office ofManagement and Budget. This will strengthen the quality and reliability ofCorps studies, designs and projects by adjusting and supplementing our current review processes. Section 2034 of WRDA 2007 identifies some potential exemptions from external review for routine actions that may be expensive but routine (such as replacing hydropower turbines in place, etc.). The Corps has not exercised any exemptions to date.

Question 7. How many projects currently under study are subject to the requirements of section 2034 for there to be independent review? Provide the Committee a list of project studies subject to the independent review provision.

Response. [continuing]. USACE currently has 63 General Investigation studies slated for independent external peer review. The attached list is comprised of efforts that have been confirmed and approved by the respective Major Subordinate Commands (Corps Division offices). This list is not all inclusive since we are in a dynamic environment, but it represents the firm list to date.

Question 8. Do you have the resources in the budget to accomplish the independent reviews? Your request for independent reviews in the Investigations account lists only $1 million.

Response. The amount budgeted for independent peer reviews represents a careful consideration of all the competing budgetary requirements and was deemed to sufficiently cover those studies included in the Budget. Should additional funds be required during fiscal year or fiscal year 9, funds will be sought from within study allocations or possibly through reprogramming, is excess funds available for this purpose can be identified.

Question 9. In developing the independent review section, the conferees worked very hard to ensure that any potential delays in the study process were eliminated

or minimized. Will your delay in implementing WRDA 1907 cause delays in completing studies, including independent reviews?

Response. Provisions for incorporating independent review into the Corps study process and scheduling have been in place since May 2005 (EC 1105–2–408). Strategies for review are part of each study's Project Management Plan (PMP), and are designed to avoid any added delays due to review. Inevitably studies' schedules may change for a variety of reasons including review, but there is no systematic effect of independent review delaying study completion. Section 2034 of WRDA 2007 changed the cost sharing for independent review to be fully Federal (up to $500K) which may lead to a funding constraint until fiscal year when this requirement will be incorporated into the normal process. Should additional funds be required during fiscal year or fiscal year 9, normal budgetary procedures requiring close cooperation between the Congress and the Administration to fund the newly enacted provisions will be used to seek funds where independent external peer review funds have not been appropriated.

Question 10. Section 2031 of WRDA 1907 requires a revision of the planning principles and guidelines which the Corps uses to develop project recommendations.

What is the status of the revisions? Will the revisions be completed within the 2 years required by law?

Response. We have already initiated revision of the Principles and the Standards (Chapter 1 of the current GuideliJ;le). The Principles and Standards focus on the basic water resources planning process including the national objectives that drive choices among alternative plans. We intend to finish revising the Principles and Standards by November of this year. I have also directed the Corps to initiate a survey of needs for revising the remaining segments of the current Principles and Guidelines. This segment contains the Procedures in Chapters II through IV of the current Guidelines on how to evaluate the benefits of water resources projects. Revising these Procedures is a matter of considerable scope and detail; a greater effort will be required for revising the Procedures than for revising the Principles and the Standards. The Corps survey of Procedures will include a schedule and cost estimate for completing revision of these Procedures. We will make every effort to meet the 2 year statutory requirement.

Question 11. Do you have the necessary resources dedicated in the budget to accomplish the revisions in the time called for?

Response. For the present effort of revising the Principles and Standards, we have dedicated sufficient resources within our available General Expense appropriation.

Question 12. What steps are you taking to ensure consultation with other Federal agencies, as required, and what steps are you taking to solicit and consider public and expert comments?

Response. I have notified the agency heads specified in Section 2031 seeking their suggestions for revising the P&S and I have requested their assistance in establishing staff designees to carry out the consultation requirements. On June 5th, prior to release of draft revisions of the Principles and Standards, I will hold a meeting here in Washington with the interested public to hear their ideas for revisions to the Principles and Standards. We also will be taking written suggestions from the public. The Federal Register clerk has our notice for this meeting, and we are issuing a press release to publicize the meeting through the Corps Public Affairs Office.

In addition we will be following prescribed procedures for vetting of guidance. When the draft revision is complete we will publish this draft on the Corps web site and place a notice in the Federal Register inviting public comments. We will receive comments for thirty days.

With regard to receiving expert review and comments, our plan is to contract with a nationally recognized institution to establish a consulting committee of experts, and we're moving expeditiously to put that proposal in place through a contract. Our vision is that the institution with which we contract will hold a conference in early August where an in dependently chosen panel of experts will review the draft revision of the Principles and Standards. By that time the comments from the public review of the draft revision also will be available to the independent panel. Furthermore, this independent review panel conference will be open to the public and will provide an additional opportunity for water resources interests to participate in the process. Therefore, I am confident that the process we envision will solicit and fully consider expert review that is fully integrated with public participation.

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
LRD	LRB	Buffalo River Section 312	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRC	Grand Calumet River Section 312 (Indiana Harbor)	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRP	Mahoning River Section 312	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRP	Upper Ohio River, Emsworth, Dashields, and Montogomery (EDM) Feasibility Study	Navigation
MVD	MVN	Alexandria to the Gulf	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Calcasieu Lock	Inland Navigation
MVD	MVN	Donaldsonville to the Gulf	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Houma Navigation Canal Deepening	Deep Draft Navigation
MVD	MVN	LCA Barataria Basin Barrier Shoreline Ecosystem Restoration	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	LCA Beneficial Use of Dredged Material (BUDMAT) Program	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration, LA (LACPR)	Flood Risk Management and Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	Plaquemines Parish Urban Flood Control	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Southwest Coastal Louisiana Hurricane Protection Study	Hurricane and Storm Risk Management
MVD	MVN	West Shore, Lake Ponchartrain, LA	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVP	Blue Earth Ecosystem Restoration, MN, SD, IA, ND	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVP	St Croix River Endangered Mussel Relocation, MN & WI	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVP	Wild Rice Feasibility Study	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVR	NESP - Project P2, Fish Passage, Lock & Dam 22.	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVS	NESP - Interim Report on Economics	Inland Navigation
NAD	NAB	Middle Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, MD	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAE	Boston Harbor (45-Foot Channel), MA	Deep Draft Navigation
NAD	NAN	Bayville Project's Beach Erosion Control and Storm Damage Reduction Feasibility Study	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NAD	NAN	Bronx River Basin, NY Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	FIMP Reformulation	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NAD	NAN	HRE Hackensack Review Plan	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Hudson-Raritan Estuary (HRE), NY and NJ	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Jamaica Bay, Marine Park and Plumb Beach, NY	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Lower Passaic HRE	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Millstone	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration

8/6/2008

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
NAD	NAN	Peckman	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Ramapo, Mahwah, NY, NJ	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWK	Kansas City Levees, MO & KS	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWP	Eugene-Springfield Metro Waterways, OR, Multi-purpose Feasibility Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
NWD	NWP	Lower Willamette Feasibility Study, OT (Willamette River Environmental Dredging)	Ecosystem Restoration
NWD	NWS	Elliott Bay Seawall, WA	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NWD	NWS	Puget Sound Nearshore Marine Habitat Restoration, WA	Ecosystem Restoration
NWD	NWS	Skagit River, WA	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWW	Walla Walla River Watershed, OR & WA	Ecosystem Restoration
POD	POA	Yakutat Watershed Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
POD	POH	Ala Wai Canal Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
SAD	SAJ	L-31 Seepage Managment Pilot Project Design Report	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAJ	Brevard County Midreach, FL GRR	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAJ	Caloosahatchee River (C-43) West Basin Storage Reservoir Project	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAJ	Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor, FL	Navigation
SAD	SAJ	Port Everglades Harbor, FL	Navigation
SAD	SAJ	Tamiami Trail, FL	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAM	Savannah Harbor	Navigation
SAD	SAW	Bogue Banks, NC	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAW	Brunswick County Beaches	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAW	Surf City & North Topsail Beach, NC	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	American River Watershed Project, Economic Reevaluation Report, CA	Flood Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	American River, Folsom Dam Mod. & Raise, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Delta Levees and Islands, CA	
SPD	SPK	Grayson and Murderer's Creeks, Walnut Creek Basin, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Natomis GRR, CA	Flood Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	Sutter Basin, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Sutter County, CA	Flood Damage Reduction

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
SPD	SPK	Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, NV	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWF	Cibolo IFS, GSAR, TX	Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWF	Elm Creek, Abilene, TX	Flood Damage Reduction
SWD	SWF	Nueces Basin, TX	Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWG	Freeport Harbor, TX	Navigation
SWD	SWG	Sabine-Neches Waterway, TX	Navigation

RESPONSES BY JOHN PAUL WOODLEY JR. TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR INHOFE

Question 1. Secretary Woodley, last year's budget stated that we need to increase revenues into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. This year's budget includes only the broad outlines sofa proposal-namely, moving from the current diesel tax to lockage fees yet your written testimony states that prompt enactment is needed. When will we see the actual proposal?

Response. We expect to submit proposed legislative language to the Congress in April 2008.

Question 2. Will the proposal be accompanied by any analysis of the impacts on users of the inland waterways system as a whole," as well as the impacts on users of different portions of the system?

Response. The Corps has this information. We would be happy to provide it to the Congress.

Question 3. The budget request includes funds for a National Portfolio assessment of water reallocation possibilities. One of the problems some of the communities in Oklahoma have run into is that even when there is available storage at, existing reservoirs, the Corps' policy on pricing that water supply storage makes it prohibitively expensive. How long has it been since this policy has been reevaluated?

Response. First, let me explain the two different pricing methods under current policy. Both methods involve the administrative reallocation of water storage, which is authorized in and limited by the Water Supply Act of 1958, as amended.

The first pricing method applies to existing storage that was authorized for water supply, but which has never been under contract. In these cases, the price is a proportional share of the original project cost, plus interest after a 10-year interest free period. This is intended to recover part of what it actually costs the Federal Government to construct the project, which was authorized to include storage for water supply from the beginning.

The second pricing method applies to the reallocation of storage from one user to another or there assignment of the use of existing storage space from one use to another purpose, as in a transfer from flood control or hydropower to water supply. In these cases, the price is based on the highest of the following: the value of benefits forgone; the revenues forgone; the replacement cost; or the updated cost of construction.

The pricing policy for the first method goes back to the Water Supply Act of 1958, which says the costs that the Federal Government incurs to provide storage for municipal and industrial water supply shall be paid by the beneficiaries of that storage. The pricing policy for the second method has been in effect since 1979. Also, a community may qualify for a reduction in price under either method, as provided in Section 322 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

Question 4. Will you commit to working with me to see if we can improve this policy so that communities can afford the water supply storage opportunities the National Portfolio assessment may present?

Response. We always are willing to reexamine policies to ensUre that they are in the national interest.

Question 5. Sometimes on the other side of the issue, hydropower interests have expressed frustration with the Corps' policy of compensating them for lost generation due to reallocations. Will you work with me to see if we can find a compromise?

Response. We are sensitive to the impacts that reallocations from hydropower storage may have on power production and the corresponding effects on the rates that the regional power administrations charge their customers. We also are sensitive to the water supply needs of the public, especially the needs of growing communities across the country. We attempt to balance power production and water supply needs to maximize the benefits that Corps projects provide. The current policy is to charge a water supply user an amount sufficient to compensate the regional power authorities for their lost revenues. The hydropower interests prefer compensation based on replacement costs, which is generally higher. We are willing to work with the Congress to identify other possible ways to address such competing uses of storage space in Corps reservoirs.

Question 6. Secretary Woodley, as I have stated in previous hearings and meetings, I am very supportive of the concept mentioned in your testimony of allowing the Corps to use the fees it collects to operate, maintain and improve recreation opportunities. Unfortunately, we have consistently run into budget scoring problems that have prevented us from enacting such a proposal. Will you please commit to working with me to see if we can come up with other ways to accomplish this goal of improving recreation opportunities that don't have the same scoring hurdles?

Response. Yes I will. However, the Administration's legislative proposal does not involve allowing the Corps to use the fees that it now collects. Generally, the Corps would spend the additional revenues in the fiscal year after it collects them. Therefore, our proposal would not have a significant net scoring impact over a 10-year period.

Question 7. Could you please give more detail on implementation of Title 9 of WRDA 2007, the National Levee Safety Program? I am particularly interested in the estimated timeframe for receiving the recommendations from the Committee on Levee Safety.

Response. On November 8, 2007, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007) was enacted into law. Title IX of this WRDA is the National Levee Safety Act of 2007 (the Act). Section 9003 of this Title authorizes a Committee on Levee Safety (Committee), which would develop recommendations for a national levee safety program, including a strategic plan for implementing this program.

The Committee would consist of 16 members. The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or their representatives, are two of the members. The Secretary of the Army would select the other 14 members as provided in section 9003. The members have not yet been selected. However, we anticipate that it should take the Committee about 180 days to develop recommendations, counting from the date of its first meeting. Of course, the actual schedule will depend on the views of the members and the nature of their recommendations.

In addition, section 9004 of Title IX authorizes the Secretary of the Army to inventory and inspect certain levees. The Corps has already begun this work using the $30 million in fiscal year supplemental appropriations that the Congress has previously provided.

