Y 4 AP 6/1: IN 8/8/2001/pt.8

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2001

DEPOSITORY
SUPERINTENDENT
OF DOCUMENTS
0393A

JUN 27 2000

ST. JOHN'S LAW LIBRARY

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

RALPH REGULA, Ohio, *Chairman*

JIM KOLBE, Arizona
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., Washington
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania

NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
ROBERT E. "BUD" CRAMER, JR., Alabama
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

DEBORAH WEATHERLY, LORETTA BEAUMONT, JOEL KAPLAN, and CHRISTOPHER TOPIK, *Staff Assistants*

PART 8

	Page
U.S. Geological Survey	1
Minerals Management Service	81
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	91
Bureau of Indian Affairs	131
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	271
Office of Insular Affairs	273
Office of the Solicitor	307
Office of the Inspector General	313
Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration	355
Indian Health Service	361

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

ST. JOHN'S LAW LIBRARY
3 5952 01143 6715

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2001

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

RALPH REGULA, Ohio, *Chairman*

JIM KOLBE, Arizona
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., Washington
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania
NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
ROBERT E. "BUD" CRAMER, JR., Alabama
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

DEBORAH WEATHERLY, LORETTA BEAUMONT, JOEL KAPLAN, and CHRISTOPHER TOPIK, *Staff Assistants*

PART 8

	Page
U.S. Geological Survey	1
Minerals Management Service	81
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	91
Bureau of Indian Affairs	131
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	271
Office of Insular Affairs	273
Office of the Solicitor	307
Office of the Inspector General	313
Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration	355
Indian Health Service	361

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

64-252 WASHINGTON : 2000

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402

ISBN 0-16-060631-4

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida, *Chairman*

RALPH REGULA, Ohio
JERRY LEWIS, California
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois
HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky
JOE SKEEN, New Mexico
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
TOM DELAY, Texas
JIM KOLBE, Arizona
RON PACKARD, California
SONNY CALLAHAN, Alabama
JAMES T. WALSH, New York
CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina
DAVID L. HOBSON, Ohio
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR., Oklahoma
HENRY BONILLA, Texas
JOE KNOLLENBERG, Michigan
DAN MILLER, Florida
JAY DICKEY, Arkansas
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR., Washington
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
TODD TIAHRT, Kansas
ZACH WAMP, Tennessee
TOM LATHAM, Iowa
ANNE M. NORTHUP, Kentucky
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
JO ANN EMERSON, Missouri
JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire
KAY GRANGER, Texas
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania
VIRGIL H. GOODE, JR., Virginia

DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
NORMAN D. DICKS, Washington
MARTIN OLAV SABO, Minnesota
JULIAN C. DIXON, California
STENY H. HOYER, Maryland
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN, West Virginia
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
NANCY PELOSI, California
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOSE E. SERRANO, New York
ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
ED PASTOR, Arizona
CARRIE P. MEEK, Florida
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
MICHAEL P. FORBES, New York
CHET EDWARDS, Texas
ROBERT E. "BUD" CRAMER, JR., Alabama
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
SAM FARR, California
JESSE L. JACKSON, JR., Illinois
CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK, Michigan
ALLEN BOYD, Florida

JAMES W. DYER, *Clerk and Staff Director*

Department of the Interior

U.S. Geological Survey

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2001

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2000.

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

WITNESSES

CHARLES G. GROAT, DIRECTOR
CARLA M. BURZYK, BUDGET OFFICER
JOHN D. TREZISE, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
KATHY CLEMENT, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PAT LEAHY, CHIEF GEOLOGIST
DENNY FENN, CHIEF BIOLOGIST
DICK WITMER, CHIEF GEOGRAPHER
ROBERT HIRSCH, CHIEF HYDROLOGIST
ROBERT McLEAN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL WILDLIFE HEALTH CENTER, MADISON, WISCONSIN

U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY'S AGE

Mr. REGULA. I think we will get started. Today we have the United States Geological Survey. How long has this agency been in existence?

Dr. GROAT. 120 years.

Mr. REGULA. It is one of the older agencies, isn't it?

Dr. GROAT. 1879.

EARLY U.S. MAPPING

Mr. REGULA. That is interesting. I did a lot of land and title work when I was practicing law, and it amazed me how those surveyors could do locations back in the 1700s where there was nothing but forests.

Dr. GROAT. Find their way through the trees.

Mr. REGULA. Right. Yet they did a pretty darn good job laying out Ohio, for example, into sections and quarter sections.

Dr. GROAT. On foot and on horseback.

Mr. REGULA. I think George Washington at one time was a surveyor, even in the Ohio country.

Dr. GROAT. He was.

Mr. REGULA. Well, we are pleased to welcome the USGS team. Is there anybody watching the store?

Dr. GROAT. We left a couple.

Mr. REGULA. It is like when the President comes to the Capitol Hill, always one cabinet officer has to stay away so there is a suc-

cession in case of emergency. Anyway, you are a very important agency. We welcome your testimony and, Mr. Director, we will put your full statement in the record and look forward to whatever you would like to tell us about how much money you need and why.

INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. GROAT. Thank you, Mr. Regula. Let me start by introducing just a few people to you. I think Mr. Kaplan has introduced you indirectly to Kathy Clement, the Deputy Director.

Mr. REGULA. The bride to be.

Dr. GROAT. We also have our Associate Directors here this morning, starting with Pat Leahy over here, who runs our geology program, Denny Fenn, biology, Dick Witmer, geography, and Bob Hirsch, water. You know Carla Burzyk from our budget office, as well as John Trezise here from the Department.

OPENING REMARKS

I'm pleased to have a chance to make a few comments based on my testimony and I will hit the highlights. One of the things I wanted to do is respond at least briefly to what this committee asked us specifically about last year which was our future, what direction the Survey was going. I want to assure you that we have not changed our science role of trying to monitor and understand changes in places that people care about and that we really want to build on what we have learned over the past 120 years about the importance of understanding the way that the Earth works and the fact that if we are successful in understanding that from a scientific point of view, then science can really play a significant role in preventing crises, creating opportunities, and supporting long-term solutions to some of our most serious problems.

USGS MISSION

We really see our mission in the USGS is to use our scientific capabilities to understand natural processes and to communicate those understandings to the people who really need those understandings to make the decisions that are so important to the resources and the environment in this country.

I want to assure you and the committee I have asked our science leaders to develop future science directions for the bureau that are consistent with this vision of the kind of contributions we can make. Also, we are making an extra special effort this year and in the future to not only come up in our own minds with what science is needed, but in a very organized way to ask those people who use our science and who are partners in conducting our science.

Mr. REGULA. Do you include other government agencies?

LISTENING SESSIONS

Dr. GROAT. Other Federal agencies, State agencies, universities, communities. In fact next week, for two days, we are having what we are calling listening sessions. We have a large number of organizations that want to come in and just tell us what they think about us and about our programs. We are looking forward to that.

We are going to try very hard to make sure that our science goals do enable us to reach fundamental understandings of change, that our science is directed towards understanding Earth and life systems so we can model them and then make projections into the future, which is of course what we want to do the most.

We are also trying to develop tools that are needed to answer critical management questions, to be able to communicate our science. Finally, because there are many organizations that do science in some form; we are particularly interested in finding what our unique contribution can be to gaining science understandings.

These directions will build on our core scientific strengths which you and the committee are well aware of and remind us of—our ability to monitor, interpret, and maintain long-term databases that are key to understanding the changes and processes that are important.

OUTSTANDING SCIENTISTS

We also are going to rely, as we always have, on the outstanding cadre of scientists that we have. I think sometimes their excellence isn't recognized as broadly as it should be in the scientific community in general and by the public. They win many awards, do first class work, and are clearly our strength.

INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

We also have to match our investment in people with investments in infrastructure. Some of our most pressing needs, if we are going to be true to our goal to monitor and understand, are equipment and monitoring tools, that we have in the form of earthquake monitoring and streamgages, for example. They are so critical in getting those processes measured, monitored and the information into people's hands. We hope in this budget and budgets in the future to convey to you the importance of that as well as some of the more important tools such as the Landsat program that provide us with new ways to survey and monitor the Earth that are much more efficient than some of the ways we have had in the past.

So in that spirit, as I pointed out, we want to carry this message, our intended goals, our past records, and our capabilities to our stakeholders and let them help us shape our future.

BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

I will just make a couple of comments on the budget request that we put forth this year. Our first priority in the budget is the safety of people in this country. We feel that our natural hazards program is one of those that contributes most directly to the understanding of hazards and the ability to predict and minimize damages from them. As the cost of natural disasters has skyrocketed to $50 billion a year, we have recognized the need to increase our ability to monitor disasters in real-time. We are requesting this year $2.6 million to upgrade our earthquake monitoring system in critical cities where most people are in danger by putting at least 150 regional and urban seismic stations in place. Also in the area of flood prediction and understanding, we are seeking $4 million to improve

our existing streamgaging network. In both cases these are things that the Congress has specifically taken an interest in and asked us to talk about.

We also want to make it possible for people, wherever they live, to enjoy not only a healthy environment but the ability to earn a decent living, so we are asking for funds this year to communicate our science to them through decision support systems in the urban areas where urban growth is rapidly encroaching on resources that are important to not only the urban areas themselves but to the country. We are also supporting a program which would provide $30 million for partnership projects across the country to both create and increase the use of geospatial information in decision making.

Resources are an important part of our program and understanding how the land changes and how it responds to changes imposed on it is an important part of our program. We want to develop more sophisticated tools for predicting how the land interacts with the oceans and with the atmosphere and how it reacts to the many uses that humans are increasingly putting on it as our population grows.

We singled out this year one of the more critical areas where both congressional and on the ground attention has been focused and that is the Pacific Northwest, where there are some very critical habitat issues related not only to the salmon and fish but related to forest use and understanding the ecosystems. The systems that support all of these things are of both commercial and environmental importance. So we are requesting a $4 million increase to enable us to provide the integrated science in the Columbia River Basin that is necessary for that. We are also seeking an additional $1.3 million to increase our capabilities in areas we have been working in the past in the Yellowstone area and Mojave Desert and in the Great Lakes, with a new effort and an integrated program.

We are also seeking $10 million for decision support to protect America's heritage and to cooperate with States with state planning partnerships in making this information available.

Finally, a really important part of this bureau's responsibility and the Department's responsibility is towards the western lands and the parks and refuges across the country. A $13 million request is included in our budget for 2001 to provide integrated science support capabilities to the Department of the Interior bureaus and $2 million to enhance our assessment of amphibian loss in the United States by adding the upper and lower Mississippi areas to our amphibian efforts.

And finally, one of the emerging areas where our biological capabilities are coming to bear is the relation between wildlife health and human health. We read in the papers about the West Nile virus last year and the encephalitis cases that were caused by it in New York City. There is a lot of concern on the East Coast that as the spring comes and mosquitoes come back out again, we are going to see a resurgence of the problem. We are requesting an additional $1 million to enhance the capability of our Fish and Wildlife Disease Program to deal not only with West Nile virus but with other wildlife diseases.

Mr. REGULA. Do you work with the Fish and Wildlife Service on all these things?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, we do. We work with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on that one in particular. We also work with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention many of the health agencies in State and Federal Government.

Our Cooperative Research Units Program in the Biological Research activity is an important part of our cooperation with universities. This year we will reach an historic level if we are successful in getting the increase we requested of $700,000. That will fill out the scientific staffs in all the Cooperative Research Units across the country. They have never been at that level before and our request is a testimony to the value we place on them and the important role they play in our biological research program.

Mr. Regula, that is in summary form where I think our emphases are in making our science useful and where we think the budget enhancements would make us more effective and efficient.

I welcome questions.

[The statement of Dr. Groat follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT
of
DR. CHARLES G. GROAT
on the
FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
before the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
March 16, 2000

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee. It is a great pleasure to come before you today to present our proposal for the budget of the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) for Fiscal Year 2001. The proposed budget requests $895 million, an increase of $82 million over the Fiscal Year 2000 enacted level. This historic request will enable us to enhance a number of our core science and monitoring programs to more fully realize our potential for providing the Nation with "Science for a Changing World."

Before I begin, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for your strong support of the USGS over the years. You are a good friend of the Survey, and I speak for all of us in the USGS when I say we appreciate what you have done for us.

This morning I will forgo the usual recitation of our recent accomplishments. Rather than focus on the past, I want to talk to you about our future. Last year, this Committee asked specifically about the USGS vision of our future role. I am happy to spend a few moments sharing our views on where the USGS is going, why, and what tools we need to get there. I also look forward to hearing your thoughts on these topics as well.

As natural scientists, we at the USGS have a long-term view of things. We know that the history of our planet is a history of change. Our role is to monitor and understand change in the places people care about -- our marine and inland coasts, our national parks and refuges, our vast and beautiful natural heritage of lands and rivers and living things. The USGS also provides a context for understanding change in our natural world, both the changes caused by our human activities, as we live and build and work and play on our planet, and the natural processes of change that continually shape our world and form the backdrop for human influences.

We have learned from the past century that understanding the way our Earth works is essential to the well being of our society. Our experiences with natural disasters, with issues of resource scarcity, with unexpected environmental effects of well-intentioned decisions, have taught us that scientific knowledge is the critical tool that permits the early detection of and early response to emerging problems. Science can prevent crises. Science creates opportunities. Science supports enduring solutions.

Our mission at the USGS is to understand natural processes and to communicate our understanding to people who can benefit from this information. Policymakers at all levels, from the U.S. Congress, to a business, to a local community, need accurate forecasts so that they can

envision the consequences of the many choices they face today. The decisions made today will shape the world we inhabit tomorrow.

I have asked our key science leaders to develop the future science directions for the bureau, incorporating the views of external partners such as the National Research Council as appropriate. Some of the overarching questions they are considering include:

- Will the science goals of our programs enable us to reach fundamental understandings of change, sustainability, and resilience of natural systems?
- Is our science directed toward understanding earth and life systems so we can model them and make projections into the future?
- Are we developing and delivering the tools needed to answer critical management questions, both today and for the future?
- What is the unique contribution of USGS to understanding and resolving societal issues?

More specifically, we are studying the ways in which the diverse capabilities of the USGS can provide the science needed for

- mitigating the impacts of earthquakes through better maps of potential ground shaking and through rapid notification of the onset of earthquakes;
- resolving conflicts over the management of rivers for multiple purposes such as water supply, habitat, hydropower, flood control, and recreation;
- developing strategies for the detection and control of invasive species;
- guiding protection and development of our Nation's coastlines consistent with growing coastal populations and vulnerable estuary and wetland environments;
- developing a better knowledge base for the sustained development of our Nation's ground-water supplies;
- guiding land-use decisions to ensure the availability of natural resources and the safety of growing communities;
- providing information on the availability, quality, and development impacts of energy resources;
- providing near real-time detection and warning of wildland fires in the United States and its territories and of volcanic activity and associated volcanic ash clouds worldwide.

These statements should sound familiar. They build on our core scientific strengths in monitoring, in interpreting, and in maintaining long-term databases that are key to understanding the Earth. I take great pride in the outstanding caliber of USGS scientists, whose excellence is recognized by their peers through countless honors and awards. We are committed to maintaining and enhancing our scientific excellence by training our current staff, to ensure that their knowledge and skills remain at the peak of their fields, and by bringing on board a new generation of bright and dedicated scientists who can ask and answer the questions of the future.

Investments in people must be matched by investments in our scientific infrastructure, in our laboratories, our monitoring instruments and systems, and the technologies we use to communicate with other scientists and with the public. Our budget request includes specific items that will strengthen our capabilities in real-time earthquake and streamflow monitoring, ensure the continued availability of Landsat remotely sensed data for earth science monitoring

and research, and enhance our ability to provide excellent science, effectively communicated, to those who need it.

People rely on our information to help them make decisions that shape the future for their communities, the Nation, and the world. Hence we have an increasing responsibility to ensure that our scientific results are effectively communicated. We welcome this evidence of our value, and we recognize that our success brings with it the obligation to strengthen our dialogue with our customers.

As Director of the USGS, I have taken steps to work with our stakeholders to help us envision the best future for the USGS. Our goal is to provide the scientific information that the Nation and the world need to thrive-- not simply survive-- in the 21st Century. Next week, the USGS leadership will be meeting with many more of our stakeholders to get their help in shaping our vision of the future.

Now let me give you a few highlights of our proposed FY 2001 budget.

Budget Highlights

USGS has developed four overarching themes within which program components address science challenges related to people, wildlife, and the land and resources that support them:

Safer Communities (+$7.1 million) -- The cost of natural disasters -- earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, coastal storms -- has skyrocketed to more than $50 billion per year. The USGS helps communities become more resilient to natural disasters by providing fundamental understanding of and information on them in real time. The USGS proposes to enhance its ability to provide advance warning of impending natural disasters, enabling communities to save lives and property. From the study of earthquakes in Alaska and the Pacific West, to floods in high-risk areas around the Nation, USGS efforts will help create stronger and safer communities.

A $2.6 million increase will expand and modernize our earthquake monitoring in urban areas in the United States. This request will install or upgrade a total of 150 regional/urban seismic stations as is proposed in the plans developed for the USGS Real Time Hazards Initiative and for the Advanced National Seismic System. We are requesting $500,000 to expand the real-time volcano monitoring capability at one additional high-risk Alaskan volcano. Since FY 1996 we have installed, operated, and maintained seismic monitors at 20 active volcanoes in Alaska's Aleutian Islands so that airplane encounters with ash clouds can be averted. This initiative also includes $4 million to improve our existing streamgaging network. We will be working with the National Weather Service and other partners to determine locations for adding stations and upgrading existing gages to provide the real-time information needed by emergency managers and the public during floods.

Livable Communities (+$47 million) -- Americans want communities where they can enjoy a healthy environment and earn a decent living. To balance competing demands for natural resources, recreational opportunities, wildlife habitat, and economic growth, planners need reliable tools and an immense amount of information. The USGS delivers these products to the

doorsteps of communities, helping them to plan for intelligent resource use and growth. With the funding proposed for FY 2001, USGS will work with local communities to solve natural resource problems by providing easy access to understandable, usable information on the natural resources vital to community health.

We propose $10 million for decision support for Urban Dynamics as part of the Department's Lands Legacy program. The funding will allow us to expand efforts to understand landscape change in large metropolitan regions and assess the impacts of such changes on a regional scale. This work will enable us to transfer historical data and tools to organizations around the country to plan for sound urban growth.

Also supporting the Lands Legacy program is a $30 million increase to fund partnership projects across the country to increase creation and use of geospatial information for informed decisionmaking. These partnerships are aimed at developing local solutions to local problems. Of the $30 million requested, $25 million will be allocated through competitively awarded matching grants and cooperative agreements. Through these partnerships, USGS and communities will share the cost of generating data and providing tools that both solve local problems and address national interests.

The OhioView pilot project taught us valuable lessons about using the Internet to deliver natural science data. In 2001, we propose investments in our information technology infrastructure that is a necessary precursor to expand partnership models like Ohio View to other regions of the country. A $2 million increase will enable us to expand, improve reliability and speed for data delivery, and provide real-time data to customers by upgrading transmission lines.

Data from Landsat satellites have provided the United States and other users with a continuous stream of land-image data since 1972. These data sets are of great value to the earth science community. In the current Mozambique flooding, for example, Landsat 7 satellite images from April of 1999 and March of 2000 are being analyzed by the United Nations and Mozambique officials to determine the impacts on transportation systems, extent of flooding, where to establish relief centers, and conditions in populated areas. A $5 million increase will allow USGS to assume long-term management responsibility for Landsat 7 operations in 2001. USGS has partnered in various ways with the Landsat programs over the years, and responsibility for operation of Landsat 7 is a logical fit with the core mission of USGS.

Sustainable Resources for the Future (+$15.3 million) -- Understanding how the land responds to change is essential for our continued enjoyment of the natural landscape in the future. With additional funding in FY 2001, USGS will develop tools to predict how the land interacts with the oceans and air and how it reacts to the many uses humans make of it. Focused research on river, coastal, and wetland habitats and other critical landscapes will increase our understanding of how these major systems respond to change and enable us to develop restoration tools for areas that have been altered. With a solid understanding of how the Earth works, we can help to ensure thriving landscapes for people and wildlife.

Over the past 50 years, the Columbia River landscape has been changed by urbanization, heavy logging, and agricultural development impacting its natural resources, including Pacific salmon.

A $4 million increase will enable us to provide integrated science for managers to establish a foundation for restoring natural processes within the river, monitoring system health, and improving the survival of critical species.

The budget includes a $1.3 million increase to address critical and emerging resource management issues in the Great Lakes Region, the Greater Yellowstone Area, and the Mojave Desert. We will approach these place-based studies with the combined expertise of our multiple disciplines to predict consequences of decisionmaking. We will also work with local, State, and Federal managers to develop decision support tools addressing high-priority resource issues through our proposed $10 million increase for the State Planning Partnerships, part of the Department's Lands Legacy program.

America's Natural Heritage (+$16.7 million) -- A vital part of America's natural legacy is its parks, refuges and other public lands, many of which are entrusted to the Department of the Interior. These landscapes and the fish and wildlife they support are key to our core national identity. USGS, in partnership with stakeholders throughout the Nation, is helping land and resource managers preserve our natural heritage by monitoring, assessment, and research that address issues of critical importance.

The budget includes a $15 million increase to support the Department's highest priority science needs. This includes $13 million for "DOI Science Priorities" that will be dedicated to bureau-specific projects and $2 million that will be used for monitoring the Upper and Lower Mississippi River Basins to characterize habitat in areas of demonstrated amphibian loss, to develop methods to use spatial analysis techniques to predict potential loss, and to conduct comprehensive research studies on causal factors.

With $1 million for new research on Fish and Wildlife Disease, we will better understand diseases such as the West Nile virus in birds of the East and Gulf Coast States, to mitigate the impacts of the disease on humans.

Finally, I would like to complete a multi-year effort to fill and support all science vacancies in the Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Units program by requesting an increase of $700,000. This program allows government and non-government entities with common interests and responsibilities for natural resource management to work together to address biological resources issues.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this budget request strengthens our ability to provide "Science for a Changing World." I would be pleased to answer any questions this Subcommittee may have.

Charles G. Groat
Director
U.S. Geological Survey
Reston, Virginia

Current Responsibilities

Dr. Groat became the 13th Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S Department of the Interior on November 13, 1998. As Director, he is responsible for leading the Nation's largest water, earth, and biological science and civilian mapping agency in its mission to provide the scientific data that enable decisionmakers to create sound policies for a changing world.

Among his many professional affiliations, Groat is a member of the Geological Society of America, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Geophysical Union, and the American Association of Petroleum Geologist. He has also served on over a dozen earth science boards and committees and has authored and contributed to numerous publications and articles on major issues involving earth resources and the environment.

Career History

Groat, is a distinguished professional in the earth science community with over 25 years of direct involvement in geological studies, energy and minerals resource assessment, ground-water occurrence and protection, geomorphic processes and landform evolution in desert areas, and coastal studies. From May to November 1998, he served as Associate Vice President for Research and Sponsored Projects at the University of Texas at El Paso, following three years as Director of the Center for Environmental Resource Management. He was also Director of the University's Environmental Science and Engineering Ph D. Program and a Professor of Geological Sciences.

Prior to joining the University of Texas, Dr Groat served as Executive Director (1992-95) at the Center for Coastal, Energy, and Environmental Resources, at Louisiana State University He was Executive Director (1990-92) for the American Geological Institute From 1983-88, he served as assistant to the Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, where he administered the Coastal Zone Management Program, and the Coastal Protection Program.

From 1978-1990, Dr. Groat held positions at Louisiana State University and the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources which included serving as professor for the Department of Geology and Geophysics, and as Director and State Geologist for the Louisiana Geological Survey. He also served as associate professor (1976-78) at the University of Texas at Austin, in the Department of Geological Sciences, and as Associate Director and Acting Director of the Bureau of Economic Geology.

Education

Dr. Groat received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Geology (1962) from the University of Rochester, a Master of Science in Geology (1967) from the University of Massachusetts, and a Ph.D. in Geology (1970) from the University of Texas at Austin

EVERGLADES SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. REGULA. I have a few questions, and then I'm sure Mr. Cramer does. Everglades. How involved are you in this project of restoring the water and the Everglades and the whole water resources issues in the Everglades?

Dr. GROAT. We are heavily involved. We have about $8.6 million in our budget that is to support studies in the Everglades in cooperation with the other agencies that are involved there. In addition to that, through some money that is appropriated to the National Park Service, we receive grants and contracts to do work related to their mission. I would say that we are a significant player in the water and life science issues there.

Mr. REGULA. Would you characterize yourself as the lead science agency on the Everglades—on the entire package which includes the Everglades, the South Florida Water Management District, agriculture, the whole works that is all part of this program?

Dr. GROAT. I would say the lead Federal science agency, certainly, yes.

Mr. REGULA. Does the State have any capability?

Dr. GROAT. The State is involved. I couldn't answer how much they are supporting science but they are certainly a partner in the planning efforts.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION SHARING

Mr. REGULA. I understand that. You mentioned in your opening statement about evaluating the Earth as a total. Are there other countries that have comparable agencies to yours that you can share information with and work with?

Dr. GROAT. It has been interesting to watch over the past few years how countries which have increasing pressures on their resources, both living and non-living, are looking to geological and biological based organizations to work with. We are seeing in our own continent the Canadian Geological Survey, which was at one time a very traditional mapping and minerals oriented program, expand their program to get into such things as global change, marine issues. Mexico is putting together a National Geological Survey for the first time that will deal not only with minerals but with mapping.

We were recently in Saudi Arabia where the Saudis, who are very much a traditional energy producing area and mineral producing area, are creating a Federal Geological Survey to also deal with seismic hazards, coastal problems, and water problems. And many are involving biological elements in this.

So there are existing surveys that are strong and there are emerging surveys that have a similar function to ours in other countries around the world. We do cooperate closely with them.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

Mr. REGULA. You do share information then. Do you have countries that send their teams over here to find out how you do it in this country?

Dr. GROAT. We do. We are very open to having capacity building operations where they come to our centers and to our laboratories

and we work with them, allowing them and helping them to use the tools that we have available to apply to their problems in their countries.

Mr. REGULA. The three that occur to me as huge land masses would be China, India, and Russia. How much activity do they have respectively?

Dr. GROAT. Just by coincidence riding up here this morning I was talking with Denny Fenn about some of the cooperative work we have with China. We have about a dozen or so people from Hunan Province coming to the United States in April to spend 5 weeks learning how our National Biological Assessment Program works because they are becoming more and more interested in that. We have groups from Canada. We have groups at various times from around the world here.

The recent Central American hurricane disaster a year or so ago, Mitch, brought us there to help them but it also brought some of their folks here to gain some of those skills.

INTERNATIONAL CONCERN FOR ENDANGERED SPECIES

Mr. REGULA. Are other countries showing concern about endangered species?

Dr. GROAT. I think they are. They react in different ways. Some of them set aside very tight preserves where nothing else is allowed to happen to protect certain species. Others take a more broad based approach to it. But the concern is that as populations grow that those kinds of things are going to be more prominent issues.

CLEAN WATER PROGRAMS

Mr. REGULA. Are you involved in the clean water programs that are becoming more and more critical in the United States in terms of preserving the quality of water, both streams, lakes, for domestic use?

Dr. GROAT. I think that is one of the best examples you could pick to demonstrate how valuable our long-term monitoring capabilities are because in looking at trends of how water quantity in surface- and ground-water changes, how water quality changes with time, so we can measure the human impact. Our records and capabilities are used very extensively to characterize that. We also have topical programs that deal with water quality issues such as hypoxia in the Gulf, nutrient transport, arsenic in New England, various kinds of pollutants that are important. So we both monitor and do specific work related to those things and we work closely with EPA in providing that information to them in their programs.

STREAMGAGE MONITORING

Mr. REGULA. You mentioned stream monitoring. I think maybe some other agencies do that also. How do you avoid duplication of effort?

Dr. GROAT. Well, in stream monitoring at least from a streamgaging point of view, there aren't too many organizations that maintain their own streamgages. They tend to cooperate with us as partners through the Federal-State Cooperative Program where we maintain the gages that are of interest to both us and

them. That is not to say there is no other agency that ever put a streamgage in. They do but not to any great extent.

GROUND-WATER STUDY

Mr. REGULA. Last year our committee requested that the survey study the ground-water program and provide ideas for the development of a ground-water research agenda. Is that under way, and does your budget continue to address this high priority area?

Dr. GROAT. It is underway. Our concern about the adequacy of our ground-water program is very high. We had hoped this year, to see a significant increase in our request for ground-water programs. We were not successful this year, but we will certainly try again. We met with a group of water agencies from the States yesterday and discussed with them the importance of ground water and the need for more monitoring of ground-water conditions. They certainly agreed.

We will be adamant in our support for ground-water programs.

STREAMGAGE REPLACEMENT

Mr. REGULA. The survey has lost over 500 streamgages, I assume for various reasons. Is anything being done to replace these units?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, in response to the request that Congress made for the USGS to provide information on what it would take to bring the Nation's streamgaging system up to par, we provided a report. The $4 million we requested this year would reactivate, upgrade, or install approximately 100 gages across the country. Some of those are ones that are inactive. Some are being lost because cooperators are unable to match the funding that we can provide. In some cases we can't match the funding they provide. A more stable funding base is a central part of a truly national streamgaging program.

Mr. REGULA. Do you need more money for this program?

Dr. GROAT. We need more money, we need to have less reliance on local cooperators to maintain a very stable system for the country. We think it is a Federal and national responsibility.

Mr. REGULA. Looking at your programs it seems like you slanted them to some extent to partnerships, money going out to States and local communities, but I think our first priority is the Federal responsibility.

Dr. GROAT. I would agree particularly in streamgaging that to the greatest degree we can support that Federally, then we will have a much more stable system. We would certainly want local input as to where those stations ought to be, but if we depend on local funds to support them, then the kinds of losses you pointed out will occur for various reasons.

NATION'S WATER SUPPLY

Mr. REGULA. Water is not a State or local commodity. It travels over great areas, and I think you have to look at the Nation's water supply and the totality in terms of trying to protect it for the future needs.

Dr. GROAT. I would agree. There are very few places whose water supply depends only on their own back yard. It comes from streams

across county and State boundaries. It comes from basins across boundaries. There is truly a Federal role in integrating that information.

U.S. WATER QUALITY

Mr. REGULA. Do you think water quality in the United States is deteriorating?

Dr. GROAT. I think there is no question that water quality is deteriorating. We hear a lot of talk about quantity and certainty quantity is going to be a challenge but the quality issue, whether it is the result of new land uses like confined feeding operations, whether it is MTBEs, whether it is pesticides, herbicides, and pharmaceuticals that weren't in the water years ago but that are now there because of our modern society, the threat to water quality is certainly going to grow.

