



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers®**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS**

**CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM**

**FIVE-YEAR DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Fiscal Year 2008 – Fiscal Year 2012**

**June 2007**

# Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Strategic Framework and Direction .....	1-6
3. Methods and Assumptions .....	6
Base Plan Scenario.....	6-8
Enhanced Plan Scenario.....	8-11
Tables Scenario.....	11-13
4. Business Programs Five Year Plans .....	14
Navigation.....	14-17
Flood Control and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction.....	17-24
Environmental.....	24
Ecosystem Restoration.....	24-27
Environmental Stewardship .....	27-36
FUSRAP .....	36-42
Hydropower .....	42-45
Recreation .....	45-51
Regulatory.....	51-57
Emergency Management .....	58-65
Water Supply .....	65-67
5. Continuing Authorities Program Management Plan.....	68-71
6. Tables.....	72
Table X-1 Cross-Walk Between Accounts and Business Programs, FY 2008, Base Plan Scenario .....	72
Table X-2 Cross-Walk Between Accounts and Business Programs, FY 2008, Enhanced Plan Scenario.....	73
Table I-1 Investigations Account, Base Plan Scenario.....	74
Table I-2 Investigations Account, Enhanced Plan Scenario.....	75
Table I-3 – Additional Studies and PEDs with Funding Capabilites.....	76-80
Table C-1 Construction Account, Base Plan Scenario .....	81
Table C-2 Construction Account, Enhanced Plan Scenario .....	82
Table C-3 Additional Construction Projects with Funding Capabilities .....	83-85
Table C-4 Continuing Authority Program Projects, Five-Year Capability-Level Funding.....	86-101
Table M-1 Mississippi River and Tributaries Account, Base Plan Scenario.....	102
Table M-2 Mississippi River and Tributaries Account, Enhanced Plan Scenario..	103
7. Attachments .....	104
Appendix F – Continuing Authorities Program ER ER-1105-2-100, as Amended.....	104-144

# **1. Introduction**

This Five-Year Development Plan presents projections of discretionary budget authority (funding) for the Army Civil Works program for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 through FY 2012. Two scenarios for overall funding levels are presented: A Base Plan Scenario and an Enhanced Plan Scenario, as discussed further in the “Methods and Assumptions” section.

Civil Works funding is distributed among eight accounts: Investigations; Construction; Operation and Maintenance; Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T); the Regulatory Program; Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP); Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE); and Expenses.

This funding supports eight program areas (business programs), plus the oversight, executive direction and management function. The eight program areas are commercial navigation, flood control and coastal storm damage reduction, environment, recreation, hydropower, water supply, emergency management, and the regulatory program.

# **2. Strategic Framework and Direction**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is 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 outcomes achieved by the Army Civil Works program are economic growth, protection of human life, improvement in quality of life, and environmental protection, restoration, and stewardship. The Five Year Program recommendations support the Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program vision. The recommendations in this plan provide for the Corps of Engineers to strengthen technical expertise and to build our problem solving capability in order to remain a military-civil team ready to deliver critical infrastructure, engineering-related technical assistance, and coalition-building expertise worldwide. Our effectiveness depends on public trust in our products and services, which in turn depends on sound principles and technical expertise. We must be able to deliver for the Army and the nation.

We have conscientiously made some sweeping changes to improve our business processes to achieve our vision as the nation's engineering leader in providing comprehensive, collaborative, and sustainable solutions to public water resources needs. We recognize that we cannot achieve our vision alone but must work with and through others to identify and solve problems. This synergy will leverage resources for the public good.

Providing sustainable and integrated water resources solutions is perhaps the core of our vision and this five-year program. 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. We must plan, design, construct, operate, manage, and maintain with an eye toward sustaining critical resources, preserving our economic vitality, and protecting our quality of life so that future generations have the ability to contribute their best in the future. This will be achieved by keeping our nation's waterways clean and

navigable for global competition, by protecting and restoring endangered resources, and by responding to threats both large and small – not the least of which is extreme flooding. Managing by objectives and greater unity and integration of effort through concerted attention to our business processes is our strategic theme. This management theme will continue to support our vision to deliver outputs based on greater performance and integrated benefits.

We have already begun to apply this framework to produce the following results:

Domestically, more than 8,000 USACE volunteers from around the nation have deployed to help citizens and communities along the Gulf Coast in the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. Even now, almost two years after Hurricane Katrina, 2,000 USACE volunteers continue to execute our FEMA-assigned disaster recovery missions along the Gulf Coast, and to work on rebuilding the New Orleans-area levee system. As to Hurricane recovery the Corps of Engineers is repairing significant damages to reaches of federally constructed levees, floodwalls and other features, repairing damaged pumping stations that were constructed or modified as a part of the Southeast Louisiana Urban Flood Control project, and repairing non-Federal levees and pump stations. Along the three outfall canals, we are installing interim closure structures and temporary pumps until a more permanent solution can be implemented. We have also initiated analyses that will explore options to improve protection along the Louisiana and Mississippi Coasts.

In the past year, a thrust to complete levee and floodwall repairs to the pre-Katrina level of protection and plans to raise the protection to the currently authorized levels were initiated. We have developed a contracting strategy to complete the New Orleans levee and floodwall repairs, restoration and improvements outlined in the 3rd and 4th FY 2006 emergency supplemental acts. One of the lessons of Katrina is that we must ensure safety and reliability through rigorous inspections to guarantee that design standards are met and that the integrity and operability of completed projects are preserved for expected levels of performance. Detailed assessments of existing levee and floodwall heights and stability will be completed as part of our analysis and design for improvements. Contracts have been awarded to raise and improve the system from current conditions to 100-year protection by December 2010 -- work that will be sequenced based on risk and uncertainty. To the degree that we can upgrade and fund a more robust program for inspection of completed works, the integrity of projects the Corps designs and builds will be preserved through rigor. Assessing the integrity and reliability of our infrastructure is our nation-wide effort aimed to preserve safety and protect human life and economic investments.

Significant progress was made in Navigation with award of contracts for major ports improvements throughout the deep-draft and inland navigation systems, including the port of New York and New Jersey and the Ambrose Channel in New York.

Almost 400 million visitors were served under the recreation program (about half of these visitors were served by program partners at state parks, concessions and parks operated by other public agencies). The national economic development (NED) benefit generated by visitation to CE parks alone was \$1.2 billion, resulting in a benefit-cost ratio of 4.27 to 1.

The Regulatory program issued more than 80,000 General Permits and more than 8,000 Individual Permits, presenting at least a 5 percent increase in permit issuance.

9000 acres of land were restored mostly from projects along the Missouri River, Upper Mississippi River, and at the Sulphur River Wildlife Management Area. Further, a major Everglades study (CERP, Site 1) was completed. Moreover, we sent two major recommendations to Congress for project authorization: Indian River Lagoon and Louisiana Coastal Area.

Significant improvements were made as part of the reliability improvement efforts; for example, under the asset management initiative we continue to establish condition indices for all major power components in each of the 75-hydropower plants operated and maintained by the Corps. These plants generate 24% of the national hydropower capability and 3% of all energy produced in the USA.

To further enhance our performance-based program budget development, we integrated by linking this year's budget to our strategic goals and objectives, ensuring that Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) metrics are similarly linked and consistent with our strategic goals. Great improvements and progress were made in achieving the President's Management Agenda (PMA). The accomplishments and progress in this area are moving us forward in meeting OMB's PART requirements.

In parallel with all these accomplishments, we initiated a concerted effort to assess and address safety, risk, and loss of life through a 12-action program built on constant assessment and continual improvement of our technical competencies and decision-making processes. These actions involve our adopting a systems approach, building risk analysis into our work, continuously updating policy, engaging the views of others, being deliberately adaptive, analyzing and aligning organizational behavior toward our goals, and investing in R&D. Efforts in all these areas will continue to solidify in the next five years.

These actions provide a focal point for building a stronger and better Corps of Engineers. They will enable us to achieve our corporate goals to support stability, reconstruction, and homeland security operations, to develop sound water resources solutions, and to implement life-cycle infrastructure management. This requires a budget process that affords a programmatic view that can balance and integrate program priorities with our long-term strategic vision. A five-year strategic framework will allow us to target excellence and manage performance toward our strategic goals and the President's priorities and goal-oriented performance-based budgeting.

This Five Year Plan 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 that address significant risk to human safety. With this emphasis in our program, a number of initiatives will continue leading to a more systematic performance-based approach. Many of these initiatives are in response to program assessments using the PART tools. This plan reflects a commitment of each Civil Works Business Program to integrate the PART targets and their respective performance measures to our strategic goals and objectives (see Business Programs Five Year Plan Section). Furthermore, it demonstrates our commitment to develop stronger partnerships and strategic alliances with sister agencies and others abroad. For instance,

the American River Watershed Project, the Shared Vision planning initiative with the State of California; this initiative integrates planning principles, systems modeling and collaboration and the work being done with the Netherlands as result of the aftermath of Katrina are prime examples of collaboration and partnership.

Under the FY 2008 Budget, funds will continue the operation of commercial navigation and other water resource infrastructure, provide a needed increase in funding for the regulation of the impacts of development on the nation's wetlands, and support restoration of nationally and regionally significant aquatic ecosystems, with emphasis on the Florida Everglades, the Upper Mississippi River, and the coastal wetlands of Louisiana. The FY 2008 Budget will also improve the quality of recreation services through stronger partnerships and modernization.

The Budget Program improves investment decision-making because the Army will continue to fund the development of economic models for navigation, benefit evaluation methods for aquatic ecosystem restoration, asset management systems and priorities, and risk-based condition indices for operating projects. These analytical tools are necessary to help evaluate maintenance and rehabilitation choices for flood and storm damage reduction, navigation, and hydropower assets more strategically. Our goal is to begin using these improved analytical tools to develop the budget within two years.

We believe that narrowing the focus of our effort to fund and complete a smaller, more beneficial set of projects will improve overall program performance and bring higher net benefits per dollar to the nation sooner. That is why the Budget proposes only one new, high-priority construction start and accelerates completion of the highest-return projects. There are 91 projects focused on providing the highest net economic and environmental returns and on addressing significant risk to human safety in the Corps' primary mission areas. The construction backlog is addressed primarily by proposing that the Administration and the Congress use objective performance measures to establish priorities among projects including potential new starts, and through a change in Corps contracting practices to increase control over future costs.

The operation and maintenance program supports the operation, maintenance and security of existing commercial navigation, flood and storm damage reduction, and aquatic ecosystem restoration works owned and operated by, or on behalf of, the Corps of Engineers, including administrative buildings and laboratories. Funds are also included for national priority efforts 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, and operation of structures and other facilities, as authorized in the various River and Harbor, Flood Control, and Water Resources Development Acts.

To improve accountability and oversight, reflect the full cost of operating and maintaining existing projects, and support an integrated investment strategy; the FY08 Civil Works budget transfers several activities to the O&M program from the construction program. This budget also takes a systems approach by organizing operation and maintenance activities by river basin and by mission area to set the stage for improved management of Civil Works assets and more systematic budget development, which is our vision for the future years. Furthermore, we are proactively searching for ways to reduce costs and thereby accomplish more with

available resources. One way to do this is through performance-based budgeting. For instance, some of the performance measures reflect the ratio of remaining benefits to remaining costs for projects with economic outputs; 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; or give priority to dam safety assurance, seepage control, static instability correction, and projects that address significant risk to human safety. Over time, this performance-based budgeting approach will significantly improve the benefits to the nation from the Civil Works program. More specific examples of how the FY 2008 Budget intends to move in this direction follow.

As stewards of water resources infrastructure critical to economic prosperity, environmental vitality, and quality of life, we are striving to ensure that this infrastructure continues to provide an appropriate level of service to the nation. However, there are many challenges ahead of us that we must confront. These challenges include:

- Maintain a quality workforce that is fully trained and ready with the technical skills and competencies necessary to provide service nationally and abroad within our funding constraints.
- Continue to accomplish our mission to meet water infrastructure needs of the Nation with available funding.
- Assess the integrity of the CW infrastructure including the levee and dam systems.
- Operate and maintain the aging infrastructure and address the growing O&M backlog. Lack of operation and maintenance of the critical aging infrastructure reduces the reliability and operability of these structures. The backlog has increased in recent years; the current backlog is estimated to be \$1.4923 billion and estimate that includes approximately two thirds of deferred maintenance and one third of critical maintenance.
- Protect and reinforce critical infrastructure. This effort requires working with the Administration and Congress on the authorization and funding to focus on those pieces of infrastructure deemed most central to the Corps' mission.

Facing these challenges will not be easy in the face of our commitment to fight the global war on terror with constrained resources. We must continue to accomplish our mission within highly restricted reprogramming guidelines, with a modified Continuing Contract clause, and with judicious management. The Corps of Engineers is committed to staying at the leading edge in service to the nation. In support of that, we are working with others to transform our Civil Works Program. We're committed to change that leads to open, transparent modernization, and a performance-based Civil Works Program.

We intend to move the program toward a systems-watershed approach in a more deliberate fashion. We expect this approach to result in greater balance and integration of

objectives and outputs, greater stakeholder collaboration and participation, and an increased ability to make smart trade-offs.

Furthermore, this plan presents our Continuing Authorities Program five-year plan. Although a small program, it has significant national value and is important to support communities with scarce resources and with vulnerable infrastructure.

Our performance measures should provide evidence that we are moving in the right direction, that is, that the Corps proposed program for the next five year period will move us in the direction that will meet Congressional and Administration goals to provide engineering services for the nation that help us win the global war on terror, secure the homeland, and contribute to a robust economy.

## **2. Methods and Assumptions**

This section describes in detail the two scenarios presented in this Five-Year Development Plan, the Base Plan and the Enhanced Plan.

In both scenarios, activities are assumed to be assigned to the same accounts as proposed for FY 2008. Specifically, funding for rehabilitations, compliance with the Endangered Species Act at operating projects, features to use material from maintenance dredging, and mitigation of shore impacts from Federal navigation operation and maintenance is assumed to be in the Operation and Maintenance account.

The section entitled “Tables by Account” consists of tables with information on studies, preconstruction engineering and design (PED) efforts, and construction projects funded by three accounts. The scenarios and tables are discussed further below.

### **Base Plan Scenario**

The Base Plan is based on the President’s budget for FY 2008 and formula-driven funding levels for FY 2009 through FY 2012 (the out-years) from Office of Management and Budget’ (OMB) MAX budget database. The Administration determines the details of its appropriations request one year at a time. Each year, the Administration works to develop the detailed estimates for the budget year for individual programs. Right before the Budget is printed, OMB generates amounts for the out-years by account that hit overall targets for defense, homeland security, and non-security spending, so that the Administration can calculate the deficit path. These mechanistic, computer-generated account data for the out-years do not represent the President's proposed levels for these individual agencies, accounts, or programs. The FY 2009 and subsequent year's requests will be made in the future. As a result, the out-year numbers represent placeholders, pending decisions in future years. The projections past FY 2008 presented in this scenario are formula-driven and do not represent budget decisions or budget policy beyond FY 2008.

Under the Base Plan, each account is assumed to maintain the same percentage of total funding in each of the out-years that it has in the FY 2008 budget. For instance, the



Investigations account is 1.83 percent of the total in the FY 2008 budget, so it would be 1.83 percent of the total in each out-year. The following table displays the overall total and the total for each account in each fiscal year from FY 2008 through FY 2012 under the Base Plan.

<b>Civil Works Targets by Fiscal Year -- Base Plan Scenario</b>					
<small>(In millions of dollars)</small>					
<b>Account:</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Investigations	90	89	88	90	91
Construction	1523	1498	1493	1529	1541
Operation and Maintenance	2471	2431	2423	2481	2501
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	260	256	255	261	263
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	130	128	127	131	132
Regulatory Program	180	177	176	181	182
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	40	39	39	40	40
General Expenses	177	174	174	178	179
<b>Total, Discretionary budget authority</b>	<b>4,871</b>	<b>4,792</b>	<b>4,776</b>	<b>4,892</b>	<b>4,930</b>

The following table displays the assumed allocation of funding among business programs. The allocations to Hydropower, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Navigation, and the Remaining Items, Continuing Authorities Programs, and other studies, projects, programs and activities (OTH) in the Investigations and Construction accounts and the Investigations and Construction portions of the MR&T accounts (I&C) are based on the tables. For the other allocations, each business program or sub-program is assumed to maintain the same percentage of total funding in each of the out-years that it has in the FY 2008 budget.

<b>Civil Works Targets by Fiscal Year -- Base Plan Scenario -- By Business Program</b>					
(In millions of dollars)					
<b>Business Program</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Navigation 1/	584	442	387	351	264
Navigation 2/	1,408	1,385	1,381	1,413	1,425
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction 1/	710	760	669	609	563
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction 2/	580	571	569	582	587
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration	218	243	371	504	577
Environmental Stewardship	110	108	108	110	111
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	130	128	127	131	132
Hydropower 1	45	33	36	31	14
Hydropower 2/	246	242	241	247	249
Recreation	267	263	262	268	270
Water Supply	4	4	4	4	4
Regulatory	180	177	176	181	182
Emergency Management	45	44	44	45	46
Executive Direction and Management	177	174	174	178	179
Other 1/, 3/	167	218	227	236	327
Total, Discretionary budget authority	4,871	4,792	4,776	4,890	4,930
1/ Included in Investigations, Construction, and Investigations and Construction portions of MRT					
2/ Included in Operation and Maintenance					
3/ Other, including Continuing Authorities Programs, Remaining Items, and additional studies, projects, programs, and activities (wedge)					

## Enhanced Plan Scenario

For the Enhanced Plan, the overall funding levels for FY 2008 through FY 2012 adjust the FY 2007 Enhanced Plan overall funding level of \$5.340 billion for projected changes in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) price index. For instance, overall funding in FY 2008 would be each subsequent year adjusted significantly \$5.467 billion, or about \$596 million more than the overall funding in the FY 2008 budget.

Within the overall funding amount provided under the Enhanced Plan, the percentage allocation of funding among accounts, that is, the funding mix, is permitted to vary from the FY 2008 budget mix. However, no account receives less funding in FY 2008 than it does in the FY 2008 budget.

FY 2008 funding under the Enhanced Plan would be distributed as follows:

- The Operation and Maintenance account and the Maintenance portion of MR&T account each would receive funding four percent above the budget amount to address priority maintenance not funded in the budget. The O&M account would receive \$2.570 billion in FY 2008, an increase of \$99 million over the FY 2008 budget amount for the O&M account. MR&T Maintenance would receive \$157 million in FY 2008, or \$5.9 million above the Maintenance portion of the FY 2008 budget amount for MR&T.

- Investigations would receive \$120 million in FY 2008 in accordance with Table I-2, discussed below. This is \$30 million above the FY 2008 budget amount and represents the capability level for budgeted projects.
- Construction would receive \$1.871 billion in FY 2008 in accordance with Table C-2, discussed below. This is \$348 million above the FY 2008 budget amount.
- MR&T investigations and construction activities would receive \$1.7 million and \$170.4 million, respectively, in FY 2008 in accordance with Table M-2, discussed below. These are \$0.6 million and \$62.6 million, respectively, above the investigations and construction portions of the FY 2008 budget for MR&T.
- The Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) account would receive \$140 million in FY 2008. This is \$10 million above the FY 2008 budget amount. The added funding would be used to accelerate remediation work.
- The Expenses account would receive \$190 million in FY 2008, which is \$13 million above the FY 2008 budget amount. The added funding would be used to improve the performance of management functions and to increase the level of effort on management initiatives.
- The Regulatory Account would receive \$207 million in FY 2008, or \$27 million above the FY 2008 budget amount. This amount represents “Level 2” performance. The additional funding would be used to accelerate permit processing, compliance and enforcement activities, and jurisdictional determinations.
- The Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies account would receive \$40 million, the same funding level as in the FY 2008 budget.

In the out-years, funding for each account generally would increase from the FY 2008 level with the GDP price index. This is about two percent per year. However, the O&M account and the Maintenance portion of the MR&T account would increase three percent per year in recognition of the aging of the Civil Works capital assets. As an offset, the Construction account and the Construction portion of the MR&T account would increase only about one percent per year.

The following table displays the overall total and the total for each account in each fiscal year from FY 2008 through FY 2012 under the Enhanced Plan.

<b>Civil Works Targets by Fiscal Year -- Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
<i>(In millions of dollars)</i>					
<b>Account:</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Gross Domestic Product Price Index	<i>121.82</i>	<i>124.56</i>	<i>127.22</i>	<i>129.8</i>	<i>132.39</i>
Investigations	120	123	125	128	130
Construction	1,871	1,888	1,901	1,911	1,922
Operation and Maintenance	2,570	2,654	2,738	2,821	2,906
Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries	329	335	343	350	357
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140	143	146	149	152
Regulatory Program	207	212	216	221	225
Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies	40	41	42	43	43
Expenses	190	194	198	202	206
<b>Total, Discretionary budget authority</b>	<b>5,467</b>	<b>5,590</b>	<b>5,710</b>	<b>5,826</b>	<b>5,942</b>

The following table displays the assumed allocation of funding among business programs. The allocations to Hydropower, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Navigation, and to Remaining Items, Continuing Authorities Programs, and other studies, projects, programs, and activities (OTH) in the Investigations and Construction accounts and the Investigations and Construction portions of the MR&T accounts (I&C) are based on the tables. For the other allocations, each business program or sub-program is assumed to maintain the same percentage of total funding in each of the out-years that it has in FY 2008 under this scenario.

<b>Civil Works Targets by Fiscal Year -- Enhanced Plan Scenario -- By Business Program</b>					
(In millions of dollars)					
Business Program	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Navigation 1/	668	465	317	337	248
Navigation 2/	1,453	1,496	1,541	1,587	1,635
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction 1/	943	1,144	773	528	509
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction 2/	598	616	635	654	673
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration	288	286	406	551	573
Environmental Stewardship	110	113	117	120	124
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140	143	146	149	152
Hydropower 1	53	41	41	13	10
Hydropower 2/	254	261	269	277	286
Recreation	301	310	319	329	339
Water Supply	4	4	4	4	5
Regulatory	207	212	216	221	225
Emergency Management	45	46	47	48	49
Executive Direction and Management	190	194	198	202	206
Other 1/, 3/	213	257	679	804	907
<b>Total, Discretionary budget authority</b>	<b>5,467</b>	<b>5,588</b>	<b>5,708</b>	<b>5,824</b>	<b>5,941</b>
1/ Included in Investigations, Construction, and Investigations and Construction portions of MRT					
2/ Included in Operation and Maintenance					
3/ Other, including Continuing Authorities Programs, Remaining Items, and additional studies, projects, programs, and activities (wedge)					

## Tables

The tables in the “Tables by Account” section are as follows:

X-1 A cross-walk between accounts and program areas for FY 2008 under the Base Plan Scenario. This table links to the discussion of performance by program area under the Base Plan in the “Five Year Plan by Business Program” section.

X-2 A cross-walk between accounts and program areas for FY 2008 under the Enhanced Plan Scenario. This table links to the discussion of performance by program area under the Base Plan in the “Five Year Plan by Business Program” section.

I-1 Five-year funding schedules under the Base Plan Scenario for the studies, PEDs, and Remaining Items funded from the Investigations account in the FY 2008 budget. No new studies or new PED phases are displayed after FY 2008. All work on the Louisiana Coastal Area Program is assumed to migrate to the Construction account starting in FY 2009. The amounts displayed after FY 2009 for the studies and PEDs represent “capability” level funding, that is, the maximum that the Corps could efficiently use for the studies and PEDs. Remaining Items are consolidated into one line item that is level-funded over time. Remaining funding is displayed in a consolidated line item for “Additional Study and PED Activities (including Remaining Items)” that initiates in FY 2010, when such funding would first become available. This line item represents the

additional funding available in each fiscal year after FY 2008 for new studies, new PED phases, and increased effort on Remaining Items.

I-2 Five-year funding schedules under the Enhanced Plan Scenario for the studies, PEDs, and Remaining Items funded from the Investigations account in the FY 2008 budget. The schedules differ from those in the Base Plan in that the individual studies and PEDs are funded at the capability level in FY 2008 as well as the out-years, and the line item for “Additional Study and PED Activities (including Remaining Items)” begins in FY 2009 and is higher in the out-years due to the overall funding level.

I-3 A list of the studies and a list of the PEDs that were not included in the FY 2008 budget but that could have been had sufficient funding been available. These represent the studies and PEDs that could be funded in the out-years in the line item for “Additional Study and PED Activities (including Remaining Items).” The studies and PEDs, respectively, are sorted into priority groups based on performance. For each study or PED, a five-year capability funding stream is displayed.

C-1 Five-year funding schedules under the Base Plan Scenario for the projects, Continuing Authority Programs (CAPs), and Remaining Items funded from the Construction account in the FY 2008 budget. FY 2008 budget policy, including the construction funding guidelines, is assumed for all fiscal years. No new projects or resumptions are displayed. The amounts displayed after FY 2008 represent capability level funding for most projects, but funding levels for those projects with the greatest year-over-year increases in capabilities are constrained so that the total funding fits within the amount assumed to be available under this scenario. In addition, for those projects that have benefit-cost ratios of below 3.0 to 1 and do not significantly reduce inundation risks to life, only the ongoing continuing contracts are funded, in accordance with FY 2008 budget policy. The CAPs are consolidated into one line and the Remaining Items are consolidated into one line, and both lines are level-funded over time. Remaining funding is displayed in a consolidated line item for “Additional Projects and Programs (including CAPs and Remaining Items),” which is not permitted to fall below \$50 million. (In fact, it does not rise above \$50 million until FY 2012 under this scenario.) This line item represents the additional funding available in each fiscal year after FY 2008 for the initiation, continuation, or resumption of additional projects and programs, for the Louisiana Coastal Area program, and for increased effort on CAPs and Remaining Items.

C-2 Five-year funding schedules under the Enhanced Plan Scenario for the projects, CAPs, and Remaining Items funded from the Construction account in the FY 2008 budget. The schedules differ from those in the Base Plan in that the funding for those projects with the greatest year-over-year increases in capabilities is not constrained after FY 2009. Also, the line item for “Additional Projects and Programs (including CAPs and Remaining Items)” is higher after FY 2009 due to the higher overall funding level.

C-3 A list of the construction projects and programs that were not included in the FY 2008 budget but that could have been had sufficient funding been available. These represent the projects and programs that could be funded in the out-years in the line item for “Additional Projects and Programs (including CAPs and Remaining Items).” The

projects and programs are sorted into priority groups based on performance and the groups are listed in priority order. For each project or program, a five-year capability-funding stream is displayed.

C-4 Five-year, capability-level funding schedules for all CAP projects.

M-1 Five-year funding schedules under the Base Plan Scenario for the investigations and construction projects funded from the Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) account in the FY 2008 budget. This table follows the procedures outlined above for Tables I-1 and C-1. However, there is no line item for additional construction projects because the projects in the FY 2008 budget could use all of the construction funds available for the account.

M-2 Five-year funding schedules under the Enhanced Plan Scenario for the investigations and construction projects funded from the MR&T account in the FY 2008 budget. This table follows the procedures outlined above for Tables I-2 and C-2. However, there is no line item for additional construction projects because the projects in the FY 2008 budget could use all of the construction funds available for the account.

M-3 A list of the investigations and a list of the construction projects that were not included in the FY 2008 budget for the MR&T account but that could have been had sufficient funding been available. The investigations and construction projects, respectively, are sorted into priority groups based on performance. For each investigation or construction project, a five-year capability funding stream is displayed.

## 4. Business Programs Five - Year Plans

### Navigation Business Program

**Program Mission and Description.** The Navigation program mission is to provide safe, reliable, efficient, effective and environmentally sustainable waterborne transportation systems for movement of commerce, national security needs and recreation.

**Program Challenges.** The program continues to respond to increasingly dynamic demand for navigation opportunities with constrained budgets and staff. The following are key program challenges:

- Providing an efficient and effective navigation system.
- Maintaining the reliability of the inland navigation system with its aging infrastructure and increasing maintenance requirements.
- Providing coastal navigation channels to meet the needs of a changing world shipping fleet.
- Depletion of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, where outlays have exceeded revenues.
- Increasing environmental restrictions on dredging and dredged material disposal (turtles, nesting birds, turbidity, sea grasses).
- Ensuring dredged material storage capability is sufficient to maintain navigation channels – filling disposal areas, difficulty in obtaining/constructing new sites.
- Implementation of assets based, consistent and accurate data platform for performance based decisions.
- Determining a cost effective method of arriving at economic value of goods shipped to serve as a factor in performance based decisions.
- Work with navigation customers, partners and stakeholders to gain consensus on performance measures. Address the cultural change regarding concerns that these measures give the appearance of unreliable waterways that could affect decisions to use alternate transportation methods.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The following initiatives are directed to improve program efficiency, sustainability and customer service:

- Support the net exporting coastal ports.
- Develop and implement a means to quantify and prioritize the maintenance repairs needed at inland navigation structures to stop the trend of increasing unscheduled lock closures.
- Implement Asset Management initiatives to optimize infrastructure investment to support program objectives. Two key areas of emphasis are: (1) Develop standard risk and reliability criteria to measure the condition of Corps inland waterway assets nationwide for use in establishing priorities for maintenance funding. Risk based condition indices will be established and populated by FY 2011. (2) Continue Facilities Equipment Management system implementation to apply consistent maintenance standards, develop standard maintenance data and provide a means to analyze maintenance trends and



unaccomplished maintenance needs. All navigation assets will be covered by FEM by FY 2010.

- Make use of this standardized Asset Management information in the budget decision process to optimize maintenance expenditures and improve the reliability of water resources infrastructure.
- Continue to develop performance measures for navigation channels.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures.** The Navigation business line support the following strategic plan goals, objectives and performance measures:

- *CW Strategic Goal 1. Provide sustainable development and integrated management of the Nation's water resources.*

Strategic Objective 1.3 - Reduce backlog of uncompleted, scheduled work on budgeted construction projects.

Strategic Objective 1.3 .1 - Deliver project benefits as quickly as possible within available resources.

- *CW Strategic Goal 3. Ensure that projects perform to meet authorized purposes and evolving conditions.*

Strategic Objective 3.1 - Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing Corps water resource projects.

Strategic Objective 3.2 - Address the operations and maintenance (O&M) backlog.

Performance Measures: Performance measures supportive of the above goals and objectives are shown below. The measures target three areas customer service, asset management and program efficiency.

Customer Service Measures:

- Navigation lock availability identifying scheduled and unscheduled closure hours per navigation system.
- Channel availability for current users.

Asset Management Measure:

- Percent of projects exceeding facilities condition index (FCI) standard - per the President's Real Property Asset Management Initiative. Measure under development.

Program Efficiency Measures:

- Studies, PEDs, and construction projects completed in FY.
- Total average annual benefits (present value) attributable to PEDs completed in FY.
- Total average annual benefits (present value) realized by construction projects completed in FY.

## Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History

The following table presents a summary of the program funding and performance. Performance information provided in the table is incomplete because the applicable data systems which will be used to collect the data are being deployed. Consequently, only lock unscheduled closure data are displayed.

Navigation Business Program										
Ten Year Funding and Fiscal Performance History										
Funding/Metric	Fiscal Year									
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Budget (\$ million)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,692	1,796	1,926
Lock unscheduled closures (000 hours)*	25	27	31	36	37	47	39	44	47	50

The table below shows the five-year funding allocations for the program for both scenarios.

NAVIGATION BUSINESS PROGRAM					
(In millions of dollars)					
Account:	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Base Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT *	584	442	387	351	264
O&M / MRT (M)	1,425	1,400	1,405	1,420	1,425
<b>Total</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>1842</b>	<b>1792</b>	<b>1771</b>	<b>1689</b>
<b>Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT *	668	465	317	337	248
O&M / MRT (M)	1,452	1,496	1,541	1,587	1,635
<b>Total</b>	<b>2120</b>	<b>1961</b>	<b>1858</b>	<b>1924</b>	<b>1883</b>

Note: \*Excludes CAP, Remaining Items and "Wedge" (additional studies, projects and activities)

### Five –Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The Base Plan program focuses on the most critical infrastructure repairs and replacements. Under this five-year scenario, unscheduled closures of inland navigation locks are expected to increase. Facility condition will slightly decline but funding for critical maintenance will keep most key navigation infrastructure functioning. The program efficiency for ongoing construction projects will continue, at constrained level and the highest return studies, PEDs, and projects will be completed.

The following table displays estimated five-year results for the Base Plan Program.

<b>Navigation Business Program Five-Year Budget Program Performance Targets</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Lock unscheduled closures (000 hours)</b>	53	56	59	63	67

### **Five – Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program**

The enhanced plan program contains funding for completion of ongoing construction projects and highest return studies. In addition, funding is included to accomplish high priority inland navigation infrastructure repairs to reduce the number of unscheduled lock closures, for additional maintenance and dredging of coastal ports. Increased investments in inland navigation infrastructure will reduce unscheduled lock closures.

The following table displays estimated five-year results for the enacted program.

<b>Navigation Business Program Five-Year Enhanced Plan Program Performance Targets</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Lock unscheduled closures (000 hours)</b>	43	38	33	28	23

### **Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Business Program**

**Program Mission and Description.** The mission of the Flood and Coastal-Storm Damage Reduction (FCSDR) business program is to safely manage flood risk and reduce damages to participating jurisdictions resulting from inland riverine flood and coastal storm hazards through various structural and non-structural means --- including design and construction of hard structures, such as dams, levees, jetties and seawalls and soft structures such as beach nourishment, flood proofing, relocation and technical assistance programs such as, the National Flood Risk Management Program, Flood Plain Management and Planning Assistance to States. The projects in the program may be authorized as multi-purpose and have additional purposes, such as ecosystem restoration, recreation, or navigation. The program also includes Dam Safety which addresses seismic, stability and seepage issues with existing Corps dams. The Inspection of Completed Works program is a vital part of the FCSDR program that inspects all Corps constructed flood damage reduction facilities and advises the owner/operator of any deficiencies that must be corrected. The objectives of the program are: 1) to identify, plan for, and design justified solutions to flood and coastal storm hazard problems; 2) to bring high-performance projects on line to start generating risk-reduction (and other) benefits; and 3) to keep Federally operated projects operating at required design levels. To help meet these objectives, the program also funds research and other activities that provide technology, capability in support of these objectives.

The FCSDR business program addresses many projects jointly with other business programs. For example, FCSDR dams are often associated with navigation locks; flood-control channels may be linked with aquatic ecosystem restoration projects; and reservoir operation criteria include flood damage reduction as well as hydropower and water supply. The program includes coordination internally with the Emergency Management program and externally with other Federal agencies, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in its planning and operations.

**Program Challenges.** The program is driven by the local desires for assistance and willingness to cost share rather than any national programmatic assessment to identify the worst flooding problems. The Corps studies and projects are conducted only where there is a willing sponsor. There are also mixed incentives among various federal programs that may lead local governments or private parties to make decisions that appear wise to them but increase flood risk exposure and liability. Risk communication is difficult to accomplish and sustain. Communities must remain vigilant in their readiness against floods, yet more frequent and common concerns frequently occupy the agendas of communities on a daily basis, while low frequency high importance events such as floods can be largely ignored until they are imminent. The decision-making basis for investment decisions rests largely on economic damages and costs, which do not capture all aspects of the harm caused by flooding. In addition, the performance of this program depends upon the frequency, magnitude and location of storms. The effectiveness of flood damage reduction projects can be diminished by activities and phenomena outside the government's control. Changes in hydrology due to upstream development, development within floodplains, and other factors can reduce the effectiveness of plans. Delayed or neglected maintenance can also reduce the effectiveness of projects. Many of these same factors in addition to the ageing of the structures themselves also affect the safety of existing dams. The ability to continue to provide the benefits afforded by these structures in a safe and reliable manner remains a large challenge.

We are continuing the development of appropriate metrics to measure the challenging aspects of this valuable program.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** In the area of Dam and Levee Safety the Corps is aggressively pursuing a levee safety program that mirrors the successes and aligns with the risk-informed policy and procedures of the evolving Corps national dam safety program and the industry's larger risk-based dam safety. Key components of these two programs are discussed below.

a. Dam Safety Assurance and Seepage Control

The Corps is continuing a transition to risk-informed concepts for prioritization and decision making within the dam safety program, including not only program requirements, but day-to-day routine activities such as inspections, instrumentation, and interim risk reduction measures. This effort is continuing, comprehensive, and integrated into the larger Civil Works program. One of the products from this effort is the justifications and prioritizations for dam safety actions – both remedial structural and non-structural -- based on a determination of risks and reliability posed by the projects.

Two years of screening level risk assessments (SPRA) have been performed, five cadres of experts have been trained in uniform assessment methods, and assessments have been accomplished on the 20 percent of dams judged to pose the highest loss of life and economic risk. Those projects with an unacceptable combination of risk, consequences, and reliability are grouped into five Dam Safety Action Classifications. The projects in the top two classifications are being fast-tracked through the planning, design, and construction process and include substantial interim risk reduction measures such as reservoir restrictions, increased surveillance, and additional public awareness.

To facilitate progress for the priority projects, the Dam Safety Assurance and Seepage Control line item in the Construction account has been expanded so that it covers not only design and initial construction, but also pre-design planning, which formerly was funded by project in the Operation and Maintenance account. Following the Army's process of identifying projects as specific budget items, the seepage control projects at Lockport Lock and Dam, Illinois, and Center Hill Dam, Tennessee migrate to line-item budgeting in FY 2008.

The assessment process and the planning, design, and construction of remedies will continue for a number of years into the future. A significant number of dam safety studies have been identified based on the preliminary risk screening, suggesting that further investigation is needed to determine if remediation is appropriate. The FY 2008 recommendations include an increase in funding for dam safety studies in the construction Remaining Items.

#### b. Levee Safety Initiatives and Program Development

The national vision for the levee safety initiative is being developed based on the concepts that federal levees should be 1) safe and reliable, 2) managed in a partnership of shared responsibilities, 3) assessed in a comprehensive and continuing program, and 4) effectively communicated to all stakeholders, decision-makers, and communities. Through collaboration and a systematic approach, this year, the Corps began a levee inventory and assessment program, with the initial stages of each component already in progress. Utilizing the lessons learned and the ongoing research being performed in risk assessment under this program, will allow the Corps to best use existing resources and maximize the efficiency of its decision making process. However, levees and dams have very different challenges in size of the portfolios and also in the social, political, and ownership responsibilities.

Considering these challenges, effort for this initiative began with funds provided under the emergency supplemental FY 2006 appropriations. The large number of levee projects and the wide range of unknown conditions, however, make FY 2008 and future year funding critical for the nation's economic growth and the safety of its citizens. The Corps will also require a much more robust Inspection of Completed Works (ICW) program to establish a new process to monitor the nation's levee systems. Funding will be necessary for detailed explorations to identify geologic foundation conditions that might result in underseepage and stability risks and to advance the science of risk assessment in new areas, such as geotechnical analysis and levee maintenance. These new scientific findings and advances must be incorporated into the nation's programs that deal with public safety. Furthermore, the Corps is working to develop communication strategies to convey to the general public the dangers inherent in a levee system and guidelines for expressing tolerable risk levels.

Phasing of efforts and pilot tests will allow the Corps and Congress to evaluate and redirect resources and priorities as we learn more about the nation's levee challenges. The lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita prompted the Corps to look closely at our planning, design, construction, and operation and maintenance principles and decision-making processes, providing us with important insights for change that we must incorporate into future work.

Twelve interrelated 'actions for change' were developed to focus Corps efforts. These 12 actions are priorities for directing the future direction of the program and must be properly budgeted for, with initial activities included in our fiscal year 2008 budget. The Corps will also be examining opportunities for redirecting ongoing activities in FY 2007 in order to meet the goals of the 12 actions in a phased approach.

As one of the 12 actions, the Corps will undertake a review of the Inspection for Completed Works (ICW) program in FY 2007, a critical first step in addressing our aging civil works infrastructure. The program will seek to better understand the integrity of these previously under-maintained structures, many of which have experienced serious neglect due to scarce local or state funds to perform maintenance.

The change to the ICW program will be the completion of the ongoing national levee inventory and assessment program currently underway. A reconnaissance-level inventory of existing levee data is the first step that is needed to properly evaluate the degree of the national problem, the first time this has ever been undertaken on such a broad scale. Getting this critical information enables the Corps to work with partners such as FEMA to prioritize the most critical of the nation's levees and the communities and populace most at risk. The assessment portion of the program is the key to evaluating geologic conditions that may be hidden or not as well understood in the past. This is an important lesson learned from the performance of the older/less stable New Orleans levees.

The ambitious 12 Actions program is critical to setting up a process to adjust the Corps strategies to best meet the growing public need to address risk to human safety. The cornerstone of this foundation will be implementation of an integrated, comprehensive systems-based approach. This water resources systems approach can be defined as a multidisciplinary, multi-objective, and multi-stakeholder framework supporting "a balanced evaluation of all relevant issues (e.g., hydrologic, geomorphic, ecologic, social, economic)" at appropriate scales of space and time. Embedded in this approach will be a broader recognition and utilization of probabilistic methods. This will include the treatment of uncertainties and extending decision-making to explicitly acknowledge risk. There will be greater consideration of local and regional implications. There are numerous other flood-prone communities nationwide that will benefit from this systems-based approach, including Sacramento, CA, where we are already incorporating these tenets in working with the Bureau of Reclamation on Folsom Dam. Prevention of another Katrina-magnitude disaster stands at the top of the Corps priority list and assisting other agencies and communities, as the Corps reasserts itself in development of state-of-the-art tools and methods. The Corps and FEMA are already working together in the important areas of floodplain mapping and levee certification.

c. Policy Study

Under the five-year program, there is a one-year policy study proposal to address the optimum use of the nation's floodplains. The study will identify policy, procedural and administrative issues that should be addressed in order to foster more successful implementation of flood damage reduction studies and projects, and to assure the sustained protection of Federal investments in flood damage reduction far into the future. The policy issues for the repair or rehabilitation will also be addressed under this study. The levee assessment program described above has begun identifying federally constructed levees that will not meet FEMA requirements for a community to participate in the National Flood Inventory Program (NFIP). The study will evaluate, identify and address the changing physical conditions of watersheds and other factors affecting flood risk, which include but are not limited to: tolerable levels for societal risks, hydrologic changes in project areas; increased development in the floodplains; project community preparedness plans; the appropriate level of responsibility and funding of remediation actions that are necessary to bring existing projects to design performance; overall watershed development rules and regulations; and attendant enforcement mechanisms.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.** The Flood Control and Coastal Damage Reduction program is linked two strategic goals and several objective under each goal.

- *Strategic Goal 1- Provide sustainable development and integrated management of the Nation's water resources.*
- *Strategic Goal 3- Ensure that projects perform to meet authorized purposes and evolving conditions. The corresponding objectives are:*

Strategic Objective 1.1. Seek water resources solutions that better balance economic, environmental and quality of life objectives.

Strategic Objective 1.12. Invest in flood and coastal damage reduction solutions when benefits exceed the costs.

Strategic Objective 1.2. Support the formulation of regional and watershed solutions to water resource problems.

Strategic Objective 3.1. Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing Corps water resource projects.

Strategic Objective 3.2. Address the operations and maintenance (O&M) backlog.

The following measures are currently in place for this program, but are being re-evaluated to help best assess critical aspects of program performance.

**Outcome Measures:**

- Percent of time Corps owned flood damage reduction infrastructure maintained at design level (long term and annual)
- Average annual flood damage reduction benefits attributable to completed construction projects (long term and annual)
- Average annual flood damage reduction benefits attributed to projects recommended in completed feasibility reports (long term and annual)

- Average annual flood damage reduction benefits attributable to projects recommended in completed pre-construction, engineering & design (PED) reports (long term and annual)
- Number of people benefited by potential projects identified in reconnaissance phase reports completed (long term and annual)

**Output Measures**

- Percent of projects exceeding facility condition index (FCI) standard (long term and annual)

The FCSDR business program identified performance-related indicators and ranking factors that enabled evaluation of the relative merits of individual items of work and investment increments. These indicators include:

- a. Benefit cost ratio (for PEDs and Construction)
- b. Net economic benefits
- c. Presence of dam safety, seepage, or static instability problems
- d. Number of people at risk in the 100-year flood plains (without project)
- e. Risk index (w/o project average depth of flooding times average velocity of flooding divided by hours of warning)
- f. Presence of outputs from other business programs
- g. Percent of time available to operate as designed
- h. Cumulative operation and maintenance costs relative to cumulative economic benefits from operation and maintenance
- i. Inclusion of watershed management principles in project formulation

**Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History**

The performance history for flood damage reduction projects is shown in following table which reflects the fact that if there are no floods, the project’s performance cannot be measured that given year. The only metric available at this time for riverine flood damage reduction projects is the annual 10-year running average of actual damages prevented. With coastal storms being less frequent, the Corps does not yet have comparable data. Also performance can only be measured for completed projects.

<b>Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Business Program (FDR)</b>											
<b>Performance History (Dollars in Billions)</b>											
	<b>Fiscal Year</b>										
	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Flood Damages Prevented	47.2	13.4	21.2	2.8	21.9	23.1	15.7	22.5	24.0	NA	NA
Appropriation.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.338	1.214	1.193	1.512	1.291

\* 10-year average is \$21.4 B exclusive of Katrina and Rita



## Budget and Enhanced Plan Scenarios Funding Program

<b>FLOOD AND COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION</b>					
(In millions of dollars)					
<b>Account:</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Base Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT *	710	760	669	609	563
O&M / MRT (M)	674	571	569	582	587
<b>Total</b>	<b>1384</b>	<b>1331</b>	<b>1238</b>	<b>1191</b>	<b>1150</b>
<b>Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT*	943	1,144	773	528	509
O&M / MRT (M)	598	616	635	654	673
<b>Total</b>	<b>1541</b>	<b>1760</b>	<b>1408</b>	<b>1182</b>	<b>1182</b>

Note: Excludes CAP and Remaining Items

### Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The FY 2008 base plan program includes additional work on high performing studies and PEDs, plus funding to continue efforts on the Chief of Engineers' twelve actions and a policy study to help improve the optimum use of floodplains.

For FY 2008 studies and design, the budget level includes continuing requirements not to exceed FY 2007 amounts, plus additional work on the highest performing studies and design efforts, with preference given to high performing studies that: involve communities with larger number of people at risk in the 100-year flood plains, greater expected inundation damages occurring without the projects; and those with watershed-system planning potential. Projects further along in the study or PED phase are ranked higher. The five-year program also includes funds for work on levee safety assessments and MapMod coordination with FEMA.

The construction account includes funding for earnings on previously awarded continuing contracts, plus associated Engineering and Design (E&D) and Supervision and Administration (S&A), for items in the FY 2007 budget. It also includes work on national priority projects: Sims Bayou, Texas, and American River Watershed, California, as well on continuing significant work on several dam safety project and dam safety studies at the dams that have been identified as high-risk.