RESPONSES BY JOHN PAUL WOODLEY JR. TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR CARPER

Question 1. As you know, chief among the WRDA 2007 reforms is the new requirement for independent review of all Corps projects that are controversial or valued at more than $45 million. I've been a strong supporter of this requirement, which will improve the safety, quality, and environmental and fiscal soundness of water resources projects. Where is the Corps along the path to independent review compliance? Have any independent reviews been conducted yet? Are certain projects exempt from the independent review requirement? If so, which kinds? Could you provide this Committee with a comprehensive list of projects slated for independent review?

Response. The Corps has had independent peer review guidance formally in place for project feasibility studies since May, 2005 (EC 1105–2–408), and a number of independent external peer reviews have been completed since that time. The Corps is currently in the process of consolidating and upgrading all of its Civil Works product review guidance with new policy to cover all work from feasibility studies through design, construction, and operation and maintenance. The new review policy will comply with Section 2034 and Section 2035 of WRDA 2007; Section 515 of Public Law 106–554 (referred to as the "Data Quality Act"); and the Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review by the Office of Management and Budget. This will strengthen the quality and reliability of Corps studies, designs and projects by adjusting and supplementing our current review processes. Section 2034 of WRDA 2007 identifies some potential exemptions from external review for actions that may be expensive but are routine (such as replacing hydropower turbines in place, etc.). The Corps has not exercised any exemptions to date.

The Corps currently has 63 Investigation studies slated for independent external peer review. The attached list is comprised of efforts that have been confirmed and approved by the respective Major Subordinate Commands (Corps Division offices). This list is not all inclusive since we are in a dynamic environment, but it represents the firm list to date.

Question 2. The costs of independent review are to be fully covered by the Federal Government and capped at $500,000. I want to know if the Corps was able to properly budget this year, given the new review requirement. Does the Corps understand they are to work the costs of independent review—and fish and wildlife mitigation for that matter—into their project costs?

Response. In these times of constrained budgets, the amount requested for independent peer reviews represents, a careful consideration of all the competing budgetary requirements. The fiscal year budget for the Civil Works program includes $1 million for independent peer review of budgeted studies, which we determined was sufficient to cover those budgeted studies that would likely require peer review. In

some cases, the amount budgeted for a specific study already includes an estimate for independent review. It is standard practice for study cost estimates to include funding for mitigation investigations, including funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct its Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act review.

Question 3. I wish highlight the, growing concerns about the Port of Wilmington's capacity to store dredge material. I believe the situation at Wilmington reflects a nationwide problem of maintaining and enhancing our existing infrastructure to meet growing demand. The primary storage site—Harbor North—is closed and the Corps is currently looking for a new site. What does the Corps see as the long-term plan for assuring adequate access to Port of Wilmington given the increasing siltation rates at the mouth of the Christina River?

Response. The long-term plan for assuring adequate access to the Port of Wilmington requires the use of additional new dredged material disposal sites in the vicinity of the Port. Using funds added by Congress in .fiscal year 2008, the Corps is conducting a Dredged Material Management Plan to identify new disposal sites and establish a path forward to bring the sites on line. The management plan will include geotechnical analysis, designs, cost estimates, NEPA documentation, real estate requirements, and coordination with local, State and Federal agencies. The draft Management Plan is scheduled to be completed by September 2008.

Question 4. While protecting the Gulf Coast is a clear priority, there are also a number of venerable areas along the East Coast that are threatened by catastrophic storms and sea level change. Is the Corps approaching its projects and priorities with due diligence paid to the increasing potential for sea level rise? If so, how?

Response. Corps of Engineers current sea-level rise policy (published in 2000, developed in 1988) is being updated. The current policy directs that two specific rates of sea-level rise (a historic rate and a future projection) be considered in project planning and design. The future projection currently specified is based on the 1987 National Research Council report. This projection is generally considered to be extreme, even today, and is much greater than more recent projections by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Additionally, while the current policy directs studies to consider "the risk associated with a substantial rise, it does not provide any guidance on how to consider that risk. The Corps currently is updating this guidance based on the findings presented in the 2007 IPCC Fourth Assessment Report. The updated sea-level rise policy will include more recent efforts to project future sea-level rise rates and will provide more detailed guidance on how to estimate sea-level rise for specific locations, how to properly incorporate these estimates in an economic analysis, and how to assess coastal vulnerability and risk from sea-level rise. This effort will include the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

The Corps is in the process of analyzing other risks associated with climate change, which have varying levels of scientific uncertainty and/or impact on Corps missions. The Corps is collaborating with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, NOAA, USGS, and State and regional agencies to understand how climate change affects water resources and to develop planning processes to address the impacts. These efforts include studies in the Western United States to evaluate the observed trend to warmer temperatures and the associated changes in precipitation (snow vs. rain) and earlier spring runoff on flood risk, water supply, and ecosystems.

Question 5. Since 1986, the Corps has been required to include a detailed mitigation plan for all civil works projects that have more than minimal adverse impacts. These directives have not been closely followed: A May 2002 GAO report found that the Corps failed to mitigate at all for 69 percent of projects constructed since 1986. WRDA 2007 fleshes out the requirements of a mitigation plan, and imposes additional requirements including monitoring and consultation. Could you please provide me with an update on the Corps' efforts to become compliant with the new mitigation requirements? Has the Corps begun consulting with State and Federal agencies regarding the progress of mitigation for each project?

Response. The Corps of Engineers is conducting a gap analysis on Section 2036(a) requirements; the new Regulatory Mitigation Rule, which was published in the Federal Register on April 10, 2008; and applicable Civil Works Planning policies to identify those areas where the civil works program may need modification to comply with the mitigation standards and policies of the regulatory program. Detailed implementation guidance to correct any deficiencies will be developed based on the identified gaps. The gap analysis is scheduled to be completed by May 23, 2008. Implementation guidance will be developed based on the resulting recommendations and should be completed by July 31. Any significant issues identified may result in interim guidance until resolution.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) is the vehicle by which Federal agencies (USFWS, NMFS) and State wildlife agencies use to comment on Corps projects. This also includes mitigation plans. Many USFWS recommendations under the FWCA concern mitigation needs and goals. Section 2036 requires a formal consultation process and the Corps is developing protocols for that process.

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
LRD	LRB	Buffalo River Section 312	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRC	Grand Calumet River Section 312 (Indiana Harbor)	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRP	Mahoning River Section 312	Ecosystem Restoration
LRD	LRP	Upper Ohio River, Emsworth, Dashields, and Montogomery (EDM) Feasibility Study	Navigation
MVD	MVN	Alexandria to the Gulf	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Calcasieu Lock	Inland Navigation
MVD	MVN	Donaldsonville to the Gulf	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Houma Navigation Canal Deepening	Deep Draft Navigation
MVD	MVN	LCA Barataria Basin Barrier Shoreline Ecosystem Restoration	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	LCA Beneficial Use of Dredged Material (BUDMAT) Program	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration, LA (LACPR)	Flood Risk Management and Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVN	Plaquemines Parish Urban Flood Control	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVN	Southwest Coastal Louisiana Hurricane Protection Study	Hurricane and Storm Risk Management
MVD	MVN	West Shore, Lake Ponchartrain, LA	Flood Risk Management
MVD	MVP	Blue Earth Ecosystem Restoration, MN, SD, IA, ND	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVP	St Croix River Endangered Mussel Relocation, MN & WI	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVP	Wild Rice Feasibility Study	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVR	NESP - Project P2, Fish Passage, Lock & Dam 22.	Ecosystem Restoration
MVD	MVS	NESP - Interim Report on Economics	Inland Navigation
NAD	NAB	Middle Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, MD	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAE	Boston Harbor (45-Foot Channel), MA	Deep Draft Navigation
NAD	NAN	Bayville Project's Beach Erosion Control and Storm Damage Reduction Feasibility Study	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NAD	NAN	Bronx River Basin, NY Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	FIMP Reformulation	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NAD	NAN	HRE Hackensack Review Plan	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Hudson-Raritan Estuary (HRE), NY and NJ	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Jamaica Bay, Marine Park and Plumb Beach, NY	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Lower Passaic HRE	Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Millstone	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration

8/6/2008

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
NAD	NAN	Peckman	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
NAD	NAN	Ramapo, Mahwah, NY, NJ	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWK	Kansas City Levees, MO & KS	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWP	Eugene-Springfield Metro Waterways, OR, Multi-purpose Feasibility Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
NWD	NWP	Lower Willamette Feasibility Study, OT (Willamette River Environmental Dredging)	Ecosystem Restoration
NWD	NWS	Elliott Bay Seawall, WA	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
NWD	NWS	Puget Sound Nearshore Marine Habitat Restoration, WA	Ecosystem Restoration
NWD	NWS	Skagit River, WA	Flood Damage Reduction
NWD	NWW	Walla Walla River Watershed, OR & WA	Ecosystem Restoration
POD	POA	Yakutat Watershed Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
POD	POH	Ala Wai Canal Study	Watershed - Multipurpose
SAD	SAJ	L-31 Seepage Managment Pilot Project Design Report	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAJ	Brevard County Midreach, FL GRR	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAJ	Caloosahatchee River (C-43) West Basin Storage Reservoir Project	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAJ	Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach Harbor, FL	Navigation
SAD	SAJ	Port Everglades Harbor, FL	Navigation
SAD	SAJ	Tamiami Trail, FL	Ecosystem Restoration
SAD	SAM	Savannah Harbor	Navigation
SAD	SAW	Bogue Banks, NC	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAW	Brunswick County Beaches	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SAD	SAW	Surf City & North Topsail Beach, NC	Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	American River Watershed Project, Economic Reevaluation Report, CA	Flood Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	American River, Folsom Dam Mod. & Raise, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Delta Levees and Islands, CA	
SPD	SPK	Grayson and Murderer's Creeks, Walnut Creek Basin, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Natomis GRR, CA	Flood Damage Reduction
SPD	SPK	Sutter Basin, CA	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SPD	SPK	Sutter County, CA	Flood Damage Reduction

PEER REVIEW PLAN TRACKING - EPR anticipated

Division	District	Study Name	Primary Mission Area
SPD	SPK	Truckee Meadows Flood Control Project, NV	Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWF	Cibolo IFS, GSAR, TX	Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWF	Elm Creek, Abilene, TX	Flood Damage Reduction
SWD	SWF	Nueces Basin, TX	Ecosystem Restoration
SWD	SWG	Freeport Harbor, TX	Navigation
SWD	SWG	Sabine-Neches Waterway, TX	Navigation

Senator BOXER. Thank you, sir. I will be asking you about that. We have enjoyed working with you all over there as well.

General.

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

General Van Antwerp. Thank you, Madam Chair and distinguished members of the Committee. It is really an honor for me to be here before you this morning and testify.

Fiscal year 2007 and the first quarter of 2008 have been busy and challenging for the Corps. In addition to the subject of this hearing, in our military programs, our program with Base Realignment and Closure, Grow the Force and Restation the Force has had such things as $2 billion, $3 billion at some of our installations. I think we are seeing a re-facing of our installations across the Army. So we are privileged to be a part of that.

Now, in civil works, as we look back, just to take a glimpse, we have completed 10 navigation projects in 2007. This particular budget here completes 12 projects in 2009. We restored over 5,000 acres under ecosystem restoration, dredged 175 channels, 368 million visitor days at our recreation sites, supported FEMA in response to 10 national disasters and processed over 87,000 permits.

So as we look forward to the Fiscal Year 2009 budget, it is a performance-based budget. It reflects the focus on projects and priorities that provide the highest net economic and environmental returns and/or addresses significant risks to human safety. It allocates funding for 79 projects for construction. It includes 11 dam safety projects, 16 life safety, and as I said, completes 12 projects in Fiscal Year 2009.

One of the emphases we will have in the Corps this year, and as this budget in 2009 reflects, is in the cost-engineering improvement area. We are really working hard to improve our cost estimates and accuracy of those costs as we go through the development process. We've stood up an independent review of cost estimates by a center of expertise in the Walla Walla District.

Finally, I'd like to say that the Corps is a very expeditionary force. Today we have over 800 civilians deployed. We have four districts, three in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. We have many heroes out there that are doing wonderful things for the Country.

Then finally, I want to State our commitment to continuous improvement. We are moving on what we call good to great, stealing from a great author who wrote the book, Good to Great. But it is where we want to go as a Corps. That means we have to deliver quality, we have to continuously improve and incorporate lessons learned, be good stewards and team with our cost-sharing partners.

That concludes my statement, and I look forward to taking questions.

[The prepared statement of Lieutenant General Antwerp follows:]

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

Madam Chair and distinguished members of the Committee, I am honored to be testifying before your committee 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 fiscal year 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 FISCAL YEAR 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 significant 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 fiscal year 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 safety, 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 ecosystem 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 fiscal year 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 decisionmakers 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 assurance 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 Chair and Members of the Committee. This concludes my statement.

RESPONSE BY ROBERT VAN ANTWERP TO AN ADDITIONAL QUESTION FROM SENATOR WARNER

Question. For the Roanoke River Flood Control project, the Corps had budgeted $5 million in FY' 05 and FY 06. Then $8.3 million in FY 07 and $10.16 million in FY 08. For FY 09, the Corps only budgeted $1.075 million. Can you assure the committee that the Roanoke River Flood Control project remains a viable project for the Corps and does the Corps expect the project to save property and lives?