EVERGLADES SCIENCE BEFORE INVESTMENT

Mr. REGULA. I mentioned the Everglades. In your opinion, is the science that is available in reconfiguring the water system in the Everglades good science? That is really what this is all about—we are going to spend a lot of money to do this. Is the project based on good science? Is science out front, or is science catching up?

It seems to me historically things have been done in South Florida and the Everglades that weren't predicated on science. The Corps of Engineers dug 1,800 miles of canals. I am not sure that was a scientific decision. Now we are talking about a huge investment down there, and that is the thrust of my question. Are we basing it on good science? Is science out front instead of lagging back here?

Dr. GROAT. I would express due concern. I think good science is being done there. I think you would have a hard time convincing everyone that the science is well coordinated and that the science is necessarily in all cases being applied to the priority issues. In some cases the planning does get out in front of science. I have long experience in Louisiana where coastal land loss is a big issue. Much of what was done that caused the coastal land loss and even to try to fix it was done before people were concerned about using science as a tool for doing it right. For science to get out in front is a big challenge.

We are seeing an experience in the California Bay Delta area, for example, where they are looking for a coordination of all the science being done there so they can have a timely and significant input into the process. We haven't seen the same thing really happen in the Everglades. I frankly think it is a missing element there.

Mr. REGULA. I am really concerned that in the rush to deal with water supply for southeast Florida population growth, to ensure the Everglades is adequately watered, and to meet agricultural interests that maybe we are getting ahead of the science and we will invest a lot of money without knowing exactly what the end result will be.

Dr. GROAT. I think that is possible. I think it is only a harbinger of things to come. It is certainly an area that there is a lot of attention and resources focused on, but we can find many places in the

country where water issues are becoming increasingly sensitive and we are in danger of getting ahead of ourselves in responding to them. Then we risk doing something that we will pay the penalty for, for generations to come.

Mr. REGULA. The 1800 miles of canals is a classic example, a huge investment of resources there, and now we discover that maybe God had a better idea than we did.

Dr. GROAT. There is great value in looking at nature to see how systems ought to work as you retool systems that man has affected, no question.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Cramer.

PROPOSED BUDGET'S FUNDING LEVEL

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome to the committee and thank you for your participation with my office in making sure that we understand an agency that I think too few of our colleagues understand and thank you for your positive comments about the chairman. This is the best subcommittee of the Appropriations subcommittees and we deal with one another in a very open, almost informal way and we are doing this to make sure we understand the boundaries that we can work within.

This institution is full of mine fields that are beyond our control from time to time, but this chairman really helps us steer through those as best we can.

You probably know that Mr. Dicks is in another hearing or he would be here and should be here shortly. I am sure he will want to ask you a number of questions as well. But I came in a little after you started with your opening statement, and so I myself am playing a little bit of catchup here.

If you maintain the budget that you have or that has been put on the table, this is going to be a good budget year for you, a 10 percent increase, and that is not a luxury that you have had in a long time, and I was trying to understand how what you do is within your territorial bounds and yet you have got the National Science Foundation and even the Weather Service in some cases.

We had Carol Browner upstairs before my other subcommittee, VA–HUD, on the EPA issues that are occasionally troublesome for a lot of us, to say the least. The Secretary was here before and said that even with this fiscal 2001 budget you were still underfunded given the importance of your mission and the quality of your science. Where would you like to go in the next few years and what does this budget represent for you as an improvement on what you have had to deal with in the past, and try to give us some brief overview.

Dr. GROAT. I think this budget in a couple of cases opens the door to areas where we need to open the door wider, and I point there to two areas in particular: the natural hazards area in the sense of earthquakes and floods and in the water area in the sense of ground water. We see water resources in total is probably the most challenging issue that is going to face this country and the world in the future. We believe we have something unique to offer in understanding, as Mr. Regula questioned, both the quality and quantity of surface and ground waters. I would see our program in water science, broadly interpreted, as expanding.

We think that the ability to bring the talent that we have in our four different disciplines together to provide integrated understandings of some of these critical resource issues, whether they be watersheds, river basins, coastal areas, and human and wildlife health areas. This is something we can offer that no other Federal agency, or State agency for that matter, can bring to the table.

CREDIBLE SCIENCE

We also think that, again along the lines of Mr. Regula's question, that science, to be valuable in providing guidance for decisions at the State, local, and Federal level, needs to be objective, needs to be credible, needs to be free of the regulatory process. One important thing that the USGS does offer is that we are not tied to any management or regulatory function. Without discrediting in any degree the science that is done at EPA or DOE or places like that, they always have at least the appearance of concerns about how their science relates to their regulatory functions. It doesn't diminish the quality of their science but sometimes it does affect the credibility. We don't have that problem.

I would hope the country as a whole and our partners in the States and universities would see that as an asset as we try to bring science to bear on some of these critical issues. I think we are working very strenuously and successfully with NOAA, NASA, and EPA to provide that scientific credibility to things that they care about, whether it be difficult water quality issues or whether it be difficult land use kinds of issues. There again we have the capabilities that they can use.

So your opening comment was a telling one to us. We feel that sometimes what we are capable of doing isn't as widely known or understood as it should be and that we have nobody to blame for that but ourselves. We are trying very hard to become more visible and more open and in doing so increase appreciation for our science and make our science as responsive as it can be to what the true needs are. I think responsiveness, integrated science, and dealing with critical resource issues such as water are the key to our future.

COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL PARTNERS

Mr. CRAMER. How do you coordinate your program activities with other agencies with related missions like the National Science Foundation?

Dr. GROAT. Sometimes that becomes as much a matter of personalities as it does a matter of intent. Federal agencies will always say yes, we are cooperating and working together and can point to numerous examples where individuals from different agencies are in fact cooperating. We can do the same thing. We can find wonderful working relationships with EPA and the National Science Foundation, for example.

What we haven't had in the past, and I and others are trying to build, is cooperation at the policy level where we agree how our missions can mesh and where we agree how, without getting terribly prescriptive about it, when initiatives are put forward, whether it be a study of drought or storms with NOAA or whether it be trying to understand biocomplexity with the National Science

Foundation, that we truly need to plan together from the beginning of the program to determine how we are going to cooperate and then we will have a much more complete and thorough interaction between the agencies. We are making some steps in that direction.

I always pick NASA as the best example of how that could work. NASA has a wonderful technology. They provide tools for understanding the Earth that we have never seen before and they are going to provide more in the future. NASA to some degree is getting into the applications business and we feel that that is really our business. We have the capability to use those tools. What a wonderful cooperative relationship it would be for the U.S. Geological Survey, with all of its capabilities, to provide the science on the ground, working in close cooperation with NASA as they provide us the tools and the technology that we use. It serves a dual purpose—one in seeing their technology applied and also gives us the wonderful tools to make those applications.

I have had a couple of conversations with Administrator Goldin lately and he seems willing to open those kind of discussions. So I think it comes to personalities willing to cooperate and more cooperation at the agency level in addition to the good cooperation that does occur at the working level.

Mr. CRAMER. I think it is important and obviously a lot of our abilities to be successful have to do with establishing those kind of relationships, giving and taking with what boundaries exist, but when there is overlapping of course we in this arena expect there to be efficiencies and not duplication and coordination there. It is troubling this year that there is a $2.2 billion increase for science initiatives but nothing for USGS on the science side.

Dr. GROAT. We have some difficulties there, Mr. Cramer. I think part of it is our routes to funding. Those folks that work through the Science Committee seem to be identified as the science crowd. Since we are not in that parcel we tend to get classified otherwise. Those that know us, as you pointed out, realize that is not the case but for us to kind of elbow our way to the table in some of those things has been a challenge. We are working hard to do better, and I hope we can.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE

Mr. CRAMER. And I hope you can too and I hope we can help with that.

You have identified four themes represented in budget increases and among those are the safer communities with a plus-up of $7.1 million and the livable communities program with $47 million plus-up. It is hard to understand how much of an increase that really is from what I have seen here. Could you give me either now or later some information about what kind of increase that represents and in the case of the livable communities, I have scanned your statement here, give us some idea of what you expect to accomplish with that kind of plus-up.

Dr. GROAT. The livable communities is a large increase and it is a large increase in our partnership arrangements. For example, within that is $30 million, of which $5 million would remain with the U.S. Geological Survey and $25 million would go in grants and contracts to cooperators. We have tried to relate——

LANDS LEGACY INITIATIVE

Mr. CRAMER. Is that lands legacy?

Dr. GROAT. That is part of, what the administration has identified as its lands legacy program, yes. Our attempt there is to use those partnerships to enhance those that already exist. You see geologic mapping listed for $7.5 million there. We already cooperate and have a grants program with State Geological Surveys for geological mapping. This would further enhance that. Some of the money in that program would go towards our biological assessment programs, the GAP program and NBII. We already partner with people and this would enhance our ability to partner there.

In the geography program, money would go to communities and others who we participate with in both using and gathering geospatial data. So it is a large increase geared to the impact of science on decision making but oriented towards partnering and increasing our partnerships with those who both use and provide data that is important to us.

Mr. CRAMER. Just in case Mr. Dicks is not able to get here—I am sure I will leave that question on the Columbia River to Mr. Dicks. I want to because my time is obviously more limited. I want to thank you for the cooperation that you and Olivia Ferriter, who I finally found back there from your office, have given to my office on an issue involving Key Cave. Mr. Chairman, this has been a nightmare for a certain community in my district that has had to deal with Fish and Wildlife and you have come to the table. In fact there is a meeting going on in my district today down there where you have come to the table and they are coming to the table and I think we are going to use your program as the main umbrella to achieve something down there that the entire community is looking forward to. So I wanted to thank you for that.

Dr. GROAT. Thank you.

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

USGS VISIT WORTHWHILE

Mr. REGULA. Let me suggest to all the members if you can find a couple of hours, go out and visit USGS. You will find it is a remarkable facility and a great resource for the Nation. I think you will find it a very worthwhile expenditure of time.

Mr. Dicks, do you want to wait while I do a couple more?

Mr. DICKS. I would like to wait for one.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Peterson.

GROUND-WATER RESEARCH FUNDING

Mr. PETERSON. Thank you and good morning. We are interested in your work on water quality. How does the current budget request for ground-water resource studies compare to the levels a decade ago and do the needs for this science compare to those of a decade ago?

Dr. GROAT. I would have to provide that for the record, Mr. Peterson, as far as the actual budget expenditures compare to a decade ago. We have recognized in our own bureau planning that our efforts in ground water are not up to the need dealing with both quantity and quality. The need to monitor water levels and water

quantity are becoming ever more apparent. We would hope in the future that would be a major both programmatic and budget initiative for us.

[The information follows:]

GROUND-WATER RESOURCES FUNDING

Funding History From FY 1990 to FY 2001
(Dollars in thousands)

Fiscal Year		Program Element Name	Funding
2001	Estimate	Ground-Water Resources	2,887
2000	Enacted	Ground-Water Resources	2,800
1999	Actual	Ground-Water Resources	3,116
1998	Actual	Ground-Water Resources	3,079
1997	Actual	Hydrogeology of Critical Aquifers	2,995
1996	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	2,995
1995	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	3,095
1994	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	5,064
1993	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	6,175
1992	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	8,593
1991	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	10,703
1990	Actual	Regional Aquifer Systems Analysis	10,862

STREAM RESTORATION PARTNERSHIPS

Mr. PETERSON. But you can be helpful—in Pennsylvania we are dealing with a lot of mine reclamation and restoration of streams that have been actually killed by acid mine drainage. We have had some good success stories. We have a lot of organizations locally, when they get a little bit of Federal help, they are very successful. Can you be helpful to those organizations? Should you be a partner?

Dr. GROAT. We can. Both in our water program and in our minerals programs we are putting an increasing amount of emphasis on the restoration of lands that have been affected by the extraction of resources, whether it be minerals in the West or coal in the East, whether it is acid mine drainage or trace metals associated with metal deposits. I think our ability to measure and understand what were baseline conditions premining and what mining has contributed and how that affects the water and landscape quality is strong. Our ability to recommend methods for watershed restoration is a very high. We are working with the Office of Surface Mining, BLM, the Federal agencies, and State and local agencies to bring that expertise to bear.

Mr. PETERSON. Which of your regional offices should I—I have working groups that I think could use your expertise. Which office should we utilize for Pennsylvania?

Dr. GROAT. For Pennsylvania I think our district office in Harrisburg would be a good place to start.

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY

Mr. PETERSON. I will make sure that our people that are in those projects contact you and make sure that your people are there for them. I am not sure they are. They may be but I just never heard them mentioned. They have had some very good projects.

You have sort of recently become the research arm of a number of agencies and some of those agencies would like to have that ability back in house and I guess when that first happened, I wasn't sure whether I thought it was good or bad but I guess the independence today, I guess I am sort of buying that maybe the independence is good. We have too many agencies that they are using the scientific side to—by not feeding us all the facts kind of use their own research arm to substantiate what they are doing rather than putting the facts out there and letting decision makers then decide from the facts. The scientific integrity, would you mind commenting on what your thoughts are?

Dr. GROAT. I do think the independence is important and I do think that makes the science credible and most useful. I think the specific thing you are referring to is when the National Biological Service, which drew its membership from various bureaus within the Department of the Interior, was put together and then ultimately placed in the USGS as a fourth division for the USGS. I think the intent there mirrors exactly what you are saying, that the need for that group to still serve the science needs of the management agencies is no less than it has ever been and the mission of it to serve those bureaus has not changed. We are very sincere in making that a reality, but the independence of the group doing

the science, not under the cap of a particular management agency, does give it that credibility. Being housed in a science agency gives you the aura of being a science group and as well as the working conditions that are more suitable for conducting science.

So we think it is the right way to go. We think it has been very productive. We think we are providing a good home for them and we think we are providing good service to those agencies who need not only biological but the geological, hydrological, and mapping capabilities that we have.

Mr. PETERSON. With the way the fragmented Federal Government is, I sometimes wonder how we get anything done. Even the committee structure down here——

Mr. REGULA. If you will yield.

Mr. PETERSON. Sure.

BIOLOGY IN USGS

Mr. REGULA. We went through this. Six years ago there was an attempt to create a new agency, the National Biological Service, and at our insistence in this committee, it was put in USGS for the very reasons that you are outlining. You have fragmentation, and we needed to talk in totality because science, as the Director has said, touches a whole lot of things. It is endangered species; it is water quality, air quality; it is stream impact, land use, et cetera. It needs to be, I think, in one place. That is why we put NBS in USGS and called it the Biological Resources Division.

Mr. PETERSON. Both in State and Federal Government we have had too many agencies that have kind of utilized their research arm to substantiate what they were doing, whether it was scientifically right or wrong. I think we all fight that because we only make—we make decisions on information received and if we don't have good data, we are not going to make good decisions. We can make political decisions but those are not in our long-term best interest in my view. We have to make all our environmental issues on sound science and what is really happening.

Dr. GROAT. I agree. Mr. Regula's foresight and the subcommittee's foresight in doing what it did with the biological group and putting them in that environment, set the stage to make what they contribute as objective as we hope the rest of our organization is. It also created the capability to put the life and earth sciences together to deal with some of these complex issues. You mentioned mine restoration, stream restoration. You have to understand the water, the biology, the landscape.

We have all those capabilities in one organization able to work together to deal with it. Then you have not only objective and credible science, you have the right mix of science. So that action allowed us to do that. We have been very appreciative of that.

WELLSBORO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

Mr. PETERSON. You know we have a special interest in Wellsboro Laboratory, which is a high-tech laboratory that has been highly underutilized. We want to continue to work with you to make sure that laboratory is adequately utilized. I guess we are interested if—genetic research is something that maybe ought to be a part of that.

Dr. GROAT. Well, given our current relationships with the State of Maine over genetic research, I don't know how much of that we want to do. Genetic research with different species, largely threatened and endangered, is the key part of the science of understanding those species and fisheries certainly. Fisheries was Wellsboro's strength in the past and can be again in the future. Genetics is one important part of that, as is the whole question of fisheries habitat, the ability to recondition streams, particularly in mine areas, where fisheries can survive and can benefit. That kind of work done at Wellsboro and places like that would have benefits across the country. I think that is the right track for a place like Wellsboro. I think we are pretty far along in providing the plan to put that lab into full use.

Mr. PETERSON. We appreciate that. Thank you.

Mr. REGULA. If you will, I think the Everglades is a classic example where you need one lead agency, namely, USGS, because there is such a diversity of groups involved in it. We want to be sure the science is out front in whatever is done there so that the huge expenditure of money achieves desirable results.

Mr. Dicks.

ADVANCED NATIONAL SEISMIC SYSTEM

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry that I wasn't here for your statement, Dr. Groat, but I did appreciate the chance. You came by to talk to me the other day. I just wanted to go through a couple of things. Earthquakes are faced by many areas of the Nation, including the Pacific Northwest. Recently an advanced national seismic system has been authorized by the House. How will such a system benefit those areas facing earthquake hazards? And I hope you would discuss the real-time hazards initiative in your response.

Dr. GROAT. Certainly. Let me start with the real-time hazards initiative. One of the most exciting technological advances of the past decade is the ability to get information about impending hazards to people who need it in real time. Streamgaging can be essentially real time. Seismometers with the right types of instruments—strong motion detectors—can get the ground motion to places that are going to feel it ahead of the actual impacts so therefore it at least gives them a tiny bit of warning ahead of time. An important part of our upgrading of our national seismic network is putting the technology in place to do that.

You are correct the report that we provided in response to Congress' request lays out a pretty aggressive national program and we have embarked on that in this year's budget with funding to provide those kinds of seismometers, up to 150 of them, to some of the more critical areas impacted by earthquakes.

Mr. DICKS. How much money is requested?

Dr. GROAT. $2.6 million, I believe.

Mr. DICKS. $2.6 million?

Dr. GROAT. But I would have to also say that the number in our Advanced National Seismic System report to the Congress said it would take $170 million to equip the Nation in a way that is consistent with the need. So it is a very small step but it is important that we take the first step.

EARTHQUAKE PROGRAM

Mr. DICKS. It says here it is expected that legislation to reauthorize the earthquake program will be enacted into law this year. This legislation proposes over $30 million per year to replace the Nation's outdated seismic network. Have you taken a position on enactment of this bill?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, we have. That is the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction program which the Science Committee did approve. It was passed by the House, I believe, and is still pending in the Senate. That bill did authorize the $150 million or so for the seismic network, and we were very supportive because we feel that is the kind of science that needs to be done to provide the advance warnings that the Nation needs.

REAL-TIME HAZARDS FUNDING

Mr. DICKS. It says here for the first—for the past few years the Survey supported the concept of a real-time hazards initiative. However, the 2001 budget request included an increase of only $7.1 million for this initiative. At this rate how long will it take to put a comprehensive program in place as envisioned by the committee and the Survey?

Dr. GROAT. Far too long, Mr. Dicks. When you look at $170 million and the $30 million a year for 5 years that the House Science Committee authorized, that is a realistic timeframe to get the technology in place. At $2.5 million a year, doing the math quickly, we are going to be many, many decades before we can put that in place and that is not quick enough.

We already have too many people in harm's way. We have more people moving in every day because these areas that are exposed to natural hazards are also very attractive places to live. If we don't bring this capability, we are in serious danger of many losses of lives and property. We would like to see that move much quicker than our budget initiative proposes this year.

Mr. DICKS. So if the committee could help you in this area, this is something that would be welcomed by you, right?

Dr. GROAT. It would be welcomed very warmly, yes, sir.

INVASIVE SPECIES IN WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. DICKS. Let me ask you another one here. Examples of this—tell us what we are doing with gap analysis and invasive species programs? This has become a huge problem, invasive species as you know in the Great Lakes area and even out in my area, Puget Sound and Willapa Bay, a lot of it is coming from these foreign containerships that come in and these species are a huge problem. What can USGS do in this area?

Dr. GROAT. It is very frightening when you look at the numbers of introduced species that have come into this country over the past few decades as global transportation has increased. Our ability to understand how they fit into the habitat, what kinds of habitats are susceptible to them and the impacts they have on native species is not growing as fast as the invasion is taking place. We frankly think we could do a lot more than we are being asked to do in invasive species because our job is to understand the land-

scape and the habitats. We do understand the distribution of native species and what conditions make that distribution take place. We would like to see more of our science brought to bear on that.

INVASIVE SPECIES LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY

Mr. DICKS. Who has the lead? Fish and Wildlife Service, do they have the lead in the executive branch?

Dr. GROAT. I think the Department of Agriculture would probably be the strongest lead in that area. Fish and Wildlife Service certainly has a significant interest in that program. Bureau of Land Management has a significant interest because of the range lands in the West. We have a very small internal effort as part of our program to deal with invasive species. We have a small increase in our budget this year.

GAP PROGRAM

You also would need to know that the GAP program is a very successful program that is underway in every State to some degree and that does identify some of the critical habitat issues that relate not only to endangered species but relates to our understanding of those systems that are important. It is a very strong partnership program with the States, with fish and game agencies and with environmental agencies to catalogue inventory, put on maps and make available in a spatially referenced way that information.

SALMON RESEARCH

Mr. DICKS. Tell me, your budget includes an additional $4 million for work on the Columbia River related to salmon. Please describe the work and more broadly the role of the Survey in large river systems like the Columbia and the Snake River. I assume you are involved there, too.

Dr. GROAT. It was interesting to watch the salmon issue evolve and it evolved very quickly. Obviously it is the focal point, the lightning rod for interest in the Northwest. When you look at salmon, trout, and all the organisms that live in that ecosystem, we felt that we had available expertise to contribute to a very important regional issue in the Columbia and the Snake Rivers. That issue is how the system works biologically and hydrologically in terms of the water and the landscape. We are proposing an integrated study of the Columbia Basin which contributes to understanding not only the salmon but the whole ecosystem. We requested $4 million for a broad based comprehensive study rather than focus only on salmon or water quality or dam removal. We don't feel that is our role. We want to provide a much more comprehensive science background for that kind of decision making.

Mr. DICKS. The National Marine Fisheries Service is talking about possibly getting even the National Academy of Sciences involved in this. Maybe there is some way you could be coordinated with them or brought into it with them, because I would like to see you all involved.

REAL-TIME HAZARDS INITIATIVE

Just going back for one moment, as I understand it on your real-time hazards initiative, you are going to start on the West Coast and I think that makes sense because that is where you have got the earthquakes and volcanic potential. And I understand that the new—in the program for the State of Washington or Seattle, 20 seismometers are requested.

Dr. GROAT. That is correct.

Mr. DICKS. When would that happen?

Dr. GROAT. That would start next fiscal year. We would start in the fall with obtaining and deploying those instruments. And Seattle and San Francisco and Los Angeles and Salt Lake City would be the focus of the program because those are the areas where the threat is the greatest.

Mr. DICKS. Are we going to go another round, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REGULA. Yes.

Mr. Wamp.

Mr. WAMP. I will kind of pick up where you left off on this GAP analysis before you got to salmon. He wore us out on salmon when we were up there last year, didn't he, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DICKS. I want you to know, Mr. Wamp, that there are some hatchery fish that you can catch and have for dinner. It is the wild salmon that we have to protect. You might have thought that there was some inconsistency.

Mr. WAMP. After 5 days up there, I say if you all would quit eating so much of this fish, we wouldn't have this problem.

Mr. DICKS. Last night we got you a steak.

Mr. WAMP. It is this supply and demand thing, it is like this gas crisis. Just quit eating so much of that fish.

Mr. REGULA. You see why it is important that we travel.

Mr. DICKS. We learn a lot.

SOUTHEASTERN WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. WAMP. More than we care to learn.

The livable communities initiative though, actually you do have an $8 million increase I think, which helps this GAP analysis for this national biological information infrastructure, which I support and I hope in a bipartisan way we support that because that is a step forward, but I am with you on invasive species. We have David Simmerlof in our part of the world in east Tennessee and we are struggling to try to find a way in east Tennessee and the Southeast to tie USGS in with private initiatives to address—and institutions like the Tennessee Valley Authority, University of Tennessee, and the Tennessee River Gorge Trust and the Tennessee Aquarium out of Chattanooga to try to tie this invasive species issue in with kind of a public-private partnership approach to the Southeast. We have a dozen real problems with our ecosystem in the Southeast, and I raise all that in support of what you are doing and let you know I am trying to help year to year find a way through this committee to address those problems.

But the biggest problem is water. I was really blown away. Last month I went into a plant in one of my counties that touches the North Carolina line and Chairman Taylor, his district that joins

mine there in the mountains of western North Carolina and eastern Tennessee, there is some pretty good water and we actually have one of these water bottling companies which net with natural spring water and I went there touring it thinking this is just another business that I am going to tour and I was kind of surprised that they sell 2 to 3 million bottles a day out of this little plant in the middle of nowhere. And they have got, you know, half a dozen drills going way down into the ground and water is such an issue.

Now, in the South, Atlanta has got a major problem so where I live to the north of Atlanta, they want our water and everybody knows it now. It is just kind of since the Olympics it has become an even bigger issue and a lot of their folks are moving up to our part of the world to get away from Atlanta but there is this big connection now on water. We are trying to tie this together. Last year we wrote some language in the bill asking you all on invasive species, and the year before we were looking at fresh water, water research.

There is this group called the National Water Trust. It has kind of evolved into the National Water Center and it is a partnership between all these agencies I am talking about, TVA, University of Tennessee. We have got a graduate degree program now in Chattanooga in environmental engineering and they want to move more into water quality and environmental research. We are trying to find a way to make it work but USGS is key because you all are the water guys.

So water supply, though, not just water quality and not just your mapping and your knowledge of the issue, but water supply, now we are having these regional roundtables in the Southeast trying to work together on what kind of a crisis we are going to have in 10 years when we really have some water supply problems.

So we wrote language in the bill last year thinking that the bill might be signed in October that would require you all within 6 months to have a study back to us, but the bill didn't get signed till Thanksgiving so now you have till May 1, which kind of messes me up on my schedule of what to do in the coming year because your study is not going to be back until he needs to know what we are going to do next.

So I need to know as soon as possible how USGS can work with the National Water Center in Chattanooga on both invasive species and this water supply issue for the Southeast United States because I am very interested in this. People in Chattanooga are very interested in this. We have done neat things in sustainability, the environment, turned our air quality around. We are beginning to turn our water quality around, but we really want to look at this sustainable issue on water supply for the Southeast and play an active role.

There is a lot of private sector money that will come to the table if we can find a way to link through public-private partnerships on these issues of environmental responsibility and stewardship, particularly with water in Chattanooga. I will just tell you it happened with air quality. It happened with the Tennessee Aquarium and other initiatives like that.

Do you have anything to update us on on southeastern water supplies or USGS's role? You all participated in all of our forums but I really haven't found a way to pull all of this together where we have a true public-private partnership.

Dr. GROAT. We are going to meet the May 1 deadline, Mr. Wamp, but if you need some advance warning we will try to provide that for you. I have to comment on the water supply situation. Who would have thought 20 years ago the Southeast would be worried about water or that Tampa Bay, Florida, would be considering a desalination plant with all the rain they get. Water is not only a western issue. It is a national issue and there is no part of the country in which water quality and quantity is not going to be an issue. And the need to understand the water budget is fundamental to solving those problems. We think that is a strong role that we can play and that is why streamgaging is critical. We talk about streamgaging in the context of floods but it is also how we measure the quantity and quality of the Nation's water. It is also why getting more capability and comprehensive programs in ground water is so important because that is a resource that is not understood very well in a broad regional sense and which has a tremendously important role to play.

I think you can make no better investment, whether it is universities in Tennessee or the Federal Survey than in understanding water, water properties, water distribution as far as importance for the country. We see that as a very strong role for us whether it is regional planning in the Southeast or whether it is national scale databases and understandings of processes. It is critically important.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Mr. WAMP. Geographic information systems, our State has made a request to me which the chairman will see here in the next couple of weeks for a State mapping initiative. Is that in conjunction with you all or do you know—it is called GIS. Can you explain what your role is there and where their role might be if the State is looking at an initiative for a statewide mapping service.

Dr. GROAT. Geographic information system approaches to assembling information about water, the land, resources, human occupation and different data layers so we can analyze them is really a critical part of understanding resource and environmental issues. We play a strong role in that. We have a large program within our organization in cooperation with State programs through the National States Geographic Information Council to provide them with information they need, provide them with capabilities that they find useful in developing geographic information systems.

So with Tennessee and with other States, we work in that area. One of the kinds of partnerships that is in the livable communities part of our budget request is intended to work with States and with communities who have an interest in expanding their capabilities to develop geographic information systems. There we can truly partner with them and give them what they need to make that work. We do some work now and we are hoping we can do more in the future through the Community/Federal Information Program.

Mr. WAMP. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. I want to say your point on water in the Southeast is well taken. I visited the Chattahoochee. We put a lot of money in the bill to protect its riparian areas because I was amazed how dependent Atlanta is on the water in the Chattahoochee. Then they filter it through their plant, and everybody downstream is drinking it. I think that is a point well made.

Mr. Kingston.

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, we enjoy Tennessee water and Tennessee whiskey equally. I notice they don't have any shortage of the whiskey up there. Maybe you better tell your bottling plant you could learn something. I don't know. We just have to keep our eyes on you guys.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I am not wearing my frog tie today. It would be appropriate too. Let me thank you all for what you are doing on this amphibian research, and I appreciate working with your staff on it. It has been great.

The question that I have in terms of coordinating with other agencies, it always seems and I am not sure that there is a problem at all but sometimes the government agencies, there is always a push for who is going to be the lead or who rightfully should be the lead. I think this committee recognizes you all as the lead agency. Do you feel you are comfortable in that position? Are things being coordinated?

Dr. GROAT. It is interesting when an issue crops up how many agencies feel they have a role and sometimes pursue independent ways of dealing with that. We think at least within the Department of the Interior that we are seen as a lead agency and we are working with BLM and others who have interest in and resources committed to amphibian issues. I think we are comfortable with the role and feel that we are in it.

SOUTHEAST RESEARCH ON AMPHIBIANS

Mr. KINGSTON. If we can help on that aspect, let me know.

Also, it is interesting to my knowledge at the moment you are not doing any real research in the Southeast on the disappearance. Am I wrong on that?

Dr. GROAT. In monitoring and inventorying, the only areas we are really not working are the Upper and Lower Mississippi and we have a request in the budget this year to cover that. Whether we are doing real site specific work on any part in the Southeast, Denny——

Dr. FENN. We have a network of monitoring systems put in place that include the Southeast—Great Smoky Mountains, Everglades and some other places—so we are covering that area.

Dr. GROAT. So the monitoring does include the Southeast.