The program for operation and maintenance includes critical operation, maintenance and repair work and capability work for the Inspection of Completed Works efforts and work on asset management and risk-base condition indices.

<b>Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Business Program (FDR)</b>							
<b>Benefit</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	
People Protected in 100-Year Flood Plain (000)	160	9	173	156	490	0	
Cumulative People Protected in 100-yr Flood Plain (000)	160	9	182	338	828	828	
Annual Benefits Brought On Line (\$M)	57	266	199	25	351	0	
Cumulative Annual Benefit Brought On Line (\$M)	57	266	465	490	841	841	

## Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

The following table displays the additional number of people in the 100-year flood plain protected each year and the stream of annual benefits brought on line each year in the FY 2008 to 2012 time frame as a consequence of the completion of construction projects in the program.

<b>Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Business Program (FDR)</b>						
<b>Benefit</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
People Protected in 100-Year Flood Plain (000)	160	9	1903	192	423	13
Cumulative People Protected in 100-yr Flood Plain (000)	160	169	2072	2272	2264	2700
Annual Benefits Brought On Line (\$M)	57	266	247	53	386	500
Cumulative Annual Benefit Brought On Line (\$M)	57	266	513	566	952	1559

## Environmental Business Program

### Environment - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration

**Program Mission and Description.** The mission of the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (AER) sub-program within the Environment business program is to help restore to a less degraded, more natural condition aquatic habitat in ecosystems whose structure, function, and dynamic processes have become degraded. The Corps uses its engineering, hydrologic, and biological expertise to design and construct projects that modify the hydrologic and geomorphic characteristics to restore more natural conditions in a cost-effective manner. Projects range in scale from those affecting hundreds of thousands of acres to those addressing equally significant resource issues but on a smaller scale. The AER sub-program addresses some problems jointly with other business programs. For example, wetland creation is often associated with initial construction or maintenance of navigation channels, ecosystem restoration is at times integrally related with flood damage reduction to provide more comprehensive projects, and ecosystem restoration outputs are frequently key elements of watershed studies.

**Program Challenges.** The demand for aquatic ecosystem restoration is great and the challenge is to arrive at a sustainable balance among the often-conflicting demands for the use and control of water resources. In the absence of a standard metric to be used among all purposes, the Corps and other Federal Agencies are working to set priorities and define performance metrics that allow objective comparison of disparate ecosystem restoration projects.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** Aquatic ecosystem restoration is a relatively new program as is the science required to develop effective restoration projects. The Corps proposes to continue an increased emphasis on scientific research that will contribute to increased program consistency, reliability and eventually to improved performance metrics as well as an assessment of performance to improve priority setting, evaluation and accountability in accordance with the goals of the PART.

Budget priority is placed on studies or projects that contribute to the cost effective restoration of regionally or nationally significant ecosystems where the Corps is uniquely well

suited due to the requirement for hydrologic and geomorphic alterations or where a Corps project has contributed to the degradation of the area to be restored. Projects that don't meet these criteria may be considered if over fifty percent complete. The objectives of the AER business program with regard to budgeting high-performing projects are to implement projects that provide high value, cost-effective outputs. Value is determined by assessing the project in terms of its impact on scarcity, connectivity, special status species, plan recognition and sustainability. For projects in design or construction status, cost per acre also is considered.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures.** This subprogram supports the CW strategic plan Goal 2 and objectives as described below.

- *Strategic Goal 2 - Repair past environmental degradation and prevent future environmental losses.*

Strategic Objective 2.1 - Restore degraded, significant ecosystem structure, function, process to a more natural condition as applicable.

Sub Objective is 2.1.1. Invest in restoration projects or features that make a positive contribution to the Nation's environmental resources in a cost-effective manner.

The applicable performance measures proposed in the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration FY 2006 PART include:

Performance Measure 1. Number of acres of habitat restored, created, improved, or protected. This is a long-term/annual output measure. The baseline is FY 2005.

Performance Measure 2. Number of nationally significant acres of habitat restored, created, improved, or protected. This measure will document the subset of acres of habitat restored each year that have high quality outputs as compared to national needs.

Performance Measure 3. Dollars per acre to restore, create, improve or protect nationally significant habitat. The cost of the projects that produce nationally significant acres in any given year will be used to calculate this figure. In the long run through efficiencies in project execution or other considerations the goal would be to restore more acres per dollar expended.

Performance Measure 4. Percentage of all acres of habitat restored, created, improved or protected that are nationally significant. Restoration of acreage that meets the criteria for national significance is expected to have the greatest impact on the restoration of the nation's ecosystems. The goal is to increase the percentage of nationally significant acres over time. Acres are credited in the last year the project is budgeted for construction.

## Funding History

<b>Environment - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Funding History (In millions of dollars)</b>				
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>			
	<b>1997-2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Investigations (I)	N/A	\$46	\$63	\$45
Construction ©	N/A	\$357	\$448	\$470
Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T (Maint))	N/A	\$7	\$5	\$7
<b>Total</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$410</b>	<b>\$516</b>	<b>\$522</b>

Note: Excludes CAP, Remaining Items and “Wedge” (additional studies, projects and activities)

## Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The base plan funding level includes continuing requirements not to exceed FY 2007 amounts, plus additional work on the highest performing studies and design efforts, with preference given to high performing studies in the last year of a phase. Optimal funding of \$13 million is provided for the Louisiana Coastal Area study, including \$8 million for the study and \$5 million for Science and Technology. Funding of investigations related remaining items is at or below the FY 2007 level except for capability funding for restoration benefit analysis.

The Construction account includes funding for earnings on previously awarded continuing contracts, plus associated E&D and S&A for items in the FY 2007 budget. Everglades work is funded at \$163 million and Upper Mississippi River Restoration is funded at \$ 23 million. The program also includes \$7.65 million complete the second barrier and to maintain the first Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier during construction.

The Operation and Maintenance account includes \$300,000 to initiate cost-shared O&M for the Seminole-Big Cypress Project in the Everglades. The O&M requirements are anticipated to grow to \$5 million over the next five years. The total funding in the Budget is \$274 million.

One element of the South Florida Everglades restoration program, the Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration (Critical Projects), would complete in FY2008, and three additional projects, West Palm Beach Canal, Manatee Pass Thru Gates, and Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park, would complete in FY09, producing a total of 767,600 acres. Five Upper Mississippi River Restoration projects would complete in 2010, 2011, 2012 producing approximately 16,000 acres. The table below shows the base plan program performance measures for FY 2007-FY 20012.

<b>Environment - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Program Performance Measures -- Base Plan Scenario</b>						
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Total Acres	3734	0	767,600	0	10,888	3,500
Nationally Significant (NS) acres	3259	0	441,600	0	10,888	3,500
Dollars per Nationally Significant (NS) acres	\$6,959	N/A	\$902	N/A	\$2,461	\$3,227
Percent NS acres	87%	N/A	57.5%	N/A	100.0%	100.0%

### Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

The following table displays outputs that would be produced in the enhanced plan program FY 2007-2012, based on completion of construction of additional projects.

<b>Environment - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Program Performance Measures -- Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>						
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Total Acres	3734	150,000	767,600	150	958,205	8,000
Nationally Significant (NS) acres	3259	0	441,600	0	811,205	8,000
Dollars per Nationally Significant (NS) acres	\$6,959	\$0	\$902	\$0	\$976	\$2,787
Percent NS acres	87%	N/A	57.5%	N/A	84.7%	100.0%

### Environment - Environmental Stewardship

**Program Mission and Description.** The Corps is authorized and directed by statutes to manage natural and cultural resources on Corps-administered land and water in accordance with ecosystem management principles to ensure their continued availability and to provide a safe and healthful environment for project visitors. The Corps Civil Works Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2004-2009 [www.usace.army.mil/functions/cwhot\\_topics/cw\\_strat.pdf](http://www.usace.army.mil/functions/cwhot_topics/cw_strat.pdf) reflects this mission, providing holistic, balanced, fiscally responsible stewardship consistent with the Corps Mission. The Environment-Stewardship Program vision is to provide healthy project lands and waters for current and future generations.

**Program Challenges.** Management of the existing natural and cultural resources is challenged by the need to meet minimum requirements of environmental mandates for resources protection, health and safety, while balancing increasing and conflicting demands for the use and development of project lands and waters with project operations for authorized purposes. The program is also challenged to prioritize increasing needs and constrained funding to assess and sustain the quantity and condition of Corps-managed resources, such that they are available for future generations.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The program priorities for FY 2008 are aligned with goals and objectives of the CW Strategic Plan. These priorities include meeting minimum requirements of environmental and legal mandates to assure project compliance and safe operation, preventing loss or degradation of resources, and advancing the completion of project natural resource inventories and master plans, which guide the effective and efficient management of existing project natural and cultural resources. The program initiative to promote the completion of natural resource inventories and master plans implements actions identified in the Environmental Stewardship PART Improvement Plan.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.** The Stewardship program supports CW Strategic Goal 3 and five of its objectives. Eight performance measures are used to assess progress toward meeting the identified goal and objectives.

- *CW Strategic Goal 3: Ensure that projects perform to meet authorized purposes and evolving conditions.*

Strategic Objective 3.1: Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing Corps water resources projects.

Performance Outcome 1: Program efficiency is achieved. A percentage of program expenditures are recovered or leveraged through prudent uses of natural resources that are in accord with the program mission.

Performance Measure 1 – Efficiency: Cents per dollar of agency operations and maintenance spending that the program lessees or licensees pay for through timber sales revenue, agricultural leases and related contributions that are consistent with the resource protection and conservation mission of the program.

Explanation 1: This measure is an assessment of Federal costs avoided in relation to the program's cost, as an indicator of program efficiency. Annual revenues are from various activities conducted for, or that are consistent with, the program's resources protection and conservation mission. For example, timber harvests are sometimes necessary to support healthy forested lands and to prevent disease or wildfire. The harvested timber must be disposed at Federal cost. However, when possible, the harvested timber is sold, thus avoiding some of the Federal disposal cost. Revenue recovered each year, equivalent to the federal costs avoided, will vary due to the nature and extent of the sustainability practices implemented. The program emphasis is on resources sustainability as opposed to revenue generation. This measure is included in the Stewardship PART; however, since the availability of revenue generating resources cannot be predicted, this measure is not a driver for budget development.

Strategic Objective 3.1.3: Ensure healthy and sustainable lands and waters and associated natural resources on Corps lands in public trust to support multiple purposes.

Performance Outcome 2: Corps lands and waters are maintained in, or managed toward, a healthy and sustainable condition. Intensive management needs and costs are reduced as lands move to a healthy, sustainable state.

Performance Measure 2 - Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters: Percent of healthy and sustainable acres on Corps fee-owned property.

Explanation 2: This measure is defined as the number of Corps fee-owned acres classified as in a sustainable condition divided by the total number of Corps fee-owned acres. The result provides an indicator of the condition status of all Corps fee-owned acres. Sustainable is defined as meeting the desired state. The acreage is not significantly impacted by any factors that can be managed and does not require intensive management to maintain the health. The acreage also meets operational goals and objectives set forth in applicable management documents.

Strategic Objective 3.1.3.1: Protect, preserve and restore significant ecological resources in accordance with master plans.

Performance Outcome 3: Endangered and threatened species are protected on Corps property.

Performance Measure 3 - Percent of Corps operating projects with Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements for which the Corps is meeting those ESA requirements.

Explanation 3: This measure demonstrates Corps status in compliance with the Endangered Species Act requirements for federally listed species. This measure is defined as the total number projects that are meeting ESA requirements of the year divided by the total number of Corps projects that have ESA compliance requirements in the year.

Performance Outcome 4: The identification and assessment of quality and quantity of ecological resources on Corps property is achieved.

Performance Measure 4 – Level One Natural Resources Inventory Completion: Percent of minimum Level One Natural Resources Inventory completed on Corps property.

Explanation 4: This measure demonstrates the status of Corps efforts in completing basic, Level One Natural Resources Inventories required by ER 1130-2-540. Such inventories are necessary for sound resource management decisions and strategies development. The minimum Level One Inventory includes four completed standard component inventories on each project: classification and quantification of vegetation, wetland, and land (soils) capability acreage, as well as identification and assessment of special status species for potential existence on Corps acreage. The measure is defined as the sum total number of acres of completed inventory for each of the four components of the minimum Level One Natural Resources Inventory, divided by four times the total number of Corps fee-owned acres. The proportion (percentage) yielded is used to evaluate the relative completeness of the Inventory.

Performance Outcome 5: Balanced public use and access to Corps project natural resources is achieved, while accomplishing Corps project missions.

Performance Measure 5 – Master Plan Completion: Percent of Corps-operated water resource projects with completed Master Plans in compliance with ER 1130-2-550.

Explanation 5: A Master Plan is completed, per regulation, to foster an efficient and cost-effective project for natural resources, cultural resources, and recreational management programs. It provides direction for project development and use and promotes the protection, conservation and enhancement of natural, cultural and man-made resources. The Master Plan is a vital tool for responsible stewardship of project resources for the benefit of present and future generation. This measure demonstrates Corps commitment to fully integrate environmental stewardship in the management of operating projects by assuring the Plans meet requirements of the ER in recognizing environmentally sensitive areas and including natural resources management objectives. This measure is defined as the number of required Master Plans completed in compliance with regulation, divided by the total number of required Master Plans.

Strategic Objective 3.1.3.2: Ensure that the operation of all Civil Works facilities and management of associated lands, including out-granted lands, complies with the environmental requirements of relevant Federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Performance Outcome 6: Cultural resources on Corps property are managed in accord with cultural resources management mandates.

Performance Measure 6 - Cultural Resources Management: Percent of projects meeting federally mandated cultural resources management responsibilities.

Explanation 6: This measure demonstrates the status of efforts to protect and preserve cultural resources on Corps administered lands and waters. It is defined as the total number of Corps projects meeting federally mandated cultural resources management responsibilities divided by the total number of Corps projects with federally mandated cultural resources management responsibilities. Performance Outcome 7: All projects comply with environmental laws, regulations and mandates to provide a safe and healthy environment.

Performance Measure 7 – Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected: Percent of significant environmental findings corrected.

Explanation 7: This measure is defined as the number of significant environmental findings corrected versus the number identified. A significant finding is a determination of not meeting an environmental requirement and that the condition poses, or has a high likelihood of posing, a direct and immediate threat to human health, safety, the environment, or the Civil Works mission. By standard operating procedure, provisional corrections are made to eliminate the immediate threat thereby reducing the severity of the finding. Complete corrections are made as soon as possible, subject to funding availability. The goal is 100 percent corrected. This measure is in the Stewardship PART, but is generally not a driver for budget development. Only in a situation where the finding may take multiple years to correct would it be possible to program for it in the budgeting process.

Strategic Objective 3.1.3.3: Meet the mitigation requirements of authorizing legislation or applicable Corps authorization decision document.



Performance Outcome 8: Corps requirements are met for the mitigation of impacts to ecological resources, as specified in project authorizing legislation.

Performance Measure 8 – Mitigation Compliance: Percent of Corps- administered mitigation lands (acres), or the percent of pounds or numbers of mitigation fish produced at mitigation hatcheries, meeting the requirements in the authorizing legislation or relevant Corps authorization decision document.

Explanation 8: This measure demonstrates Corps status in meeting mitigation requirements that are specified in project authorizations. Achievement of mitigation contributes to restoring lands and other resources to a healthy and sustainable condition. The measure is defined as either the number of mitigation acres meeting mitigation requirements divided by the total number of designated mitigation acres, or the number of mitigation fish produced divided by the total number of mitigation fish needed to meet requirements.

**Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History.** Budgeting by business program was first implemented for the FY 2005 budget development. Funding history for the Stewardship business program as a distinct entity did not exist prior to that time. The program' budget decreased by about 5 percent over the FY 2005 to FY 2007 period. (Table H-1).

Actual FY 2005 and FY 2006 performance data is provided for the six measures that existed at that time, with estimates provided for FY 2007 on the measures existing in that year (Table H-2). Performance estimates for most of the Stewardship program measures are directly related to the funding provided or proposed, for some other measures the linkage is less direct. Where measures were not applicable during any year, Table H-2 displays a performance history of not applicable (NA). The Efficiency performance results for FY 2005 and FY 2006 were 9 percent and 10 percent respectively, exceeding the annual target of 1 percent. However, the estimated FY 2007 Efficiency performance result is 1 percent, in accord with the established target for this measure. As stated earlier, the annual efficiency result is not directly related to the budget, so the target is set at 1 percent each year to avoid promoting revenue recovery at the expense of resources sustainability. The Stewardship outcome of maintaining or achieving increased healthy and sustainable lands and waters suffered with constrained funding from FY 2005 – FY 2007. The percentage of land and water acres classified in a healthy and sustainable condition fell from 37 percent to 21 percent by FY 2007, in part due to incomplete data from FY 2005 captured in a new data collection system. However, vital stewardship tasks remained unaccomplished. Corps land and water conditions remained less than sustainable or degraded due to the unavailability of funds for actions such as those to control expanding invasive species population which alter or destroy native species diversity, erosion prevention, boundary surveillance, encroachments and trespass prevention, and timber theft on Corps property. In addition, some gains were made in completing Level One Natural Resources Inventories, which increased from 33 percent to 38 percent by FY 2007. However, a decline in the Master Plans compliance result was realized during the period from FY 2005 – FY 2007, primarily resulting from increased accuracy in reporting of the total Master Plans that are required. The Cultural Resources Management result for FY 2007 of 72 percent is based on anticipated outputs of the FY 2007 proposed budget. The Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected measure is an internal management measure that has been tracked since FY 1998, with the FY 2005 and FY 2006 results of 75 percent and 63 percent respectively. The estimated FY 2007 Findings Corrected performance result of 70 percent was

determined based on the historical average performance level. Mitigation Compliance performance was estimated to decline with decreased funding over the period, with results of 61 percent by FY 2007. Total mitigation acres decreased from FY 2005 as data definitions were clarified in the performance measure development process.

<b>Table H-1 Environmental Stewardship Business Program Funding History (In Millions of Dollars)</b>			
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>		
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Operation and Maintenance (O&M)	91	85	93
Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T O&M)	9	9	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	94	95

<b>Table H-2 Environment - Stewardship Business Program Performance History</b>			
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>		
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007 (Estimated)</b>
Efficiency	9%	10%	1%
\$ Revenue (in millions)	9.23	9.87	0.95
\$ Appropriation (in millions)	100	94	95
Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters	37%	21%	21%
# Fee acres classified as in sustainable condition (in millions)	1.06	1.41	1.41
# Fee acres (in millions)	2.80	6.73	6.73
Endangered Species (ES) Protection (NA=not applicable-measure not implemented in year)	NA	NA	NA
# Projects meeting ES Act requirements	--	--	--
# Projects with ES Act requirements	--	--	--
Level One Natural Resources Inventory Completion Index	33%	38%	38%
Average # acres with completed inventory (in millions)	2.33	2.54	2.54
Average # acres requiring inventory (in millions)	7.17	6.99	6.99
Master Plan Completion	32%	27%	27%
# Up-to-date master plans	101	104	104
# Master plans required	306	380	380
Cultural Resources Management (NA = not applicable-measure not implemented in year)	NA	NA	72%
# Projects meeting cultural resources requirements	--	--	141
# Projects with cultural resources requirements	--	--	197
Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected (FY 07 result estimated based on historical average performance)	75%	63%	70%
# Significant findings corrected (FY07 data not yet available)	3	26	--
# Significant findings (FY 07 findings can not be predicted)	4	41	--
Mitigation Compliance	76%	61%	61%
# Acres meeting mitigation requirement (in thousands)	390	273	273
# Acres authorized for mitigation (in thousands)	610	448	448

## Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The five-year Base Plan Scenario funding projections for the program are based on the President's budget for FY 08 and formula driven funding levels for FY 2009 through FY 2012 from OMB's MAX budget data base (Table H-3).

Five-year Base Plan Scenario performance targets (Table H-4) for Efficiency are held at 1 percent over the term to maintain consideration of the program goal, but to avoid promoting revenue recovery at the expense of resources sustainability. With the decline of funding for years FY 2008 – FY 2010, targets for the Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters measure must be reduced from the FY 2007 target of 21 percent (Table H-2) to a target of 19 percent by FY 2010 (Table H-4), in order to focus funding on the priority of fully meeting mandated stewardship requirements. Base Plan Scenario funding for Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters in FY 2008 will be insufficient to maintain the performance outcome target level of FY 2007 and degradation of land conditions will be realized. Also, a related decrease in anticipated performance output will manifest over the period from FY 2008 – FY 2010 such that outputs for Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters would shift to avoiding compromise of minimum safe project operating conditions, and to preventing immediate degradation or loss of transitioning land and water resources, rather than maintaining the sustainable condition classification status those resources. Over the 5-year period, vital stewardship efforts (such as trespass and encroachment prevention; erosion, fire, pest, and invasive species prevention, boundary surveillance and monitoring, and shoreline use evaluation), and staffing levels necessary to achieve Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters outputs will remain unfunded and the cost for those efforts will generally increase, forcing the annual targets to trend downward, generally, or stagnate.

In order to meet all mandated requirements for Endangered Species Protection, the target for this priority measure will be held at 100 percent for each year under this scenario funding. The Level One Natural Resources Inventory Completion target will not change over the five-year period, holding at 38 percent. Insufficient funding is afforded in this scenario to increase outputs toward this measure. Similarly, no increases in the Master Plans Completion target may be anticipated due to insufficient available funding. Decreases in the Master Plan Completion performance target in the out-years (27 percent in FY 08 to 25 percent by FY 2012) are warranted as current Plans become out-of date, adding to the pool of those needing update. Lack of progress in the completion of Inventories and Master Plans is not in accord with the Stewardship PART Improvement Plan and compromises the ability to develop and implement best resource management strategies and decisions, due to the lack of standard up-to-date resource quality and quantity data, and up-to-date project resources management guides.

Cultural resources management responsibilities will not be fully met in any year of the Base Plan Scenario level funding. With essentially flat funding over the five-year period targets for this measure will remain unchanged from the FY 2007 estimated level of performance. The targets for Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected remains constant at 100 percent for all years under this funding scenario, to fully comply with environmental statutes and to eliminate direct and immediate threat to human health and the environment. In addition, Mitigation Compliance is maintained as a priority output, and targets are also held at 100 percent each year, to order meet Corps commitments in project authorization legislation to mitigate ecological impacts caused by project construction or operation.

<b>Table H-3</b>						
<b>Environmental Stewardship Business Program</b>						
<b>Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Level Funding</b>						
<b>(In Millions of Dollars)</b>						
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Operation and Maintenance (O&M)	93	106	104	104	106	107
Mississippi River and Tributaries, (MR&T)	2	4	4	4	4	4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>

<b>Table H-2</b>						
<b>Environmental Stewardship</b>						
<b>Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Level Performance Targets</b>						
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>					
	<b>2007 Estimate</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Efficiency	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
\$ Revenue (in millions )	0.95	1.10	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.11
\$ Appropriation (in millions)	95	110	108	108	110	111
Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters	21%	19%	18%	18%	19%	19%
# Fee acres classified as in sustainable condition (in millions)	1.41	1.27	1.21	1.21	1.27	1.27
# Fee acres (in millions)	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73
Endangered Species (ES) Protection (NA=not applicable-measure not implemented in year)	NA	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Projects meeting ES Act requirements	--	237	237	237	237	237
# Projects with ES Act requirements	--	237	237	237	237	237
Level One Natural Resources Inventory Completion Index	38%	38%	38%	38%	38%	38%
Average # acres with completed inventory (in millions)	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65
Average # acres requiring inventory (in millions)	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99
Master Plan Completion	27%	27%	27%	27%	26%	25%
# Up-to-date master plans	104	104	104	104	99	95
# Master plans required	380	380	380	380	380	380
Cultural Resources Management	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%	72%
# Projects meeting cultural resources requirements	141	141	141	141	141	141
# Projects with cultural resources requirements	197	197	197	197	197	197
Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Significant findings corrected (FY 07-12 data not yet available)	--	--	--	--	--	--
# Significant findings (FY 07-12 findings can not be predicted)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mitigation Compliance	61%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Acres meeting mitigation requirement (in thousands)	273	448	448	448	448	448
# Acres authorized for mitigation (in thousands)	448	448	448	448	448	448

### Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

The Enhanced Plan Scenario funding level from FY 2008 – FY 2012 rises from \$110 million to \$124 million, based on the FY 2008 President’s budget and projected changes in the Gross Domestic Product price index over the period (Table H-5). Performance targets projected for the five-year period are based on historic performance results and estimated outputs anticipated from the FY 2007 level of funding.

Performance targets are set to maintain or improve performance outputs and to accomplish the overall program outcome of Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters (Table H-6). As explained previously, the Efficiency measure targets are held constant at 1 percent over the term. The Enhanced Plan Scenario funding from FY 2008 – FY 2012 allows the percentage of lands and waters classified in a healthy and sustainable condition to rise to from 19 percent to 25 percent by FY 2012, modestly advancing the program’s overall outcome. The minimum Endangered Species Protection requirements will also be fully met each year with the Enhanced Plan Scenario funding. Minor increases Level One Natural Resources Inventories and Master Plan completions will be achieved in accord with the Stewardship PART Improvement Plan, such that 40 percent and 29 percent, respectively, will be completed by the end of FY 2012. Also, with increased funding each year, the minimum Cultural Resources Management requirements will be met at 82 percent of Corps projects by FY 2012, increasing output in this category by 10 percent over the five-year period. The Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected target holds constant at 100 percent each year. In addition, the Enhanced Plan Scenario level will provide funding sufficient to fully meet the minimum Mitigation Compliance requirements in each year of the period.

<b>Table H-3</b> <b>Environmental Stewardship Business Program</b> <b>Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Level Funding</b> (In Millions of Dollars)						
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Operation and Maintenance (O&M)	93	106	109	112	115	119
Mississippi River and Tributaries, (MR&T)	2	4	4	5	5	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	95	110	113	117	120	124

<b>Table H-2 Environmental Stewardship Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Level Performance Targets</b>						
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>					
	<b>2007 Estimate</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Efficiency	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
\$ Revenue (in millions )	0.95	1.10	1.13	1.17	1.20	1.24
\$ Appropriation (in millions)	95	110	113	117	120	124
Healthy and Sustainable Lands and Waters	21%	19%	20%	22%	23%	25%
# Fee acres classified as in sustainable condition (in millions)	1.41	1.27	1.34	1.48	1.54	1.68
# Fee acres (in millions)	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73	6.73
Endangered Species (ES) Protection (NA=not applicable-measure not implemented in year)	NA	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Projects meeting ES Act requirements	--	237	237	237	237	237
# Projects with ES Act requirements	--	237	237	237	237	237
Level One Natural Resources Inventory Completion Index	38%	38%	38%	38%	39%	40%
Average # acres with completed inventory (in millions)	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.72	2.79
Average # acres requiring inventory (in millions)	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99	6.99
Master Plan Completion	27%	27%	27%	28%	28%	29%
# Up-to-date master plans	104	104	104	106	106	110
# Master plans required	380	380	380	380	380	380
Cultural Resources Management	72%	72%	72%	82%	82%	82%
# Projects meeting cultural resources requirements	141	141	141	161	161	161
# Projects with cultural resources requirements	197	197	197	197	197	197
Significant Environmental Compliance Findings Corrected	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Significant findings corrected (FY 07-12 data not yet available)	--	--	--	--	--	--
# Significant findings (FY 07-12 findings can not be predicted)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mitigation Compliance	61%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# Acres meeting mitigation requirement (in thousands)	273	448	448	448	448	448
# Acres authorized for mitigation (in thousands)	448	448	448	448	448	448

## **Environment - Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)**

**Program Mission and Description.** The FUSRAP program was established to identify, evaluate, and remediate sites affected with contaminated materials (primary contaminants are radium, thorium, and uranium) during Manhattan Engineering District (MED) and Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) activities. Through the years, Congress has added similar sites to the program. The goals of the program are:

- To minimize risk to human health and the environment;
- To maximize the cubic yardage of contaminated material disposed;
- To return the maximum number of affected individual properties to beneficial use; and
- To have all remedies in place as quickly as possible within available funding limits.

Program Challenges. Current program challenges include:

- Increased soil volumes and disposal costs in FY 2006
  - Linde (additional \$30 million)
  - Shpack (additional \$20 million)
  - Colonie (additional \$12 million)
- Additional eligible, “potential” sites are currently being evaluated
  - Joslyn Manufacturing
  - Superior Steel
  - Scioto Laboratory
  - DOE is considering referral of Callite Tungsten as eligible for potential inclusion to the program
- Decreased funding in FY 2007 will cause an extension of the program, affecting stakeholder expectations

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The program met or exceeded three of six program measures targets set for FY 2006. Two additional targets were not measured in FY 2006 and will not be measured until the conclusion of FY 2008. Three targets were not met because the Corps has found significantly more than the estimated volume of contaminated materials on several sites. Work plans in FY 2008 and out-years will be developed by balancing the following priorities:

- health & safety issues (evaluation and management of site risk)
- legal requirements
- political issues
- program goal of closing out sites

Three initiatives have been developed to increase efficiency:

- Coordination with other agencies on disposal contracts
  - Transportation and disposal remain a large percentage of project costs. The Corps is working to coordinate disposal requirements with the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Department of Defense (DOD) executive agent for radioactive waste disposal in order to reduce disposal costs.
- Risk-informed waste management
  - Corps is working with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to find ways to manage waste according to a material’s risk to the public, workers, and the environment, rather than by its pedigree or origin, per recent recommendations from the National Academies of Science.
- Stakeholder buy-in on program goals

- The Corps is working to focus more site specific and national stakeholder attention on the overall program and the goals of protecting the public and closing out sites. The Corps is working to show how individual site decisions impact this goal.
- The Corps is coordinating with the Department of Energy's Legacy Management (LM) GOAL 4: *Management of legacy land and assets, emphasizing protective real and personal property reuse and disposition*. DOE's goal is to increase the percentage of LM managed federal property in beneficial reuse, which would allow for the reduction in cost to manage LM federal property in its inventory. Five DOE properties are being managed and remediated by the Corps under FUSRAP. The remediated Wayne property is being transferred as park land to the local community in coordination with DOE toward helping them meet their Goal 4 measure. In addition, the Colonie and the Middlesex Sampling Plant sites are moving toward completion. The closure of these two sites will also help DOE to meet or exceed their goals. In addition, the Corps is coordinating with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on four sites that will help them to meet their license termination strategic goal. The Corps is currently investigating if this strategic goal is directly related to NRC's PART measures.

### **Strategic Goals, Objectives and Performance Targets**

- CW Strategic Goal #2.3. Assist in the cleanup of contaminated, hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste sites as authorized or requested by others.

Strategic Objectives 2.3.1. Achieve the clean-up objectives of the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

Performance Outcome. To minimize risk to human health and the environment.

Associated Performance Measures:

Performance Measure 1 - Number of Records of Decision (RODs) signed. As studies are completed and best alternatives for cleanup activities are decided, the number of RODs will increase. A final ROD establishes the final cleanup standard, which controls the actual estimate of the remaining environmental liability for each site.

Performance Measure 2 - Number of Remedial Investigations (RI) completed. The RI establishes the baseline risk assessment whereby the level of risk to human health and the environment is identified.

Performance Measure 3 - Number of action memorandums signed. Where warranted by risk or other limited factors, action memorandums allow the Corps to move toward reducing risk more rapidly than through production of a ROD. No action memorandums are presently identified.



Performance Outcome. To maximize the cubic yardage of contaminated material disposed in a safe and legal disposal facility.

Associated Performance Measures:

Performance Measure 1 - Cubic yardage of contaminated material disposed. Target soil amounts after FY08 are dependent on previous year funding and scheduled activities. Therefore, at this time it is not possible to predict target soil amounts for out-years.

Performance Measure 2 - Total cost of disposal of contaminated material as measured in cubic yards. Currently this measure is scheduled to be evaluated at the end of FY09.

Performance Outcome. To return the maximum number of affected individual properties to beneficial use.

Associated Performance Measure 1 - Number of individual properties returned to beneficial use.

Performance Outcome. To have all remedies in place as quickly as possible within available funding limits

Associated Performance Measure:

Performance Measure 1 - Cumulative percentage of FUSRAP funding that is expended on cleanup activities rather than studies.

Performance Measure 2 - As the program matures, the percentage of funding expended on cleanup activities will be greater than funding spent on conducting studies.

Performance Measure 3 - Currently this measure is scheduled to be evaluated at the end of FY08 and FY16.

Performance Measure 4 -Number of remedies in place or response complete.

Performance Measure 5 - As select portions of sites or complete sites meet their remedial action goals, the risk to human health and the environment is reduced to within acceptable levels and properties are able to be used within a community without fear of increasing cancer risk or further degrading the environment.

### **Program Funding History**

Funding for the program has been relatively stable; however, with little accounting for the addition of new sites or for inflation. The Corps began managing FUSRAP in FY 1998 and the current program performance measures were developed in 2004. In FY 2005, the program received \$24 million above the recommended amount. That year performance metrics were exceeded in four categories. Performance measures for this program were established in FY 2004. Performance metrics from FY 1998 through FY 2004 are shown as a roll-up under FY

2004 in the following table. Funding amounts for years prior to FY 2004 are as follows (in Millions): FY 1998 - \$163; FY 1999 - \$140; FY 2000 - \$150; FY 2001 - \$140; FY 2002 - \$144; FY 2003 - \$139.

<b>Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)</b>					
<b>Appropriation Funding Level (in millions of dollars)</b>		<b>FY04 (actual)</b>	<b>FY05 (actual)</b>	<b>FY06 (actual)</b>	<b>FY07 (actual)</b>
<b>Funding (Dollars in Millions)</b>		139	164	139	139
<b>Performance Measures</b>					
Number of RODs signed	Target/Actual	9/9	2/3	3/2	7
Remedial Investigations completed	Target/Actual	21/21	4/5	5/4	4
Action Memos signed	Target/Actual	3/3	-	1/1	-
Cubic yardage of contaminated material removed	Target/Actual	2,926,945/ 2,926,945	167,538/ 242,750	213,450/ 225,000	120,000
Total cost of disposal of contaminated material	Target/Actual	\$700/\$675	-	-	-
Individual Properties returned to beneficial use	Target/Actual	65/65	5/5	15/15	12
Cum. Funding expended on cleanup rather than studies	Target/Actual	77 % / 77 %	-	-	-
Remedies in place or response complete	Target/Actual	4/4	1/2	2/0	3

At this time, there are no Action Memorandums planned for any of the sites. However, the target for this metric may change, pending the results of Remedial Investigations currently being conducted at some sites.

The total cost of disposal of contaminated material will be next measured in FY 2009, according to the FUSRAP PART target evaluation plan. The metric measuring the amount of

funding expended on cleanup rather than studies will next be measured in FY 2008, according to the FUSRAP PART target evaluation plan.

### Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The five-year funding for this program would enable the program to have seven individual portions (operable units) completed, as shown in the following table. These figures do not include adjustments for inflation or labor costs. Transportation costs have been increasing in recent years at greater than the inflation rate due to demand for rail lines and rail cars, thus buying power as is steadily being eroded. The table below shows the program with respective performance measures.

<b>Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)</b>							
<b>Base Plan Program</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>						<b>Total (FY08-FY12)</b>
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	
<b>Funding Stream</b> (Dollars in Millions)							
	139	130	128	127	131	132	
<b>Performance Measures</b>							
<b>Metric</b>	<b>Target</b>						
Number of RODs signed	7	3	1	1	1	1	7
Remedial Investigations completed	4	2	1	1	1	0	5
Action Memos signed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cubic yardage of contaminated material removed	120,000	150,500	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	710,500
Total cost of disposal of contaminated material (reported periodically)	-	-	\$600	Data unavailable at this time			-
Individual Properties returned to beneficial use	12	15	3	4	4	5	31
Cum. Funding extended on cleanup rather than studies	-	80 %	81 %	82 %	83 %	84 %	84 %
Remedies in place or response complete	3	1	1	1	1	2	7

### Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

If the program were to receive funding as projected in the Base Plan Scenario for FY 2008 – FY 2012, nine remedies would be completed as shown in the following table. Some contracts for disposal of radioactive materials are expiring in FY 2008 and prices are expected to

increase significantly. The increased funding level for FY 2008 would enable projects to take better advantage of the existing contract rates. The program for the five years and respective performance measures are shown in table below.

<b>Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP)</b>							
<b>Enhanced Plan Program</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>						
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>Total (FY08-FY12)</b>
<b>Funding Stream</b> (Dollars in Millions)							
	139	140	143	146	149	152	
<b>Performance Measures</b>							
<b>Metric</b>	<b>Target</b>						
Number of RODs signed	7	3	1	1	2	2	9
Remedial Investigations completed	4	2	2	1	1	-	6
Action Memos signed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cubic yardage of contaminated material removed	120,000	160,000	165,000	170,000	170,000	180,000	845,000
Total cost of disposal of contaminated material (reported periodically)	-	-	\$600	Data unavailable at this time			-
Individual Properties returned to beneficial use	12	20	5	5	8	6	44
Cum. Funding extended on cleanup rather than studies	-	80 %	81 %	82 %	83 %	84 %	84 %
Remedies in place or response complete	3	1	2	2	2	2	9

## **Hydropower Business Program**

**Program Mission and Description.** The mission of the Corps' Hydropower Business Program is to provide reliable hydroelectric power services at the lowest possible cost, consistent with sound business principles, in partnership with other Federal hydropower generators, the Power Marketing Administrations, and Preference Customers, to benefit the Nation.

**Program Challenges.** The primary challenges to the Hydropower Business Program are related to asset management issues. Aging infrastructure and constrained funding for operating, maintaining, and replacing hydropower assets are driving this challenge. The current state of the hydropower infrastructure results in the program performing below industry standards on all performance metrics. Significant improvements in program performance will be the key program challenge over the next five years.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The Hydropower Business Program priorities for FY2008 are aligned with goals and objectives of the Civil Works Strategic Plan. These priorities include increasing the reliable operation of hydropower facilities and reducing risks of major equipment failures. Additionally, improving upon percent of time generators are available when electrical power is needed the most is another key program priority. Program initiatives include meeting approved National Electric Reliability Corporation reliability standards and ensuring continued compliance. As part of the reliability improvement initiative, the program's asset management initiative is underway to establish condition indices for all major power components in each of the 75 hydropower plants. Lastly, an on-going O&M cost benchmarking initiative with other industry organizations will determine how well the program utilized resources to produce a kilowatt-hour of electric power compared to others in the industry.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.** The Hydropower Business Program supports Civil Works Strategic Goal 3 and five of its objectives. Eight performance measures are used to assess progress toward meeting the identified goal and objectives.

- *Civil Works Strategic Goal 3: Ensure that projects perform to meet authorized purposes and evolving conditions.*

Strategic Objective 3.1: Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of existing Corps water resources projects.

Performance Objective 1: Percent of region achieving a forced outage rate of 2 percent or less.

Performance Measure 1: Forced Outage Rate

Explanation 1: The performance metric measures system reliability against industry standard. It measures the percentage of regions achieving a system-wide annual forced outage rate of 2 percent or less. A region is considered a Corps Major Sub-Command or Division.

Performance Objective 2: Percentage of region achieving a peak unit availability rate of 95 percent or greater.

Performance Measure 2: Peak Availability Rate.

Explanation 2: Percentage of regions achieving a system-wide availability of 95 percent during peak demand season. This metric is a measure of system reliability. A region is considered a Corps Major Sub-Command or Division

Efficiency Objective: Meet O&M cost efficiency target.

Explanation: Percentage of regions whose facilities achieve cost efficiency as measured by cost per megawatt-hour or cost per megawatt, adjusted for unit size, compared to similar hydropower facilities.

**Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History.** Budgeting by business program was first implemented for the FY 2005 budget development. The Hydropower Programs' budget over the FY 2005 to FY 2007 period is shown in Table H-1.

<b>Table H-1</b>			
<b>Hydropower Business Program</b>			
<b>Funding History</b>			
(in millions of dollars)			
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>		
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Operation and Maintenance (O&M)	153	219	257
Construction	70	44	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	223	263	285

Table H-2 shows the corresponding performance metric for the FY 2005 – FY 2007 period.

<b>Table H-2</b>			
<b>Hydropower Business Program</b>			
<b>Performance History</b>			
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>		
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007 (Estimate)</b>
Forced Outage ( percent)	4.66	3.73	3.62
Peak Unit Availability ( percent)	87.5	88.7	89.3
O&M Cost Efficiency Benchmark (\$/MWh)			

Table H-3 shows both the budget and Base Plan Scenarios Five-Year Funding Stream

<b>Table H-3 Hydropower</b> (In millions of dollars)					
<b>Account:</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Base Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT*	45	33	36	31	14
O&M / MRT (M)	246	242	241	247	249
Total	291	275	277	278	263
<b>Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
Investigations/Const. / MRT*	53	41	41	13	10
O&M / MRT (M)	254	261	269	277	286
Total	307	302	310	290	296

Note: Excludes CAP, Remaining Items and "Wedge" (additional studies, project and activities)

### Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The five-year Base Plan Scenario funding projections for the Hydropower Business Program are based on the President's budget for FY 2008 and formula driven funding levels for FY 2009 through FY 2012 from OMB's MAX budget data base (Table H-3).

The five-year performance targets in Table H-4 correlates with the funding levels shown in Table H-4.

<b>Table H-4</b> <b>Hydropower Business Program</b> <b>Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Level Performance Targets</b>					
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Forced Outage ( percent)	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.9
Peak Unit Availability ( percent)	90.0	89.7	89.4	88.7	88.5

### Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

The Enhanced Plan Scenario funding level from FY 2008 – FY 2012 peaks in 2010 with a small incremental rise and falls off for the remainder of the period. Funding levels are based on the FY2008 President's budget and projected changes in the Gross Domestic Product price index over the period. Performance targets projected for the five-year period are based on historic performance results and estimated outputs anticipated from the FY 2007 level of funding.

<b>Table H-5 Hydropower Business Program Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Performance Targets</b>					
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Forced Outage ( percent)	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.8
Peak Unit Availability ( percent)	90.7	91.2	91.7	91.6	91.6

## **Recreation Business Program**

**Program Mission and Description.** The Recreation program mission is to provide quality outdoor public recreation experiences to serve the needs of present and future generations and to contribute to the quality of American life, while managing and conserving natural resources consistent with ecosystem management principles.

**Program Challenges.** The following are key program challenges:

- Provide acceptable levels of service to all CE recreation visitors.
- Improve and maintain facilities at high performing parks.
- Current law limits the retention of recreation use fees at projects, constraining the ability of the Corps to finance recreation infrastructure maintenance and improvements with recreation user fees.
- Achieve consistent and acceptable service levels that have been externally validated with customers, partners and other stakeholders.
- Refine the ability to prioritize funding resources among projects to plan for potential long-term growth in demand for outdoor recreation opportunities on high performing Corps managed lands as indicated by visitation trend analyses.
- Better communicate achievement of performance goals to field offices to focus execution toward performance goals.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The following initiatives are directed to improve program efficiency, sustainability and customer service:

- The Recreation Program Performance Improvement Initiative (RPPII) is directed toward a) implementing new guidance toward park operations (including park closures), b) developing guidance for modernization projects, c) developing a suite of detailed management performance measures to improve program execution and d) sharing best practices using the NRM Gateway to improve operational efficiencies.
- Asset Management initiatives are directed toward optimizing infrastructure investment to support program objectives under the following activities a) annually monitor the condition and utilization of recreation facilities to inform budget decisions and b) use critical maintenance indicator in Rec-BEST to inform budget decisions.



- A Customer Service initiative will be established to a) benchmark Corps service levels with other agencies and program partners, b) develop minimum service levels (required for public health and safety) below which parks will be closed and c) review and if necessary, adjust acceptable levels of service based on the results of items a and b above.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures.** The Recreation business program is integrated and focus on achieving the following goals, objectives and performance measures:

- *CW Strategic Goal 3. Ensure that projects perform to meet authorized purposes and evolving conditions*

Strategic Objective 3.1.7. Provide justified outdoor recreation opportunities in an effective and efficient manner at all Corps-operated water resources projects.

Strategic Objective 3.1.8. Provide continued outdoor recreation opportunities to meet the needs of present and future generations.

Strategic Objective 3.1.9. Provide a safe and healthful outdoor recreation environment for Corps customers.

**Performance Measures.** Performance measures are directed toward three dimensions of the Recreation Program; customer service, asset management and program efficiency.

Customer Service Measures

- Customer Service\* (percent of visitors to CE managed parks served at acceptable service levels; supports objective 3.1.9)
- Customer Satisfaction (percent of visitors reporting satisfaction with their visit to a Corps managed park; supports objective 3.1.9)

Asset Management Measures

- Recreation Unit Day Availability (RDU) (the capacity of facilities to provide recreation opportunities; supports objective 3.1.8)
- Facility Service\* (percent of visitors served at CE managed parks with a facility condition score of “4 - fair to good or better”; supports objective 3.1.9)
- Facility Condition. (average CE managed park facility condition score, based on a seven point scale 1 = poor to 7 = excellent; supports objective 3.1.9)

Program Efficiency Measures:

- Total NED Benefits (supports objective 3.1.7)
- Remaining Benefits/Remaining Cost\* (supports objective 3.1.7).
- Cost Recovery (recreation receipts/program budget; supports objective 3.1.7)

**Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History.** The following table presents a summary of the program’s funding and performance. Performance information provided in the table is incomplete because the systematic program performance monitoring was initiated until 2004 with the development of Rec-BEST to support the budget development process.

<b>Recreation Business Program</b>								
Ten-Year Funding and Performance History								
<b>Consideration</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>							
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
Budget (\$ million)	237	252	261	274	262	270	268	267
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Visitor Centers						79%	78%	77%
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Parks						51%	50%	50%
Customer Satisfaction <sup>2</sup>						88%	87%	86%
RUDA <sup>3</sup> (\$ million)					74	74	74	74
Facility Service <sup>4</sup>						48%	48%	48%
Facility Condition <sup>5</sup>					3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
NED Benefits (\$ million)					1,223	1,243	1,216	1,171
RB/RC <sup>6</sup>					4.28	4.3	4.27	4.27
Cost Recovery <sup>7</sup>	15%	13%	13%	13%	16%	16%	16%	16%
1. Percent of visitors served at parks with acceptable service levels. 2. Percent of visitors who are satisfied with their visits to Corps managed parks. 3. Recreation Unity Day Availability- the total possible recreation opportunities (in site days/nights) provided at Corps 4. Percent of visitors served at parks areas with average Facility Condition at "Fair to Good" or better. 5. Based on a seven point scale: 1 = poor to 7 = excellent 6. Remaining benefits/remaining cost ratio. RB/RC ratios are based on actual expenditures for the years reported. 7. Percent of total Recreation Receipts to Budget.								