Response. Yes, sir. The Roanoke River, Upper Basin, Virginia project remains an economically viable and environmentally sound flood damage reduction project that can potentially save lives and reduce flood damage to properties. The $1.075 million funding level was the capability level of funding, or the most that the Corps could efficiently and effectively spend during FY 09.

RESPONSES BY ROBERT VAN ANTWERP TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR INHOFE

Question 1. General Van Antwerp, the Committee has noted for the last several years that the balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund continues to grow, even as many of our nation's ports are not operating at authorized depths due to lack of funding. The American Association of Port Authorities has estimated that at least $1.3 billion is needed for fiscal year 2009 for operation and maintenance activities that are funded through the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Would you agree with that estimate?

Response. Senator we agree that $1.3 billion is an estimate of what could be budgeted for these activities, in Fiscal Year 2009 to maintain our coastal navigation projects. The 2009 Budget effectively balanced the Corps' diverse portfolio ofCorps infrastructure projects, of which coastal navigation channels are a part.

Question 2. What is the Corps' capability for fiscal year 09?

Response. The Corps' capability for maintenance of coastal navigation projects in fiscal year could be as high as $1.3 billion, which includes additional dredging, dredged material placement site construction and maintenance, and jetty, breakwater and certain bridge maintenance. However, a number of external factors could reduce this capability estimate substantially, including natural events, the timing of appropriations bill passage, etc.

RESPONSES BY ROBERT VAN ANTWERP TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR VOINOVICH

Question 1. [Provide] a list of QM and CO backlog projects.

Response. NOTE: Similar question from Rep. Boustany, Transportation and Infrastructure Hearing on deferred maintenance and similar questions from Visclosky QFR #60 on O&M backlog and similar answer.

The Construction and O&M Backlog Tables are attached; however, this backlog listing of projects 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 backlog is relatively high priority whereas other work may be a lower priority relative to funding needs in other Corps areas.

Question 2. [What is] the total that the Corps has spent on Katrina related projects. What would be the Corps objectives for working to decrease this backlog of projects?

Response. Sir, the Corps has expended $2.7 billion on Katrina related projects. With the fiscal year Budget of $5.761 billion in emergency appropriations the goal is to have100-year protection by the end of 2011. Some features that dentate 100-year protection are scheduled to complete after 2011, including permanent pumps at the three outfall canals and features of the Southeast Louisiana interior drainage project. The work in Mississippi has been completed, other than administrative legal processes which could take a number of years due to the appeals process.

Question 3. How much money is in the Hub or Maintenance Trust Fund?

Response. The balance in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund as of January 31, 2008 (latest report available from Treasury) is $4.349 billion.

Question 4. How much money has the Corps allocated to the Great Lakes in the fiscal year budget for dredging and what are the Corps capabilities for these dredging projects?

Response. The table below lists the estimated Great Lakes Dredging in the fiscal year President's Budget and our capability by project. Please note that the amounts represent an illustrative distribution of funding that may change and should not be considered to be budget estimates. The total, illustrative, estimated funding for

Great Lakes dredging in the Budget is $36,075,000, and the capability is $62,211,000 for all channels and harbors, regardless of size or commercial tonnage.

FY09 CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG by PROJECT

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
AK	SITKA HARBOR, AK	5,950
AK	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	500
AK	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	9,000
AL	MOBILE HARBOR TURNING BASIN	16,200
AR	BEAVER LAKE, AR	600
AR	FOURCHE BAYOU BASIN, LITTLE ROCK, AR	3,536
AR	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	40,000
AR	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,000
AR	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR & TX	8,000
AR	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	12,000
AR	WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOWS, AR	28,671
AZ	NOGALES WASH, AZ	11,000
AZ	RIO DE FLAG FLAGSTAFF, AZ	22,970
AZ	TRES RIOS, AZ	20,000
AZ	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	21,844
CA	AMER RVR - DAM RAISE	1,000
CA	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON FEATURES), CA	20,000
CA	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA	4,500
CA	CACHE CREEK SETTLING	20
CA	CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM, CA	45,000
CA	CAMBRIA SEAWATER DESALINATION, CA	2,000
CA	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	2,385
CA	COLORADO LAGOON, CA	835
CA	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	700
CA	FARMINGTON RECHARGE (SEC 502)	3,000
CA	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	12,000
CA	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	3,126
CA	HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING STUDY, LOS ANGELES, CA	10,000
CA	IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	2,000
CA	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	885
CA	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	215
CA	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,000
CA	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500
CA	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	14,000
CA	NAPA RIVER, CA	30,605
CA	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	8,000
CA	NORCO BLUFFS, SANTA ANA RIVER, CA	1,183
CA	NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE, CA	7,000
CA	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	350
CA	PLACER COUNTY SUB-REGIONAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT	5,000
CA	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	2,455
CA	RAMS COORD WESTERN REGION	10
CA	SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	200
CA	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	79,032
CA	SALTON SEA RESTORATION, CA	2,000
CA	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	1,400
CA	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	500
CA	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	7,281
CA	SAN RAMON VALLEY RECYCLED WATER, CA	6,600
CA	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	102,500
CA	SANTA MARIA LEEVES, CA	1,500
CA	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	4,000
CA	SOUTH PERRIS, CA	20,000
CA	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	6,000
CA	STOCKTON METROPOLITIAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	10,000
CA	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	780
CA	TULE RIVER, CA	2,820
CA	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	8,500

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
CA	UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA	10,823
CA	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	1,677
CA	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	23,400
CA	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,000
CO	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,000
CO	ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	4,000
DC	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	4,653
DE	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE & NJ	250
DE	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, PT. MAHON, DE & NJ	5,000
DE	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	1,390
DE	DELAWARE COAST, BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY BEACH	150
DE	DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	2,150
DE	DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	150
FL	BROWARD COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSABLE)	1,000
FL	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	1
FL	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA	28,375
FL	COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN	1,805
FL	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	250
FL	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	12,192
FL	LAKE WORTH SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	3,587
FL	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSABLE)	6,664
FL	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	15,000
FL	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	2,700
FL	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	2,561
FL	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	4,000
FL	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	250
FL	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	3,793
FL	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL, FL	9,297
FL	SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	34,641
FL	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER, FL	10,000
FL	TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL	13,015
FL	TAMPA HARBOR, FL'	2,367
GA	ALLATOONA POWERHOUSE REHAB	8,241
GA	AUGUSTA, GA	2,587
GA	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	498
GA	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,081
GA	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA & SC	19,359
GA	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	1,500
GA	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	1,615
GA	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	3,023
HI	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	6,000
IA	DAVENPORT, IA	4,850
IA	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	6,962
IA	DES MOINES RECREATION RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA	16,840
IA	LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	1,375
ID	RURAL IDAHO, ID	7,500
IL	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	8,950
IL	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	5,000
IL	COOK COUNTY INFRASTRUCTURE, IL	2,000
IL	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	18,000
IL	EAST ST LOUIS & VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), IL	375
IL	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	1,007
IL	GREAT LAKES FISHERIES AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL, IN, MN, OH & PA	10,215
IL	ILL WW OBRIEN L&D	10,535
IL	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION , IL	8,835
IL	LAGRANGE LOCK & DAM, ILWW, IL	4,160
IL	MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, IL	3,000
IL	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	3,467
IL	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	300

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
IL	OHIO RIVER SE ILLINOIS	400
IL	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEV., IL B5	5,000
IL	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	13,520
IL	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	4,816
IN	CALUMET REGION, IN	4,000
IN	CEDAR LAKE, IN	5,700
IN	CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, IN	1,000
IN	GRAND CALUMET RAP, INDIANA	500
IN	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	1,600
IN	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	5,307
IN	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	13,000
IN	LAKE MICHIGAN WATERFRONT, IN	2,000
IN	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	6,000
IN	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	300
IN	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	2,100
KS	M5-CAP-1135-GARDEN CITY, KS	45
KS	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	21,200
KY	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	12,500
KY	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	12,170
KY	KENTUCKY RIVER, LOCK AND DAM 10, KY	500
KY	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	1,100
KY	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY	3,000
LA	ASCENSION PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	2,000
LA	COMITE RIVER, LA	18,000
LA	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, LA	2,000
LA	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	25,000
LA	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	1,870
LA	IBERIA PARISH, LA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	2,000
LA	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	10,000
LA	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	18,500
LA	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	40,000
LA	LIVINGSTON PARISH ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	2,000
LA	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	3,000
MA	MUDDY RIVER, MA	7,000
MD	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	200
MD	BALTIMORE METRO - GWYNNS FALLS, MD	2,000
MD	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA & PA	2,000
MD	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	3,500
MD	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	200
MD	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	2,175
MI	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	17,000
MN	BRECKENRIDGE, MN	2,877
MN	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	3,000
MN	MILLE LACS REGIONAL WASTEWATER, MN (GARRISON/ KATHIO TWNSHP)	2,000
MN	NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MN	10,000
MN	ROSEAU, MN	6,000
MN	STILLWATER, MN	1,439
MO	ALTON TO GALE	300
MO	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	4,120
MO	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	7,600
MO	BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI	8,077
MO	CAPE GIRARDEAU (FLOODWALL), MO	4,942
MO	CHESTERFIELD, MO	5,000
MO	EAST AR ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY	500
MO	L&D25 SAFETY STUDY OF SCOUR	1,250
MO	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	295
MO	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	4,104
MO	MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT, MO	3,000
MO	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	2,600

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
MO	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	3,000
MO	ST. LOUIS, MO (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW)	3,000
MO	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	500
MO	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	2,000
MS	DESOTO COUNTY WASTEWATER TREATMENT, MS	4,860
MS	MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MS	25,000
MT	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	950
MT	RURAL MONTANA, MT	12,325
NC	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	550
NC	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	400
NC	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	20,000
NC	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	2,610
NC	STANLY COUNTY - HWY 740	1,500
NC	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	400
NC	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	96,075
NC	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	300
ND	GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	3,000
ND	OHIO ENV INFRASTRUCTURE (SEC 594)	15,000
NE	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	500
NE	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	2,800
NE	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NEBRASKA	1,500
NE	WESTERN SARPY COUNTY AND CLEAR CREEK	6,156
NJ	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND), NJ	14,900
NJ	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NJ	80
NJ	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ - OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ	250
NJ	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT	3,500
NJ	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS, DE & NJ	7,000
NJ	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	34,885
NJ	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	7,300
NJ	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	250
NJ	JOSEPH G MINISH HISTORIC WATERFRONT PARK,NJ	7,500
NJ	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	250
NJ	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS SYSTEM, CA	23,300
NJ	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, NJ	5,502
NJ	RAMAPO AND MAHWAH RIVERS, MAHWAH, NJ AND SUFFERN, NY	750
NJ	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY(PORT MONMOUTH), NJ	5,000
NJ	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000
NJ	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	10,000
NJ	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	14,700
NM	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	2,400
NM	ALBUQUERQUE LEVEES	500
NM	CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	363
NM	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	500
NM	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE RESTORATION	8,000
NM	NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM	8,829
NM	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, ALBUQUERQUE, NM	13,097
NV	TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION 108	4,000
NV	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	7,247
NY	BDOB ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX NY	3,111
NY	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, NY	500
NY	GLFER - GRINDSTONE CREEK DAM	25
NY	GLFER - UPPER NIAGARA R.	25
NY	LAKE CHATAUQUA	50
NY	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	5,000
NY	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	80,900
NY	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	1,000
NY	NEW YORK ENV. INFRASTRUCT.	5,000
NY	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	500
NY	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	5,000

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
NY	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	8,900
NY	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	315
NY	TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	300
NY	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON REST, COOPERSTOWN, NY	923
OH	ATWOOD LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	200
OH	BEACH CITY LAKE, OH SEEPAGE CORRECTION REHAB	1,500
OH	BOLIVAR DAM, OH SEEPAGE MAJOR REHAB	1,500
OH	CLENDENING DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	500
OH	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	750
OH	DOVER DAM, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	6,500
OH	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	600
OH	HOLES CREEK	2,600
OH	MAHONING RIVER, OH	4,000
OH	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	9,384
OH	MILL CREEK, OH	6,000
OH	MOHAWK DAM, OH SEEPAGE CORRECTION MAJOR REHAB	1,500
OH	OHIO ENV INFRASTRUCTURE (SEC 594)	22,603
OH	OHIO RIVERFRONT STUDY, CINCINNATI, OH	8,000
OH	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, OH	3,300
OH	PLEASANT HILL LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER, OH (DAM SAFETY)	1,000
OH	ZOAR LEVEE @ DOVER DAM, OH SEEPAGE CORRECTION - REHAB	1,500
OK	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	290
OK	LAWTON, OKLAHOMA	30
OK	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	31,000
OK	YUKON, OKLAHOMA	30
OR	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	5,315
OR	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	2,000
PA	EAST BRANCH DAM - PA	1,000
PA	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	586
PA	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	4,782
PA	NORTHEAST COUNTIES ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	1,500
PA	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	1,000
PA	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	1,000
PA	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	16,405
PA	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	800
PA	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, PA	5,000
PA	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, PA	3,200
PA	THREE RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMO PROGRAM, PA	2,500
PA	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	10,000
PR	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	763
PR	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	17,000
PR	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	500
PR	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	7,000
SC	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	250
SC	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	12,825
SC	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	11,688
SD	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	14,427
SD	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	6,000
SD	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	6,500
TN	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	4,000
TN	SHELBY COUNTY, TN	300
TX	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	22,618
TX	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES (CULLEN PARK)	6,020
TX	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,000
TX	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	1,000
TX	CENTRAL CITY, FORT WORTH, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	30,000
TX	CLEAR CREEK, TX	1,500
TX	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,000
TX	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX	16,000