AVIAN VACUOLAR MYELINOPATHY STUDY

Mr. KINGSTON. Also on your bird study, the AVM, I will try to pronounce that, avian vacuolar myelinopathy.

Dr. GROAT. That is closer than I get.

Mr. KINGSTON. Anything going on in the Southeast, on that coastal area particularly?

Dr. GROAT. There is work going on in Arkansas I know. Denny or Bob McLean—we actually happen to have with us Bob McLean, the director of our National Wildlife Health Center, who is probably the world's expert.

Mr. REGULA. Please to the table, and give your name and position so we have it for the record.

Dr. MCLEAN. Robert McLean. I am the Director of USGS National Wildlife Health Center in Madison, Wisconsin. We have been involved with this avian vacuolar myelinopathy since 1994. It first appeared in Arkansas and has now moved to the Southeast. We have a study currently in North Carolina and are working in South Carolina and Georgia. There is something that is killing bald eagles and water birds, so we are continuing to try to figure out the cause of this unknown etiology at this time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now that we both have been upstaged by somebody who can pronounce this thing: specifically Georgia Southern University, or Savannah State University, can you look into the possibility of getting them in the fold on that because a lot of coastal birds in our area represent the entire coast of Georgia. I just kind of like to know not necessarily just for Georgia but also South Carolina, Florida on that.

Dr. MCLEAN. We do work with the University of Georgia on this issue on a regular basis and I know many people at Georgia Southern, Dr. Oliver is a good friend and I have worked with him in the past. His group has done some bird work there. We work with Dr. Chandler as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Are you familiar with the Raptor Center that they have there?

Dr. MCLEAN. Yes, I am.

SALTWATER INTRUSION

Mr. KINGSTON. That could help. Switching gears, on saltwater intrusion, have you all ever done anything on the Floridian aquifer in Georgia in terms of saltwater intrusion? It is always coming up. It goes back to what Mr. Wamp was talking about trying to look for sources of water.

Dr. GROAT. We do have studies underway of the Floridan aquifer right now, recognizing it is important to Georgia, South Carolina and Florida as well. This is one of the important ground-water systems that has relations to water supply, to surface water as well. So, yes, sir, we do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Have you ever studied in the past the Savannah River, Savannah River Harbor? Fish and Wildlife and Corps of Engineers right now are in the process of looking at that. Are you all in that at all?

Dr. GROAT. Bob Hirsch, do you want to comment on that?

Dr. HIRSCH. I am Robert Hirsch, Chief Hydrologist at USGS. I was just in Georgia last week and was briefed on our participation in the sound science initiative for the coastal area. In cooperation with the State we are doing about $800,000 worth per year of studies relating to the Florida aquifer, some of the overlying aquifers,

the saltwater intrusion running the entire coastline and actually up into South Carolina as well. Very active program dealing with that issue in conjunction with the State environmental agency.

Mr. KINGSTON. As you know, it is a very volatile issue right now. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH UNITS

Mr. REGULA. I have reviewed the budget for the National Park Service's, Biological Research Management Division for next fiscal year, and they are proposing to establish a number of new Cooperative Ecosystem Study Units at various universities. Can you explain how these units would be different from the co-op research units that you operate and we fund in your budget? Or is this a duplication of effort?

Dr. GROAT. I don't think it is a duplication, Mr. Regula. We fund—through universities—the Fish and Wildlife Cooperative Research Units. The program that you referred to is not only the National Park Service, but the expectation is that other Federal agencies will provide funding and scientific expertise to deal with issues beyond fish and wildlife. We are a participant in that program and we don't really see it as a buildup of duplicative scientific expertise in the National Park Service. Rather it is them providing resources to allow that expertise to be applied to other things they are concerned about. So at least up to this point, we have been a participant and are comfortable with it.

USGS PRESENCE IN OHIO

Mr. REGULA. Do you have an office in Ohio?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, we have water offices in Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. I was just curious because many of the activities like earthquakes and other hazards are in other States.

Mr. Dicks.

INVASIVE SPECIES

Mr. DICKS. Go back to invasive species again. Tell me again what you guys do on invasive species.

Dr. GROAT. Well, we do things that are related to specific species. We do things that are in support of the land management and resource management bureaus within the Department of the Interior. It is one of the great mysteries to me, Mr. Dicks, when the President signs an executive order, when 48 Senators sign a letter saying how important invasive species are to this country, that when you look at the net impact of that on budgets of organizations that deal with the issue, it is very small.

Mr. DICKS. How much is in your budget for invasive species?

Dr. GROAT. There is a $2 million increase in our budget.

Mr. DICKS. How much existing money?

Dr. FENN. Thank you. Denny Fenn, the Chief Biologist for the USGS. I think we have something in the order of about $5 million currently being spent. The kind of things that we are doing in the area are in some cases mapping and defining the extent of the problem. In other cases, it is working on biological control meth-

odologies for controlling invasive species that are already established or other kinds of methods for control and working with the agencies to try to help them solve the problem. And in other cases, it is expending some effort to try to provide some national leadership to bring all the groups together in scientific colloquia and symposiums to deal with the issues. We were recently involved in an international program in South Africa on some common problems between the nations, for example, with invasives.

INVASIVE SPECIES INTERAGENCY GROUP

Mr. DICKS. You mentioned the Agriculture Department. They take the lead? Is there an interagency group on invasive species?

Dr. FENN. There is.

Mr. DICKS. Who chairs that?

Mr. FENN. It is co-chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Interior and Jim Baker from the Department of Commerce. So it is at the highest levels in the three Departments. Agriculture has the lead in terms of trying to protect the country from new invasives moving in and they have a very large biological control research effort for agricultural pests, whereas the Department of the Interior is more concerned about it from an ecosystem and wild lands perspective.

One correction I would say is that in this budget, there is in the DOI Science Priorities initiative, the $13 million includes about $2 million in it for invasive species. It is not a specific line item but it is contained within——

INVASIVE SPECIES FUNDING

Mr. DICKS. That is in the Interior Department?

Dr. FENN. In the DOI Science Priority initiative of the USGS budget.

Mr. DICKS. $7 million?

Dr. FENN. There is an increase of about $2 million added to the $5 million we are currently spending.

Mr. DICKS. So that is $7 million total. So that is a total within the USGS, $7 million—BLM, Parks, Interior, other agencies have funds for invasive species as well?

Dr. FENN. For direct management of invasive species on their lands.

Dr. GROAT. Through our science support, they indicate to us their science support needs, they ask us to request monies for the science of invasive species and, as Denny indicated, we are requesting that. In addition they have their own monies for management of the invasive species themselves.

FEDERAL STRATEGIES FOR INVASIVE SPECIES

Mr. DICKS. Can you—that is what I wanted to get to is this control. What are we doing to try to deal with these problems? I understand the science, which is crucial. You have got to know how to deal with them but does the administration have a strategy for how we deal with these invasive species?

Dr. FENN. I think they do. I think that is part of the reason this new invasive species Council has been put together is to try to co-

ordinate across the three departments with the major problems and solutions. An example I will give you just to describe the kind of things that are going on is sea lamprey control in the Great Lakes.

SEA LAMPREY CONTROL

Mr. DICKS. What is it called again?

Dr. GROAT. Sea lamprey control. It is a kind of an eel like organism that attaches itself onto the side of lake trout and salmon and lives off the body juices of those fish. It slowly kills those fish and it has knocked the population of lake trout in the Great Lakes very low in the last 50 years. What USGS has done is to do some research on lampricides, chemicals that can be used to treat and kill these lamprey—attack them at their breeding locations in the confined streams around the Great Lakes, lowering the population of sea lampreys so the Fish and Wildlife Service and various agencies managing those animals can recover the lake trout.

That is an example of the kind of things that are being done now.

HARBOR SEALS AT HOOD CANAL

Mr. DICKS. I notice you also have a program on Hood Canal, a place dear to my heart, regarding harbor seals. Are you aware of that?

Dr. FENN. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. Which I think is a good idea. Because we are talking about endangered species, Chinook and chum, that are both listed on Hood Canal and to take a look at the increasing number of harbor seals that are feeding on imperiled runs of chum and Chinook and salmon in Hood Canal, a large natural inlet.

Dr. FENN. You have a situation there where you have relatively small populations where there used to be huge numbers and the seals have found out where the choke points are, where the narrow passages are and they are concentrating there, making it easier for them to capture these fish and taking huge proportions of them, lowering the population even further. What they are trying to do is keep that in balance. They are natural predators preying on their natural species but unfortunately salmon are in too small numbers to support that. That is what that effort is about.

Mr. DICKS. I applaud these efforts and I think much of what you are doing is good. I just wish we could have a more aggressive approach. I don't blame that on you. I know it is because of budgetary pressures.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Peterson.

ZEBRA MUSSELS IN THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. PETERSON. If we could go back to the invasive species. Maybe your partner shouldn't have left. How involved are you in the zebra mussel issue in the Great Lakes and tributaries?

Dr. FENN. Zebra mussels, I think we have two or three of our centers, the Great Lakes Science Center and our Upper Mississippi Ecological Science Center in Wisconsin that are deeply involved in

monitoring the spread of that species and in working on control methodologies that might help reduce the spread and the numbers of those animals that are causing so many problems up and down the Great Lakes. So we are spending, I don't know what the exact number is, but a fairly sizable chunk of money in both of those centers attacking the zebra mussels issue.

Mr. PETERSON. Do we have some light at the end of the tunnel?

Dr. FENN. It is a tough issue. The animal has some very fascinating ways of spreading itself and ways of reproducing rapidly so it is really a challenging problem at this point. We don't have any clear definitive ways of knocking it back. We haven't given up yet.

Dr. GROAT. Maybe the light at the end of the tunnel is the water is a lot clearer than it used to be.

Mr. PETERSON. They do serve a purpose but they are a problem. They are a purifier, right?

Dr. FENN. They are a filter feeder so they take a lot of the natural plant organisms out of the water, if you will, as they filter through it.

GREAT LAKES RESTORATION

Mr. PETERSON. Could you quickly explain your overall involvement in the Great Lakes and restoration of them and what role you play and who you partner with?

Dr. GROAT. One of our new initiatives this year in our place-based studies program is to bring together more of the partners in the Great Lakes that are interested and to focus on one area where we could get a good start and that is Lake Michigan and Lake Michigan Basin. That would be an interdivisional effort within the USGS and interagency effort with State and local agencies.

Denny mentioned the Great Lakes Science Center which works there. We also have a very strong coalition of Great Lakes States interested in geological mapping and they have formed a very innovative approach to three dimensional mapping that is applicable to not only geology but ground water, waste disposal and resources for the whole Great Lakes area, all the area that was covered by the glaciers. That is a very active, aggressive group that we have a strong partnership with.

I think our interest as well is the traditional water stations, monitoring stations. We have done studies on Great Lakes erosion. Remember a few years ago when the lake levels were so high and people were concerned and now we have the opposite problem. Lake levels are so low. Our coastal group has been working on water-level effects in the Great Lakes area. I think as our work in the Great Lakes expands, all of our divisions' efforts will grow as will cooperation with agencies from the regions who have concerns.

GREAT LAKES SCIENCE FUNDING

Mr. PETERSON. There has been huge progress made in the Great Lakes. I don't think enough people know about it. Are there any initiatives we ought to be funding? Is there anything we ought to be doing that could make us move forward quicker?

Dr. GROAT. One of the needs that has been identified in the Great Lakes is to apply a technology that has been extremely suc-

cessful off the Pacific coast at Los Angeles and in Lake Tahoe and that is to map the bottom of the lake in great detail. You can see topographic features, sediment patterns and if we are interested in those things that live in the Great Lakes, whether they are commercial fisheries or sport fisheries, understanding the bottom habitat is an extremely important part. This tool is a wonderful tool. We have had fisheries people being among the strongest advocates for applying that tool. We have looked at it. I couldn't give you any cost numbers right now, but we could for the record.

[The information follows:]

GREAT LAKES MAPPING

Detailed mapping of the lake bottom is done using either ship-mounted acoustic systems in deeper water (greater 10-20m water depth) or airborne laser systems. The objective is to obtain accurate bathymetry and bottom characterization data suitable for identification of resources and habitats at a scale consistent with resource management needs. Acoustic systems include multi-beam bathymetry and side-scan sonar. Multi-beam systems are the most suitable for the basin-scale coverage required. Side-scan sonar may be applied locally where more detailed description is required.

The cost of mapping with acoustic systems varies greatly with water depth. The width of the area mapped with each transit of the ship is approximately 5 times the water depth. Thus deeper water can be covered with fewer transits, and in less time. The common analogy is to mowing the lawn. Mapping in deep water is akin to having a mower, which cuts a wider swath, thus reducing the time required to cover any given area. Mapping costs of each of the lakes (US portion) varies from $3 million to approximately $12 million. The time required for data collection similarly varies from 1 to 4 years.

Laser mapping of the shallow portions of the lake depends almost exclusively on the area mapped. Mapping costs of each of the lakes could range from $2 million to $8 million. The time required for data collection, estimating the availability of airborne systems, varies from a few weeks to 2 years.

Mr. DICKS. Would the gentleman yield.
Mr. PETERSON. Sure.

SIDE-SCAN SONAR MAPPING

Mr. DICKS. What do you call this?
Dr. GROAT. It is a digital bathymetry program. It is side-scan sonar—instruments that send signals which bounce back from the bottom. We record those and it provides a very fine-grain detailed map of the bottom. We can provide you some examples from the West Coast and Lake Tahoe that would be very striking.
Mr. REGULA. Let me interrupt. There is a vote on the rule for the property rights bill. I had planned to reconvene because I have some additional questions but, Mr. Moran, I don't know if you want to come back or would you like to get yours in now.
Mr. MORAN. I would appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. PETERSON. Could I make one final comment. I think the chairman and I both have a special interest in Lake Erie.
Dr. GROAT. I grew up on Lake Erie, so I do too.
Mr. MORAN. This also is a special day, as the chairman knows. That lunch with the Irish ambassador is a no miss——
Mr. REGULA. I didn't get invited to that one.

CHESAPEAKE BAY WATERSHED

Mr. MORAN. Consider yourself blessed.
This subcommittee has been appropriately and consistently supportive of what you have been doing, and I particularly like the local communities initiative, the sustainable resources for the future. It is all exciting, and I think it is all constructive. I look forward to following the GIS system as you develop this system that John and the chairman have been talking about. It is going to be very helpful to far more communities around the country.
I would just like you to address specifically and briefly the Chesapeake Bay watershed. We have got some serious concerns that have been raised. I don't know how valid they are, but with all the development going on, particularly in the Washington Metropolitan Area, we are losing our trees, thus we see a lot of erosion. It affects our watershed and I would like to get your view on how important this is and what the trend is from the GIS surveys.
Dr. GROAT. I think it is extremely important not only for the Chesapeake itself but for understanding how those key coastal systems that are impacted by people respond. The more work we do, more impacts we see. We wouldn't have known a few years ago that ground water or the atmosphere are significant contributors to nitrogen loads. Or how important agricultural practices are in providing nutrients to the system. Perhaps more importantly, we were not aware of how much long range planning is needed to deal with these impacts. There aren't any instant fixes and if the science is truly going to guide the fixes, then there needs to be the time allowed and the management strategies developed.
So the Chesapeake is probably the best organized example in the country of science agencies and regulatory agencies working together both on the science and the management in conjunction with State and local areas. So I think it is extremely important for itself because of where it is. I think it is also extremely important

as a laboratory for how we deal with this in the Pacific Northwest or wherever we happen to be. We are putting a lot of effort into it and hope to keep that level of effort at least as high as it is now.

Mr. MORAN. Very good. Norm was showing me you do have some written material here about it as well. I will have to get out and see what you are doing.

Dr. GROAT. I would be pleased to show you around.

Mr. MORAN. Dr. Groat, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you. We are going to suspend here while we vote and then I know Mr. Dicks has some additional questions as do I, so we will be back.

[Recess.]

USGS REORGANIZATION

Mr. REGULA. I am aware that you are reorganizing the Survey, shifting responsibilities to regional directors away from divisions. Do you think this will be effective in maintaining your focus on national, long-term concerns of the Survey?

Dr. GROAT. I think it will, Mr. Regula. Rather than shifting away, we are really trying to bring more balance to our programs. Whether they be applied in the regions or nationally they have tended to be largely structured and controlled through Reston and through our headquarters. The effort here is to give those programs that are focused in the regions where our scientists are—where our scientists in the regions are doing their work and interacting with the people who use the science—more regional control. We don't intend to take our national programs like seismic monitoring, streamgaging programs and so forth and regionalize those. Those will remain as nationally guided, nationally instructed programs. We are just trying to get our science closer to the people who use the science and have them have a more direct role in the regions, designing programs that suit the regions. So they are all important and we are not diminishing one but we are expanding the other.

COOPERATION BETWEEN USGS AND STATES

Mr. REGULA. Do you have a lot of interaction with the States?

Dr. GROAT. We do on many fronts. I don't think you could find any one of our programs in our disciplines in our regions that aren't in some way cooperating with State agencies, whether they be mapping agencies or mapping programs, water programs, environmental programs. State interactions are a very strong part of our program and an increasingly important one.

UNCONTROLLABLE COST OFFSETS

Mr. REGULA. The Survey seems to be the only bureau that had to fully offset its uncontrollable cost increases with program decreases. Doesn't this policy defeat the reason for funding uncontrollables?

Dr. GROAT. Well, that has been a difficult challenge for us. Having to cut programs to cover uncontrollable costs is painful to the programs. It is painful to the bureau as it goes through the process of deciding what to cut and what not to cut. As far as how we are treated in that area related to other bureaus—other bureaus within

the Department of the Interior, we have asked some questions as well. I don't know whether John Trezise wants to comment on that or not, but we are discussing it. Let me put it that way.

Mr. REGULA. Let me say we are sympathetic too.

Dr. GROAT. Thank you. We would like to see a more direct approach to funding uncontrollables.

COASTAL AND MARINE GEOLOGY PROGRAM

Mr. REGULA. We have a high regard for your work and that may be reflected in our markup.

The committee has a long history of supporting the coastal and marine geology program. The budget this year proposes significant reductions and redirections of the core program. In many instances coastal issues need a better understanding by members. It appears that your budget would not treat this as a high priority. Maybe I am just not getting the thrust of what you are doing?

Dr. GROAT. Our budget this year does include a half million decrease in the pilot program in Kitsap County in Washington, which we actually concluded. It also includes a half million dollar increase in the Columbia River area for some of the coastal work there, so it really comes out as a net even as far as program monies, and then we do have the uncontrollable costs added. I guess my answer would be watch us in 2002. We recognize that coastal issues, whether it be the oceans or the lakes, are of increasing importance to the country and we have a wonderful ability with our integrated programs to deal with issues there.

So we are contemplating and testing on our partners and our clients a much more aggressive and comprehensive coastal program in 2002. So I think you will see more light there.

MAPPING AND DIGITIZING SCHEDULE

Mr. REGULA. Does this year's budget keep you on schedule for mapping and digitizing?

Dr. GROAT. Well, my honest answer is, yes, it does, but the sad part of the answer is it is a very, very slow rate and at the rate we are going now, it will take us 40 to 50 years to do the updating that we need. If we were to be very aggressive in updating maps and orthophotos—orthophoto based maps—digital databases, it would cost more on the order of $20 to $25 million a year to keep those constant. Yes, we are on schedule but the schedule is not nearly as aggressive as it needs to be.

MAINTENANCE BACKLOG

Mr. REGULA. I note that you have a maintenance backlog, and I think that in prior testimony the total is about $140 million, but you only have $2 million to address this issue. As you know, we have placed emphasis on all the agencies on backlog. Would you want to comment? That amount doesn't seem like it is going to get you there.

Dr. GROAT. It is not a big dent at all. We felt we made some progress last year when we were able to get some funding in there but relative to the need, it is very small and we haven't completely solved the puzzle yet as to how to give it higher priority and move

it along quicker than we are now. We would agree with the subcommittee that it is an important priority.

Mr. REGULA. Does it mean this backlog has any critical dimensions? Would we be able to meet really serious critical problems with the $2 million, or do you need some more there, you know, fixing a roof, for example. Leaks can be destructive or heating systems, all sorts of things.

Dr. GROAT. We have prioritized based on health and safety first and then on need in general second. So monies we have do go to those high priorities but it is not going to fix the leaky roofs and out of date plumbing systems in all the places that need it. So help there would be appreciated.

USGS AND FWS RELATIONSHIP

Mr. REGULA. When Jamie Clark, Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, testified before our committee recently, she described the relationship between her agency and USGS Biological Resources Division as challenging. Is that an accurate description?

Dr. GROAT. Well, I guess any family relationship is challenging. I find it only to be challenging in the amount of resources available for the work. Whether the biologic group is within the bureaus of the department or whether they are with us, there is never enough money to do all the work. That funding challenge is one that we would all like to see a solution to. I think the relationship of our scientists to their scientists, our receptiveness to listening to their needs and trying to meet them is very high. The folks are still in the same place. They haven't gone anywhere. They are still fulfilling the same mission. So I think it is a good relationship.

I think the positioning of the biologists and the people that serve them in the USGS is working well. I think the only significant challenge is dollars and we are doing everything we can to make it work. I think it is working.

FUTURE BIOLOGICAL DIRECTIONS

Mr. REGULA. What do you see as the future directions of the Biological Resources Division?

Dr. GROAT. I think they have proven their ability to do science in response to real needs in support of the DOI science bureaus and that is their first order of responsibility. I think being housed in the USGS, provides other opportunities to provide that life dimension to all the critical systems important to this country. I think we will see that without diminishing their support of Interior bureaus, they are their playing more and more of a strong role in many of the issues you have raised around the table here today. Whether it is in coast or watersheds or water supply, the biologic dimensions are going to be applied increasingly.

USGS BOTANISTS

Mr. REGULA. It makes me recall, I think we had a garden club member testify a year or two ago that we don't have enough botanists in government. Do you have botanists on your staff?

Dr. GROAT. I saw the number, and Denny might remember—20 or so—that we do have several botanists and of course botary is an

important part of natural landscapes in general, and in dealing with invasive species. We think we have a good mix of the right kinds of biologists.

GREAT LAKES MAPPING

Mr. REGULA. Great Lakes mapping. The budget for this year included funding. What is the status of this project?

Dr. GROAT. The $0.5 million, I believe it is that we have requested for Great Lakes, is to start the place-based study there.

Mr. REGULA. The mapping you just discussed a while back, the mapping at the bottom of bodies of water, or is this a different type of mapping?

Dr. GROAT. This is more of an integrated program focusing on Lake Michigan. It includes some mapping components but it has biology and geology as well. The kind of mapping that I talked about for the bottom of the Great Lakes isn't really underway right now. There has been some planning but it isn't being implemented right now.

Mr. REGULA. Maybe we ought to do a pilot project on Lake Erie.

Dr. GROAT. I would agree with that. Seriously that would be an excellent place to do it. Lake Erie is a relatively shallow lake. The habitats are critical.

Mr. REGULA. It is not too huge, but yet it is probably surrounded by pretty much of a cross-section of the kind of activities focused on a lake of that size.

Dr. GROAT. Our mapping people would welcome an opportunity to do a pilot on the Great Lakes. We think it would show great things.

Mr. REGULA. How much would that cost? Do you have any idea?

Dr. GROAT. I will find that out for you, Mr. Regula.

[The information follows:]

LAKE ERIE PILOT MAPPING PROJECT

Existing data used for mapping bathymetry and bottom type for Lake Erie date from the 1950's and earlier. The data densities, with observations separated by 10's of meter to kilometers, are insufficient for habitat characterization and resource management. Updated data and maps are needed to provide geologic and biologic understanding of lake-bed habitat character and processes. Managers also require more detailed bottom maps relevant to the location of offshore sand deposits and the impact of human activities (dredging, dumping, fishing, etc.). The required data density and accuracy can be achieved with newer mapping tools. Detailed mapping of the lake-bed is achieved through the use of sophisticated technologies which return accurate bathymetric and bottom characterization information. These technologies are coupled with GPS navigation to precisely locate the features mapped.

Multi-beam acoustic systems allow bathymetry and sediment characteristics to be mapped over large areas with moderate spatial resolution (measurements at approximately 1-2m intervals). This is sufficient for creation of bottom depth and bottom type maps suitable for identification of resources, habitats, and human impacts on a basin scale. Side-scan sonar surveys provide more detailed characterization of the bottom that may be locally required to differentiate habitats, particularly critical spawning areas, and to assess local populations, such as zebra mussel aggregations. Both these techniques rely on interpretation of acoustic signals reflected from the bottom. These techniques are not suitable for the shallower water depths (less than 10m) along the lakeshore. These shallow regions represent critical spawning and foraging habitats for many lake species, and are also areas of maximum human impact. Airborne Laser mapping provides the required bathymetric capability for shallow water, and ongoing development suggests it may also provide information relevant to the mapping of bottom composition. Furthermore, uniquely clear water conditions associated with the zebra mussel invasion offer a unique opportunity to broadly apply this technique. This is particularly true of Lake Erie, which has a broad shallow near-shore zone.

Multi-beam and side-scan mapping of the entire US portion of Lake Erie greater than 10m in depth would cost approximately $3 million annually over a 3 year period. This would provide for complete multi-beam coverage, and some detailed side-scan to meet specific management requirements. Initial efforts would begin in the Western Basin of the lake, where the need for detailed maps is greatest. To complete the mapping effort with shallow water data from airborne systems would cost an additional $6 million for Lake Erie, which has a relatively broad shallow shorezone, optimally spread over the same three year period.

The resulting maps and databases would be state-of-the-art management tools. The combination of high density, precision navigated, bathymetry and bottom characterization would be unique in the Great Lakes. Similar efforts in Lake Tahoe, off Los Angeles, and in the Stellwagon Bank and Florida Keys Marine Sanctuaries have been extremely successful.

OHIO PILOT PROJECT

Mr. REGULA. What is the status of the Gateway to the Earth/Ohio pilot project?

Dr. GROAT. We learned a lot from the Ohio pilot project. The real key for an organization like us that has huge chunks of data, whether it is in map form or other form, is getting it to customers and people who use it. This is what we learned in Ohio. While maintaining that we are trying to expand that work, the $2 million we have for increasing our computer infrastructure is based on what we learned in Ohio so that we can get our equipment upgraded to move that information out into the real world.

LONG DISTANCE LEARNING

Mr. REGULA. Do you get involved in long distance learning whereby a geology class at a university could interact with people in Reston in your headquarters?

Dr. GROAT. That is an interesting question. We have the capability for people using our facilities for long distance conferencing and for others to communicate with us. I am not aware that we have actually had long distance classroom participation in our programs, but it certainly could help.

Mr. REGULA. From what I have seen out there, it seems you have resources that would be very valuable to classes, science classes at a high school level as well as at the college level in the various disciplines. Maybe it is something you ought to think about because it is a coming thing.

Dr. GROAT. No question.

Mr. REGULA. The Smithsonian, for example, had a class out in Canton, Ohio, that was having like a classroom experience with a person at the Smithsonian, and the potential is enormous.

Dr. GROAT. It is. In fact, we do many things in the educational area. Many of our websites have programs designed specifically for different grade levels in the schools and they make great use of it. We have a teacher's packet, for example, that we give out. Student contact with our scientists using those kinds of communication technologies are really things of the future. In fact, our whole ability as a widely disbursed organization to communicate with each other to do classes and training rather than pulling all the people together in one place can use those very same facilities. The education of people outside the Survey with those inside can go hand in hand in using the same technology.

FIRE DETECTION EFFORTS

Mr. REGULA. I think the whole communications area is huge.

Last question. You are developing technology to detect fires; i.e., heat seeking technology, determining heat as to the source. Would this be useful to the Forest Service?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, we have a remarkable program in cooperation with the intelligence community and a facility that allows us to use some magnificent technologies. One of the great applications that we have been able to develop is to be able to sense and see very small fires with a very high degree of accuracy. We have tested it and we have also been out talking to various States about their

ability to use this and also with the Federal firefighting community. The real challenge that is left is not the technology itself which is, as you saw, very well proven, but getting that into the workplace. They have systems they use now, the fire towers, the traditional ways. Being able to provide our kind of information to them either over the Internet or through satellite communication is where we need to go next. That is our next big challenge.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Dicks.

Mr. DICKS. Under biological research and monitoring plan areas, you spend quite a bit of money, don't you?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, sir, we do.

ENDANGERED AND AT RISK SPECIES

Mr. DICKS. $113 million. Tell me about what you do on endangered and at risk species.

Dr. GROAT. Our role there is really to provide the information that understands the distribution, the ecology, the stresses that are put on various species whether they are threatened, endangered or whether they are part of the general population. So we lead towards understanding and we try to provide the scientific information that determines what the stresses are and then also to support the plans, the habitat conservation plans that are put in place to recreate the habitats that make them viable. And that is the approach we are really taking in the Pacific Northwest is understand the habitat so that you can deal with the issues.

Mr. DICKS. And you do get into ecosystem analysis too.

Dr. GROAT. Yes, sir, we do. We try to apply a systematic approach to understanding critical ecosystems—the Mojave Desert, the work Mr. Regula referred to in the Everglades—those are all part of the ecosystem effort that we have.

Mr. DICKS. And you did play a role in the Pacific Northwest forest plan?

Dr. GROAT. Yes, we did. We didn't have the lead but we provided some science support there. We have a laboratory in Oregon that was an active participant.

INFORMATION TO LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS

Mr. DICKS. How do you get the information to the local and State governments? For example, right now we have a listing of these salmon and each of the communities is developing a rule underneath the 4(d) rule to come into compliance so that they are not hit on take. Do you have a way of communicating with the local communities on this stuff?

Dr. GROAT. We have a way that is very general right now. One of the things we would hope for with the partnerships that we are proposing is that those communities that have a need for specific types of information could receive funding to work with us so that we provide exactly what they need. Right now much of the information they might need is there but they have to find a way to make it useful. This way we would fund a partnership to work with them to do that. The answer is that we are doing some but could do more if we had that kind of program in place.

Mr. DICKS. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

PARTNERSHIPS WITH COLLEGES

Mr. REGULA. Just a couple of questions. You have partnerships with colleges. I think I was in Los Angeles or somewhere in California where the earthquake system was such that the county government, the city government, the State government all were tied together for information purposes.

Dr. GROAT. We do. We have many partnerships with colleges ranging from our cooperative research units in the biological area to cooperative research arrangements, particularly on the West Coast in earthquakes, with Cal Tech and a whole bunch of schools there. They provide some of the science that underpins and supports the science we are doing and actually operate, help operate, some of the seismic monitoring networks that are there.

Mr. REGULA. Do you have similar facilities in Seattle and the State of Washington?