The table below shows the five-year funding for the program for both scenarios.

<b>Recreation Business Program</b>					
(In millions of dollars)					
<b>Appropriation Account</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Base Plan Scenario Program</b>					
Operation and Maintenance, General (O&M)	251	246	247	252	254
Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T)	16	15	15	16	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>270</b>
<b>Enhanced Plan Scenario Program</b>					
Operation and Maintenance, General (O&M)	284	293	301	311	320
Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T)	17	17	18	18	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>339</b>

### Five –Year Base Plan Scenario Program.

The Base Plan program focuses on providing acceptable levels of service to visitors to Corps operated parks with funding to address mandated access for disabled visitors and requirements critical maintenance that will prevent the loss of essential recreation infrastructure. Under this program:

## Performance Measures

### Customer Service

- Customer satisfaction expected to decrease slightly resulting from declines in customer service and site/facility condition.

### Asset Management

- The Corps will continue to maintain public outdoor recreation opportunities nationwide with total recreation unit days available at or near 60 million annually.
- Facility condition will slightly decline but funding for critical maintenance will keep most key recreation infrastructure functioning.

### Program Efficiency

- To more efficiently manage the program, service levels at individual recreation sites will decline steadily as a result of increasing operation and maintenance costs. Some of these impacts will be mitigated by efficiency improvements.
- Overall program efficiency, as measured by RB/RC, will decline by almost 10 percent under the budget program due to aging facilities.

The following tables display estimated five-year results for the Base Plan Scenario program.

Recreation Business Program					
Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program Performance Targets					
Consideration	Fiscal Year				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Budget (\$ million)</b>	267	263	262	268	270
Visitation (Corps managed areas -- million)	127*	127*	127*	127*	127*
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Parks	48%	47%	46%	45%	44%
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Visitor Centers	75%	74%	73%	72%	71%
Customer Satisfaction <sup>2</sup>	87%	87%	87%	86%	86%
Recreation Unity Day Availability <sup>3</sup> (in millions)	60*	60*	60*	60*	60*
Facility Service <sup>4</sup>	47%	47%	46%	46%	45%
Facility Condition <sup>5</sup>	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
NED Benefits (\$ million)	1,126	1,086	1,061	1,064	1,051
RB/RC (remaining benefits/remaining cost)	4.22	4.13	4.05	3.97	3.89
Cost Recovery (Recreation Receipts/Budget)	16%	16%	16%	15%	15%
1. Percent of visitors served at parks with acceptable service levels. 2. Percent of visitors who are satisfied with their visits to Corps managed parks. 3. RUDA- the total possible recreation opportunities (in site days/nights) provided at Corps managed parks. 4. Percent of visitors served at parks with average Facility Condition at "Fair to Good" or better. 5. Based on a seven point scale: 1 = poor to 7 = excellent. *The strategy to address budget short fall may include a combination of reduced service levels and reduced					

## Five – Year Enhanced Plan Program

The Enhanced Plan program contains funding for improvements that address visitor health and safety needs, modernize electrical service at high performing campgrounds, improve operational efficiency and improve access to facilities for disabled visitors. In addition, the

enhanced plan includes funding to increase visitor assistance services by rangers to conduct water safety programs and increase patrols in beach areas and Corps operated parks. The program also includes funding for visitation surveys to maintain the capability to monitor visitation levels at Corps projects. The five-year performance projections reported under this scenario are based on estimates provided by field managers in Rec-BEST during the past three years.

## **Performance Measures**

### Customer Service

- Customer satisfaction is expected to hold steady through limited investments in service, site and facility improvements.

### Asset Management

- The downward trend in facility condition projected under the base plan program will be mitigated and facility condition will slightly increase as a result of limited facility improvement investments in high performing parks.
- Visitors served at facilities rated as “fair-good” or better will remain constant.

### Program Efficiency

- Service levels at individual recreation sites will be maintained and/or adjusted to reflect the level of visitation, relative to the cost of such maintenance, at those sites.
- Program efficiency, as measured by RB/RC, will decrease slightly due to higher operation and maintenance costs.

The following table displays estimated five-year results for the enhanced plan.

Recreation Business Program					
Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program Performance Targets					
Consideration	Fiscal Year				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Budget (\$ million)</b>	301	310	319	329	339
Visitation (Corps managed areas -- million)	144	144	144	144	144
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Visitor Centers	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Customer Service <sup>1</sup> - Parks	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%
Customer Satisfaction <sup>2</sup>	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%
Recreation Unity Day Availability <sup>3</sup> (million)	74	74	74	74	74
Facility Service <sup>4</sup>	48%	48%	48%	48%	48%
Facility Condition <sup>5</sup>	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7
NED Benefits (\$ million)	1,337	1,341	1,340	1,342	1,340
RB/RC (remaining benefits/remaining cost)	4.44	4.35	4.27	4.18	4.1
Cost Recovery (Recreation Receipts/Budget)	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%

1. Percent of visitors served at parks with acceptable service levels.  
2. Percent of visitors who are satisfied with their visits to Corps managed parks.  
3. RUDA- the total possible recreation opportunities (in site days/nights) provided at Corps managed parks.  
4. Percent of visitors served at parks with average Facility Condition at "Fair to Good" or better.  
5. Based on a seven point scale: 1 = poor to 7 = excellent.

## Regulatory Business Program

**Program Mission and Descriptions.** The mission of the Regulatory Program is twofold: to protect our nation's aquatic resources while allowing necessary development to proceed. In FY 2006, the Corps authorized more than 96,000 activities; an increase of more than 4,000 permits issued in FY 2005, and completed more than 100,000 jurisdiction determinations. Of the approximately 96,000 permits, more than 90 percent were authorized by regional and nationwide general permits with an average processing time of 63 days. Nationwide, these permits issued by the Corps authorized approximately 14,000 acres of impacts to wetlands. Through the permit process, the Corps required applicants to avoid impacts to more than 3,500 acres of wetlands and provide more than 38,000 acres of wetlands as mitigation.

**Program Challenges.** The Regulatory program continues to be scrutinized as development pressures mount and national public awareness of the aquatic environment, including wetlands continues to rise. Sensitivity to wetlands has resulted in greater direct input from the public and environmental interest groups, leading to greater complexity and controversy in the review of permit proposals. As the complexities grow, the delays in making permit decisions increase. This has been exacerbated by the Supreme Court decision in the Carabell-Rapanos cases on jurisdiction. This split decision without a majority opinion resulted in delays in many jurisdictional determinations and subsequent permit actions. This complex decision increased the challenges faced by the Permit managers within our program to make timely permit decisions (most on private property) with the proper environmental review and documentation.

**Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities.** The Corps has begun several initiatives to speed the permit decision process and improve environmental review and documentation. The first

initiative was to conduct a Lean Six Sigma analysis of the Individual permit process to reduce waste and streamline this procedure. The outcome will be a shorter, more consistent permit review that will be promulgated nationwide this year. The second major initiative is the development and installation of a spatial database to track all Corps permits by June of 2007. This data-base will enable interagency data sharing and facilitate comprehensive environmental analysis including cumulative impact analysis. These two initiatives directly support the priority to expedite permit review while improving environmental analysis and documentation.

**Strategic Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.** The Corps' Regulatory program has developed three specific strategic goals and PART performance objectives that are directly linked to our priorities. The three strategic goals/performance objectives are:

- No Net Loss of Aquatic Resources.
- Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts to Aquatic Resources
- Expedite Permit Processing

The Corps measures the acres of wetlands impacted, avoided, and mitigated to confirm that the three goals are being met. However, to confirm that these goals are being met, the Corps defined eight performance measures, which are designed to be measured quickly and easily while providing data on the goals. The eight performance measures include:

Performance Measure 1 - Individual Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections on XX percent of all individual permits issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year.

Performance Measure 2 - General Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of XX percent of all General Permits (GPs and NWPs) with reporting requirements issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year.

Performance Measure 3 - Mitigation Site Compliance - The Corps shall complete field compliance inspections of XX percent of active mitigation sites each fiscal year. Active mitigation sites are those sites authorized through the permit process and are being monitored as part of the permit process but have not met final approval under the permit special conditions.

Performance Measure 4 - Mitigation Bank/In Lieu-Fee Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections/audits on XX percent of active mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs annually.

Performance Measure 5 - Resolution of Non-compliance Issues. The Corps will reach resolution on non-compliance with permit conditions and/or mitigation requirements on XX percent of activities determined to be non-compliant at the end of the previous fiscal year and determined to be non-compliant during the current fiscal year.

Performance Measure 6 - Resolution of Enforcement Actions. The Corps shall reach resolution on XX percent of all pending enforcement actions (i.e., unauthorized activities) that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been received during the current fiscal year.

Performance Measure 7 - General Permit Decisions - The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all General permit applications within 60 days.

Performance Measure 8 - Individual Permits. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all Standard permits and Letter of Permission (LOPs) within 120 days. This standard shall not include Individual Permits with Formal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Consultations.

### Ten-Year Funding History and Performance History

The Corps' Regulatory program has been collecting permit processing data over the past 15 years. However, only permit and enforcement data was collected through the older database. Compliance data has been collected only for the last four years. A summary of the historic funding and performance data is shown in Table 1.

### Five- Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The proposed budget for FY 2008 funding is \$180 million. For the initial funding level, the program would provide more than a minimum level of service for each of the eight performance measures but not reach target level. Issuance of guidance on the Carabell-Rapanos Supreme Court decision which includes additional requirements for analysis and documentation along with review by EPA, will increase workload across the country resulting in decreased performance. The initial funding level would allow continued program work; however, would not provide funds to initiate or continue strategic objectives for the program, including watershed studies, new SAMPs (Special Area Management Plans), and new State Programmatic General permits (SPGP's). The performance level for each of the measures is shown below.

<b>Regulatory Business Program</b>	
<b>Measure</b>	<b>Performance Based on \$180M</b>
1. Individual Permit Compliance	15 %
2. General Permit Compliance	10 %
3. Mitigation Site Compliance	15 %
4. Mitigation Bank/In Lieu-Fee	30 %
5. Resolution of Non-compliance Issues	25 %
6. Resolution of Enforcement Actions	25 %
7. General Permit Decisions	80 %
8. Individual Permits	65 %

The base plan program begins in FY 2008 with \$180 million decreases for the next two years and then rises slightly to \$182 million FY 2012. All funds will be used to try to maintain performance by keeping personnel on board with flat and decreasing budgets, the number of permit managers will decline over the five-year period. This will lead to increasing permit processing times, fewer permits being issued, and significantly lower performance across all objectives as illustrated in Table 2.

## Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

The enhanced plan program funding level for FY 2008 is \$207 million. For this level of funding, the program will be in a better position to raise performance while addressing new workload requirements in response to the Carabell-Rapanos decision; performance will not be projected to reach targets for any performance measures. The performance level for each of the measures is shown in following table.

<b>Regulatory Business Program</b>	
<b>Measure</b>	<b>Performance Based on \$207M</b>
1. Individual Permit Compliance	20 %
2. General Permit Compliance	10 %
3. Mitigation Site Compliance	20 %
4. Mitigation Bank/In Lieu-Fee	50 %
5. Resolution of Non-compliance Issues	30 %
6. Resolution of Enforcement Actions	30 %
7. General Permit Decisions	85 %
8. Individual Permits	70 %

In addition, a limited amount would be used to enable the Regulatory program to begin to analyze how to accomplish the watershed planning approach in permit processing and mitigation management. The watershed or systems approach is crucial to the program and to meeting our performance measures, as this would enable better coordination and collaboration with all parties, improved assessment techniques, and provide on-line access to Regulatory information for all agencies and the public. The watershed approach is designed to enable regulators to make more permit decisions faster, on a regional basis, and with significantly improved environmental review. Components of the watershed approach that need to be funded include continued development of analytical tools for the assessment of cumulative impacts and acquisition of spatial data on wetlands that will be used by the Corps in conjunction with other federal and state agencies as well as, local governments and the public. Additional funds are also needed for implementation of State Programmatic General Permits (SPGP's), a permit process where the states are enabled to make permit decisions on a specified subset of activities covered by existing state programs. This would lead to streamlined permit processes and "one stop shopping" for many common, low impact activities on aquatic resources.

The five-year enhanced plan program assumes the program funding starting at \$207 million and rising gradually to \$225 million in FY 2012. As the Corps Regulatory program is primarily funded for labor, performance will decrease with personnel as the budget rises by an amount that is less than normal inflation (approximately 5 percent per year). Table 3 provides estimates of performance reduction as funding rises at level below normal inflation and personnel numbers slowly declines.



**Table 1 - Regulatory Business Program**

<b>Historic Funding and Performance</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Funding</b> (Dollars in Millions)	<b>127</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>158</b>
Measure 1: Individual Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections on XX percent of all individual permits issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year Percentage	21	18	16	14	41
Measure 2: General Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of XX percent of all General Permits (GPs and NWP) with reporting requirements issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year	7	6	5	5	7
Measure 3: Mitigation Compliance. The Corps shall complete field compliance inspections of XX percent of active mitigation sites each fiscal year. Active mitigation sites are those sites authorized through the permit process and are being monitored as part of the permit process but have not met final approval under the permit special conditions (success criteria).	13	15	11	9	10
Measure 4: Mitigation Bank Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections/audits on XX percent of active mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs annually.	25	25	20	19	25
Measure 5: Non-compliance Resolution. The Corps will reach resolution on non-compliance with permit conditions and/or mitigation requirements on XX percent of activities determined to be non-compliant at the end of the previous fiscal year and determined to be non-compliant during the current fiscal year.	33	30	26	24	37
Measure 6: Enforcement Resolution. The Corps shall reach resolution on XX percent of all pending enforcement actions (i.e., unauthorized activities) that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been received during the current fiscal year.	25	25	37	23	58
Measure 7: General Permit processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all General permit applications within 60 days.	90	88	85	85	82
Measure 8: Individual Permit Processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all Standard permits and Letter of Permission (LOPs) within 120 days. This standard shall not include Individual Permits with Formal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Consultations	65	58	61	61	61

**Table 2 - Regulatory Business Program**

<b>Base Plan Program and Projected Performance</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Funding</b> (Dollars in Millions)	<b>180</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>182</b>
Measure 1: Individual Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections on XX percent of all individual permits issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year Percentage	15	13	12	11	8
Measure 2: General Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of XX percent of all General Permits (GPs and NWP) with reporting requirements issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year	10	9	8	8	6
Measure 3: Mitigation Compliance. The Corps shall complete field compliance inspections of XX percent of active mitigation sites each fiscal year. Active mitigation sites are those sites authorized through the permit process and are being monitored as part of the permit process but have not met final approval under the permit special conditions (success criteria).	15	13	12	11	8
Measure 4: Mitigation Bank Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections/audits on XX percent of active mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs annually.	30	25	20	20	15
Measure 5: Non-compliance Resolution. The Corps will reach resolution on non-compliance with permit conditions and/or mitigation requirements on XX percent of activities determined to be non-compliant at the end of the previous fiscal year and determined to be non-compliant during the current fiscal year.	25	20	18	15	12
Measure 6: Enforcement Resolution. The Corps shall reach resolution on XX percent of all pending enforcement actions (i.e., unauthorized activities) that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been received during the current fiscal year.	25	20	18	15	12
Measure 7: General Permit processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on 90 percent of all General permit applications within 60 days.	80	75	75	75	75
Measure 8: Individual Permit Processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on 75 percent of all Standard permits and Letter of Permission (LOPs) within 120 days. This standard shall not include Individual Permits with Formal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Consultations	65	55	55	55	50

**Table 3 - Regulatory Business Program**

<b>Enhanced Plan Program Funding and Performance</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Funding</b> (Dollars in Millions)	<b>207</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>225</b>
Measure 1: Individual Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections on XX percent of all individual permits issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year Percentage	20	20	20	19	19
Measure 2: General Permit Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections of XX percent of all General Permits (GPs and NWPs) with reporting requirements issued and constructed within the preceding fiscal year	10	10	9	8	8
Measure 3: Mitigation Compliance. The Corps shall complete field compliance inspections of XX percent of active mitigation sites each fiscal year. Active mitigation sites are those sites authorized through the permit process and are being monitored as part of the permit process but have not met final approval under the permit special conditions (success criteria).	20	20	19	19	18
Measure 4: Mitigation Bank Compliance. The Corps shall complete compliance inspections/audits on XX percent of active mitigation banks and in lieu fee programs annually.	50	50	45	45	40
Measure 5: Non-compliance Resolution. The Corps will reach resolution on non-compliance with permit conditions and/or mitigation requirements on XX percent of activities determined to be non-compliant at the end of the previous fiscal year and determined to be non-compliant during the current fiscal year.	30	28	27	26	25
Measure 6: Enforcement Resolution. The Corps shall reach resolution on XX percent of all pending enforcement actions (i.e., unauthorized activities) that are unresolved at the end of the previous fiscal year and have been received during the current fiscal year.	30	28	27	26	25
Measure 7: General Permit processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all General permit applications within 60 days.	85	85	84	84	83
Measure 8: Individual Permit Processing. The Corps shall reach permit decisions on XX percent of all Standard permits and Letter of Permission (LOPs) within 120 days. This standard shall not include Individual Permits with Formal Endangered Species Act (ESA) Consultations	70	70	69	68	67

## **Emergency Management Business Program**

**Program Mission and Description.** The Corps Emergency Management program goal is to provide rapid and effective response to hazards both natural and man-made, to protect lives and property, reduce damages from floods and coastal storms, and provide reliable and safe drinking water during droughts and when supplies are contaminated and facilitate rapid economic recovery after disasters. The Corps prepares for and responds to natural disasters under the Flood Control and Coastal Emergency (FCCE) program established by Public Law 84-99 (1955) and to manmade disasters under the National Emergency Preparedness Program (NEPP). Through both programs, the Corps supports the Department of Homeland Security under the National Response Plan. The Corps also provides direct capability to communities during floods and in support of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) within the Department of Homeland Security augments state and local response and recovery capabilities.

**Challenges.** Challenges to the program include maintaining a consistent level of preparedness to meet the threat from natural and manmade disasters, meeting the training and credentialing requirements for the National Response Plan and the National Incident Management System in light of increased rehabilitation costs due to an aging flood control infrastructure.

Missions continue to increase with every evolution of the National Response Plan (NRP). USACE teams have been established to execute life saving, life sustaining and recovery missions and are now routinely recognized and are relied upon by DHS as the national teams that deploy whenever incidents are beyond state and local capabilities to respond. USACE is also now designated as the federal/state/local “Coordinator” for Public Works and Engineering under the National Response Plan. As the Coordinator, USACE is responsible for overseeing DHS efforts to assess state and local capabilities and capacities to provide water, ice, temporary power, public works restoration, debris management and other support following disaster events. Where state/local gaps exist, USACE has the responsibility for leading efforts to build state and local government capabilities respond to Public Works and Engineering related missions. Also, as Coordinator, USACE is responsible for leading ESF#3 intergovernmental Catastrophic Disaster Planning initiatives that support DHS Planning Scenarios. Each of these new missions drains resources from other more established mission sets.

**Strategic Goals and Objectives.** The emergency management program supports goal 4 of the CW Strategic Plan goals and objectives. The underlying purpose of this goal is to manage the risks associated with all types of hazards and to increase the responsiveness to disasters under the civil works emergency management program within the Corps' Office of Homeland Security in support of Federal, state, and local emergency management efforts. Further, the objectives of this goal are to attain and maintain a high, consistent state of preparedness; provide a rapid, effective, efficient all hazards response; and promote effective and efficient long-term recovery. Disaster preparedness and response capabilities are not limited to water-related disasters; it also encompasses a broad range of natural disasters and national emergencies which draw on the engineering skills and management capabilities of the organization. Readiness to respond to disasters and emergency incidents is critical to national security.

- *Strategic Goal 4 - Reduce vulnerabilities and losses to the nation and the Army from natural and man-made disasters, including terrorism*

Performance Measure 1: The Corps has established designated Planning & Response Teams (PRT) that are organized to provide rapid emergency response for a specific mission area. This measure is calculated as a percentage of time during the fiscal year that Planning & Response Teams are fully staffed, trained and ready to deploy.

Performance Measure 2: The Corps performs inspections of flood control works operated and maintained by public sponsors to insure and assess their operations and maintenance condition. This measure is determined by the percentage of scheduled inspections completed during the fiscal year.

Performance Measure 3: The Corps performs repairs of flood control projects damaged by flood or storm under authority of P.L. 84-99. This measure is determined by the percentage of projects damaged during a fiscal year that are repaired prior to the next flood season.

Performance Measure 4: Under the Corps Rehabilitation and Inspection Program (RIP) inspected projects are given condition ratings that characterize the project maintenance condition. This measure is determined by the percentage of the total projects inspected during the fiscal year that received a rating of minimally acceptable or higher.

### Funding History and Performance History

Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies Account											
Funding and Performance History (Dollars in Thousands)											
Fiscal Year											
Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Regular Energy and Water Appropriation	10,000	10,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	14,900	0	0	0
Supplemental Appropriation	135,000	415,000	0	0	0	50,000	-25,000	60,000	0	348,000	5,407,989
Annual Obligations/Outlays	61,238	146,500	138,200	88,200	68,600	60,300	43,700	36,600	51,541	122,842	825,900

Unlike other Civil Works accounts for which funding requirements are programmed based on scheduled work, the FCCE account can only project funding requirements for preparedness activities. The frequency and magnitude of emergency events determines the resources needed for actual emergency response in any given fiscal year, as does the obligation rate of FCCE funds. Table above shows ten years of historic funding for the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies. Performance measures for this program were established in FY04. Table below shows program funding and performance measures for FY 2004 through FY 2006.

<b>Emergency Management Historic Program Funding and Performance Levels</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>			
	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (Dollars in Millions)</b>				
Regular Energy and Water Appropriation	0	0	0	0
Supplemental Appropriation	0	348	5,408	1,561
<b>O&amp;M, National Emergency Preparedness Program (Dollars in Thousands)</b>				
Regular Appropriation	5.6	5	5	5
Supplemental Appropriation	0	0	0	0
<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Target</b>
Percent of time that Planning Response Teams for a given mission area are in Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	93 %	82 %	92 %	90 %
Percent of time that PL 84-99 Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness at the beginning of flood/hurricane season (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	96 %	92 %	92 %	85 %
Cumulative percent of Federal and non-Federal projects in the RIP with satisfactory ratings (minimally acceptable or higher rating)	93 %	94 %	95 %	90 %
Percent of scheduled inspections performed for all non-Federal Flood Control Works in RIP, as required by ER 500-1-1	90 %	96 %	93 %	92 %
Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented (either repaired to pre-flood conditions or possible non-structural alternative) prior to the next flood season (see note below)	75 %	92 %	65 %	88 %
Percent of time that the National Deployable Tactical Operations System equipment and teams are in Green readiness status	*N/A	N/A	92 %	90 %
Effective execution of the National Training Program (USACE-wide) readiness life cycle (see note below)	92 %	94 %	74 %	90 %
Percent of time that the performance of the deployed PRT is rated at or above Highly Successful in support of FEMA under the NRP	93 %	86 %	95 %	90 %

Notes: \*N/A implies not measured for specified year.

### **Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program**

The Base Plan program funding level is \$45 million for readiness (preparedness) under the Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies (FCCE) account and the National Emergency Preparedness Program.

\$40 million for FCCE would ensure baseline readiness or preparedness to respond to a broad range of disasters and emergencies. Activities funded include coordination, planning, limited training, and the conduct of response exercises with key local, State and Federal stakeholders/partners under Corps statutory authorities and in support of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Department of Homeland Security; and the purchase and stockpiling of critical supplies and equipment and support facilities (Emergency Operations Centers). Readiness funding would pay personnel costs for Emergency Management personnel assigned to Emergency Operations Centers, Crisis Management Teams, Crisis Action Teams, Regional Operations Centers, Planning and Response Teams, Special Cadres, and Levee Inspection Teams.

\$5 million would be for NEPP in the Operation and Maintenance, General, account and will focus on Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), Continuity of Government (COG) and critical Catastrophic Response Planning Initiatives. The following table shows the five-year Base Plan funding streams for the program.

The funding level is \$45 million in FY 2008 which includes Base Plan funding FCCE preparedness and NEPP programs. Consequently, this amount represents baseline readiness and \$0 for response and recovery costs activities such as emergency operations during flood and hurricane seasons; repairs to flood damage reduction and hurricane shore protection projects damaged by floods or storms; drought assistance; and advance measures activities.

Funding under the Base Plan is for preparedness activities, as well as to maintain and upgrade Deployable Tactical Operating System (DTOS) units, purchase two additional Rapid Response Vehicles (RRVs) and purchase equipment over the five-year period. Beginning in FY 2009, the constant or slightly decreasing funding does not allow for improvements to the preparedness program. Other impacted preparedness activities include: additional training and exercises for the planning and response teams; PL 84-99 training and updating ENGLink. The need for additional funding for response and recovery would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Relying on supplemental appropriation can delay response and recovery actions.

<b>Emergency Management</b>					
<b>Projected Program Funding and Performance Levels – Base Plan Scenario</b>					
<b>Appropriation Account (Dollars in Millions)</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Operations & Maintenance (O&M) National Emergency Preparedness Program (NEPP)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0
Flood Control & Coastal Emergencies (FCCE)	40.0	39.0	39.0	40.0	40.0
<b>Performance Measures</b>					
Percent of time that Planning Response Teams for a given mission area are in Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	90 %	87 %	84 %	81 %	78 %
Percent of time that PL 84-99 Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness at the beginning of flood/hurricane season (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	90 %	87 %	84 %	81 %	78 %
Cumulative percent of Federal and non-Federal projects in the RIP with satisfactory ratings (minimally acceptable or higher rating)	92 %	89 %	86 %	83 %	80 %
Percent of scheduled inspections performed for all non-Federal Flood Control Works in RIP, as required by ER 500-1-1	94 %	91 %	88 %	85 %	82 %
Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented (either repaired to pre-flood conditions or possible non-structural alternative) prior to the next flood season* (see note below)	60 %	57 %	54 %	52 %	50 %
Percent of time that the National Deployable Tactical Operations System equipment and teams are in Green readiness status	92 %	89 %	86 %	83 %	80 %
Effective execution of the National Training Program (USACE-wide) readiness life cycle** (see note below)	70 %	67 %	64 %	62 %	60 %
Percent of time that the performance of the deployed PRT is rated at or above Highly Successful in support of FEMA under the NRP	90 %	87 %	84 %	81 %	78 %

Notes:

\*The five year plan only covers preparedness activities therefore accomplishment of this function is completely dependent on supplemental appropriations.

\*\* Funding only covers minimum baseline training, new requirements would be impacted.

### **Five-Year Enhanced Scenario Program**

Similar to the Base Plan scenario, the enhanced Plan scenario funding level for FY 2008 is \$45 million and includes funding the initial FCCE preparedness program and NEPP program. Consequently, this amount represents baseline preparedness or readiness and \$0 for response and recovery costs.



\$40 million for FCCE in FY 2009 would ensure baseline readiness or preparedness to respond to a broad range of disasters and emergencies. Activities funded include coordination, planning, limited training, and the conduct of response exercises with key local, State and Federal stakeholders/partners under Corps statutory authorities and in support of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Department of Homeland Security; and the purchase and stockpiling of critical supplies and equipment and support facilities (Emergency Operations Centers). Readiness funding would pay personnel costs for Emergency Management personnel assigned to Emergency Operations Centers, Crisis Management Teams, Crisis Action Teams, Regional Operations Centers, Planning and Response Teams, Special Cadres, and Levee Inspection Teams.

\$5 million would be for NEPP in the Operation and Maintenance, General, account and will focus on Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), Continuity of Government (COG) and critical Catastrophic Response Planning Initiatives. The following table shows the five-year Enhanced Plan Scenario funding streams for the program.

The combined funding level is \$45 million in FY 2008 which includes enhanced plan scenario funding FCCE preparedness and NEPP programs. Consequently, this amount represents baseline readiness and \$0 for response and recovery costs activities such as emergency operations during flood and hurricane seasons; repairs to flood damage reduction and hurricane shore protection projects damaged by floods or storms; drought assistance; and advance measures activities.

Funding under the enhanced plan scenario is for preparedness activities, as well as to maintain and upgrade Deployable Tactical Operating System (DTOS) units, purchase two additional Rapid Response Vehicles (RRVs) and purchase equipment over the five-year period. From FY 2009 through FY 2011, the \$1 million/year increase would provide for modest improvements to the preparedness program, such as additional training and exercises for the planning and response teams; PL 84-99 training and updating ENGLink. Funding for response and recovery activities relies on supplemental appropriation which can delay timely response and recovery activities.

<b>Emergency Management Projected Program Performance Levels – Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
<b>Appropriation Account (Dollars in Millions)</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>				
	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Operations & Maintenance (O&M) National Emergency Preparedness Program (NEPP)	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.0
Flood Control & Coastal Emergencies (FCCE)	40.0	41.0	42.0	43.0	43.0
<b>Performance Measures</b>					
Percent of time that Planning Response Teams for a given mission area are in Green state of readiness (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	90 %	90 %	91 %	91 %	92 %
Percent of time that PL 84-99 Response Teams are in the Green state of readiness at the beginning of flood/hurricane season (trained, fully staffed, ready to deploy)	90 %	90 %	91 %	91 %	92 %
Cumulative percent of Federal and non-Federal projects in the RIP with satisfactory ratings (minimally acceptable or higher rating)	92 %	92 %	93 %	93 %	94 %
Percent of scheduled inspections performed for all non-Federal Flood Control Works in RIP, as required by ER 500-1-1	94 %	94 %	95 %	95 %	96 %
Percent of time solutions are developed and implemented (either repaired to pre-flood conditions or possible non-structural alternative) prior to the next flood season* (see note below)	60 %	57 %	54 %	52 %	50 %
Percent of time that the National Deployable Tactical Operations System equipment and teams are in Green readiness status	92 %	93 %	93 %	94 %	95 %
Effective execution of the National Training Program (USACE-wide) readiness life cycle** (see note below)	70 %	71 %	72 %	73 %	74 %
Percent of time that the performance of the deployed PRT is rated at or above Highly Successful in support of FEMA under the NRP	90 %	91 %	91 %	92 %	92 %

Notes:

\*The five year plan only covers preparedness activities therefore accomplishment of this function is completely dependent on supplemental appropriations.

\*\* Funding only covers minimum baseline training, new requirements would be impacted

## **Water Supply Business Program**

**Mission and Description.** The Water Supply business program mission is to provide storage in Corps multiple purpose reservoirs for beneficial municipal and industrial (M&I) water supply use in connection with other authorized purposes. The program covers authorized and discretionary M&I and irrigation storage in reservoirs and lakes, but does not include water supply “plumbing” (e.g., infrastructure for water treatment or water transport). The M&I program currently has 9.8 million acre-feet of storage space in 136 Corps reservoir projects located in 25 states plus Puerto Rico. Reimbursement for this storage is through 307 water storage agreements with state and local interests. These agreements commit the sponsors to repay a total of \$1.5 billion of project costs plus yearly operation and maintenance expense. These funds are returned to the U.S. Treasury. No funds are included in this program for construction.

### **Challenges**

- Meet the increasing competition for available water supplies as a result of rapid population and economic growth.
- Meeting this growing demand will require more efficient use of existing water supplies.
- Primacy over water supply development and management has been and will continue to reside with states and localities.

### **Highlights of Initiatives and Priorities**

The Portfolio Assessment for Water Supply is a new initiative included under Remaining Items in FY 2008 Budget. This initiative will develop a set of criteria to guide project or basin specific water reallocation studies. A portfolio of these studies will be developed with a view of showing the best studies on a national basis to justify further review. The assessment program will also enable the Corps to determine the feasibility of alternate funding arrangements that rely on program beneficiaries to provide the funding for any follow-up studies.

### **Strategic Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures**

In partnership with non-Federal water management plans and consistent with law and policy, manage Corps reservoirs to provide water supply storage in a cost-efficient and environmentally responsible manner. Performance is measured by (1) acre-feet of storage under contract versus acre-feet available and (2) percent of costs covered by revenues returned to the U.S. Treasury.

### **Ten-Year Funding History**

Water supply has been reported in appropriations accounts going back to the requirements of GRPA since the mid-90s. However, the FY 2005 budget was the first year that the Corps restructured the budget process to focus on the business lines, including Water Supply, as the initial building blocks for development of the budget. There is, therefore, only a three-year funding history for water supply; FY 2005 through FY 2007. For each of those three years the water supply program received \$2.0 million.

## Ten-Year Performance History

The performance of the water supply business program has been obtained on only a case-by-case basis over the years based on when a specific data requests. Prior to being assessed by the Program Assessment Rating Tool, data was collected on a regular basis. Thus, only limited performance data is available, from 1996, 2004 and 2005.

### Ten-Year Water Supply Program Performance Acre-Feet under Contract versus Acre-Feet Available (Storage in millions of acre-feet)

Criteria	Fiscal Year		
	1996	2004	2005
<b>Acre-Feet under Contract versus Acre-Feet Available</b>			
Acre Feet Available (Millions)	9.524	9.856	9.761
Acre Feet Under Contract (Millions)	8.764	9.108	9.356
Percent of Available Storage under Contract	92.0%	92.4%	95.9%
<b>Costs to be Recovered versus Costs Recovered</b>			
Costs to be recovered (\$ Millions)	1,333.50	1,477.20	1,459.80
Costs recovered (\$ Millions)	700.3	1,064.00	1,096.10
Percent Recovered	52.5%	72.0%	75.1%

## Five-Year Base Plan Scenario Program

The Base Plan program for O&M includes funding sufficient to meet minimum legal responsibilities for the operation and maintenance of the project facilities needed specifically for water supply as well as the development and renegotiation of water supply agreements and the billing and collection of payments and repayments. The program for O&M also includes: the costs of two ongoing reallocation studies (the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa / Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint study and the Texas Water Allocation Assessment); three well justified operational/hydraulic/hydrology type studies (John H. Kerr, VA, W. Kerr Scott, NC, and Wolf Creek, KY); and the funding required for the joint costs allocated to water supply for the Cougar, OR water temperature control facility. There are no Investigation funds include in this program except for the Portfolio Assessment that was included in the FY 2007 budget as a new Remaining Item. The request for FY 2008 will complete the study.

<b>Water Supply Business Program -- Base Plan Scenario Funding History (Dollars in Millions)</b>					
Account:	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.3
<b>Investigations</b>	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
<b>Total</b>	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.6

## Five-Year Enhanced Plan Scenario Program

If the program were to receive funding as projected in the Enhanced Plan scenario for FY 2008 – FY 2012, additional investigations could be undertaken in FY2008 for Chatfield, CO, Middle Brazos, TX, Big Sandy, KY, WV, & VA, and Willamette, OR. Additional studies could be initiated in FY 2009 and beyond as a follow-up to the nationwide portfolio assessment of water reallocation opportunities.

<b>Water Supply Business Program -- Enhanced Plan Scenario</b>					
<b>Funding History (Dollars in Millions)</b>					
<b>Account:</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Operation and Maintenance</b>	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.1
<b>Investigations</b>	1.3	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0
<b>Total</b>	6.0	6.8	7.4	8.0	8.1

## Performance Targets

Water supply performance targets, percent of acre-feet under contract versus acre-feet available and percent of costs recovered versus costs to be recovered are impacted primarily by the negotiation, collections and billings portion of the O&M budget. This value is the same for the budget and enacted plans. While studies, surveys and investigations for water have the potential to increase the absolute number of acre-feet available for contracting and the potential revenues to be returned to the Treasury, the action does not take place until a contract is negotiated through the O&M portion of the budget relating to negotiations, collections and billings. The performance targets for the two water supply performance measures are as shown in table below. These values are as displayed in the 2006 PART.

<b>WATER SUPPLY BUSINESS PROGRAM</b>							
Performance Targets							
<b>Target</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>						
	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Percent of storage under contract versus acre-feet available	95.9	96	96.1	96.2	96.3	96.4	96.5
Percent of costs covered by revenues returned to the Treasury	75.2	75.4	75.6	75.8	76	76.2	76.4

## **5. Continuing Authorities Program Management Plan**

### **Introduction**

This section presents the five-year Continuing Authorities Program (CAP) Program Management Plan (PMP) for Fiscal Years 2008-2012, as part of the CW Five Year Development Plan. This document governs planning for the CAP program over the period FY 2008 through FY 2012. It will be updated annually to respond to changes in policy and Congressional direction and to cover succeeding 5-year periods.

### **Background**

On 19 November 2005, the President signed into law P.L. 109-103, an Act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. House Report 109-275, the Conference Report accompanying the Act, concluded that significant management reform of the CAP program is necessary. Therefore, after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, concurrent with the budget submission, the Corps was directed to submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a program management plan detailing the specific actions the Corps will take to prioritize projects and to manage the program in the future. This management plan will include at least a five-year time horizon consistent with the five-year comprehensive budget plan and be incorporated into the larger planning effort. In developing its management plan and in an effort to reduce the backlog of projects, the Corps was directed to place highest priority on projects and studies having executed cost sharing agreements.

### **Program Purpose**

The CAP is a group of 10 legislative authorities under which the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to plan, design, and implement certain types of water resources projects without additional project specific congressional authorization. The purpose of the CAP is to plan and implement projects of limited size, cost, scope, and complexity. Although there is no specific minimum project size or cost, very small projects are not pursued under CAP as they should be implemented by other Federal or non-Federal entities, and large or complex problems are pursued under the specifically authorized programs. The following table lists the CAP authorities and their project purposes.

## Continuing Authorities Program - Authorities

Authority	US Code	Project Purpose
Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended	33 USC 701r	Streambank and shoreline erosion protection of public works and non-profit public services
Section 103, River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended (amends Public Law 79-727)	33 USC 426g	Beach erosion and hurricane and storm damage reduction
Section 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended	33 USC 577	Navigation improvements
Section 111, River and Harbor Act of 1968, as amended	33 USC 426i	Shore damage prevention or mitigation caused by Federal navigation projects
Section 145, Water Resources Development Act of 1976, as amended	33 USC 426j	Placement of dredged material on beaches
Section 204, Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended	33 USC 2326	Beneficial uses of dredged material
Section 205, Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended	33 USC 701s	Flood control
Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended	33 USC 2330	Aquatic ecosystem restoration
Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1954, as amended (amends Section 2, Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937)	33 USC 701g	Removal of obstructions, clearing channels for flood control
Section 1135, Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended	33 USC 2309a	Project modifications for improvement of the environment

In the absence of specific legislative direction to the contrary, CAP shall not be used:

- for study only activities;
- to implement or replace any portion of a project specifically authorized by Congress;
- to nullify or change an existing condition of non-Federal responsibility required for a project specifically authorized by Congress or implemented under a CAP authority;
- to adopt a non-Federal project for future maintenance at Federal expense;
- to restore completed Corps projects to their authorized dimensions;
- to accomplish required non-Federal maintenance at a Federally constructed project;
- to satisfy non-Federal mitigation requirements; or
- to correct deficiencies on another CAP project or a specifically authorized project.

### **Project Management Planning and Development**

General guidance on project planning and development is contained in the Planning Guidance Notebook, Engineer Regulation (ER) 1105-2-100, dated April 2000. Guidance specific to the CAP is contained in Appendix F to ER 1105-2-100, which was updated January 2007 (Attachment 1).

Under Appendix F as amended (see Appendix section), there are now two phases for each CAP. However, CAP phases that were ongoing at the time Appendix F was amended and that meet certain criteria have been “grandfathered.” The two phases are described below.

**Feasibility Phase.** The feasibility phase is the project formulation phase during which all planning activities are performed that are required to demonstrate that Federal participation in a specific project is warranted and to prepare for the initiation of the design and implementation phase for that project. All plan formulation, and attendant decision documents, shall be completed during

this phase, including all technical analyses, policy compliance determinations, and Federal and non-Federal environmental and regulatory compliance activities required for approval of the decision document. Feasibility phase costs in excess of \$100,000 are cost shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor.

**Design and Implementation Phase.** This phase is the phase of the project during which all post feasibility phase activities (except for operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, or rehabilitation activities) are performed. Activities include negotiation and execution of the PCA, final design, preparation of contract plans and specifications, construction, and any other activities required to construct or implement the approved project. Design and implementation phase costs are shared in accordance with general legislation for the applicable project purpose.

### **Program Implementation and Management**

Appendix F to ER 1105-2-100, in Section II, describes CAP management procedures. Appendix F was amended on January 31, 2007. The amended version includes modified procedures for transitioning to the two-phased approach, as summarized in table F-1 therein.

General guidance on execution of the Civil Works program, including reprogramming and contracting principles and procedures, is governed by an Engineer Circular (EC). This annual program execution guidance is superseded each fiscal year to reflect the new energy and water appropriations and accompanying reports.

The EC includes guidance that continuing contracts will not be used for the CAP.

As part of the Headquarters responsibility to monitor program policy and financial procedural compliance in this program, HQUSACE and field CAP managers will meet periodically to conduct policy and procedural after action reviews of projects with PCAs executed in the past year and review financial status and actions. In addition to monitoring policy and procedural compliance, these reviews serve as a forum for identification of management and procedural problems, general policy issues, and successes which will in turn form the basis for any needed corrective action and continued evolution.

### **FY2008 Program Funding Priorities**

The policies and procedures outlined below for FY 2008 and beyond are subject to change as further direction is provided from the Executive Branch and in law or Committee reports.

Beginning with FY 2007, the Budget has identified particular CAP projects proposed for funding. In addition, the Budget has proposed to migrate the section 202, 145, and 111 CAP programs to the Operation and Maintenance account.

For FY 2008, prioritization considerations included consistency with administration policy, project performance and the completion of ongoing phases, with emphasis on construction. This will help to ensure a high return from the use of available funds, facilitate project completions and the delivery of services, reduce the backlog of uncompleted projects, ensure consistent



behavior and predictable allocation decision making on the part of CAP managers, and improve communication between the Executive Branch and Congress on project priorities.

Once the Committee of Conference has made specific allocations, if any, the Corps of Engineers will adhere to those allocations. In the absence of additional guidance from the Committees, the Corps would allocate the remaining appropriated funds based on considerations of project performance and the completion of ongoing phases, with emphasis on construction.

Performance of CAP projects is measured in a manner designed to correspond closely with the way the performance of specifically authorized projects is measured. Performance factors that are considered, as appropriate to the several business lines, are listed below:

- Safety Issues.
- People at Risk in Floodplain.
- Benefit Cost Ratio.
- Acres Restored.
- Restoration Cost per Acre.
- Environmental Significance.
- Years of Monitoring Required.
- Priority Mandates (e.g. Court Orders).
- Last Year Allocated.
- Last Year Budgeted.
- PCA in Place.
- FCSA in Place.
- Percent Complete.
- Year of Completion.
- Project Phase (i.e. Feasibility or D&I).
- Project Status (e.g. Continuing, Initiating, Completing).
- MSC Priority Ranking.