PRIMARY STATE	PROJECT NAME	FY 2009 Backlog ($000)
TX	EL PASO, TX	800
TX	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	2,000
TX	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	3,400
TX	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	10,000
TX	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	100
TX	JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON, TX	2,000
TX	LOWER COLORADO WHARTON/ONION TX	11,000
TX	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,900
TX	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX & OK	5,163
TX	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	14,700
TX	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	5,700
TX	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	41,073
TX	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,500
UT	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	50
UT	RURAL UTAH	5,812
VA	AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	7,608
VA	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	1,400
VA	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	3,660
VA	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80
VT	LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATE,VT	2,000
WA	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	5,280
WA	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	16,445
WA	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,580
WA	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	4,000
WA	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WA	7,945
WA	SHOALWATER BAY, WA	5,700
WI	NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI	6,870
WI	ST. CROIX FALLS SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, WI	4,207
WV	CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	3,000
WV	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	1,500
WV	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WEST VIRGINIA	200
WV	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	600
WV	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA & KY	56,000
WV	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	1,050
WV	SOUTHERN WV ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, WVV RESTORATION, W	4,000
WV	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, PA & WV	4,000
WY	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	890
	TOTAL	**2,426,142**

FY09 O&M BACKLOG BEYOND BUDGET by PROJECT

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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
CA	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	SPD	$180.0
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
CT	PATCHOGUE RIVER, CT	NAD	$1,500.0
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
GA	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	SAD	$16,208.0
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
KS	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	NWD	$236.1
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
MA	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	NAD	$9.7
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	$87.8
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
MI	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	LRD	$928.8
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NC	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	SAD	$11,594.8
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NJ	SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	NAD	$9,610.0
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
NY	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	NAD	$59.3
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
OK	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	SWD	$1,185.7
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	WILLAMETTE 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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
PA	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	LRD	$4,214.6
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
TX	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	SWD	$7,368.0
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
VA	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	LRD	$38.4
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

PRIMARY STATE	PROGRAM CODE NAME	MSC	FY 2009 Deferred Maintenance Portion ($000)
WI	SAXON HARBOR, WI	LRD	$310.0
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**

RESPONSES BY ROBERT VAN ANTWERP TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR VITTER

Question 1. In 2007, the Corps of Engineers released a technical report on the alternatives for the outfall canals and pumping stations near Lake Pontchartrain. This technical report was required by section 4303 of the P.L. 110–28. This report discusses an option 280 to pump to the river, and provides discharges directly to the Mississippi River in Jefferson parish. Please further describe the advantages and operational effectiveness of option 2a.

Response. It should be noted that the option to discharge directly to the Mississippi River in Jefferson Parish was not considered as a stand-alone solution because it does not satisfy the purpose of the project, which is to provide hurricane storm surge protection for the three outfall canals (17th Street, Orleans Avenue, and London Avenue), while not impeding evacuation of storm water. Therefore, the advantages and disadvantages and operational effectiveness of the option to discharge directly to the Mississippi River in Jefferson Parish were considered in addition to those of Option 2. The additional advantages and operational effectiveness for this option are listed below.

• Increases interior drainage capacity and reduces local flooding. The area of Jefferson Parish served by this diversion would have supplemental or redundant drainage capacity (local). It would also allow that area of Jefferson Parish to be less dependent on Orleans Parish drainage operations and from any dependence upon conditions in the 17th Street Canal.

• Reduces the required flow in 17th Street"Canal, which reduces the required canal size for Option 2 and the size of the pump station at Lake Pontchartrain for either Option 1 or Option 2 if constructed prior to a new pump station at or near the lakefront on 17th Street Canal.

• Provides potential for better floodplain management capability by subdividing the basin and providing operational flexibility between sub-basins. If an interconnection link between the 17th Street system and the new Jefferson Parish system is provided it would provide operational flexibility for both systems. Operational reliability and flexibility is increased because this diversion would allow for cross-parish pumping during emergencies in either Jefferson or Orleans Parish.

• Provides a mechanism for by-passing some of the;,lt7th Street Canal flow during construction of the deeper canal sections associated with Option 2. If this option were in place prior to construction of Option 2, then there would be additional flexibility to redirect flows during construction.

• However discharging interior drainage from Jefferson Parish to the Mississippi River is approximately three times as expensive as discharging the same amount of volume of water through the 17th Street Canal to Lake Pontchartrain.

Question 2. Would combining option 2a with one of the technical options (in the report) provide the best technical alternative that would provide the most comprehensive flood control measures for Jefferson Parish compared to any of the other technical options (in the report) being utilized by itself?

Response. The studies associated with this project have not considered "the most comprehensive flood control measures for Jefferson Parish", Alternative analysis has been more closely focused on the development of features for the Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System for protection of the three outfall canals. The information generated and the conceptual studies performed to date cannot be extrapolated to determine the most comprehensive flood control measures for Jefferson Parish.

Question 3. While the technical report evaluated option 2a only with option 2t the report also noted that 2a could be linked to option I as well since it may provide additional operational flexibility to option I. Therefore which of the technical options when combined with option 2a would provide the best technical option when combined. Which combination of option 2a with another technical option would be the best technically advantageous and more operationally effective option when combined?

Response. Option 2a when combined with any of Option It Option 2, or Option 3t does not change the preliminary evaluation described in the Report to Congress for P.L. 110–28, Chapter 3, SEC 4303:

• Options I and 2 appear more technically advantageous over Option 3 because they are more effective in reducing risk of flooding. Option 3 results in a much longer line of protection against hurricane storm surge and therefore has more exposure to hurricane storm surge and a higher risk of overtopping.

• Option I could be more advantageous considering the engineering challenges and construction complexity of Option 2.

• Option 2 is generally more technically advantageous overall and may be more operationally effective than Option 1 because it would have fewer pump stations that offers greater reliability and further reduces risk of flooding.

Some of the reported advantages of Option 2A are associated with a smaller deepened canal; however with the construction issues associated with Option 2 those advantages would not be applicable to other options that did not include a deepened canal. Therefore advantages of reduced canal size associated with Option 2a would only be realized in combination with Option 2.

• However it must be also acknowledged that there are also disadvantages to Option 2. Namely that discharging interior drainage from Jefferson Parish to the Mississippi River is approximately two and one half times as expensive as discharging the same amount of volume of water through the 17th Street Canal to Lake Pontchartrain.

Question 4. I understand the Corps of Engineers is also working on an economic analysis and an environmental analysis of the alternatives for the outfall canals and pumping stations near Lake Pontchartrain. When is the actual date of release of the upcoming Corps report(s) on the economic analysis and environmental analysis? Will the report also include the technical aspects the Corps analyzed as well?

Response. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the Corps of Engineers is investigating the effects of the proposed options on environmental and socioeconomic resources and preparing an Individual Environmental Report (IER 5). IER 5 is expected to be released to the public for comment in Mayor June, 2008. As part of the evaluation of alternatives, technical components of all considered alternatives are described in the report. IER 5 references the Report to Congress cited above. A full economic analysis of the alternatives is not currently being conducted or planned.

Question 5. After over 15 years since studying had begun, the Morganza to the Gulf project was finally authorized within Sec. 1001 of WRDA 2007. When did the Corps of Engineers come to the opinion that the cost for the Morganza to the Gulf project would exceed 20 percent of the number supplied to Congress in the context of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 conference?

Response. It was in late 2007 that the Corps came to the opinion that the cost of the Morganza to the Gulf project would exceed 20 percent of the cost authorized in WRDA 2007. After Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, new hydraulic designs were developed using the updated surge models. With our focus being on determining new post Hurricane Katrina IOO-year elevations for New Orleans and vicinity, this analysis for Morganza to the Gulf region was not completed until late 2007. The analysis showed that the elevation of the levees and structures would need to increase by 8–12 feet to provide a IOO-year level of protection. This represents an increase of approximately 70 percent over the elevations used to develop the cost estimates included in the feasibility study. Significant revisions were also made to the design criteria as a result of lessons learned during Hurricane Katrina. Revisions to the design criteria were not complete until late 2007.

Question 6. During the hearing, Assistant Secretary Woodley said he did not believe the Corps of Engineers had a new cost estimate for the Morganza project, yet the Corps of Engineers has been holding up work moving forward on this project. How could the Corps of Engineers determine the project costs could exceed 20 percent of the authorized level without a revised cost estimate? How can the Corps of Engineers hold up work on the Morganza project when they did not have a new cost estimate on the Morganza project?

Response. The Corps has not stopped working on the Morganza to the Gulf project. We are continuing to develop detailed designs for the Houma Lock and Floodgate Complex and will have completed 50 percent of the plans and specifications by mid summer 2008. A new project cost for the Morganza to the Gulf could not be developed until the new hydraulic data was available and the design criteria for 100-year protection had been revised to reflect the updated surge models. A new cost estimate is currently being developed for the Morganza to the Gulf project and the scheduled completion date is July 2008. As a result of the 70 percent increase in the required elevations of the levees and structures and the changes to the design criteria, we are confident that the total project cost authorized in WRDA 2007 will increase by more than 20 percent. Morganza to the Gulf was authorized in WRDA 2007 but a Record of Decision (ROD) has not been signed. Given the significant changes in project costs and benefits, we need to reaffirm that tMe project remains economically justified before we would proceed further with the project. Also, as a result of new hydraulics and revised design criteria, the potential environmental impacts associated with the project have changed significantly. A revised programmatic EIS documenting the new project footprint and revised environmental

impacts will be needed before the ROD can be signed. The increased project cost will require congressional re-authorization but that would only be needed prior to exceeding the authorized cost. A post authorization change (PAC) report, scheduled for completion in the summer of 2009, will be prepared to support re-authorization. Assuming that the project remains justified and with updated environmental information completed in the summer of 2009, the Corps could sign the ROD.

Question 6. Instead of holding up the entire project, how could the Corps of Engineers move forward with aspects of the project which are ready to go, like the Houma Lock?

Response. Since the Houma Lock is not a separable element of the Morganza to the Gulf project, the economics of the project will have to be reaffirmed and a revised programmatic EIS completed, including assessing site specific impacts of the lock, before we could sign the ROD. Funds will have to be appropriated for construction of the project before we could move forward to construction.

Question 7. Why has the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) work been halted with regards to the Houma Lock? Please supply citations for the law that backed such decisionmaking, the names of those who made such a determination, dates and any written communication (internal and external) that discussed and/or instructed the EIS work to be stopped.

Response. We have not stopped working on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Houma Lock and Floodgate Complex. As discussed above, a revised programmatic EIS will be prepared to document changed conditions and we are incorporating all constructible features into this document. Completion of the revised programmatic EIS is currently scheduled for the summer of 2009. Once the revised programmatic EIS has been completed and the ROD has been signed, all environmental clearances will in place to begin construction oft? Houma Lock and Floodgate Complex.

Question 8. What solutions can the Corps of Engineers suggest that would still allow flexibility for the Corps by placing projects under one umbrella, but not increase the historic nonFederal cost share for either of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV) project nor the Southeast Louisiana (SELA), so that it does not place an undue financial burden on Louisiana that is still struggling with hurricane recovery efforts?

Response. A system authorization proposed by the Administration for Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (LPV), West Bank and Vicinity and Southeast Louisiana (SELA) would allow greater flexibility to adjust to changes in conditions; environmental factors; technical situations; the market; and the movement of funds already appropriated by Congress to project features or contracts that require additional funding. While working within the overall appropriations provided, a system authorization would facilitate programmatic management and optimum use of resources to design and construct a comprehensive, quality system and advance schedules to meet the operational goal of completing the system in the June 2011 timeline. We will implement the project in accordance with cost sharing policy.

Question 9. How many cubic yards of clay material will be needed to complete projects in the Hurricane Protection System? Do you anticipate finding and transporting enough clay material of appropriate quality to complete projects within the 2011 time frame? If not, what?

Response. The Hurricane and Storm Damage Risk Reduction System (HSDRRS) requires over 100 million cubic yards of borrow material, approximately 20 Superdomes worth, to build 350 miles of earthen levees throughout five parishes.