Dr. GROAT. We do have cooperative arrangements with University of Washington and Washington State for programs, both biological and physical.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

Mr. REGULA. Do you use any volunteers? I am just curious because that is a very strong feature of parks and forests? Do you use any in your programs?

Dr. GROAT. We do. We use lots of volunteers. We have folks we can't get rid of frankly who want to help. They volunteer and they provide science and provide other services. We have people who just have an interest in the things we do that serve as docents and participate in programs. So both at the center levels right up to the headquarters level we make extensive use of volunteers.

VISITORS TO USGS FACILITIES

Mr. REGULA. Do you get visitors at any of your facilities? I am not speaking of Reston but throughout the country.

Dr. GROAT. We do. At the regional level we hold large open houses at our regional centers and attract thousands and thousands of people. This year the big open house is being held at Menlo Park. We figure we will have 20,000 people show up there. We make a very extensive effort to showcase our programs and to showcase them in a way that is meaningful to the general public. Many of our centers and laboratories do the same thing on an individual basis.

USGS PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

Mr. REGULA. Do you and your staff people get invited to go to the Rotary, the Kiwanis and the Chamber of Commerce to tell your story in these communities?

Dr. GROAT. They do. One of the reasons for the reorganization and the regionalization related to this. One of the important aspects of balancing the regions with the headquarters is to empower and encourage those people that are out there in the regions to talk to anybody who will listen because if we are going to be better known, then we have got to be aggressive about it. So for Rotary Clubs, garden clubs, schools, citizens groups of all kinds, we think

we have something interesting to tell them and they generally find that to be the case.

BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. REGULA. Basic research. Will the reorganization strengthen it or at least maintain it as you have done it historically?

Dr. GROAT. We hope it is going to strengthen it. We define basic research as the research that provides the understandings of those systems and processes that we want to make useful to people. If we ever leave the basic research function, we are going to cut off the seed corn that makes our programs work. We hope that by expanding our programs, by expanding the appreciation for the need for the science, we will be able to attract more resources and more interest in doing the science itself. So the basic research function, the fundamental research function, needs to remain strong and needs to grow and needs to be relevant. As we replace people who retire, as we add to the work force, we need to be sure we are hiring the types of scientists that meet the needs of the future, not the needs of the past. That is an important part of our planning effort.

VISITS TO USGS WEB SITES

Mr. REGULA. Do you get a lot of hits on your web site?

Dr. GROAT. We certainly do. We have an arrangement with Microsoft for the TerraServer where we get 5 or 6 million hits or so a day. These are people all over the country who are interested in geographical information about where they are located, their houses and maps. Many of our websites get thousands and thousands of hits a day from all kinds of people.

Mr. REGULA. So you have several websites?

Dr. GROAT. We have one website that has hot links to many, many subsites and subsets so people can come into that central site and get access to all of them. The TerraServer is a separate entity.

INFORMATION ACCESS

Mr. REGULA. If someone were thinking about buying a piece of property, could they get information about the potential of that particular piece of property for, say, earthquake hazards, flooding or some of the other things that you cover?

Dr. GROAT. That is really the significant major objective of our Gateway to the Earth program. We want a citizen to be able to put their finger on a point on the map and access it and say I want to know everything I can about this area. Or they want to know whether it is safe for my house, whether the geology is stable, whether it is landslide or hazard potential, whether if I drill a well, I am likely to find water.

Mr. REGULA. Can you get that information?

Dr. GROAT. That information is all there now but it is not accessible in any easy sort of way. It is back to the question asked about the communities. How do we make it easy for a person who is not a scientist, not a technical person to get at our data, and that is what Gateway to the Earth and Community/Federal Informaiton Partnerships programs are intended to do, to facilitate their access.

We think if we can do that we are going to serve a larger, greatly increased number of people more meaningfully than we are now.

Mr. REGULA. I would think planning commissions, zoning commissions, developers would certainly use your information.

Dr. GROAT. They do. They use it extensively now. We just feel we have got 120 years worth of understanding of the Earth that we could make available to people and we need to organize it better and work with those communities to make sure it is in a form that they can use it. That is the major objective.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Dicks, you have anything further?

Mr. DICKS. No, I don't, Mr. Chairman. But we do appreciate the work you are doing and we hope you will keep us informed especially on this earthquake hazards issue. I think that is very important.

Dr. GROAT. We would agree.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you. I think this has been a very good hearing. Your testimony has been effective, and we all learn new things every day. We will try to be sensitive to your needs and a lot of what we are able to do will be determined by what kind of an allocation we have. We recognize the value of what USGS does on behalf of the American people.

So thank you for coming, and with that the committee is adjourned.

Dr. GROAT. I thank you, Mr. Regula, and the subcommittee for being interested and supportive.

[Additional questions for the record follow:]

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
HEARING QUESTIONS

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

FY 2000 Appropriations	$813,376,000
FY 2001 Request	$895,379,000
Difference	+82,003,000

FY 2000 Staffing	9 476
FY 2001 Staffing	9,502
Difference	26

Question: What is the status of investments in the long-term viability of the Survey in terms of adequate staffing, training, and instrumentation?

Answer: Our staffing levels are adequate to carry out our programs as funded by the Congress. With respect to training, USGS promotes professional development in its cadre of scientists at all program levels and will continue to do so. Regarding infrastructure and instrumentation, keeping current with the latest technology is a challenge given rapidly changing technological advances. We do utilize a working capital fund to provide a stable funding source for some planned instrumentation investments. Also, we propose modest increases on an annual basis to upgrade our information systems, monitoring networks, and data collection tools. Several such increases are included in the 2001 request The Congress has been supportive of these requests, within their tight allocation levels We will continue to work with the Congress to find ways to keep our investments in our instrumentation safe and up to date.

Question: The Bureau is requesting $18 million for uncontrollable costs. This seems rather low for such a labor-intensive organization. Does your request include all uncontrollable cost increases? If not, please provide to the Committee an analysis detailing all of the Survey's uncontrollable costs.

Answer: Yes, the USGS budget contains funding for all Department-allowable uncontrollable costs.

Question: In many instances the rationale for program decreases are based on scientific studies coming to an end. However, wouldn't you agree that as one scientific study ends funds should be shifted to the next high-priority study in order to maintain a vigorous program of scientific research?

Answer: Yes, as scientific studies end, funds are shifted to high priority projects that build upon our previous work or respond to emerging science issues. This budget proposes to fund some new areas of scientific study and to apply information and results of our current scientific work in new areas. Funds from completed or ending studies will be used to offset increases in other higher priority areas of our budget.

Question. What is the rationale for requesting additional FTE in the 2001 budget? How will these FTE be allocated between the field and Washington office?

Answer The USGS budget request includes an increase of 26 FTE These FTE amounts are initial estimates; refinements to them will occur as we progress through the appropriations cycle Based on our final funding level, we will allocate any additional FTE resources to our field operations where the new work in our programs will be conducted

Question How would you allocate the $25 million to States and local communities you are requesting for "State Planning Partnerships"?

Answer The USGS would allocate funds through competitive mechanisms such as cooperative data agreements, innovative partnerships, contracts, and interagency agreements. Each of these mechanisms will require that the cooperator/grant recipient match the funding allocation with either matched funds or in-kind services. The USGS plans to issue an announcement that explains the various program components as well as selection criteria and contract/grant mechanism details.

Question· Do you currently have the authority to implement such a grant program?

Answer. Yes. The USGS currently has competitive contract/grant mechanisms in place to establish partnerships with State and local communities (e g , the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977)

Question. Are you proposing to target these grants to specific areas? If so, please provide an analysis detailing the allocation of these funds?

Answer. USGS is planning to provide a general program announcement identifying the USGS programs that will be providing grants These programs include (1) the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, (2) Biological Information Management and Delivery, and (3) Mapping Data Collection and Integration. Each of these programs currently has criteria and procedures in place to solicit and select grant proposals. In some cases, geographic, or "target," areas may be given priority in the program announcement. These target areas may be identified because of gaps in national data coverage, multi-partnership requirements, or a high-priority science study area. In addition, specific geographic- or issue-based target areas are, in many cases, prioritized or established through multi-sector advisory committees

Question The Committee supports the Survey's efforts to distribute scientific information to local decision makers However, wouldn't you agree that the Survey's first priority is to provide quality information based on good science, and that this year's budget does not provide the resources to help improve the Survey's in-house science capability?

Answer: The USGS appreciates the Committee's support of our efforts to distribute scientific information to local decision makers However, we do not agree that this year's budget lacks resources to help improve our in-house science capability. While a significant portion of our proposed increase would be allocated as external competitive grants to local communities, an equally significant amount is proposed for USGS-conducted work in the areas of developing decision support tools, upgrading our real-time hazards monitoring activities, and augmenting long-term research in the areas of water quality and wildlife health.

Question: How do you expect to deal with such expensive and high-priority science programs such as replacing the Nation's outdated seismic network, or maintaining and expanding the streamgaging network, to name just two areas?

Answer. Expanding and modernizing hazards monitoring and information networks is a high priority for the USGS. We hope that by highlighting the critical work of these programs we can provide the visibility and leadership that will attract additional support from State and local governments and from the private sector We agree that increased efforts to distribute scientific information to local decisionmakers must be based on a solid foundation of scientific data from modern instruments and techniques. The FY 2001 budget places a high priority on upgrading USGS hazards information networks. The Real-Time Hazards proposal includes $4 million in additional funds to install or reactivate streamgaging equipment at 50 sites and upgrade existing equipment at 100 sites, $2.6 million to upgrade 150 new regional/urban seismic stations, and $0 5 million to expand real-time volcano monitoring. These increases are part of a multi-year plan that began in FY 2000.

Question: Your 2001 budget contains a modest proposal to increase seismic monitoring. Given the strong bipartisan endorsement of this program, why is the Administration moving so timidly to implement this important program area?

Answer: Given all of the competing priorities within domestic resources, the Administration believes the increase proposed will allow the USGS to begin to address the highest priority monitoring needs based on the multi-year plan.

Question: Recently the National Research Council reviewed the Survey's Coastal and Marine Geology Program. The results of this study indicated that the Survey was in a unique position to provide high-priority research to advance our understanding of the Nation's coastal resources. What is the Survey doing to advance the recommendations of the NRC?

Answer: The National Research Council (NRC) review was a thorough investigation of the USGS' Coastal and Marine Geology Program's recent accomplishments as well as its ability to meet national needs for scientific information. The NRC concluded that the impact and usefulness of the Program's efforts depends on its ability to provide scientific information and knowledge within a national context. It identified three scientific challenges for focus: to understand the dynamic changes along the Nation's coasts within a geologic framework; to develop a national knowledge data bank of the coastal geology; and to develop a predictive capability for the Nation's coasts. Due to limited resources, they suggested that in order to advance knowledge on a national scale while still addressing critical regional issues, the program would be required to restrict its breadth of issues that have been historically addressed.

The USGS is responding to these recommendations. The recommendations for improved data availability and broader integration of project results to provide national-scale products have been incorporated in our project planning process for FY 2001. As part of wider USGS efforts, we are increasing efforts to seek external input from collaborators and customers in the development of science plans and product lines. We have, with external input, developed an initial strategic plan for meeting the challenges presented in the NRC review and are beginning the process of developing detailed operational plans.

Question This Committee has a long history of supporting the coastal and marine geology program However, in recent years, including fiscal year 2001, the Survey's budget proposed significant reductions and redirections of this core program In many instances coastal issues in need of better understanding are brought to the Committee by members, yet your budget suggests that this area is not a high priority. Can you explain why you appear to be abandoning this core program area?

Answer We are not abandoning our core responsibilities in the Coastal and Marine program While recent budgets have proposed reductions, we regard our scientific contributions through this program as being vital to address pressing issues facing coastal and marine communities.

Question. Does the Survey believe that expanding the marine program at the present time makes sound scientific sense?

Answer: Given the wide variety of critical coastal issues throughout the Nation, expanding our coastal and marine program makes sense However, given overall priorities, expansion was not possible within this budget request.

Question: I see that you are proposing to redirect the $2 million included in last year's bill for the Gateway to the Earth/Ohio pilot. How are you proposing to reallocate these funds, and how will this affect the program being expanded into a national program?

Answer: USGS uses the term, "Gateway to the Earth" to refer to a USGS-wide program to create a coherent set of hardware, software, network, and people that will allow users to find, get, and use natural science information in ways that are useful to them. The OhioView pilot has been called "Gateway to the Earth" because it has some elements that could be considered prototypes for a national program. We will apply lessons learned in the OhioView pilot to our existing Internet communications system, particularly to transmit large amounts of data quickly. With the $2.0 million increase in the Science Support budget activity, we will begin to upgrade data transmission lines used to connect the three major regional USGS centers in Reston, VA; Denver, CO; Menlo Park, CA; with one another and with the EROS Data Center in Sioux Falls, SD. Upgrades will also be possible at five field offices (Ft. Collins, CO; Lafayette, LA; Austin, TX; Madison, WI; and Atlanta, GA). These monies will increase capacity by 30 times the current amount, improve reliability and speed for delivery of data and information, and provide real-time data to our customers across the country. This upgrade and improvement in USGS information infrastructure is a necessary investment for USGS to expand and replicate the OhioView model and other partnership models to other parts of the country

Question: What other areas of the country are presently competing for Gateway to the Earth program resources besides Ohio?

Answer: In FY 2000, other areas of the country requesting OhioView-type pilot resources include the Texas Water Development Board and the Mississippi Space Commerce Initiative. The Texas Water Development Board has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the USGS that outlines areas where cooperative activities would be mutually beneficial. One component of this agreement addresses the exchange of data and products over high-speed networks between the Texas Natural Resources Information System and the USGS EROS Data Center. We have an agreement with the Mississippi Space Commerce Initiative (MSCI). The MSCI requires near-real-time delivery of satellite and geospatial data over high-speed networks to support its activities in the State. Negotiations are ongoing to develop similar

agreements in FY 2000 with the California Land Science Information Partnership, the National Interagency Fire Center, the Alaska Geospatial Data Clearinghouse, and the State of Washington.

Question: It appears that in development of your budget request for the new C/FIP grant program you seem to have bifurcated existing programs by maintaining current base funds as an in-house program, while budget increases are proposed to go out as a grant. This policy doesn't seem to make a lot of sense, could you explain the rationale for this decision?

Answer Over the years the USGS has used cooperative partnerships with State and local communities to accomplish its mapping and science programs. Much of this work is conducted through cooperative agreements, interagency agreements, and contracting using base funds. For example, the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, (recently reauthorized under P.L. 106-148), has employed matching-fund grants with State geological surveys and universities to undertake cooperative projects since it was first authorized by the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992. The C/FIP program provides USGS with partnership opportunities to augment its core mapping and science programs, while at the same time leveraging State and local resources and requirements for better decision making at all levels. These augmentations and leveraging will be made in the form of competitively awarded grants and cooperative agreements For example, the C/FIP initiative has been endorsed through letters of support from the National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC) and the National Association of Counties (NACo) to increase partnership opportunities with State and county mapping and science programs. In addition, several States such as Utah, North Carolina, and Tennessee have contacted the USGS expressing support for the C/FIP initiative and an interest in entering into cooperative partnership arrangements.

Question: Examples of this bifurcation are the Gap Analysis and Invasive Species programs, where the program increases are included in C/FIP. The Committee believes that such an approach can jeopardize important USGS science programs. How does USGS respond to this concern?

Answer: Rather than bifurcate and weaken a core program, such as Gap Analysis, the C/FIP initiative is intended to strengthen it by making a broader range of Gap data available to a larger audience and by providing analytical tools and user support to resource managers. It would help USGS ensure maximum return on investment by providing broad scientific support to complex resource issues. Further, the Gap program would be strengthened by an expanded focus on areas of pressing need such as aquatic systems and invertebrate species coverage

The USGS Invasive Species Program is not included as a specific program increase request in the C/FIP initiative, but it will benefit from the initiative. It is anticipated that a portion of the biology component of C/FIP would be used to fund cooperative activities that increase the amount of biological data and information available through the National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII). Our focus will be on selected high priority topics and themes, including invasive species. The C/FIP increase would complement ongoing invasive species research by supporting activities of government agencies, university scientists and other groups to integrate their invasive species data into the NBII network. This additional information would help fill information gaps and provide scientists and resource managers with greater access to invasive species information from many sources.

Question: In terms of the Gap Analysis Program, Congress has already invested nearly $30 million in this program. This program documents the types of vegetation and the

distribution of species, on a State-by-State basis, so that we can better understand what components of our natural heritage are not well represented in parks, reserves, or other protected lands. How much work has been completed so far with the funds that have been provided?

Answer: Gap projects have been completed or are underway in 47 of the Lower 48 States. Alabama has not yet started, but work will begin this year. We also have completed preparatory work in Hawaii.

To date, 10 States have been completed, including statewide land cover mapping, modeling of vertebrate species distributions, analysis of land stewardship, and completion of final reports. These include: Arkansas, California, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. We anticipate that the end of calendar year 2000 will see the completion of an additional 27 States. These include: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho update, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon update, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. This represents the majority of the 48 conterminous States to be completed this year. While all State projects may not be complete today, much of the data that has been collected is already available and in use. For example, about three-quarters of the land cover mapping for the lower 48 States is now available.

GAP represents a new method of developing natural resources data. Significant research and development has occurred along the way. Also, special projects to expand or apply the data have been conducted. These include: aquatic pilot projects in New York and Missouri, development of decision support systems to aid counties and the Fish and Wildlife Service, support of county planning projects in New Mexico, Washington, and Tennessee and, support of the statewide Oregon Biodiversity Project.

Question: How is the Gap program coordinated with State fish and game agencies?

Answer: When the Gap Analysis Program initiates work on any State project, it first establishes the most qualified scientific/technical team available. We require that this team have expertise needed to conduct the project expertly and complete the project at a reasonable cost. State agencies, especially State fish and game departments, are always invited to participate in Gap projects usually as a principal investigator or in another major role. Often, as project teams become established, several State agencies play a principal role on or working with the team. Examples of agency contributions include sharing data bases, managing State projects, and conducting contract work. The goal of every Gap analysis project is to produce information products that are useful to its partners, especially State agencies because of their extensive responsibilities for lands, wildlife, and water resources management.

Question: Given that the State level Gap projects are the first attempt to collect and analyze data of this sort, what have we learned so far?

Answer: The real lessons learned are in the data. For example, the data from the 11 States where the vegetative cover is complete show that up to 90 percent of the vegetation types has less than 10 percent of their area in some kind of protected area. Although the Gap Analysis Program provides the scientific data rather than making management recommendations, such findings are most significant to the resource managers and planners who on a daily basis wrestle with issues of resource use and protection. The challenge for GAP

is to make sure that current, defensible, scientific information is available and usable by all who make resource decisions

We have learned that the State-based business model is the most effective and necessary way of conducting the Gap Analysis Program. As many Federal agencies are organized at the State level, securing their support for Gap, including the use of their data bases, requires a State-centered approach. As anticipated, however, State-based mapping has resulted in consistency challenges at boundary areas, so our project updates employ a multi-State or regional approach And even though future projects will involve several States working together, USGS will continue to develop agreements with individual States in order to obtain local data, expertise and commitment to the project. It is likely that we will use regional coordinators to oversee several projects to ensure consistency. Our experiences in the early years of GAP have also included tremendous advances in the technologies for classifying satellite imagery, for developing models to predict species ranges and habitat preferences, and in developing techniques to check the accuracy of our data.

Question: Why is this program important for ongoing land management and conservation purposes?

Answer: GAP was initiated to provide a proactive alternative to threatened and endangered (T&E) species listings by identifying potential problems far in advance and thus avoiding crisis actions that interfere with planned human uses of the land. GAP is the result of a 10-year commitment from Congress and the Administration to develop data that could be used in long-term conservation planning. Our approach is to facilitate this planning without the immediate pressures of dealing with species nearing extinction, with the goal of keeping common species common GAP provides information about which components of our natural landscape (vertebrate species and naturally occurring vegetation communities) are underrepresented in areas where they are protected. Because of the increasing availability of GAP data, land and resource managers now have an opportunity to weigh the impact of land use practices and better understand the effect of these practices on the future landscape.

Question: The current Gap program focuses primarily on land-based resources, but many of the Nation's most pressing management concerns involve fish and other aquatic resources? Are you planning on expanding this program to cover the aquatic environment?

Answer: Yes. USGS has planned to include aquatic resources. Frequently our partners request that Gap projects include aquatic resources At present, however, base funding of the program is insufficient to allow us to include the aquatic component of GAP at the same level of mapping and analysis employed for terrestrial resources. In the meantime, we have focused on improving the processes for conducting an aquatic component by funding pilot studies. These pilots, conducted in New York and Missouri, have been jointly funded with DOD and EPA, and have resulted in developing methods and protocols that have positioned GAP to be ready for a national effort when funding is available. Small amounts of funding have also been secured in a few States (Georgia, Ohio, Oregon, and South Dakota) that allows integration of a limited amount of aquatic information. The C/FIP initiative includes an increase of $4 million for GAP. If these funds are provided, GAP will incorporate the results of its pilot efforts into a national project model. The pilots conducted to date have focused entirely on freshwater systems covering a very small portion of the country. Even considering the excellent results we have achieved in States like Missouri, we are keenly aware of the challenges awaiting us in other areas as regional variation presents technical and theoretical challenges not yet mastered Our vision is to expand the aquatic component of GAP into key States and regions where personnel

and data are ideally situated to allow development of a model that can be used nationwide and that ties aquatics directly to the other components of GAP

Question. Are Gap projects active in all 50 States?

Answer: GAP projects are active in 47 States Projects are being organized and are nearly ready to begin in Alabama and Hawaii Alaska poses a significant challenge due to its size, biological complexity, the difficulty of obtaining cloud-free satellite imagery for its extensive land area and potential cost

Question. Is additional funding required for State projects?

Answer: Yes, additional funding is required for State projects if the goals of GAP are to be realized The $4 million increase for GAP (C/FIP) in the President's budget would give the program a significant boost. These funds would be used to accelerate the level of activity on State projects, to expand the scope of work done to begin incorporating aquatic resources into Gap work plans, and to take on large and complex projects, such as Hawaii and Alaska, that have not been feasible under the current level of funding

Question: As State Gap projects are completed, what are your plans to use the NBII for information dissemination?

Answer: Our plan is to ensure that Gap is a full partner in the National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII) by linking all GAP data sets to the NBII system and by meeting all NBII requirements and standards such as those for metadata. Many GAP datasets, information products, and tools are already available through the NBII network The national GAP data server, soon to come online will also be fully integrated with NBII.

Question: Will NBII develop tools that would help resource managers access and use data?

Answer: Yes, this is an important part of the NBII program. NBII is currently providing access to a variety of software tools that can be used to analyze biological data for fish and wildlife habitat evaluation and modeling population trends of selected species over time. The NBII also develops new tools that managers can use to locate the specific biological data and information they need from many widely distributed sources on the Internet Enhancement of the NBII program, as requested through the C/FIP initiative, would provide the support needed to develop and make available a wide range of advanced tools to allow managers to access larger, more complex data sets and complete the necessary analyses for resource management decisions.

Question. The Committee is pleased to see the proposed expansion of the National Cooperative Geological Mapping program However, as in the case of the Gap program it appears that you have bifurcated this priority program by maintaining current base funds as an in-house program, while budget increases are proposed to go out as a grant. What is the reason for this approach when the program is already being funded as a cooperative program between State Geological Surveys and the U.S. Geological Survey?

Answer: Additional funds requested for the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program would be distributed between the internal and external components of the program in accordance with the provisions of P.L 106-148 (recent reauthorization). These provisions

stipulate how mapping is prioritized and how funds are distributed The grants components of the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program have been in existence since 1992.

Question: How will expansion of this program serve the mutual interests of the Survey and the States?

Answer: Expansion of the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program will allow the Federal and State surveys to keep up with an increasing demand for modern geologic maps. The National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999 includes provisions for establishing priorities that serve the mutual interests and roles of USGS and the States. Priorities for new mapping are established under the guidance of a Federal Advisory Committee, through regional Federal-State workshops and joint project planning, and through national review panels. State priorities for new mapping are set by individual State Mapping Advisory Committees, which collectively include more than 500 public and private sector members. State and Federal mapping priorities are coordinated at national review panels, in which USGS, State surveys, and universities are represented.

Question: The Committee requested a report on the status of the National Streamgaging Network. That report identified some significant problems associated with the network. I understand that you have developed a plan for resolving these deficiencies Could you provide some of the highlights of this plan and then comment on the degree to which this year's budget request is designed to address these needs?

Answer: In 1999, we completed the report "Streamflow Information for the Next Century — A Plan for the National Streamflow Information Program of the U. S. Geological Survey." This report represents our vision of the infrastructure that will be required to meet the streamflow information needs of the Nation in the 21st century. The plan includes an enhanced streamgaging network to meet critical Federal interests, collection of time-critical data during floods and droughts, a reliable and enhanced information delivery system, and new technology for collecting, analyzing and disseminating streamflow information. The critical Federal interests include providing river stage and discharge data for flood forecasting, monitoring flows from key river basins, monitoring major rivers at State, Tribal, and international boundaries, providing streamflow information for restoring watersheds that have impaired water quality, and monitoring sentinel watersheds.

Our budget request includes a $4 million increase that would fund improvements to the streamgaging network to help meet one of the Federal interests listed above: adding streamgaging stations and upgrading equipment at existing stations to support the flood-forecasting network of NWS.

Question: Have you obtained the advice of the National Research Council on what to do with the National Streamgaging Network? Is your proposed budget responsive to these recommendations?

Answer: The budget request includes a $4 million increase that responds directly to the first recommendation of the NRC, "Maintaining the integrity and continuity of the streamgaging network." Specifically, the increase will be used to restore gages to portions of the network that have been deactivated in the past decade and thus enhance the USGS ability to provide real-time streamflow data for flood forecasting and warning, as well as provide information for flood hazard mitigation. The budget increase also will support, to a lesser extent, three additional NRC recommendations. Some of the requested funding will be used to enhance a network

evaluation model and to develop prototypes of new instruments for measuring streamflow We also will initiate investigations for improving flow-frequency estimation, including assessments of the effect of land use and other changes on the flood and drought time series

As part of a response to a Congressional request, the USGS recently published a report outlining future plans for streamgaging titled, "Streamflow information for the next century " The USGS report fully addresses all of the recommendations of the NRC report

Question: In total, the Survey has lost over 500 streamgages, is anything being done to replace these lost units? Should some, or all of these units be replaced?

Answer: We have identified more than 1,300 locations where new or reactivated stations are needed to meet critical Federal interests. Many of the 500 streamgaging stations that were discontinued because of funding deficiencies in recent years are part of this group of stations. The increase would add 25 new streamgaging stations and reactivate 25 stations in support of the flood-forecasting network of NWS.

Question: What is the Survey doing to adequately fund those streamgaging units considered by the National Weather Service as flood forecasting sites?

Answer: The USGS has worked closely with NWS to identify sites that are critical for the Nation's flood forecasting network The 13 River Forecast Centers of the NWS have provided a list of streamgaging stations that are needed for adequate flood forecasting in their areas of responsibility. The USGS and emergency managers in each State have reviewed these stations and established priorities for meeting both flood forecasting and other information needs in the respective States. In FY 2000, 17 of these high priority stations will be built or reactivated. The FY 2001 budget request includes a $4 million increase that would fund 50 additional high priority stations to support flood forecasting

The National Weather Service has 3,750 sites at which it provides flood forecasts Of these, the current streamgaging network is able to provide the needed data to 2,950 of them, leaving a need for an additional 800 stations. Streamgages that are needed by NWS are funded by a variety of sources: a combination of USGS funds and funds from Federal, State, and local partners, with about two-thirds of the funding coming from our partners. Such extensive reliance on partnerships is inadequate to provide the continuity of support that is needed for these flood forecast stations. The funding for Real Time Hazards would increase the number of stations funded entirely from USGS funds The Survey has been working closely with NWS and other emergency and water managers to prioritize a list of sites that are most critical for the Nation's flood forecasting network.

Question: How does the current budget request for ground-water resource studies compare to the levels of a decade ago, and how do the needs for this science compare to those of a decade ago?

Answer: The FY 2001 funding for the Ground-Water Resources Program is $2 9 million. A history of funding for the program follows. In FY 1990, this program received $10 8 million to conduct regional ground-water studies of the Nation's most used aquifers. A decade ago, the most pressing ground-water issues were centered on contamination of ground water. Issues related to over pumping and equitable sharing of ground-water resources were not the driving issues that they were 20 years ago when drought conditions spread throughout many parts of the country. Today, with drought conditions again possible, concerns about water availability

have been revived There is also wider recognition of the effects of ground-water withdrawals on surface water and on the biological resources associated with lakes, wetlands, riparian areas, and estuaries. There is much greater concern that ground-water use must incorporate sustainability of the resource. Ground-water resource issues have become more complicated because they now involve three principal components. (1) long-term availability of ground-water supply, (2) protection of ground-water quality, and (3) effects of ground-water development on streams, lakes, wetlands, and estuaries.

Fiscal Year	Program Element Name	($000)
2001 Request	Ground-Water Resources	2,887
2000 Enacted	Ground-Water Resources	2,800
1999 Actual	Ground-Water Resources	3,116
1998 Actual	Ground Water Resources	3,079
1997 Actual	Hydrogeology of Critical Aquifers	2,995
1996 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	2,995
1995 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	3,095
1994 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	5,064
1993 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	6,175
1992 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	8,593
1991 Actual	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	10,703
1990 Actual [1/]	Regional Aquifer-System Analysis	10,862

[1/] After sequestration.

Question: The Survey's Federal/State cooperative water program is a long standing, popular, and important program. I understand that an independent review of this program was completed during the past year. What are the key findings of this review?

Answer: An independent and external review begun in 1998 of the Cooperative Water Program is nearing completion. The External Review Committee comprised more than 20 representatives from cooperating agencies and Tribes, Federal agencies, national water resources organizations, and the private sector. A total of 91 separate initial findings and recommendations were developed and published in USGS Circular 1192. Selected findings and recommendations are listed below.

- The Cooperative Water Program is meeting its mission; the mission is still valid.
- The words "Federal-State" should be removed from the Program title in recognition of the broader range of cooperative partners involved in the program. The proposed program title is "Cooperative Water Program."
- Funding for the program is not adequate to satisfy all the needs identified. The External Review Committee recommends that funds be increased to a level sufficient to achieve a full match for the current and future cooperator offerings and should be indexed for inflation.
- The External Review Committee recommends that separate Federal funding should be provided for a core national streamgaging network outside of the Cooperative Water Program.
- The External Committee found that the USGS has appropriate internal guidance dealing with project selection that facilitates the avoidance of competition with the private sector. The External Review Committee has made recommendations that will enable the USGS to

enhance its project selection criteria and to better communicate with the private sector to avoid competition. Competition is a concern in only a small number of projects nationwide.