## 6. Tables

**TABLE X-1. CROSS - WALK, ACCOUNTS AND PROGRAMS FOR FY 2008, BASE PLAN SCENARIO**

TABLE X-1 Business Line/Account Cross-Walk 2008 Base Plan Scenario (Dollars in Millions)												
Business Lines/Funding Categories:	I	C	O&M	MR&T				FUSRAP	FCCE	REG	E	TOTAL
				I	C	O&M	Total					
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	41	665	475	1	96	106	203					1,384
Hydropower		45	246									291
Navigation	19	572	1,383		10	25	35					2,009
Environment												
<i>Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration</i>	30	241	1		2		2					274
<i>Stewardship</i>			106			4	4					110
<i>FUSRAP</i>								130				130
Regulatory										180		180
Recreation			251			16	16					267
Emergency Management			5						40			45
Water Supply			4									4
Expenses											177	177
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>1,523</b>	<b>2,471</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>4,871</b>

**TABLE X-2. CROSS - WALK, ACCOUNTS AND PROGRAMS, ENHANCED PLAN SCENARIO**

TABLE X-2 Business Line/Account Cross-Walk 2008 Enhanced Plan Scenario (Dollars in Millions)												
Business Lines/Funding Categories:	I	C	O&M	MR&T				FUSRAP	FCCE	REG	E	TOTAL
				I	C	O&M	Total					
Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction	16	674	544	1	170	136	307					1,541
Hydropower		131	176				0					307
Navigation	17	651	1,451	1			1					2,120
Environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Aquatic Ecosystem</i>	32	256	0				0					288
<i>Stewardship</i>			106			4	4					110
<i>FUSRAP</i>							0	140				140
Regulatory							0			207		207
Recreation			284			17	17					301
Emergency Management			5				0		40			45
Water Supply			4				0					4
Expenses							0				190	190
Other	55	159										214
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>1,871</b>	<b>2,570</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>5,467</b>

**TABLE I-1. INVESTIGATIONS ACCOUNT, BASE PLAN SCENARIO**

Investigations -- Base Plan Scenario						
(Dollars in Thousands)						
DIV	Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
POD	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300	564	0	0	0
SAD	AUGUSTA, GA	750	750	700	700	700
POD	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	50	0	0	0	0
MVD	BAYOU SORREL LOCK, LA	1,371	700	550	280	0
NAD	BOSTON HARBOR (45-FOOT CHANNEL), MA	377	0	0	0	0
SWD	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	400	0	540	540	544
LRD	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	100	500	400	0	0
NWD	CACHE LA POUFRE, CO	340	35	0	0	0
MVD	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	395	152	0	0	0
SPD	CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	300	0	2,000	2,000	1,200
NAD	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	100	34	0	0	0
SPD	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	250	910	0	0	0
SPD	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	700	0	0	0	0
SAD	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	150	0	400	300	115
SWD	DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	100	1,000	1,000	399	0
NAD	DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	62	146	0	0	0
NAD	EASTWARD EXPANSION CRANEY ISLAND, VA	3,000	6,250	0	0	0
SAD	EDISTO ISLAND, SC	218	191	191	0	0
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	97	0	0	0	0
SPD	ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	425	0	0	0	0
SWD	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	721	0	0	0	0
LRD	GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA & WI	800	900	500	0	0
SWD	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	488	0	0	0	0
SWD	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	300	0	1,233	1,433	1,117
POD	HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	100	0	100	100	100
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	200	754	0	0	0
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	200	1,700	871	300	0
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	200	2,065	1,781	400	0
MVD	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	400	1,700	887	100	0
LRD	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	300	865	0	0	0
SAD	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	300	0	300	300	220
POD	KAHUKU, HI	60	168	30	0	0
NWD	KANSAS CITIES, MO & KS	100	2,000	2,500	838	0
NWD	KANSAS CITIES, MO & KS	589	0	0	0	0
SAD	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	531	0	0	0	0
MVD	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM REST, LA (SCIENCE PROGRAM)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
MVD	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	8,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	300	0	421	421	350
NWD	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	100	0	750	750	873
NWD	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	130	0	0	0	0
NAD	LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	300	207	0	0	0
POD	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	150	0	0	0	0
NAD	MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200	0	600	600	600
SPD	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	311	111	0	0	0
LRD	MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	257	0	0	0	0
SAD	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	554	0	0	0	0
NAD	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	256	0	0	0	0
SWD	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	250	0	800	800	800
NWD	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	400	1,600	810	0	0
SPD	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	300	1,940	0	0	0
SWD	RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	223	350	120	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	700	1,508	0	0	0
SWD	SPRINGFIELD, MO	354	0	0	0	0
MVD	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	281	33	0	0	0
SPD	SUTTER COUNTY, CA	339	496	0	0	0
SWD	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	300	500	500	470	0
NWD	TOPEKA, KS	100	300	300	500	575
SPD	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	191	0	0	0	0
NAD	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON REST, COOPERSTOWN, NY	102	0	0	0	0
SPD	VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ	658	0	1,150	850	386
MVD	WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	270	171	0	0	0
POD	YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	300	700	300	0	0
NWD	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	200	0	700	700	700
XXX	REMAINING ITEMS	54,700	54,700	54,700	54,700	54,700
ZZZ	Additional studies and PEDS (including remaining items)	0	0	7,866	17,519	23,020
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>90,000</b>	<b>89,000</b>	<b>88,000</b>	<b>90,000</b>	<b>91,000</b>

**TABLE I-2. INVESTIGATIONS ACCOUNT, ENHANCED PLAN SCENARIO**

Investigations -- Enhanced Plan Scenario						
(Dollars in Thousands)						
DIV	Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
POD	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	300	560	0	0	0
SAD	AUGUSTA, GA	750	750	700	700	700
POD	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	50	0	0	0	0
MVD	+-	1,370	700	550	280	0
NAD	*	380	0	0	0	0
SWD	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, BROWNSVILLE CHANNEL, TX	1,200	540	380	0	0
LRD	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	500	500	0	0	0
NWD	CACHE LA POUFRE, CO	340	40	0	0	0
MVD	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	440	100	0	0	0
SPD	CALIFORNIA COASTAL SEDIMENT MASTER PLAN, CA	900	2,000	2,000	1,090	0
NAD	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	100	30	0	0	0
SPD	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	1,160	0	0	0	0
SPD	COYOTE & BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	700	0	0	0	0
SAD	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	450	300	220	0	0
SWD	DALLAS FLOODWAY, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	1,000	1,000	500	0	0
NAD	DISMAL SWAMP AND DISMAL SWAMP CANAL, VA	210	0	0	0	0
NAD	EASTWARD EXPANSION CRANEY ISLAND, VA	9,250	0	0	0	0
SAD	EDISTO ISLAND, SC	220	190	190	0	0
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER, HAMPTON ROADS, VA	100	0	0	0	0
SPD	ESTUDILLO CANAL, CA	430	0	0	0	0
SWD	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	720	0	0	0	0
LRD	GREAT LAKES NAV SYST STUDY, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA & WI	800	900	500	0	0
SWD	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	490	0	0	0	0
SWD	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	1,580	1,580	1,230	280	0
POD	HAGATNA RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, GUAM	100	100	100	100	100
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, HACKENSACK MEADOWLANDS, NJ	950	0	0	0	0
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	2,140	970	0	0	0
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	1,500	2,950	0	0	0
MVD	ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION, IL	2,000	1,050	0	0	0
LRD	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	910	250	0	0	0
SAD	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	520	250	200	150	0
POD	KAHUKU, HI	220	40	0	0	0
NWD	KANSAS CITIES, MO & KS	2,000	2,500	940	0	0
NWD	KANSAS CITIES, MO & KS	590	0	0	0	0
SAD	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	530	0	0	0	0
MVD	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM REST, LA (SCIENCE PROGRAM)	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
MVD	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	8,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	450	500	420	300	50
NWD	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	750	750	970	0	0
NWD	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	130	0	0	0	0
NAD	LYNNHAVEN RIVER BASIN, VA	300	210	0	0	0
POD	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	150	0	0	0	0
NAD	MERRIMACK RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, NH & MA	200	600	600	600	240
SPD	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE BOSQUE, NM	420	0	0	0	0
LRD	MILL CREEK WATERSHED, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	260	0	0	0	0
SAD	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	550	0	0	0	0
NAD	NEW JERSEY SHORE PROTECTION, HEREFORD TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	260	0	0	0	0
SWD	NUECES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	500	800	800	800	800
NWD	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	1,900	910	0	0	0
SPD	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	2,240	0	0	0	0
SWD	RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	400	290	0	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	2,210	0	0	0	0
SWD	SPRINGFIELD, MO	350	0	0	0	0
MVD	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	280	30	0	0	0
SPD	SUTTER COUNTY, CA	840	0	0	0	0
SWD	TEXAS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	300	1,470	0	0	0
NWD	TOPEKA, KS	940	200	210	200	230
SPD	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	190	0	0	0	0
NAD	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON REST, COOPERSTOWN, NY	100	0	0	0	0
SPD	VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION, AZ	1,810	820	410	0	0
MVD	WILD RICE RIVER, RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN	270	170	0	0	0
POD	YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	900	400	0	0	0
NWD	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	700	700	700	700	620
XXX	REMAINING ITEMS	54,700	55,930	57,120	58,280	59,440
ZZZ	Additional studies and PEDS (including remaining items)	0	36,920	51,260	59,520	62,820
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>120,000</b>	<b>123,000</b>	<b>125,000</b>	<b>128,000</b>	<b>130,000</b>

**TABLE I-3. ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND PEDS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES**

Potential Investigation Studies (Wedge)						
(Dollars in thousands)						
DIV	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
SWD	ABILENE, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN-ELM CREEK)	400	105	0	0	0
NWD	ADAMS COUNTY, CO	300	581	0	0	0
SPD	AGUA FRIA, TRILBY WASH, AZ	600	1,000	480	0	0
POD	ALASKA REGIONAL PORTS, AK	800	200	200	200	200
SPD	ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	600	243	0	0	0
SAD	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	500	418	0	0	0
NWD	AMAZON CREEK, OR	500	45	0	0	0
MVD	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	1,305	953	0	0	0
MVD	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BAYOU MANCHAC, LA	700	1,051	0	0	0
NAD	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MD	500	400	178	50	0
POD	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	500	599	0	0	0
SPD	ARANA GULCH WATERSHED, CA	300	400	281	0	0
SWD	ARKANSAS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OK	0	500	0	0	0
SPD	ARROYO DE LA LAGUNA, CA	200	500	300	0	0
SPD	ARROYO SECO WATERSHED, CA	700	499	0	0	0
MVD	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	1,322	81	0	0	0
SPD	BALLONA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	900	700	395	0	0
NAD	BALTIMORE METRO WTR RES. - PATAPSCO AND BACK RIVERS	1,200	1,500	900	71	0
MVD	BARABOO RIVER, WI	0	300	300	500	500
POD	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	300	169	0	0	0
SAD	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	500	649	577	608	0
NAD	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	0	0	0	0	0
MVD	BLUE EARTH RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MN (MN RIVER AUTH)	400	331	0	0	0
SAD	BOGUE BANKS, NC	250	0	0	0	0
SWD	BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	400	250	200	200	120
NWD	BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	400	750	750	3,000	5,000
SPD	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	597	0	0	0	0
MVD	BOSSIER PARISH, LA	500	800	1,458	0	0
SAD	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	98	0	0	0	0
NAD	BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	750	500	338	0	0
NWD	BRUSH CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	201	0	0	0	0
SWD	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	3,363	66	0	0	0
MVD	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	750	850	1,000	0	0
MVD	CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS NAVIGATION, LA	800	149	0	0	0
MVD	CALEDONIA LEVEE, WI (BARABOO RIVER, WI)	300	330	330	0	0
SPD	CARPINTERIA SHORELINE STUDY	400	428	0	0	0
MVD	CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA	250	255	150	0	0
NWD	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	500	135	0	0	0
NWD	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA (FEAS)	1,000	117	0	0	0
LRD	CHERRY RIVER BASIN, WV	54	100	350	300	0
NAD	CHES BAY SHORELINE-SEDI BUDG, MODEL & REG SEDI MGT, MD,PA,VA	849	0	0	0	0
NAD	CHES BAY SHORELINE-SUSQUE REGIONAL & RESERVOIR SEDIMENT MGMT	400	500	350	50	0
NAD	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, MARYLAND COASTAL MANAGEMENT, MD	1,000	1,260	200	0	0
NAD	CHRISTINA RIVER WATERSHED, PA, DE & MD	500	547	0	0	0
SPD	CITY OF INGLEWOOD	300	0	0	0	0
SPD	CITY OF NORWALK, CA	250	1	0	0	0
SPD	CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, CA	600	100	410	317	0
SPD	COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (LOS ANGELES COUNTY)	823	0	0	0	0
NAD	CONNECTICUT RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NH & VT	0	500	500	490	0
SPD	CORTE MADERA WATERSHED, CA	600	800	601	0	0
POD	CRAIG HARBOR, AK	300	300	200	0	0
LRD	CUYAHOGA RIVER BULKHEAD STUDY, CLEVELAND, OH	300	0	0	0	0
SAD	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL	400	500	282	0	0
SAD	DEEP AND CAMP CREEKS WATERSHED STUDY, GA	400	800	800	800	645
NAD	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, PA	350	0	0	0	0
NAD	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, NJ	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	0
NAD	DELAWARE RVR COMP, NY, NJ, PA & DE (WATERSHED FLD MGT PLAN)	350	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
POD	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	1,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	500	1,000	800	0	0
SPD	DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CA	500	2	0	0	0
MVD	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI FEASIBILITY	100	500	600	500	0
MVD	DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI	250	1,030	0	0	0
LRD	DUCK CREEK, WASHINGTON, NOBLE, GUERNSEY & MONROE COUNTIES, OH	350	150	150	0	0
SPD	EAST MESA LAS CRUCES,NM	413	0	0	0	0
SPD	EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, CA	1,500	1,408	0	0	0
POD	EKLUTNA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	0	400	200	400	0
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER # 3	0	200	200	200	0
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER # 4	0	0	200	200	200
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER # 5	0	0	0	200	200
NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENV RESTORATION, VA (PHASE II)	181	170	0	0	0
NWD	ELLIOTT BAY SEAWALL	770	954	660	1,241	0
SPD	ESPANOLA VALLEY RIO GRANDE AND TRIBS, NM	500	860	0	0	0
MVD	FABIUS LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	500	250	0	0	0

**TABLE I-3. ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND PEDS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES  
(Continued)**

Potential Investigation Studies (Wedge)						
(Dollars in thousands)						
DIV	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
MVD	FARGO,ND-MOORHEAD,MN & UPSTREAM SUB-BASIN (RRN BASIN AUTH)	500	800	718	0	0
SPD	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	449	0	0	0	0
NAD	GATHRIGHT DAM & LAKE MOOMAW	300	400	317	0	0
SWD	GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
SWD	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	0	0	0	0	0
SWD	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER REALIGNMENTS, TX	700	679	0	0	0
SWD	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	628	0	0	0	0
SWD	GIWW, VICINITY OF PORT ISABEL, TX	700	700	700	714	0
SWD	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER BASIN WATERSHED, OK, KS, MO & AR	300	580	800	750	453
SWD	GRAND LAKE COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, OK	500	750	850	900	763
SPD	GRAYSON AND MURDERER'S CREEKS, WALNUT CREEK BASIN, CA	600	499	0	0	0
MVD	GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
SAD	HATTERAS AND ORACOCKE ISLANDS, NC	800	1,600	1,510	1,200	500
SAD	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	400	318	0	0	0
LRD	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	300	0	0	0	0
MVD	HOT SPRINGS CREEK, AR	200	200	220	0	0
NAD	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, GOWANUS CANAL, NY	800	256	0	0	0
SPD	HUMBOLDT BAY LONG TERM SHOAL MGMT	500	500	433	0	0
SPD	HUNTINGTON HARBOR DREDGING, CA	550	739	739	738	738
LRD	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION	200	0	0	0	0
SAD	INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS, GA	800	835	0	0	0
SAD	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	400	407	0	0	0
NWD	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD	0	0	0	227	0
NWD	JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	602	0	0	0	0
NAD	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE REALLOCATION, MD & WV	450	300	50	0	0
MVD	JOHN GLENN GR LAKES BASIN STRAT PLAN,IL,IN,MI,MN,NY,OH,PA&WI	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
LRD	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	50	0	0	0	0
POD	KAWAIIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	450	0	0	0	0
LRD	KEITH CREEK, ROCKFORD, IL	248	350	334	0	0
POD	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	0	0	50	50	50
POD	KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	300	0	0	0	0
SPD	LA RIVER WATERCOURSE, HEADWORKS AREA, CA	562	0	0	0	0
SPD	LA RIVER WATERCOURSE, SAN JOSE CREEK, CA	1,000	225	41	0	0
SPD	LAGUNA CREEK WATERSHED	500	300	164	0	0
SPD	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	400	400	300	300	129
SPD	LAKE ELSINORE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	0	500	187	0	0
NAD	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	556	0	0	0	0
NWD	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	770	406	400	400	400
SAD	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	500	583	0	0	0
MVD	LANSING, MI	0	100	175	0	0
SPD	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	525	525	500	0	0
POD	LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	300	0	0	0	0
SPD	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CORNFIELDS, CA	2,000	914	0	0	0
SWD	LOWER GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TX	500	600	500	500	508
SWD	LOWER SABINE RIVER, TX	500	500	400	400	400
SWD	LOWER SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASIN (TRI-COUNTY), TX	275	275	350	167	0
SWD	LOWER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	525	1,500	975	0	0
LRD	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, PA	304	0	0	0	0
SPD	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	608	0	0	0	0
NWD	MANHATTAN, KS	500	386	0	0	0
SWD	MARION RESERVOIR, KS, WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	500	100	0	0	0
MVD	MARSH LAKE, MN (MN RIVER AUTHORITY)	220	0	0	0	0
POD	MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	400	200	200	0	0
SAD	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	525	0	0	0	0
LRD	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	400	319	0	0	0
LRD	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	100	0	0	0	0
SWD	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	600	850	633	0	0
NAD	MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER - CAMERON RUN/HOMLES RUN, VA	800	800	300	86	0
NAD	MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER - GREATER SENECA/MUDDY BRANCH, MD	800	369	0	0	0
NAD	MIDDLE POTOMAC RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, VA, WV, MD & PA	550	600	350	50	0
SAD	MILE POINT, FL	100	0	0	0	0
MVD	MINNEHAHA CREEK WATERSHED, UMR LAKE ITASCA TO L&D 2, MN	620	533	403	0	0
MVD	MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, MN & SD	25	0	0	0	0
SPD	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	50	0	0	0	0
NWD	MOUNT ST HELENS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WA	300	300	400	0	0
SWD	MOUNTAIN FORK RIVER WATERSHED OK & AR	250	100	0	0	0
SPD	MUGU LAGOON, CA	175	86	0	0	0
SPD	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	0	71	0	0	0
SPD	N CA STREAMS, LOWER CACHE CRK, YOLO CNTY, WOODLAND & VIC, CA	40	0	0	0	0
SPD	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	600	600	582	0	0
SPD	NAVAJO NATION, AZ, NM, UT	500	2,173	2,172	2,172	2,172
POD	NAWILIWILI HARBOR MODIFICATION, KAUAI, HI	250	204	150	0	0
NAD	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	100	2	0	0	0

**TABLE I-3. ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND PEDS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES  
(Continued)**

Potential Investigation Studies (Wedge)						
(Dollars in thousands)						
DIV	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
NAD	NEW JERSEY SHORELINE ALTERNATIVE LONG-TERM NOURISHMENT, NJ	500	551	351	0	0
SPD	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	118	0	0	0	0
NAD	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	0	222	0	0	0
NAD	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	455	0	0	0	0
SWD	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	250	257	0	0	0
SPD	OCEAN BEACH, CA	500	539	0	0	0
LRD	OHIO RIVER BASIN (COMPREHENSIVE), OH,PA,WV,KY,TN,IN,IL,VA,AL	400	280	200	300	250
LRD	OHIO RIVER SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS, IL	300	51	0	0	0
LRD	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	990	2,000	2,000	1,383	1,383
SWD	OOLOGAH LAKE WATERSHED, OK & KS	500	600	508	0	0
SPD	ORANGE COUNTY SHORELINE, LOWER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	400	400	400	1,000	1,132
SPD	ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	0	2	0	0	0
SPD	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	0	556	556	545	700
SPD	PAHRUMP VALLEY WATERSHED, NV	0	250	500	500	250
SPD	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	300	500	206	0	0
NAD	PECKMAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	750	500	328	0	0
SPD	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	2	0	0	0	0
NAD	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA (SECTION 216)	300	450	200	215	0
SPD	PIMA COUNTY, AZ	0	35	0	0	0
LRD	PINE KNOT, DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, PA	250	450	0	0	0
MVD	PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	300	0	0	0	0
SAD	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	350	0	0	0	0
POD	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	300	0	0	0	0
NAD	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, TURNING BASIN, NH	200	150	0	0	0
SPD	POSO CREEK, CA	600	75	0	0	0
LRD	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	108	300	0	0	0
NAD	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, NJ	350	500	500	500	500
NAD	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, HIGHLANDS, NJ	400	400	84	0	0
NAD	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, KEYPORT, NJ	400	300	59	0	0
MVD	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH BASIN, MN, ND, SD & MANITOBA, CANADA	300	1,210	1,170	1,170	1,200
SWD	RED RIVER WATERWAY, OK, TX & AR	43	200	400	500	500
SPD	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	500	700	701	0	0
SWD	RESACAS AT BROWNSVILLE, TX	750	280	0	0	0
NAD	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	150	250	250	223	0
SPD	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX	200	200	200	200	119
SPD	RIO SALADO OESTE, SALT RIVER, AZ	239	0	0	0	0
SAD	RIO YAGUEZ IN MAYAGUEZ, PR	0	100	100	150	326
SPD	RIVERSIDE COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CALIFORNIA	0	0	0	0	0
SWD	ROMA CREEK, RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	800	276	0	0	0
POD	ROTA HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	100	100	100	100	100
MVD	ROUGE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	0	145	150	150	150
MVD	ROUGE RIVER WATERSHED CAPABILITY, MI	500	500	200	0	0
SPD	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	700	700	642	0	0
SWD	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	500	0	0	0	0
SPD	SAC-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA ISLANDS AND LEVEES, CA	2,750	2,000	1,036	0	0
SPD	SAN BERNARDINO LAKES AND STREAMS, CA	850	553	0	0	0
SPD	SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	200	55	0	0	0
SPD	SAN DIEGO CO SHORELINE	500	500	400	0	0
SPD	SAN DIEGO NORTH COUNTY SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	375	248	0	0	0
SPD	SAN FRANCISQUITO CREEK, CA	700	700	700	700	716
SPD	SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	400	251	252	0	0
SPD	SAN JACINTO RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	950	0	0	0	0
SPD	SAN JOAQUIN RB, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, ORESTIMBA CREEK, CA	1,230	0	0	0	0
SPD	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, LOWER SAN JOAQUIN, CA	0	600	800	500	0
SPD	SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY REGION, CA	750	300	750	750	0
SPD	SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	750	275	274	0	0
SPD	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	600	475	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA ANA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, BIG BEAR LAKE, CA	1,250	98	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA CLARA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	1,500	1,500	574	0	0
SPD	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (GRANT TO FT. LOWELL), AZ	0	0	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA FE, NM	250	436	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA ROSA CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	500	500	322	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH ESTUARY AND FRESHWATER WETLANDS, GA & SC	300	0	0	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	0	0	0	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH HARBOR SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS, GA & SC	165	2,000	0	0	0
SAD	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	300	300	300	400	0
NAD	SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	341	500	0	0	0
NAD	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN ESTUARINE, PA	300	451	0	0	0
NAD	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, WISSAHICKON CREEK BASIN, PA	300	0	0	0	0
MVD	SEARSPORT HARBOR, ME	250	20	0	0	0
SPD	SERRANO CREEK, CA	4,000	500	139	0	0
SPD	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	2,000	0	0	0	0
NAD	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	250	250	250	250	79



Potential Investigation Studies (Wedge)						
(Dollars in htousands)						
DIV	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
NWD	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	500	500	523	603	0
NWD	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	900	1,171	0	0	0
SPD	SONOMA CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	600	850	0	0	0
LRD	SOUTH FORK OF SOUTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER (BUBBLY CRK), IL	500	1,000	402	0	0
SPD	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO SHORELINE, CA	2,800	2,800	1,505	0	0
NAD	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	200	0	0	0	0
SWD	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	300	600	650	700	700
SWD	SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	702	379	0	0	0
SWD	SPARKS ARROYO COLONIA, EL PASO COUNTY, TX	125	0	0	0	0
SWD	SPAVINAW CREEK WATERSHED, OKLAHOMA AND ARKANSAS	211	0	0	0	0
MVD	ST CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	600	1,325	0	0	0
MVD	ST JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LA	270	0	0	0	0
SAD	ST JOHNS COUNTY FLA	112	0	0	0	0
MVD	ST LOUIS MISSISSIPPI RIVERFRONT, MO & IL	150	386	300	0	0
SAD	ST LUCIE COUNTY BEACHES, FL	250	128	0	0	0
MVD	ST. CROIX R, WI RELOC ENDANG MUSSELS (ZEBRA MUSSEL CONT-UMR)	700	1,010	252	0	0
MVD	ST. CROIX RIVER BASIN, MN & WI	400	430	440	465	0
NAD	STONY BROOK, MILLSTONE RIVER BASIN, NJ	300	1,250	1,009	0	0
SPD	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	0	67	0	0	0
SWD	SULPHUR RIVER BASIN, TX	890	860	1,330	422	0
SPD	SUN VALLEY WATERSHED, CA	800	400	375	0	0
SAD	SURF CITY AND NORTH TOPSAIL BEACH, NC	458	0	0	0	0
NAD	SUSQUEHANNA & DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, PA	450	400	400	200	0
NAD	SUSQUEHANNA R BASIN ENV RESTORATION & LOW FLOW MGMT PLAN, PA	500	400	150	0	0
NAD	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY	500	350	150	0	0
SPD	TAHOE, CA	600	411	412	0	0
SAD	TAR RIVER AND PAMLICO SOUND, NC	300	200	300	213	0
SPD	THE COYOTE CREEK - LOWER SAN GABRIEL WATERSHED, CA	700	461	0	0	0
POD	TINIAN HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, CNMI	100	100	100	100	100
POD	UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	300	300	200	0	0
NAD	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	0	200	500	500	0
LRD	UPPER LICKING WATERSHED, MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEMS STUDY, OH	400	350	0	0	0
LRD	UPPER OHIO NAVIGATION STUDY, PA	4,200	6,200	1,900	1,000	750
NAD	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, CATATONK CREEK WATERSHED, NY	150	50	0	0	0
SWD	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	2,500	400	400	346	0
NWD	UPPER TURKEY CREEK, KS	356	0	0	0	0
SAD	UTOY, SANDY & PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	0	800	800	796	0
POD	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	500	0	0	0	0
SPD	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	800	218	218	0	0
NWD	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	1,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	WASHITA RIVER BASIN, OK	68	0	0	0	0
NWD	WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY, MO	0	0	0	0	0
LRD	WELLS L&D, LITTLE KANAWHA, WV	0	0	0	0	0
MVD	WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	1,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN, & MI	750	750	700	100	0
SPD	WESTMINSTER (EAST GARDEN GROVE) WATERSHED	900	954	0	0	0
LRD	WHEELING CREEK, OH WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	400	0	0	0	0
MVD	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	600	600	600	438	0
NWD	WHITE RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	250	2,250	0	0	0
SPD	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	400	300	0	0	0
NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	200	203	0	0	0
NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	748	696	683	418	0
NWD	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	48	0	0	0	0
SPD	WILSON AND OAK GLEN CREEKS, CA	429	0	0	0	0
SWD	WISTER LAKE WATERSHED, OK	119	0	0	0	0
SAD	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	600	348	0	0	0
POD	YAKUTAT HARBOR, AK	0	900	900	0	0
NWD	YELLOWSTONE RIVER, GLENDIVE, MT	100	400	350	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>137,885</b>	<b>117,058</b>	<b>67,894</b>	<b>38,818</b>	<b>25,933</b>

**TABLE I-3. TABLE I-3. ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND PEDS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES (Continued)**

Potential PED Projects (Wedge)							
(Dollars in Thousands)							
Priority	DIV	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>1. Projects with a BCR above 3.0</b>							
1	SWD	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	450	219	0	0	0
1	SWD	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	1,500	1,100	1,100	1,023	0
<b>2. Projects with a BCR between 1.5 and 3.0</b>							
2	MVD	DAVENPORT, IA	47	0	0	0	0
2	NWD	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	295	0	0	0	0
2	SPD	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	1,500	4,765	0	0	0
2	NWD	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	500	0	0	0	0
2	MVD	PRAIRIE DU PONT AND FISH LAKE FLOOD PROTECTION, IL	120	250	380	0	0
2	MVD	RIVER DES PERES, MO	150	700	625	600	0
2	NWD	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD AND GREENBURGH, NY	500	478	100	100	100
<b>3. Other projects, including those having no Executive Branch position</b>							
3	SAD	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SNOW'S CUT, NC	300	450	0	0	0
3	SWD	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX (42 FOOT PROJECT)	500	500	0	0	0
3	SAD	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	400	0	0	0	0
3	SWD	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	2,250	0	0	0	0
3	LRD	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	200	527	525	0	0
3	SAD	C&SF INDIAN RIVER LAGOON, FL	915	687	0	0	0
3	SAD	CAHABA RIVER BASIN, AL	350	200	0	0	0
3	NWD	CENTRALIA, WA	1,200	900	847	0	0
3	NWD	CHARITON RIVER, MO	200	275	200	0	0
3	SPD	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	425	500	0	0	0
3	MVD	DARDENNE CREEK, MO	300	300	0	0	0
3	MVD	ECORSE CREEK, MI	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
3	LRD	ERICSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	250	250	1,000	1,027	500
3	NWD	LAWRENCE, KS	170	340	165	0	0
3	SWD	LITTLE RIVER COUNTY, AR	300	100	0	0	0
3	SPD	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	618	0	0	0	0
3	SPD	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	1,020	0	0	0	0
3	NWD	MRLS UNIT L-246 REVIEW, MO	200	200	200	0	0
3	LRD	PARKERSBURG RIVERFRONT PARK, WV	100	0	0	0	0
3	NWD	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ	725	725	725	727	0
3	SAD	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	300	400	400	300	0
3	SWD	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	2,971	1,486	1,485	1,114	373
3	SWD	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	313	0	0	0	0
3	SAD	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	500	0	0	0	0
3	SPD	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	2,000	0	0	0	0
3	SAD	WEST ONSLOW BEACH & NEW RIVER INLET, NC	600	0	0	0	0
3	MVD	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	350	400	400	400	245
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>23,019</b>	<b>16,752</b>	<b>9,152</b>	<b>6,291</b>	<b>2,218</b>

**TABLE C-1. CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT, BASE PLAN SCENARIO**

Construction (C) -- Base Plan Scenario						
(Dollars in Thousands)						
DIV	Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
SPD	ALAMOGORDO, NM*	4,200	0	0	0	0
SPD	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	36,500	42,805	70,659	82,537	51,000
NWD	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	9,000	4,255	0	0	0
NAD	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT, NY	8,500	5,000	2,700	260	260
NWD	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	3,500	4,105	6,775	9,891	4,428
LRD	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	12,000	22,000	24,000	21,000	22,400
SWD	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	14,840	17,404	28,730	17,826	0
SAD	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA *	6,400	0	0	0	0
SWD	CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	17,300	18,700	11,600	120	0
SAD	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	5,000	5,552	449	0	0
LRD	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	52,800	51,500	52,500	47,200
MVD	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	4,500	5,277	7,723	1,800	481
LRD	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL	7,650	4,250	0	0	0
LRD	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	9,000	4,806	0	0	0
LRD	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN *	35,200	33,000	0	0	0
SWD	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	15,850	9,364	0	0
NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA*	15,000	17,591	12,409	0	0
LRD	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (Levee 33)*	6,620	4,000	0	0	0
MVD	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	2,500	1,041	0	0	0
NWD	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	11,030	3,070	850	850	850
LRD	EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRECTION)	43,000	6,196	663	28	0
NAD	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	4,150	4,867	8,034	8,698	10,000
NWD	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (REPLACEMENT)	6,200	7,271	12,002	17,522	3,444
SPD	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	4,900	2,200	1,750	368	0
SAD	HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	55,780	56,039	40,484	21,920	52,516
SWD	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	16,320	0	0	0	0
MVD	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (REPLACEMENT)	20,450	28,600	20,445	20,445	20,445
MVD	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA *	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
SAD	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	13,000	10,000	10,705	0	0
LRD	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY*	52,000	12,600	10,000	2,700	0
LRD	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	13,000	12,000	6,000	2,597	0
LRD	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	70,300	63,300	59,100	94,800	64,700
NWD	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,000	1,173	1,936	2,826	4,663
LRD	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV*	25,000	8,860	0	0	0
LRD	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN*	45,000	6,270	0	0	0
LRD	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL*	33,500	20,000	0	0	0
LRD	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	11,850	4,727	0	0	0
MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	2,100	2,463	4,065	5,935	9,792
NWD	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	10,200	10,700	1,000	1,000	1,000
NWD	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (FISH PASSAGE)	11,500	11,869	165	0	0
NAD	MUDDY RIVER, MA	10,000	11,727	3,422	0	0
SPD	NAPA RIVER, CA*	7,500	0	0	0	0
NAD	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	91,000	106,718	138,282	95,000	59,000
SPD	OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	42,000	29,000	19,950	17,000	7,728
LRD	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	104,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	100,000
SWD	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)*	17,300	11,200	11,200	11,200	8,212
SAD	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	35,000	40,197	26,876	7	0
NAD	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	10,000	11,727	19,359	28,261	46,631
SAD	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,900	2,300	0	0	0
SPD	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, NM	800	800	1,321	1,928	3,181
SAD	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	11,500	13,486	22,262	32,500	53,626
SAD	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	10,150	7,600	2,278	0	0
LRD	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,000	520	380	0	0
SPD	SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	900	0	0	0	0
SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	21,530	25,246	41,675	60,841	22,700
SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	500	0	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	17,000	19,936	32,910	48,044	79,273
SWD	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	24,150	28,326	14,579	1,609	0
SAD	SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	162,390	190,452	314,382	458,961	531,000
SPD	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	8,000	9,382	11,318	4,000	507
SPD	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	18,000	73,000	36,000	20,077	500
NWD	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	9,000	10,000	6,000	6,354	4,493
NWD	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	28,500	45,000	40,000	35,000	15,169
MVD	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	23,460	27,517	39,173	33,170	33,170
LRD	WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	54,100	32,900	38,200	39,100	36,300
	Additional projects and programs(including CAPs and remaining items)	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	136,006
	Continuing Authorities Program	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000
	Remaining Items	72,830	72,825	72,825	72,825	72,825
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,523,000</b>	<b>1,498,000</b>	<b>1,493,000</b>	<b>1,529,000</b>	<b>1,541,000</b>

\* Zeros in Columns = Completed

\* Additional funding for these projects is included in Table C-3

**TABLE C-2. CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT, ENHANCED PLAN SCENARIO**

Construction (C) -- Enhanced Plan Scenario						
(Dollars in Thousands)						
DIV	Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
SPD	ALAMOGORDO, NM*	4,200	0	0	0	0
SPD	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	69,990	60,141	51,631	44,500	53,500
NWD	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	9,000	4,255	0	0	0
NAD	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT, NY	8,500	5,000	2,700	260	260
NWD	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,711	14,189	5,100	2,699	0
LRD	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)	12,000	22,000	24,000	21,000	22,400
SWD	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	22,563	56,238	0	0	0
SAD	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA *	6,400	0	0	0	0
SWD	CANTON LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	33,173	8,527	6,020	0	0
SAD	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	5,000	5,552	449	0	0
LRD	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	52,800	51,500	52,500	47,200
MVD	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	7,000	7,000	4,000	1,781	0
LRD	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL, SECOND BARRIER, IL	9,250	2,650	0	0	0
LRD	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	9,000	4,806	0	0	0
LRD	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN *	35,200	33,000	0	0	0
SWD	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	25,000	15,850	9,364	0	0
NWD	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA*	15,000	30,000	0	0	0
LRD	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (Levee 33)*	6,620	4,000	0	0	0
MVD	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	2,500	1,041	0	0	0
NWD	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	11,030	3,070	850	850	850
LRD	EMSWORTH L&D, OHIO RIVER, PA (STATIC INSTABILITY CORRECTION)	43,000	6,196	663	28	0
NAD	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	7,000	9,213	2,333	8,299	10,300
NWD	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (REPLACEMENT)	11,889	17,911	16,639	0	0
SPD	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	6,900	2,000	318	0	0
SAD	HERBERT HOOVER DIKE, FL (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	55,776	56,039	40,484	21,920	52,516
SWD	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	16,320	0	0	0	0
MVD	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT LOCK AND DAM, IL (REPLACEMENT)	20,445	28,600	20,445	20,445	20,445
MVD	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA *	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
SAD	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (REPLACEMENT)	13,000	10,000	10,705	0	0
LRD	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY*	52,000	12,600	10,000	2,700	0
LRD	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	21,000	10,000	2,597	0	0
LRD	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	70,319	63,300	59,100	94,800	64,700
NWD	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA	1,918	3,132	3,000	3,000	1,581
LRD	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV*	25,000	8,860	0	0	0
LRD	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN*	45,000	6,270	0	0	0
LRD	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL*	33,500	20,000	0	0	0
LRD	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	11,847	4,727	0	0	0
MVD	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	4,027	8,348	7,200	7,200	7,200
NWD	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	10,200	10,700	1,000	1,000	1,000
NWD	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (FISH PASSAGE)	11,500	11,869	165	0	0
NAD	MUDDY RIVER, MA	18,000	7,149	0	0	0
SPD	NAPA RIVER, CA*	7,500	0	0	0	0
NAD	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	144,000	124,371	83,000	82,658	53,972
SPD	OAKLAND HARBOR (50 FOOT PROJECT), CA	60,000	19,950	19,950	15,778	0
LRD	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	104,000	110,000	110,000	110,000	100,000
SWD	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)*	17,300	11,200	11,200	11,200	8,212
SAD	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	35,000	40,197	26,876	7	0
NAD	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	19,175	83,832	98,067	6,301	0
SAD	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	9,200	0	0	0	0
SPD	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, NM	800	800	9,000	9,000	9,000
SAD	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	20,300	40,000	40,000	40,000	34,973
SAD	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	10,150	7,600	2,278	0	0
LRD	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	1,000	520	380	0	0
SPD	SACRAMENTO DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	900	0	0	0	0
SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	41,281	101,794	28,715	100	100
SPD	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	500	0	0	0	0
SPD	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	32,598	109,202	50,131	32,000	36,139
SWD	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	41,505	21,609	4,554	1,000	0
SAD	SOUTH FLORIDA EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	206,269	227,348	360,952	507,344	531,175
SPD	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	11,000	10,350	10,350	1,507	0
SPD	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	18,000	73,000	36,000	20,077	500
NWD	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	9,000	10,000	6,000	6,354	4,493
NWD	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS (DAM SAFETY)	33,500	40,000	40,000	35,000	15,169
MVD	UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESTORATION, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	31,819	33,520	33,170	33,170	33,170
LRD	WOLF CREEK, KY (SEEPAGE CONTROL)	54,100	32,900	38,200	39,100	36,300
	Additional projects and programs(including CAPs and remaining items)	50,000	50,000	446,770	559,968	657,082
	Continuing Authorities Program	36,000	36,810	37,594	38,358	39,122
	Remaining Items	72,825	74,464	76,050	77,596	79,141
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,871,000</b>	<b>1,888,000</b>	<b>1,901,000</b>	<b>1,911,000</b>	<b>1,922,000</b>

\* Zero Columns = Completed

\* Additional funding for these projects is included in Table C-3

**TABLE C-3. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES**

Potential Construction Projects							
(Dollars in Thousands)							
DIV	Priority	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>1. Projects with Benefit-Cost Ratios of 3.0 to 1 or Greater</b>							
SAD	1	ALLATOONA POWERHOUSE REHAB	1,000	1,000	11,500	11,500	0
MVD	1	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF CORR)	350	1,000	2,500	2,500	1,290
LRD	1	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	12,100	12,100	9,500	28,800	48,700
SAD	1	MOBILE HARBOR, AL (TURNING BASIN)	14,501	26,861	0	0	0
NAD	1	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	100	0	0	0	0
NAD	1	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	3,784	0	0	0	0
<b>2. Other Justified Projects with a Favorable Executive Branch Position 1/</b>							
SPD	2	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	2,400	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
SPD	2	ALAMOGORDO, NM	0	4,200	4,200	4,200	1,387
SPD	2	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA	4,500	0	0	0	0
NAD	2	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR, NJ (NJ SHORE PROTECT)	20,000	20,000	2,249	11	11
NWD	2	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	10,272	10,593	0	0	0
NWD	2	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	8,200	266	0	0	0
NAD	2	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET (ABSECON ISLAND), NJ	9,500	5,400	10,410	19,880	1,584
NAD	2	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	6,300	3,667	3,000	0	0
NWD	2	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	6,000	11,352	21,759	24,293	0
LRD	2	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	0	0	35,000	3,000	5,000
SWD	2	CLEAR CREEK, TX	2,000	15,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
NWD	2	COLUMBIA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, OR & WA	0	7,000	1,669	1,873	0
NWD	2	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	13,924	7,037	3,011	0	0
MVD	2	COMITE RIVER, LA	24,000	13,565	18,565	18,000	13,089
MVD	2	CROOKSTON, MN	275	0	0	0	0
NAD	2	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT	2,600	22	22	22	22
NAD	2	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS, DE & NJ	3,100	36	36	36	36
NAD	2	DELAWARE COAST, BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY BEACH	150	265	280	4,141	296
NAD	2	DELAWARE COAST, CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	105	2,122	60	60	440
NAD	2	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	3,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	28,246
LRD	2	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	3,000	3,000	7,000	6,076	1,180
NWD	2	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	6,450	0	0	0	0
MVD	2	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	1,125	15,000	15,000	13,780	10,000
SPD	2	EL PASO, TX	250	800	800	800	10,000
NWD	2	FT RANDALL TURBINE REHAB	1,476	9,102	27,333	36,022	39,152
SWD	2	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	5,000	1,351	0	0	0
SPD	2	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	8,000	463	0	0	0
SWD	2	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX (GALVESTON CHANNEL)	23,080	10,130	0	0	0
LRD	2	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	5,547	0	0	0	0
MVD	2	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	19,488	46,000	76,000	70,000	80,000
SAD	2	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	10,000	5,802	0	0	0
SWD	2	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	379
POD	2	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	15,000	0	0	0	0
SAD	2	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	5,300	2,706	0	0	0
POD	2	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	150	12,275	489	329	0
SAD	2	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	600	600	0	0	0
LRD	2	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	0	39,000	74,000	71,500	57,000
MVD	2	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	3,900	4,100	4,007	0	0
SPD	2	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELEN, NM	300	500	500	500	8,400
SPD	2	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	500	1,180	3,403	7,381	6,811
LRD	2	MILL CREEK, OH	5,780	0	0	0	0
NWD	2	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	2,800	3,004	2,463	1,817	0
NWD	2	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	500	1,000	7,000	8,000	416
SAD	2	MOBILE HARBOR, AL (1200 foot channel)	1,699	0	0	0	0
NAD	2	MOOREFIELD, WV	876	0	0	0	0
SPD	2	NAPA RIVER, CA	3,619	39,800	13,845	0	0
SPD	2	NOGALES WASH, AZ	17,876	0	0	0	0
NAD	2	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA (DEEPENING)	3,400	0	0	0	0
LRD	2	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	2,100	3,140	1,890	2,470	2,750
SWD	2	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	0	5,800	3,600	0	0
NAD	2	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, NJ	4,000	3,421	4,000	0	0
SPD	2	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	8,394	0	0	0	0
SPD	2	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	600	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
SPD	2	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	3,153	0	0	0	0
SPD	2	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	11,528	3	0	0	0
NWD	2	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, SAUNDERS COUNTY, NEBRASKA	1,700	579	0	0	0
NAD	2	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	10,000	9,335	800	8,800	1,160
POD	2	SITKA HARBOR, AK	6,300	0	0	0	0
MVD	2	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	118,448	14,049	0	0	0
MVD	2	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	1,934	2,500	2,500	1,221	0
SAD	2	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	4,000	280	0	0	0
MVD	2	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	25	0	0	0	0
SPD	2	STOCKTON METROPOLITAN FLOOD CONTROL REIMBURSEMENT, CA	10,000	1,677	0	0	0
SAD	2	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (REPLACEMENT)	11,860	0	0	0	0
SPD	2	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	12,935	12,000	8,039	0	0
SPD	2	TULE RIVER, CA	1,000	1,500	2,000	7,000	2,500
SAD	2	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (REPLACEMENT)	11,723	0	0	0	0
SWD	2	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM, OK (MAJOR REHABILITATION)	50,500	9,000	4,100	0	0
SWD	2	WHITNEY LAKE POWERHOUSE, TX (MAJOR REHAB)	4,500	5,000	6,000	3,375	0
SAD	2	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	45,000	20,000	6,350	0	0
LRD	2	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	3,500	0	0	0	0
MVD	2	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	982	2,800	2,800	1,136	0
NAD	2	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	5,600	1,533	0	0	0

**TABLE C-3. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES (Continued)**

Potential Construction Projects							
(Dollars in Thousands)							
DIV	Priority	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>3. Projects with BCRs below 1.0, Otherwise Inconsistent with Policy, or Having No Executive Branch Position</b>							
NAD	3	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	7,608	13,219	13,219	0	0
POD	3	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	16,000	9,000	0	0	0
POD	3	ALASKA COASTAL EROSION, AK	56,000	0	0	0	0
POD	3	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION, AK	1,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	412	0	0	0	0
MVD	3	BOIS BRULE DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MISSOURI	8,483	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	BRIDGEPORT, CT (CSO)	200	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG INLET, BRIGANTINE ISLAND, NJ	80	90	458	2,684	98
SAD	3	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	4,100	17,297	0	0	0
NWD	3	BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, ND	1,893	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	CALFED LEVEE STABILITY PROGRAM, CA	18,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
LRD	3	CALUMET REGION, IN	6,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	9,056	1,120	0	0	0
SPD	3	CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	340
LRD	3	CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	6,200	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA & PA	118	250	0	0	0
POD	3	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	1,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS, IN	2,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS	1,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	18,700	15,600	15,570	19,490	19,195
LRD	3	CUMBERLAND COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, TN	200	2,000	2,805	0	0
SAD	3	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	20,000	22,514	9,067	5,485	9,950
NAD	3	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE & NJ	250	6,280	73	76	80
NAD	3	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ - OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ	250	2,119	10	10	10
NAD	3	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, PT. MAHON, DE & NJ	4,800	2,747	30	30	35
NAD	3	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	390	420	450	460	470
NAD	3	DELAWARE COAST, REHOBOTH BEACH TO DEWEY BEACH, DE	2,700	35	35	2,710	35
POD	3	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	3,000	0	10,000	20,000	10,000
POD	3	DILLINGHAM EMERGENCY BANK STABILIZATION, AK	5,000	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, NY	750	1,000	500	1,000	500
LRD	3	EASTERN SHORE AND SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA, VA	200	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	FALL RIVER AND NEW BEDFORD, MA (CSO)	200	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	FARMINGTON RECHARGE (SEC 502)	3,000	3,190	3,000	3,000	4,000
LRD	3	GENESEE COUNTY, MI	600	450	450	450	450
SWD	3	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	5,800	7,950	0	0	0
SWD	3	GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	14,516	1,654	0	0	0
LRD	3	GRAND CALUMET RAP, INDIANA	500	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	GRAND CALUMET RAP, INDIANA	500	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	600	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	9,600	1,150	1,190	1,220	15,000
NAD	3	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	100	8,892	10,000	10,000	2,471
LRD	3	GREAT LAKES FISHERY & ECO REST, IL, IN, MN, OH, PA	200	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	1,500	17,260	14,130	14,130	13,770
POD	3	HAINES HARBOR, AK	1,000	10,000	0	0	0
SPD	3	HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING STUDY, LOS ANGELES, CA	8,000	8,000	4,157	0	0
NAD	3	HARTFORD, CT (CSO)	200	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,800	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	IMPERIAL BEACH, SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CA	1,037	8,000	100	100	100
LRD	3	ISLAND CREEK BASIN IN AND AROUND LOGAN, WEST VIRGINIA	200	110	100	100	150
LRD	3	JOHN T MYERS - LOCK IMPROVEMENTS, IN & KY	10,500	12,000	10,000	35,000	45,000
LRD	3	KENTUCKY RIVER, LOCK AND DAM 10, KY	500	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	5,000	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	LAKE CHAMPLAIN WATERSHED INITIATE, VT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
LRD	3	LAKE MICHIGAN WATERFRONT, IN	400	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
SAD	3	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	9,677	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	LAWTON, OKLAHOMA	4,452	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, VA & KY	66,000	73,524	55,050	45,907	39,500
SPD	3	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	200	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	5,000	260	260	5,000	260
SPD	3	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	969	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	850	1,300	570	1,955	10,390
SAD	3	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	25	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	LYNCHBURG, VA (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW)	300	300	300	300	300
NAD	3	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET (NJ SHORE PROTECTION)	100	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
SWD	3	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR & OK	3,500	10,000	20,000	15,000	0
SWD	3	MCCLELLAN-KERR AR RIVER NAV SYSTEM, 12-FT NAVIGATION CHANNEL	40,000	40,000	39,996	42,152	0
SAD	3	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	24,000	21,870	21,773	18,849	5,834
MVD	3	MISSISSIPPI ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MS	10,000	25,000	25,000	10,411	0
MVD	3	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, LA	286	0	1,002	432	0
NAD	3	NARRAGANSETT BAY OVERFLOW MGMT FACILITY, RI	200	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	NEGAUNEE, MI	400	450	450	450	450
NAD	3	NEW HAVEN, CT (CSO)	200	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM	10,000	5,000	4,464	0	0
SAD	3	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA & SC	14,900	5,600	0	0	0
LRD	3	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	5,000	5,000	845	0	0
POD	3	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	1,500	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	NORTH VALLEY REGIONAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE, CA	3,000	3,000	3,008	3,000	3,000

**TABLE C-3. ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS WITH FUNDING CAPABILITIES (Continued)**

Potential Construction Projects							
(Dollars in Thousands)							
DIV	Priority	Name	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
LRD	3	NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, MN	10,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
LRD	3	NORTHERN WISCONSIN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE, WI	10,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	5,231
LRD	3	OAKLAND COUNTY, MI	250	1,225	1,200	1,200	1,200
SAD	3	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	1,097	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	32,759	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	OHIO RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, KY IN, IL, OH, WV, PA	1,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	1,820	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	4,100	16,100	13,800	14,300	14,000
LRD	3	OTTAWA RIVER HARBOR, OH	200	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NJ	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
SAD	3	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	5,840	5,840	0	0	0
SPD	3	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	3,200	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	PLACER COUNTY SUB-REGIONAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT	4,167	4,167	4,167	4,167	0
LRD	3	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA & WV	150	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	PORT ARTHUR & VICINITY, TX (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)	500	1,625	0	0	0
POD	3	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	8,000	0	10,000	0	0
SAD	3	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL, FL	6,800	5,296	0	0	0
LRD	3	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	750	620	670	700	690
MVD	3	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & LA	10,000	5,000	6,650	5,100	5,000
NAD	3	RICHMOND, VA (COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW)	600	600	600	600	0
NWD	3	RURAL MONTANA, MT	5,000	5,000	5,415	0	0
SPD	3	RURAL NEVADA	5,931	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	RURAL NEVADA	15,079	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	RURAL UTAH, UT	6,436	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	SACRAMENTO AREA, CA	6,285	6,285	6,285	6,285	0
SWD	3	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	17,550	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
SPD	3	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	4,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	2,000	23,773	57,874	44,273	49,974
LRD	3	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	2,940	584	0	0	0
POD	3	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	3,000	3,000	25	0	0
NAD	3	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	9,685	10,072	0	0	0
LRD	3	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, PA	11,475	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	SOUTH PERRIS, CA	21,520	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY	4,400	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	SOUTHERN WV ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, WV	6,400	0	0	0	0
POD	3	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	3,000	0	0	0	0
LRD	3	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	900	0	0	0	0
SPD	3	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, ALBUQUERQUE, NM	1,000	3,200	6,000	7,281	0
SPD	3	TAHOE BASIN RESTORATION 108	17,436	0	0	0	0
SAD	3	TAMPA HARBOR, BIG BEND, FL	3,165	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	TEXS CITY CHANNEL (50-FOOT PROJECT), TX	40,000	1,882	0	0	0
LRD	3	THREE RIVERS WET WEATHER DEMO PROGRAM, PA	4,645	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
NAD	3	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	7,400	300	300	6,300	320
SPD	3	TRES RIOS, AZ	38,200	6,218	6,217	6,217	6,217
SPD	3	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	17,394	0	0	0	0
POD	3	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	15,000	0	0	0	0
MVD	3	UPPER MISS RIVER - ILLINOIS WW SYSTEM, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	16,200	260,000	260,000	260,000	260,000
SPD	3	UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CA	18,045	0	0	0	0
NAD	3	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	3,669	80	80	140	6,045
NAD	3	WATERBURY DAM PROJECT	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
LRD	3	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, PA & WV	1,729	28,000	16,000	12,923	9,200
NWD	3	WESTERN SARPY COUNTY AND CLEAR CREEK	7,040	3,613	0	0	0
NAD	3	WOONSOCKET, RI	1,950	0	0	0	0
POD	3	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	10,000	0	0	0	0
SWD	3	YUKON, OKLAHOMA	5,454	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1,543,522</b>	<b>1,310,047</b>	<b>1,203,025</b>	<b>1,129,410</b>	<b>938,114</b>

1/ A justified project is justified based on benefit-cost ratio of 1.0 or higher or aquatic ecosystem restoration outputs.