The Corps is pursuing three alternatives to acquire borrow material: "Government Furnished," which means the Corps identifies the borrow source location, investigates and approves the borrow material as suitable for use and acquires real eState interests over the land through the non-Federal sponsor; "Contractor Furnished," which requires a construction contractor to provide their own borrow material from an approved site; and "Supply Contracts", under which supply contractors bid for task orders for the supply of borrow material for HSDRRS projects. A recently issued Sources Sought Inquiry yielded approximately 60 responses and identified potential suppliers with the capacity to deliver large quantities of clay for construction of HSDRRS projects.

Applying this three pronged approach to the acquisition of borrow, and working in collaboration with the non-Federal sponsor, the Corps remains confident that the required quantities and delivery schedules can be met.

RESPONSES BY ROBERT VAN ANTWERP TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR LIEBERMAN

Question 1. Clear, navigable waterways are vital to the economic health of Connecticut and dredging projects are needed to maintain access to our ports and New London submarine base. I am concerned that the President's budget only requests $1 million in 2009 to develop the Long Island Sound Dredged Materials Management Plan (DMMP). This plan is essential to ensure that dredged materials are managed in an economically sound and environmentally responsible manner. Without adequate resources over the next few years, the DMMP will not be finished in time to meet the Environmental Protection Agency's deadline and the New London disposal site will be forced to close.

The fiscal year President's budget requested $2.8 million and Congress appropriated $3.5 million in fiscal year for this work. What is the rational for the signification reduction in funds in fiscal year 09? What impact will ibis reduction have on the Army Corps' ability to complete the DMMP on time?

Response. The Project Management Plan for the Regional Dredged Material Management Plan and Programmatic Environmental Impact statement for Long Island Sound, October 2007, identifies a funding need of $4.8 million through fiscal year 09. The fiscal year appropriated amount of $3.525 million plus the fiscal year President's Budget amount of$1 million compares favorably ($4.8 million vs. $4.525 million) with the needs of the project through fiscal year 09. While the $4.525 is slightly less than the estimated amount through fiscal year 09, this is not expected to have an adverse impact on the schedule for completing the DMMP. Given the high defamed and keen competition for Operation & Maintenance funds, the preliminary. cost estimate for the DMMP and the early stage of the DMMP study at the time funds were budgeted for fiscal year 09, the requested budget amount of $1 million in fiscal year 09 was considered adequate.

Question 2. I understand that Army Corps is beginning to look at entire ecosystems, rather than specific projects, when making assessments. I am concerned however, that environmental costs and benefits are not readily assessed in most construction funding decisions. When construction projects were prioritized in the fiscal year request, how much weighting was applied to environmental costs or benefits? What was the rationale for this weighting?

Response. There is no explicit weighting that occurs during the budget prioritization process. Rather, environmental costs and benefits are incorporated into the plan formulation and evaluation process during the course of the feasibility study. During the pre-construction study process, interactions with other projects in the system and potential project effects on the environment are considered when evaluating alternative solutions to the various water resources problems. The Corps also considers any ecosystem benefits that a project would provide. The studies include consideration of the array of information necessary for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and numerous other environmental statutes. During design, the Corps continues to consider changed conditions and revise its cost estimates to incorporate current data. The costs of avoidance, minimization and mitigation of potential negative affects on the project and the costs of positive environmental features are included in the total project cost. These costs are part of the benefit/cost ratios which are one of several factors considered in making recommendations for funding. For flood damage reduction and navigation studies, another factor used in determining funding priorities was whether the project also produced ecosystem benefits and was a part of a more comprehensive watershed plan.

Question 3. The fiscal year request for Operations and Maintenance was broken down into 21 watersheds. The fiscal year request allocates O&M funding by 54 sub watershed systems. What was the rationale or this change? What process was used to break down the 21 watersheds into 54 sub-watershed systems? For example, the U.S. Geological Survey identifies 10 specific subregions in the New England watershed, but the Army Corps budget is divided into a Northern New England subregion and a Southern New England subregion.

Response. For Operation and Maintenance (O&M), the fiscal year and 2008 budgets proposed allocations on a regional basis, allocating funding by 21 watersheds identified by the U.S. Geological Survey's watershed and sub-watershed identification system.

The fiscal year Budget proposes to allocate O&M funding on a more refined systems basis, still based on the USGS watershed and sub-watershed identification system. In order to more clearly identify the systems among which funding is allocated, the Budget proposes to allocate funding among 54 systems. These 54 systems more closely align with how projects are managed in the watersheds.

Funding operation and maintenance using this framework will increase efficiency in the O&M ofCivil Works projects. Managers in the field are encouraged to think systematically when assessing risks and establishing maintenance priorities early in the budget process. Also, they will be better able to adapt to uncertainties and better able to address emergencies, as well as other changed conditions over the course of the fiscal year, while remaining consistent with congressional appropriations decisions.

Question 4. The Army Corps has recently revised the standards by which levees are considered safe, but has not provided local governments with the resources needed to meet these new requirements. This has presented a financial hardship for the local communities responsible for maintaining the levees and the homeowners needing flood insurance. For example the East Hartford levee in Connecticut historically met all of the requirements from the Army Corps but was deemed deficient under the new criteria. The local community had to pass a bond measure to finance work that was previously not required. Why has the Army Corps not provided greater financial assistance to local communities responding to these more stringent requirements? What is the Army Corps doing to help local communities bring their levees back into compliance?

Response. In light of the problems experienced during Hurricane Katrina the Corps is more actively enforcing the requirements of levee maintenance. These requirements are consistent with the original Operation and Maintenance Manuals provided communities at completion of Federal projects with the exception of more stringent vegetation removal requirements. Strict enforcement of levee maintenance requirements is necessary to ensure projects provide the designed level of protection and minimize the risk to public safety. The operation and maintenance is a local responsibility under the original project cooperation agreement. The Corps will continue to inspect levee projects to identify maintenance deficiencies and work with owners to correct these deficiencies in a timely manner.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much.

I will start off, I think we will each take 5 minutes.

Let me say, I want to talk about Corps reform. And I understood, Mr. Woodley, that you were sort of saying not enough time, not enough time. Well, the law was enacted in November. The conference report was filed in August. And the Corps has now had over 7 months to know what the new requirements would look like. And two of the most significant of the programmatic changes, independent review and improvements in the mitigation program, became effective upon enactment and certainly were not surprise.

So has implementing guidance been issued?

Mr. WOODLEY. Senator, we already have a great deal of guidance in place covering independent review.——

Senator BOXER. No, since the law, has new guidance been issued since the law was passed?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't believe we have yet issued our new guidance for peer review. But I know that we are certainly working very hard to do so.——

Senator BOXER. OK, how many project studies have been modified to reflect the new requirements?

Mr. WOODLEY. However many are required to be modified.

Senator BOXER. Well, how many have already been modified?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't know, but——

Senator BOXER. Do you have staff who could tell you how many? Any staff there that knows that, or sir, do you know that, Lieutenant General, how many project studies have been modified to reflect the new requirements of Corps reform, independent review and the mitigation program?

General Van Antwerp. We will get you the number, but we are doing independent review on all our projects. We have thresholds, because we have our internal review and we have external review.

But we are doing peer review on all of our projects today. We can get you the number and those specific projects. But we have incorporated that in.

Senator BOXER. I understand. But my understanding from my staff, which Mr. Woodley praised and praised by both sides, is that it is not in conformance with the new law. Section 2036(b) of WRDA 2007 requires that a status report on mitigation be submitted concurrent with the submission of the budget request. Has that status report been submitted, sir? Sirs?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't believe so.

Senator BOXER. OK. When will it be submitted? You are in violation of a law here.

Mr. WOODLEY. I am sure we will get in compliance with it as soon as we possibly can.

Senator BOXER. OK. Well, let me just say to colleagues, whether you like the law or you don't like the law, you have to follow the law. Or we are just a lawless society here. Now, Senator Feingold worked very hard on Corps reform. He wanted to take it way further than a lot of us were willing to go. Senator Inhofe and I worked very closely together to get to some place where we could all live with it. And you are not even doing that.

So Section 2034 of WRDA 2007 requires independent review of projects meeting certain criteria, it includes a look-back to studies initiated up to 2 years ago. As far as I know, you haven't initiated any of these.

Mr. WOODLEY. Senator, we have initiated that in every case, every single activity underway has been, is——

Senator BOXER. So every——

Mr. WOODLEY [continuing].—actively under review to determine its——

Senator BOXER. But it is under your old guidance, not under the new guidance in the new law, is my understanding.

Mr. WOODLEY. Well, it is being scrubbed, there is no new guidance, but we are operating under the law.

Senator BOXER. Well, there is new guidance, it is called the law.

Mr. WOODLEY. There is new guidance——

Senator BOXER. Did you, when you——

Mr. WOODLEY [continuing].—it is called the law. That is exactly right.

Senator BOXER [continuing].—handed in your budget request, did you or did you not follow the law, which says, a status report on mitigation be submitted concurrent with the submission of the budget request? And you didn't do that.

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't think we were able to get that done.

Senator BOXER. Right. That is my point. Do you have the resources in the budget to accomplish the independent review and everything else you have to do under the new law?

Mr. WOODLEY. Well, we certainly have included additional funding in the investigations account to cover the independent review for any project that didn't otherwise have it, and then that is an additional million dollar allocation that we got in the investigations account. As you know, that account has not been increased in our budget request for many years.

Senator BOXER. Section 2031 of WRDA 2007 requires a revision of the planning principles and guidelines which the Corps uses to develop project recommendations. Where does that stand in the process? Where are you in that process?

Mr. WOODLEY. I have created an interagency team to begin that process. I am preparing the schedule on that, and we are moving very aggressively to complete that.

Senator BOXER. OK, well, if I could just close here, because my time is up and I will come back later, you are working off of the old, as I understand it, pre-Katrina rules in terms of independent review. And that is a problem. Because after Katrina, we all moved in a different direction here. So I am just a little bit befuddled by the lack of response, I am a little concerned about it. So I hope we can meet with you perhaps after this hearing is over, maybe you do need more resources and maybe you can't tell us. Maybe Senator Voinovich is right, that you just don't have enough to do the job you are supposed to do.

But you didn't do what you were supposed to do in your budget request and it is disturbing to me. I will withhold my other questions until my second round.

Senator ISAKSON.

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Secretary Woodley, in my discussions and my staff's discussions with the staff at the Corps, as we were working toward this year, it was my understanding that staff recommendations were to include the Savannah expansion project, and it did not end up getting in the budget. Where was the decision made to not do Savannah in Fiscal Year 2009?

Mr. WOODLEY. The decision was not a peculiar one to Savannah. The decision was to establish the criteria on which we would base our budgeting decisions, and Savannah did not meet one or more of those criteria. I believe there is still NEPA work underway that needs to be completed before we can proceed with Savannah. But I would have to be brought up to speed on that to be exactly sure what it is.

Senator ISAKSON. General Van Antwerp is nodding his head. Is that correct?

General Van Antwerp. I think I can add. We have funded this to the capability which is $700,000. It is to complete the Record of Decision which is scheduled for June 2009, completion of that Record of Decision.

Senator ISAKSON. So if you would, Secretary Woodley or General Van Antwerp, whichever one is appropriate, if you could send me a communication to my office to let me know what criteria it is that Savannah needs to be able to be included in the next budget, which will be Fiscal Year 2010, I would greatly appreciate those points of criteria.

I understand the inclusion of the completion of the Oakland Harbor in California. We in Georgia benefited from the Corps' commitment to complete Brunswick years ago. So I understand that. But I am equally very desirous of getting the Savannah enhancement project started, so that when the Panama Canal project is completed, we can remain the second largest port on the Eastern Seaboard, and I don't think anybody else can really take our place ca-

pacity-wise, anyway. So it is essentially in the best interest of the United States to do that.

Secretary Woodley, with regard to the ACT and the ACF and the water control manuals that the Corps has committed to complete, is the money sufficient in this budget to do that process?

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

Senator ISAKSON. On both of them?

Mr. WOODLEY. I believe so, yes, sir.

Senator ISAKSON. OK. Check, because if I believe so means maybe——

Mr. WOODLEY. No, no. No, sir, I am not in doubt. That activity, we regard that as a very high priority activity within the operation and maintenance of those facilities on those two waterways or watersheds. Although I would have to look at the schedule, I don't know that we are budgeting in 2009 to complete that process. However, we are budgeting fully to continue all activities associated with that process. I believe it is not able to be brought to full completion in 2009, but that we are certainly fully funding our activity, because I agree with you and have long advocated the updating of those manuals to allow us to appropriately manage the Federal responsibilities on both of those watersheds.

Senator ISAKSON. My understanding, I think you are correct, my understanding, and you all can correct me, is that this is really a 2-year project. My question obviously is, is there sufficient money to do this year's Fiscal Year 2009 in the, what should be, I guess there is enough money in the current 2008 to begin the project and in 2009 to continue the project, and if necessary in 2010, there would need to be money to complete the project. So it is a 2-year project, 18 to 24 months. It is also my understanding the Corps has brought in a person not previously affiliated with all this to oversee both of these water control plants, is that correct?

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

General Van Antwerp. That is correct.

Senator ISAKSON. So some time in the next 2 years, and we do have the person on board who is going to lead the charge?