- The products of the program meet the needs of cooperators and other customers while contributing to the national interest. The products are well regarded, credible, reliable, unbiased, and generally of excellent quality.

Question: Does your 2001 budget request address the recommendations of this review?

Answer: The USGS budget request does not address the recommendations of this review because the report was not complete at the time the FY 2001 budget was being formulated and could not be considered by USGS. The public comments on the report have been compiled and will be presented to the Advisory Committee on Water Information (ACWI) at their May 2000 meeting. ACWI will then forward the recommendations to USGS.

Question: In all of the disciplines of the Survey the Committee believes that a vigorous program of basic research is an important part of your program, along with applied science, and data gathering. In the area of water, how does the proposed budget address the need for a continuing program of basic water research? What is the situation with the other divisions?

Answer: The proposed 2001 budget includes a $6,985,000 decrease for water resources research based on completion of some projects and curtailment of others. Proposed new funds ($1,500,000) will support basic hydrologic research related to amphibians and the Columbia River. The net decrease to in-house hydrologic research (-11 percent) will result in curtailment of effort in some long-term activities. In FY 2000 the USGS mapping program allocates approximately 5 percent of its research budget to basic research and 95 percent to applied research. The proposed FY 2001 budget helps the mapping program increase basic geographic research activities to approximately 10 percent of its research budget. For geology, the proposed budget allows for a 6 percent increase in research, primarily focused on enhancing monitoring networks, conducting applied science in service to customers, and funding grants to entities outside the USGS. The proposed budget will increase total biological research funds by approximately 17 percent.

Question: Have you had sufficient funds to hire younger scientists to replace those that retire, or are being lost to the private sector?

Answer: An aging workforce makes this issue of critical concern to the USGS. For example, more than two-thirds of USGS scientists are over 40, and almost half of the scientific workforce will be eligible to retire within the next 10 years. Efforts to retain core science expertise, address new and emerging science issues, and the increased costs of doing research in all programs has stretched the budget and have prevented a steady and consistent replacement of our scientific staff. As a result, we have not been able to bring in enough new scientists to keep pace with retirement and attrition.

Question: Will the 2001 request enable you to bring on new scientists as one component of moving your research programs along?

Answer: In some areas we will be able to bring on a limited number of new scientists. For example, in our biology programs, much of the $700,000 increase to the Cooperative Research Units will be used to bring in new scientists, as will portions of certain other increases.

Question: You have been mapping the land surface for over 100 years. How are these data being used to support resource management decisions?

Answer: Land surface data (e.g., elevation, orthoimagery, hydrography) form the base mapping information critical to Federal agencies managing the Nation's natural resources. This information, used in conjunction with geographic information systems, provides policymakers a powerful tool to assist in land and water resource management, ecosystem assessment, environmental monitoring and regulation, and hazard assessment and mitigation. National programs such as USGS National Water-Quality Assessment program, USDA Soil Survey Program, EPA Clean Water Program, and FEMA Flood Hazard Mapping Program all benefit by having access to land surface mapping information when establishing national policy and management approaches for the Nation's natural resources. Examples of using land surface data to support management decisions include:

- Using USGS elevation data to help NOAA identify optimal locations for radio towers to provide hazard and disaster warnings to 95 percent of the U.S. population, thus minimizing the number of towers needed and reducing the cost to taxpayers.

- Using USGS topographic maps as the basis for many of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps. These maps, when coupled with the output of hydraulic models, provide a clear indication of areas at high risk of flooding.

- Using USGS greenness indices to help the agricultural industry identify potential crop yields and, when combined with land cover and meteorological data, as a tool for those responsible for fighting wildland fires.

- Using USGS topographic maps as the base for locating wetlands, sensitive environmental areas, energy and mineral resource areas, wilderness and road less areas, endangered species habitats, and other ecological and environmental components used in resource management within the Department of the Interior.

Question: How will this year's budget request support basic data programs in the national mapping program?

Answer: The mapping data programs fall into two primary groups: high-priority DOI requirements totally funded from Federal appropriations and cooperatively funded national data programs. USGS solicits other Interior bureaus' mapping data requirements and integrates and prioritizes these needs to maximize the extent to which the map data produced addresses multiple bureau needs. This process has allowed us to achieve a four to one multiplier for these funds. In other words, each Federal dollar generates a product that meets a requirement by an average of four different Federal users. Although this $10 million program successfully leverages funding, the FY 2001 identified needs total $125 million.

The mapping cooperative data programs are operated as national partnerships with other Federal and State agencies. Collection and prioritization of national requirements for mapping data are accomplished through consortia of partners who also provide matching funds for data programs. The mapping programs leverage Federal dollars with cooperator funding ($42 million Federal to $33 million cooperator) to address the national data program needs. In this program for FY 2000, an additional $22 million of potential cooperator funding was left on the table due to a lack of funds to match the cooperator offerings. At current funding levels, most of the basic

map data products will be updated on a cycle of longer than 50 years. Urban and land cover change is progressing at such a fast pace that customers are requesting 3- to 5-year update cycles for the map products.

Question: This year's budget request proposes an increase of $5 million for Landsat program operations. What is the rationale for funding this program through the Survey?

Answer: The rationale for USGS assuming responsibility for Landsat 7 mission operation is that this is the most appropriate arrangement from a technical and mission-role standpoint. The Department of the Interior is the Federal agency that stands to benefit the most from the mission. Land remote sensing data are integral to USGS mapping responsibilities and are increasingly incorporated into all science programs. Furthermore, land remote sensing data are routinely used by Interior's land management bureaus to monitor land conditions and improve resource management decisions. Given this tight connection to the DOI mission, USGS has a strong motivation to manage the Landsat 7 mission for maximum results. With the $5 million proposed increase, USGS will be prepared to make a strong commitment to its success.

Question: Why should the Survey have full operations and management responsibility for the Landsat program?

Answer: In addition to the reasons described in the response to the question above, note that USGS is the only U.S. Government agency that has been continuously involved in the Landsat Program (since 1966) and that USGS has strong, established cooperator relationships for which the agency provides land science research and applications for users in government, academia, and the private sector, many of which use Landsat data as a fundamental data source. As evidence of its major commitment to, and increasing reliance on, remote sensing data, USGS is participating as a full partner with NASA in requirements, definitions, development, operations, and management of the Nation's civilian land remote sensing satellite systems. The USGS helps NASA define objectives for land data sensor design and land data acquisition. As the USGS already is the designated data reception, processing and distribution facility for Landsat 7, full operations and management of this system will enhance not only the bureau's programs, but also its position of global leadership for acquiring, managing, and using land observation data. The goal is to ensure the long-term availability of satellite-derived earth surface data to support land resource management decision making for the Nation.

Question: What has been the Survey's role in the Landsat program, and what should its role be in the future?

Answer: The USGS is the only Federal agency to have a continuous role in the program since 1966. As the science bureau for the Department of the Interior, USGS has a mission-driven interest in acquiring, maintaining, and distributing moderate-resolution satellite data of regional, national, and global land areas. The USGS role in the Landsat 7 mission derives from the Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-555), Presidential Decision Directive NSTC-3 (1994), and the National Strategy for Land Remote Sensing (1996). Based on these documents and its mission as the Nation's primary agency for gathering, analyzing, and distributing land-based earth science data and information, it is appropriate that the USGS, in cooperation with NASA, should be the lead agency in shaping the future of the Landsat Program.

Question: How do you intend in the future to sell imagery to commercial customers?

Answer: As with other USGS products, we are working to move retail sales into the hands of the private sector through USGS business partners. The business partner program includes more than 2,000 authorized business partners who sell USGS topographic maps. In the last few years the program has been expanded to include the additional USGS product lines of digital cartographic data, aerial photographs, and satellite data.

Most recently the data products from the Landsat 7 Earth-observing satellite have been made available under the terms of the business partner program. Since January 1, 2000, six satellite data business partners have signed into the program. At this time, the new business partner agreement associated with satellite remotely sensed data does not provide for bulk purchase prices. However, as an incentive for participation, satellite data business partners that reformat, recombine, resample, or otherwise enhance the data, will receive customer referrals from the USGS. As USGS gains operational experience with Landsat 7 data products, we will determine where volume savings accrue and can be passed on to partners and other large-volume customers in bulk prices.

Question: There is some concern by the private sector that transferring the operation of Landsat may result in the Survey processing imagery for the commercial marketplace at prices in direct competition with them. Could you please comment.

Answer: The Landsat 7 Program was initiated in 1992 by Congress to ensure Landsat data continuity after the Landsat Commercial Operator determined that development of a follow-on Landsat-like system was not considered to be commercially viable. Landsat legislation (Land Remote Sensing Policy Act of 1992; P.L. 102-555) calls for a data policy to "...ensure that unenhanced data are available to all users at the cost of fulfilling user requests." As a result of that legislation, Landsat Program Management established data prices that are based directly on actual production costs. To promote private-sector exploitation of Landsat, the USGS has adopted a data policy for Landsat 7 that limits the product suite to low-level uncorrected or systematically corrected products, removes previous restrictions on reprocessing and/or redistribution, and encourages the private sector to develop higher order products through a network of value-added processors. The USGS believes this policy will stimulate development of a broad base of private sector involvement and support. We further believe that this market development represents a direct benefit to, rather than competition with, commercial suppliers of high-resolution data. Numerous private-sector value-added companies (e.g., IMAGELINKS, EARTHSAT, Pacific Meridian) have hailed affordable Landsat 7 data as the key to developing a viable commercial remote-sensing marketplace.

Question: Your budget request proposes an increase of $10 million for urban dynamics. What is the significance of monitoring and assessing the Nation's urban areas?

Answer: Monitoring and assessing our Nation's urban areas is crucial to developing a scientific understanding of the effects of a changing landscape on the growth and environmental quality of the Nation. Understanding the causes and consequences of change in our land and water resources is only possible through monitoring and assessment. This understanding helps to address issues like urban sprawl, vulnerability to natural hazards, loss of open space, the pollution of the air and water, economic growth, and the vitality of communities. Earth and biological science information is key to these and other issues. The growth of the Nation's urban and suburban regions is not a new phenomenon, but the activities of a growing population that enjoys high per capita consumption of resources and increasingly resides in

urbanized areas have many environmental, ecological, and resource impacts. For example, natural habitats are being changed and their interface with human habitats altered in ways that affect animal and plant communities. Sustainable sources of clean drinking water may be stressed in regions experiencing rapid growth. The availability and transportation of the natural resources necessary to fuel the growth of urban infrastructure (e.g., stone, gravel, and crushed rock) are directly affected by growth. This is why it is critical that the consequences of urban change be understood to address environmental and natural resource issues.

Question: What is the difference between this proposed budget increase and your current efforts in urban areas?

Answer: Our current research effort develops historical perspectives of the urban landscape, with some analysis and modeling. The proposed increase will allow us to better integrate geographic, biologic, hydrologic, and geologic data, information, and knowledge critical for understanding the consequences behind the Nation's changing urban environments. We will increase our efforts to (1) understand landscape change in large metropolitan regions, (2) assess the impacts of these changes on regional ecosystems and resources, (3) enhance and apply technology for monitoring, analyzing, and predicting rates, patterns, and impacts of landscape changes resulting from natural and human causes, and (4) provide decision makers with accurate data for improved decision making, policy, and planning.

Question: What specific products will be produced in the urban program, and how will these products be used by various customers?

Answer: Specific program products will include spatial data bases and earth science data that document the land use history of large metropolitan regions. These histories, as well as assessments of regional development and models of potential changes in regional development will be produced for large metropolitan regions with significant challenges involving growth and environmental sustainability. Data bases for study areas will contain digital maps of urban extent, transportation routes, water features, and other significant land uses compatible for use in geographic information systems. Digital animations will help visualize temporal patterns. Models that simulate land use change will be developed. These historical data sets and the tools and methodologies for their analysis will be transferred to organizations around the country for use in urban growth analysis and related issues. For example, planners use the data, visualizations, and models to construct larger scale identities that engage citizens in addressing growth-related issues; extractive industries can explore the accessibility of resources under differing growth scenarios; and State and Federal organizations use the information as a basis for evaluating the potential impacts of programs and policies that might influence land use.

Question: What is the national mapping program role in the real time hazards initiative?

Answer: There are no new funds for the national mapping program in the FY 2001 real time hazards initiative. However, base maps and digital map data of the national mapping program are used at all levels of government and by the private sector as the basis for disaster mitigation and planning. After disasters occur, USGS supplies topographic maps, aerial photographs, image maps, satellite imagery, and other digital map products to emergency response, relief, and reconstruction activities. In addition, the USGS Center for Integration of Natural Disaster Information performs information acquisition and synthesis, data integration, geographic information systems analysis, and custom product development in support of

evaluation, relief, and reconstruction. Currently, all mapping hazards activities are funded from within existing programs

Question: Are you backloading the maintenance process so that you do not have to deal with this issue during this year's budget process?

Answer: The USGS does have a sizable deferred maintenance backlog; however, using the five-year plan, we have identified and established a schedule to address the highest priority projects (see below)

Question: Have you developed a five year plan for reducing your maintenance backlog? If yes, how have funds been allocated across this five year period?

Answer: Yes, we have developed a five-year deferred maintenance and capital improvement plan (fiscal year 2001-2005). Presuming spending levels that continue at the FY 2001 level, the allocation will be as follows (in thousands of dollars):

Deferred Maintenance and Capital Improvement	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005
Facilities	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050
Equipment	485	485	485	485	485
Condition Assessments	215	215	215	215	215
Maintenance Management System	240	240	240	240	240
Total	2,990	2,990	2,990	2,990	2,990

The five-year plan, which provides project-level detail and costs, is being provided under separate cover.

Question: What do you see as the major short-and long-term biological issues facing the Nation, and in this context would you describe future direction for your Biological Resources Division (BRD)?

Answer: Fragmentation and loss of habitats, global climate change, problems with management of waste products, and non-sustainable demands on local land and water resources are factors that underlie the long- and short-term biological issues facing the Nation. Increasing ecosystems and the benefits they naturally provide (cleansing water, barriers to erosion, productive forests and range, places for recreation) results in enormous economic cost for the Nation and the overall health and well being of people. Issues that should be addressed immediately include:

- Invasive Species, terrestrial and aquatic
- Effects of urban sprawl, non-sustainable land-use, and deforestation,
- Declines in fish, wildlife, amphibians, migratory birds, and aquatic communities,
- An inability to gauge changes and ecosystem health due to a lack of ecosystem monitoring and restoration tools,
- Wildlife diseases and potential threats to humans,
- Possible interaction of genetically altered organisms with wild populations,
- Contaminants and toxic substances in water and waste, and
- The unknown possible impacts if the individual stresses above compound one another.

While they must be addressed immediately, most are not simple, short-term issues. USGS is addressing all of these issues to some degree and will expand efforts with increases for biology proposed in the 2001 budget. Examples of future directions include (1) developing the framework to inventory and monitor national biological resources, (2) conducting multi-discipline studies to enable management decisions at the ecosystem level, and (3) constructing models and computer-aided natural resource decision tools, such as Vesper. VegSpec is a tool for finding and selecting plants adapted for use in solving vegetative problems, such as invasive species. The program was created to help one effectively choose plant species appropriate to the climate, soils, and location.

Question: What BRD core capabilities do you need to build or strengthen in order to maintain a viable biological research program?

Answer: USGS biological scientists originally worked in DOI land management bureaus on DOI land and resource management issues. Core capabilities were in fisheries biology, wildlife biology, migratory birds, endangered species, wetland science, contaminant biology, range science, aquatic biology, and the functioning and management of natural landscapes and systems. We must maintain an acceptable level of capability in all of these disciplines while building the capability to meet emerging biological challenges. We need more expertise in wildlife health and in botany and plant science to combat and control invasive species. Similarly, we need to expand our capability in population genetics in order to understand the potential impact of genetically altered organisms on natural communities and, conversely, the potential for these organisms in endangered species recovery or invasive species control, and we need the expertise of landscape ecologists and fire ecologists to describe the effects of changing land uses on ecosystem processes. In order to improve our capability to use and apply information, we expect to build additional capability in GIS, decision support, computer modeling, and information management.

Question: I understand that several States have expressed interest in establishing new cooperative research units. Does the Survey have a long-term strategy to expand these units? What would be gained by expanding the cooperative research units?

Answer: At the direction of Congress, the Unit program has focused on filling and supporting all existing Unit science vacancies. As this goal is nearing completion, several States have expressed interest in establishing new Units or expanding existing units. Rarely has a Unit been established at our initiative. Instead, the program has responded to the needs of program Cooperators, as expressed through their Congressional delegations. The USGS will remain responsive to State agencies, universities, and Congress on this issue within the confines of the budget. Expanding the Unit program would increase the availability of program expertise to land and resource managers and enhance USGS interactions with States currently without Units.

Question: Please describe how the $8 million request for BRD portion of the Community/Federal Information Partnerships initiative would be spent?

Answer: The $8 million request for the biological component of C/FIP would be used to enhance two information management and delivery programs: the Gap Analysis Program (GAP) and the National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII). Half of the requested increase ($4 million) would be used to fund cooperative projects with State agencies and local communities, universities, and others to make available existing Gap data and expand the

scope of data being developed through GAP to include invertebrate species and freshwater aquatic environments. The remaining $4 million portion of the request would be used for competitive matching grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements with States, universities, and non-government organizations to expand the amount of biological data available through the NBII. We will also develop specialized NBII nodes around the United States that will provide more rapid, integrated delivery of biological information; provide fully integrated access to information on invasive species, migratory birds, Pacific salmonids, and declining amphibians, and integrate biological information for high priority geographic regions or major ecosystems of the United States

Question: How would C/FIP benefit BRD's core research programs?

Answer: A fundamental objective of our core research programs is to ensure that scientific information is made fully available to decision makers, scientists, teachers and students, and the general public. This information can assist resource managers at all levels in making better decisions that can more effectively protect and conserve natural resources. To address many of the Nation's most important biological science issues, such as invasive species, migratory bird conservation, or amphibian declines and deformities, resource managers need access to biological data developed through USGS research and from other key non-USGS sources. The C/FIP initiative will provide support needed to integrate the biological data and information resulting from USGS research with the very extensive and significant biological data and information sources maintained by other Federal and State agencies, university scientists, and others. By integrating key non-USGS biological data sets into the existing Gap Analysis and NBII information networks, our scientists and our customers gain access to a more comprehensive information base to use in research and resource management.

Question: What is BRD currently doing to identify both the short-term and long-term research of the Department's land management agencies? How prepared is the Survey to meet these needs?

Answer: We hold regular meetings at the local, regional, and national levels to identify the needs of resource management bureaus and then evaluate USGS capability to respond to these needs and identify potential future issues. Our core capabilities allow us to respond to many multidisciplinary issues faced by land management agencies, but significant funding increases are needed to meet the extensive array of research needs identified through this process. The budget increases requested in FY 2001, especially in DOI Science Support, Wildlife Health, Amphibians Research and Monitoring, Decision Support Systems, and C/FIP are a step in the right direction in improving USGS capacity to meet the needs of our Nation's land and resource managers.

Question: To what extent are the other DOI agencies seeking the Survey's scientific expertise? Do you have the scientific and financial resources to address these concerns?

Answer: The DOI bureaus rely on USGS, as the DOI science bureau, to provide scientific research and information on biological and earth science issues. All of the bureaus have signed the "Agreement on USGS Research Support for DOI Resource Management Bureau Needs" and have played a major role in formulating the USGS' budget request for DOI Science Priorities. The agreement's emphasis on consultations and prioritization of bureau science needs, and regular assessments of USGS current activities are also helping USGS be more responsive to Interior's bureaus. All of the bureaus have participated in regional and

national meetings with the USGS to discuss priority management issues that require scientific study The bureaus recognize that USGS scientific expertise and resources are an essential component to land and resource decision making. Because the priority requests posed by the DOI bureaus for scientific expertise exceed the financial resources of the USGS current-year budget, increases proposed for FY 2001 will address the highest priority needs of the DOI bureaus. These increases are essential for USGS to provide the science support needed by the DOI bureaus.

Question After reviewing the budget for National Park Service's Biological Resources Management Division for fiscal year 2001, there seems to be a duplication of effort between NPS and the Survey. NPS is proposing to establish a number of new Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units at various universities around the country. Could the Department or the Survey explain how these units are different from the Cooperative Research Units funded through the Survey's Biological Research Division?

Answer: The establishment of Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESUs) was authorized in the 1998 National Parks Omnibus Management Act (P.L. 105-391 Sec. 203(b)). These units differ from existing USGS Cooperative Research Units (CRUs) in several significant ways

CESUs have a broad mission to provide multi-disciplinary research, technical assistance, and education to multiple federal agencies concerned with natural and cultural resource management. CRUs are focused on biological resources, and disciplines related to fish, wildlife and natural resource management.

Each CESU includes a host university and several partner institutions (including at least one minority institution), not limited to land-grant universities. A CRU is typically a cooperative agreement with one university, and the state fish and game agency

CESUs include multiple federal cooperators; currently six federal agencies within three cabinet-level Departments are participants. Each CESU operates under a similar agreement with the universities, with common language and a standard overhead rate (15 percent). CRUs have many clients at both the State level and the Federal level. Federal clients include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, and other DOI bureaus, and also other agencies such as the Department of Defense

Direction of the CESU program is regional in nature, and is largely Federal. In contrast, USGS CRUs have fewer formal Federal cooperators but provide DOI with a closer tie to State resource agencies. The strong linkage of the CRU program with State agencies is as hallmark of the program: State agencies provide direction to their local CRU, which may focus on local, regional, national, or international issues.

Question: Could the Department or the Survey explain why this research could not be accomplished through the existing Cooperative Research Units?

Answer: As noted above, State agencies provide direction to their local CRU. The State/CRU may focus on local, regional, national or international issues, but they do not necessarily focus on ecosystem-wide issues. On the other hand, as explained in the response to question 70, the ecosystem is the organizing principle underlying CESUs. The intent of the CESU model is to welcome all Federal agencies with a stake in the ecosystem, and together

with their host universities and State partners, focus their attention on ecosystem-wide problems of mutual concern.

In addition, the CESUs are more focused on highly interdisciplinary research than are CRUs, and that increases their capacity for coordinating and providing technical assistance and research to partner agencies beyond that currently available through the CRU program. The two programs are highly complementary to one another.

Question: The NPS budget includes a request for the establishment of learning centers. Could the Department or the Survey explain what these learning centers will be doing?

Answer: The centers will serve as focal points for coordinating and presenting a wide range of educational activities for a broad range of audiences, beyond park visitors. They also will provide a locus of support for outside researchers wanting to conduct research in parks. They will provide this focus and support using existing infrastructure, with the emphasis being on adaptive reuse of park buildings or use of existing structures in gateway communities. The emphasis is on the coordination function.

For example, the Alaska SeaLife Center will allow parks in Southwest Alaska to partner with this Center in Seward. The National Park Service will establish a presence in this center to provide information and education about park resource issues and, through the center, will be better able to provide a base of support for researchers in the area using the parks. It will provide a venue for getting research results to the public, in a location and forum that is user friendly and already an attraction.

The Atlantic Learning Center at Cape Cod will be a part of the Highlands Center for the Arts and Environment, on the site of the former North Truro Air Force Station. Specifically, it will house both a wet and dry laboratory, provide temporary living space for 9-18 persons, provide two classrooms, and office space. It will allow expansion of teacher and high school mentoring, development of education programs on sustainable design and understanding the local environment—the latter in part by highlighting research results from research conducted using the center. Initial research that will be supported through use of the facilities includes research into kettle ponds, water quality, and estuarine fisheries by researchers from the Marine Biological Laboratory, the Waquoit Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve volunteers, and the University of Rhode Island.

The McGraw Ranch Research and Learning Center at Rocky Mountain National Park will provide housing for 20 researchers, seminar space, library space, computing capability, and a laboratory for preparing or stabilizing samples and collections. Researchers from Colorado State University, the US Geological Survey, Colorado University, and the University Northern Colorado are expected to use the facility. It will allow the park to significantly expand its ability to host and partner in educational activities with Colorado Science and Math Opportunities, the Association of Black Environmentalists, and Emporia State University.

The Purchase Knob Science and Education Center at Great Smoky Mountains National Park will provide 20 rooms to house researchers or trainees, research and education laboratories, a meeting area and office space. It is an important component in supporting researchers involved in the All Taxa Biodiversity Inventory. This project is attempting to catalog all species in the park and would represent a scientific milestone, since the National Park Service and other land managers usually attempt only to inventory selected priority species and groups of species.

Thus, this represents an important contribution the park can make to furthering scientific knowledge about our natural heritage.

The Pacific Coast Learning Center at Point Reyes National Seashore will support research on coastal ecology, environmental history and cultural landscapes, fire ecology and prescribed fire through provision of office space, a laboratory, accommodations, and access to computer information. Researchers from the US Geological Survey, Moss Landing Marine Laboratory, the Point Reyes Bird Observatory, the Center for Marine Conservation, the Audubon Ranch, several state universities and others will use the facility. The center will provide educational material about research being conducted at the center and about resource management and stewardship. It will partner with three other education centers.

Question: With the exception of inventory, monitoring and critical mitigation is the Park Service proposing any other science programs that could be accomplished by Survey's Biological Resources Division?

Answer: One goal of the Natural Resource Challenge initiative is to increase the availability of science information to support NPS decisionmaking. The NPS will consult with USGS as it implements the Challenge initiative to ensure it takes advantage of USGS's inherent strengths and expertise. For example, the National Park Service is proposing $1.725 for vegetation mapping in a joint NPS-USGS program. The program was transferred from the NPS in 1994 and current funding in the Survey's Biological Research Division is sufficient to produce vegetation maps at a rate that will require 30 years to complete. This increase, which will be a cost-share with the USGS, will allow that program to proceed at a much faster rate.

In addition, USGS is conducting biological assessment activities in National Parks, such as the assessment of how the reintroduction of wolves to Yellowstone is affecting caribou populations, vegetation, etc. Finally, all these inventory monitoring, mitigation, and assessment activities feed into USGS efforts to create decision support tools to assist park managers in making effective choices about resource management on park lands.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Question: What is the current status of funding and research efforts at the Florida Caribbean Science Center?

Answer: Allocations in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to the Florida Caribbean Science Center totaled $4.9 million and $4.8 million, respectively. In FY 2000, the center is monitoring amphibians throughout the Southeast, which has greater amphibian diversity than all other parts of the Nation combined. The center is studying the estuarine communities in southwest Florida. Continued support from the National Park Service allows center scientists to conduct studies important for the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration, including models that will predict outcomes of management actions and will support management decision making.

The center is supporting recovery of the Florida manatee through comprehensive studies. Researchers are examining the role of disturbances from fires, floods, and hurricanes in maintaining the diversity of south Florida ecosystems and depressing populations. The center's scientists are analyzing the distribution, biology, and environmental effects of nonnative aquatic species introduced into the environment. Scientists are conducting research to understand endocrine disruption and the role of environmental contaminants. These are some of examples of the many studies conducted by the center in the areas of coastal and marine ecology, restoration ecology, invasive species, and biological diversity.

Question: I understand that certain new functions will be transferred to the Florida Caribbean Science Center. What are the FTE's, funding, and research programs that are associated with this transfer?

Answer: A transfer of function to the USGS Florida Caribbean Science Center is not envisioned at this time. The Florida Caribbean Science Center, which has long had a relatively small program in coastal and marine science, decided in consultation with the USGS Center for Coastal Geology to co-locate its coastal and marine scientists with the physical scientists in the St. Petersburg facility to improve the scope and quality of science each could provide. Primary motivations for this decision were the excellent facilities and opportunities for collaboration offered by the Center for Coastal Geology facility. As of March 2000, three individuals have moved and more moves are expected through FY 2000, when 7 to 8 biologists will be stationed at the facility. In time, the co-location of biological scientists and physical scientists in this facility is expected to result in enhanced integration of research for both programs.

Question: The Florida Caribbean Science Center in conjunction with USGS leadership has been working on a new five-year coastal initiative. For the record, please provide the details of this draft plan by year, including FTEs, funding, and research programs.

Answer: Several planning efforts for coastal initiatives are now underway in USGS, though there is not a 5-year coastal initiative currently in existence. Although the Florida Caribbean Science Center has been involved in some phases of this activity, the process in which it has been involved has not reached the level of detail where it could project FTEs, year-by-year funding, or specific research activities at this time. Currently USGS is conducting the following studies: supporting the recovery of the Florida manatee through comprehensive studies; investigating population and habitat requirements of anadromous fish, such as the Gulf sturgeon in coastal rivers; studying the status, trends, and factors affecting sensitive coastal communities, including seagrass beds and coral reefs; and providing resource managers with information on the ecology and conservation of estuaries and coastal bays. In the future, we

hope to put forth a coastal initiative, and the Florida Caribbean Science Center would be a major participant in the development of this initiative.

QUESTIONS FROM CONGRESSMAN JIM KOLBE

Question: What plans does the agency have for distributing the proposed cuts to the Toxics Substances Hydrology Program, and what will the effect of these cuts be on the research programs?

Answer: The proposed $1,740,000 decrease in Toxic Substances Hydrology results from completion of a Minnesota study of crude oil contamination and completion of a New Hampshire study of contamination in fractured rock, and the discontinuation of lower priority projects, including research on exposure of aquatic organisms to pesticides in San Francisco Bay and a study to determine whether a range of new "emerging" water contaminants (including antibiotics, prescription and non-prescription drugs, industrial and household chemicals, and hormones) enter natural waters. The results from these studies provided scientific information on: (1) the mobility of contaminants in complex hydrologic environments, (2) the effectiveness of natural remediation to clean up aquifers, and (3) the potential for new compounds to enter the environment; however, no new information will be generated.

Question: What plans does the agency have for distributing the proposed cuts to the Hydrologic Research and Development Program, and what will the effect of these cuts be on the research programs? Can you explain how previous work in this area will be done if these proposed cuts materialize?

Answer: The proposed $2,454,000 decrease in the Hydrologic Research and Development Program will eliminate work on the development and application of geophysical methods to examine how water and contaminants are transported in the fractured rock systems in the Northeast and the Appalachians. The decrease will also reduce research in the following areas: mobility and degradation of nutrients at several sites, including Chesapeake Bay; the link between human activities, flow system changes, and water quality in the Middle Rio Grande basin, Williams and Shingobee Lakes in Minnesota, and San Francisco Bay-Delta; natural variations in pristine areas that can provide a baseline to better understand the impact of human activities on water resources; "emerging" contaminants that may impact aquatic life, waterfowl, and human health; and how microorganisms alter the chemistry and productivity of aquatic environments and potable water supplies. The primary effect of the cuts will be less information available related to the specific sites mentioned above. In the longer term the effect will be slower progress in developing the next generation of hydrologic computer models used to tackle and resolve complex hydrologic problems in the areas of microbiology, water quality, and ground-water/surface-water interactions.

