

Will & Carlson, Inc.

WRDA 2007

BUILDING A NEW FOUNDATION FOR THE WEST

A REPORT TO

THE

OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS

PREPARED

BY

PETER CARLSON

PRESIDENT

DECEMBER, 2007

5335 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Suite 440 · P.O. Box 42727, Washington, D.C. 20015
(202) 966-2190 · Fax (202) 966-2191 Email: pcarlson@willandcarlson.com

INTRODUCTION

The following report entitled *WRDA 2007 Building a New Foundation For the West*, was prepared by Peter Carlson of the government relations firm of Will & Carlson, Inc. The report covers the full range of projects contained in the *2007 Water Resources Development Act* (2007 WRDA). It focuses on the specific projects in the State of Oregon in the context of other provisions for the Western United States which are listed at the end of the report. This is done for the sole purpose of providing statewide organizations, such as the Oregon Water Resources Congress, examples of policy changes and projects to consider as they make future decisions regarding future water resource issues in their own particular state and region. Where there are future policy recommendations, interpretations and editorial comments in this report, these are solely those of Will & Carlson., Inc.

It is our hope that this report will be shared with other Western states and anyone with an interest in national, regional, state and local water policy and planning issues. By providing this information we also hope to help bring about a more rounded understanding on what the 2007 WRDA represents for the future of the West. We believe it not only represents a vital tool chest, but also the individual tools to better assist those charged with this responsibility.

BACKGROUND

The passage of the *2007 Water Resources Development Act* (H.R.1495/P.L.110-114), the seven-year-in-the-making new authorization bill for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers program, has presented the membership of the Oregon Water Resources Congress (OWRC) and its partner organizations with numerous project authorizations and policy changes to assist in the management and development of water resource projects and programs in the respective seventeen Western states.

For those unfamiliar, the Oregon Water Resources Congress is a statewide association founded in 1912 to represent local governments that supply water for irrigation, primarily irrigations districts and water control districts, and including member ports, other special districts and local government. The association represent the entities that operate water management systems, including water supply reservoirs, canals, pipeline, and hydropower production.

This report has been prepared to highlight those projects that are authorized or modified by the new legislation and to bring to light new policy changes for programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. While the State of Oregon is in the beginning stages of a process for updating its own state water plan, I believe the Corps can be a more important partner by assisting the state and the OWRC membership with the new tools provided in this legislation. Historically, at least half of the OWRC membership has looked to the Department of the Interior's U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for assistance. And, in recent years, I have seen the emergence of assistance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service through programs that were tailored to address specific needs; involving components of programs these agencies offered to certain segments of the OWRC membership.

This report will focus on the first five titles of the new Act: Title I – Project Authorizations, Title II – Policy Provisions, Title III – Project Related Provisions, Title IV – Studies, and Title V – Project Miscellaneous Provisions. The remaining titles of the Act focus on non-Western parts of the country. Since there are over 700 individual provisions in the new Act, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is in the process of developing implementation guidance for each title.

TITLE I

Title I authorizes the Corps to carry out all new projects that have completed reports from the Chief of Engineers. There is one provision for Oregon in this title - Johnson Creek, a small project for aquatic ecosystem restoration - and 54 other provisions for the rest of the West.

TITLE II

Title II contains the *General Provisions* where the preponderance of guidance from Corps Headquarters will be forthcoming. There are 47 non-project specific provisions in this title that represent about \$400 million. For many of the parties involved in the development of this legislation, the major debates and discussions centered around Section 2034 – *Independent Peer Review*. Continued oversight and additional legislative efforts are expected to occur in the near future as a result of standing policy differences as well as an expected degree of review that were wanted from those who feel a strong need for further reform in this policy area.

TITLE II-POLICY DISCUSSION AND MY SPECIFIC COMMENT ON CONTENT

The General Provisions of Title II provide in virtually every section valuable tools, reports and policy changes that will shape the future of OWRC members and their partners throughout the West. I would like to stress how important it is to be involved in the implementation of the guidance, reviews and reports so that the challenges of today and tomorrow can be addressed in the most informed and appropriate manner.

An area of interest is how the provisions in this Title will be integrated with other legislation currently before Congress. There are provisions for national water policy commissions and provisions for other studies to take place, or studies that have been previously authorized that have yet to yield results. In addition there are new provisions in the Farm Bill legislation before Congress that could also be beneficial. It is within this Title of the Act that I would like to draw the most attention by the OWRC membership and its partners in the West who are not used to working with the Corps. .