General Van Antwerp. Mr. Isakson, if I might just add, there is a 1.8 in this budget, Fiscal Year 2009, and then that leaves about 1.9 after 2009. But what is in the budget right now will take us through so we can be engaged throughout that time. But it is a two to 3 year process, largely because of the environmental part.

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Vitter.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you again, gentlemen, for all of your leadership and work.

I want to go right to the three topics I enumerated in my opening statement. First, the additional funds for the 100 year level of protection. Again, thanks to the President, thanks to the Administration for that commitment.

But I am concerned about timing. General, isn't it true that the original timeframe for that work was to complete it by 2010, but that has now slipped to 2011?

General Van Antwerp. I believe that is true. I know that the slippage, it is now, we are targeting the 2011 hurricane season, so the June timeframe.

Senator VITTER. Now, Corps officials beneath you have said they need this money appropriated by the start of the fiscal year, October 1st, to stick to that timeframe, is that accurate?

General Van Antwerp. That is accurate. We have looked at when we need to award contracts and put those contracts out. We need a good portion of this money right at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2009, October-ish.

Senator VITTER. Great. General, do you know the last time Congress has acted on the Corps appropriation bill in a timely way by October 1st?

General Van Antwerp. Not in memory, sir.

Senator VITTER. In 1999. Do you know many times Congress has done that in the last 10 years? Once in the last 10 years.

So given the obvious emergency nature and significance of this work, why are we asking for it in that model, which ensures, absolutely ensures, particularly in a Presidential election year, further slippage?

Mr. WOODLEY. Perhaps I had better answer that, Senator. I can tell you that when we submit a budget, we do it on the assumption that it will be prepared and that there will be an appropriation by the beginning of our Fiscal Year and we plan our execution on that basis.

I agree that it is becoming more rare than it ought to be.

Senator VITTER. Mr. Secretary, let me suggest, this goes to the future of the New Orleans region, the survival of the New Orleans region. So why are we building assumptions in to our work that are patently false?

Mr. WOODLEY. I do not have a good answer for that question, and I would say that if Congress does not intent to complete this process within the current Fiscal Year that alternate provisions should be made in order to ensure that no delays are experienced on the ground.

Senator VITTER. It is true, is it not, that this is being requested as emergency spending not under the cap?

Mr. WOODLEY. That is correct.

Senator VITTER. So for all these reasons, I believe we should clearly move this to the supplemental, which presumably will happen sooner. And my second concern under this category is the cost shares. As you know, components of this work are being requested by the Administration at a higher cost share to the State, at a more demanding cost share to the State than ever before. SELA is normally 75/25 Federal/State. You are asking 65/35. Lake Pontchartrain vicinity is normally 70/30 Federal/State. You are asking 65/35.

After we have gone through Katrina and Rita, why would you make the cost share more demanding rather than at least stick to the historical cost share or even offer some additional help?

Mr. WOODLEY. You remember that the cost share applies only to that portion of the work that is in excess of what had previously been, prior to Katrina, had been authorized by Congress. So the vast majority of the work being undertaken is being undertaken at

full Federal expense. I think that is entirely appropriate and I agree with that.

The issue of cost share being more demanding is really related to another issue, which is the absolute imperative that I feel to operate, plan, authorize and manage the construction and the ongoing operation and maintenance of this set of works as a single system. The great lesson, if we have a lesson, of Katrina is that is what was not done. So we had a series of fragmented works that were done to different standards and that sort of thing.

Senator VITTER. Mr. Secretary, you can do all that integration and ask the State for a different number. That has no impact on the level of integration you bring to the work, correct? I mean, we are talking about what bill you hand the State, what number you had the State, one number or a lower number. That has nothing to do with the integration in terms of the ongoing work you are talking about. Does it?

Mr. WOODLEY. It establishes, it seemed to me to establish that principle on the most firm basis. And certainly you are exactly right, we are perfectly capable of managing the accounting in a different way if Congress should so propose.

Senator VITTER. Well, again, these two programs I am talking about, SELA and Lake Pontchartrain, have been around a long time. You are asking for a more demanding cost share for that work than ever before, than the historical share, that which was re-confirmed in WRDA, than that which was re-confirmed in the supplemental over the last several years. And that seems particularly odd, given the extra pressure and demands that we have gone through because of the hurricanes.

Mr. WOODLEY. Yes, sir.

Senator BOXER. Senator Vitter, would you, your time is up, I would like to engage you in a question, because I don't understand it, either. It is baffling to me, this 65. Did that just come out of the blue? We didn't legislate it.

Senator VITTER. Not the blue, OMB.

Senator BOXER. It came out of OMB. But we did not legislate that change.

Senator VITTER. No, in fact, we legislated the opposite. We have said several times, in WRDA and before that in the supplemental, we re-confirmed the historical cost shares which for one of these projects is 75/25, for another is 70/30. So we have only not said that, we have said the opposite.

Senator BOXER. Well, OMB is once again wrong. OK.

Senator BARRASSO.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate it.

I wanted to get, if I could, back to some of the things I mentioned in my opening statement, about Cheyenne, Wyoming, concerns with the water supply there, and trichloroethylene, which is a chemical that is used to clean engines, rocket and motor parts, and there is a long history of the people in Wyoming and their commitment to our military and the missile systems which are there and in the ground. And the concern is this plume that people agree is there and folks living there think is one, related to the missile site and the Department is saying no, maybe several causes.

Why does the Army Corps think that it is not all one plume? And I don't know how specifically you are familiar with the situation.

Mr. WOODLEY. Senator, I have no responsibility for the program that is managing that. But fortunately, the Chief of Engineers does. I believe he is prepared to respond to that. But that is a formerly used Defense site program, which is managed as a military program within the Defense Department structure.

General VAN ANTWERP. First of all, I would say we are going to do the right thing here. There is a remedial investigation going on and there is some difference in the values that were found in the data from the investigation that was done by the city of cheyenne and done by the remedial application. We have to come to grips with that.

We are doing a feasibility study, that is underway. We have the money for that and we will come to grips with this. I agree with you, what are the other contributing factors, if there are contributing factors to it, apart from this plume that we know came from this remediation site. So we will get to the truth on that and get that to you.

Senator BARRASSO. The concern is, and I appreciate your comments that you are going to do the right thing, there does seem to be needless delay in this. I know I wrote to you back in December with concerns, because there was a letter written by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality back in 2006, and several months later there was a meeting but not a formal letter response. I got a letter back from the deputy director of military programs, Joseph Tyler, dated February 8th. He talks about, he apologizes that there wasn't a response back to the letter. That is where I think we have needless delay.

Then he says that there is going to be a joint agency meeting March 11, 2008, which coincidentally is today. I know this hearing was initially set for a month ago, and I was going to at that time ask you, can you assure me that by the hearing, March 11th, today, that we really do get answers to this. So this probably will be held after our discussion.

But we are very serious in Wyoming about saying, we are not used to needless delays. In Wyoming, we like to get things done right away.

General VAN ANTWERP . We owe you an answer. I believe that is being held today. We will get you the results of that. So I owe you an answer to that.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

[Presiding] Senator Cardin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Senator CARDIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First let me welcome our witnesses, and I am sorry I couldn't be here to listen to your entire testimony.

Secretary Woodley, I appreciate your call yesterday in regard to Chesapeake City. I am glad to see that is moving forward. I want to just concentrate on the Mid-Bay report that is due in regards to the next chapter of restoration and dredging for the Chesapeake Bay. The last time we had a chance to talk, I was under the im-

pression that it is on schedule. I just really want to make sure that we can anticipate the report being delivered on time. We anticipate acting in this Committee on the next round of authorizations. It is important that we have that report in a timely manner for our Committee to act.

I just want to take this opportunity, General, or Mr. Secretary, if you could comment on that and give us assurances that the report will be timely filed, I will feel a little bit better.

General VAN ANTWERP. Sir, we just checked on this last night, as everyone was engaged here. It is another good thing, a lot of things happened before the hearing. That is good. But we are on schedule, it will go before the Civil Works Review Board in July 2008. And I am expecting the Chief's report by the end of September, beginning of October.

Senator CARDIN. That is even a little bit earlier than I think you told me the last time.

General VAN ANTWERP. We are trying to deliver on this.

Senator CARDIN. And I thank you, and I thank you for your cooperation. We have had a good working relationship in trying to make sure we stay on schedule. I thank you for that.

Madam Chairman, I am going to ask that my full opening statement be made part of the record.

[Presiding] Without objection, so ordered.

Senator CARDIN. It is basically very complimentary of the work that you all do and the importance to our State from the western part, on flight control, to the eastern part, on serious erosion issues and weather problems. The Army Corps has been extremely helpful in maintaining and help us make sure that our channels are open for recreation and business use.

Our challenge, quite frankly, is not with the two of you but with the budgets that have been submitted, as I am sure the Chairman has pointed out. We are going to do everything we can to help in that regard. It is a little disappointing to see all the work that we do, particularly on the Water Resources Reauthorization Act and on the programs that you all have done so much work to get ready and then find that the appropriated dollar amounts make it difficult for you to do the right investigations or the right construction or maintenance. I can assure you that we will do everything we can to make sure that the dollars are available for the good work that you all do.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

[The prepared statement of Senator Cardin follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Madame Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing today.

Maryland has a geography and topography which makes the Chesapeake Bay particularly susceptible to the adverse effects of erosion. This erosion contributes to five millions of cubic yards of sediment deposited annually into the bay, adversely affecting water quality, destroying valuable wetlands and habitat, and clogging navigation channels.

Along our Atlantic coast, powerful winter storms and tropical cyclones can cause considerable beach erosion—threatening the economic vitality of our premier Atlantic coast resort city, Ocean City.

In the mountains of the western part of the State, runoff from heavy rains contributes to the potential of flooding in western communities.

Maryland relies heavily upon the Army Corps of Engineers' civil works programs which are of high value to the health of our Chesapeake Bay, the configuration of our Atlantic and Bay coastlines, and to overall health our State's economy. The Corps of Engineers has projects and provides assistance to virtually every jurisdiction in the State of Maryland.

The Chesapeake Bay is the nation's largest estuary. The Corps' oyster and habitat restoration, shoreline protection, and sediment management programs are integral to our efforts to restore the Bay. The oysters represent more that just a source of income for the oysterman who harvest them, they are also natural biological filters—continually cleaning up the Bay.

The Port of Baltimore is one of the largest ports on the east coast and a vital engine of economic activity, contributing $2 billion to the State's economy and employing 18,000 Marylander's directly and tens of thousands more indirectly.

There are 126 miles of shipping channels leading to the Port of Baltimore. Maryland also has more than 70 small navigation projects supported by the Corps around the Chesapeake Bay and Atlantic Ocean. These navigation projects are critical to commercial and recreational fisherman, to local and regional commerce and to local economies.

Along Maryland's 31 miles of Atlantic Ocean coastline, there are two critical Corps projects—a hurricane protection project at Ocean City, and a mitigation of shoreline erosion project at Assateague Island National Seashore.

We rely heavily on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for flood protection in communities in Western Maryland and for water supply.

As you can see, the civil works programs of the Corps have widespread beneficial impact throughout our state. Indeed similar impacts can be seen all across the Country. States need these resources to protect their communities from potential natural disasters and to improve the overall quality of their environments.

Unfortunately, the President's proposed budget underfunds the Corps at a time when there is a significant backlog of projects to be completed. The budget places an unrealistically large burden on States to fund these projects (like beach renourishment). Furthermore, the budget does not even begin to implement many of the priorities of WRDA passed just last year.

The hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on beach restoration today may mean saving many times over those amounts to clean up that beach and provide assistance to property owner's following a significant storm.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today on the priorities of the President with respect to the Corps' activities.

The Corps' work is critical. We need a level of commitment that is commensurate with its importance.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator VOINOVICH.

Senator VOINOVICH. First of all, I want to say thank you, Mr. Woodley, for your service to our Country, and General, thank you very much for your service. I am sure that sometimes you think that ours is not to reason why, ours is just to do or die. We are asking a lot of things from you and quite frankly, the money is not there.

I would like to just talk about a couple of things that are on my mind in terms of Ohio. We have the Cleveland Port Authority. It is very, very important to the economy of northeastern Ohio. The President's budget has provided $6,710,000 for dredging. We need $16,810,000 for the dredging. This is a very important project, and I am expecting that somebody is going to figure out how we are going to get that money to do it, or we will have to close the port.

What bothers me is that there is $4.5 billion in the fund, the dredging fund that has been set aside. And for some reason, that is not being used. Well, the reason it is not being used is that the Administration is using that to balance the budget. They are borrowing trust funds, like they are Social Security, to hide the real costs of this budget. In other words, they just show a deficit of X number of dollars but the fact of the matter is, they only show the

public debt, they don't show the Government debt. That to me is being, it is unacceptable.

Second of all, we have a little project down in Finley, Ohio, where they have had the worst flooding that they have ever had in the city's history. It is a continuing authority and we need the money to just do the feasibility study for that project. It is not a whole lot of money. I would like to know when are we going to be able to get that money so that can be taken care of for that community, so they get some idea of what it is they can do to help themselves and to eliminate the situation they have. We have the public-private partnership there, we have the businesses that are interested, they may even come up with some money to fund the most important project that might make a difference for their community. But we can't get it done unless we have the feasibility study done and I am hoping that we are going to figure out how to do that.