Question: What plans does the agency have for distributing the proposed cuts to the Hydrologic Networks and Analysis Program, and what effect would this proposed cut have on the stream gauging/real-time hazards program?

Answer: The proposed decrease of $2,791,000 in the Hydrologic Networks and Analysis Program includes $1,974,000 that will eliminate 80 percent of the hydrologic research that is related to climate variability and change. A portion of the climate variability and change program will continue to measure and analyze glacier growth and shrinkage. The decrease will also eliminate $817,000 that supports several short-term studies begun in FY 2000, including studies of ground water on the island of Molokai, Hawaii, a hydrologic study of Noyes Slough in the area of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a study of ground water in southern Maryland. The decrease in Hydrologic Networks and Analysis will have no direct effect on the streamgaging and real-time hazards program.

QUESTIONS FROM CONGRESSMAN GEORGE NETHERCUTT, JR.

Methyl tertiary-butyl ether or MTBE

Question: I understand that the USGS has been assessing the number of occurrences of methyl tertiary-butyl ether or MTBE in groundwater. I understand that a USGS report, scheduled to come out this spring, is focusing on 10 Mid-Atlantic States, including Virginia and New Jersey. Can you give me an update on the status of this report? Will you ultimately be looking at more States? Will you be working with EPA to study groundwater problems in other parts of the country?

Answer: The USGS and EPA have collaborated on an analysis of existing MTBE data in Community Water Systems (CWS) in these States. We have assembled data for about 2,000 of approximately 10,500 CWS in the 12 States. The stratified random sample provides a statistical evaluation of the occurrence of MTBE in CWS. This area was selected for study because of the widespread usage of MTBE in these States and because the States have tested for MTBE even though it is not required by the Safe Drinking Water Act. The draft report, currently in review by EPA and others, is scheduled for distribution the end of FY 2000. The 12 States in this analysis are Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.

At present, we do not anticipate similar analysis for additional States. Because MTBE has not been as widely used in many other States and CWS have not been required to collected data on MTBE, we would not expect similar data being available widely. We will however discuss with EPA additional work that should be done. We will also continue to work with EPA on MTBE and other ground water contaminant issues. As an example of other recent work with EPA, we have published results on naturally occurring arsenic in ground water. The arsenic study also focused on areas where natural arsenic may be affecting CWS.

Columbia River Initiative

Question: How do you coordinate your efforts with the other Federal agencies? Does USGS work with private entities and the State agencies doing salmon research as well?

Answer: There are a number of mechanisms by which USGS coordinates science efforts with other Federal agencies. Currently there is a workgroup under the auspices of the Office of Science and Technology Policy called the Interagency Salmon Science Team, which coordinates science efforts. USGS, primarily through the Western Fisheries Science Center, meets routinely with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for science planning coordination. Some salmon research is also done under the Pacific Northwest Forest Plan and for the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation. Coastal research is coordinated with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. USGS also provides scientific information related to salmon on a reimbursable basis to several Federal agencies, most notable the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Bonneville Power Administration.

USGS works closely with the States of the Pacific Northwest, including Alaska, particularly in environmental monitoring. One example of such cooperation and coordination is our work with the Idaho Statewide Surface Water Network. Stream gauging, water quality assessments, stream temperature and other hydrologic and biologic activities are coordinated with States and local communities. USGS Cooperative Research Units conduct salmon research on a

partnership basis with local universities and State fish and game departments. USGS has worked with local counties to characterize habitat, and with other local cooperators in planning community-wide meetings on information sharing in support of salmon restoration.

QUESTIONS FROM CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON

Question: First of all, I appreciate the work your agency is doing and proposes continuing next year to study the amphibian population decline and malformation problems. You know I fully support your request to continue this research and would like to expand it if possible. How much are other Federal agencies involved in this effort? How are or how could FWS, NPS, or other agencies synthesize their resources to cooperate more formally in these studies?

Answer: There is considerable effort ongoing by numerous Federal agencies to study amphibian population declines and malformations. For example, the EPA and the NPS have entered into an interagency agreement (IAG) that includes investigating relationships between ultraviolet light exposure and its effects on amphibian populations at 14 PRIMENet (Parks Research and Intensive Monitoring of Ecosystems Network) locations. The NPS is cooperating with the USGS through an existing IAG to conduct amphibian inventories on these same PRIMENet parklands. The FWS is monitoring selected national wildlife refuges throughout the country for different chemical contaminants (insecticides, herbicides, etc.) that may be causing or contributing to amphibian malformations. The BLM is conducting amphibian surveys on some of its lands, including areas in the Pacific Northwest and possibly Southern California. In 1998, Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt established an interagency Taskforce on Amphibian Declines and Deformities (TADD). The mission of TADD, which includes representation from Interior agencies as well as other departments and agencies throughout the Federal government, is to promote and coordinate Federal agency activities for elucidating the causes of declines and deformities and addressing the causes when known.

The FWS, NPS, BLM, and other agencies (EPA, U.S. Forest Service, etc.) have fully cooperated by helping USGS plan its national Amphibian Research and Monitoring Initiative (ARMI). These agencies will participate in regional interagency ARMI workshops, and have agreed to provide the amphibian information they collect to the USGS amphibian data management center located at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center.

Question: I understand that the Fish and Wildlife Foundation has initiated a program to incorporate more resources and to partner with private landowners to not only further study the problem, but also to jointly develop strategies to address the causes once they are identified through serious scientific evaluation. Are you familiar with the program? Can you comment on it? Does USGS also communicate and cooperate with private entities and foundations on these things to help ensure that everyone's moving not necessarily in lock step, but at least in some coordinated fashion?

Answer: The program to which you are referring is the Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (PARC). The mission of PARC is to conserve amphibians, reptiles, and their habitats as integral parts of our ecosystem and culture through proactive and coordinated public/private partnerships. A key to PARC's success is its inclusion of all individuals, organizations, and agencies with an interest in amphibian and reptile conservation. PARC, which is modeled after the highly successful Partners in Flight program for neotropical migratory bird conservation, has a regional structure with six technical working groups (Research, Education/Outreach, Management, International, Inventory/Monitoring, and Policy/Regulation/Trade). The USGS has representation on the Research, Inventory/Monitoring, and most of the other groups.

Although the initial focus of ARMI will be to conduct amphibian monitoring on Interior lands, USGS is developing partnerships with other stakeholders in the public and private sectors to expand the scope of monitoring efforts to include all major regions and habitats occupied by amphibians. USGS will coordinate with these groups in the use of common monitoring methods and data collection strategies. The additional information collected by these private entities is critical if USGS expects to achieve ARMI's goals, which include a better understanding of the scope and severity of amphibian declines nationwide.

Question: I have seen your request for $1,000,000 to study Fish and Wildlife Disease. I understand part of this will be used to study the brain lesions that are affecting birds along the east coast (avian vacuolar myelinopathy, AVM). What would you think of coordinating this research with a consortium of universities in the Southeast and East to leverage more support?

Answer: Avian Vacular Myelinopathy, or AVM, remains a mysterious neurologic disease that first was identified in the brains of bald eagles at Lake Ouachita in Arkansas. Most recently, AVM has been identified in Coots and other waterfowl in North and South Carolina and Georgia. Part of the $1 million budget request will be utilized to study AVM as well as the West Nile encephalitis virus outbreak in the New York City region.

The suggestion for coordinating this research with a consortium of universities is appropriate and already a critical part of this research effort. The USGS National Wildlife Health Center in Madison, Wisconsin has a close and cooperative working relationship with the Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study (SCWDS) at the University of Georgia's College of Veterinary Medicine in Athens, Georgia. The National Wildlife Health Center has designated $100,000 of this budget request for a grant to SCWDS to further promote cooperative research mutually beneficial to both State and Federal agencies.

The two research organizations share information, coordinate research, sponsor joint workshops as well as funding and other scientific efforts. For example, the first Wildlife Health Alert of 1999 (#99-01) went to a national network and mailing list of Fish and Wildlife departments, universities and interested organizations The alert announced the joint effort of USGS scientists at the National Wildlife Health Center and SCWDS in Athens, Georgia. The alert listed the phone numbers of both organizations where interested individuals could contact the experts on AVM. The proposed budget request will help continue this important cooperation and coordinated effort to identify and eventually prevent the spread of the AVM disease.

Question: USGS has studied saltwater intrusion problems in ground water/aquifers across the country. Has any of your research been conducted on the North Florida Aquifer in Southeast Georgia? Have you studied past saltwater intrusion into the Savannah harbor? Private contractors are now working on projections and modeling on the effects of and mitigation of potential harbor expansion. Has USGS also been engaged with Fish and Wildlife in these studies?

Answer: USGS has studied saltwater intrusion of the Upper Floridian aquifer in coastal Georgia for over 50 years through the Federal-State Cooperative Water Program. Within the Cooperative program, the USGS is currently conducting an evaluation of ground-water flow, saltwater contamination, and alternative water sources. This study is a part of the Coastal Sound Science Initiative that is being coordinated by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. The USGS effort in the Initiative includes offshore drilling near Savannah and Hilton Head Island; drilling of deep test wells onshore; evaluation of alternative water supplies in

surficial and Miocene aquifers and in man-made seepage ponds; and simulation of saltwater intrusion using digital ground-water models.

At Savannah Harbor, the USGS in 1998 assisted the Corps of Engineers in an assessment of aquifer leakage to determine conditions prior to possible harbor expansion by collecting and analyzing water-quality and water-level data.

During the past year, USGS has served as technical reviewer and advisor to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) at monthly meetings of the Modeling Technical Review Group for the Savannah Harbor Expansion Project. This involves preparation of a written report to USFWS on model development, implementation, calibration, and application after each meeting.

Department of the Interior

Minerals Management Service

(81)

Minerals Management Service

Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee

Questions for the Record: FY 2001 Request

Offsetting Collection of Fees

Question 1: The budget request estimates offsetting collections of $117 million. Please provide a table that shows the estimated and actual levels of offsetting collections for Fiscal Years 1994-2000.

Answer: The $117.41 million estimate for FY 2001 includes $10 million in new user fees. Currently, MMS is discussing possible new user fees with both the Department and the Office of Management and Budget.

Comparison of Actual *vs* Estimated Offsetting Collections
millions of dollars

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Actual	5.36	12.73	30.93	63.03	96.25	103.68	103.85*	NA
CAP	5.00	8.80	15.40	41.00	71.68	100.00	124.00	117.41**

* Reflects projected income from above $3 per acre rents.
*** assumes Congressional authorization of $10 million in new offsetting collections*

Question 2: If the actual level of offsetting collections is less than the estimate this year, what programs will not be funded?

Answer: If the projected shortfall materializes for FY 2000, Congress has granted us the authority to utilize receipts from the $3 per acre rents to make up the difference. If a shortfall were to occur in FY 2001, we would spread the impact among all MMS Programs; for instance, delaying implementation of the Royalty Reengineering Initiative, and reducing helicopters used to support the inspection of offshore facilities.

Question 3: The estimate for offsetting collections assumes a new $10 million fee. Please describe this proposed fee program.

Answer: MMS is exploring possible options that could be used to generate new receipts to address any potential shortfall in offsetting collections, so as not to adversely affect MMS s operating budget. Our goal is to identify possible charges or fees that could generate sufficient amounts to offset potential shortfalls, without adversely

affecting leasing and development of OCS oil and gas. To establish a new revenue source designed to maintain a consistent level of offsetting receipts, we believe that legislation may be needed to authorize the Department to establish and retain a new type of fee. Currently, MMS is discussing several possible new fees with the Department and the Office of Management and Budget.

Question 4: When will the fee proposal be forwarded to the authorizing committees?

Answer: Currently MMS is discussing possible new user fees with both the Department and the Office of Management and Budget. When those discussions are completed, MMS will prepare and forward the necessary proposed legislation to the Congress.

Question 5: If the fee proposal is not enacted, what programs will not be funded?

Answer: If the Congress does not enact the Administration's proposal, but provides and additional direct appropriation in the amount of the offset, no programs will be reduced. However, if the fee proposal is not enacted and additional appropriations are not provided to cover the shortfall, MMS would spread the impact among all its programs, for instance, delaying implementation of the Royalty Reengineering Initiative and reducing helicopters used to support the inspection of offshore facilities.

Uncontrollable Increases

Question 6: Is funding uncontrollable increases your highest priority? If not, what is.

Answer: Full funding of uncontrollable cost increases, which are almost entirely approved pay increases and mandatory General Service Administration rent increases, is the Department's highest priority. Funding MMS's uncontrollables will avoid decreases in important service program areas such as the Royalty Reengineering Initiative, helicopters used to support the inspection of offshore facilities, and the State and Indian Audit Program.

Question 7: The oil spill research activity shows level funding. Is this activity immune from inflation and other uncontrollable costs or will research activities be curtailed?

Answer: For the past several years, MMS had indeed been experiencing upward pressure on the available funding for oil spill research – mostly from inflation and increased operating costs associated with the Oil and Hazardous Materials Simulated Environmental Test Tank (OHMSETT) facility in Leonardo, New Jersey. We have been able to maintain a level expenditure rate by encouraging industry participation in research, reducing the breadth of research topics, and deferring OHMSETT expenditures

to only those deemed crucial to continuing operations. MMS is experiencing a resurgence in offshore activities (brought on by the highest oil prices in more than a decade) with the focus being the deepwater areas of the Gulf of Mexico. There, significant levels of joint research are being discussed with industry to address the means to cope with potential oil spills.

Geological Interpretive Tools

Question 8: The request included $0.8 million to upgrade and replace geological tools. Is this a one-time purchase or the start of an on-going program?

Answer: The additional $0.8 million is for life-cycle maintenance of our Geologic Interpretive Tools (GIT). Life-cycle maintenance is a continuous, though staggered, process of replacing/upgrading technologies to ensure that IT capabilities are maintained at the level necessary to accomplish the systems purpose. Life-cycle management helps to prevent the degradation of IT systems and minimizes costly replacements due to technology failures, incompatibilities, and obsoleteness. Thus by its nature, it is an on-going requirement for the life of the system.

Question 9: If the latter, how many years will the program take and what are the out-year funding needs for the next five years?

Answer: We are in the process of assessing our life-cycle replacement requirements. Different system components obsolesce at different rates, and for GIT components this range is from four to eight years. If we maintain a 4-8 year life-cycle time period, then $0.8 million per year may be sufficient to maintain this capability.

Question 10: How rapidly is the technology that the industry utilizes improving, and how will you keep pace with these changes?

Answer: The introduction of new significant technologies in the petroleum industry can be subdivided into three categories: seismic data acquisition techniques, interpretation techniques, and software improvements to incorporate these other changes. Significant seismic acquisition techniques like 3-D seismic data and 4-C or 4-D seismic acquisition have been introduced on an average five-year cycle. Improved interpretation techniques like amplitude versus offset, coherence/variance cube technology, visualization, seismic wave shape analysis, and the reemergence of the use of gravity and magnetic data analyses are on a shorter cycle time. These technologies are introduced about every two to three years. Major software updates are occurring at a one to two year time interval to keep pace with not only the technological advances in industry, but also in computer workstation technology. **Funding of the requested $0.8 million to implement life-cycle replacement requirements for GIT will give MMS the resources to address technology changes.**

Question 11: Please give a concrete example of how the use of this new technology will allow you to improve your ability to receive fair market value for OCS oil and gas resources.

Answer: The Geological Interpretive Tools (GIT) technology provides MMS the ability to evaluate data to determine the oil and gas potential of OCS tracts. Utilizing GIT allows a significant reduction in the magnitude of assessed risk and, therefore, provides the means to appropriately increase our determination from a nominal value to as much as several millions of dollars. This occurs on dozens of tracts in a typical lease sale. Conversely, the sophisticated analysis made possible with these tools allows us to condemn prospects that may otherwise have been judged to be highly valuable. As the data increases in complexity and variety and the search for smaller and more subtle prospects intensifies, updated GIT tools provide the only means to correctly analyze the improved data, image areas of hydrocarbon potential and generate appropriate estimates of fair market value.

A high bid rejection in Sale 169 provides a concrete example of how the tools improve the ability to receive fair market value for OCS oil and gas resources.

Ewing Bank (EW) block 788 received one bid in Sale 169 of $154,253. On 3-D time migrated data, an industry standard data set; no oil and gas resource potential was evident that would indicate this bid was insufficient to meet fair market value criteria. A 3-D pre-stack depth-migrated data set was identified and evaluated using GIT. This new assessment identified an intrusive salt body, below which two potential hydrocarbons traps were identified. From this GIT-based assessment, fair market value of the tracts was determined to be $1,100,000. The high bid on this tract was subsequently rejected as being insufficient. The ability of GIT to image the salt and identify hydrocarbon potential was critical to the fair market value determination.

For this Sale 169 evaluation, no nearby wells existed, but the ability to effectively evaluate the data using GIT provided the means to reduce risk and reject the high bid. Subsequent to Sale 169, the Hickory subsalt discovery was drilled two blocks (six miles) to the north of EW 788 which confirmed the existence of hydrocarbons below the salt. In Lease Sale 172, EW 788 received a high bid of $3,859,200. This bid was accepted as fair market value.

Question 12: Provide your best estimate of the impact on future revenue potential through the use of these improved interpretive tools.

Answer: These interpretive tools influence potential revenue streams by helping MMS make sound decisions on bid classification and determining foregone royalty payments.

Rejection decisions
The Geological Interpretive Tools (GIT) were implemented in MMS in December 1993 and have been routinely used for all fair market value determinations since 1995

- During FY 1995 through FY 1998, $45 million in high bids on 94 tracts in the Gulf of Mexico were rejected as insufficient. Subsequent sales resulted in high bids of $235 million on the same tracts for an increase in government receipts of $190 million.

- In FY 1999, an additional thirteen tracts that previously had $8.5 million in high bids rejected as insufficient had subsequent bids accepted. The bids accepted totaled $18.6 million.

- During the five years GIT has been utilized, an average of $40 million per fiscal year have been realized from increased high bids of previously rejected tracts. If GIT technology is kept current in the future, we expect similar gains.

Granting royalty relief
The decision to grant royalty relief can have significant economic implications. Automatic royalty suspension volumes fall into three categories: 17.5 MBOE for fields in water depths greater than 200 meters to 400 meters; 52.5 MBOE for fields in water depths greater than 400 meters to 800 meters; and 87.5 MBOE for fields in water depths greater than 800 meters. Eligibility is determined very early in the exploration phase and is awarded on a field basis. The determination of what leases comprise a specific field is based on a sophisticated analysis of complex geophysical data sets and limited well data.

In an effort to improve decisions, reduce cycle times and increase profitability, companies are constantly introducing new data types and/or analysis techniques. These analyses can only be performed with GIT. The potential loss to the United States or to industry from poor decisions due to the inability to access the necessary data or use the most recent technology can range into the hundreds of millions of dollars for each field designation. A $25 barrel of oil multiplied at the appropriate royalty rate (1/6 for leases in water depths of less then 400 meters and 1/8 for leases in water depth of greater then 400 meters) equals $72,916,667, $164,062,500, and $273,437,500, respectively, in foregone royalty payments.

Royalty Reengineering Initiative

Question 13: Your royalty reengineering initiative entails the development and acquisition of major new information technology systems that will need to interface smoothly with new technology systems (TFAS and TAAMS) being developed for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of Special Trustee. Describe the steps you are taking with the BIA and OST to ensure that these new systems will be most compatible and easy to use for BIA, OST and MMS.

Answer: Prior to award of the new RMP financial system contract to Andersen Consulting, RMP staff supplied record layouts and data element descriptions to the TAAMS development contractor illustrating present data transfers from RMP systems to those of the BIA. Three months after the contract was awarded (12/1999), BIA/OST and TAAMS development staff were invited to meet with RMP and Andersen Consulting counterparts to be briefed on the RMP reengineering initiative and commence a dialogue on future system development activites. Key players and contacts were identified at that meeting. In February 2000, BIA and RMP staff met to discuss reengineering related production reporting concepts and issues. The General Design of the new RMP financial system is scheduled to be completed in June 2000. During March 2000, key RMP staff met with BIA/OST and TAAMS development staff to further address development and interface issues. Furthermore, during the April-May timeframe meetings will be scheduled with BIA/OST staff to address design concepts, system interfaces, and other issues of mutual interest. Joint communications between technical staff, functional staff, development contractors and management will be maintained throughout the life of the project.

Question 14: For the record, list the specific individuals who have been tasked with working with OST, BIA, and the Department in implementing the TAAMS system.

Answer: The following individuals have been tasked to work with BIA/OST:

Milton K. Dial, Reengineering Project Manager

Ken Madsen, IT Project Manager

Dave Petersen, Andersen Consulting Project Manager

Oil Valuation Rulemaking

Question 15: The moratorium on publishing new rules on oil valuation expires on March 15, 2000. The Committee understands that you will publish rules as close to that date as possible. What budget impacts do you anticipate from the new rules?

Answer: The oil valuation rule was published on March 15, 2000. In comparison to the current rule, we estimate that the new rule will result in annual additional royalties of about $67.8 million. We also estimate that industry will be able to claim about $0.5 million in additional transportation allowances, resulting in an estimated net royalty increase of $67.3 million per year. Further reducing this figure for the estimated $0.7 million annual additional cost of MMS administration, the estimated net benefit to the Federal Government is $66.6 million annually. For the portion of FY 2000 remaining after the June 1, 1999, effective date of the rule, the estimated net benefit is $22.2 million.

In the Record of Compliance (ROC) developed for the final Federal oil valuation rule, we estimated an additional annual MMS burden of 13,480 hours at a cost of $674,000 to implement the new rule. This translates into about six to seven additional FTE s. However, we believe these additional FTE s will be offset by a reduction in MMS audit costs under the new rule. Also, MMS's costs may decrease as industry, MMS and State personnel become more proficient in applying the provisions of the new rule. Further, we based the ROC estimates on the best information available at the time. The ultimate costs may change as we move into the implementation stage and respond to a quantity of industry requests for approvals and determinations that may be different than we originally estimated. We also recognize that the final cost is partially dependent on the number and types of training sessions and other outreach required to inform industry and MMS/State auditors of the new rule s provisions.

Management of Funds

Question 16: The Committee was recently informed about an employee who embezzeled $395,000 from the Minerals Management Service (MMS) over a period of three years. What are you doing with financial control systems to ensure that this does not happen again?

Answer: The embezzlement was discovered by MMS staff while reconciling the bureau's administrative operating accounts. These are the funds appropriated by Congress to pay salaries and buy goods and services for the operations of the bureau. The embezzlement did not involve any royalty collection or payments or their status at the Treasury.

MMS staff compiled the initial evidence provided to the Inspector General's investigators and cooperated with them to obtain further documentation. The embezzlement scheme involved funds about to be returned to the Treasury from expiring appropriations. The individual responsible for ensuring that these funds were correctly returned to Treasury felt that she could defeat the existing checks and balances. No system gave the embezzler the authority to approve and make payments without the proper documentation to indicate a legitimate expense to the MMS. The embezzler created false records to conceal her actions and make it appear that legitimate expenditures were being made. She was able to accomplish these actions by illicitly obtaining the passwords and system authorities of other employees. This made it appear that the payments were being ordered and verified by two separate people. No other MMS employees were culpable in this theft.

A number of steps have been taken to prevent this event from occurring again. Immediately upon discovering the likelihood of embezzlement, the passwords and authorities of the suspected employee were revoked. This included her access to the building in which she had been working as well as her access to files and systems.

At the same time, the passwords of all other employees in the finance organization were changed and their authorities to take actions in the accounting system were temporarily curtailed pending a more detailed review of any possible overlaps. The more detailed review has been completed and authorities necessary to the conduct of regular business have been restored to finance organization employees.

Other steps taken included the reassignment of the lead accountant and the establishment of an interagency task force to review and reconcile MMS accounts. The Inspector General's auditors have been key participants in the review of all of our processes. Finally, we have engaged a nationally known public accounting firm to provide a further review of the finance processes and controls.

As the Inspector General was quoted as saying in a February 19, 2000 Washington Post article on this incident, the system has been fixed and the embezzlement would not happen today.

Department of the Interior

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

(91)

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING
RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Responses to

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD: FY 2001 REQUEST

FY 1999 Appropriations	**$278,699,000**
FY 2000 Appropriations	**$291,733,000**
FY 2001 Request	**$309,234,000**
Difference	**+$17,501,000**

FY 2000 Staffing Estimate	**647**
FY 2001 Staffing Estimate	**650**
Difference	**+3**

Question 1: How much money is currently in the abandoned mine lands trust fund?

ANSWER: As of February 29, 2000, the unappropriated balance in the abandoned mine lands trust fund was $ 1,310,590,382. The exact amount of the unappropriated balance fluctuates as collections are received during the year.

Question 2: Please provide a table with the AML fund balance, and the amount added to the fund each year and the amount appropriated out of the fund each year, for the period 1995 through 2000, and include the projections for FY 2001 in the President's budget.

ANSWER:

Summary Status of Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund
Fiscal Years 1995 - 2001
(Dollars in Thousands)

Fiscal Year	Receipts & Interest Income			Appropriations			Cumulative Unappropriated Fund Balance
	Amount	Interest Earned	Cumulative	Amount	Transfer to UMWA	Cumulative	
1995	255,433	61,730	4,083,084	182,386		3,105,498	977,586
1996	256,451	69,383	4,408,918	173,887	47,184	3,326,569	1,082,349
1997	266,783	81,006	4,756,708	177,085	31,374	3,535,028	1,221,680
1998	273,039	67,031	5,096,778	177,623	32,562	3,745,213	1,351,565
1999	276,674	82,831	5,456,283	185,392	81,766	4,012,371	1,443,912
2000	277,200	72,700	5,806,183	196,208	108,959	4,317,538	1,488,645
2001	277,000	82,800	6,165,983	211,000	67,000	4,595,696	1,570,287

NOTES: The FY 2000-2001 fee receipt amounts and interest earnings are projections. Beginning In FY 1992, SMCRA was amended to allow the AML Fund to be invested. The Energy Policy Act of 1992 provided that funds from the interest earned could be transferred to the United Mine Workers of America Combined Benefit Fund. Beginning in FY 1996, the appropriated amount includes payment to the United Mine Workers of America Combined Benefit Fund. The FY 2001 transfer is a projection. The FY 2000 transfer included a one-time emergency supplemental of $68 million.

Question 3: Is there interest earned on the fund? What is the cumulative annual interest? How much of the interest is transferred each year to other accounts?

ANSWER:

The Abandoned Mine Reclamation Act of 1990 authorized interest to be paid on the AML fund. As of the end of FY 2000, $544.7 million is projected as cumulative interest earnings on the AML Fund. The following table provides information on the transfer of interest earned by the AML Fund to other accounts by fiscal year. The remaining balance of interest projected as of the end of FY 2000 is $237.3 million.

Interest and Transfers of the AML Fund

FISCAL YEAR	INTEREST	ORIGINAL TRANSFERS REQUEST [A]	TRANSFERS AFTER ADJUSTMENTS [3]	BALANCE OF INTEREST
FY92	$39.3 M	$7.0M [1]	$7.0M [1]	$32.3M
FY93 - FY95	$132.4M	N/A	$68M [2]	$64.4M
FY1996	$69.4M	$47.2M [A]	$43.5M [3]	$25.9M
FY1997	$81.0M	$31.4M [A]	$49.3M [3]	$31.7M
FY1998	$67.0M	$32.6M [A]	$53.7M [3]	$13.3M
FY1999	$82.9M	$81.8M [A]	$44.9M [3]	$38.0M
FY2000	$72.7M [4]	$42.5M [A]	$41.0M [4]	$31.7M [4]
TOTAL	$544.7M [4]	$242.5M [A]	$307.4M	$237.3M [4]

A/ Original UMWA CBF transfer request to OSM for estimated unassigned health care premiums.
1/ Clean Streams Initiative transfer in FY1999.
2/ UMW additional transfer in FY2000.
3/ FY1996 through FY1999; includes initial year transfers and subsequent year UMWA CBF invoice adjustments.
4/ FY2000 interest is a projection (approximately $31M earned as of 2/29/00), therefore totals are projected for Interest level and Balance of Interest. Transfer amount is UMWA/CBF estimated bill for unassigned health premiums.

Question 4: What is the total cost estimate for the amount of abandoned mine work that remains to be done? At the current rates, how long will it take to get half of this work done?

ANSWER: As of December 31, 1999, OSM's Abandoned Mine Land Inventory includes $6.3 billion in unreclaimed high priority (Priority 1 and 2) coal mining related problems, including $3.6 billion in new watershed sites added by Pennsylvania. The newly added watershed problems are areas that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania determined represented a potential danger to human health and safety and general welfare, a priority two determination. These problems have existed as long as the program has existed, but only recently has Pennsylvania raised the priority from 3 to 2 and added them to the inventory. Pennsylvania is the only state thus far to list such problems, but that does not mean that others will not in the future.

The inventory is dynamic, as new problems including landslides and subsidence events occur continually. Other problems that are currently ineligible for inclusion in the inventory become eligible as economic development moves into an old mining area or problems deteriorate to the point they become threats to human health and safety. Even without any new problems being identified, it would take over twenty years at the current appropriation rate to reclaim half the outstanding high priority problems.

Question 5: Please provide some summary information on the National Abandoned Mine Lands Inventory: the number of sites, the acreage by state, the type of reclamation required, and the severity/priority ranking for sites.

ANSWER: The Abandoned Mine Land Inventory includes 15,229 sites having priority 1, 2, or 3 problems. Of these, 8,724, or 57 percent, are funded or completed and 6,505 are not funded. The number of sites are shown below by State and Indian Tribe.