When one reads through the hearing record and floor debates over the past seven years, it is evident that Congress recognizes that adequate water resources are essential to economic growth and environmental sustainability. Independent research shows that the nation will face significant water resource challenges to support projected population growth and to sustain regional economies and the health of regional ecosystems.

While the primacy for water resources management is at the state and local level, there is a Federal role in supporting the leadership of state and local governments in sustaining economic growth and healthy ecosystems, and to manage water resources in unique interstate contexts. One need look no further than the Columbia River to see those challenges, and on a micro-scale the Deschutes Basin to see a working model of what can be achieved. The Congress - through *WRDA 2007* - recognizes the national asset inherent in the planning, engineering and scientific capabilities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The nation cannot afford to overlook the benefits of the Corps working with state and local governments to support sustaining our economy and the environment, particularly when these non-federal entities also recognize the benefits of such partnerships.

State, tribal and local governments and interstate agencies are responding to water resource challenges through partnership planning and by designing the financial mechanisms to build the infrastructure to sustain economic growth and our environment. In Oregon, one sees the effort that is underway to update the State Water Plan as well as the funding that is made available by the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board (OWEB) and the funding that comes from the Northwest Power Planning Council, as examples of innovative integration of non-traditional financing to move water resource-related programs forward. In other parts of the West, the State of Texas is acknowledged as an innovator; the Texas Water Development Board is providing leadership and technical guidance for a bottom-up state water plan that is viewed as a model for other state and Federal water planners to emulate – a forward-looking approach for addressing future water resource challenges . Other states in the West, such as Oklahoma, have actually legislated state water resources planning.

Professionals in the water resource policy business advance the following points with regard to planning efforts:

- Development of dependable water supply for a single entity is no longer a viable option, since ensuring that water-poor regions have adequate sources necessitates a condition of interdependency between regions. The result will be solutions that coordinate regional and interstate issues. For the West, this is brought home by the simple fact that the Columbia, the Colorado, the Rio Grande, Platte and the Missouri Rivers transverse more than one state border.
- With the increasing demand for water, development efforts of single-purpose water supply projects are meeting increased opposition and judicial challenge. Future projects will have to take into account all the competing purposes (economic, environmental, recreation, etc.) for the available water. Watershed interactions will focus attention on formulating multi-purpose projects. However, a greater consideration of the authority to undertake single-purpose water supply projects may become an important tool to address conditions that result uniquely from climate change.

The uncertainties of climate change increase the uncertainties of meeting already difficult water resource challenges. Greater consideration must be given, not only in the West but the country as a whole, to the formulation of adaptive management strategies to cope with these challenges and sustain our water resources for present and future generations. The Corps of Engineers should continue to support state, tribal and local governments and interstate agencies in developing climate change strategies. This is a mission for the Corps given not only its nationwide presence but as having the lead status as the most capable water resource planning agency, with the potential to become the ‘integrator’ of information from other mission efforts in the water resource arena by the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

In the *Water Resources Development Act of 2007*, particularly in Title II, Congress took some initial steps that help achieve these described aims by empowering the Corps to support non-federal water resources plans:

1. Sec. 2013. Technical Assistance - Facilitating increased Corps support to states, tribes and localities through modest adjustments to Section 22 of the Flood Control Act of 1970.
2. Sec. 2017. Access to water resource data - Empowering partnerships between the Corps and non-federal interests to share data and develop analysis tools to support integrated water resources management.
3. Sec. 2033. Planning - Creating ‘Planning Centers of Expertise’ to position the Corps to lead the complex, integrated planning to meet our water resource challenges.
4. Sec. 5119. Statewide comprehensive water planning, Oklahoma - Groundbreaking authority to support state water resources planning through the unparalleled planning, engineering and technical knowledge of the Corps. This section is an excellent example of what the new trend-line should be for the future in water resources planning.

There are some in the country who believe that, even with the reform efforts that have been implanted in the *WRDA 2007* legislation, the recent past performance and actions by the Corps does not support granting such mission scope and control to them. To that end I would recommend legislation creating a State Water Resources Advisory Board in at the Federal level, to give increased voice to the states in evaluating Corps’ water resource projects and programs. It should provide a mechanism for more proactive involvement of governors, mayors, county executives and other elected officials in the management of water resource programs. This is one of the important lessons gained from a review of other bottom-up planning efforts, referenced above.