I appreciate the fact that you have money in for the Everglades, that was my legislation, for the CERP, Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. That is moving along. And I am not from Florida, but the fact is, that is a very important ecological project, I think one of the most important in the Country. That gets me back to the Great Lakes. The President issued an executive order creating the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration and the Great Lakes Interagency Task Force. The Corps is a participant in both of those.

The question I have is, can you tell me what actions, if any, the Corps has taken in response to the release of that strategy report? So there are three things. Strategy, feasibility and what are you doing about the Great Lakes?

Mr. WOODLEY. Let me talk about first of all Finley. I think we are on track for that. We have money in the 2008, it is a continuing authorities project, so it is not one that we individually budget for. We budget for the program. But I believe that is on track with 2008 funding, and we understand and agree with you that it is an important priority within that program.

The Great Lakes, we have participated of course with the interagency teams on that, we have some very interesting studies ongoing that are aimed at facilitating the restoration, including one that is creating a comprehensive tool for people who are interested in restoration to be able to access on a web basis, through the Internet, to understand what the options are and what various programs they can bring to bear on local issues for restoration within the basin.

The other thing that I think is very interesting and that is underway in that regard in Ohio is the Ashtabula project that is, I believe we are going to be able to complete during this fiscal year. That will return that very important port facility in Ashtabula to service and deal with the contamination, the historical contamination of that watershed. I think that is a remarkable, very substantial achievement that we have in partnership with our colleagues at EPA.

Senator VOINOVICH. Although the budget that EPA is asking for to do that kind of contamination removal is putrid. I started that dredging and contamination project when I was Governor of Ohio

back in 1995 and earmarked $6 million of State money. Finally we are getting it done, amen and hallelujah.

[Laughter.]

Senator BOXER. Nice to see you smile, sir.

Senator Klobuchar.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. I am sure I will make you smile again.

Mr. Woodley, in your written testimony you mentioned that the budget for the emergency management program includes $40 million in the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account to fund preparing for flood and coastal emergencies. Specifically you mentioned that this funding would cover review and updating of emergency response plans.

Back in Minnesota, several counties were devastated this summer. I was there the day afterward, cows floating by, in last summer's flooding, and still these counties are still preparing their emergency response plans, they are very complicated for these small counties to handle. Until some of these communities, such as the ones in Fulmer County, get their emergency response plan approved, they cannot receive certain small business rebuilding loans from FEMA.

Does the Corps intend to prioritize any funds in the Flood Control and Emergencies account for helping communities who have not fully prepared emergency response plans?

Mr. WOODLEY. Senator, I am not aware of how those funds are used in conjunction with the localities. So I will have to research that and get back to you.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. OK, if you could. It has just been very difficult for them, they are trying to cross all the T's and dot all the I's. But what has been happening is they can't receive these small business loans. I have been at these stores and these places along their main street and they literally have been, every business was devastated. So they are trying to get help with that, so we can work with your office on that later. I appreciate it.

The other thing I am just following up on, what Senator Voinovich asked about with the Great Lakes, could you just tell me what work the Corps is doing with these lake levels? We are very concerned with Lake Superior. It is at its lowest level in 80 years. It has been affecting our barge traffic. We believe it is climate change because the ice has been melting and the water evaporating. Nevertheless, it is a problem. Could you illuminate what the Corps is doing in that regard?

Mr. WOODLEY. I can tell you that our work on that is done in conjunction with the International Joint Commission on the Great Lakes. So we deal with the IGC on regulating lake levels where they are to be regulated.

The other significant action that is underway in that regard is the St. Clair River study that we are trying to determine whether the dredging that has been undertaken in the St. Clair River area is having a hydrological effect that was unintended there. It is not clear whether it is. So we have work underway with the IGC to determine that.

But we recognize that the lake levels are down and it is having an effect on operations across the basin.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Thank you.

I talked in my opening comments about how I believe the Administration's budget is far below the Corps' capability for investment in navigation, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration programs. I mentioned some of the work that needs to be done in Minnesota. Assistant Secretary Woodley, what amount do you believe the Corps could effectively invest in Fiscal Year 2009?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't know that I have a particular figure, Senator, but it is well in excess, in the construction account, of the amount that we were able to devote to that in the President's budget.

Senator KLOBUCHAR. Thank you.

Senator BOXER. Thanks, Senator.

We are going to start second rounds, 5 minutes each, and then you will be done. This question is for the General, actually both these questions, because these are longer term questions. I talked in my opening statement about Sacramento, and I am very grateful that you really have been dedicated to it. I guess what I want to do, since I have you here on the record, is to just make sure that this dedication is not just for the budget year, but until the project is done. If you could expand on that a little.

General VAN ANTWERP. Absolutely, ma'am, it is long-term. There are some short-term aspects having to do with looking at all the levees right now, making sure what the standards are, getting them up to standard. But it is also a longer term, as we look at climate change, other things that will be affecting that. So we are with you for the long term.

Senator BOXER. That is good, because again, just for the record, this flood plain is home to half a million people, it contains 165,000 homes, 1,300 government facilities, including our State capital of the largest State in the Union, and businesses providing 200,000 jobs. So this is, I mean, I could argue cost benefit ratios about a lot of places but this is open and shut, as far as it goes. Then to think that the predictions were worse for that area than for Louisiana, I mean, it really gets me going, gets me concerned.

I will be working very closely with you throughout. I am going to go back up there and take a look-see myself. But I just would hope that we would have some transparency here if there are any problems, if you see problems on the horizon, because we know it is going to be very expensive. But the cost of doing nothing, in terms of lives and property damage and the rest of it, is just really almost untold.

Then the other question I had revolves around the Napa River flood control project. I understand the budget has $7.39 million in it. But my understanding is the capability, meaning the project, could take up to $22.8 million. So I want to confirm that is accurate.

General VAN ANTWERP. Ma'am, I am actually showing capability of $24.6 million. And you are correct on the 2009 budget.

Senator BOXER. OK. Well, I hope we can work together. If we are fortunate enough and Congress does move and does restore funding, and I think Congress will, this budget may pass by, I don't know if it will or won't. We have Presidential, we have some illnesses, et cetera. But if this budget does pass, we will have a big

restoration of dollars in the budget itself, and then of course in appropriations we will work as well.

So would you be open to looking at that project, since it is capable of $24.6 million, if you do have more resources, can we talk about that?

General VAN ANTWERP. Yes, ma'am.

Senator BOXER. OK. Those were my two issues, and I would ask Senator Vitter if he would like a second round.

Senator VITTER. Yes, thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Morganza to the Gulf, as I said in the opening statement, it is an enormous frustration to me and everybody who cares about this project in Louisiana. It appears that the Corps is determined not to do this project, no matter what Congress does. Why do I say that? It is because the Corps first started looking at this, was directed to in 1992. The project was authorized in WRDA 2000, pending a chief's report by a certain date, and the Corps missed the deadline. The project is authorized again fully in WRDA 2007. And a month after WRDA 2007 passes, the Corps says, no, nothing doing, because we think project costs will exceed 20 percent of the authorized level, everything is on hold.

That appears to us as complete bad faith and complete determination to not do this work, no matter what Congress says. What is the status of Morganza to the Gulf right now, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. WOODLEY. Right now the project is authorized, based on a feasibility study that is several years old. I think it is entirely prudent that we predetermine, because of the dramatic events that have taken place, and the dramatic changes that have taken place in the cost of construction in that part of the world, that go, that we move aggressively and quickly to determine an up to date cost estimate for the project and advise you of that cost estimate at the earliest possible date.

Senator VITTER. When was it determined by the Corps that you think project costs will exceed 20 percent of authorized level?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't know exactly when that particular determination was made. I do know that it has been apparent for some time that the feasibility study completed in 2002 had been overtaken by events.

Senator VITTER. Why isn't the Corps doing what happens all the time in big projects when there are new, open questions, that you move forward with certain work and you continue to refine and answer those open questions? That is done all the time in big projects, but not here. We are just calling a halt to any progress here.

Mr. WOODLEY. I believe that the rules under which we operate call for us, when a project has, when it is apparent that a project is going to go very substantially over its authorized level, that we return to the authorizing committee for further instructions.

Senator VITTER. Well, let me go back to that time line. Because we passed WRDA in November 2007. Then on December 13th, 1 month later, the chief of engineers' office informs the local sponsor that they expect the costs to go over 20 percent of authorized levels. Why didn't you say boo to us when we are putting the number in WRDA, rather than wait a couple weeks after WRDA passes and say essentially, gotcha? You think you have an authorization? You

don't. Why isn't that clear evidence of basically bad faith, a determination to not do this project on your part?

Mr. WOODLEY. We have made no, by no means have we made a determination not to do the project.

Senator VITTER. You made a determination not to do any work in the foreseeable future, even though we just passed the authorization.

Mr. WOODLEY. We made a determination, I believe, to update the cost estimate and to advise the Congress of the fact that the authorized cost estimate is probably inadequate to complete the project.

Senator VITTER. Do you have a new cost estimate?

Mr. WOODLEY. As of today, I don't believe that we do.

Senator VITTER. So you don't know that it is over 20 percent of the authorized level?

Mr. WOODLEY. It would astonish me if it were not.

Senator VITTER. OK, but you don't have a new cost estimate?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't believe we do.

Senator VITTER. So why can't we move forward with aspects of the project which are ready to go, like the Houma Locks?

Mr. WOODLEY. I would say that, if that lock is a separable element that can be separately justified, that we can proceed with preliminary work like the preconstruction engineering and design with respect to that.

Senator VITTER. Let me move quickly to another big topic that I mentioned, which is the outfall canals. When will the final report be given to Congress regarding the preferred solution to the outfall canal issue?

Mr. WOODLEY. Let me ask the Chief if he could address the operational aspects on that.

General VAN ANTWERP. We are looking at all alternatives for that, sir. One of the things that we are looking at very closely is, should we remove the existing stations, as you have seen, and we have all seen down there. We are proceeding with, we want to go design-build for this. And I think that, I don't know, Don, would you have a date when we might be complete with the report?

Speaker. No, sir, the design-build contractor will give us——

Senator VITTER. I believe there has been a technical report, we have that.

General Van Antwerp. Right, that is correct.

Senator VITTER. I believe there is a cost economic report due, and I thought it was very soon. Is there not a tentative date for that report?

General VAN ANTWERP. We don't have a date for that report. Let me get that to you. But what we are going to do with the design-build, then we will get, as that designer and builder comes on, we are going to get accurate cost data.

Senator VITTER. Madam Chair, can I just follow up on this one topic?

Senator BOXER. One more minute.

Senator VITTER. Will that cost economic report include a specific recommendation in terms of one of the four options, 1, 2, 2(a) or 3?

General VAN ANTWERP. Yes, sir.

Senator VITTER. That decision has not been made yet?

General VAN ANTWERP. No, it has not, to my knowledge.

Senator VITTER. OK. If that decision has not been made, why is the cost of one particular option build into the budget submission? That is the fact. You have submitted a budget. That budget assumes a cost for this work. That is the cost of one of those four options, not all of them, one of them. So it seems to us that everything has been pre-judged. Why am I wrong in coming to that conclusion?

General VAN ANTWERP. I will have to dig deeper into that. I can't answer that question.

Senator VITTER. Finally, Mr. Secretary and General, I would just point out that the technical report, I think, gives clear evidence that option 2, including the possibility of 2(a), is superior in terms of the top goal, flood protection. It says, option 2 is generally more technically advantageous and may be more effective operationally over option 1, because it would have greater reliability and further reduces risk of flooding. I think it is very clear that option 2 is more robust and reduces the risk of flooding much more than option 1. The problem is, even though you say a decision has not been made, the funding level is the funding level of option 1. That obviously causes us great concern that things are being pre-judged by folks like OMB, being driven by cost over engineering.

Senator BOXER. Senator, I think you have made your point here. I think it would be very important for the Corps to explain themselves, because if you are saying a decision has been made, yet you have put a certain amount in, have they put in, Senator Vitter, the largest amount?

Senator VITTER. No, they put in a smaller amount for option 1.

Senator BOXER. That is why that doesn't seem to make any sense, you are right. If they put in the larger amount to be conservative and say, well, if we have to go there, it makes sense. I think Senator Vitter has made some important points. I hope you will get back to him on this, because it does sound odd to me.

Senator Voinovich.

Senator VOINOVICH. I would like a letter from you, Secretary, on the backlog of your OM projects. What is the backlog of your OM projects. I would also like to have a letter on the backlog of construction projects. We added a lot more with the last WRDA bill. But I would like to have that list of how much we——

Mr. WOODLEY. Which backlog do you want, Senator?

Senator VOINOVICH. The whole darned backlog, the backlog of the projects that you have that have been, all the engineering work has been done and a local share is in place. I want to know what it is.

I would also like to know, and all due respect to Senator Vitter, I would like to know how much money has the Corps spent on Katrina since this has all been started. I want to know how much money we spent there. Yes, sir, go ahead.