Number of Sites by State/Indian Tribe

	Sites		
State/Indian Tribe	**Unfunded**	**Funded ***	**Completed**
Alaska	4	2	24
Alabama	331	28	633
Arkansas	38	9	86
Blackfeet	1	0	0
California	3	0	2
Cheyenne River	5	0	15
Colorado	93	20	523
Crow	5	0	50
Northern Cheyenne	0	0	6
Fort Berthold	2	0	1
Fort Peck	1	0	5
Georgia	1	0	22
Hopi	0	0	13
Iowa	91	2	56
Idaho	1	0	0
Illinois	62	66	720
Indiana	102	46	579
Jicarilla Apache	0	0	3
Kansas	238	11	203
Kentucky	885	204	675
Massachusetts	1	0	0
Maryland	29	21	78
Michigan	3	13	21
Missouri	112	2	106
Montana	244	15	445
Navajo	0	6	131
North Carolina	0	0	4
North Dakota	33	0	66
New Mexico	18	11	108
Ohio	224	87	580
Oklahoma	199	6	117
Oregon	16	0	5
Pennsylvania	1,190	120	819
Rocky Boys	2	0	3
Rhode Island	0	0	1
San Carlos Apache	1	0	0
South Dakota	0	0	4
Southern Ute	6	0	5
Tennessee	140	25	119
Texas	4	1	24
Uintah & Ouray	1	0	3
Ute Mountain Ute	0	0	1
Utah	43	0	114
Virginia	210	33	292
Washington	26	0	29
White Mountain Apache	1	0	0
Wind River	11	0	17
West Virginia	2,123	14	1,135
Wyoming	5	22	117
Total	**6,505**	**764**	**7,960**

All Programs, Priorities 1, 2, and 3; Sites are considered "Funded" when cost data shows at least partial funding or partial reclamation.

The Inventory has problems totaling 625,745 acres. In this context, an acre is a standardized unit of measurement obtained by a statistical conversion of all types of reclamation problems including subsidence, landslides, open shafts, underground fires, and unstable man-made cliffs called highwalls. Of the 625,745 acres, 245,218, or approximately 40 percent, have already been reclaimed or have been funded. The number of acres is by State and Indian Tribe is illustrated below:

	Acres by State		
State/Indian Tribe	**Funded & Completed**	**Unfunded**	**Total**
Alaska	216	240	456
Alabama	23,980	72,751	96,731
Arkansas	5,363	3,809	9,172
Blackfeet	0	1	1
California	7	2	9
Cheyenne River	785	51	837
Colorado	2,674	2,961	5,635
Crow	292	46	339
Northern Cheyenne	83	0	83
Fort Berthold	12	4	16
Fort Peck	34	2	36
Georgia	306	66	373
Hopi	275	0	275
Iowa	3,387	5,352	8,739
Illinois	10,566	1,979	12,545
Indiana	9,213	3,400	12,613
Jicarilla Apache	4	0	4
Kansas	2,665	5,890	8,555
Kentucky	51,923	32,267	84,189
Maryland	1,943	822	2,764
Michigan	1,087	34	1,121
Missouri	5,346	11,029	16,375
Montana	3,556	1,388	4,944
Navajo	2,048	7	2,054
North Carolina	1	0	1
North Dakota	2,687	3,819	6,506
New Mexico	385	277	662
Ohio	10,831	37,326	48,158
Oklahoma	4,697	28,715	33,413
Oregon	2	9	11
Pennsylvania	34,689	39,231	73,920
Rocky Boys	3	2	5
Rhode Island	6	0	6
South Dakota	4	0	4
Southern Ute	2	6	8
Tennessee	2,947	9,876	12,823
Texas	2,523	250	2,772
Uintah & Ouray	6	0	6
Ute Mountain Ute	1	0	1
Utah	1,198	1,059	2,256
Virginia	8,153	40,381	48,534
Washington	36	301	337
Wind River	10	23	33
West Virginia	17,487	77,086	94,573
Wyoming	33,788	65	33,853
Total	**245,218**	**380,527**	**625,745**

All Programs, Priorities 1, 2, & 3

The types of problems in the inventory are listed below by unit and estimated reclamation cost. The total estimated unfunded reclamation cost is $8.3 billion. Three problem types -- polluted water (human consumption, highwalls, and underground mine fires) -- account for two thirds of these costs.

Required Reclamation by Problem Type

Problem Type	Units	Unfunded Units	Unfunded Costs
Bench	Acres	5,082.1	15,416,269
Clogged Stream	Miles	451.2	58,909,426
Clogged Stream Lands	Acres	24,376.3	197,355,883
Dangerous Highwalls	Feet	4,461,038.0	578,565,251
Dangerous Impoundment	Count	911.0	17,412,823
Ind. Or Res. Waste Dump	Acres	278.4	882,202
Dangerous Pile or Embankment	Acres	15,914.8	320,415,980
Dangerous Slide	Acres	2,268.7	73,532,177
Equipment & Facilities	Count	1,400.4	4,288,834
Gases: Hazardous or Explosive	Count	23.0	2,176,001
Gob	Acres	7,214.2	56,449,851
Highwalls	Feet	7,057,135.0	1,050,415,926
Hazardous Equipment or Facilities	Count	3,248.0	31,437,439
Haul Road	Acres	1,000.2	5,381,854
Hazardous Water body	Count	1,134.0	51,303,153
Industrial or Residential Waste	Acres	1,106.1	64,915,275
Mine Opening	Count	992.0	7,262,185
Other		11,453.1	22,637,947
Portal	Count	9,048.0	33,314,488
Pit, Open Pit, Strip Pit	Acres	4,398.6	42,679,370
Polluted Water: Agricultural/Industrial	Count	409.0	97,936,065
Polluted Water: Human consumption	Count	4,606.0	3,736,978,784
Subsidence-Prone Area	Acres	8,177.3	368,419,620
Spoil, Spoil Bank	Acres	96,127.8	295,323,274
Surface Burning	Acres	487.8	21,078,292
Slurry	Acres	981.5	9,143,305
Slump	Acres	2,126.8	98,704,072
Underground Mine Fire	Acres	3,852.4	851,745,525
Vertical Opening	Count	14,783.0	99,773,756
Water	Gallons	57,710.0	92,819,642
Total			**8,306,674,669**

All Programs, Priorities 1, 2, & 3

Question 6: Please give an indication of the number of new sites that have been added to the priority listing over the last five years, and those that have been satisfactorily reclaimed.

ANSWER:

Additions to the AML Inventory	Number (Sites)	Cost (Million $)
New Sites Added Over the Past 5 Years:	3,232	$4,600.7*
Number of these New Sites reclaimed	1,279	$ 95.6

*Includes $3.6 million in watershed problems (12 sites) added by Pennsylvania in late 1999.

Question 7: Your budget statement says that you still hope to fund the abandoned mine lands (AML) program at a level commensurate to fee receipts by 2003. Please provide a table which indicates, by year, fee receipts and either the appropriated level or the anticipated request for the AML program, for the period from 1992 to 2003.

ANSWER:

AML FEE RECEIPTS

Fiscal Year	Fee Receipts	Actual Appropriations or Projected Outyears
1992	242	188
1993	238	188
1994	244	190
1995	255	182
1996	256	174
1997	267	177
1998	273	178
1999	276	185
2000	276.7 (est)	196
2001	277.0 (est)	211 (est)
2002	281.2 (est)	245.5 (est)
2003	280.6 (est)	280 (est)

The outyear appropriations for FY 2001 to FY 2003 are based on a proportional phase-in to achieve an appropriations level equal to fee receipts. They should not necessarily be construed as OSM's future budget requests.

Question 8: Are there other accounts, either within the OSM or within the Department of the Interior, that you can suggest will get corresponding funding decreases in order to maintain the budget balance?

ANSWER: The OSM competes each year, as a part of the overall budget process, to obtain additional funds for high priority programs. Increasing the AML appropriation to the level of receipts has been OSM's highest priority. OSM also must compete against funding priorities of all other Bureaus within the Department each year.

Question 9: The SMCRA will be expiring soon. What discussions have you had with the Hill and within the Administration regarding its reauthorization?

ANSWER: While SMCRA is not expiring, OSM's authority to collect the abandoned mine reclamation fee will expire on September 30, 2004. In FY 2001, the Administration has proposed legislation to ensure continued benefits for retired coal miners and their dependents as well as ensuring continued solvency of the United Mine Workers Combined Benefit Fund and for continued abandoned coal mine lands reclamation. The Administration is proposing an extension of the authority to collect the abandoned mine reclamation fee at the same rate for an additional ten years. OSM has not had any formal discussions with members or staff of Congress on this issue.

Question 10: The current inventory of such abandoned coal mine sites still requiring reclamation far exceeds projected revenues from the fee. The authority to collect this fee expires in FY 2004. The questions are:

a) at current revenue rates, how much reclamation; priority 1s, 2s, and 3s, will be left unfunded after the authority to collect the fee expires?

ANSWER 10 (a): Assuming that the President's budget request is enacted, and that full funding is achieved in 2003, approximately $7.6 billion of presently identified priority 1, 2, and 3 unfunded coal costs will remain when the authority to collect the fee expires.

b) does OSM plan to seek an extension of the authority to collect the fee to address the remaining problems?, and

ANSWER 10 (b): As stated in the FY 2001 budget, the Administration is committed to proposing a ten-year extension of the authority to collect fees at current rates.

c) is any portion of the interest currently being earned on the fund going to be available for reclamation.

ANSWER 10 (c): Transfers to the United Mine Workers of America Combined Benefit Fund each year have been less than the interest available for each year. The Fund is accumulating a surplus of interest each year. Interest not transferred to the UMWA each year, is available for appropriation to address reclamation in accordance with SMCRA.

Question 11: Your GPRA performance goal for the AML reclamation program is the number of acres reclaimed. I have several questions relating to this measure:

a) Does this measurement include reclamation of other kinds of coal mining problems left abandoned, such as subsidence due to underground mining, high walls left standing and under ground acid drainage?

ANSWER 11 (a): OSM uses acres to measure the accomplishment of reclamation. An acre is a statistical conversion of all reclamation problems to an equivalent measure. This measure includes all types of coal related problems including subsidence due to underground mining, mud slides, high walls left standing after mining, and underground acid drainage. This converted measure allows OSM to compare projects in a consistent manner.

b) If not, how are these kinds of problems measured?

ANSWER 11 (b): OSM measures all types of coal related reclamation problems by statistically converting them to an acreage equivalent.

c) What does the footnote in this year's budget mean? Quote: "The FY99 accomplishments for acres reclaimed is a calculated estimate." Is this different than what you were measuring in the FY 2000 budget? Why?

ANSWER 11 (c): The acres accomplishment estimate is normally derived by comparing the total completed acreage reported on the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System at the end of a given fiscal year to that reported acreage at the end of the previous fiscal year. Improvements in the Inventory System in 1999 allowed for easier data entry. We believe that this led to a reporting by some States of backlogged completion numbers resulting in an artificially high 1999 number. To make comparisons between years more meaningful, we adjusted downward the reported FY 1999 completion figure to approximate a true one-year period. We will evaluate the reported numbers as of the end of fiscal year 2000 to see if the "catch-up" of data entry has been completed.

d) What is the current cost per acre to reclaim abandoned coal mines?

ANSWER 11 (d): Over the life of the program, the average construction cost per statistical acre of high priority coal mine problems reclaimed has been approximately $11,000. However, average per acre reclamation costs will fluctuate depending on the types of reclamation problems addressed in a given year. For example, if a number of mine fires are reclaimed, the average per acre construction cost will rise; if mostly shafts and portals are sealed, average costs will be lower.

Question 12: Regarding appropriation language for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund; Your detailed budget submission; on page Introduction -10, proposes language for the increase as follows:

> **$ 13 million is to be used only in those states and by those Tribes that are using AML funds to address environmental problems caused by historic abandoned coal sites and other mine sites, and who obligate to grants all of their distributed**

portion of the fiscal year 2000 AML appropriation." However, the Appendix of the President's Budget does not include " ..and other mine sites, ...". in its appropriation language. What is the effect of deleting the "and other mine sites" language from this provision?

ANSWER: The Administration's proposed appropriation language is what correctly appears in the Appendix to the President's Budget. OSM's Budget Justification document contains a typographical error as it inadvertantly did not delete the provision to "... and other mine sites..." The effect of the additional provision would be that certified States/Tribes (Louisiana, Montana, Texas, Wyoming, Hopi and Navajo) would not receive any of the requested AML grant increase. These States would receive the same grant distribution as in FY2000.

Small Operators Assistance Program

Question 13: The small operators assistance program (SOAP) is usually used to promote remining. What is the relationship between the SOAP program and remining?

ANSWER: While operators are not required to perform remining in order to receive assistance, there is a trend for SOAP projects to involve mining on previously disturbed land. In Pennsylvania, almost three-fourths of the permits issued to SOAP operators in 1997 included remining and concomitant reclamation of abandoned mine lands. These operators are able to mine and reclaim disturbed areas which are too small to be profitable for a large operation.

Question 14: In FY 1999, OSM requested and was granted a reprogramming of $2,080,000 for the SOAP program. In approving this reprogramming, we wrote; " The Committee directs the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement to submit a recommendation to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by May 1, 1999, for fully funding this program in FY 2000..." Does OSM's request for FY 2001 fully fund the SOAP requirements?

ANSWER:

In formulating the FY 2001 budget, OSM examined its priorities and determined how best to allocate available resources among competing needs. OSM's FY 2001 request for SOAP, combined with available carryover funds and recoveries, will fund the program at a measured level of effort to meet program demand. To accomplish this, OSM, in conjunction with the States, established a team to identify an appropriate level of provided services and an allocation mechanism to meet available resources.

Question 15: If you do not request additional SOAP funds, and if the Congress only appropriates what you request, will you institute a system to prioritize awards of assistance through the SOAP program? Have you thought of competitive awards for assistance via the SOAP program?

ANSWER: SOAP funding is currently distributed to States using a formula based on recent program activity, specifically the number of small operator applications approved for assistance. This priority is intended to maximize the number of operators SOAP can assist within the

available funding. In a way, States can compete for funding–a State which can serve more operators with the money they get is likely to receive additional funds in future years.

Each State program is required to establish its own system for allocating limited funds among operators. These State priorities vary, but a first-come-first-serve policy is the most common.

Question 16: Please provide a summary table, by year, of SOAP appropriations, carry-over funds available, amount obligated, and funding requested each year for the period of FY 1979 to FY 2000.

ANSWER:

Small Operator Assistance Program

Fiscal Year	Funding Request by OSM	SOAP Appropriations	Carryover Funds Available to OSM	Amount Obligated by OSM to States
1979	10,000,000	15,000,000	–	0
1980	25,000,000	25,000,000	10,000,000	71,000
1981	10,000,000	5,000,000	19,929,000	822,000
1982	1,000,000	0	24,107,000	8,703,000
1983	0	0	14,853,104	2,536,000
1984	0	0	12,682,702	802,000
1985	0	0	4,566,189	1,461,932
1986	3,100,000	2,949,000	2,246,358	1,471,000
1987	0	0	876,675	65,027
1988	0	0	2,365,394	1,592,350
1989	0	0	1,035,272	773,871
1990	1,500,000	2,000,000	261,401	1,619,022
1991	1,500,000	1,492,000	1,547,134	1,901,383
1992	1,500,000	1,851,000	1,502,685	2,286,614
1993	1,775,000	1,760,000	4,936,184	2,374,500
1994	1,760,000	1,760,000	5,588,797	547,733
1995	1,760,000	1,757,000	6,146,879	3,606,743
1996	0	0	5,415,951	3,896,190
1997	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,663,140	3,710,475
1998	1,500,000	1,500,000	603,916	2,807,000
1999	1,500,000	3,580,000	240,000	3,613,049
2000	1,500,000	1,500,000	40,008	

United Mine Workers Health Fund

Question 17: We remain concerned and confused about the large amount of funds being provided for the United Mine Workers (UMW) of America from the AML fund. Please provide a table which indicates all transfers from Federal accounts to the UMW combined health fund for the past 10 years.

ANSWER:

INTEREST TRANSFERS FROM THE AML FUND

UMWA Payment Statistics (as of December 31, 1999 - unassigned)

	Interest Earned	FY 96 Payment	FY 97 Payment	FY 98 Payment	FY 99 Payment	FY 2000 Payment	Total Bills	Interest Balance
FY 93-95	$132.50					68	68	64.5
FY96 Bill	$69.40	47.2		-10.7	9.6	-2.5	43.6	25.8
FY 97 Bill	$81.00		31.4	7	15.1	-4.2	49.3	31.7
FY 98 Bill	$67.00			36.2	9.5	8	53.7	13.3
FY 99 Bill	$82.80				47.6	-2.7	44.9	37.9
FY 00 Bill (1)	$72.7 (1)					41.0 (1)	42.5	31.2
Total Payment		$47.20	$31.40	$32.50	$81.80	$108.96	$302.00	

(1) Note: FY 2000 payment is net of adjustments submitted by CBF for prior years where overestimate resulted in overpayment for the indicated years. FY 2000 interest earned is a projection. Total payment of $108.96 is correct ($68M + 40,959,941.61 (bill less adjustments)). (2) Note: The $68 million was a special one-time transfer in the FY 2000 Interior Appropriations Bill.

Question 18: The FY 2000 Interior Appropriations Act included in Title V a $68 million special payment to the combined health fund. Why was this necessary? Why are you not asking for additional funding for this fund this year?

ANSWER: In FY 2000, the Administration proposed a one-time only transfer, from the AML interest to the UMWA Combined Benefit Fund (UMWACBF) for eligible past costs of the "*Eastern*" court case and related decisions. These court decisions required payments for health care costs for certain beneficiaries to come from the unassigned pool, rather the assigned pool, thereby necessitating federal funds be provided, as pursuant to SMCRA and the Coal Act. Such transfer of AML interest was limited to no more than $42 million and to be taken from AML interest earned from FY 1993 through FY 1995.

In FY 2000, the Interior Appropriation Act increased the one-time transfer total from $42 million to $68 million. The appropriations report language stated that the $68 million was expected to stave off insolvency in the fund for the short term, and that Congress would revisit the matter this year in order to secure the fund's long-term financial stability. For FY 2001, the Administration now proposes a plan for long-term stability by amending the authorizing language in the Coal Act, to include a mandatory General Fund Transfer - not appropriated -therefore maintaining the character of the limited use of AML interest transfer.

Question 19: How much funding was transferred to the combined health fund as a result of the Title V provision mentioned above and when did this occur? We understand that the funding was not reduced by the .38% across the board cut that applied to all Federal discretionary appropriations. Why not?

ANSWER: A total of $108, 959,941.61 million was transferred to the UMWACBF in FY 2000 from AML interest. The transfer occurred in two components. The first component ($40,959,941.61) was transferred on November 4, 1999 and is the estimated annual transfer of interest earned on the AML Fund that the Secretary is required to make to the CBF under section 402 (h) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. The second component ($68 million) was transferred on December 16, 1999 and is to defray health care benefit costs associated with the current stressed finances of the CBF.

The across the board cut was not applied to the UMWA transfer amount because according to the terms of the across the board reduction, mandatory accounts were exempt.

Question 20: What is the overall fiscal status of the UMW combined health fund? What legislative actions are being considered to solve this problem? Please summarize Administration efforts this fiscal year to work with the appropriate authorizing committees to provide a long-term solution to the health fund problem.

ANSWER: The Administration projects that, without the Administration's proposal, the Combined Benefit Fund will have an accumulated deficit of nearly $50 million by the end of FY 2001. A $50 million annual deficit is projected each year thereafter, if the current level of service is maintained. Obviously, such steadily deepening deficits, which the Congress foresaw last fall, cannot be sustained, which is why we propose a long-term intervention.

The President's FY 2001 Budget proposal includes legislation in three parts that addresses long term concerns associated with the Combined Benefit Fund's Health Care premium accounts.

First, the legislation will provide for an annual mandatory General Fund Federal transfer for a period of 10 years. The 10-year total amounts to $346 million with a transfer of $38 million in FY 2001.

Second, the legislation will reverse the effects of the court decision in *National Coal v. Chater* regarding calculation of the premiums charged coal companies that had contractually agreed to pay for their coal miner employee's retirement health benefits. This would increase operator premiums by about 10% over current levels, bringing it to a level that better reflects actual benefit premium rates, and also continues cost containment practices.

The 10-year revenue gain to the Combined Benefit Fund of this reversal is approximately $86 million, with approximately an $11 million gain in FY 2001.

Third, the legislation will clarify a provision of the Coal Act regarding the timing of the Social Security Administration's assignment of retired miners to the companies that had

employed them and had agreed to pay for their retirement health benefits.

The Administration also proposes to extend the AML reclamation fee an additional 10 years, beginning in FY 2005 to FY 2014. In addition to financing growing reclamation needs identified under current law, some of the interest earnings on the fund balance will continue to finance the health costs of coal miners (and their families) who are "unassigned" under current law – generally retired miners whose former employers are no longer in business.

Question 21: Has the Federal government ever audited the UMW of America Combined Health Benefit fund? Please summarize these audits and explain why the fund appears to have shortfalls now.

ANSWER: The Department of the Interior's Inspector General is currently auditing the Combined Benefit Fund at the specific request of the Director of OSM. The fund has not been audited by the Department of Interior before; however each year the Fund contracts with independant auditors. The books have always received a clean report.

Question 22: The FY 2000 President's budget claimed that there would be a legislative proposal that year to provide $42 million for the United Mine Workers of America for health benefits. Why was this proposal never presented to the Congress?

ANSWER: The FY 2000 President's Budget included a legislative proposal that would have provided a one-time transfer of $42 million. The details of the full legislative package were delayed in being transmitted to the Congress. In FY 2000, rather than the original $42 million proposed, a one-time transfer of $68 million was passed by Congress and signed by the President. The long-term proposal in the FY 2001 budget (which, as mentioned, consists of authorizing legislation only), has already been transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Interior.

Emergency Reclamation Program

Question 23: Please describe the emergency program and provide a table which indicates the distribution of funds, by state and year, during each of the past 5 years.

ANSWER: Emergency projects are those involving abandoned mine lands that present a danger to public health, safety, or general welfare and which require immediate action. Under Section 401(a) of SMCRA, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to address emergency problems with appropriated funds from the Fund for the emergency restoration, reclamation, abatement, control, or prevention of effects of coal mining practices. The following States have assumed responsibility for the AML emergency program within their borders: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Virginia, and West Virginia.

STATE EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

State/Tribe	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Alabama	300,000	300,000	300,000	400,000	425,000
Alaska	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Arkansas	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Illinois	561,000	561,000	588,970	611,223	621,000
Indiana	110,000	310,000	247,998	267,152	293,344
Kansas	460,000	460,000	450,000	465,000	460,000
Missouri	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	49,771
Montana	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
N Dakota	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Ohio	1,700,000	1,700,000	2,240,000	2,070,663	2,100,000
Oklahoma	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40,000
Virginia	350,000	350,000	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
W Virginia	4,350,000	4,350,000	1,704,032	3,699,962	1,071,885
Totals	8,044,000	8,244,000	6,244,000	8,727,000	6,274,000

The above table displays the amounts granted through the annual distribution process. Actual annual expenditures for emergencies may result in changes to these figures.

The following table shows Federal emergency project expenditures (by state for the last 5 years) for all states that have elected not to assume control of the AML emergency program.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

STATE/ TRIBE	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
California	n/a	n/a	n/a	$538,911	$14,283
Colorado	$5,736	$34,514	$17,774	$424	$32,516
Indiana	$2,968	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Iowa	$215	$11,140	$73,765	$212,590	$0
Kentucky	$4,922,208	$3,728,636	$5,912,246	$6,965,902	$5,274,053
Maryland	n/a	$40,670	$49,845	$89,435	n/a
Michigan	$30,752	n/a	n/a	$90,193	$36,825
Missouri	$20,383	$1,829	n/a	n/a	n/a
Oklahoma	$3,825	$1,320	$1,994	$14,495	n/a
Pennsylvania	$3,788,357	$3,094,573	$3,491,912	$5,952,731	$2,529,655
Tennessee	n/a	n/a	$315,330	$108,209	$1,216
Washington	$12,000	$325,860	$56,100	$83,666	$61,470
TOTALS	$8,788,444	$7,238,542	$9,920,966	$14,056,556	$7,950,018

FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Question 24: Please provide a summary of the extent of needs for the Federal reclamation projects. What is the inventory and how complete is it?

ANSWER:

OSM is requesting the following amounts for the Federal Reclamation Program for FY 2001:

Emergency projects	$10,970,000
High Priority projects	2,382,000
Appalachian Clean Streams; Cooperative Agreements	2,750,000
Operations	5,201,000
Total	$ 21,303,000

Unfunded Federal Reclamation Program problems in the inventory total $20.3 million. These are eligible AML problems in States not having their own AML programs, on Indian Tribal lands.

Unfunded Federal Reclamation Problems	
State/Indian Tribe	
Alaska	101,042
California	150,000
Cheyenne River	100,000
Georgia	232,000
Idaho	5,000
Michigan	4,463,000
Oregon	163,000
Tennessee	10,992,430
Washington	4,024,600
Wind River	77,000
Total	**20,308,072**

Question 25: How much funding is needed to keep the inventory up-to-date?

ANSWER: While OSM does not specifically track these costs, OSM estimates it costs $200,000 per fiscal year to keep the inventory current. This does not include the costs to the States and Indian Tribes as they enter data into the system.

Question 26: What funding are you requesting for the federal reclamation program for projects and for operations? Please also list program and project expectations by agency for the lands managed by the Forest Service, BLM, and BIA.

ANSWER: OSM is requesting the following amounts for the Federal Reclamation Program: $10,970,000 for emergency projects; $2,382,000 for high-priority projects; $2,750,000 for Appalachian Clean Steams Cooperative Agreements, and $5,201,000 for reclamation operations. Total requested funding is $21,303,000.

OSM expects to receive funds from the National Park Service to assist in reclaiming AML sites in the New River Gorge in West Virginia and at Friendship Hill in Pennsylvania.

APPALACHIAN CLEAN STREAMS

Question 27: How do the projects selected for the Appalachian clean streams initiative rank on the state priority lists? Please provide a table of 1998, 1999 and 2000 to date funded projects and their ranking. How much has already been obligated for this program of the FY 2000 appropriation? How much do you anticipate obligating this fiscal year?

The States generally classify acid mine drainage pollution as a priority 2 problem, affecting public health, safety, and general welfare. OSM anticipates obligating all FY 2000 project funds ($5.9 million) by issuing grants to States before the close of the fiscal year. Since the States obligate funds throughout the year, the exact amount already obligated by States for FY 2000 is not precisely known.

The following table provides a listing of Appalachian Clean Streams projects funded from FY 1998 to FY 2000. It does not include FY 2000 State or Cooperative Agreement projects for which funds have not been obligated.

Project #	Project Name, State	State Priority Ranking
1	Cane Creek, Alabama	2
2	Acmar Washer, Alabama	2
3	Peabody Will Scarlet Mine, Illinois	3
4	Wheeler Creek, Indiana	2
5	Lick Creek, Indiana	2
6	Augusta Lake, Indiana	2
7	Log Creek Church, Indiana	2
8	Four Rivers, Indiana	2
9	De Neer, Iowa	2
10	Mitchell, Iowa	2
11	Ketchup Lake, Kentucky	2
12	Rock Creek, Kentucky	2
13	Spewing Camp Branch Refuse, Kentucky	1

14	Cherry Creek (Teets), Maryland	2
15	Potomac Hill Run, Maryland	2
16	Georges Creek, Maryland	3
17	Everhart, Maryland	2
18	Coney Cleaner, Maryland	2
19	Elklick I and II, Maryland	2
20	Elklick III, Maryland	2
21	Neff Run, Maryland	2
22	Rock Lodge, Maryland	2
23	Railroad St. (Coney Silk Mill), Maryland	2
24	Mill Run, Maryland	2
25	Tebo Creek, Missouri	2
26	Old Bevier Wetland, Missouri	2
27	Upper Cedar Creek, Missouri	2
28	Hiram Channel, Ohio	2
29	Linton Road, Ohio	2
30	Linden, Ohio	2
31	Snake Hollow, Ohio	2
32	Salem Hollow ,Ohio	2
33	Jobes Hollow, Ohio	2
34	Little Raccoon Creek, Ohio	2
35	Carbondale Wetland, Ohio	2
36	Rock Run 24, Ohio	2
37	Middle Creek (Swatara), Pennsylvania	2
38	Oven Run (Koontztown), Pennsylvania	2
39	Carbon Run, Pennsylvania	2
40	Mill Creek, Pennsylvania	2
41	Swatara Creek (Tremont), Pennsylvania	2
42	Loyalsock Creek, Pennsylvania	2
43	Little Toby Creek, Pennsylvania	2
44	Keystone Ave.(Lucky Run), Pennsylvania	2
45	Vintondale, Pennsylvania	2
46	Upper Guest River, Virginia	2
47	Ely Creek, Virginia	2
48	Browns Creek, West Virginia	2
49	Grass Run, West Virginia	2
50	Lower Paint Creek, West Virginia	2
51	Bull Run, West Virginia	2
52	McCarty Highwall (Beaver Creek), West Virginia	2
53	Buffalo Creek, West Virginia	2
54	Fickey Run, West Virginia	2
55	Piney Swamp, West Virginia	2

Question 28: Please provide a summary table of the Appalachian clean streams initiative funding by year, including funding requested, appropriations maxima, and amount obligated. Also include the amount of funds contributed by States and by other partners, but do not include the value in-kind work as if it was funding.

ANSWER:

APPALACHIAN CLEAN STREAMS FUNDING HISTORY

Fiscal Year	Request	Appropriated	Obligated
1996	$11.0	0	0
1997	$ 4.3	Up to $ 4.0	$ 3.9
1998	$ 5.0	Up to $ 5.0	$ 2.5
1999	$ 7.0*	Up to $ 7.0	$ 7.0
2000	$ 8.0*	Up to $ 8.0	**
Funds Contributed by Partners to date			$ 41.2 million

* Total includes $ 0.2 million for Acid Drainage Technology Initiative; $ 0.750 million for Appalachian Clean Streams Cooperative Agreements; $ 0.150 million for partnership assistance.
**All funds will be obligated by the end of FY 2000.

Question 29. Which additional projects do you propose to add to the clean streams initiative with your 2001 budget proposal? Do you anticipate funding all of the projects that were begun in 2000 or will some of these be dropped? How long does it take to complete most of these projects?

ANSWER:

OSM anticipates that approximately 40 new Clean Streams projects will commence (planning, design, or construction) in FY 2001, including both State projects and Cooperative Agreement projects. Once funds are appropriated, the States will select those to be funded through the grant program. OSM will select projects funded through cooperative agreements.

OSM expects that some projects begun in FY 2000 will receive additional FY 2001 funds. Due to the complexity of Appalachian Clean Streams projects and the need to form project funding and management partnerships, they generally take longer than a small, conventional AML project. Once begun, Clean Streams projects move fairly quickly. Several projects funded in FY 2000 were completed in a few months time.

Question 30. What would be the impact of funding the clean streams program at the fiscal year 1998 level? Which proposed projects would not be included?