There is a very simple way to express the concepts behind such efforts; it's called 'Following the P's'. When thought of in terms of people, places, policies, projects and programs, one may regard the important elements as preparedness, planning, prevention, partnerships and protection – to become guiding principles in these expected planning efforts.

TITLE III

Title III of *WRDA 2007* authorizes about \$3.1 billion of new project-related provisions. Approximately 75 of the provisions in this Title are in the Western states, several in our neighboring states of Idaho and Washington. There is \$15 million provided for the Upper Willamette River Watershed Ecosystem effort, and directive language on land conveyance for Boardman, the Lookout Point Project, and Lowell

TITLE IV

Title IV contains about \$157 million in new studies. The Corps has indicated that most of these would follow their normal budgeting process. This section authorizes \$5 million for a 'Corps Ecosystem Restoration and Fish Passage Improvement' program. For OWRC members who are avid historians, this concept was the precursor for the development of the *Fish Restoration Irrigation Mitigation Act* (FRIMA) program that was authorized in 2000. An example of the maxim '*No good idea goes unpunished*' - sometimes it just takes years to grow on its own. This section also contains a study for the Walla Walla River Basin.

TITLE V

Title V of the legislation contains Miscellaneous Provisions. There are about 115 provisions for the West and two for Oregon: the Fern Ridge Dam and \$35 million for Albany, Oregon under the Corps ever-expanding and increasingly controversial Section 219 program. This program has grown into some 275 projects that have been authorized for wastewater improvements (67 in this legislation). The Congress has authorized the Corps to undertake certain projects and areas, which haven't been able to obtain funding through federal agencies such EPA, within their Section 219 program. The Title also contains authorization for a research program for Columbia River and Snake River Salmon.

CONCLUSION

What many don't realize is that the *WRDA 2007* legislation is national in scope. More importantly, it is a program for projects, studies and initiatives that are of great importance to the West and beneficial to Oregon in particular. It is a program that, if used appropriately, can meet challenges before they become problems. And, given the ongoing Federal budgetary challenges, it offers regional stakeholders opportunities through partnerships, whether they involve cooperation at the local, the state, or the federal level.

The Oregon Congressional delegation has a long history of interest in the disposition of Corps of Engineers' programs, especially in the navigation and flood control areas. They have shown a consistent regard for the environmental division of the program, and have been heavily involved in the provisions contained in Title II of the legislation.

The OWRC membership has a dependable tradition of working with the Bureau of Reclamation. In recent years, members have also found themselves using program tools from the Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And, as any committed water resource professionals would, they have pursued and participated and involved themselves in, and made use of, state and regional programs - bringing additional value to addressing water resource challenges. You have also been great practitioners in educating your fellow Westerners on new ideas and approaches. As a believer in the maxim '*You can't use what you don't know about*' - I expect you will put this new information, and this new legislation, to great benefit.

In order to better assist your understanding of its details in greater depth, attached to the electronic version of this report is the '*Water Resources Development Act of 2007*' - P.L. 110-114

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT (S. 1495) PL 110-114
Project Provisions Located In the 17 Western States**

**Title I – WATER RESOURCE PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS
(Total Dollar Amount Authorized in Whole Title \$6.17 billion – Approximately \$3.5 billion Federal)**

Section 1001 - PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Arizona

Santa Cruz River, Paseo De Las Islesias - \$97.7m

Tanque Verde Creek -\$ 5.9m

Salt River (Rio Salado Oeste) Maricopa County- \$166.6m

Salt River (Va Shly'ay Akimel) Maricopa County -\$162.1m

California

Hamilton City - \$52.4m

Imperial Beach (Silver Strand Shoreline) - \$13.7m

Matilija Dam - \$144.5m

Middle Creek - \$45.2m

Napa River Salt Marsh -\$134.5m

Colorado

South Platte River (Denver County Reach) - \$20.1m

New Mexico

Southwest Valley (Bernalillo County) -\$24.8m

Texas

Corpus Christi Ship Channel - \$188.1m

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway -\$17.2m

Lower Colorado River Basin Phase 1 - \$110.7m

Washington

Centralia, (Chehalis River, Lewis County) - \$6.5m (credit)