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING**

<b>Continuing Authorities Program Construction Account Projects Only</b> (Dollars in Thousands)							
<b>Construction Account Projects Budgeted in FY2008 by Business Line</b>							
Business Line	FY08 Budget	FY08 Obligation Capability	FY09 Obligation Capability	FY10 Obligation Capability	FY11 Obligation Capability	FY12 Obligation Capability	Total FY08-12 Obligation Capability
FDR	12,513	12,513	315	0	0	0	12,828
NAV	320	320	374	0	0	0	694
ENR	22,193	22,193	3,073	0	0	0	25,266
Totals	35,026	35,026	3,762	0	0	0	38,788

<b>Universe of Construction Account Projects for FY2008 Budgeting by Business Line</b>							
Business Line	FY08 Budget	FY08 Obligation Capability	FY09 Obligation Capability	FY10 Obligation Capability	FY11 Obligation Capability	FY12 Obligation Capability	Total FY08-12 Obligation Capability
FDR	12,513	138,810	26,798	35,737	8,154	315	209,814
NAV	320	46,574	10,390	1,701	200	0	58,865
ENR	22,193	244,998	78,756	39,895	11,676	220	375,545
Totals	35,026	430,382	115,944	77,333	20,030	535	644,224

<b>Construction Account Projects Budgeted in FY2008 by Section</b>							
Section	FY08 Budget	FY08 Obligation Capability	FY09 Obligation Capability	FY10 Obligation Capability	FY11 Obligation Capability	FY12 Obligation Capability	Total FY08-12 Obligation Capability
14	721	721	0	0	0	0	721
103	400	400	0	0	0	0	400
107	320	320	374	0	0	0	694
205	11,392	11,392	315	0	0	0	11,707
206	11,158	11,158	1,799	0	0	0	12,957
208	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1135	11,035	11,035	1,274	0	0	0	12,309
Totals	35,026	35,026	3,762	0	0	0	38,788

<b>Universe of Construction Account Projects for FY2008 Budgeting by Section</b>							
Section	FY08 Budget	FY08 Obligation Capability	FY09 Obligation Capability	FY10 Obligation Capability	FY11 Obligation Capability	FY12 Obligation Capability	Total FY08-12 Obligation Capability
14	721	27,571	1,831	0	0	0	29,402
103	400	7,153	2,190	3,425	890	0	13,658
107	320	46,574	10,390	1,701	200	0	58,865
205	11,392	103,716	22,777	32,312	7,264	315	166,384
206	11,158	158,932	48,851	31,509	3,307	220	242,819
208	0	370	0	0	0	0	370
1135	11,035	86,066	29,905	8,386	8,369	0	132,726
Totals	35,026	430,382	115,944	77,333	20,030	535	644,224



**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
14	LRD	14 OLD FORT NIAGARA, YOUNGSTOWN, NY	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	SPD	27TH STREET BRIDGE, GLENWOOD SPRINGS, CO	DI	FDR	-	322	-	-	-	-	322
14	LRD	ALDEN SEWER DISTRICT #2	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	NWD	ARGOSY ROAD BRIDGE, RIVERSIDE, MO	DI	FDR	-	650	-	-	-	-	650
14	MVD	BARNES CO., KATHRYN, ND	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
14	SWD	BATESVILLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT, WHITE RIVER, AR	DI	FDR	-	477	-	-	-	-	477
14	MVD	BEAR CREEK, ROLAND, STORY CO., IA	FEA	FDR	-	60	30	-	-	-	90
14	LRD	BEAVER CK WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT,	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	BELLE ISLE, DETROIT, MI	DI	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
14	LRD	BELPRE, OH SEWER AND WATERLINE PROTECTION	FEA	FDR	-	40	40	-	-	-	80
14	LRD	BIG SISTER CREEK, N. COLLINS	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	MVD	BLACK RIVER, RIVER DRIVE	DI	FDR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
14	LRD	BLANCHARD RIVER, OTTAWA, OH	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	SWD	BRITTON ROAD BRIDGE, JONES, OK	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	LRD	CANADAWAY SEWERLINE	DI	FDR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
14	MVD	CASS LAKE, LEECH LAKE TRIBE	DI	FDR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225
14	MVD	CAULKS CREEK, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO	DI	FDR	-	400	21	-	-	-	421
14	LRD	CHAGRIN RIVER, GATES MILLS, OH	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	LRD	CITY OF BLUFFTON, WELLS CO (SEC 14)	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	MVD	COAL CREEK, ALBIA, MONROE CO., IA	DI	FDR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
14	MVD	COAL CREEK, ALBIA, MONROE CO., IA	FEA	FDR	-	38	-	-	-	-	38
14	LRD	CONWAY, CROWS RUN, PA	FEA	FDR	-	126	-	-	-	-	126
14	LRD	CROOKED CREEK, MADISON, IN	DI	FDR	-	220	-	-	-	-	220
14	LRD	CUYAHOGA RIVER, BATH ROAD	DI	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	LRD	CUYAHOGA RIVER, VAUGHN RD.	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP, WARREN CO	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	NAD	DELAWARE CANAL, PAUNNACUSSING CREEK, BUCKS COUNTY, PA	DI	FDR	-	750	-	-	-	-	750
14	MVD	DES MOINES RVR, KEOSAUGUA, VAN BURNE CO., IA	FEA	FDR	-	60	30	-	-	-	90
14	LRD	DUNKARD CREEK, BLACKVILLE, PA	FEA	FDR	-	39	-	-	-	-	39
14	NWD	EAST FORK BIG CREEK, BETHANY, MO	FEA	FDR	-	69	-	-	-	-	69
14	LRD	EAST LIVERPOOL, OH	FEA	FDR	-	129	-	-	-	-	129
14	NAD	EAST POINT, NJ	DI	FDR	-	360	-	-	-	-	360
14	LRD	EAST VALLEY CREEK, ANDOVER	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	EIGHTEENMILE CREEK, NEWFANE	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	EIGHTEENMILE CREEK, NORTH CREEK RD.	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	NAD	ELIZABETH RIVER, VALLEYVIEW ROAD, HILLSIDE, NJ	DI	FDR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
14	MVD	ELK RIVER, SHERBURNE CO.	DI	FDR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
14	LRD	ELLICOTT CREEK, NORTH FOREST RD., AMHERST	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	ERIE BASIN MARINA, BUFFALO, NY	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	MVD	FT. ABERCROMBIE, ND	DI	FDR	-	960	-	-	-	-	960
14	MVD	FT. ABERCROMBIE, ND	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	LRD	GRAND RIVER (NOWS), GRAND HAVEN, MI	DI	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
14	LRD	GRAND RIVER, PAINESVILLE, OH, SR84 BRIDGE	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	LRD	GRAYCLIFF HOUSE, EVANS, NY	FEA	FDR	-	80	-	-	-	-	80
14	LRD	GREEN HILL RD., ASHTABULA RIVER, PLYMOUTH TOWNSHIP	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	HANLOCK RD., ASHTABULA RIVER, PLYMOUTH TOWNSHIP	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	MVD	HIGHWAY A, TURKEY CREEK, MO	FEA	FDR	-	35	-	-	-	-	35
14	LRD	HODGENVILLE, KY	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
14	NAD	HOLMES BAY [STATE HIGHWAY RTE 191], WHITING, ME	DI	FDR	-	675	-	-	-	-	675
14	LRD	HURON RIVER, S.R. 99	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	MVD	IA RVR, IA CITY, JOHNSON CO., IA	FEA	FDR	-	60	30	-	-	-	90
14	MVD	IA RVR, SAC & FOX SETTLEMENT, TAMA COUNTY, IA	DI	FDR	-	348	-	-	-	-	348
14	LRD	KANAWHA RIVER, CHARLESTON, WV (MAGIC ISLAND TO PATRICK STREE	DI	FDR	-	960	-	-	-	-	960
14	LRD	KENOSHA HARBOR, RETAINING WALL, KENOSHA, WI	DI	FDR	-	700	-	-	-	-	700
14	LRD	KEUKA LAKE, HAMMONDSPORT	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	KINNICKINNIC RIVER STORM SEWER, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WI	DI	FDR	-	130	-	-	-	-	130
14	POD	KWETHLUK, AK	DI	FDR	100	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	MIDDLE BASS ISLAND, OH, DEIST ROAD	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	LRD	MONONGAHELA RIVER, W. ELIZABETH, PA	FEA	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
14	NAD	MT. PLEASANT AVE., MALAPARDIS BROOK, HANOVER, NJ	DI	FDR	-	650	-	-	-	-	650
14	SWD	NOKOMIS RD, TEN MILE CREEK, LANCASTER, TX	DI	FDR	-	516	-	-	-	-	516
14	LRD	NORTH PARK	DI	FDR	-	700	600	-	-	-	1,300
14	LRD	NORTH SHORE DRIVE, SOUTH BEND, IN	FEA	FDR	-	65	-	-	-	-	65
14	MVD	OAKLAND SEWAGE FACILITY, TN	DI	FDR	-	46	-	-	-	-	46
14	LRD	OHIO RIVER, HUNTINGTON, WV SEVENTH STREET WEST SEC 14	DI	FDR	-	190	190	-	-	-	380
14	LRD	OHIO RIVER, HUNTINGTON, WV SEVENTH STREET WEST SEC 14	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	LRD	OHIO RIVER, HUNTINGTON, WV STAUNTON AVENUE SEC 14	DI	FDR	-	70	70	-	-	-	140
14	LRD	OHIO RIVER, HUNTINGTON, WV STAUNTON AVENUE SEC 14	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	SWD	OLD CHAPPELL HILL ROAD, DAVIS CREEK, WASHINGTON COUNTY, TX	FEA	FDR	-	180	-	-	-	-	180
14	MVD	OUACHITA RIVER, CITY OF MONROE, LA	FEA	FDR	-	60	-	-	-	-	60
14	NAD	PARTRIDGE BROOK, WESTMORELAND, NH	DI	FDR	-	381	-	-	-	-	381
14	NAD	PATUXENT RIVER, PATUXENT BEACH ROAD, MD	DI	FDR	-	700	-	-	-	-	700
14	LRD	PEPPER'S FERRY RWTR, RADFORD, VA SEC 14	DI	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	LRD	PIPE CREEK, HAYES HOLLOW RD.	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	NWD	PLATTE CITY SEWER, PLATTE CITY, MO	DI	FDR	-	260	-	-	-	-	260
14	NWD	PLATTE RIVER BRIDGE, CONCEPTION, MO	DI	FDR	-	227	-	-	-	-	227
14	SPD	POWERS BLVD, COLORADO SPRINGS, CO	DI	FDR	-	441	-	-	-	-	441
14	NAD	QUODDY NARROWS, SOUTH LUBEC ROAD, LUBEC, ME	DI	FDR	-	202	-	-	-	-	202
14	LRD	RANSOM CREEK, HOPKINS ROAD, AMHERST, NY	DI	FDR	-	730	-	-	-	-	730
14	MVD	RED DUCK - NINETH STREET, KY #14	DI	FDR	-	595	-	-	-	-	595
14	MVD	RED LAKE RIVER, MN	DI	FDR	-	960	-	-	-	-	960
14	MVD	RED LAKE RIVER, MN	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
14	LRD	ROCKPORT, IN	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
14	NWD	ROUTE YY, WORTH COUNTY, MO	DI	FDR	-	50	177	-	-	-	227
14	NWD	ROUTE YY, WORTH COUNTY, MO	FEA	FDR	-	99	-	-	-	-	99
14	LRD	SALAMANCA, NY	FEA	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70
14	SPD	SAND COVE PARK, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA	DI	FDR	-	59	-	-	-	-	59
14	NWD	SAND HILL BRIDGE, MEDICINE CREEK, GRUNDY CO., MO	DI	FDR	-	305	-	-	-	-	305
14	NWD	SAND HILL BRIDGE, MEDICINE CREEK, GRUNDY CO., MO	FEA	FDR	-	79	-	-	-	-	79
14	MVD	SARTELL, MN	DI	FDR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
14	LRD	SEC 14 LINCOLN BOROUGH, PA	FEA	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70
14	MVD	SHOTWELL CREEK, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MO	DI	FDR	-	158	45	-	-	-	203
14	LRD	SIX-MILE CREEK, ITHACA, NY	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	NAD	SOUTH BRANCH,RAHWAY RIVER,WOODBIDGE,NJ	DI	FDR	-	550	-	-	-	-	550
14	NWD	SOUTH FORK CLEAR CREEK, ROUTE FF, MARYVILLE, MO	DI	FDR	-	189	-	-	-	-	189
14	LRD	SOUTH HARRISON COUNTY, IN	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
14	MVD	SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, CAMPUS ROAD, BATON ROUGE, LA	DI	FDR	-	204	-	-	-	-	204
14	MVD	SPRINGDALE CREEK SPRINGDALE CEMETARY PEORIA IL	FEA	FDR	-	60	30	-	-	-	90
14	NWD	ST JOHNS LANDFILL, OR	DI	FDR	-	809	-	-	-	-	809
14	NWD	STRANGER CREEK AT K-32, KS	DI	FDR	-	100	328	-	-	-	428
14	NWD	STRANGER CREEK AT K-32, KS	FEA	FDR	-	73	-	-	-	-	73
14	LRD	STURGEON RIVER, HOUGHTON COUNTY, MI	FEA	FDR	-	80	200	-	-	-	280
14	MVD	TALLAHATCHIE RIVER, SITE 3, TALLAHATCHIE COUNTY, MS	DI	FDR	621	621	-	-	-	-	621
14	LRD	THIEME DRIVE, FORT WAYNE, IN	DI	FDR	-	60	-	-	-	-	60
14	LRD	TONAWANDA CREEK, LOCKWOOD, NIAGARA COUNTY	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	TONAWANDA CREEK, NEWSTEAD	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	TONAWANDA CREEK, RIDDLE ROAD, NY	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	LRD	TONAWANDA CREEK, TONAWANDA CREEK RD., AMHERST	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	LRD	TOWN OF PORTER	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	NAD	TOWN OF WELLS, NY	DI	FDR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
14	MVD	TUCKER ROAD, COMITE RIVER, LA	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
14	LRD	TUSCARAWAS CO RD 1, (JOHNSON HILL), OH	DI	FDR	-	295	-	-	-	-	295
14	SWD	U.S. HIGHWAY 71 BRIDGE, RED RIVER, OGDEN, AR	DI	FDR	-	465	-	-	-	-	465

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
14	LRD	WALKER LANE, WASHINGTON, WV SECTION 14	FEA	FDR	-	40	40	-	-	-	80
14	LRD	WALNUT BOTTOM RUN, ING-RICH ROAD, BEAVER FALLS, PA	FEA	FDR	-	77	-	-	-	-	77
14	NWD	WEST FORK MEDICINE CREEK, GALT BRIDGE, MO	DI	FDR	-	119	-	-	-	-	119
14	NWD	WEST FORK MEDICINE CREEK, GALT BRIDGE, MO	FEA	FDR	-	11	-	-	-	-	11
14	NAD	WESTFIELD RIVER, AGAWAM, MA	DI	FDR	-	155	-	-	-	-	155
14	NAD	WESTFIELD RIVER, OLD RTE 9, CUMMINGTON, MA	DI	FDR	-	188	-	-	-	-	188
14	LRD	WESTON, WV (US RT 19 S)	FEA	FDR	-	90	-	-	-	-	90
14	SWD	WHITE RIVER, AUGUSTA, AR	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
14	SAD	WHORTON BEND ROAD, ETOWAH CO., AL	DI	FDR	-	524	-	-	-	-	524
<b>Total Section 14</b>					<b>721</b>	<b>27,571</b>	<b>1,831</b>	-	-	-	<b>29,402</b>
103	MVD	BAYOU TECHE - CHITIMACHA	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
103	POD	COMMERCIAL PORT ROAD, GUAM 000	DI	FDR	-	100	-	1,877	-	-	1,977
103	POD	F-1 FUEL PIER, GUAM	FEA	FDR	-	300	175	75	-	-	550
103	SAD	FORT SAN GERONIMO, PR	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
103	SPD	GOLETA BEACH, CITY OF GOLETA, CA	DI	FDR	-	200	1,815	-	-	-	2,015
103	SPD	GOLETA BEACH, CITY OF GOLETA, CA	FEA	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
103	NAD	INDIAN RIVER INLET, SUSSEX COUNTY, DE	DI	FDR	-	544	-	-	-	-	544
103	LRD	LAKE ERIE AT PAINESVILLE	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
103	LRD	LAKE ERIE ATHOL SPRINGS, NY	DI	FDR	-	-	100	60	890	-	1,050
103	LRD	LAKEVIEW PARK	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
103	LRD	LASALLE PARK, BUFFALO, NY	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
103	POD	LELOALOA SHORE PROTECTION, AMERICAN SAMOA	DI	FDR	-	150	100	1,413	-	-	1,663
103	NAD	NANTASKET BEACH, HULL, MA	FEA	FDR	-	81	-	-	-	-	81
103	NAD	PHILADELPHIA SHIPYARD, PA	DI	FDR	-	2,802	-	-	-	-	2,802
103	NAD	PLEASURE ISLAND, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
103	LRD	PORTER COMMUNITY PARK	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
103	SAD	PUERTO NUEVO BCH, PR	FEA	FDR	-	73	-	-	-	-	73
103	SAD	TARPON SPRINGS, FL	DI	FDR	-	922	-	-	-	-	922
103	POD	UNALAKLEET STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, UNALAKLEET, AK	FEA	FDR	400	400	-	-	-	-	400
103	SAD	VETERAN'S DRIVE SHORELINE, ST.THOMAS, U.S.V.I.	DI	FDR	-	281	-	-	-	-	281
<b>Total Section 103</b>					<b>400</b>	<b>7,153</b>	<b>2,190</b>	<b>3,425</b>	<b>890</b>	-	<b>13,658</b>
107	POD	APRA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, GUAM	FEA	NAV	-	70	225	225	100	-	620
107	SWD	ARKANSAS RIVER, RUSSELLVILLE HARBOR, AR	DI	NAV	-	2,746	-	-	-	-	2,746
107	NAD	BASS HARBOR, TREMONT, ME	DI	NAV	-	144	-	-	-	-	144
107	NAD	BLACKWATER RIVER, HAMPTON HARBOR, NH	DI	NAV	-	144	-	-	-	-	144
107	MVD	BLYTHEVILLE HARBOR, AR	DI	NAV	-	3,280	-	-	-	-	3,280
107	NAD	BUCKS HARBOR, MACHIASPORT, ME	FEA	NAV	-	42	-	-	-	-	42
107	LRD	BUFFALO INNER HARBOR, NY	DI	NAV	-	2,000	1,600	-	-	-	3,600
107	NAD	CHARLESTOWN BREACHWAY & NINIGRET POND, CHARLESTOWN, RI	DI	NAV	-	301	-	-	-	-	301
107	POD	CHEFORNAK NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, CHEFORNAK, AK	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	LRD	CLEVELAND LAKEFRONT STATE PARK, OH	FEA	NAV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	POD	COLD BAY NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	LRD	COOLEY CREEK, OH	FEA	NAV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	POD	DOUGLAS HARBOR, AK	DI	NAV	-	2,778	-	-	-	-	2,778
107	NAD	EAST BOAT BASIN, SANDWICH, MA	FEA	NAV	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
107	MVD	EAST TWO RIVER, TOWER, MN	FEA	NAV	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
107	POD	ELIM NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, ELIM, AK	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	LRD	ESCANABA, MI	FEA	NAV	-	57	252	-	-	-	309
107	NAD	FISHERMANS COVE, NORFOLK, VA	DI	NAV	-	252	-	-	-	-	252
107	SWD	GALVESTON ISLAND HARBOR, GALVESTON, TX	FEA	NAV	-	400	199	-	-	-	599
107	LRD	GRAND MARAIS, MN	FEA	NAV	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
107	LRD	GRAND PORTAGE HARBOR, MN	FEA	NAV	-	100	30	-	-	-	130
107	POD	GUSTAVUS NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, AK	FEA	NAV	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
107	POD	IGIUGIG NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, IGIUGIG, AK	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	POD	KAHO'OLAWA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	FEA	NAV	245	245	249	-	-	-	494
107	LRD	KNIFE HARBOR, MN	FEA	NAV	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
107	POD	KOKHANOK HARBOR, AK	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	LRD	MACKINAC ISLAND HARBOR BREAKWATER, MI	FEA	NAV	75	75	125	-	-	-	200
107	NAD	NANTICOKE HARBOR, MD	DI	NAV	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
107	POD	NANWALEK NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, AK	FEA	NAV	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
107	NAD	NASSAWADOX CREEK, NORTHAMPTON COUNTY, VA	DI	NAV	-	608	-	-	-	-	608

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
107	SAD	NEW RIVER INLET, ONSLOW CO., NC	FEA	NAV	-	80	-	-	-	-	80
107	LRD	NFTA BOAT HARBOR	FEA	NAV	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
107	POD	NORTH KOHALA NAVIGATION, HI	FEA	NAV	-	320	200	-	-	-	520
107	LRD	NORTHERN MICHIGAN COLLEGE, TRAVERSE CITY, MI	DI	NAV	-	50	50	1,214	-	-	1,314
107	MVD	NORTHWEST TENNESSEE REGIONAL HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, TN	DI	NAV	-	3,110	-	-	-	-	3,110
107	NAD	OAK BLUFFS HARBOR, OAK BLUFFS, MA	DI	NAV	-	360	-	-	-	-	360
107	LRD	OHIO RIVER, PROCTORVILLE, OH SEC 107	FEA	NAV	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
107	LRD	OLCOTT HARBOR, NEWFANE, NY	FEA	NAV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	LRD	ONTONAGON RIVER, MI	DI	NAV	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
107	POD	OUTER COVE MARINA, CNMI	FEA	NAV	-	70	200	200	100	-	570
107	SPD	OYSTER POINT MARINA	DI	NAV	-	650	-	-	-	-	650
107	SAD	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	DI	NAV	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
107	NAD	POINT JUDITH HARBOR, NARRAGANSETT, RI	FEA	NAV	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
107	MVD	PORT FOURCHON EXTENSION, LAFOURCHE PARISH, LA	DI	NAV	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
107	POD	PORT GRAHAM NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, Port Graham, AK	FEA	NAV	-	160	-	-	-	-	160
107	SPD	PORT HUENEME, CA	DI	NAV	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000
107	NAD	RHODES POINT, MD	DI	NAV	-	3,600	-	-	-	-	3,600
107	LRD	ROUGE RIVER, MI	FEA	NAV	-	64	194	62	-	-	320
107	NAD	ROUND POND HARBOR, BRISTOL, ME	FEA	NAV	-	80	-	-	-	-	80
107	POD	SEWARD MARINE INDUSTRIAL CENTER NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	DI	NAV	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
107	SAD	SHALLOTTE RIVER, BRUNSWICK COUNTY, NC	FEA	NAV	-	49	-	-	-	-	49
107	POD	SMALL NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, ILIAMNA, AK	FEA	NAV	-	290	-	-	-	-	290
107	POD	ST LAWRENCE, AK	DI	NAV	-	9,600	-	-	-	-	9,600
107	NAD	ST. JEROME CREEK, ST. MARY'S COUNTY, MD	DI	NAV	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
107	NAD	ST. JEROME CREEK, ST. MARY'S COUNTY, MD	FEA	NAV	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
107	POD	TATITLEK, AK	DI	NAV	-	205	2,900	-	-	-	3,105
107	POD	TATITLEK, AK	FEA	NAV	-	140	154	-	-	-	294
107	POD	TELLER NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, TELLER, AK	FEA	NAV	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
107	LRD	TWO HARBORS, MN	FEA	NAV	-	75	137	-	-	-	212
107	LRD	WALNUT CREEK ACCESS AREA, ERIE COUNTY, PA	FEA	NAV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
107	SAD	WALTER SLOUGH, DARE COUNTY, NC	DI	NAV	-	448	-	-	-	-	448
107	NAD	WESTPORT, MA	DI	NAV	-	531	-	-	-	-	531
107	NAD	WOODS HOLE GREAT HARBOR, FALMOUTH, MA	FEA	NAV	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
107	LRD	WURLAND, KY (NAVIGATION CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT)	DI	NAV	-	3,650	3,650	-	-	-	7,300
107	LRD	WURLAND, KY (NAVIGATION CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT)	FEA	NAV	-	25	25	-	-	-	50
<b>Total Section 107</b>					<b>320</b>	<b>46,574</b>	<b>10,390</b>	<b>1,701</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>58,865</b>
205	LRD	205 LIMESTONE CREEK, FAYETTEVILLE, NY	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
205	NAD	ABERJONA RIVER, WINCHESTER, MA	DI	FDR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
205	MVD	AITKIN, MN	DI	FDR	-	200	400	5,073	-	-	5,673
205	MVD	AITKIN, MN	FEA	FDR	-	216	-	-	-	-	216
205	LRD	AMBERLEY CREEK, CINCINNATI, OH	DI	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	SWD	ARCHEY FORK CREEK, CLINTON, AR	DI	FDR	-	108	-	-	-	-	108
205	SAD	ARROYO, PR (205)	FEA	FDR	-	271	-	-	-	-	271
205	LRD	ATHENS, OH RICHLAND AVE. CORRIDOR	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
205	LRD	BALDWIN CREEK, NORTH ROYALTON, OH	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
205	LRD	BANLICK CREEK, KENTON CO., KY	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	MVD	BAYOU CHOUPIQUE CAP 205	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	MVD	BAYOU QUEUE DE TORTUE, VERMILION PARISH, LA	FEA	FDR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
205	LRD	BEAVER CREEK & TRIBS, BRISTOL, TN	DI	FDR	800	800	-	-	-	-	800
205	LRD	BEAVER CREEK, FRENCHBURG, KY	FEA	FDR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
205	NAD	BEML MILL BROOK HIGHLAND PARK NJ	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	SAD	BEN HILL COUNTY, GA	DI	FDR	-	1,200	-	-	-	-	1,200
205	NAD	BEPJ POPLAR BROOK	DI	FDR	-	850	-	-	-	-	850
205	LRD	BIG SISTER CREEK, ANGOLA	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	NAD	BLACK ROCKS CREEK, SALISBURY, MA	DI	FDR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
205	NWD	BLACKSNAKE CREEK, ST. JOSEPH, MO	DI	FDR	-	500	1,000	2,139	-	-	3,639
205	NWD	BLACKSNAKE CREEK, ST. JOSEPH, MO	FEA	FDR	-	6	-	-	-	-	6
205	LRD	BLASDELL STP	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	SAD	BOCA DE CACHETA, PR	FEA	FDR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
205	LRD	BREAKNECK CREEK, FRANKLIN	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	LRD	BRUSH CREEK, GLADY FORK, PRINCETON, WV	FEA	FDR	-	25	25	-	-	-	50
205	LRD	BUCKEYE LAKE, OH	DI	FDR	-	429	-	429	-	-	858
205	LRD	BUCKEYE LAKE, OH	FEA	FDR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
205	SAD	BYRUM CREEK, ANDERSON COUNTY, SC	FEA	FDR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
205	MVD	CANE BEND, BOSSIER PARISH, LA	FEA	FDR	-	100	50	-	-	-	150
205	MVD	CANISTEO MINE PIT LAKE, MN	DI	FDR	-	300	-	2,000	-	-	2,300
205	MVD	CANISTEO MINE PIT LAKE, MN	FEA	FDR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
205	SAD	CASHIE RIVER, WINDSOR, NC	FEA	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70
205	LRD	CAZENOVIA CREEK, STEVENSON STREET, BUFFALO	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	MVD	CEDAR RIVER, CEDAR FALLS UTILITIES, CEDAR FALLS, IA	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	NAD	CEDAR RUN, PA	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	MVD	CHIPPEWA RIVER AT MONTEVIDEO, MN	DI	FDR	3,472	3,472	-	-	-	-	3,472
205	LRD	CITY OF BLUFFTON, WELLS CO (SEC 205)	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	LRD	CITY OF DELPHI, CARROLL CO (DEER CK LEVEE)	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	LRD	CITY OF FLEMING-NEON, LETCHER CO	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	SPD	CITY OF WHITTIER, CA	DI	FDR	-	1,200	-	-	-	-	1,200
205	NWD	CONCORDIA, KS	FEA	FDR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
205	SPD	COSGROVE CREEK FLOOD CONTROL, CALAVERAS COUNTY	DI	FDR	-	750	-	-	-	-	750
205	MVD	COUSHATTA INDIAN RESERVATION FDR PROJECT, ALLEN PARISH, LA	FEA	FDR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
205	SWD	COWSKIN CREEK, WICHITA, KS	DI	FDR	-	1,100	-	-	-	-	1,100
205	MVD	CROWN POINT BASIN, JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	NWD	DAM BREAK EARLY WARNING SYSTEM, SILVERTON, OR	DI	FDR	-	425	-	-	-	-	425
205	LRD	DETROIT BEACH, LAKE ERIE, FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP, MI	DI	FDR	-	50	100	1,230	-	-	1,380
205	LRD	DETROIT BEACH, LAKE ERIE, FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP, MI	FEA	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
205	NWD	DRY CREEK, CHEYENNE, WY	FEA	FDR	-	32	-	-	-	-	32
205	LRD	DUCK CREEK, OH FWS	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
205	MVD	EAST PEORIA, IL	DI	FDR	100	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	LRD	EIGHTEENMILE CREEK, BOSTON	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	LRD	EIGHTEENMILE CREEK, HAMBURG	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	LRD	ELIZABETHTOWN, KY	DI	FDR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
205	NAD	ELKTON, MD	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	SAD	EST LA GRANGE ST CROIX	DI	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	NWD	EUREKA CREEK, MANHATTAN, KS	DI	FDR	-	150	670	2,000	303	-	3,123
205	MVD	FARGO, RIDGEWOOD ADDITION, ND	DI	FDR	1,720	1,720	315	-	-	-	2,035
205	SWD	FARMERS BRANCH, TARRANT COUNTY, TX	DI	FDR	-	1,276	656	4,005	1,252	-	7,189
205	LRD	FISH CREEK/CUYAHOGA RIVER, KENT	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	POD	FORT YUKON FLOOD CONTROL, FORT YUKON, AK	FEA	FDR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
205	SWD	FRED CREEK, TULSA, OK	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	NAD	FULMER CREEK, VILLAGE OF MOHAWK, NY	DI	FDR	-	1,112	-	-	-	-	1,112
205	MVD	GOOSE CREEK, JACKSON, MO	FEA	FDR	-	109	-	-	-	-	109
205	LRD	GRAND RIVER, HARPERSFIELD DAM	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	LRD	GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS, OH	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
205	LRD	H0ODS CREEK, BOYD COUNTY, KY	FEA	FDR	-	-	37	-	-	-	37
205	SWD	HAIKEY CREEK, BIXBY, OK	DI	FDR	-	250	3,875	-	-	-	4,125
205	SPD	HATCH, NM	DI	FDR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
205	SPD	HEACOCK CHANNEL, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, RIVERSIDE, CA	DI	FDR	5,300	5,300	-	-	-	-	5,300
205	SWD	HEBER SPRINGS, CLEBURNE CO., AR	FEA	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
205	NAD	HESHBON TO HEPBURNVILLE, LOWER LYCOMING CREEK	DI	FDR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
205	SWD	HESTER, ADAMSON & HEARTSILL CREEKS, GREENWOOD, AR	FEA	FDR	-	166	-	-	-	-	166
205	SWD	HIDDEN VALLEY, NEEDMORE BRANCH, GREENE COUNTY, MO	FEA	FDR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
205	SWD	HIGH SCHOOL BRANCH, NEOSHO, MISSOURI	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	SWD	HIGHWAY 164 BRIDGE, LITTLE PINEY, HARGARVILLE, AR	DI	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70
205	LRD	HINKSTON CREEK, MT STERLING, KY	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	SAD	HOMINY SWAMP, WILSON, NC	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	SWD	HOWELL CREEK, WEST PLAINS, MO	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	MVD	HUBBLE CREEK, JACKSON, MO	FEA	FDR	-	106	-	-	-	-	106
205	LRD	HUGHES CREEK, KANAWHA COUNTY, WV SEC 205	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
205	MVD	INDIAN CREEK, CEDAR RVR, CEDAR RAPIDS, IA	FEA	FDR	-	408	-	-	-	-	408

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
205	LRD	IRONDEQUOIT CREEK, PENFIELD, NY	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
205	NAD	JACKSON BROOK, MORRIS CITY, NJ	DI	FDR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
205	SWD	JAM UP CREEK, MOUNTAIN VIEW, MO	DI	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	MVD	JEAN LAFITTE, FISHER SCHOOL BASIN, LA	DI	FDR	-	1,851	-	-	-	-	1,851
205	MVD	JORDAN, MN	FEA	FDR	-	243	-	-	-	-	243
205	POD	KEOPU-HIENALOLI STREAM, ISLAND OF HAWAII, HI	DI	FDR	-	500	100	5,510	-	-	6,110
205	LRD	KESHEQUA CREEK, NUNDA	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
205	MVD	KINGS POINT, WARREN COUNTY, MS	FEA	FDR	-	135	-	-	-	-	135
205	LRD	KNOX COUNTY, KELSO CREEK, IN	FEA	FDR	-	302	-	-	-	-	302
205	POD	KULIOUOU STREAM, OAHU, HI	FEA	FDR	-	213	184	-	-	-	397
205	MVD	LAC QUI PARLE RIVER, DAWSON, MN	DI	FDR	-	869	-	-	-	-	869
205	MVD	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	DI	FDR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
205	LRD	LAMOTTE CREEK, PALESTINE, IL	FEA	FDR	-	95	-	-	-	-	95
205	SWD	LEWIS CREEK, BULVERDE, TX	FEA	FDR	-	290	-	-	-	-	290
205	SWD	LINE CREEK, CHICKASHA, OK	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	SWD	LITTLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	DI	FDR	-	730	800	870	800	300	3,500
205	LRD	LITTLE DUCK CREEK, OH	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	SWD	LITTLE FOSSIL CREEK, HALTOM CITY, TX	DI	FDR	-	4,762	-	-	-	-	4,762
205	MVD	LITTLE RIVER DIVERSION, DUTCHTOWN, MO	DI	FDR	-	709	-	-	-	-	709
205	MVD	LOCKPORT TO LA ROSE, LAFOURCHE PARISH, LA	DI	FDR	-	2,011	-	-	-	-	2,011
205	NAD	LONG HILL TOWNSHIP	DI	FDR	-	3,115	-	-	-	-	3,115
205	MVD	LOUISIANA, MO	FEA	FDR	-	113	-	-	-	-	113
205	MVD	LOVINGTON, IL	FEA	FDR	-	91	75	-	-	-	166
205	LRD	MACOMB COUNTY, MI	FEA	FDR	-	75	262	24	-	-	361
205	MVD	MAD CREEK, MUSCATINE, IA	DI	FDR	-	3,492	-	-	-	-	3,492
205	LRD	MAGAZINE BRANCH, ELK RIVER, CHARLESTON, WV	DI	FDR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
205	LRD	MAGAZINE BRANCH, ELK RIVER, CHARLESTON, WV	FEA	FDR	-	151	151	-	-	-	302
205	SPD	MAGPIE & DON JULIO CREEKS, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA	DI	FDR	-	1,585	-	-	-	-	1,585
205	LRD	MASCATATUCK RIVER LOG JAM, SCOTT CO, IN	FEA	FDR	-	40	-	-	-	-	40
205	MVD	MCKINNEY BAYOU, TUNICA COUNTY, MS	DI	FDR	-	300	3,145	-	-	-	3,445
205	MVD	MEREDOSIA, IL	FEA	FDR	-	87	-	-	-	-	87
205	LRD	MILL CREEK, GARFIELD HEIGHTS	FEA	FDR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
205	SWD	MILLWOOD, GRASSY LAKE, AR, SECTION 1135	FEA	FDR	-	5	-	-	-	-	5
205	MVD	MINNESOTA RIVER, GRANITE FALLS, MN	DI	FDR	-	400	400	5,778	-	-	6,578
205	NAD	MONTOURSVILLE, LYCOMING COUNTY, PA	DI	FDR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
205	LRD	MORRIS CREEK, KANAWHA AND FAYETTE COUNTIES, WV SEC 205	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200
205	NAD	MOYER CREEK, VILLAGE OF FRANKFURT, NY	DI	FDR	-	890	-	-	-	-	890
205	MVD	NEWPORT, MN	DI	FDR	-	450	1,800	-	-	-	2,250
205	NAD	NORTH RIVER, PEABODY, MA	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	SPD	OAK CREEK FLORENCE CO BE710	DI	FDR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
205	LRD	ONONDAGA CREEK, SYRACUSE	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
205	MVD	PAILET BASIN, JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	FEA	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	POD	PALAI STREAM, HAWAII, HI	DI	FDR	-	50	375	175	4,259	-	4,859
205	POD	PALAI STREAM, HAWAII, HI	FEA	FDR	-	62	-	-	-	-	62
205	SWD	PALO DURO, CANYON, TX (LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT)	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
205	SWD	PECAN CREEK, GAINESVILLE, TX	DI	FDR	-	1,120	1,500	1,471	-	-	4,091
205	NWD	PLATTE RIVER, FREMONT, NE	FEA	FDR	-	190	-	-	-	-	190
205	NWD	PLATTE RIVER, SCHUYLER, NE	FEA	FDR	-	150	170	-	-	-	320
205	LRD	PLEASANT CREEK, GREENWOOD, IN	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	SWD	POST OAK CREEK, CORSICANA, TX	FEA	FDR	-	323	-	-	-	-	323
205	SWD	PRAIRIE CREEK, RUSSELLVILLE, AR	FEA	FDR	-	155	-	-	-	-	155
205	NWD	RANDOLPH, NE	FEA	FDR	-	100	124	-	-	-	224
205	MVD	RED DUCK CREEK, KY #205	DI	FDR	-	401	75	-	-	-	476
205	NWD	RED OAK, IOWA	FEA	FDR	-	175	101	-	-	-	276
205	LRD	RICHLAND CREEK, NASHVILLE, TN	DI	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	SAD	RIO CULEBRINAS-AG205	DI	FDR	-	230	-	-	-	-	230
205	SAD	RIO DESCALABRADO (205)	DI	FDR	-	216	-	-	-	-	216
205	SAD	RIO EL OJO DE AGUA PR BER	DI	FDR	-	5,519	-	-	-	-	5,519
205	SWD	RIO GRANDE AND UNNAMED TRIBUTARY, EAGLE PASS, TX	FEA	FDR	-	432	-	-	-	-	432
205	SAD	RIO GUAMANI, GUAYANA, PR BEGUM	DI	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
205	SAD	RIO JACAQUAS PR(205)	FEA	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
205	SAD	RIO LOCO, GUANICA, PR	DI	FDR	-	268	-	-	-	-	268
205	SAD	RIO OROCOVIS, PR. 205	FEA	FDR	-	303	-	-	-	-	303
205	SAD	RIO PATILLAS, PR(205)	FEA	FDR	-	185	-	-	-	-	185

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM												
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands												
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total	
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		
205	MVD	ROCKFORD, MN	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200	
205	MVD	ROSETHORNE BASIN, JEAN LAFITTE, LA	DI	FDR	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	2,000	
205	NWD	ROSSVILLE, KS SEC 205	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100	
205	POD	SALCHA FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION, SALCHA, AK	DI	FDR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150	
205	MVD	SANDY CREEK, TN #205	DI	FDR	-	4,130	4,000	-	-	-	8,130	
205	NAD	SAUGATUCK RIVER, WESTPORT, CT	FEA	FDR	-	71	-	-	-	-	71	
205	SAD	SCOTTS CREEK, SC CAP 205	FEA	FDR	-	156	-	-	-	-	156	
205	SWD	SEDEGWICK, KS, LITTLE ARK RIVER WATERSHED	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350	
205	LRD	SIX MILE CREEK, ITHACA	FEA	FDR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100	
205	NWD	SNOQUALMIE RIVER, WA (BESNQ)	DI	FDR	-	25	25	25	-	-	75	
205	LRD	SOUTH SUBURBAN AREA OF CHICAGO, IL	FEA	FDR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300	
205	LRD	ST. MARY'S RIVER, FORT WAYNE, IN	DI	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50	
205	NAD	STEELE CREEK, VILLAGE OF ILION, NY	DI	FDR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500	
205	SAD	STONY CREEK, ROCKY MOUNT, NC	FEA	FDR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70	
205	SPD	SUN VALLEY, EL PASO, TX	FEA	FDR	-	265	-	-	-	-	265	
205	NWD	TONGUE & YELLOWSTONE RVRS, MILES CITY, MT	FEA	FDR	-	100	300	-	-	-	400	
205	NAD	TOOKANY CREEK, CHURCH ROAD, PA	DI	FDR	-	4,804	-	-	-	-	4,804	
205	NAD	TOOKANY CREEK, GLENSIDE ROAD, PA	DI	FDR	-	4,828	-	-	-	-	4,828	
205	SWD	TOWN BRANCH, CORSICANA, TX	FEA	FDR	-	268	-	-	-	-	268	
205	SWD	TOWN BRANCH, NEWARK, AR	FEA	FDR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50	
205	MVD	TOWN OF CARENCRO, LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	DI	FDR	-	6,000	-	-	-	-	6,000	
205	LRD	TUSCARAWAS CO BEAVERDAM CREEK	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	-	-	-	200	
205	LRD	VILLAGE OF RUSSELLS POINT, LOGAN CO.	FEA	FDR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200	
205	POD	WAIHOLE-WAIKANE VALLEY, OAHU, HI	FEA	FDR	-	100	200	200	150	-	650	
205	POD	WAIAKEA STREAM, HAWAII, HI	FEA	FDR	-	666	-	-	-	-	666	
205	POD	WAIILELE STREAM, OAHU, HI	DI	FDR	-	228	-	733	-	-	961	
205	LRD	WEST VIRGINIA STATEWIDE FLOOD WARNING SYSTEM	DI	FDR	-	500	500	500	500	15	2,015	
205	LRD	WHITE RIVER, ANDERSON, IN	DI	FDR	-	340	-	-	-	-	340	
205	SPD	WHITE SLOUGH BE608	DI	FDR	-	1,648	-	-	-	-	1,648	
205	SWD	WHITEWATER RIVER, AUGUSTA, KS	DI	FDR	-	380	-	-	-	-	380	
205	MVD	WILD RICE & MARSH RIVERS, ADA, MN	DI	FDR	-	2,538	637	-	-	-	3,175	
205	LRD	WILLIAMSTOWN, WV	FEA	FDR	-	100	100	100	-	-	300	
205	SWD	WILLOWWOOD ADDITION, EDMOND, OK	FEA	FDR	-	270	-	-	-	-	270	
205	MVD	WINNEBAGO RVR, MASON CITY, IA	FEA	FDR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225	
205	LRD	WV RALEIGH CO., NORTH SAND BRANCH	FEA	FDR	-	25	25	50	-	-	100	
205	MVD	WYNNE, AR #205	DI	FDR	-	1,125	-	-	-	-	1,125	
205	LRD	ZIMBER DITCH, STARK CO, OH	FEA	FDR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350	
<b>Total Section 205</b>						<b>11,392</b>	<b>103,716</b>	<b>22,777</b>	<b>32,312</b>	<b>7,264</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>166,384</b>
206	LRD	5TH AVE DAM REMOVAL, COLUMBUS, OH	DI	ENR	-	1,200	-	1,050	-	-	2,250	
206	SAD	ALLATOONA CREEK, COBB CO., GA	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300	
206	SAD	ALLEN CREEK, HALL CNTY, GA	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275	
206	SAD	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION FOR ROSE BAY, VOLUISIA CO., FL	DI	ENR	4,362	4,362	-	-	-	-	4,362	
206	LRD	ARCOLA CREEK, MADISON, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	600	-	-	-	600	
206	SPD	ARKANSAS RIVER FISHERIES HABITAT RESTORATION, PUEBLO, CO	DI	ENR	25	25	-	-	-	-	25	
206	SWD	ARKANSAS RIVER, ARK CITY, KS	DI	ENR	-	200	920	-	-	-	1,120	
206	NWD	ARROWHEAD CREEK AT WILSONVILLE, OR	DI	ENR	-	1,313	-	-	-	-	1,313	
206	SPD	ARROYO LAS POSITAS, CA	FEA	ENR	-	161	-	-	-	-	161	
206	MVD	BAYOU GROSSE TETE RESTORATION, IBERVILLE PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125	
206	LRD	BEARGRASS CREEK, LOUISVILLE, KY, WETLANDS & REPARIAN RESTORA	DI	ENR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350	
206	SAD	BEAVER RUIN CREEK, GWINETT CO., GA	FEA	ENR	-	345	-	-	-	-	345	
206	LRD	BELLE ISLE PIERS, DETROIT, MI	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50	
206	NAD	BELLE ISLE STATE PARK, LANCASTER COUNTY, VA	DI	ENR	-	86	54	614	-	-	754	
206	SAD	BIG COTTON INDIAN CREEK, GA	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275	
206	SAD	BIG FISHWIER CREEK, FL	DI	ENR	-	163	-	-	-	-	163	
206	NAD	BIRD ISLAND RESTORATION, MARION, MA	DI	ENR	-	2,270	-	-	-	-	2,270	
206	POD	BLACK LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	3,460	-	-	-	-	3,460	
206	POD	BLACK LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	3,460	-	-	-	-	3,460	
206	LRD	BLOOMINGTON, IN, WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	DI	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150	
206	SPD	BLUE HOLE LAKE, NM	FEA	ENR	-	224	-	-	-	-	224	
206	SPD	BLUE RIVER, CO (SEC 206)	FEA	ENR	-	213	-	-	-	-	213	
206	SAD	BOOTHEEL CREEK, FL	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200	
206	SAD	BOQUERON REFUGE, PR	FEA	ENR	-	345	-	-	-	-	345	