Mr. WOODLEY. With respect to construction on flood damage and storm surge reduction works, is that what you had in mind?

Senator VOINOVICH. I have the construction projects that you got for the Army Corps of Engineers, including Army Corps projects and the environmental restoration, which we continue to lay on top

of the Corps of Engineers. If there is a question about what it is, I want whoever is going to draft the letter to come to my office and we will sit down and talk about it. We will look at the options, so that we are comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges.

Mr. WOODLEY. Absolutely. That is what I am concerned about.

Senator VOINOVICH. Let's get that scheduled. I want to get that done with a week's time with you, OK?

Mr. WOODLEY. Absolutely. We are available for that.

Senator VOINOVICH. All right, we will see what that is.

The other thing is, I want to know how much money is in that, is it $4.5 billion in the dredging fund?

Mr. WOODLEY. I don't think it is quite that much, but it is a lot of money.

Senator VOINOVICH. It is a lot of money. And it is just sitting there?

Mr. WOODLEY. It is just sitting there.

Senator VOINOVICH. Yes, sir. And I have already talked about the fact that Cleveland Port Authority is not going to have the money to do the dredging. I would like to have the number that you have allocated for dredging in the Great Lakes and what the actual cost is of doing the dredging in the Great Lakes, so we have that number in place.

Last but not least, the Chairman of the Committee has raised the issue about prioritizing. I notice in this written testimony it says that "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 the situation and to achieve greater value to the Nation from the Civil Works construction, the budget again proposes performance guidelines to allocate funds among construction projects."

I think the Chairman was talking about, we try to come up with a new prioritization of how you go about doing these projects. I think, Madam Chairman, you said that they haven't done it yet.

Senator BOXER. That is right.

Senator VOINOVICH. I think that is one of the things that we ought to be doing. We ought to be looking at prioritization. I know when I was Governor, I came in and they had $26 billion of highway projects. So we spent 3 years coming up with an objective as to determining which ones are priority one, priority two and priority three, so we had some semblance of just where we should be going with this.

And I would at least like the Corps to do what we asked them to do in the last WRDA bill, and the Chairman of the Committee, Madam Chairman has talked about starting another WRDA bill. Maybe as a parting shot or contribution to America, Mr. Woodley, maybe you ought to write us a letter and say, if you really wanted to get this done in terms of prioritization and get things, kind of a semblance of what is No. 1, No. 2, No. 3 priorities, understanding that you get lobbied from all of us for our own pet projects, I would like to know some objective, your ideas on how we could be more

objective in getting at this backlog and in conveying to the American people just what it is.

That is our problem. They don't get it. They don't get it. They just think that money is coming out of—something. They don't understand that we are $9 trillion in debt. They don't understand that our dollar is worth very little today. They don't understand that our debt now is being purchased by the Arab nations and the Chinese and others. They don't get it.

So we need to get those facts in front of us. I know Senator Clinton and I and others have an infrastructure commission that we would like to get done. It is sitting over in the House. We need to do that, as a national priority, Madam Chairman, we need to have a comprehensive, we did it with highways, for this Country, so that we all understand just exactly what the challenge is. Because we have been sticking our head in the sand too long. We are going to wake up and we are not going to have the infrastructure that we need to be competitive in this global marketplace.

Senator BOXER. Senator Voinovich, I so much appreciate your comments. I will work with you on this.

Do you have any further comments?

Senator VOINOVICH. That is it.

Senator BOXER. OK. Let me just say, rather than ask any further questions, I will be sending a letter, just because, General, I was very pleased that you mentioned global warming. Because in all of your plans, I am assuming you are now really looking hard at that. Am I correct?

General VAN ANTWERP. Ma'am, we are looking hard at climate change. I will use those words. Because we know that the climate has actually been very schizophrenic, even here in the United States, some places in the southwest were just inundated, and of course, we have drought in other places. So it definitely is part of it. Sea level rise is another thing that has to be accounted for in projects.

Senator BOXER. What I am going to do is send you a letter, because right now, in California, the reason we are at such risk due to global warming is because with rising temperatures, and as we know, that has nothing to do with what the temperature is today or tomorrow, it is temperature over time, as the scientists have told us, and they have given us their crystal ball, and they are 90 percent certain that they are right.

So we have this crystal ball the scientists have given us, they say look at it, and with rising temperatures, we are going to see the rate of the melting snow pack will cause increased runoff, increasing the flood elevation, making flooding more devastating. We are already seeing that snow pack melt sooner. It means you have to be very mindful of releases from different reservoirs and so on and so forth.

So I am going to send you a letter. I am going to ask you how you are incorporating the impacts of the snow pack due to global warming into the Corps' plan and into your operating procedures for existing reservoirs. Because I will tell you, if you don't look at it, and we make a plan for one set of circumstances, it turns out to be inadequate because we didn't build this in, it is a real problem.

And as you probably know, there are some insurers who have stopped insuring properties that are along the coastlines now. This is serious stuff. The United States of America, we are big business. And you are part of it. Without your work, as Senator Voinovich says, we can't have the kind of economy that we have to have. We need that infrastructure. So it has to fit the times.

Now, I am going to work hard with others to try and avert the worst damaging impacts. I would recommend to you a book called Six Degrees. If you haven't read it, you ought to read it. This is a national—and I hope maybe Senator Voinovich will read this book. What this individual does, he writes for National Geographic. He shows what would happen for every degree of warming over time. It just puts it into some very stark terms. Those of us who are working hard know we can't avert it all, but we can avert the worst if we move forward. I hope you are taking it into account.

I think you have seen a lot of strong feelings today in front of you. I hope you realize that we care about the work you do. We want to give you the tools to do the best that you can. We want your honesty. Let OMB put on their eye shades, and let them tell us what their priorities are. Guess what? They are not elected and they don't have the jobs you have. We are going to restore the money for the Corps. We don't care what they say. We are going to restore it. We did it last time, we are going to do it again. Why? Because we have to be able to address the infrastructure needs of our people.

So we are going to do that. So get ready to plan that. That gets to Senator Voinovich's last point about prioritization. I asked you about a couple of projects that I know well. And it is important for you to be thinking, if we do get that funding restored, and when you have Senator Inhofe and everybody work together to restore it, it will be restored. We hope you will move quickly to tell us what projects you think are worthy of moving forward.

And that gets again to Senator Voinovich's point, which ones are ready with the local share, the reports are done, the environmental impact assessments are done. We need to be ready, because my view is you will get additional funding. Because we are not going to be cutting the Army Corps' budget. It is just not going to happen. It can't happen for a great Country like this.

So we thank you very much. If we were tough on you, understand it is out of deep commitment to the work that you do that we are kind of tough.

Thank you very much. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. INHOFE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Thank you Chairman Boxer for holding this hearing, and thank you Secretary Woodley and General Van Antwerp for testifying before us today.

Today's hearing is to look at the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Corps of Engineers as well as the implementation of WRDA 2007. Let me first say a few words about WRDA 2007 before I speak to the budget request. Many of us on this committee worked very hard for several years to enact what should have been WRDA 2002. Instead, we had 5 extra years in which project cost estimates increased significantly and many local communities had to hope that the delay wouldn't prove disastrous. We owe these local communities and Federal taxpayers nationwide better than that.

In order to avoid these circumstances going forward, Senator Boxer and I have both previously indicated how important we feel it is to get back on a 2-year cycle by working on a WRDA 2008. Today I want to reaffirm my commitment to doing so.

We should not underestimate how important the many project authorizations and policy improvements in WRDA 2007 are to the country's economy, public safety and environment. I look forward to hearing from the Assistant Secretary and the Chief what their plans are for speedy implementation of these many important provisions.

As far as the President's budget request for fiscal year 9, I have to say that I was extremely disappointed to see that this request was not only a significant decrease from fiscal year enacted levels, but that it was even a decrease from the fiscal year budget request. Unfortunately, it's not uncommon for a Presidential budget request to come in under the previous year's enacted levels. It doesn't seem to matter which party is in the White House or which party controls Congress, Congress typically does more to acknowledge and address our water resources needs than does the executive branch. To see a reduction from last year's budget request, however, is truly disheartening.

As a fiscal conservative, I strongly support the overall goal of reigning in government spending, but I firmly believe that the two things the Federal Government should spend money on are defense and infrastructure. It may not be as exciting or headline-grabbing as some other areas of government spending, but a robust and well-maintained national infrastructure system is what allows our economy to remain strong and continue to grow.

I was pleased to see the Administration acknowledge the need for continued investment in our inland waterways system. Just from a parochial perspective, I know that the McKlellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System in Oklahoma and Arkansas could function much more efficiently and productively if we proceed with deepening it to 12 feet from its current 9 foot depth. I am not fundamentally opposed to user fees where appropriate, but I plan to wait for more details before deciding whether to support or oppose this proposal.

Finally, let me convey my appreciation for the Corps' work in subsidence reporting, cleanup and resident assistance at the Tar Creek Superfund site. The Corps has consistently responded quickly and helpfully to the variety of issues that have arisen during our efforts at this site.

I look forward to hearing the witness testimony and to discussing these issues in more depth during the question and answer period.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Thank you Madam Chairman for convening this important hearing to discuss the Fiscal Year 2009 President's Budget request for the Army Corps of Engineers. In my home State of Connecticut, we rely heavily on the work of the Army Corps to keep our harbors open, our rivers navigable, and our cities dry. I am greatly aware of the important work this agency does and believe it is essential that they are provided with sufficient resources to complete their work in the most efficient and environmentally responsible manner. With those resources comes the responsibility for improved management and increased transparency into the decisionmaking process. I hope that the witnesses here today will elaborate on specific actions that are being taken in this regard to meet the requirements in the Water Resources Development Act of 2007.

While the Army Corps is beginning to place greater emphasis on performance-based budgeting when making construction prioritization decisions, I believe more must be done to increase the use of environmental metrics in their benefit to cost analysis of projects. WRDA recognizes the importance of responsible environmental management, and yet I fear that the Army Corps failed to consider environmental factors as part of its benefit to cost ratio when setting construction priorities for 2009. Given the diverse environmental implications of the work that the Army Corps undertakes on this Nation's behalf, not including the environment as part of the benefit to cost ratio is unacceptable.

While environmental considerations may not have played a large role when setting construction priorities, I want to applaud the Army Corps for beginning to look beyond individual projects toward the broader watershed implications of their work and solutions to problems in the area of operations and maintenance. A more holistic view is essential to preserving the environment and I am pleased to see that the Army Corps is beginning to use the US Geological Survey's sub-watersheds as a way to allocate funding among 54 geographic areas. Unfortunately, details on how specific sub-watersheds were identified and the actual implementation of this sub-wa-

tershed allocation of operations and maintenance funding are not very clear. I hope the witnesses today will provide specific details on how this management approach will be used and how it differs from the watershed allocations from the Fiscal Year 2008 budget.

I am also interested in hearing from these witnesses on the progress the Army Corps is making in implementing a number of the reforms called for in WRDA. I am a strong advocate for greater transparency in the decisionmaking process the Army Corps uses to select and fund projects. For example, the use of peer review can be an effective tool to ensure that projects are appropriately assessed and a wide range of impacts fully considered before significant funds are allocated for a project that may have been improperly scoped. I am interested to know what progress the Army Corps is making on identifying projects that meet the peer review criteria established in WRDA and how the peer review process will be implemented in the future.

The Army Corps faces a number of challenges as it undertakes ambitious management reforms. I thank the witnesses for being here today to help us navigate the contents of the Fiscal Year 2009 request for the Army Corps of Engineers, including the steps that are being taken to comply with the requirements of WRDA, and welcome them to this hearing.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN WARNER, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Good Morning Madame Chairwoman and colleagues on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. I thank you for holding this hearing today to discuss the President's proposed budget for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and also to discuss the implementation of last year's Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) bill.

As my colleagues are aware, the President's fiscal year 2009 budget request for the Army Corps of Engineers is $4.741 billion, an amount that represents a decrease of $851 million from the fiscal year 8-enacted level of $5.592 billion. I am concerned about this decrease in light of the passage of WRDA 2007 and the growing infrastructure needs of our Nation. This hearing is a good first step, as we open dialog to budgetary concerns and the needs of our nation's civil works program provided by the Army Corps of Engineers.

I was glad to see the passage of WRDA in 2007, legislation that was long overdue. Today, I look forward to an engaging discussion about the progress made by the WRDA reforms and the progress that remains to be seen. As we look back on the efforts we have made, I am confident that we can create a successful WRDA for 2008.

Last, I'd like to note the good work that the Corps has been doing and is doing in my state, Virginia. Divided amongst five Army Corps districts (Baltimore, Huntington, Nashville, Wilmington, and Norfolk), Virginia has been lucky to have extremely competent and talent leaders at each outpost. Their professionalism and dedication have furthered projects across the state—from flood control projects in the city of Roanoke and Town of Grundy, to the development of Craney Island in Norfolk, to oyster restoration efforts in the Chesapeake. I have been pleased to work with all of these districts and praise their good work.

Madame Chairwoman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning, and for holding this important hearing.

○