Section 1002 Small Projects for Flood Damage Reduction (Studies)

Arizona

Little Colorado River Levee

California

Barrel Springs Wash, Palmdale

Borrego Springs

Colton

Dunlap Stream, Yucaipa

Hunts Canyon Wash, Palmdale

Ontario and Chino

Santa Venetia

Whittier

Wildwood Creek, Yucaipa

Texas

Congelosi Ditch, Missouri City

Dilley

Wyoming

Cheyenne

Special Rules

California

Ontario and Chino

Santa Venetia

Whittier

Wildwood Creek, Yucaipa

Texas

Dilley

Section 1003 – Small Projects for Emergency Streambank Protection (Studies)

California

Aliso Creek

Texas

Johnson Creek, Arlington

Section 1005 – Small Projects for Improvement of the Quality of the Environment

California

Ballona Creek, Los Angeles County

Ballona Lagoon Tide Gates, Marina Del Rey

Section 1006 Small Projects for Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration

California

Ben Lomond Dam, Santa Cruz

Dockweiler Bluffs, Lost Angeles County

Salt River

San Diego River

Santa Rosa Creek, Santa Rosa

Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel and Lower San Joaquin River

Suisun Marsh, San Pablo Bay

Sweetwater Reservoir, San Diego County

Montana

Mobley Dam, Tongue River

S and H Dam, Tongue River

Vandalia Dam, Milk River

Nevada

Truckee River, Reno

Oregon

Johnson Creek

Special Rules

Truckee River, Reno - \$6 million

Section 1007 Small Projects For Shoreline Protection

California

Nicholas Canyon, Los Angeles

Texas

Port Aransas

Section 1010 – Small Projects for Aquatic Plant Control

Nebraska

Republican River Basin

TITLE II General Provisions

(Total dollar Amount Authorized in Whole Title – Approximately \$400million)

- Sec. 2001 – Non-Federal Contributions
- Sec. 2002 – Funding to Process Permits
- Sec. 2003 – Written Agreement for Water Resources Projects
- Sec. 2004 - Compilation of Laws
- Sec. 2007 – Use of Other Federal Funds
- Sec. 2008 – Revision of Project Partnership Agreement – Cost Sharing
- Sec. 2011 – Tribal Partnership Program
- Sec. 2012 – Wildfire Fighting
- Sec. 2013 – Technical Assistance
- Sec. 2014 – Lakes Program – Lake Sakaakawea, North Dakota
- Sec. 2015 – Cooperative Agreements - wetlands restoration
- Sec. 2016 – Training Funds
- Sec. 2017 – Access to Water Resource Data
- Sec. 2019 – Ability To Pay – Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas
- Sec. 2020 – Aquatic Ecosystem and Estuary Restoration (Allows for Dam Removal)
- Sec. 2024 – Modification of Projects for Improvement of the Quality of the Environment
- Sec. 2025 – Remediation of Abandoned Mine Sites
- Sec. 2026 – Leasing Authority (Indian Tribes)
- Sec. 2027 – Fiscal Transparency Report
- Sec. 2028 – Support of Civil Works Program – University of Texas Center for Decision
and Risk Analysis
- Sec. 2030 – Interagency and International Support Authority
- Sec. 2031 – Water Resources Principles and Guidelines
- Sec. 2032 – Water Resource Priorities Report
- Sec. 2033 – Planning
- Sec. 2034 – Independent Peer Review
- Sec. 2035 – Safety Assurance Review
- Sec. 2036 – Mitigation for Fish and Wildlife and Wetland Losses
- Sec. 2037 – Regional Sediment Management – Fletcher Cover, California, Galveston
Bay, Texas, -Benson Beach, Washington
- Sec. 2039 – Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration
- Sec. 2040 – Electronic Submission of Permit Applications
- Sec. 2041 – Project Administration
- Sec. 2043 – Studies and Reports for Water Resources Projects
- Sec. 2044 – Coordination and Scheduling of Federal, State, and Local Actions
- Sec. 2045 – Project Streamlining

TITLE III - PROJECT RELATED PROVISIONS
(Total Dollar Amount Authorized in Whole Title – Approximately \$3.1 billion)

Arizona

Nogales Wash and Tributaries - \$25.4m
Rio De Flag, Flagstaff – \$54.1m
Tucson Drainage Area - \$66.7m