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
206	SPD	BOTTOMLESS LAKE STATE PARK, NM	DI	ENR	1,452	1,452	-	-	-	-	1,452
206	LRD	BRIGHTWOOD LAKE, CONCORD	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	MVD	BROWNSVILLE BRANCH, LONOKE CO, AR	DI	ENR	-	239	-	-	-	-	239
206	NAD	BRUSH NECK COVE, WARWICK, RI	DI	ENR	-	180	-	-	-	-	180
206	SAD	BUTLER CREEK, GA	DI	ENR	-	350	1,675	1,675	-	-	3,700
206	SAD	C-1 REDIVERSION/LAGOON RESTORATION, BREVARD COUNTY, FL	DI	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SAD	CABIN CREEK, SPALDING CNTY	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
206	LRD	CABIN CREEK, WEST VIRGINIA	FEA	ENR	-	113	100	-	-	-	213
206	NWD	CAMP CREEK, ZUMWALT PRAIRIE PRESERVE, OR	DI	ENR	-	531	-	-	-	-	531
206	SPD	CANOA RANCH AQUATIC RESTORATION, AZ	FEA	ENR	-	362	-	-	-	-	362
206	LRD	CANONSBURG LAKE, PA	DI	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	NWD	CARPENTER CREEK, WASHINGTON	DI	ENR	-	1,000	754	-	-	-	1,754
206	SPD	CARPINTERIA CREEK PARK, CA	FEA	ENR	-	140	-	-	-	-	140
206	SPD	CARSON RIVER CITY, NV	DI	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	LRD	CASS RIVER, CITY OF VASSAR, MI	FEA	ENR	-	73	-	-	-	-	73
206	LRD	CEDAR LAKE, IN	DI	ENR	-	3,200	150	4,210	-	-	7,560
206	SAD	CHAPEL BRANCH, SC	DI	ENR	-	340	-	-	-	-	340
206	SAD	CHAPEL BRANCH, SC	FEA	ENR	-	167	-	-	-	-	167
206	NWD	CHARITON RIVER/RATHBUN LAKE WATERSHED, IA	DI	ENR	-	271	50	2,500	1,350	-	4,171
206	SAD	CHATTACHOOCHIE RIVER DAM REMOVAL, GA	DI	ENR	-	2,000	-	-	-	-	2,000
206	NAD	CHENANGO LAKE, NY	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SWD	CHEROKEE CREEK AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OK	FEA	ENR	-	195	-	-	-	-	195
206	SPD	CHINO CREEK, CA	FEA	ENR	-	250	42	-	-	-	292
206	NAD	CHIPPOKES STATE PARK, SURRY COUNTY, VA	DI	ENR	-	347	57	773	-	-	1,177
206	MVD	CHRISTINE AND HICKSON DAMS	FEA	ENR	-	207	23	-	-	-	230
206	SPD	CIENEGA CREEK AQUATIC RESTORATION, AZ	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	SPD	CITY CREEK, UT	DI	ENR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225
206	SPD	CITY CREEK, UT	FEA	ENR	-	145	-	-	-	-	145
206	MVD	CLEAR LAKE, IA	DI	ENR	-	762	1,705	-	-	-	2,467
206	MVD	CLEAR LAKE, IA	FEA	ENR	2	2	-	-	-	-	2
206	LRD	CLEARWATER LAKE, GOGEBIC COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	NAD	CODORUS CREEK, PA	DI	ENR	-	1,200	-	-	-	-	1,200
206	NWD	COFFEE LAKE AT WILSONVILLE, OR	FEA	ENR	-	150	100	-	-	-	250
206	SAD	CONCORD STREAMS RESTORTION, CONCORD, NC	DI	ENR	-	1,030	-	-	-	-	1,030
206	LRD	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, WI	FEA	ENR	-	91	250	-	-	-	341
206	MVD	CONFLUENCE GREENWAY	FEA	ENR	-	244	-	-	-	-	244
206	MVD	CONFLUENCE POINT STATE PARK, MO	FEA	ENR	86	86	100	-	-	-	186
206	SWD	COTTONWOOD CREEK, ARLINGTON, TX	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	SWD	CROW CREEK AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, TULSA, OK	FEA	ENR	-	195	-	-	-	-	195
206	SWD	CRUTCHO CREEK, OKLAHOMA COUNTY,OK. (ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PR	FEA	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
206	LRD	CUYAHOGA RIVER STREAM PROJECT, AKRON, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	40	-	-	-	40
206	SAD	DAVIS LAKE RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	NAD	DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD	DI	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
206	NAD	DENTS RUN, MD	DI	ENR	-	1,500	-	-	-	-	1,500
206	LRD	DETROIT RIVER, CITY OF TRENTON, MI	FEA	ENR	-	100	225	-	-	-	325
206	LRD	DOWAGIAC RIVER, CASSOPOLIS, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	370	14	450	-	909
206	MVD	DRAYTON DAM	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	LRD	DRY BRANCH CK, CITY OF LAWRENCE, MARION CO.	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	MVD	DUCK CREEK/FAIRMOUNT PARK WETLAND RESTOR SCOTT COUNTY, IA	DI	ENR	-	50	166	100	100	100	516
206	MVD	DUCK CREEK/FAIRMOUNT PARK WETLAND RESTOR SCOTT COUNTY, IA	FEA	ENR	-	78	-	-	-	-	78
206	LRD	EAST FORK WHITE RIVER, COLUMBUS, IN	DI	ENR	-	80	-	-	-	-	80
206	POD	EKLUTNA, AK	DI	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SPD	EL PASO, RIO BOSQUE WETLANDS RESTORATION, TX	FEA	ENR	-	175	-	-	-	-	175
206	NAD	ELIZ RIVER, GRANDY VILLAGE, NORFOLK, VA	DI	ENR	-	956	-	-	-	-	956
206	NAD	ELIZ RIVER, OLD DOMINION UNI DRAINAGE CANAL, NORFOLK, VA	DI	ENR	-	195	-	-	-	-	195
206	NAD	ELIZ RIVER, SCUFFLETOWN CREEK, CHESAPEAKE, VA	DI	ENR	-	101	-	-	-	-	101
206	NAD	ELIZ RIVER, WOODSTOCK PARK, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	DI	ENR	-	621	-	-	-	-	621



**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
206	MVD	EMIQUON FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	195	4,000	449	-	-	4,644
206	SPD	ENGLISH CREEK	DI	ENR	-	1,122	-	-	-	-	1,122
206	NWD	EUGENE DELTA PONDS, OR	DI	ENR	1,485	1,485	-	-	-	-	1,485
206	LRD	EUGENE FIELD, IL	DI	ENR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
206	SPD	FAIRMOUNT PARK AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	FEA	ENR	-	297	-	-	-	-	297
206	NAD	FALL BROOK, PA	DI	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	LRD	FALLS RUN, WHEELING CREEK, BELMONT, OH	FEA	ENR	-	119	-	-	-	-	119
206	SAD	FILBIN CREEK, SC	FEA	ENR	-	257	-	-	-	-	257
206	MVD	FOREST PARK, ST LOUIS, MO	FEA	ENR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225
206	LRD	FOX RIVER/TICHIGAN LAKE, WATERFORD, WI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	MVD	FREEBORN COUNTY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MN	FEA	ENR	-	100	114	-	-	-	214
206	LRD	FREEMAN LAKE WILDLIFE REFUGE, ELIZABETHTOWN, KY	DI	ENR	-	181	-	-	-	-	181
206	SWD	GALLA CREEK, AR	DI	ENR	-	793	-	-	-	-	793
206	SWD	GALVESTON COUNTY MUD 12 EXOSYSTEM RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SWD	GIWW - MAD ISLAND MARSH, TX	DI	ENR	-	200	3,000	1,750	-	-	4,950
206	NWD	GOOSE CREEK, CO	FEA	ENR	27	27	-	-	-	-	27
206	LRD	GOOSE POND/MIAMI OXBOW	FEA	ENR	-	98	-	-	-	-	98
206	SWD	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER ABOVE MIAMI, OK	FEA	ENR	-	206	-	-	-	-	206
206	MVD	GRAND MARAIS RIVER, RLWSD	DI	ENR	-	172	1,113	-	-	-	1,285
206	MVD	GRAND MARAIS RIVER, RLWSD	FEA	ENR	-	182	18	-	-	-	200
206	LRD	GRASS LAKE, FOX RIVER, IL	DI	ENR	-	700	50	685	-	-	1,435
206	SPD	GREEN RIVER, UT	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	NAD	GREENBURY POINT, MD	DI	ENR	-	700	-	-	-	-	700
206	NAD	GROVER'S MILL POND, TWP OF WINDSOR, MERCER COUNTY, NJ	DI	ENR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
206	SAD	GUM THICKET CREEK, NC	FEA	ENR	-	155	-	-	-	-	155
206	MVD	HAY CREEK, ROSEAU COUNTY, MN	DI	ENR	-	243	3,423	-	-	-	3,666
206	NWD	HERON HAVEN, NE	DI	ENR	-	459	-	-	-	-	459
206	LRD	HIGGINS LAKE, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	LRD	HOCKING RIVER WETLANDS, LANCASTER, OH	DI	ENR	-	331	-	331	-	-	662
206	LRD	HOCKING RIVER WETLANDS, LANCASTER, OH	FEA	ENR	-	132	132	-	-	-	264
206	LRD	HOFFMAN DAM, IL	DI	ENR	-	3,200	207	2,115	-	-	5,522
206	SAD	HOGAN'S CREEK, FL	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	LRD	HOMER LAKE, ST JOSEPH RIVER	FEA	ENR	-	75	254	140	-	-	469
206	MVD	HORICON MARSH, WI	FEA	ENR	-	100	200	-	-	-	300
206	MVD	HORSESHOE LAKE RESTORATION, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL	DI	ENR	-	30	2,163	-	-	-	2,193
206	MVD	HORSESHOE LAKE RESTORATION, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL	FEA	ENR	-	10	-	-	-	-	10
206	LRD	HOUGHTON LAKE, ROSCOMMON CO, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	442	-	-	-	517
206	LRD	HUFF RUN, BELDON SITE, OH	DI	ENR	-	367	-	367	-	-	734
206	LRD	HUFF RUN, BELDON SITE, OH	FEA	ENR	-	150	159	-	-	-	309
206	LRD	HUNTSVILLE SPRING BRANCH, HUNTSVILLE, AL	DI	ENR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
206	LRD	HURON RIVER, ROCKWOOD, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	MVD	IA RVR/CLEAR CREEK, JOHNSON COUNTY, IA	DI	ENR	-	32	1,548	-	-	-	1,580
206	MVD	IA RVR/CLEAR CREEK, JOHNSON COUNTY, IA	FEA	ENR	-	80	-	-	-	-	80
206	SPD	INCLINE & 3RD CREEKS, NV	DI	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
206	NWD	INDIAN CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CALDWELL, ID	DI	ENR	-	3,664	-	-	-	-	3,664
206	NWD	ISSAQUAH CREEK, WA	DI	ENR	-	709	-	-	-	-	709
206	SAD	JACKSON CREEK, GWINETT CO., GA	FEA	ENR	100	100	500	-	-	-	600
206	MVD	JACKSON FISH PASSAGE PROJECT	FEA	ENR	-	83	-	-	-	-	83
206	SPD	JANES-WALLACE MEMORIAL DAM, SANTA ROSA, NM	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	NWD	JOHNSON CREEK/SPRINGWATER, OR	DI	ENR	-	608	-	-	-	-	608
206	LRD	JOHNSON POND, LYNDONVILLE, NY	FEA	ENR	-	-	180	99	-	-	279
206	LRD	JONESBOROUGH (206), TN	FEA	ENR	-	215	-	-	-	-	215
206	MVD	KANKAKEE, KANKAKEE COUNTY, IL	DI	ENR	-	100	96	-	-	-	196
206	NWD	KELLOGG CREEK, OR	FEA	ENR	-	357	-	-	-	-	357
206	MVD	KETTLE MORAIN WET PRAIRIE RESTORATION, WI	FEA	ENR	-	100	100	100	-	-	300
206	SPD	KEYSTONE HERITAGE PARK WETLAND RESTORATION, EL PASO, TX	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SWD	KICKAPOO CREEK, CONCHO RIVER, UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	FEA	ENR	-	242	-	-	-	-	242
206	MVD	KINNICKINNIC RIVER, WI	DI	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	MVD	KINNICKINNIC RIVER, WI	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
206	LRD	KOONTZ LAKE, IN (SEC206)	DI	ENR	-	2,500	77	3,725	-	-	6,302
206	MVD	LA STATE PEN, LAKE KILLARNEY RESTORATION, W FELICIANA PAR,LA	DI	ENR	-	1,600	-	-	-	-	1,600
206	NAD	LAKE ANNA, LOUISA, ORANGE AND SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTIES, VA	DI	ENR	-	347	-	-	-	-	347
206	SWD	LAKE AUSTIN ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, AUSTIN, TX	FEA	ENR	-	170	-	-	-	-	170
206	MVD	LAKE BELLE VIEW AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WI	DI	ENR	-	3,798	-	-	-	-	3,798
206	SAD	LAKE CONNESTEE, SC	DI	ENR	-	115	-	-	-	-	115
206	SAD	LAKE CONNESTEE, SC	FEA	ENR	-	27	-	-	-	-	27
206	SWD	LAKE CYPRESS SPRINGS, FRANKLIN COUNTY, TX	FEA	ENR	-	175	-	-	-	-	175
206	MVD	LAKE LOU YAEGER RESTORATION, IL	FEA	ENR	-	100	75	-	-	-	175
206	MVD	LAKE MAUVAISTERRE, JACKSONVILLE, IL	FEA	ENR	-	202	-	-	-	-	202
206	SPD	LAKE NATOMA, CA	FEA	ENR	-	437	-	-	-	-	437
206	SAD	LAKE TSALA APOPKA	FEA	ENR	-	6	-	-	-	-	6
206	MVD	LAKE VERRRET RESTORATION, ASSUMPTION PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	706	-	-	-	-	706
206	MVD	LEMAY WETLAND RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	FEA	ENR	-	66	-	-	-	-	66
206	LRD	LEXINGTON ROAD PARK GREENWAY - JEFFERSON COUNTY	FEA	ENR	-	84	-	-	-	-	84
206	LRD	LICKING RIVER DAM REMOVAL, FALMOUTH, KY	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	LRD	LITTLE CUYAHOGA RIVER, AKRON, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	60	-	-	-	60
206	SAD	LITTLE RIVER WATERSHED, HALL COUNTY, GA	DI	ENR	-	250	2,000	1,668	-	-	3,918
206	LRD	LOCKPORT PRAIRIE NATURE PRESERVE, WILL COUNTY	DI	ENR	-	1,000	171	-	-	-	1,171
206	LRD	LONG LAKE, IN	FEA	ENR	-	500	400	-	-	-	900
206	NAD	LOWER BLACKSTONE RIVER, RI	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	NWD	LOWER BOULDER CREEK, CO	FEA	ENR	-	638	173	-	-	-	811
206	NAD	LOWER HEMPSTEAD HARBOR,VILLAGE OF SEA CLIFF,NY	FEA	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	LRD	LOWER MEMOMONEE RIVER VALLEY, MILWAUKEE, WI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	SPD	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PAIUTE	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	SWD	LOWER WHITE ROCK CRK DALLAS TX	FEA	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
206	SAD	LYNCHES RIVER, LAKE CITY, SC	DI	ENR	-	1,250	-	-	-	-	1,250
206	SAD	LYNCHES RIVER, LAKE CITY, SC	FEA	ENR	59	59	291	-	-	-	350
206	NAD	MALDEN RIVER ECOSYSTEM, MA	DI	ENR	-	81	-	-	-	-	81
206	LRD	MALLETT'S CREEK, WASHTENAW COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	313	-	-	-	388
206	NAD	MANHAN DAM, EASTHAMPTON, MA	DI	ENR	-	410	-	-	-	-	410
206	NAD	MANHASSET BAY, TOWN OF NORTH HEMPSTEAD, NY, ECOSYSTEM RESTOR	FEA	ENR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
206	LRD	MARION MILL POND, VILLAGE OF MARION, OSCEOLA COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	100	314	-	-	-	414
206	LRD	MARYVILLE, TN	DI	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
206	LRD	MENOMONEE, WI	FEA	ENR	-	50	100	-	-	-	150
206	LRD	MENTOR MARSH	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	NAD	MILFORD POND, MILFORD, MA	DI	ENR	-	4,300	-	-	-	-	4,300
206	SAD	MILL CREEK ECOSYSTEM REST.	FEA	ENR	-	25	-	-	-	-	25
206	NAD	MILL CREEK RESTORATION AT MOREA, SCHUYLKILL COUNTY, PA	FEA	ENR	-	215	-	-	-	-	215
206	NAD	MILL POND RESTORATION, NASHUA, NH	DI	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	NAD	MILL POND, LITTLETON, MA	DI	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	NAD	MILL RIVER, STAMFORD, CT	DI	ENR	-	2,988	-	-	-	-	2,988
206	SWD	MINERAL BAYOU, DURANT, OK	FEA	ENR	-	133	-	-	-	-	133
206	SPD	MISSION CREEK, CA	FEA	ENR	-	406	-	-	-	-	406
206	NWD	MISSOURI STREAM RESTORATION, MO	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	POD	MOKUHINIA/MOKUULA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MAUI, HI	FEA	ENR	-	1,356	-	-	-	-	1,356
206	NAD	MONGAUP WATERSHED ENVIRON. RESTORTION, LIBERTY, SULLIVAN, NY	FEA	ENR	-	165	-	-	-	-	165
206	SWD	MOSES LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, TEXAS CITY, TX	FEA	ENR	-	30	-	-	-	-	30
206	NAD	MUD CREEK,GREAT SOUTH BAY,PATCHOGUE,NY	FEA	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
206	SAD	MULBERRY PLANTATION, SC	FEA	ENR	-	197	-	-	-	-	197
206	NAD	NANTICOKE CREEK, LUZERNE COUNTY, PA	DI	ENR	-	830	-	-	-	-	830
206	NAD	NARROWS RIVER, NARRAGANSETT, RI	DI	ENR	-	180	-	-	-	-	180
206	NAD	NASHAWANNUCK POND, EASTHAMPTON, MA	DI	ENR	-	715	-	-	-	-	715
206	SAD	NC OYSTER RESTORATION, NC	FEA	ENR	-	130	-	-	-	-	130
206	NAD	NEPONSET RIVER, BOSTON, MA	DI	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	LRD	NFTA OUTER HARBOR	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
206	NAD	NINIGRET & CROSS MILLS PONDS, CHARLESTOWN, RI	DI	ENR	-	800	-	-	-	-	800
206	LRD	NIPPERSINK CREEK	FEA	ENR	-	500	100	150	-	-	750
206	SAD	NOISETTE CREEK, SC	FEA	ENR	-	194	-	-	-	-	194
206	NAD	NORTH BEACH, MD	FEA	ENR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
206	SPD	NORTH FORK GUNNISON, CO (206)	DI	ENR	-	3,725	-	-	-	-	3,725
206	MVD	NORTH OTTAWA, MN	DI	ENR	-	300	-	4,297	-	-	4,597
206	MVD	NORTH OTTAWA, MN	FEA	ENR	-	52	48	-	-	-	100
206	LRD	NORTH PARK, ALLEGHENY COUNTY	DI	ENR	-	3,272	-	-	-	-	3,272
206	NWD	NORTH SATUS DRAIN, YAKIMA, WA	FEA	ENR	-	135	-	-	-	-	135
206	NAD	NORTHWEST BRANCH, ANACOSTIA RIVER, MD	DI	ENR	-	2,500	-	-	-	-	2,500
206	NWD	OAKS BOTTOM, OR	FEA	ENR	-	103	-	-	-	-	103
206	LRD	OHIO RIVER GARVIN BROWN NATURE PRESERVE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, K	DI	ENR	-	302	-	-	-	-	302
206	LRD	OHIO RIVER, HAYS KENNEDY PARK, LOUISVILLE, KY	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	SWD	OLMOS CREEK, RESTORATION, SAN ANTONIO, TX	DI	ENR	-	149	600	-	-	-	749
206	LRD	ORE KNOB, NC AQUATIC RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	900	-	-	-	-	900
206	LRD	ORLAND PARK, IL	DI	ENR	2,800	2,800	-	-	-	-	2,800
206	NAD	OSGOOD POND RESTORATION, MILFORD, NH	DI	ENR	-	65	-	-	-	-	65
206	LRD	OTSEGO LAKE, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	NAD	PAINT BRANCH FISH PASSAGE, MD	DI	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
206	MVD	PAINTERS CREEK, MN	DI	ENR	-	2,787	-	-	-	-	2,787
206	NWD	PARADISE CREEK, CITY OF MOSCOW, ID	DI	ENR	-	580	2,100	37	-	-	2,717
206	LRD	PAUL DOUGLAS WOODS, SOUTH BARRINGTON, IL	FEA	ENR	-	300	100	197	-	-	597
206	LRD	PECK LAKE, GENEVA, IL	FEA	ENR	-	300	175	-	-	-	475
206	MVD	PIGS EYE LAKE	FEA	ENR	-	410	-	-	-	-	410
206	LRD	PITCHER LAKE OXBOW RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	99	-	-	-	-	99
206	SAD	POCOTALIGO RIVER AND SWAMP ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, SC	DI	ENR	-	494	-	-	-	-	494
206	NWD	PORT OF SUNNYSIDE, WA	DI	ENR	-	400	3,965	-	-	-	4,365
206	NWD	PORT OF SUNNYSIDE, WA	FEA	ENR	-	68	-	-	-	-	68
206	NAD	POTASH BROOK, NY	FEA	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	MVD	QUINCY BAY, IL	FEA	ENR	-	100	200	-	-	-	300
206	NAD	QUONOCONTAUG POND, CHARLESTOWN, RI	DI	ENR	-	70	-	-	-	-	70
206	LRD	RANSOM CREEK, AMHERST	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	SWD	RED OAK CREEK TRIBUTARY, RED OAK, TX	FEA	ENR	-	175	-	-	-	-	175
206	SAD	REEDY RIVER, SC	DI	ENR	-	674	-	-	-	-	674
206	SAD	REEDY RIVER, SC	FEA	ENR	-	247	-	-	-	-	247
206	SAD	REEVES CREEK, CLAYTON CNTY	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
206	SPD	RINCON CREEK	FEA	ENR	-	393	-	-	-	-	393
206	SWD	RIO GRANDE, LAREDO, TX	DI	ENR	-	270	700	700	607	-	2,277
206	SWD	RIO GRANDE, LAREDO, TX	FEA	ENR	-	61	-	-	-	-	61
206	SAD	ROSCOE'S CUT, MACINTOSH	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	NAD	RUN POND COASTAL ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	DI	ENR	-	195	-	-	-	-	195
206	NWD	SALMON RIVER, CHALLIS, ID	DI	ENR	-	2,575	528	212	-	-	3,315
206	SPD	SALT RIVER RESTORATION, CA	DI	ENR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
206	SWD	SAN MARCOS RIVER, SAN MARCOS, TX	FEA	ENR	-	439	-	-	-	-	439
206	SAD	SAV HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTOR	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
206	NAD	SAXIS ISLAND, ACCOMACK COUNTY, VA	DI	ENR	-	74	1,429	-	-	-	1,503
206	LRD	SAXMAN RUN	FEA	ENR	-	188	-	-	-	-	188
206	LRD	SECORD AND SMALLWOOD LAKES, GLADWIN COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	64	317	-	-	-	381
206	LRD	SHAMROCK LAKE, CITY OF CLARE, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	LRD	SHERADEN PARK & CHARTIERS CR, PA	DI	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	SWD	SHIREY BAY/RAINEY BRAKE WMA	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
206	NAD	SOUNDVIEW PARK, CITY OF BRONX, NY	DI	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
206	NWD	SOUTH FORK NOOKSACK RIVER, WA	FEA	ENR	-	82	-	-	-	-	82
206	SAD	SOUTH NEWPORT RIVER 207	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	LRD	SOUTH PARK LAKE	FEA	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
206	NAD	SOUTHAMPTON CREEK, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	139	-	-	-	-	139
206	NAD	SPRING CREEK, NY	DI	ENR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
206	LRD	SPRING LAKE, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	SWD	SPRING LAKE, SAN MARCOS, TX	DI	ENR	-	290	951	-	-	-	1,241
206	NWD	SPRINGFIELD MILLRACE, OR	DI	ENR	-	1,304	1,830	-	-	-	3,134
206	LRD	SQAW CREEK, IL	DI	ENR	-	1,200	147	1,600	-	-	2,947
206	NWD	SQUAK VALLEY PARK RESTORATION, WA	DI	ENR	-	619	-	-	-	-	619
206	SPD	ST. HELEN-NAPA RIVER RESTORATION	DI	ENR	150	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	SAD	STEVENSON CREEK, CLEARWATER, FL	DI	ENR	-	2,867	-	-	-	-	2,867

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
206	MVD	STORM LAKE, IA	DI	ENR	-	138	2,034	-	-	-	2,172
206	MVD	STORM LAKE, IA	FEA	ENR	10	10	-	-	-	-	10
206	SPD	SULPHUR CREEK AQUATIC RESTORATION, LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA	DI	ENR	-	1,200	-	-	-	-	1,200
206	SPD	SWEETWATER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	DI	ENR	-	1,585	-	-	-	-	1,585
206	SPD	SWEETWATER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	FEA	ENR	-	285	-	-	-	-	285
206	LRD	SYRACUSE LAKEFRONT, ONONDAGA, NY	FEA	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
206	SPD	TAMARISK ERADICATION, CO	DI	ENR	-	304	-	-	-	-	304
206	NAD	TEN MILE RIVER, RI	DI	ENR	-	935	-	-	-	-	935
206	SPD	THOMPSON CREEK RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
206	LRD	THREE CREEKS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, OH	DI	ENR	-	451	-	451	-	-	902
206	LRD	THREE CREEKS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, OH	FEA	ENR	-	206	206	-	-	-	412
206	NAD	TIDAL MIDDLE BRANCH, MD	DI	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
206	NWD	TILLAMOOK BAY & ESTUARY, OR	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	SWD	TOLEDO BEND RESERVOIR, TX & LA	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	NAD	TREATS POND, COHASSET, MA	DI	ENR	-	700	-	-	-	-	700
206	SAD	TURKEY CREEK REST., FL	FEA	ENR	-	320	-	-	-	-	320
206	SPD	TURTLE BAY, CA	DI	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
206	LRD	UNDERWOOD CREEK, WAUWATOSA, WI	FEA	ENR	-	75	220	-	-	-	295
206	MVD	UNIVERSITY LAKES RESTORATION, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	DI	ENR	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	1,000
206	SPD	UPPER JORDAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, UT	DI	ENR	-	3,270	-	-	-	-	3,270
206	SPD	UPPER YORK CREEK DAM REMOVAL, CA	DI	ENR	-	550	-	-	-	-	550
206	SPD	VALLEY CREEK PARK WETLAND RESTORATION, EL PASO, TX	FEA	ENR	-	175	-	-	-	-	175
206	MVD	VERMILLION RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	1,000	-	-	-	-	1,000
206	SWD	WALNUT BRANCH, SEGUIN, TX (SEC 206)	DI	ENR	-	1,044	444	-	-	-	1,488
206	NWD	WANAMAKER WETLANDS, KS	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
206	LRD	WATAUGA, NC, AQUATIC RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	1,120	1,120	-	-	-	2,240
206	LRD	WATAUGA, NC, AQUATIC RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	180	50	-	-	-	230
206	MVD	WATKINS CREEK, ST LOUIS, MO	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	SPD	WEBER RIVER, UT (SEC 206)	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
206	SPD	WEST JORDAN RIVER, UT	DI	ENR	-	480	-	-	-	-	480
206	SPD	WEST JORDAN RIVER, UT	FEA	ENR	-	7	-	-	-	-	7
206	NAD	WESTERN BRANCH, PATUXENT, MD	DI	ENR	-	1,200	-	-	-	-	1,200
206	SAD	WESTERN CARY STREAMS RESTORATION, CARY, NC	DI	ENR	-	30	-	-	-	-	30
206	NWD	WESTMORELAND PARK, OR	DI	ENR	-	1,661	-	-	-	-	1,661
206	SPD	WHITE SLOUGH WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY, LODI CA	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
206	MVD	WHITEBREAST WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IA	DI	ENR	-	25	1,500	1,500	800	120	3,945
206	MVD	WHITEBREAST WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IA	FEA	ENR	-	121	-	-	-	-	121
206	SAD	WILSON BAY RESTORATION, JACKSONVILLE, NC	DI	ENR	-	2,356	-	-	-	-	2,356
206	SAD	WILSON BRANCH, SC	DI	ENR	-	44	-	-	-	-	44
206	LRD	WILSON PARK CREEK, MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
206	MVD	WINDOM FISH PASSAGE, MN	FEA	ENR	-	100	125	-	-	-	225
206	NAD	WINNAPAUG POND, WESTERLY, RI	DI	ENR	-	1,120	-	-	-	-	1,120
206	NAD	WISWALL DAM, DURHAM, NH	DI	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
206	SWD	WOLF PEN CREEK, COLLEGE STATION, TX	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
206	SPD	WOOD CANYON AQUATIC RESTORATION, LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA	DI	ENR	-	661	-	-	-	-	661
206	SPD	WOOD CANYON AQUATIC RESTORATION, LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
206	SWD	WWTP, MERIDIAN, TX	FEA	ENR	-	246	-	-	-	-	246
206	SWD	WWTP, STEPHENVILLE, TX	DI	ENR	600	600	908	-	-	-	1,508
206	MVD	ZEMUARRY PARK LAKE RESTORATION, TANGIPAHOA PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225
<b>Total Section 206</b>					<b>11,158</b>	<b>158,932</b>	<b>48,851</b>	<b>31,509</b>	<b>3,307</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>242,819</b>
208	SWD	BLACKWELL LAKE, BLACKWELL, OK	DI	FDR	-	310	-	-	-	-	310
208	LRD	DICKENSON COUNTY, VA, SEC 208	DI	FDR	-	60	-	-	-	-	60
<b>Total Section 208</b>					<b>-</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>370</b>
1135	SAD	ACADEMY CREEK, HALL CNTY	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
1135	SPD	AGUA FRIA RIVER RIPARIAN RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	96	-	-	-	-	96

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
1135	NAD	ALLIN'S COVE, BARRINGTON, RI	DI	ENR	5	5	-	-	-	-	5
1135	MVD	AMITE RIVER DIVERSION SPOIL BANK GAPPING, LIVINGSTON PH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
1135	SPD	AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION @ PUBLO OF SANTA ANA, NM	DI	ENR	-	335	-	-	-	-	335
1135	SWD	ARK. RVR ENV REST, LK DARDANELLE, RUSSELLVILLE & FT SMITH, A	FEA	ENR	-	10	-	-	-	-	10
1135	SWD	ARKANSAS RIVER, GARDEN CITY, KS	FEA	ENR	-	145	-	-	-	-	145
1135	SPD	ASHLEY CREEK ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, UT	DI	ENR	-	259	-	-	-	-	259
1135	NAD	ASSUNPINK CREEK, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	2,976	-	-	-	-	2,976
1135	LRD	AUGRES RIVER, ARENAC COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	87	87	110	-	-	284
1135	SAD	BACK RIVER, CHATHAM COUNTY, GA	FEA	ENR	-	275	-	-	-	-	275
1135	MVD	BATTLE ISLAND, WI	DI	ENR	-	150	380	-	-	-	530
1135	MVD	BATTLE ISLAND, WI	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	MVD	BAYOU DESIARD, MONROE, LA	DI	ENR	1,707	1,707	-	-	-	-	1,707
1135	MVD	BAYOU MACON, E&W CARROLL & FRANKLIN PARISHES, LA	DI	ENR	-	2,647	-	-	-	-	2,647
1135	MVD	BAYOU MACON, LAKE VILLAGE, AR	DI	ENR	-	600	-	-	-	-	600
1135	SAD	BELHAVEN HARBOR ENVIRON, NC	FEA	ENR	-	170	-	-	-	-	170
1135	NWD	BELLEVIEW WETLANDS, CO	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
1135	NWD	BENNINGTON LAKE DIVERSION DAM, WA	FEA	ENR	338	338	-	-	-	-	338
1135	SWD	BIG LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OK	DI	ENR	-	408	-	-	-	-	408
1135	MVD	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, CLARKSDALE, MS	FEA	ENR	-	100	68	-	-	-	168
1135	NWD	BLOOMINGTON AREA RESTORATION, LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	DI	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
1135	NWD	BLOOMINGTON AREA RESTORATION, LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	FEA	ENR	25	25	-	-	-	-	25
1135	NWD	BLUE VALLEY WETLANDS, JACKSON CO., MO	DI	ENR	-	100	500	341	-	-	941
1135	NWD	BLUE VALLEY WETLANDS, JACKSON CO., MO	FEA	ENR	19	19	-	-	-	-	19
1135	NAD	BOYD'S SALT MARSH RESTORATION, RI	DI	ENR	203	203	-	-	-	-	203
1135	NWD	BRAIDED REACH	DI	ENR	-	100	4,665	-	-	-	4,765
1135	NWD	BRAIDED REACH	FEA	ENR	-	256	-	-	-	-	256
1135	NAD	BROAD MEADOWS MARSH RESTORATION, MA	DI	ENR	-	1,888	-	-	-	-	1,888
1135	LRD	BUFFALO RIVER HABITAT	FEA	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1135	SPD	BULL CREEK CHANNEL ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	DI	ENR	-	2,090	-	-	-	-	2,090
1135	SAD	C-102/103 RESTORATION, DADE COUNTY, FL	DI	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	SAD	C-7 MIAMI-DADE, FL	DI	ENR	-	224	-	-	-	-	224
1135	SAD	C-9, MIAMI-DADE, FL	DI	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
1135	SAD	CALOOSAHATCHEE OXBO	FEA	ENR	-	330	-	-	-	-	330
1135	MVD	CANNON BRAKE/LOWER VALLIER, ARK & JEFFERSON COUNTIES, AR	DI	ENR	-	1,157	-	-	-	-	1,157
1135	LRD	CAYUGA LAKE INLET, ITHACA	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	LRD	CDF #3, OREGON, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	100	-	-	-	100
1135	NWD	CITY OF RICHLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA	DI	ENR	-	1,327	-	-	-	-	1,327
1135	LRD	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	225	-	-	-	225
1135	LRD	CROCKERY CREEK LAMPREY BARRIER, MI	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	SPD	CUCAMONGA AND DEER CREEK CHANNELS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	FEA	ENR	-	152	-	-	-	-	152
1135	SAD	DADE COUNTY, FL	DI	ENR	-	217	-	-	-	-	217
1135	NAD	DELAWARE BAY OYSTER RES, NJ	DI	ENR	783	783	-	-	-	-	783
1135	LRD	DILLON LAKE, OH SECTION 1135	FEA	ENR	-	450	450	-	-	-	900
1135	MVD	DUCK CREEK, STODDARD COUNTY, MO	DI	ENR	-	3,243	-	-	-	-	3,243
1135	MVD	DUMP LAKE, YAZOO COUNTY, MS	FEA	ENR	-	116	-	-	-	-	116
1135	SWD	EAGLELAND HABITAT RESTORATION, SAN ANTONIO, TX	DI	ENR	-	328	-	-	-	-	328
1135	LRD	EAST HARBOR STATE PARK, WEST HARBOR, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	96	-	-	-	96
1135	SPD	ECOSYSTEM REVITALIZATION @ ROUTE 66	DI	ENR	3,637	3,637	-	-	-	-	3,637
1135	LRD	ESTRAL BEACH, NEWPORT, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	-	-	-	-	75
1135	NAD	FAIRMOUNT DAM, PA	DI	ENR	-	1,452	-	-	-	-	1,452
1135	NWD	FERN RIDGE LAKE MARSH RESTORATION, OR	DI	ENR	30	30	-	-	-	-	30
1135	LRD	FLINT RIVER AND SWARTZ CREEK, FLINT, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	315	-	-	-	390
1135	MVD	FRAZIER/WHITEHORSE OXBOW LAKE WEIR, LA	DI	ENR	-	1,269	-	-	-	-	1,269
1135	NAD	GERRITSEN CREEK, BROOKLYN, NY	DI	ENR	-	3,700	-	-	-	-	3,700
1135	LRD	GREEN RIVER DAM, OUTLET WORKS MODIFICATIONS, KY	FEA	ENR	200	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	LRD	GULL POINT, PRESQUE ISLE, ERIE, PA	FEA	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1135	MVD	HNC MILE 12-31.4 RESTORATION, TERREBONNE PARISH, LA	DI	ENR	-	2,500	-	-	-	-	2,500

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
1135	NAD	HOOSIC RIVER,TOWN OF ADAMS,MA	FEA	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
1135	LRD	HOVEY LAKE WILDLIFE AREA HABITAT DEVELOPMENT, IN	DI	ENR	-	480	-	-	-	-	480
1135	LRD	HOYT LAKE - SCAJAQUADA CREEK, BUFFALO, NY	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	LRD	INDIAN RIDGE MARSH, CHICAGO, IL	DI	ENR	-	719	525	-	-	-	1,244
1135	SWD	JOE CREEK HABITAT RESTORATION, TULSA, OK	DI	ENR	-	200	3,575	-	-	-	3,775
1135	SWD	JOPPA PRESERVE RESTORATION, TX	DI	ENR	-	355	2,000	1,000	550	-	3,905
1135	LRD	KALAMAZOO RIVER, BATTLE CREEK, MI	FEA	ENR	-	75	334	-	-	-	409
1135	POD	KANAHA POND WILDLIFE SANCTUARY RESTORATION, MAUI, HI	FEA	ENR	845	845	845	-	-	-	1,690
1135	POD	KAUNAKAKAI STREAM ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MOLOKAI, HI	DI	ENR	-	342	-	-	-	-	342
1135	POD	KAWAINUI MARSH ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, OAHU, HI	DI	ENR	-	4,034	-	-	-	-	4,034
1135	SWD	KEITH LAKE FISH PASS, JEFFERSON COUNTY, TX	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	LRD	KIDS CREEK, TRAVERSE CITY, MI	DI	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	NAD	LAKE CHAMPLAIN SEA LAMPREY BARRIERS	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	MVD	LAKE FAUSSE POINT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, ST. MARY PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	250	-	-	-	-	250
1135	MVD	LAKE GEORGE RESTORATION, YAZOO COUNTY, MS	DI	ENR	-	1,160	-	-	-	-	1,160
1135	SAD	LAKE JESSUP	DI	ENR	-	2,862	-	-	-	-	2,862
1135	LRD	LAKE POYGAN, WI	FEA	ENR	-	400	227	-	-	-	627
1135	MVD	LAKE ST. JOSEPH, TENSAS PARISH, LA	DI	ENR	-	150	150	3,029	-	-	3,329
1135	MVD	LAKE ST. JOSEPH, TENSAS PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	71	71	71	-	-	-	142
1135	SPD	LAS CRUCES DAM ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DONA ANA COUNTY NM	DI	ENR	-	450	-	-	-	-	450
1135	SWD	LEWISVILLE LAKE, FRISCO, TX	DI	ENR	-	260	670	500	-	-	1,430
1135	NWD	LONG BRANCH LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	174	-	-	-	-	174
1135	SAD	LONGWOOD COVE WETLANDS, GAINESVILLE, GA	DI	ENR	-	250	2,000	-	-	-	2,250
1135	MVD	LOWER CACHE RIVER, AR 1135	FEA	ENR	-	750	-	-	-	-	750
1135	NWD	LOWER COLUMBIA SLOUGH,OR	DI	ENR	1,605	1,605	-	-	-	-	1,605
1135	NWD	LOWER DECATUR BEND, NE, IA	DI	ENR	-	2,324	68	-	-	-	2,392
1135	MVD	LOWER DEER CREEK, MS	FEA	ENR	-	100	71	-	-	-	171
1135	NAD	LOWER KINGMAN ISLAND	DI	ENR	110	110	-	-	-	-	110
1135	MVD	LOWER OBION RIVER & VICINITY, DYER COUNTY, TN	DI	ENR	-	2,565	144	-	-	-	2,709
1135	LRD	LOWER ROUGE, ROTUNDA DR. AND I-94, MI	DI	ENR	-	50	155	104	2,401	-	2,710
1135	LRD	MANISTEE RIVER LAMPREY BARRIER, MI	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	NWD	MAPES CREEK, WA	DI	ENR	-	248	1,540	173	-	-	1,961
1135	MVD	MARK TWAIN LAKE FISH HABITAT, MO	FEA	ENR	-	20	130	-	-	-	150
1135	SWD	MILLWOOD, GRASSY LAKE, AR, SECTION 1135	DI	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	LRD	MONROE LAKE, IN, MOIST SOIL UNITS	DI	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	NAD	MORDECAI ISLAND COASTAL WETLANDS, NJ	DI	ENR	-	750	-	-	-	-	750
1135	MVD	MORGANZA FOREBAY RESTORATION, POINTE COUPEE PH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	225	-	-	-	-	225
1135	LRD	MT ETNA/MT HOPE WETLANDS, SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	DI	ENR	-	142	-	-	-	-	142
1135	SPD	MURPHY SLOUGH, CA	DI	ENR	-	291	-	-	-	-	291
1135	LRD	NB PENTWATER RIVER LAMPREY TRAP, MI	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	LRD	NFTA OUTER HARBOR	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	NAD	NMLC, BUZZARD BAY, MA	DI	ENR	-	430	-	-	-	-	430
1135	SWD	NORFORK TAILWATER RESTORATION, AR	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	NAD	NORTH NASHUA RIVER, FITCHBURG, MA	DI	ENR	-	110	-	-	-	-	110
1135	NAD	NORTHPORT HARBOR,TOWN OF HUNTINGTON,NY	DI	ENR	-	350	-	-	-	-	350
1135	SWD	O.C. FISHER LAKE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, TX	DI	ENR	-	2,238	700	550	303	-	3,791
1135	SWD	OLD MAIN STEM TRINITY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, DALLAS, TX	FEA	ENR	-	175	-	-	-	-	175
1135	MVD	OLD RIVER NORTH, CONCORDIA PARISH, LA	FEA	ENR	-	100	75	-	-	-	175
1135	SWD	OLD TRINITY RIVER CHANNEL WILDLIFE RESTORATION, DALLES, TX	DI	ENR	-	452	600	500	397	-	1,949
1135	SAD	PALM RIVER RESORATION	DI	ENR	-	356	-	-	-	-	356
1135	NAD	PINE MOUNT CREEK	DI	ENR	-	2,900	-	-	-	-	2,900
1135	SAD	PONCE DE LEON AIWW	FEA	ENR	-	109	-	-	-	-	109
1135	NAD	POND CREEK, NJ	DI	ENR	-	750	-	-	-	-	750
1135	NWD	PRISON FARM SHORELINE HABITAT, ND	FEA	ENR	74	74	-	-	-	-	74
1135	NAD	RAHWAY RIVER,CITY OF RAHWAY,NJ	FEA	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
1135	NWD	RATHBUN LAKE HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECT, IA	DI	ENR	500	500	358	-	-	-	858