California

Cache Creek Basin
Calfed Levee Stability Program - \$106m
Compton Creek
Grayson Creek/Murderer's Creek
Hamilton airfield - \$228.1m
John F. Baldwin Ship Channel and Stockton Channel
Kaweah River
Larkspur Ferry Channel –
Llagas Creek - \$105m
Magpie Creek – \$10m
Oakland Inner Harbor Tidal Canal (land conveyance)
Pacific Flyway Center, Sacramento - \$2m
Petaluma River - \$41.5m
Pine Flat Dam -\$20m
Pinole Creek
Prado Dam
Redwood City Navigation Project
Sacramento and American Rivers Flood Control \$683m
Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel
Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel (1986 Auth)
Sacramento River Bank Protection
Salton Sea Restoration - \$30m
Santa Ana Mainstem - \$1.8billion
Santa Barbara Streams -\$30m
Santa Cruz Harbor
Seven Oaks
Upper Guadalupe River \$244m
Walnut Creek Channel
Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase I
Wildcat/San Pablo Creek Phase II
Yuba River Basin - \$107m

Colorado

South Platte River Basin

Idaho

Dworshak Reservoir Improvements \$5.3m

Little Wood River - \$9m

Kansas

Milford (land conveyance)

Strawn Cemetery, John Redmond Lake (land conveyance)

Montana

Lower Yellowstone Project

Yellowstone River and Tributaries

Upper Basin of Missouri River

Nebraska

Antelope Creek, Lincoln

San Creek Watershed, Wahoo

Western Sarpy and Clear Creek \$21.6m

Nevada

Lower Truckee River, McCarran Ranch – \$5.7m

New Mexico

Cooperative Agreements

Middle Rio Grande Restoration \$25m

North Dakota

Missouri River Restoration - \$25m

Wahpeton - \$12.m

Oklahoma

Arcadia Lake

Arkansas River Corridor -\$50m

Lake Eufaula

Oklahoma Lakes Demonstration Program

Ottawa County

Red River Chloride Control

Waurika Lake

Oregon

Upper Willamette River Watershed Ecosystem Restoration - \$15m

Boardman (land conveyance)

Lookout Point Project (land conveyance)

Lowell (extinguishment of Reversionary Interest)

South Dakota

Missouri River Restoration

Texas

Cedar Bayou –

Denison (land conveyance)

Freeport Harbor

Lake Kemp

Lower Rio Grande Basin

North Padre Island, Corpus Christi Bay

Pat Mayse Lake

Proctor Lake

San Antonio Channel

Washington

Lower Granite Pool (Extinguishment of Reversionary Interest)

McNary Lock and Dam, McNary National Wildlife Refuge

Snake River Project - \$5m

Yakima River, Port of Sunnyside

Title IV – STUDIES

(Total Dollar Amount Authorized in Whole Title – Approximately \$157million)

Arizona

Gila Bend

California

Aliso Creek

Fresno, Kings, and Kern Counties

Fruitvale Avenue Railroad Bridge, Alameda

Los Angeles River revitalization \$25m

Lytle Creek, Rialto

Mokelumne River, San Joaquin County

Orick

Oceanside Shoreline Special Study

Rialto, Fontana and Colton

Sacramento River

San Francisco Bay, Sacramento San Joaquin Delta,

South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study

Twentynine Palms

Yucca Valley

Colorado

Selenium Study

Idaho

Boise River

Oregon

Ecosystem Restoration and Fish Passage Improvements - \$5m
Walla Walla River Basin

Southwestern United States

Drought Study - \$7m

Texas

Abilene

Coastal Texas Ecosystem Protection and Restoration
Port of Galveston

Utah

Grand County and Moab
Southwestern Utah

Washington

Elliott Bay Seawall

Title V Miscellaneous Provisions

(Total Dollar Amount Authorized in Whole Title – Approximately \$4.5billion)

Watershed Management

Washington

Sauk River Basin

Dam Safety

Idaho

Fish Creek Dam, Blaine County

Estuary Restoration

Expedited Reports and Completion of Project

California

Laguna Creek Watershed flood damage reduction

Expedited Completion of Reports

Colorado

Fountain Creek Watershed

Texas

Sabine-Neches Waterway

Missouri River and Tributaries, Mitigation, Recovery, and Restoration, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming

Research and Development Program for Columbia and Snake River Salmon Survival
\$25m/\$10m

Program of Environmental Assistance

California - \$40m

California

Calaveras River and Littlejohn Creek and Tributaries, Stockton

Cambria

Contra Costa Canal

Dana Point Harbor

East San Joaquin County

Eastern Santa Clara Basin

LA-3 Dredged material Ocean Disposal Site Designation

Lancaster

Los Osos

Pine Flat Dam Fish and Wildlife Habitat

Raymond Basin, Six Basins, Chino Basin and San Gabriel Basin

San Francisco

San Francisco, Water Front Area

San Pablo Bay

St. Helena

Upper Calaveras River, Stockton

Colorado

Rio Grande, Environmental Management Program

Idaho

Rural Idaho - \$55m

Riley Creek Recreation Area

Nebraska

Lower Platte River Watershed Restoration

New Mexico

Rio Grande Environmental Management Program

Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas

Rural New Mexico – \$25m

Nevada

Rural Nevada - \$150m

Oklahoma

Statewide Comprehensive Water Planning -\$6.3m

Oregon

Fern Ridge Dam

South Dakota

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and Terrestrial, Wildlife Habitat

Restoration - \$500,000/\$500,000

Texas

Environmental Assistance - \$40m

Bosque River Watershed - \$10m

Dallas County region -\$40m

Dallas Floodway -\$459m

Harris County –

Johnson Creek, Arlington -\$80m

Onion Creek

Rio Grande Environmental Management Program

Washington

Baker Bay and Ilwaco Harbor

Hamilton Island Campground

Erosion Control, Puget Island

Willapa Bay

Construction of Flood Control Projects by Non-Federal Interests

California

Perris

Texas

Buffalo Bayou

Halls Bayou

Additional Assistance For Critical Projects (Sec. 219 Projects)

California

Alameda and Contra Costa Counties - \$25m
Aliso Creek, Orange County -\$5m
Amador County - \$3m
Arcadia, Sierra Madre, and Upland -\$33m + \$13m
Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency - \$15m
Brawley Colonia, Imperial County \$1.4m
Calaveras County - \$3m
Contra Costa Water District - \$23m
East Bay, San Francisco, and Santa Clara Areas - \$4m
East Palo Alto - \$4m
Imperial County - \$10m
La Habra - \$5m
La Mirada - \$4m
Los Angeles County -\$3m
Los Angeles County, Santa Monica Bay - \$20m
Malibu- \$3m
Montebello - \$4m
New River - \$10m
Orange County -\$10m
Port of Stockton - \$3m
Perris – Eastern Municipal Water District - \$3m
San Bernardino County - \$9m
Santa Clara County - \$5.5m
Santa Monica - \$3m
Southern Los Angeles County - \$15m
Stockton - \$33m
Sweetwater Reservoir - \$375,000
Whittier -\$8m

Colorado

Arkansas Valley Conduit - \$10m
Boulder County - \$10m
Montezuma and La Plata Counties -\$1m
Otero, Bent, Crowley, Kiowa and Prowers Counties -\$35m
Pueblo and Otero Counties -\$34m

Kansas

Atchison - \$20m

Nevada

Clark County – \$30m
Clean Water Coalition - \$50m
Glendale Dam - \$10m
Henderson -\$13m
Indian Springs - \$12m
Reno, Highland Canal Bypass - \$13m
Washoe County - \$14m

North Dakota

Water-related Infrastructure - \$15m
Devils Lake -\$15m

Oklahoma

Ada - \$1.7m
Alva – \$250,000
Ardmore - \$1.9m
Bartlesville - \$2.5m
Bethany – \$1.5m
Chickasha - \$650,000
Disney and Langley - \$2.5m
Durant - \$3.3m
Eastern Oklahoma State University, Wilberton - \$1.0m
Guymon - \$16.0m
Konawa - \$500,000
Lugert-Altus Irrigation District - \$5m
Midwest City -\$2m
Mustang - \$3.325m
Norman - \$10m
Oklahoma Panhandle State University - \$275,000
Weatherford - \$500,000
Woodward, \$1.5m

Oregon

Albany – \$35m

South Dakota

Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation - \$35m

Texas

Central Texas - \$20m
El Paso County - \$25m
Ft. Bend - \$20m

Utah

Duchesne, Iron and Uintah Counties - \$10.8m