**TABLE C-4. CONTINUING AUTHORITY PROGRAM, FIVE-YEAR CAPABILITY-LEVEL FUNDING (Continued)**

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM											
Construction Account Projects Only -- Dollars in Thousands											
Sec	MSC	Project Name	Phase	Business Line	FY08 Budget	Obligation Capability					Total
						2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	
1135	NWD	RATHBUN SHORELINE SITE RESTORATION APPANOOSE & MONROE CO.,IA	DI	ENR	-	200	212	-	-	-	412
1135	NAD	RESTORATION OF GRASS DALE, DE	DI	ENR	-	1,012	-	-	-	-	1,012
1135	LRD	ROCHESTER HARBOR NAVIGATION CHANNEL, NY	DI	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1135	SWD	ROCK CREEK @ BOYLE PARK, LITTLE ROCK, AR	DI	ENR	-	660	-	-	-	-	660
1135	SWD	ROCK CREEK @ BOYLE PARK, LITTLE ROCK, AR	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
1135	LRD	ROUGE RIVER OXBOW, WAYNE CO., MI	FEA	ENR	-	150	265	-	-	-	415
1135	MVD	RUFFY BROOK AND CLEARWATER RIVER	DI	ENR	-	230	824	-	-	-	1,054
1135	NWD	SALT CEDAR INVASIVE SPECIES ERADICATION/RESTORATION, NE	FEA	ENR	-	125	-	-	-	-	125
1135	MVD	SAND HILL RIVER	DI	ENR	-	145	673	-	-	-	818
1135	SAD	SARASOTA BAY REST FL	DI	ENR	-	400	-	-	-	-	400
1135	LRD	SCHMIDT CREEK, PRESQUE ISLE COUNTY, MI	DI	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	LRD	SEA LAMPREY BARRIER, MANISTIQUE, MI	FEA	ENR	-	87	87	175	-	-	349
1135	LRD	SEA LAMPREY BARRIER, PAW PAW,MI	DI	ENR	-	25	50	650	-	-	725
1135	MVD	SHELBYVILLE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA RESTORATION, IL	DI	ENR	-	200	212	1,000	2,118	-	3,530
1135	LRD	SHELDON'S MARSH, HURON/SANDUSKY, OH	FEA	ENR	-	-	151	-	-	-	151
1135	NWD	SHORTY'S ISLAND	DI	ENR	-	100	4,265	-	-	-	4,365
1135	NWD	SHORTY'S ISLAND	FEA	ENR	-	679	-	-	-	-	679
1135	NWD	SMITHVILLE ACQUATIC PLANTINGS	DI	ENR	-	275	245	-	-	-	520
1135	LRD	SMOKES CREEK, ERIE COUNTY, NY	FEA	ENR	-	-	150	150	199	-	499
1135	MVD	SPUNKY BOTTOMS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	FEA	ENR	-	97	-	-	-	-	97
1135	SPD	STEAMBOAT CREEK, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	DI	ENR	-	120	-	-	-	-	120
1135	SPD	STEAMBOAT CREEK, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	FEA	ENR	-	129	-	-	-	-	129
1135	MVD	STEEP BANK CREEK, FELSENTAL NWR, AR	DI	ENR	-	80	659	-	-	-	739
1135	MVD	STEEP BANK CREEK, FELSENTAL NWR, AR	FEA	ENR	59	59	-	-	-	-	59
1135	LRD	SUCKER RIVER, ALGER COUNTY, MI	FEA	ENR	-	87	-	-	-	-	87
1135	LRD	TAPPAN LAKE, OH SEC 1135	FEA	ENR	-	413	413	-	-	-	826
1135	SWD	TAYLOR BAY, WOODRUFF COUNTY, AR	FEA	ENR	-	124	-	-	-	-	124
1135	SWD	TAYLORS BAYOU, PORT ARTHUR, TX	FEA	ENR	-	200	170	-	-	-	370
1135	LRD	TIMES BEACH ENVIRINMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, BUFFALO, NY	FEA	ENR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1135	LRD	TRAIL CREEK, LAPORTE COUNTY, IN	DI	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	SPD	TUJUNGA WASH ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	DI	ENR	-	500	-	-	-	-	500
1135	SAD	UMBRELLA CREEK, CAMDEN CNTY	FEA	ENR	-	200	-	-	-	-	200
1135	MVD	UPPER DEER CREEK, MS DELTA, MS	FEA	ENR	-	161	-	-	-	-	161
1135	LRD	UPPER ROUGE, MICHIGAN AVE. TO ROTUNDA DR., MI	DI	ENR	-	50	155	104	2,401	-	2,710
1135	SAD	VIRGINIA BEACH KEY, FL (SEC. 1135)	DI	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
1135	NWD	WALLA WALLA RIVER SECTION 1135, OR	DI	ENR	824	824	-	-	-	-	824
1135	LRD	WELLS LOCK AND DAM, ELIZABETH, WV	FEA	ENR	-	-	250	-	-	-	250
1135	NAD	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	DI	ENR	-	4,300	-	-	-	-	4,300
1135	SPD	WHITTIER NARROWS NATURE CENTER & WILDLIFE REFUGE RESTORATION	DI	ENR	-	1,559	-	-	-	-	1,559
1135	SPD	WHITTIER NARROWS NATURE CENTER & WILDLIFE REFUGE RESTORATION	FEA	ENR	-	270	-	-	-	-	270
1135	LRD	WILLS CREEK, MASON MINE 280, OH	DI	ENR	-	1,150	-	-	-	-	1,150
1135	LRD	WILLS CREEK, MASON MINE 280, OH	FEA	ENR	-	50	-	-	-	-	50
1135	NWD	WOOD DUCK MARSH, IA	FEA	ENR	-	100	-	-	-	-	100
1135	SPD	WOODSON BRIDGE, CA (SEC 1135)	DI	ENR	-	300	-	-	-	-	300
1135	SPD	WOODSON BRIDGE, CA (SEC 1135)	FEA	ENR	-	150	-	-	-	-	150
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>35,026</b>	<b>430,382</b>	<b>115,944</b>	<b>77,333</b>	<b>20,030</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>644,224</b>

**TABLE M-1. MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MR&T) ACCOUNT, BASE PLAN SCENARIO**

<b>Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&amp;T) -- Base Plan Scenario</b>						
<small>(Dollars in Thousands)</small>						
<b>DIV</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Investigations</b>						
<b>Surveys and Collection and Study of Basic Data</b>						
MVD	Alexandria to the Gulf, LA	200	100	0	0	0
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway Land Study	200	200	300	300	300
MVD	Coldwater Below Arkabutla Lake, MS	300	125	0	0	0
MVD	Collection-Study of Basic Data	400	400	400	400	400
	<b>Total of Surveys and Collection and Study of Basic Data</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>700</b>
	<b>Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PEDs)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Additional Studies and PED's</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>413</b>
	<b>TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,083</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>1,104</b>	<b>1,113</b>
<b>Construction</b>						
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway, LA	1,800	3,878	3,653	3,797	3,750
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin, LA	23,800	20,259	20,558	20,922	20,651
MVD	Channel Improvement	53,395	41,952	44,153	45,076	45,502
MVD	Mississippi River Levees	28,767	40,015	37,325	38,382	39,102
	<b>Total Construction</b>	<b>107,762</b>	<b>106,104</b>	<b>105,689</b>	<b>108,177</b>	<b>109,005</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>						
MVD	<b>Total Maintenance (Project-Specific Listing Omitted)</b>	<b>151,138</b>	<b>148,813</b>	<b>148,232</b>	<b>151,719</b>	<b>152,882</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>260,000</b>	<b>256,000</b>	<b>255,000</b>	<b>261,000</b>	<b>263,000</b>



**TABLE M-2. MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (MR&T) ACCOUNT, ENHANCED PLAN SCENARIO**

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries (MR&T) -- Enhanced Plan Scenario						
(Dollars in Thousands)						
DIV	Name	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Investigations</b>						
<b>Surveys and Collection and Study of Basic Data</b>						
MVD	Alexandria to the Gulf, LA	542	0	0	0	0
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway Land Study	200	750	750	750	750
MVD	Coldwater Below Arkabutla Lake, MS	425	0	0	0	0
MVD	Collection-Study of Basic Data	495	505	515	525	535
<b>Total of Surveys and Collection and Study of Basic Data</b>		<b>1,662</b>	<b>1,255</b>	<b>1,265</b>	<b>1,275</b>	<b>1,285</b>
<b>Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PEDs)</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Additional Studies and PED's</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>521</b>
<b>Total Investigations</b>		<b>1,662</b>	<b>1,699</b>	<b>1,736</b>	<b>1,771</b>	<b>1,806</b>
<b>Construction</b>						
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin Floodway, LA	4,224	4,258	4,335	4,384	4,430
MVD	Atchafalaya Basin, LA	34,000	34,275	34,896	35,289	35,652
MVD	Channel Improvement	64,600	65,000	66,179	66,924	67,613
MVD	Mississippi River Levees	67,514	68,058	69,293	70,074	70,794
<b>Total Construction</b>		<b>170,338</b>	<b>171,591</b>	<b>174,703</b>	<b>176,671</b>	<b>178,489</b>
<b>Maintenance</b>						
MVD	<b>Total Maintenance (Project-Specific Listing Omitted)</b>	<b>157,000</b>	<b>161,710</b>	<b>166,561</b>	<b>171,558</b>	<b>176,705</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>329,000</b>	<b>335,000</b>	<b>343,000</b>	<b>350,000</b>	<b>357,000</b>

**7. ATTACHMENTS**

**APPENDIX F. CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM, ER-1105-2-100**

ER-1105-2-100  
Appendix F, Amendment #2

CECW-CP  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC 20314-1000

Regulation  
ER 1105-2-100  
31 January 2007

APPENDIX F  
CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraph	Page
<b>SECTION I - PROGRAM OVERVIEW</b>		
Purpose and Applicability.....	F-1	F-1
Definitions.....	F-2	F-3
General Principles.....	F-3	F-5
Restrictions on Program Eligibility.....	F-4	F-8
Coordination Account.....	F-5	F-8
Program Cost Sharing.....	F-6	F-9
Statutory Federal Participation Limits.....	F-7	F-9
Converting GI Funded Studies or PED to CAP.....	F-8	F-11
Converting CAP Feasibility Studies to GI.....	F-9	F-12
<b>SECTION II – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</b>		
Feasibility Phase.....	F-10	F-13
Design and Implementation Phase.....	F-11	F-17
Approval Authorities for Decision Documents and Agreements.....	F-12	F-20
Post Implementation Federal and Non-Federal Responsibilities.....	F-13	F-20
After Action Reviews.....	F-14	F-20
Non-Federal Feasibility Work & Non-Federal Design and Implementation Work.....	F-15	F-21
Real Estate.....	F-16	F-23
Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.....	F-17	F-23
Multi-Purpose CAP Projects.....	F-18	F-23
Recreation.....	F-19	F-24
Ecosystem Restoration Policies Applicable to Section 204,		

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Paragraph	Page
Section 206, and Section 1135.....	F-20	F-25
Monitoring and Adaptive Management.....	F-21	F-28
Design Deficiency Corrections.....	F-22	F-29
 <b>SECTION III – SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR PROJECT AUTHORITIES</b>		
Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended – Streambank and Shoreline Erosion Protection of Public Works and Non-Profit Public Services.....	F-23	F-30
Section 103, River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended – Beach Erosion and Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction.....	F-24	F-31
Section 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended – Navigation Improvements.....	F-25	F-32
Section 111, River and Harbor Act of 1968, as amended – Shore Damage Prevention or Mitigation Caused by Federal Navigation Projects.....	F-26	F-34
Section 145, Water Resources Development Act of 1976, as amended - Placement of Dredged Material on Beaches.....	F-27	F-36
Section 204, Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended – Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.....	F-28	F-37
Section 205, Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended – Flood Control.....	F-29	F-38
Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended – Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration.....	F-30	F-39
Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1954, as amended – Snagging and Clearing for Flood Damage Reduction.....	F-31	F-40
Section 1135, Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended – Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment.....	F-32	F-40
 SAMPLE – SECTION 107 PROJECT FACT SHEET.....		F-43
 <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		
TABLE F-1, CAP TRANSITION.....		F-2
TABLE F-2, CAP AUTHORITIES.....		F-4
TABLE F-3, STATUTORY FEDERAL PARTICIPATION LIMITS		F-11

APPENDIX F

Continuing Authorities Program  
SECTION I – PROGRAM OVERVIEW

F-1. Purpose and Applicability.

a. Purpose. This appendix provides the policy and procedural guidance for planning, design, and implementation of projects pursued under the legislative and administrative provisions of the Continuing Authorities Program.

b. Applicability. The new project implementation processes in this Appendix will apply to all CAP projects initiated (received initial work allowance) after 31 January 2006. In addition, Table F-1 describes the transition of any ongoing CAP project (received initial work allowance prior to 31 January 2006) to the new CAP project implementation processes. For the purpose of applying Table F-1:

(1) A “decision document” means: a Detailed Project Report for Section 204, 206, and 1135 projects if Federal costs exceed \$1M; a Planning and Design Analysis (PDA) for Section 204, 206, and 1135 projects with Federal costs less than \$1M; and a PDA for Section 14 and 208 projects. A Preliminary Restoration Plan is not considered a decision document.

(2) Because a PDA consists of all the planning and design activities to demonstrate that Federal participation is warranted and no formal report is required, “the approval date for the decision document” is the date on which the district determines to proceed with design activities. Further, for ongoing PDAs it will be necessary to separate the costs incurred for feasibility activities from those incurred for design activities by the district allocating the total costs incurred for the PDA between the costs of the planning portion of the PDA (feasibility phase costs) and the design portion of the PDA (design costs).

(3) A “work allowance” is a work allowance issued by HQUSACE located in Washington. A reprogramming action initiated by the district or the division is not considered a work allowance.

TABLE F-1 CAP TRANSITION	
Project Status as of 31 January 2006 (under Old Procedures)	Procedures for Further Work on Project
All Sections – Work not started	Follow new procedures for entire project.
Sections 103,107,111, and 205 -- 100% Federal portion (\$100,000) of feasibility study was under way	Complete 100% Federal portion of feasibility study. Follow new procedures for remainder of study and design/construction of project.
Sections 103, 107, 111, and 205 – Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) was executed	Follow new procedures for remainder of study and design/construction of project.

<p>and decision document was not approved</p>	
<p>Sections 206 and 1135 with Federal costs exceeding \$1M – Feasibility study was under way and decision document was not approved</p> <p>Sections 206 and 1135 with Federal costs NTE \$1M -- Feasibility level work on PDA was under way (district had not determined to proceed with design level work)</p>	<p>Complete feasibility study with 100% Federal financing of feasibility costs. Follow new procedures for design/construction of project. However, all feasibility costs will be included in total project costs in the Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).</p>
<p>Section 204 with Federal costs exceeding \$1M – Feasibility study was under way and decision document was not approved</p> <p>Section 204 with Federal costs NTE \$1M, Section 14, and Section 208 -- Feasibility level work on PDA was under way (district had not determined to proceed with design level work)</p>	<p>If decision document is approved by 31 January 2007 -- Complete feasibility level work with 100% Federal financing of feasibility costs. Follow new procedures for design/construction of project. However, the PCA should include provision that all feasibility costs in excess of \$100K are shared 50/50 with sponsor.</p> <p>If decision document is not approved by 31 January 2007 – Stop all feasibility level work by 31 January 2007, except for negotiation of FCSA. Resume feasibility level work after FCSA execution. FCSA should include normal provision that all feasibility costs in excess of \$100K, including feasibility costs incurred prior to execution of FCSA, are shared 50/50 with sponsor.</p>
<p>Sections 204, 206, and 1135 with Federal costs NTE \$1M, Section 14, and Section 208 -- Design level work on PDA was under way (district had determined to proceed with design level work and PCA was not executed)</p> <p>Sections 204, 206, and 1135 with Federal costs exceeding \$1M, and Sections 103, 107, 111, and 205 – Design (P&amp;S) underway and PCA was not executed</p>	<p>Continue design with 100% Federal financing of design costs in FY 2006, and in each <u>consecutive</u> year thereafter that the project receives a work allowance.</p> <p>If design is funded in <u>consecutive</u> years until fully funded, complete design at 100 percent Federal financing. Negotiate a PCA.</p> <p>If design level work is not fully funded, and there is a fiscal year when the project does not receive a work allowance, stop all design work by March 31 of that fiscal year, except for negotiation of a PCA. Resume design level work after PCA execution.</p> <p>For Section 204, 206, and 1135 projects, include all feasibility and design costs in total project costs under the PCA.</p> <p>For Section 14 and 208 projects, include all feasibility and design costs, in excess of \$40K, in total project costs under the PCA.</p> <p>For Section 103, 107, 111, and 205 projects, include all</p>

	design costs, but no feasibility costs, in total project costs under the PCA.
All Sections – PCA was executed	New procedures will not apply.

F-2. Definitions.

a. The term “Continuing Authorities Program” or “CAP” means a group of 10 legislative authorities under which the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to plan, design, and implement certain types of water resources projects without additional project specific congressional authorization. Table F-2 lists the CAP authorities and their project purposes.

b. The term “decision document” means the consolidated documentation of technical and policy analyses, findings, and conclusions upon which the District Commander bases the recommendation to the Major Subordinate Command Commander to approve the recommended project for implementation. The decision document will be used to support the PCA. Minimum decision document requirements are listed in Section II, paragraph F-10.f. (2) of this Appendix.

c. The term “feasibility phase” means the project formulation phase during which all planning activities are performed that are required to demonstrate that Federal participation in a specific project is warranted, culminating in approval of the decision document. All plan formulation must be completed during this phase, including all technical analyses, policy compliance determinations, and Federal and non-Federal environmental and regulatory compliance activities required for approval of the decision document.

d. The term “design and implementation phase” means the phase of the project during which all post feasibility phase activities (except for operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, or replacement activities) are performed including negotiation and execution of the PCA, final design, preparation of contract plans and specifications, construction, and any other activities required to construct or implement the approved project.

e. The letters “LERRD” mean lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged or excavated material disposal areas.

f. The letters “LERR” mean lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations.

g. The letters “LER” mean lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

h. The letters “OMRR&R” mean operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement.

i. The letters “HQ RIT” mean a Regional Integration Team located in HQUSACE, Washington, D.C.

j. The letters “PED” mean preconstruction engineering and design.

k. The letters “GI” mean General Investigations.

1. The letters “MSC” mean Major Subordinate Command.

TABLE F-2 CAP AUTHORITIES		
AUTHORITY	US CODE	PROJECT PURPOSE
Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended	33 USC 701r	Streambank and shoreline erosion protection of public works and non-profit public services
Section 103, River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended (amends Public Law 79-727)	33 USC 426g	Beach erosion and hurricane and storm damage reduction
Section 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended	33 USC 577	Navigation improvements
Section 111, River and Harbor Act of 1968, as amended	33 USC 426i	Shore damage prevention or mitigation caused by Federal navigation projects
Section 145, Water Resources Development Act of 1976, as amended	33 USC 426j	Placement of dredged material on beaches
Section 204, Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended	33 USC 2326	Beneficial uses of dredged material
Section 205, Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended	33 USC 701s	Flood control
Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended	33 USC 2330	Aquatic ecosystem restoration
Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1954, as amended (amends Section 2, Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937)	33 USC 701g	Removal of obstructions, clearing channels for flood control
Section 1135, Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended	33 USC 2309a	Project modifications for improvement of the environment

### F-3. General Principles.

a. Purpose. The purpose of the CAP is to plan and implement projects of limited size, cost, scope, and complexity. Although there is no specific minimum project size or cost, very small projects should not be pursued under CAP as they should be implemented by other Federal or non-Federal entities. Further, District Commanders, in coordination with the MSC Commanders, should consider termination of CAP feasibility activities when the estimated or actual total cost of feasibility studies equals or exceeds the estimated implementation cost including LERRD value. Finally, large or complex problems should be pursued under the specifically authorized programs.

b. General Requirements. Projects recommended for implementation pursuant to CAP authorities must be justified in accordance with the requirements of the applicable project purpose as discussed in Appendix E of this regulation and must be implemented in accordance with the applicable legal and policy requirements as further discussed in Section III of this Appendix.

c. Using CAP at Projects Specifically Authorized by Congress. CAP authorities may be used to provide additional improvements to a completed portion of a specifically authorized project so long as they do not impair or substantially change the purposes or functions of the specifically authorized project.

d. Multi-purpose Projects. Multi-purpose projects may be formulated using CAP authorities in accordance with procedures stated in Section IX of Appendix E of this regulation and as discussed in Section II, paragraph F-18 of this Appendix.

#### e. Plan Formulation, Evaluation, and Selection Principles.

(1) General. Plan formulation, evaluation, and selection will follow the procedures developed for specifically authorized studies and projects as discussed in Appendix E of this regulation, at a level of detail appropriate for the scope and complexity of the proposed CAP project. District staff, in coordination with MSC staff, will determine the appropriate level of detail of analyses required to produce a quality project in a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost. Simplified evaluation procedures may be adopted for low risk/low cost projects and when the consequences of failure are minimal and do not pose a threat to human life or safety. However, District and MSC Commanders cannot deviate from legislative requirements, or from policy or regulatory requirements of HQUSACE, the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or other Federal agencies.

(2) Formulation and Evaluation. Alternative plans should be developed to the level of detail necessary to select a justified, acceptable, and implementable plan that is consistent with Federal law and policy and, to the extent that law and policy permit, consistent with the goals of the non-Federal sponsor. Benefit and cost, risk and uncertainty, cost effectiveness, and incremental cost analyses will be undertaken using procedures appropriate for the scope and complexity of the project. Further, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable statutes, when formulating measures and plans that will result



in the recommendation for a project, the project delivery team must consider opportunities to reasonably avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts and mitigation requirements.

(3) Guidance on model certification will apply to models used in the planning of CAP projects.

(4) Environmental Sustainability. As expressed in ER 200-1-5 (30 October 2003), in implementing the USACE Environmental Operating Principles and associated doctrine, the Corps must strive to achieve environmental sustainability, which is defined as “a synergistic process whereby environmental and economic considerations are effectively balanced through the life cycle of project planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance to improve the quality of life for present and future generations.” For all CAP projects, and particularly for those not implemented under the ecosystem restoration authorities, this principle is best satisfied through forethought in the formulation stage of project development. The goal is to design projects that will not degrade existing ecosystem quality while eliminating or minimizing the need for compensatory mitigation measures. Section II, paragraph F-20 of this Appendix provides basic guidance for formulation of ecosystem restoration projects and references to other environmental related guidance.

(5) Selection of a Plan. Plan selection will be in accordance with the guidance in Appendix E of this regulation for the applicable project purpose(s). Further, if a locally preferred plan (LPP) is proposed by a non-Federal sponsor, a decision document recommending such LPP may only be approved after a waiver has been obtained in accordance with Section II, paragraphs F-10.f.(3) and F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix.

(6) Guidance on Collaborative Planning will apply to the multipurpose project planning (Combined Plans) described in Section II, paragraph F-18 of this Appendix. In particular, the plan selection concepts will be incorporated into the plan development and recommendation process.

#### f. Modification of Design and Construction Standards.

(1) General. Corps design and construction standards can be modified to reduce project costs for CAP projects provided that the application of modified standards has no more than minimal increased risk to public health and safety, and has no more than a minimal impact on the operation, structure, or purposes of any existing Corps project. Modifications cannot result in adverse impacts or effects extending beyond the CAP project area. The basis for a modification of standards is a comparison of the risk of failure or improper functioning with the consequences of failure or improper functioning. However, modification of mandatory standards requires a waiver in accordance with ER 1110-2-1150. If a State permit is required for the non-Federal sponsor to operate the project, the applicable State engineering standards must be met.

(2) Coordination with non-Federal sponsors. Modification of standards pursuant to paragraph F-3.f.(1) of this Appendix must be discussed with the non-Federal sponsor so it recognizes and understands any risk that it may be assuming as part of its responsibilities under the PCA, including any potential effect on its OMRR&R responsibilities.

g. Project Implementation Process. CAP projects will be implemented in two phases: the feasibility phase and the design and implementation phase. Each phase is carried out under the provisions of a separate cost sharing agreement executed by the District Commander and the non-Federal sponsor. Guidance addressing these two phases is set forth in Section II, paragraphs F-10 and F-11 of this Appendix.

h. Requirements to serve as a non-Federal Sponsor.

(1) For projects pursued under Sections 14, 103, 107, 111, 145, 205, and 208, non-Federal sponsors must be public agencies able to enter into cost sharing agreements in accordance with the requirements of Section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended. Section 221 specifies that the non-Federal sponsor must be “a legally constituted public body with full authority and capability to perform the terms of its agreement and to pay damages, if necessary, in the event of failure to perform.” The non-Federal sponsor’s responsibilities include paying its required share of project costs; provision or performance of LERRD (or LERR, as applicable) for the project; and performance of OMRR&R for the project, as applicable.

(2) For projects pursued under Sections 204, 206, and 1135, a non-Federal sponsor may be an entity that meets the “public body” requirement of Section 221, or may be a non-profit entity. In either event, the non-Federal sponsor must have the full authority and capability to perform the terms of its agreement and to pay damages, if necessary, in the event of failure to perform. As with a public body non-Federal sponsor, a non-profit entity that serves as the non-Federal sponsor must be able to demonstrate not only its capability to participate during design and implementation of the project but also its long-term commitment and capability to finance and perform any necessary OMRR&R activities. Further, as required by Federal statute, the affected local government must consent to a non-profit entity being the non-Federal sponsor for a Section 204, 206, or 1135 project.

i. Federal Funds Used As Part of Non-Federal Sponsor Share. The non-Federal sponsor must not use Federal program funds to meet its obligations, including LERRD, for a project unless the Federal agency providing the Federal portion of such funds verifies in writing that expenditure of such funds for such purpose is expressly authorized by Federal law. The term “Federal program funds” includes the funds or grants provided by a Federal agency as well as any non-Federal matching share or contribution that was required by such Federal program or grant.

#### F-4. Restrictions on Program Eligibility.

a. Studies. CAP will not be used for study only activities.

b. Specifically Authorized Projects. CAP will not be used to implement or replace any portion of a project specifically authorized by Congress.

c. Existing Non-Federal Responsibilities. CAP will not be used to nullify or change an existing condition of non-Federal responsibility required for a project specifically authorized by Congress or implemented under a CAP authority.

d. Non-Federal Operation and Maintenance. CAP will not be used to adopt a non-Federal project for future maintenance at Federal expense, to restore completed Corps projects to their authorized dimensions, or to accomplish required non-Federal maintenance at a Federally constructed project.

e. Design Deficiencies. CAP will not be used to correct design deficiencies on another CAP project or a specifically authorized project.

F-5. Coordination Account. The Coordination Account is provided to District Commanders by authority line item under procedures established by the HQUSACE Programs Integration Division (CECW-I). This account will be used for all initial contacts and site investigations with local interests until a potential Federal interest is identified and a decision by the non-Federal sponsor and the Corps is made to initiate the feasibility phase. The account should be used to screen out ineligible situations or cases where it is unlikely that a project eventually will be implemented. This account may also be used for internal coordination prior to establishing a project account, or non-project specific coordination activities such as participation in regional or national CAP review meetings. These funds may also be used for participation in regional meetings and interagency coordination where the primary means of Corps participation is through CAP projects. However, Coordination Account funds are not to be used as supplements for coordination activities which receive line item funding, such as EPA's National Estuary Program or the Coastal America initiative. Coordination account funds are not cost shared, will be counted against the authority's statutory annual program limit, but will not be counted against any specific per project limit. Coordination activities related to specific on-going projects will be accomplished using that project's funding account, and shared accordingly.

F-6. Program Cost Sharing.

a. Feasibility Phase. This phase will be initially Federally funded up to \$100,000. Any remaining feasibility phase costs will be shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor pursuant to the terms of a CAP FCSA. If the feasibility phase can be completed for less than \$100,000, a CAP FCSA is not required. The Federally funded \$100,000 can only be used in the feasibility phase. Any unused portion of the Federally funded \$100,000 is not transferable to the design and implementation phase.

b. Design and Implementation Phase. All costs beyond the feasibility phase are considered total project costs and will be shared as specified in the authorizing legislation for that purpose. The specific requirements for each individual project must be detailed in the project's PCA.

F-7. Statutory Federal Participation Limits.

a. General. The CAP legislative authorities contain specific Federal financial participation limits which apply to (1) the amount of Federal participation allowed for each specific project implemented under a CAP authority (per project limit); (2) the amount of Federal participation under a CAP authority in any one fiscal year (annual program limit); or (3) both a per project limit and an annual program limit. Table F-3 displays the applicable per project and annual program Federal participation limits for each CAP authority. All Corps funds expended

for feasibility and design and implementation activities are counted against the statutory per project and annual program limits. For Sections 204, 206, and 1135, expenditures by other Federal agencies on feasibility and design and implementation activities are included in the Federal share of the project cost and counted toward the Federal per project limits and annual program limits. For Sections 14, 103, 107, 111, 145, 205, and 208, expenditures of other Federal agencies under their own authorities are not included in these Federal per project limits and annual program limits. For Section 107 projects for commercial navigation, Federal expenditures for operation and maintenance of the general navigation features are not counted toward the Federal per project limit and annual program limit. In no event will Civil Works funds be allotted to a project for the feasibility or design and implementation phases if the allotment would result in the applicable per project or annual program limit being exceeded. Refer to Section III, paragraph F-26.g of this Appendix for instructions regarding the Section 111 Federal participation limit. HQUSACE will monitor the annual program limits and will issue guidance on how to proceed in the event an annual program limit is approached. The amounts shown below as the annual program limit for Sections 204, 206, and 1135 is the limit on annual appropriations from Congress (and on obligation of those appropriations) for that authority. For the remaining authorities, the amounts shown below as the annual program limit is the annual limit of allotments from HQUSACE for that authority.

b. Costs in Excess of the Statutory Federal Per Project Participation Limit. There is no limit on the total project costs of a project implemented under CAP. However, Army policy does not permit continuing with planning of a project pursuant to CAP when after application of the appropriate Federal/non-Federal cost sharing percentages, it is estimated that the Federal share would exceed the applicable per project limit.

(1) If this is discovered before execution of the PCA, the study may be converted to the GI program in accordance with paragraph F-9 of this Appendix. As an alternative to conversion to the GI program (except in the case of Section 111), the non-Federal sponsor may offer to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit. If the MSC Commander supports this offer, the MSC Commander shall treat the offer as a proposal for a policy deviation in accordance with Section II, paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix. In no event will Federal funds in excess of the per project limit be allotted to a project even if the non-Federal sponsor proposes to reimburse the Government for any amount in excess of the per project limit.

(2) If this is discovered after execution of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must contribute funds in accordance with the terms of the PCA for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit or the PCA will be terminated (Table F-3).

TABLE F-3 STATUTORY FEDERAL PARTICIPATION LIMITS		
Authority	Per Project Limit (\$)	Annual Program Limit (\$)
Sec 14	1,000,000	15,000,000
Sec 103	3,000,000	30,000,000
Sec 107	4,000,000	35,000,000
Sec 111	5,000,000	N/A
Sec 145	N/A	N/A
Sec 204	N/A	15,000,000
Sec 205	7,000,000	50,000,000
Sec 206	5,000,000	25,000,000
Sec 208	500,000	7,500,000
Sec 1135	5,000,000	25,000,000

F-8. Converting GI Funded Studies or PED to CAP.

a. General. The MSC commander may approve transfer of an ongoing GI funded study or PED to CAP. However, the MSC commander may not use GI and CAP funds simultaneously on any study.

b. Converting GI 905(b) Studies to CAP. A new CAP study may be initiated based on the analyses of a GI 905(b) investigation which found that there is likely a Federal interest in pursuing further planning analyses.

(1) For a new CAP study that will continue with evaluation of the same or generally similar project that was the subject of the GI 905(b) investigations, the GI 905(b) investigations will be considered the initially Federally funded portion of the CAP feasibility phase. Therefore, the initial amount of such new CAP study that would be funded at 100 percent Federal expense will be reduced by the amount of funds expended for the GI effort. If it is determined that the cost of the GI efforts equaled or exceeded \$100,000, then all costs of the new CAP study will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor. None of the GI expenditures will be counted against the applicable CAP per project or annual program limits.

(2) For a new CAP study that will evaluate a project that is one of many that could result from a more encompassing GI 905(b) investigation (such as a watershed study), only that portion of the GI effort that is allocated by the district to the project being pursued under the new CAP study will be considered as the initially Federally funded portion of the CAP feasibility phase. Therefore, the initial amount of such new CAP study that would be funded at 100 percent Federal expense will be reduced by the amount of funds expended for the GI effort that the district allocates to the project being studied. If it is determined that the cost of the GI efforts equaled or exceeded \$100,000, then all costs of the new CAP feasibility study shall be shared with the non-Federal sponsor. None of the GI expenditures will be counted against the applicable CAP per project or annual program limits.

c. Converting GI Funded Cost Shared Feasibility to CAP. Prior to converting to CAP, work for the GI cost shared feasibility study should be terminated in an orderly manner pursuant to the provisions of the existing GI FCSA. However, the MSC Commander may find it more appropriate to complete the ongoing GI effort and convert to CAP upon completion of the feasibility study. In any event, a conversion to CAP would require executing a CAP FCSA for any remaining feasibility phase items required to proceed to execution of a PCA. All costs of the CAP feasibility phase activities will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor. None of the GI expenditures will be counted against the applicable CAP per project or annual program limits.

d. Converting GI Funded PED to CAP. Prior to converting to CAP, work for a GI PED (pre-authorization) should be terminated in an orderly manner pursuant to the provisions of the existing Design Agreement. However, the MSC Commander may find it more appropriate to complete the ongoing GI effort and convert to CAP upon completion of the PED phase. In any event, a conversion to CAP would require execution of a PCA to address any remaining design activities and to proceed with construction. All remaining costs of the CAP design and implementation phase will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor. None of the GI expenditures will be counted against the applicable CAP per project or annual program limits. Conversion of a GI funded PED to CAP is only applicable for a project that has not been specifically authorized for construction by Congress. If a project has been specifically authorized for construction, it will not be transferred for implementation under CAP until Congress specifically deauthorizes the project or Congress specifically funds its implementation under a CAP authority in law.

#### F-9. Converting CAP Feasibility Studies to GI.

a. General. CAP studies must be converted to GI once it has been determined that the solution will be beyond the scope of CAP. If possible, any such determination should be made during that portion of the feasibility phase that is 100 percent Federally funded. The determination and supporting analyses will be documented.

b. Conversion to GI Prior to Execution of a CAP FCSA. If further study is required to complete a decision document, after the determination that a CAP study should be converted to the GI program, a new GI reconnaissance or feasibility phase study, as appropriate, will be started following the process for new GI studies. The process for new GI studies can be found in the annual Budget EC.

c. Conversion to GI After Execution of a CAP FCSA but Before Completion of the Feasibility Phase. If it is determined after execution of the CAP FCSA that a project should be converted to the GI Program, work under the CAP FCSA will be terminated in an orderly manner pursuant to the terms of the CAP FCSA, and a new GI feasibility phase study will be started following the process for new GI studies.

d. Conversion to GI After Feasibility Phase but Prior to Execution of PCA. If it is determined after completion of the feasibility phase but before execution of the PCA that a project should be converted to the GI Program, a new GI PED will be started following the process for new GI PED.

## SECTION II – PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

### F-10. Feasibility Phase.

a. General. The feasibility phase encompasses the entire range of planning activities required to demonstrate that Federal participation in a project is warranted and justified. This phase will be initially Federally funded up to \$100,000. Any remaining feasibility phase costs will be shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor pursuant to the terms of a CAP FCSA. If the feasibility phase can be completed for less than \$100,000, a CAP FCSA is not required. The Federally funded \$100,000 can only be used in the feasibility phase. Any unused portion of the Federally funded \$100,000 is not transferable to the design and implementation phase.

#### b. Initiation of Feasibility Phase.

(1) Request for Assistance. A feasibility phase is normally initiated based on receipt of a letter from a potential non-Federal sponsor stating its desire to participate in a solution, and acknowledging its financial responsibilities for the study and the project, if one is recommended.

(2) Legislative Action. A feasibility phase may also be initiated based on directions contained in authorization or appropriations act language or committee report language accompanying such legislation and receipt of a letter from a potential non-Federal sponsor stating its desire to participate in a solution, and acknowledging its financial responsibilities for the study and the project, if one is recommended.

#### c. Procedures to Obtain Federal Funding for Feasibility Phase.

(1) 100% Federally Funded Portion of Feasibility Phase. After the decision by the non-Federal interest and the Corps to initiate the feasibility phase, the district should request the funds necessary for the \$100,000 Federally funded portion of the feasibility phase.

(2) Cost Shared Portion of Feasibility Phase. Upon execution of the CAP FCSA (see paragraph F-10.d. of this Appendix), the district should request the remainder of the Federal funds (above the \$100,000 Federally funded portion) required for the feasibility phase.

(3) Funds Requests. The district should prepare and send the requests for funds, through the MSC Programs Office, to the appropriate HQ RIT for coordination with HQ Programs Integration Division (CECW-IP). Each request should identify the name of the project, the PWI, the CAP authority it will be implemented under, the total amount of funds requested, and, if the remainder of the feasibility phase will extend beyond one fiscal year, the amount of funds needed by fiscal year. The study should be entered into PRISM and P2 as soon as possible.

d. Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA). No CAP FCSA is required if the feasibility phase can be completed for \$100,000 or less. Any feasibility phase costs in excess of \$100,000 will be shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor pursuant to the terms of a CAP FCSA executed by the District Commander and the non-Federal sponsor. The model CAP FCSA will be used. Authority to approve a CAP FCSA, including any deviations, and to execute the CAP FCSA will be in accordance with the implementation memo for the CAP FCSA. The

CAP FCSA must be negotiated and executed during the 100 percent Federally funded portion of the feasibility phase and no funds in excess of \$100,000 will be allotted to a project until the CAP FCSA is executed. Subsequent to execution of the CAP FCSA, no work may be initiated until the non-Federal sponsor's appropriate proportional share of costs over \$100,000 has been made available either in cash or through an agreement on a schedule for and estimated value of non-Federal feasibility work (see paragraph F-15 of this Appendix) that is necessary for the feasibility phase.

e. Required Milestones. The purpose of the two required milestones listed below is to assure that continuing work on the feasibility phase is consistent with the policies, principles, priorities, procedures, and constraints of CAP, thus preventing excessive expenditures on questionable projects. The MSC Commander shall develop requirements, to be submitted by the district to the MSC, for the information necessary to support the determinations made at these milestones. These requirements should be consistent with the scope and scale of the situation under study. The MSC Commander may establish additional milestones as deemed necessary for each study.

(1) Federal Interest Determination. The first milestone is the determination that study efforts are likely to lead to project implementation. The purpose is analogous to that served by a 905(b) Report. The review would include consideration of problem specification, identification of Federal interest and potential for solution(s) that would result in a policy consistent project of a scope appropriate for CAP, with a willing and capable sponsor. This determination will be accomplished early enough in the Federally funded portion of the feasibility phase to ensure that there are no impediments to proceeding with the project.

(2) Alternatives Formulation Briefing. The second milestone is an Alternatives Formulation Briefing (AFB) that takes place after the alternative plans have been formulated and prior to the release of the draft decision document for public review. The purpose of the AFB is to ensure that plans have been properly formulated, legal and policy issues have been identified and a consensus on resolution has been reached, and the MSC concurs with the plan that will likely proceed into the design and implementation phase.

f. Decision Document Requirements and Approval.

(1) General. Subject to the minimum requirements set forth in paragraph F-10.f.(2) of this Appendix, the MSC Commander will establish decision document requirements and formats. The guidance in Appendix G of this regulation covering feasibility report content should help guide technical and policy decision document requirements.

(2) Decision Document Requirements. The minimum decision document and supporting documentation requirements are: a clear description of the recommended plan; demonstration of the project justification based on standard Corps project justification criteria for the particular project purpose in accordance with the general guidance applicable to the project purpose(s); documentation of the results of any request for a waiver of policy under paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix; documentation of compliance with appropriate Federal, State, and local environmental and regulatory requirements such as NEPA, etc., normally included in a feasibility study specifically authorized by the Congress; a completed Real Estate Plan consistent



with the requirements of Chapter 12, ER 405-1-12; the non-Federal sponsor financial analysis and financing plan at a level of detail appropriate to the scale of the project; District Real Estate certification that the non-Federal sponsor has the capability to acquire and provide the required real estate interests; a detailed description of the non-Federal sponsor's local cooperation requirements; identification of the anticipated operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation activities, including estimated costs; the feasibility level ITR certification; and the District Counsel statement of legal sufficiency for the decision documentation and NEPA process.

(3) Locally Preferred Plans. Projects may deviate from the NED and/or NER plan if requested by the non-Federal sponsor and approved by ASA (CW). The decision document may recommend locally preferred plans (LPP) formulated using the same procedures for specifically authorized projects described in paragraph 2-3.f.(4) of this regulation. Before a decision document recommending a LPP may be approved, a waiver request prepared in accordance with paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix must be approved by ASA (CW). When the LPP is clearly of less scope and cost and meets the Administration's policies for high priority outputs, a waiver is usually granted. For those cases, in which the LPP has costs in excess of the NED or NER plan, the decision document must describe and compare the NED or NER plan and the LPP and specify the difference in the costs of the two plans and that the non-Federal sponsor agrees to pay all costs over the Federal share of the NED or NER plan. The LPP, in this case, must have outputs similar in-kind, and equal to or greater than the outputs of the Federal plan.

(4) Waiver for Deviation from Policy.

(a) Policy Waivers Identified During Feasibility Phase. The MSC Commander must seek a waiver for any deviation from policy and obtain a response coordinated through Headquarters and OASA (CW) staff before he or she can approve a decision document containing a deviation from policy. Waivers are required for any proposed deviation from general policy including but not limited to policies regarding plan formulation and cost sharing, as well as the specific policies on statutory Federal per project participation limits (see Section I, paragraph F-7.b.(1) of this Appendix), recommendation of a LPP (see paragraph F-10.f.(3) of this Appendix), limits on recreation costs (see paragraph F-19 of this Appendix), limits on cost shared monitoring (see paragraph F-21 of this Appendix), and implementing a Section 107 project (see Section III, paragraph F-25.d. of this Appendix). The MSC Commander must submit the waiver request to the appropriate HQ RIT together with a full explanation of the circumstances for the waiver. The appropriate HQ RIT will prepare a letter responding to the MSC request, which will be coordinated through Headquarters staff and the OASA (CW) staff. In no event will the decision document be approved until all deviations from policy have been addressed through waiver requests and the written response from the HQ RIT has been received by the MSC.

(b) Policy Waiver Identified After the Feasibility Phase but Before Execution of the PCA. The only waiver request that will be considered after approval of the decision document is a waiver of the specific policy on statutory Federal per project participation limits (see Section I, paragraph F-7.b.(1) of this Appendix) due to cost escalation identified during any design performed prior to execution of the PCA. The MSC Commander must submit the waiver request to the appropriate HQ RIT together with a full explanation of the escalation of costs between the

approval of the decision document and the identification of the need for a waiver and the non-Federal sponsor's offer to contribute funds for any costs that normally would be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit. The appropriate HQ RIT will prepare a letter responding to the MSC request, which will be coordinated through Headquarters staff and the OASA (CW) staff. In no event will the PCA be executed until the written response from the HQ RIT has been received by the MSC.

(5) Decision Document Approval. Approval of the decision document will be by letter of the MSC Commander to the District Commander, with a copy furnished to the appropriate HQ RIT. This authority may not be further delegated to the District Commander. The approval letter will certify that the requirements specified in this Appendix for approving the decision document have been satisfied; summarize the findings, conclusions, and rationale for approving the decision document; and certify that the project addressed in the decision document is justified and is policy compliant or has received the necessary policy waivers.

g. Completion of the Feasibility Phase. The feasibility phase is completed when 1) the decision document, addressing a plan formulated in accordance with the Principles and Guidelines, has been approved by the MSC Commander or 2) the feasibility phase is terminated.

h. Termination of the Feasibility Phase. Following coordination with affected non-Federal interests, the feasibility phase should be terminated if analyses indicate a lack of Federal interest or a lack of public support or if a satisfactory letter of intent is not received from a potential non-Federal sponsor within a reasonable length of time (as determined by the MSC Commander in consultation with the District Commander). The phase is officially terminated when the District Commander so advises the MSC Commander and the appropriate HQ RIT of termination of the study. The District Commander will also notify Congressional delegations and non-Federal interests when the study has been officially terminated.

#### F-11. Design and Implementation Phase.

a. General. This phase follows completion of the feasibility phase and includes all of the activities that would normally be included in the PED and construction phases of specifically authorized projects. All costs incurred for this phase will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor in accordance with the cost sharing requirements of the applicable CAP authority.

b. Initiation of Design and Implementation Phase. This phase begins upon the MSC Commander approval of the decision document that recommends proceeding into the design and implementation phase. The first action of the design and implementation phase is negotiation and execution of a PCA.

c. Procedures to Obtain Federal Funding for Design and Implementation Phase.

(1) Initial Work Allowance to Negotiate and Execute PCA. Upon approval of the decision document by the MSC Commander, thus completing the feasibility phase, the district shall submit a request for funds, not to exceed \$50,000, to pay the Federal costs of negotiating the PCA and initiating design. While these costs are 100% Federally funded prior to the PCA, once the PCA is executed the Federal costs to negotiate the PCA and initiate design will be

included in total project costs and shared with the non-Federal sponsor pursuant to the terms of the PCA. No additional funds in excess of \$50,000 will be allotted to a project until the PCA is executed.

(2) Remainder of Design and Implementation Phase. After execution of the PCA, the district should request the remaining funds required for the design and implementation phase as appropriate to comply with budgetary and contracting guidance.

(3) Funds Requests. The district should prepare and send the requests for funds, through the MSC Programs Office, to the appropriate HQ RIT for coordination with HQ Programs Integration Division (CECW-IP). Each request should identify the name of the project, the PWI, the CAP authority it will be implemented under, the total amount of funds requested, and if the design and implementation phase will extend beyond one fiscal year, the amount of funds needed by fiscal year. The request should also contain a current CAP Fact Sheet. The project information in PRISM and P2 should be updated as soon as possible.

d. PCA. The design and implementation phase will be conducted under the provisions of the PCA executed by the District Commander and the non-Federal sponsor. The appropriate model PCA will be used. Authority to approve the PCA, including any deviations, and to execute the PCA shall be in accordance with the implementation memo for the appropriate model.

(1) Design. The design portion will conclude with completion of the plans and specifications for the project. Compliance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations, including, but not limited to NEPA and Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1341) must be verified and documented during the design portion.

(2) Implementation. Once the design portion has been completed, the parties must decide whether to proceed with implementation of the project, or terminate the PCA, in an orderly manner pursuant to the provisions of the PCA. However, no Government or non-Federal sponsor construction work shall be initiated prior to compliance with all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

e. Solicitations for Contracts.

(1) Solicitations for contracts will not be issued prior to execution of the PCA unless approved in advance by the MSC Commander following the District's written request.

(2) Further, solicitations for construction contracts should not be issued until the District Chief of Real Estate has certified in writing that sufficient real property interests are available to support construction under such contracts. However, in exceptional circumstances the District Commander may proceed and issue a solicitation contrary to this general policy after full assessment of the risks and benefits of proceeding.

(3) In those cases where solicitations are issued without sufficient real property interests, or prior to PCA execution, as allowed above, the solicitation documents should advise potential bidders of such facts.

f. Contract Bid Opening.

(1) No contract bids will be opened prior to execution of the PCA and prior to receipt of the non-Federal sponsor's required cash contribution. In no event will this policy be waived.

(2) If the District Commander issued a solicitation for a construction contract without sufficient real property interests to support a construction contract as described in paragraph F-11.e.(2) of this Appendix, sufficient real property interests must be available to support implementation under that contract before submitted bids may be opened and considered. The MSC Commander may approve opening bids prior to sufficient real property interests being available after receipt and review of a District's written request that includes adequate justification and full risk and benefit assessment. Due to concerns regarding liability and fairness to potential bidders, approval of such requests are discouraged and should be granted only in exceptional circumstances.

g. Award of Construction Contracts. Construction contracts will not be awarded until the District Chief of Real Estate has certified in writing that sufficient real property interests are available to support implementation under that contract. HQUSACE will consider limited exceptions to this policy only after submission of a written request by the District, through and with the concurrence of the MSC Commander, to the appropriate HQ RIT that contains clear and persuasive evidence that the outstanding real property interests will be obtained in a timely manner, that proceeding to award poses no significant liability or risk to the Government, and that approval is otherwise appropriate considering all relevant facts and circumstances.

h. Completion of the Design and Implementation Phase. The design and implementation phase is completed when 1) the District Commander determines that project construction and any cost shared monitoring, to be performed after physical construction, is complete or 2) the PCA is terminated, in an orderly manner pursuant to the provisions of the PCA, prior to completion of project construction.

i. OMRR&R of the Project. Upon physical completion of the project, the District Commander will notify the non-Federal sponsor in writing that construction of the project is complete, and will provide the non-Federal sponsor with an Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation, and Replacement (OMRR&R) Manual. Upon receipt of the notice of completion of construction of the project, the non-Federal sponsor will operate, maintain, repair, rehabilitate, and replace the project in accordance with the OMRR&R Manual.

j. Project Completion Report. After project completion, including any cost shared monitoring to be performed after physical construction is complete, and the final audit and project closeout, the District Commander will transmit a project completion report to the MSC. The report will contain a short description of the project, the final Federal and non-Federal feasibility and design and implementation costs by phase, and the date that the non-Federal sponsor was provided notice of physical completion in accordance with the terms of the PCA.

[F-12. Approval Authorities for Decision Documents and Agreements.](#)

a. Decision Documents. As discussed in detail in paragraph F-10.f. of this Appendix, the MSC Commander is authorized to approve project decision documents that he or she certifies are in compliance with law and policy including those where necessary policy waivers have been received (see paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix). Decision document approval authority may not be delegated to the District Commander.

b. Agreements.

(1) Authorities With Approved Model Agreements. The authority to approve a CAP FCSA or PCA, including any deviations thereto and the authority to execute such agreements, will follow the authorities and procedures outlined in the implementation memo for the applicable model.

(2) Authorities Without Approved Model Agreements. In cases where there is not an approved model, the MSC Commander, must forward to the appropriate HQ RIT one hardcopy and an electronic copy of a PCA package each containing the following: a clean copy of the negotiated draft agreement; a copy of the negotiated draft agreement with the deviations indicated by redline/strikeout from the Section 205 structural flood damage reduction model; a list of the deviations from the Section 205 structural flood damage reduction model and detailed reasons for the deviations; Certificate of Legal Review signed by the District Counsel; CAP PCA Checklist; and current letter of intent from the non-Federal sponsor. All documents requiring signatures (CAP checklist, Certificate of Legal Review, and letter of intent) must be scanned so that required signatures are contained in the electronic files.

F-13. Post Implementation Federal and Non-Federal Sponsor Responsibilities. Once any CAP project or separable element, under any CAP authority, has been completed, the project will be treated in the same manner as a completed project that was specifically authorized by the Congress. This includes assuring non-Federal sponsor compliance with PCA responsibilities and the periodic inspection of projects.

F-14. After Action Reviews. As part of the Headquarters responsibility to monitor policy and procedural compliance in this program, HQUSACE and MSC CAP managers will meet to conduct policy and procedural after action reviews of projects with PCAs executed in the past year. The procedural reviews shall be based on HQUSACE and existing MSC documentation requirements for decision-making. In addition to monitoring policy and procedural compliance, these reviews will serve as a forum for identification of management and procedural problems, general policy issues, and successes which will in turn form the basis for any needed corrective action and continued evolution of program operating principles.

F-15. Non-Federal Feasibility Work and Non-Federal Design and Implementation Work.

a. General. Non-Federal feasibility work and non-Federal design and implementation work is planning, design, or implementation activities performed by the non-Federal sponsor in lieu of the Federal Government during the feasibility phase or design and implementation phase, respectively. Such work is often referred to as “work-in-kind”. Neither non-Federal feasibility work nor non-Federal design and implementation work includes activities the non-Federal sponsor must perform as required in the CAP FCSA or PCA, respectively, such as participation on the study coordination team or Project Coordination Team, performance of activities related

to acquisition of LERRD, investigation or response actions under the Hazardous Substances article, and certain audit-related activities. Credit may be afforded only for non-Federal feasibility work or non-Federal design and implementation work performed after execution of the applicable agreement (CAP FCSA or PCA). Non-Federal sponsors will not be afforded credit against the non-Federal share of a CAP study or project or reimbursed for any work undertaken, or contributed, or provided, for a CAP study or project except as described below.

b. Feasibility Phase. In accordance with the principles of Section 105(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended, the non-Federal sponsor may be afforded credit against its share of study costs for the value of non-Federal feasibility work performed during the feasibility phase.

(1) Performance of non-Federal feasibility work and affording of credit toward the non-Federal sponsor's share is only applicable for the portions of feasibility studies beyond the first \$100,000 in cost, and for non-Federal feasibility work performed subsequent to execution of the CAP FCSA.

(2) Credit afforded in accordance with the principles of Section 105(a) is limited to credit for non-Federal feasibility work that does not result in any reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor. Therefore, the credit for non-Federal feasibility work can only be applied toward the additional cash requirement. To determine the additional cash requirement, subtract from the total required non-Federal share of total study costs the costs that the non-Federal sponsor must incur under the CAP FCSA for participation in the study coordination team and certain audit-related activities. Any amount of non-Federal feasibility work that exceeds the additional cash requirement must be included in total study costs but will be a 100 percent non-Federal sponsor responsibility.

c. Implementation Phase. Pursuant to Section 215 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, as amended, the non-Federal sponsor may be afforded credit against its share of total project costs for the value of non-Federal design and implementation work performed during the design and implementation phase.

(1) In the CAP program, the policy is that the maximum amount of credit that can be afforded for non-Federal design and implementation work is limited so that it does not result in any reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor. Therefore, the credit for non-Federal design and implementation work can only be applied toward the additional cash requirement. To determine the additional cash requirement, subtract from the total required non-Federal share of total project costs the sum of the value of LERRD and the costs that the non-Federal sponsor must incur under the PCA for participation in the Project Coordination Team, investigations or response actions under the Hazardous Substances Article, and certain audit-related activities. Any amount of non-Federal design and implementation work that exceeds the additional cash requirement will be included in total project costs but will be a 100 percent non-Federal sponsor responsibility.

(2) For Section 1135 projects, no more than 80 percent of the non-Federal sponsor's share may be non-Federal design and implementation work.

(3) For Sections 14, 205 (structural), and 208 projects, non-Federal design and implementation work cannot be credited toward the 5 percent cash requirement.

d. Eligible Parties to Perform Non-Federal Feasibility Work or Non-Federal Design and Implementation Work. Non-Federal feasibility work and non-Federal design and implementation work for credit may only be provided by the non-Federal sponsor, and can be accomplished by the hired labor of the non-Federal sponsor or by contract administered by the non-Federal sponsor.

e. Determination of Value. The value of the non-Federal feasibility or design and implementation work will be estimated prior to the initiation of the effort. For the purposes of estimating total study costs or total project costs and projecting the non-Federal sponsor's cash requirement, the Corps and the non-Federal sponsor will agree upon a value for such work at the beginning of the study or design and implementation, as applicable. The actual amount of credit to be afforded for non-Federal feasibility or design and implementation work will be subject to an audit to determine reasonableness, allowability and allocability of the costs and will not exceed the actual costs incurred or the amount of the Government estimate of such work if the work had been performed by the Government, whichever is less. The Corps shall apply applicable Federal regulations, including OMB Circular A-87 or A-122 (for non-profit sponsors). The non-Federal sponsor must comply with applicable Federal and state laws and regulations, including the requirement to secure competitive bids for all work to be performed by contract.

f. Ineligible Activities. The non-Federal sponsor may not receive credit for supervision and administration of work performed by the Government or the Government's contractors. Many of the tasks included in the Supervision and Administration account during the design and implementation phase, including most of the contract management related activities, are inherent Government functions which may not be contracted out or assigned to others to perform (see Federal Acquisition Regulation subpart 7.5). The non-Federal sponsor will receive credit for supervision and administration of any contracts that it awards subject to an audit to determine reasonableness, allowability, and allocability of the costs.

g. Other Contributions. Contributions of cash, funds, materials and services from other than the non-Federal sponsor may be accepted for ecosystem restoration projects (Sections 204, 206, and 1135) under the provisions of Section 203 of the WRDA of 1992. However, the value of such contributions will not be included in total project costs and will not be credited toward the non-Federal sponsor's share of total project costs.

F-16. Real Estate.

a. Real Estate Plan Requirements. The analysis of the nature and extent of real estate requirements must be conducted in accordance with Chapter 12 of ER 405-1-12, including consideration and identification of the specific interests, estates, and acreage required for the project. While all CAP decision documents must contain a Real Estate Plan (REP) prepared in accordance with Chapter 12, the level of detail required for each topic required to be discussed in the REP will vary depending on the scope and complexity of the project. The level of detail contained in the REP generally should match the level of detail contained in the balance of the project decision document.

b. Existing Projects. For projects involving modification of existing projects, the interests and estates acquired for the existing project, as well as any outgrants, must be analyzed by the District Real Estate Division to determine if sufficient rights are available for the project modification. A standard lease format has been prepared for Section 1135 projects and is included in Chapter 8 of ER 405-1-12.

c. Credit. The value and amount of credit given for LERRD required to be provided by the non-Federal sponsor will be determined after review and preliminary approval by the District Real Estate Division after consultation with the Project Manager.

F-17. Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material. There is a new budget category of work that includes Section 145, as amended and Section 204, as amended. The primary purpose of budgeting these types of projects under one line item is that beneficial use of dredged material and sediment management requires an integrated, systematic approach using all applicable authorities. This budgetary approach enhances the consideration and use of these authorities during dredging activities. Guidance on each individual authority is located in Section III of this Appendix.

F-18. Multi-Purpose CAP Projects.

a. General. In an effort to promote comprehensive collaborative planning, the formulation of multipurpose projects may be accomplished under CAP. The term “multi-purpose project” often is used to describe two different types of situations, each involving different formulation. In the first situation, a project is formulated as either a NED plan with incidental NER benefits or a NER plan with incidental NED benefits and costs are shared according to one cost sharing formula. In the second situation, often referred to as “Combined Plans”, an NED plan and an NER plan are formulated together, i.e. have interdependent features, using a trade-off analysis. Combined Plans require complex evaluation and tradeoff analyses not normally consistent with the limited scope and complexity associated with CAP projects. Each of these two approaches is appropriate for consideration under CAP.

b. Cost Allocation Between Purposes for Combined Plans. If the districts wish to engage in the formulation and evaluation of Combined Plans, they should follow the procedures stated in Section IX of Appendix E of this regulation. However, in no case will the cost for a purpose included in the Combined Plan exceed the statutory Federal per project limit for that purpose under its applicable CAP authority. The cost for each purpose will include the separable costs, plus the joint costs allocated to each purpose. Cost allocation will be performed using the SCRUB method as described in Appendix E of this regulation. The costs for each purpose will be shared in accordance with the cost sharing formula for the applicable CAP authority. For accounting purposes, it is critical to keep track of the costs assigned to each purpose. Consultation with HQ is required prior to proceeding with the Combined Plan approach.

c. Limitations. Sections 14 and 1135 will not be used for multi-purpose planning under the CAP Program. Section 111 will not be used in conjunction with any other CAP authority besides Section 103. Further, Sections 145 and 204 will not be used in conjunction with any other CAP authorities besides Section 107.



d. Recreation. As used in this paragraph, the addition of recreation does not result in a “multi-purpose project”. For procedures and limitations for adding recreation to CAP projects, see paragraph F-19 of this Appendix.

F-19. Recreation.

a. General. Recreation features may be added to any project implemented under the CAP authorities (except for Section 14 and Section 208), if appropriate. Any recreation features should be formulated in accordance with current policies and procedures governing recreation (see Section VII of Appendix E of this regulation).

b. Limits on Inclusion of Recreation Features. For each CAP authority, justified separable recreation features may be added (except for Section 14 and Section 208) if the cost of such measures does not increase the Federal share of total project costs by more than 10 percent of the Federal share of total project costs without the added recreation, except as follows:

(1) When adding recreation to a multi-purpose project, the recreation costs must not exceed 10 percent of the total Federal cost of the combined purposes;

(2) Where the non-Federal sponsor has waived reimbursement of the value of LERRD as described in paragraph F-20.c.(5) of this Appendix, the 10 percent amount will be calculated on total project cost that does not include the value of LERRD for which the non-Federal sponsor waives reimbursement;

(3) The formulation of non-structural flood damage reduction projects is not constrained by the limitation of increased Federal cost for recreation; and

(4) Where a policy waiver has been approved in accordance with paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix.

c. Cost Sharing. Separable recreation features will be cost shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor.

F-20. Ecosystem Restoration Policies Applicable to Section 204, Section 206, and Section 1135.

a. General. A discussion of policies applicable to ecosystem restoration may be found in Appendix E of this regulation, in ER 1165-2-501, and in EP 1165-2-502. This paragraph describes policies for projects formulated under Section 204, Section 206, and Section 1135.

b. Considerations in Determining Real Estate Requirements. Paragraph F-16 of this Appendix presents the general principles for determining real estate requirements for CAP projects. However, the formulation of ecosystem restoration projects generally can present challenges with regard to determining the acreage, interests, and estates required to support the implementation of ecosystem restoration projects under CAP authorities. Accordingly, the following policies, procedures, and three part analyses must be applied in determining the real estate requirements for such projects.

(1) Acreage Required. Identification of the acreage directly and physically required to implement and operate and maintain ecosystem restoration project features typically is similar to the efforts in non-ecosystem restoration projects and presents few unusual difficulties. However, determining what additional acreage may be required outside of the "footprint" of project features to reasonably ensure the production of the benefits upon which the project was formulated may be more complex. The need to include, and the amount of, acreage in addition to the footprint of project features and immediately surrounding areas should be carefully evaluated by the project delivery team. Factors to consider in making this determination include the physical integrity of the project, cost effectiveness, incremental costs, operation and maintenance requirements, and the risks associated with not including the additional acreage. For example, there may be an acceptable minimal risk that future land use detrimental to the project will occur on the land adjacent to the project footprint where it is owned in fee by a public agency whose mission is compatible with project outputs or where development of the adjacent land is legally restricted for the foreseeable future to purposes consistent with project outputs. Inclusion of acreage in addition to that required for the footprint of project features must be directly tied to identified and measurable planning and implementation objectives, must not be simply assumed to be required for the project, and must be properly documented and justified. In some cases, an interest in all of the land benefiting from the project may not be required to reasonably ensure that the outputs justifying the project are obtained.

(2) Interest Required.

(a) General Policy. Determination of required interests (fee or permanent easement) must be driven by program, policy, and project requirements that ensure achievement of ecosystem benefits and protection of the Federal interest in a manner that best serves the public interest. As a matter of Corps policy, and as stated in ER 405-1-12, fee title is required as a general rule for all lands required for the construction and operation and maintenance of the project. The rationale for this general rule is that the land use requirements for implementation of CAP restoration projects, and the significant restrictions on remaining non-project land uses, generally are tantamount to fee ownership and to fee value. Further, where the restoration project provides the opportunity for use by the general public in ways consistent with the ecosystem restoration purpose, members of the general public should not be excluded from project lands that have been purchased, or otherwise provided, with public funds. Finally, fee title greatly reduces the risk that incompatible uses on project land will occur over the period of OMRR&R and, when compared to easement interpretation and enforcement that may vary from state to state, ensures that ownership rights vested in the project are clear and enforceable.

(b) Exceptions to General Policy Requiring Fee. Notwithstanding that fee title is generally the interest that must be provided to support CAP ecosystem restoration projects, there are circumstances where it may be appropriate to utilize permanent easements instead of fee. Such circumstances include:

i. where only select and easily identifiable and narrow affirmative rights are required for successful implementation of the project (for example, channel improvement rights or the right to flood);

ii. where project lands consist of the bed and immediate bank of a watercourse for the installation of features that improve habitat for aquatic resources (for example, root wads, shallow excavations, riffles, etc.);

iii. where the acreage of project lands, as assembled, is relatively small, is limited to that acreage necessary to construct and operate and maintain project ecosystem restoration features, and does not provide the opportunity for use by the general public in ways consistent with project purposes either because the lands are isolated from lawful public access (such as a public road, adjacent public lands, or publicly accessible watercourse) or because of the configuration of the project lands; or

iv. where project lands are owned in fee by public agencies other than the non-Federal sponsor and the owning agency cannot convey fee title and will not serve as a co-sponsor of the project; foreseeable future uses of the land by the public agency fee owner are compatible with project purposes; and public access is provided otherwise or is not compatible with project purposes.

(c) Approval Authority. Where one or more of the circumstances described above in subparagraph (2)(b) exist, and the project decision document, or other written request of the District, persuasively describes the need for an exception from the general policy rule, the MSC may approve use of a permanent easement instead of fee for the implementation of the CAP ecosystem restoration project where use of such easement will satisfy project requirements and protect the project benefits. All other requests for an exception to require easement rather than fee are discouraged and must be forwarded to the appropriate HQ RIT for review, coordination within HQUSACE, and approval.

(3) Estate Required. Once the appropriate interest is determined as described above, the corresponding standard estate must be used as explained and identified in Chapter 12 to ER 405-1-12. Except as otherwise provided in Chapter 12, all non-standard estates must be approved at HQUSACE with requests for such approval forwarded to the appropriate HQ RIT for review, coordination within HQUSACE, and approval.

#### c. Eligibility Limitations.

(1) Work on Other Federal Agency Lands. In the absence of specific legislative authority or direction of the Department of the Army, restoration projects will not be implemented on other Federal lands. Where incidental restoration benefits may accrue to lands owned by another Federal agency, these incidental benefits may be identified, but not included in the benefit evaluation.

(2) Remediation. Recommended projects will be for ecosystem restoration, not remediation of pollution problems covered by other statutes or for which others are liable. Remediation is typically for the purpose of meeting target criteria for contaminants or regulatory conditions related to human health and safety, rather than for ecosystem quality.

(3) Eradication of non-native or invasive species. Projects may be implemented for control of noxious or invasive species in situations where there is not another applicable Corps

authority. This will be limited to a single action at any location. However, during formulation, the likelihood of obtaining positive outputs in sufficient quantity and/or for a sufficient period of time to justify the costs must be considered.

(4) Section 206 and Section 1135 projects with high LERRD values. The Corps ecosystem restoration mission is to apply its planning, hydrologic and engineering expertise to solve large and/or complex restoration problems. Projects with very limited manipulation of the ecosystem that utilize extensive tracts of land appear to present themselves as preservation measures rather than restoration measures. Such projects are not appropriate civil works ecosystem restoration investments. Therefore, as an indicator of this potential situation, land values for a restoration project generally should not exceed 25 percent of total project costs. If the estimated LERRD value for a proposed project exceeds 25 percent of total project costs, the MSC must evaluate the project formulation to ensure that the project properly utilizes Corps expertise and is not land intensive. As part of its evaluation, the MSC must ensure that the project plan requires only the lands necessary to implement the project and to reasonably assure that the benefits sufficient to justify the project are achieved.

(5) Voluntary waiver of reimbursement of LERRD value in excess of non-Federal sponsor's percentage share for Section 206 and Section 1135 projects. If the MSC determines that the project properly utilizes Corps expertise, that the project plan is not land intensive, but that the estimated LERRD value exceeds 25 percent of total project costs (e.g., due to high land values in urban areas) the MSC may approve the project for implementation if the non-Federal sponsor provides a letter of intent to voluntarily waive reimbursement for the value of LERRD that exceeds the non-Federal sponsor's percentage share of total project costs. If the non-Federal sponsor does not voluntarily waive reimbursement for the value of LERRD that exceeds its percentage share of total project costs, any further efforts on the project should be suspended. Work on such suspended projects will continue only to the extent Congress provides funding specific to the project. If the non-Federal sponsor does provide the necessary letter of intent, the project decision document must clearly describe that the non-Federal sponsor has voluntarily agreed to waive reimbursement for the value of LERRD above its percentage share of total project costs, and the PCA must contain provisions for implementing this concept. Notwithstanding that the non-Federal sponsor has agreed to such a waiver, compliance with the following principles must continue:

(a) The project must be formulated so that only the lands necessary to implement the project and reasonably assure benefits sufficient to justify the project are required for the project;

(b) The estimated value of all project LERRD must be considered in comparison of alternatives for plan selection; and,

(c) The non-Federal sponsor must comply with all applicable provisions of Public Law 91-646, as amended and implementing regulations, for all LERRD that it must acquire to implement the project.

F-21. Monitoring and Adaptive Management.

a. Monitoring. Monitoring to be performed after physical construction is complete is rarely appropriate for CAP. Such monitoring will only be appropriate where the uncertainty of achieving the projected outputs is high. All proposed monitoring to be performed after physical construction is complete must be clearly defined and justified in the project decision document. Such monitoring will be limited to no more than five years after completion of physical construction. The cost of such monitoring will be included in total project costs and shared with the non-Federal sponsor and will not exceed one percent of the costs included in total project costs for the features that are to be monitored minus the costs for monitoring. A waiver is needed pursuant to paragraph F-10.f.(4) of this Appendix to increase either of these limits (costs or duration). Monitoring will not be performed on recreation features. The non-Federal sponsor will be responsible for performance of OMRR&R during the monitoring period.

b. Adaptive Management. Adaptive management will not be performed and will not be a cost shared item in CAP projects.

F-22. Design Deficiency Corrections.

a. Design Deficiency Criteria. The engineering criteria described in ER 1165-2-119 for establishing the existence of a design deficiency apply to the establishment and correction of design deficiencies for CAP projects. Costs for all design deficiency corrections at non-Federally operated and maintained projects will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor in accordance with the current cost sharing for that purpose as established in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, as amended, unless, in the case of a project implemented with different cost sharing, an exception is granted by ASA (CW) during the investigation of the design deficiency.

b. Design Deficiency Correction for Uncompleted Project. Where the District Commander has not notified the non-Federal sponsor of completion of construction of the project in accordance with the terms of the PCA, the investigation and remediation of any design deficiency correction will be carried out and cost shared under the project PCA. The Federal share of all work on the project, including the deficiency correction, cannot exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit.

c. Design Deficiency Correction for Completed Project. The following procedures will be followed where the District Commander already has notified the non-Federal sponsor of completion of the project. The MSC Commander may initiate a reconnaissance-level study of the project with the sole purpose of determining whether the improper functioning is the result of a design deficiency. This study will be funded at 100 percent Federal expense under Inspection of Completed Works and will be limited to no more than \$100,000. If the study concludes that a deficiency exists, the corrective works will be processed as a new project decision. Design and implementation work will be carried out under the original PCA, once it has been modified to reflect the addition of the deficiency correction work under the new decision document, and will be cost shared in accordance with the current cost sharing formula for that purpose as established in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, as amended, unless, in the case of a project implemented with different cost sharing, an exception is granted by ASA(CW) during the reconnaissance-level study. However, if there is not an existing PCA for the project, one will be prepared to cover design and implementation work necessary to correct the design deficiency. The Federal share of all work on the project, including the deficiency

correction, cannot exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit. None of the costs of the work financed under Inspection of Completed Works will be counted against the applicable CAP per project limit.

### SECTION III - SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR PROJECT AUTHORITIES

#### F-23. Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended - Streambank and Shoreline Erosion Protection of Public Works and Non-Profit Public Services.

a. General. This program is designed to implement projects to protect public facilities and facilities owned by non-profit organizations that are used to provide public services that are open to all on equal terms. These facilities must have been properly maintained but be in imminent threat of damage or failure by natural erosion processes on stream banks and shorelines, and are essential and important enough to merit Federal participation in their protection. The streamlined formulation and justification procedures outlined in this paragraph are in recognition of the urgency of addressing such projects.

b. Eligible Facilities. Eligible facilities are: highways, highway bridge approaches, public works, churches, public and private non-profit hospitals, schools, and other public or non-profit facilities offering public services open to all on equal terms; and known historic properties whose significance has been demonstrated by a determination of eligibility for listing on, or actual listing on, the National Register of Historic Places. The historic property (ies) must be open to all on equal terms.

c. Restrictions. Although the facilities may be eligible for protection, the following situations are not eligible for implementation: work designed solely to protect undeveloped land or to protect non-essential, temporary, or mobile facilities; bank failure clearly not related to stream flow, storm, or wind driven waves; inadequate drainage (groundwater, surface runoff, overland flow, poor drainage undermining the facility itself and springs); facilities that are the cause of erosion (e.g. exfiltrating sewer-lines, drains, water lines, lagoons); erosion clearly and directly caused by the operation of a man-made project or facility (e.g. the use of navigation facilities or the operation of water control structures); levees or other facilities for which the owner has a contractual agreement with the Federal government to maintain; construction, repair, restoration, relocation, or modification of the facility to be protected; work within the limits of Corps projects which are operation and maintenance responsibilities of those projects; and work benefiting other Federal agencies, which will be accomplished on a cost reimbursable basis under other Corps programs.

d. Formulation and Justification. Following a finding of eligibility, and given the narrow geographic focus, low cost of these projects, and the imminent threat to the facilities, the formulation and evaluation should focus on the least cost alternative solution. The least cost alternative plan is considered to be justified if the total costs of the proposed alternative is less than the costs to relocate the threatened facility.

e. Valuation of LERRD. The valuation of LERRD for crediting purposes for a Section 14 project is the same as for any other project, except when the lands, easements or rights-of-way are part of the tract of land that includes the facility or structure being protected. In such cases,

the non-Federal sponsor will not receive credit for the value of LERRD it provides that are part of the tract of land on which the facility or structure to be protected is located, if such tract of land is owned by either the non-Federal sponsor or the owner of the facility or structure on the date that the PCA is executed.

f. Project Cost Sharing. Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as structural flood damage reduction projects implemented under specific congressional authorization. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for a minimum of 35 percent of total project costs to a maximum of 50 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must pay 5 percent of total project costs in cash, provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must pay additional cash so that its contributions equal 35 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

F-24. Section 103, River and Harbor Act of 1962, as amended - Beach Erosion and Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction.

a. Eligibility. This authority may be used for protecting multiple public and private properties and facilities and single non-Federal public properties and facilities against damages caused by storm driven waves and currents. All projects must be formulated for hurricane and storm damage reduction, in accordance with current policies and procedures governing projects of the same type which are specifically authorized by Congress (see Section IV of Appendix E of this regulation). Any policies and procedures applicable to Federal participation in projects involving beach nourishment must apply to Section 103 projects involving beach nourishment.

b. Project Cost Sharing. Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as hurricane and storm damage reduction projects implemented under specific congressional authorization. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 35 percent of total project costs assigned to hurricane and storm damage reduction, plus 50 percent of total project costs assigned to recreation plus 100 percent of total project costs assigned to privately owned shores (where use of such shores is limited to private interests) during the design and implementation phase. Any costs assigned to protection of Federally owned shores are 100 percent Federal. See Appendix I of this regulation and ER 1165-2-130 for more detailed guidance regarding cost sharing of hurricane and storm damage reduction projects. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than the non-Federal sponsor's required share, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash

payment so that its contributions equal the required share. OMRR&R on non-Federally owned shores is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

F-25. Section 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended - Navigation Improvements.

a. General. Section 107 projects are to be formulated for commercial navigation purposes in accordance with current policies and procedures governing projects of the same type which are specifically authorized by Congress (see paragraph 3-2.d.(2) of this regulation and Section II of Appendix E of this regulation).

b. As modified by Section 201 of WRDA 1996, Public Law 104-303, Section 101 of WRDA 1986, Public Law 99-662, requires that the term "general navigation features" include dredged material disposal facilities required for construction or operation and maintenance of the other general navigation features. Accordingly for Section 107 projects, both the Federal costs of initial construction and the Federal costs of construction for subsequent dredged material disposal facilities count toward the per project limit. Studies of projects for which the per project limit would be reached as a consequence of the construction of future dredged material disposal facilities should be converted to a GI study unless a waiver is obtained pursuant to Section I, paragraph F-7.b(1) and Section II, paragraph F-10.f.(4). of this Appendix.

c. Project Cost Sharing. Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as commercial navigation projects implemented under specific congressional authorization.

(1) Commercial Navigation. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 10 percent of total costs of construction of the general navigation features (GNF) (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) for depths, excluding associated over-depth and entrance channel wave allowances, less than or equal to 20 feet, 25 percent of total costs of construction of the GNF (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) for depths, excluding associated over-depth and entrance channel wave allowances, in excess of 20 feet but equal to or less than 45 feet, and 50 percent of total costs of construction of the GNF (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) for depths, excluding associated over-depth and entrance channel wave allowances, in excess of 45 feet during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor will participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the sponsor's contributions listed above is less than the non-Federal sponsor's required share, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that non-Federal contributions equal the required share. In addition, the non-Federal sponsor must pay an additional 10 percent of the total costs of construction of the GNF (including costs of construction of dredged material disposal facilities) which will be offset by the value of LERR provided by the non-Federal sponsor for the project. Further, the non-Federal



sponsor will be responsible for the construction and operation and maintenance of any local service facilities required for the project. Operation and maintenance (O&M) of the GNF will be a Federal responsibility. For projects in excess of 45 feet, the non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 50 percent of the increased costs of operation and maintenance. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix). The costs of O&M of the GNF are not counted toward the statutory Federal per project participation limit for Section 107.

(2) Recreational Navigation. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 50 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 50 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that its contributions equal 50 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

d. A Section 107 fact sheet including a project map must be prepared for all proposed Section 107 projects and submitted electronically to the appropriate HQ RIT for review, coordination within HQUSACE (including CECW-I), and consultation with OASA(CW) during the Federally funded portion of the feasibility phase. The CAP FCSA or the PCA (if a CAP FCSA is not required or has already been executed as of 31 January 2006) will not be executed until the OASA (CW) has concurred or non-concurred in proceeding with the project. However, in the event of non-concurrence, work on the project may proceed only to the extent that Congress makes specific allocations to the project. See page 43 of this Appendix for sample format of fact sheet.

e. If the decision document determines that the project is not economically justified, no further action shall be taken under this authority.

F-26. Section 111, River and Harbor Act of 1968, as amended - Shore Damage Prevention or Mitigation Caused by Federal Navigation Projects.

a. Purpose. This authority authorizes the planning of a justified level of work for prevention or mitigation of damages to both non-Federal public and privately owned shores to the extent that such damages can be directly identified and attributed to Federal navigation works located along the coastal and Great Lakes shorelines of the United States, and shore damage attributable to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Further, the Corps is authorized to implement such a project without specific Congressional authorization

if the Federal share of the first cost of implementation is \$5,000,000 or less.

b. Eligible work. Under this authority, Federal funds may only be used to address the shore damages caused by the Federal navigation works. If there are multiple causes for the damages, Federal participation in a Section 111 solution may continue only if the non-Federal sponsor agrees to bear all costs associated with correcting the shore damage not attributed to the Federal navigation works or if the integrated solution is pursued under both Section 111 and Section 103 as a Combined Plan in accordance with Section II, paragraph F-18 of this Appendix or under an authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction study or project. However, when there is a larger shore damage problem caused by more than just the Federal navigation works, a complete solution may be formulated under either an authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction study and project, or under Section 103. Section 111 cost sharing would apply to those portions of the project addressing damages caused by the Federal navigation works.

c. Coordination.

(1) Implementation measures proposed under this authority will be coordinated with other Federal and non-Federal shore protection projects in the same geographic area.

(2) To the extent practicable, any Section 111 projects and shore protection pursued under other authorities in the same area will be combined into a comprehensive regional project.

d. Restrictions.

(1) Geographic Limitation. Work under this authority extends only to the geographic limit of damages that can be directly identified and attributed to the navigation project.

(2) Construction, Operation, and Maintenance on Federally Owned Land. The Corps may not use this authority to provide shore damage control measures on Federally owned property when the Federal Government would be the major beneficiary. The Corps may include Federal property to be protected if the property is a small but integral part of the shore damage control measure but the Corps will not bear any financial responsibility for the share of project or maintenance costs attributable to these lands.

(3) Erosion Process. Works for prevention or mitigation of shore damages such as those caused by riverbank erosion or vessel generated wave wash will not be addressed under this authority.

e. Level of Mitigation. The target degree of mitigation is the reduction of shore damage to the level which would have existed without the influence of navigation works at the time such navigation works were accepted as a Federal responsibility. This authority will not be used to restore shorelines to historic dimensions.

f. Periodic Nourishment. Policy and procedures applicable to Federal participation in periodic nourishment for shore protection projects will apply to Section 111 projects with periodic nourishment.

g. Limit on Delegated Corps Implementation Authority. Section 111 provides the Secretary of the Army the authority to implement projects for which the estimated Federal first cost is \$5,000,000 or less (Feasibility phase costs are shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor in accordance with Section I, paragraph F-6.a. of this Appendix; these costs are not included in computing the estimated Federal first cost). If the Federal share of implementation costs for a Section 111 project, including periodic nourishment during the period of analysis, would exceed \$5,000,000, the project may not proceed as a Federal undertaking without specific congressional authorization. This provision applies even if the non-Federal sponsor is willing to be responsible for the amount of the Federal share exceeding \$5,000,000. If at any time it becomes apparent that the Federal share of total project costs would definitely exceed \$5,000,000, the Section 111 works may not proceed or continue as a Federal undertaking without specific Congressional authorization, and the work should be converted to GI in accordance with Section I, paragraph F-9 of this Appendix.

h. Items of Non-Federal Cooperation.

(1) Total Project Cost. The costs of implementing measures under this section must be shared in the same proportion as the cost sharing provisions applicable to the project causing the shore damage.

(2) Real Estate. The non-Federal sponsor's responsibility for providing interests in real estate, and for performance of facility or utility relocations, required for projects pursued under Section 111 will be the same as for the project causing the shore damage. HQUSACE should be consulted early in the formulation process if there are questions regarding this issue.

(3) Operation and Maintenance. The non-Federal sponsor is required to operate and maintain the mitigation measures, and, in the case of interests in real property acquired in conjunction with non-structural measures, to operate and maintain the property in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Corps.

(4) General. The above are items that are generally required to implement a project under this authority. However, given the wide variety of circumstances that could exist for Section 111 projects such items may not be appropriate for all projects. Therefore, for any projects proposed for implementation under this authority it is recommended that the details of the project be coordinated with the MSC, appropriate HQ RIT, and HQ Policy Compliance Division, early in the feasibility phase, to ensure that the appropriate items of cooperation are identified for the project.

F-27. Section 145, Water Resources Development Act of 1976, as amended – Placement of Dredged Material on Beaches.

a. General. The purpose of this authority is to provide for placement of beach quality sand, that has been dredged in constructing or maintaining navigation inlets and channels adjacent to such beaches, when the costs are greater than the least cost disposal plan, provided that (1) a State requests it, (2) the Secretary of the Army considers it to be in the public interest, (3) the additional cost of disposal is justified by reduction in potential hurricane and storm damages, (4) the non-Federal sponsor is willing to contribute the appropriate share of the

additional costs, and (5) requirements for public use and access are provided. In cases where the additional costs for placement of the dredged material is not justified, the Corps may still perform the work if the State requests it, and the State or other non-Federal sponsor contributes 100 percent of the additional costs. Consideration must be given to the schedule of a State, or a political subdivision of a State, for providing its share of funds for placing sand on beaches, and, to the extent practicable, accommodation of such schedule.

b. Feasibility Phase. There is no requirement to identify the NED plan for a Section 145 project. However, there is a need to demonstrate efficient use of Federal funds. The additional costs of the requested disposal must be justified by the NED benefits associated with the protection of the beach upon which the sand is placed and must meet all other related policies and procedures associated with storm damage reduction including but not limited to public access, environmental acceptability, cost sharing, and the provision of LERRDs. These analyses will be performed during the feasibility phase and shared 50/50 with the non-Federal sponsor.

c. Project Cost Sharing. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 35 percent of the additional costs of placement of the material. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. However, the non-Federal sponsor will not receive credit for the value of LERRD required for the project – only the incremental placements costs are shared by the Government. OMRR&R on non-Federally owned shores is a 100% non-Federal responsibility.

F-28. Section 204, Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended - Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material.

a. General. The purpose of this authority is to carry out projects for the protection, restoration, and creation of aquatic and ecologically related habitats, including wetlands, in connection with dredging for construction, operation, or maintenance by the Secretary of an authorized navigation project.

b. Determination of Base Plan. Disposal of dredged material associated with construction or maintenance dredging of navigation projects should be accomplished in the least costly manner consistent with sound engineering practice and meeting all Federal environmental requirements. This constitutes the base plan for the navigation purpose. If the base plan (least cost disposal alternative) includes disposal of material in a manner benefiting the environment the costs for this disposal are included in total costs of the general navigation features and funded accordingly. Where the disposal of material in a manner that benefiting the environment is not part of the base plan for the navigation purpose, the base plan shall serve as a reference point for determining the incremental costs of the ecosystem restoration features that are attributable to the environmental purpose.

c. Section 204(e) of WRDA 1992, as amended (often referred to as Section 207). Although it amends Section 204 of WRDA 1992, Section 207 of WRDA 1996 is a separate authority, which authorizes for navigation projects, subject to certain requirements, the use of a disposal method that is not the least cost option if the incremental costs are reasonable in relation to the environmental benefits. Implementation of Section 207 is not covered by this Appendix.

Therefore, the MSC and district should consult with the appropriate HQ RIT and the HQ Policy Compliance Division for appropriate guidance prior to considering use of this authority.

d. Project Cost Sharing. Any incremental costs above the cost of the base plan will be shared with the non-Federal sponsor. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 25 percent of total project costs of the Section 204 project during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 25 percent of total project costs of the Section 204 project, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that its contributions equal 25 percent of total project costs of the Section 204 project. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility.

F-29. Section 205, Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended - Flood Control.

a. General. Projects implemented under this authority are formulated for structural or non-structural measures for flood damage reduction in accordance with current policies and procedures governing projects of the same type which are specifically authorized by Congress (see Section III of Appendix E of this regulation).

b. Project Cost Sharing. Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as structural flood damage reduction projects or non-structural flood damage reduction projects implemented under specific congressional authorization.

(1) Structural Flood Damage Reduction Projects. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for a minimum of 35 percent of total project costs to a maximum of 50 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must pay 5 percent of total project costs in cash, provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must pay additional cash so that its contributions equal 35 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

(2) Non-Structural Flood Damage Reduction Projects. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 35 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor

must make a cash payment so that its contributions equal 35 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

c. If the decision document determines that the project is not economically justified, no further action shall be taken under this authority.

F-30. Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as amended - Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration.

a. General. The purpose of this authority is to develop aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects that improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost effective in accordance with current policies and procedures governing projects of the same type which are specifically authorized by Congress (see Section V of Appendix E of this regulation).

b. Project Cost Sharing. Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as ecosystem restoration projects implemented under specific congressional authorization. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 35 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that its contributions equal 35 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

F-31. Section 208, Flood Control Act of 1954, as amended - Snagging and Clearing for Flood Damage Reduction.

a. General. This authority provides for minimal measures to reduce nuisance flood damages caused by debris and minor shoaling of rivers. This authority is treated as a flood damage reduction project for policy eligibility and cost sharing purposes.

b. Restrictions. Work under this authority is limited to clearing and snagging or channel excavation and improvement with limited embankment construction by use of materials from the channel excavation. If investigation indicates that placement of revetment is needed to provide a

complete and fully effective project, this work will be accomplished at the expense of the non-Federal sponsor.

c. **Project Cost Sharing.** Projects implemented under this authority have the same project cost sharing requirements as structural flood damage reduction projects implemented under specific congressional authorization. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for a minimum of 35 percent of total project costs to a maximum of 50 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must pay 5 percent of total project costs in cash, provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, perform necessary non-Federal audits, and perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must pay additional cash so that its contributions equal 35 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

F-32. Section 1135, Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended - Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment.

a. **Purpose.** This authority provides for the review and modification of structures and operations of water resources projects constructed by the Corps for the purpose of improving the quality of the environment when it is determined that such modifications are feasible, consistent with the authorized project purposes, and will improve the quality of the environment in the public interest. In addition, if it is determined that a Corps water resources project has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment, restoration measures may be implemented at the project site or at other locations that have been affected by the construction or operation of the project, if such measures do not conflict with the authorized project purposes.

b. **Eligible Projects.** A project must fit at least one of the categories described in the following sub-paragraphs.

(1) **Modification of an Existing Corps Project.** These are projects that incorporate modifications in the structures or operations of a permanent water resources project constructed by the Secretary of the Army in response to a Corps construction authority. For projects in this category, there is no requirement to demonstrate that the Corps project contributed to degradation.

(2) **Restoration Projects.** Restoration projects may be undertaken at those locations where the construction or operation of an existing Corps project has contributed to the degradation of the quality of the environment. These projects do not need to modify an existing Corps project.

(3) Joint projects. Where a project was constructed or funded jointly by the Corps and another Federal agency, those elements constructed or funded by the other Federal agency may be modified using the Section 1135 authority. Where the construction or operation of the joint project has contributed to the environmental degradation, projects may be undertaken which contribute to the restoration of the degraded ecosystem.

c. Project Cost Sharing. The non-Federal sponsor is responsible for 25 percent of total project costs during the design and implementation period. In accordance with the terms of the PCA, the non-Federal sponsor must provide all LERRD required for the project, participate in the Project Coordination Team, and perform necessary non-Federal audits. The non-Federal sponsor also must perform investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER required for the project except for the investigations necessary to identify the existence and extent of hazardous substances on LER owned by the United States and administered by the Corps. If the value of the non-Federal sponsor's contributions listed above is less than 25 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor must make a cash payment so that its contributions equal 25 percent of total project costs. OMRR&R is a 100% non-Federal responsibility. The non-Federal sponsor's required share determined above could increase if the Federal costs of planning, design, and implementation for the project exceed the statutory Federal per project participation limit for this authority and the non-Federal sponsor agrees to contribute funds for any costs that would normally be part of the Federal share but are over the per project limit (see Table F-3 and Section I, paragraph F-7.b. of this Appendix).

d. Non-Federal Design and Implementation Work. For all Section 1135 projects, the value of non-Federal design and implementation work that can be credited toward the non-Federal sponsor's share of total project costs is limited to 80 percent of the non-Federal sponsor's share of total project costs.

e. OMRR&R. For Section 1135 projects, the costs of OMRR&R are a 100 percent non-Federal responsibility and the work is usually performed by the non-Federal sponsor. However, upon request by the non-Federal sponsor, the Government may perform the OMRR&R of a Section 1135 project modification on behalf of the non-Federal sponsor, if the entire Section 1135 project modification is on lands for which the Corps has the necessary real estate interest and is responsible for operation and maintenance (i.e. the land has not been leased to another agency for fish and wildlife purposes). In such event, the non-Federal sponsor must pay the Government, in advance of performance of such work, for the costs of OMRR&R attributable to the Section 1135 project modification. The decision to perform OMRR&R, on the behalf of the non-Federal sponsor, should be documented in the decision document and appropriate language should be included in the PCA addressing Government performance of OMRR&R.

f. Cost Allocation. The Section 1135 project features are in addition to the existing Corps project features, and they are distinct from mitigation. Therefore, the costs of the Section 1135 project feature will not be allocated to the existing Corps project, but must be shared in accordance with the provisions of Section 1135 of WRDA 1986, as amended.



**SAMPLE - SECTION 107 PROJECT FACT SHEET**

1. Project Name: Official Name of Project
  
2. a. Corps District:  
  
b. Sponsor:
  
3. Congressional Delegation: List affected House and Senate members. Include congressional District numbers.
  
4. Location: Provide one or two sentences, sufficient to locate the vicinity of the study/project area.
  
5. Problem: Briefly describe the problem and the scope of the study/project in general terms.
  
6. Alternative Plans Considered. Briefly list the features of each alternative, explain why the alternative was not selected, and state whether the alternative met policy criteria.
  
7. Description of Likely Recommended Plan. Include a brief narrative description of the likely recommended plan, including major features and expected outputs. Give full coverage to features sensitive to the eligibility criteria of paragraph 3-2.d.(2) of ER 1105-2-100.
  
8. As of the date of this fact sheet, are there any policy waivers required, including a waiver for deviation from the NED Plan? If so, provide rationale for waiver and highlight waiver request in transmittal.
  
9. Scheduled Initial Construction Award (FY):
  
10. Authorization, appropriations act, or report language: Cite specific provisions, and attach copies of language.
  
11. Financial Information:
  - a. Feasibility Study Cost: \$ (Federal share: \$ )
  
  - b. GNF Costs:  
Total: \$ (Federal share: \$ )  
(Plans and specifications: \$ )  
(Construction: \$ )
  
  - c. LERR Costs: \$
  
  - d. Local Service Facilities (LSF) costs: \$
  
  - e. Ultimate Federal Cost: \$

f. Benefit/Cost ratio:

g. Average Annual O&M Costs: \$

12. Complete Funding History by FY (Include one line for each additional FY):

	AMOUNTS SPECIFIED ("NAMED") BY CONGRESS	NET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR
FY		
FY		
FY		

13. Supplemental Information: Any additional information, which, may impact on an implementation decision on this project.

14. Project Map: Attach a map of the project area showing the navigation servitude boundaries superimposed over the general navigation features and local service facilities. The boundaries between the GNF and LSF must be clearly delineated.