ANSWER:

Project funding at the FY 1998 level of "up to $5.0 million" would cause severe reductions to the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative and would eliminate seed money to many deserving projects. Particularly hard hit could be States with lower historic coal production such as Missouri, Virginia, Alabama, and Maryland. Many States have non-OSM funding partners and projects they would like to start but cannot due to lack of available funds, even at the higher levels appropriated in FY 1999 and 2000. Funding the FY 1998 level would also force OSM to terminate watershed cooperative agreements and thus eliminate funding of projects sponsored by local nonprofit groups and a potent source of fund leveraging. Specific projects that would or would not be funded can not be identified at this time.

Minimum Level Programs

Question 31. You are proposing appropriation language to increase "minimum level program states" AML funding levels to $2.0 million per state. Are there a significant number of priority 1 and priority 2 coal reclamation projects left to do in such states? If not, why are you proposing this change?

ANSWER:

The inventory includes $346.4 million in unfunded priority 1 and 2 coal related problems in the minimum level program States and on Indian Tribal lands. The following table illustrates the problems by State:

Unfunded High Priority Coal Problems	
State/Indian Tribe	
Alaska	38,336,915
Arkansas	14,087,409
Crow	460,347
Iowa	22,953,897
Kansas	64,225,551
Maryland	8,104,878
Missouri	37,965,909
New Mexico	3,645,000
North Dakota	41,409,861
Oklahoma	90,864,623
Utah	90,864,623
Total	**346,364,223**

Question 32. Please provide a table which indicates which States would have reduced AML funding, and the amount of the reduction, if the Administration request to change the minimum level program funding to $2,000,000 were implemented.

ANSWER:

The minimum program adjustment is taken from Federal Share funds, which are distributed to States based on their historical coal percentages. Therefore, the States with the largest historical coal percentages will be most affected, i.e., Pennsylvania (37%), West Virginia (21%), Kentucky (11%) and Illinois (11%). Using the FY 2000 distribution for illustrative purposes, the table below shows the changes to the Federal share distribution if the minimum program level were increased to $2 million.

MINIMUM LEVEL PROGRAM STATES
REDUCED STATE FUNDING

State/Tribe	FY 2000 Federal Share Distribution	Hypothetical Federal Share Distribution	Difference
Alabama	1,639,129	1,495,868	(143,261
Alaska	1,340,182	1,840,182	500,00
Arkansas	1,500,000	2,000,000	500,00
Colorado	798,828	729,010	(69,818
Illinois	6,072,393	5,541,662	(530,731
Indiana	1,976,981	1,804,191	(172,790
Iowa	1,495,096	1,995,096	500,00
Kansas	1,457,296	1,957,296	500,00
Kentucky	5,951,329	5,431,179	520,15
Louisiana	0	0	
Maryland	1,285,532	1,785,532	500,00
Missouri	1,393,343	1,893,343	500,00
Montana	0	0	
New Mexico	194,205	430,705	236,50
North Dakota	570,538	1,070,538	500,00
Ohio	3,722,455	3,397,110	(325,345
Oklahoma	1,320,134	1,820,134	500,00
Pennsylvania	19,628,987	17,913,401	(1,715,586
Texas	0	0	
Utah	512,335	899,149	386,81
Virginia	1,826,650	1,667,000	(159,650
W Virginia	11,281,187	10,295,204	(985,983
Wyoming	0	0	
Crow	0	0	
Hopi	0	0	
Navajo	0	0	
Nat'l Total	63,968,600	63,966,600	

Question 33. What is the current inventory in each minimum program level state of priority 1 and 2 reclamation projects not yet funded?

ANSWER:

The following table provides the current inventory of priority 1 and 2 unfunded projects in the minimum program States and for Tribes.

Unfunded High Priority Coal Problems

Minimum Program States/Indian Tribe

State/Indian Tribe	Unfunded
Alaska	38,336,915
Arkansas	14,087,409
Crow	460,347
Iowa	22,953,897
Kansas	64,225,551
Maryland	8,104,878
Missouri	37,965,909
New Mexico	3,645,000
North Dakota	41,409,861
Oklahoma	90,864,623
Utah	24,309,223
Total	**346,364,223**

Question 34. If the state minimum program level were restored to $2 million per state and the appropriation were otherwise at the requested level, what would be the impact on other programs and projects?

ANSWER:

Assuming 10 States would be eligible for minimum program status at the $2 million level (New Mexico and Utah would become eligible), the minimum program adjustment would be approximately an additional $5 million. This means that $5 million in priority 1 and 2 projects of the contributing States would be delayed so that an additional $5 million in priority 1 and 2 problems of the minimum program States could be addressed.

Question 35. What additional work would be done by the minimum program states if their minimum funding level were raised to $2 million?

ANSWER:

The minimum program States abate hazards to public health and safety and abate

environmentally degrading problems the same as the other program States and Indian Tribes. They need a steady, constant source of funding to be able to address these problems. A $2 million level would allow minimum program states to maintain viable, cost effective programs. An increase in the minimum program to $2 million per State would result in that State's increased reclamation of high priority (priority 1 and 2) projects. Since projects are selected by the States, we can not say which specific ones would be done with the increased funds.

Question 36. How would the priorities of the increased projects in the minimum program states contrast with those projects which would be lost in the larger program states (which would be reduced to supplement the minimum program states)?

ANSWER:

While minimum program States can address priority 3 problems, an analysis of data taken from the Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System shows that the preponderance of reclamation being done nationwide is high priority work in both the larger States and in the minimum program States. This generally means that the overall reclamation priorities would not change with a shift in funds from the larger States to the minimum program States.

Environmental Protection

Question 37. What is the funding level which the States estimated that they will require for title V grants in FY 2001? Why is your budget request so far below the level needed and requested by the states?

ANSWER:
The States/Tribes estimates for FY 2001, submitted in May 1999, total $61 million. OSM's decision regarding the level of funding for the regulatory grant program was based on anticipated State/Tribal expenditure levels and historic obligation rates and budget target levels.

Question 38. The House Appropriations Committee last year added $1,500,000 to the environmental protection activity by transferring $1,000,000 from the AML clean streams cooperative agreement program and $500,000 from the AML fee compliance program. In so doing, the House Committee reported that, "This transfer will help the States and Tribes meet their increased demand and workload requirements as well as State uncontrollable fixed costs relating to State and Tribal regulatory grants." The questions are:

(a) This fiscal year, you are requesting only $52,697,000 for State Regulatory Grants, which is only $514,000 increase over the appropriation for FY 2000. Why are you not asking for more? Do the States claim that they have a funding shortfall compared with the funding level required to run an effective program?

ANSWER 38 (a): The States/Tribes estimates for FY 2001, submitted in May 1999, total $61 million. OSM's decision regarding the level of funding for the regulatory grant program was based on anticipated State/Tribal expenditure levels and historic obligation rates and budget target levels. While the primacy states as a group do claim that they have a funding shortfall, OSM will work with the States/Tribes to minimize the effects of any actual funding shortfall.

(b) The States have suggested that the funding provided for State regulation and technology have not kept up with fixed cost increases during the recent past. Please provide a table which indicates for the period 1995-2000 the appropriation level for State regulation programs and the level which the States have requested the OSM provide.

ANSWER:

HISTORICAL REGULATORY FUNDING
FISCAL YEARS 1995 - 2000

State	FY 1995 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation	FY 1996 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation	FY 1997 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation	FY 1998 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation	FY 1999 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation	FY 2000 18 Month Estimates	Initial Allocation
Alabama	1,421,625	1,204,372	1,426,065	1,189,270	1,313,750	1,039,433	1,218,815	769,358	1,120,204	896,167	1,029,275	913,745
Alaska	238,365	197,510	201,770	173,561	205,235	171,753	173,580	173,580	204,600	173,662	178,872	173,461
Arkansas	223,646	165,151	188,539	170,980	172,149	171,222	196,838	162,454	180,576	140,364	179,871	163,509
Colorado	1,524,493	1,477,883	1,885,561	1,483,276	1,830,077	1,571,274	1,919,426	1,633,954	2,152,816	1,609,340	1,977,084	1,640,906
Illinois	2,390,919	2,375,423	2,534,161	2,175,233	2,303,062	2,287,009	2,326,532	2,366,904	2,327,701	2,462,102	2,462,102	2,326,864
Indiana	1,829,318	1,767,511	1,835,741	1,669,864	1,794,033	1,672,028	2,161,827	0	2,123,387	1,525,699	2,098,457	1,968,463
Iowa	160,928	157,328	168,984	155,010	186,283	155,230	180,570	155,371	189,599	118,184	184,352	120,502
Kansas	106,113	116,708	135,178	125,119	112,007	119,100	104,166	111,899	116,400	105,102	115,481	107,164
Kentucky	14,169,420	12,372,454	13,376,850	12,256,815	14,356,535	12,474,450	14,119,789	13,249,061	13,377,600	12,515,093	13,050,259	13,760,571
Louisiana	232,322	210,685	236,655	208,339	201,980	183,813	182,563	181,146	200,246	168,919	187,128	193,544
Maryland	552,434	446,308	548,476	440,712	627,573	471,378	663,173	538,519	894,713	468,150	583,966	477,333
Mississippi	84,018	32,922	31,687	30,181	121,050	30,224	0	132,072	200,000	115,960	132,072	116,235
Missouri	416,255	408,492	405,946	423,577	472,157	424,176	573,166	441,097	649,650	417,940	459,947	426,138
Montana	1,111,910	844,663	1,039,514	859,756	1,158,812	860,973	1,107,409	895,318	950,000	890,483	1,035,810	907,949
New Mexico	780,201	685,471	702,721	676,876	710,699	677,790	677,112	677,112	688,700	593,676	630,159	605,627
North Dakota	555,517	518,459	593,082	509,883	513,144	510,705	527,339	500,207	525,217	505,131	542,130	482,827
Ohio	2,507,903	2,508,663	2,619,887	2,477,206	2,500,065	2,127,024	1,551,254	1,400,240	1,641,545	1,296,657	2,307,000	1,438,580
Oklahoma	953,912	848,494	851,296	837,655	883,153	838,041	923,404	872,512	898,898	879,676	999,991	937,715
Pennsylvania	11,863,750	10,570,276	11,374,000	10,427,071	9,807,986	10,645,890	12,023,329	10,610,597	12,305,040	10,399,980	11,365,156	10,603,971
Texas	1,199,335	1,195,607	1,290,153	1,160,615	1,286,116	1,182,286	1,446,563	1,448,563	1,561,884	1,449,116	1,448,392	1,441,853
Utah	1,640,745	1,305,350	1,694,012	1,288,982	1,678,209	1,390,948	1,678,209	1,460,206	1,668,059	1,472,300	1,670,163	1,533,595
Virginia	3,128,074	3,172,726	3,575,533	3,132,943	3,362,093	2,957,853	3,074,483	3,065,512	3,353,700	2,947,968	3,245,664	3,143,371
West Virginia	7,988,468	7,489,670	8,303,205	7,376,206	8,326,998	7,217,537	8,142,287	7,505,455	7,717,097	7,373,026	8,027,670	7,517,645
Wyoming	1,392,135	1,511,704	1,500,210	1,492,750	1,541,354	1,494,863	1,533,982	1,494,863	1,548,430	1,511,005	1,506,671	1,540,843
Tribes									600,000	600,000	600,000	611,769
TOTALS	$56,487,807	$51,562,330	$56,738,428	$50,762,000	$55,469,518	$50,676,000	$56,515,814	$50,056,000	$57,196,160	$50,656,000	$56,015,692	$52,156,000

3/24/00 AEHIST5

(c) On the other hand, you are requesting a $1.0 million increase for the Appalachian Clean Streams program and $1:0 million increase for Watershed Cooperative Agreements. Are these programs of higher priority than the State Regulatory programs?

ANSWER:

OSM's first priority for the past three years has been the funding for AML reclamation projects; work accomplished via reclamation grants to states, the Appalachian Clean Streams and the Watershed Cooperative Agreements. This is a single purpose activity; to reclaim all priority 1 and 2 reclamation work, as described in the Act, as soon as possible. Increasing grants for regulatory activities only recently has become a high priority item as the economy has improved and State matching share monies have become available, previously withheld State pay raises have been made, etc. OSM plans to review the funding for this program when it prepares its FY 2002 budget request.

Question 39. Tennessee is not a state with an approved state regulatory program, and therefore, OSM runs a Federal regulatory program in that state. What are the costs to run a Federal program compared to costs for a state run program. How does Tennessee compare to Kentucky, for example, adjusted for such factors as number of coal operation sites?

ANSWER:

Generally, the difference in total costs to run a Federal regulatory program and a State regulatory program is the salary costs for personnel; which is approximately 29% higher for Federal employees and the 50% matching provided by states running their own programs. This is based on a recent OSM analysis in which comparisons were made between the Tennessee Federal Program and several other programs in the OSM Appalachian Region, including the Kentucky Program. Utilizing Kentucky as an example, the total cost of the Kentucky program, including the State share, is three percent less per mine site than the total cost of the Tennessee Federal Program. OSM operates the program in Tennessee with ten percent fewer staff per mine site than Kentucky.

Question 40. According to the OSM, the State of West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has inadequate staffing for its surface mining regulatory program. To what extent is this shortfall a federal versus a State responsibility? Are you planning to have the Department of the Interior take over the West Virginia State regulatory program because it is currently inadequate? Are you planning to give the State additional federal funds because the State appears to be unable or unwilling to fund adequately its surface

mining regulatory program?

ANSWER:

OSM funds 50 percent of the total cost of a State program. OSM has recommended that WVDEP consider hiring as many as 58 more people to maintain an adequate staffing level. This would result in a need for more funds for the program from both the State and OSM.

OSM has also been working with the State to determine its needs in light of mountaintop mining in that State. On February 8, 2000, OSM formalized its concerns in a letter requiring WVDEP to submit an amendment to the approved State program to address the appropriateness of the staffing level in relation to program issues. OSM has not initiated action to take over any part of the program. OSM plans to continue to work closely with the State to resolve the concerns without the need to take over the program.

Question 41. Please provide a table which indicates the federal funding for the West Virginia surface coal mining regulatory program each year and the funding requested by the State, for the period 1996-2001. For FY 2001, indicate the funding assuming full funding of the OSM request to the Committee.

ANSWER:

WEST VIRGINIA FEDERAL FUNDING

DESCRIPTION	FY-1996	FY-1997	FY-1998	FY-1999	FY-2000	FY-2001
FEDERAL FUNDING REQUESTED	$ 7,941,528	$ 7,756,303	$ 7,571,216	$ 7,780,697	$ 8,524,792	$ 8,087,597
FEDERAL FUNDING AWARDED	$ 7,207,333	$ 7,217,537	$ 7,505,455	$ 7,373,026	$ 7,517,645	$ 7,054,986

NOTE: THE FY-2001 FUNDING ESTIMATE WAS MADE ALMOST 18 MONTHS AGO. WVDEP FUNDING NEEDS MAY HAVE TO BE REASSESSED.

Question 42. What is the regulatory workload in West Virginia and how does this compare to other States with major coal programs, such as Pennsylvania and Kentucky? Has the State of West Virginia provided sufficient funds to its regulatory program?

ANSWER:

OSM has completed numerous comparisons of West Virginia activities to adjacent States. West Virginia shows the least resource and staff expenditure in every comparison.

Regulatory Workload

State	Inspectable Units	Permitting Actions	Staff	Funding
West Virginia	2,988	818	228	$15,900,000
Kentucky	2,586	596	415	$26,500,000
Pennsylvania	2,379	591	300	$21,600,000

In 1991, OSM and West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) agreed on a minimum staffing level needed in order for WVDEP to properly administer its approved permanent regulatory program. After a short build up in 1992 to 299, the staffing level has dropped to its present 228. Although some activities have decreased since the1992 period, OSM believes the current level is insufficient to administer the program and has required WVDEP to submit a corrective plan.

Question 43. We noticed that in both Environmental Restoration and in Environmental Protection you describe an activity called Program Development and Maintenance but that activity does not appear in Technology Development and Transfer. On page ER-34, your justifications state that:

> **" This program activity provides funding for reclamation program management and programmatic guidance to States and Tribes." I assume it is the same for Environmental Protection. Why is there no comparable component for Technology Development and Transfer?**

ANSWER:

The program activity of Program Development and maintenance was established to cover grants management, rulemaking, policy development, special projects and other activities to support OSM's mission and primary goals of Environmental Restoration and Environmental Protection. Technology Development and Transfer is a support business line directly related to providing assistance to the States and Tribes in the form of technical assistance, technical training, and the transfer of technology.

Question 44. Within TDT (page TDT-59), several of your estimates for output are for less accomplishment than the actual reported for FY 1999. Are you lowering your expectations?

ANSWER:

OSM is not lowering expectations, only waiting until there is a longer base-line of performance data before raising the performance targets. OSM thinks that the initial targets of 85 to 90 percent customer satisfaction are reasonable and is pleased that the FY 1999 performance targets were exceeded. While OSM has not raised its performance goals in this program area, efforts are being made to determine how customer satisfaction can be improved and how these efforts can be more accurately measured and progress projected.

Question 45. There seem to be at least three component parts to the OSM - State assistance efforts; the Applicant Violator System, the Technical Information Processing System and the Technical Training activity. How much is OSM devoting to each of these activities and could not the States subsume the responsibility to take over? Could the States participate in the funding of these activities?

ANSWER:

While these costs are not tracked in specific detail, the FY 2001 President's Budget contains estimated base funding for these programs in the following amounts:

Applicant Violator System	$2.4 million
Technical Training Program	$2.4 million
Technical Information Processing System	$1.5 million

OSM believes these programs can be operated more efficiently and effectively using nationwide systems rather than having the 24 States and three Indian tribes develop and operate their own systems. Using a nationwide system takes better advantage of economies of scale and helps insure consistency among users in implementing SMCRA.

All three components operate at a national level with significant involvement from the States, Tribes and other Federal agencies. They rely heavily on sharing information and expertise. This pooling of information and capabilities provides for uniformity of requirements and processes among States and eliminates duplication.

This coordinated and consolidated approach is the most efficient way to assist States and tribes to carry out their regulatory responsibilities. It would be very difficult, operationally and financially, for individual States and Tribes to operate these systems at current success levels.

OSM has not requested the States to participate in funding these systems. OSM believes that this is in keeping with its oversight role to provide technical assistance to the States, who have the primary responsibility to regulate coal mining activities within their borders. Through provision

of these technical assistance systems, OSM ensures the quality of State regulatory programs. The States and Tribes also devote considerable resources to maintain the quality of these programs. They serve on advisory boards, obtain and enter important permit information, design courses and serve as instructors, and provide technical expertise in specialized fields.

Question 46. The performance measures for Financial Management do not appear to be indicative of performance. Your request shows 99% attainment for virtually all measures. Would this not signify that the funding level for this business line might be too high? At what funding level would performance begin to diminish?

ANSWER:

OSM believes that the measures -- percent of permits reporting and percent of audited tons accurately reported -- provide the best gauge of the outcomes as specified by law, and that the requested funding level is appropriate. The main component of this business line, Fee Compliance, includes the financial and accounting activities for the AML program. Since this is a financial program, OSM's customers (i.e., states, tribes, and industry) demand a high level of accuracy. In deciding what to measure, OSM looked to the Surface Mining Act, which requires the Secretary to maintain full compliance with the reclamation fee provisions. The program generated $276 million for the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Fund last year.

The requested funding level is needed to maintain compliance at current levels and to continue to generate revenue needed for future reclamation work. Each one percent of compliance equates to $2.7 million and the program pays for itself.

Any funding reduction is likely to have an immediate impact on the performance output due to reductions taken in the past three years due to automation and changes in the industry. OSM would also be unable to provide industry with the service they have requested. For example, industry organizations and individual companies have asked for more frequent audits to reduce the time they must maintain records, which now stands at six years.

Question 47. How much funding have you requested in each appropriation account for fixed costs? Does this cover all fixed cost increases?

ANSWER:

Exclusive of pay increases, which are included and fully funded in all of OSM's program activities, fixed costs are budgeted in the Executive Direction and Administration business line in the General Services program activity. Fixed costs increases include rent, telecommunications, postage, the working capital fund, reimbursable services, unemployment compensation and worker's compensation. OSM's funding request for FY 2001 is $8,257,000; $5,351,000 in the Regulation and Technology appropriation and $2,906,000 in the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund appropriation. The President's Budget provides sufficient funding to

cover OSM's fixed cost increases.

Mountaintop mining issue

Question 48. On October 20, 1999 the chief US district judge for West Virginia ruled that mountaintop coal mining cannot freely dispose of waste in streams without appropriate permits. Under which circumstances do you feel it is appropriate for mountaintop removal mining to cover and eliminate streams?

ANSWER:

For mountaintop removal mining operations to place dredged or fill material into streams, the applicant must satisfy the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements of both the Clean Water Act and SMCRA.

Under SMCRA and its implementing regulations, spoil not needed to achieve approximate original contour (AOC) or a specified postmining land use is excess spoil. To obtain approval to place this material in a designated disposal site containing a stream, the applicant must receive a permit under both Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and SMCRA. SMCRA at Section 515(b)(22) and the regulations at 30 CFR 816.71-73 prescribe the manner and method of the placement of the excess spoil material.

Section 515(b)(22) of SMCRA establishes specific construction criteria for the fill if the disposal area contains a spring, natural water course or wet weather seep. Further, OSM's regulations at 30 CFR 816.57 require that the regulatory authority make specific findings before any disturbances to land within 100 feet of an intermittent or perennial stream may occur. These findings are (1) that the mining activities will not cause or contribute to the violation of applicable State or Federal water quality standards, and (2) that the activities will not adversely affect the water quantity and quality or other environmental resources of the stream.

Question 49. What is the current status of the mountain top mining issue in the state of West Virginia? What is OSM, in its oversight capacity, doing to resolve the problem?

ANSWER:

Much of the controversy now relates to issues in the Bragg v. Robertson litigation. The lawsuit was filed on July 16, 1998, against the West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) regarding the loss and degradation of streams due to the construction of valley fills. In December, 1998 four federal agencies (OSM, COE, Environmental Protection Agency, and Fish and Wildlife Service) and West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection signed a Settlement Agreement with the plaintiffs. The Settlement Agreement requires the Federal agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the effects of mountaintop mining and to coordinate an interagency review of surface mine permit applications that propose to discharge fill material into waters of the United

States. These activities are still ongoing at this time.

On October 20, 1999, U.S. District Judge Haden issued a decision in Bragg v. Robertson on the stream buffer zone question. The United States, the State of West Virginia and mining industry and union interveners all appealed Judge Haden's decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. In the October 20, 1999, decision, Judge Haden interpreted West Virginia's stream buffer zone rule as precluding the placement of excess spoil from mining in intermittent and perennial streams.

Apart from the stream buffer zone question, the State of West Virginia and the plaintiffs had earlier entered into a consent decree which had settled the remaining counts of the litigation. Judge Haden approved the consent decree in February 2000. The industry has appealed the approval of the consent decree to the Fourth Circuit. The Fourth Circuit consolidated this appeal with the appeals of Judge Haden's October 20, 1999, decision.

On Monday, April 17, 2000, the United States and the mining industry and union intervenors filed their appellate briefs on the stream buffer zone ruling. West Virginia's brief is due on May 17, 2000.

In its brief, the United States argues that excess spoil from mining operations is "fill" material and accordingly regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. As to the stream buffer zone issue, the United States largely agreed with Judge Haden's ruling, but argues that Judge Haden's injunction prohibiting the placement of any excess spoil into intermittent or perennial streams is overly broad.

OSM Oversight Efforts

As part of the coordination process initiated under the December 1998 settlement agreement, OSM is providing technical assistance to WVDEP in the review of individual permit applications for large surface mines. The goal is to have a sound surface mining permit that can serve as the platform for other permitting actions such as required by COE for Clean Water Act requirements.

To implement these improvements over the long term, OSM is also working closely with WVDEP to improve the permitting process through guidance, training and oversight. On March 30, 2000, OSM and WVDEP signed a joint plan to develop guidance and training on several key areas of the permitting process.

OSM is working closely with WVDEP in assuring that the agreements reached in the Consent Decree approved in February can be completed. OSM provided assistance to WVDEP in the Development of the plan to meet approximate original contour (AOC) requirements, and has provided input into the development of WVDEP's new rules for postmining land uses where a variance is granted. Official changes to the State's program are now being reviewed by OSM.

Finally, OSM is continuing to monitor and assist in the resolution of issues discovered in oversight through an action plan signed with WVDEP on April 27, 1999. This action plan

includes some of the same issues now related to the litigation but it more specifically assures adequate monitoring of resolution activities. OSM will continue to work with WVDEP in resolving all known issues relating to mountaintop mining and to address any new issues that may be identified as a result of the ongoing EIS evaluation.

Question 50. Several federal agencies are currently working on an EIS on the effects of mountaintop removal mining and valley fills. How will this EIS affect future mining activities, valley fills, and mining regulation? Please explain this project and its costs by bureau or agency. Does the Interior Department have sufficient funding for this activity?

ANSWER:

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and OSM are jointly preparing the EIS in cooperation with the State of West Virginia. Its purpose is "to consider developing agency policies, guidance, and coordinated agency decision-making processes to minimize, to the maximum extent practicable, the adverse environmental effects to waters of the United States and to fish and wildlife resources from mountaintop mining operations, and to environmental resources that could be affected by the size and location of fill material in valley fill sites." The EIS is anticipated to recommend a series of actions that may include better agency coordination in application processing; improved outreach; common definitions of regulatory terms; development of guidelines, policies, and new regulatory requirements or suggested legislative changes to the Clean Water Act or SMCRA. It is anticipated that the final EIS will be published in FY 2001.

The EIS will address the impacts of placing valley fills in streams; the types of mitigation that might be required for stream impacts; improved reclamation, better post mining land uses, and better environmental results from surface coal mining operations. Decisions based on the EIS should benefit the public with an enhanced decision making process.

The following table shows the components of the EIS, their funding history, and the amount and source of funding committed to assure completion of all activities. In summary, the estimated FY 2000 commitments are: EPA-$2,352,000; COE-$420,000; Department of the Interior-$639,000; for a total FY 2000 cost of $3,411,000. Distribution of the remaining FY 2000 costs is detailed in the following table--based upon agency lead responsibility for carrying out each EIS-related study or activity. In a few cases, the lead is shared. For example, sharing of the expenses associated with the contracts to prepare the draft and final EIS documents were divided between EPA and COE. The Interior Department is committed to finding the necessary funds to fulfill its EIS obligation.

MOUNTAINTOP MINING/VALLEY FILL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT *Source of Funding by Topic*				
Study Topic	**($000) Total Costs (Extramural)**	**($000) Funded FY98 (Source)**	**($000) Funded FY99 (Source)**	**($000) Reprogram FY00**
Fill Inventory	$297	$140 (OSM) $17 (EPA IV)	$40 (EPA III) In kind-OSM	$ 50 OSM $50 EPA
Flooding	$306	$150 (OSM) $56 (COE)	$30 (COE) In kind-OSM	$ 70 COE, OSM in kind
Stability	$45	None	$45 (COE) In kind-OSM	None
Mining & Reclamation Technology	$275	None	$100 (DOE & EPA)	$175 EPA OSM in kind
Future Mining	$296	None	$136 (WV Leg.)	$160 ($125-EPA + $35-OSM)
Fill Hydrology	$394	None	$127 (WV Leg.) $127 (USGS)	$140 USGS
Landscape Ecology	$736	None	$126 (CVI) $ 50 (EPA-III) $ 65 (WVDEP)	$495 EPA
Terrestrial	$254	None	$129 (WV Leg.)	$125 FWS
Fisheries	$194	None	$ 25 (FWS) $130 (COE)	$ 39 FWS
Streams	$725	None	$ 35 (EPA-III) In kind (EPA, COE, WVDEP, OSM)	$690 EPA
Soils & Forest Productivity	$0	None	In kind (OSM)	None
Aquatic Ecosystem Enhancement	$71	None	In kind (EPA, OSM, FWS, COE, WVDEP)	$ 71 EPA

MOUNTAINTOP MINING/VALLEY FILL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT *Source of Funding by Topic*				
Study Topic	**($000) Total Costs** (Extramural)	**($000) Funded FY98** (Source)	**($000) Funded FY99** (Source)	**($000) Reprogram FY00**
Socio-economics	$150	None	None	$150 EPA
Economics	$360	None	$185 (WV Leg.)	$175 EPA
Post Mining Land Use	$45	None	$ 45 (WV Leg.)	None
Mine Dust and Fumes	$63	None	$ 63 (WV Leg.) In kind (OSM)	None
Blasting	$250	None	None	$250 OSM
EIS Preparation	$958	None	$252 (EPA-III) $130 (COE)	$576 ($226-EPA + $350-COE)
Environmental Experts	$270	None	$ 75 (EPA-III)	$195 EPA
Total	**$5,689**	**$363**	**$1,915**	**$3,411**

Question 51. Part of the confusion concerning mountaintop mining and stream obliteration may have been caused by the different definitions of stream buffer zones used by different federal agencies. Can you summarize the US Fish and Wildlife Service definition of stream buffer zone as it concerns filling streams with mining waste and explain how this differs from the EPA or Army Corps of Engineers definition?

ANSWER:
To the best of OSM's knowledge, neither the FWS, EPA nor the COE have regulations that define stream buffer zones; only the Office of Surface Mining's regulations use the term stream buffer zone.

Question 52. The state of West Virginia has joined an appeal to the district judge ruling that is being brought by several coal mining companies. Why has the Interior Department not joined this appeal? Are you in favor or opposed to this appeal?

ANSWER:
The Department of the Interior was not a named defendant in the initial filing of the lawsuit nor has it been added since that filing. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the only named federal defendant in the lawsuit. On December 17, 1999, the Department of Justice filed a protective

Notice of Appeal. On Monday, April 17, 2000, the federal government filed its brief in the Fourth Circuit. The federal government's position disagrees with the scope of the district court's conclusion addressing the Department of Interior's Federal stream bufer zone regulations and that excess spoil generated from surface mining operations is "waste" rather than "fill" and more properly regulated under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act. While we agree with the district court that the environmental findings required in the stream buffer zone regulations must be made before a waiver can be granted for a variance, we do not agree that the placement of any excess spoil, regardless of the amount, in intermittent or perennial streams can never satisfy the requirement for a waiver.

Question 53. The recent court action may also lead to tougher standards requiring coal miners to return the landscape to "approximate original contour" as required by the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act. Under which circumstances do you feel it is appropriate to allow waivers to the approximate original contour requirement?

ANSWER:

SMCRA and its implementing regulations authorize a waiver of AOC restoration requirements for the following types of operations:

- Mountaintop removal operations as described in section 515(c)(2) of the Act. These operations must involve a post mining land use of agricultural, commercial, industrial, residential, or public facility (including recreational facilities) use. In addition, the applicant must make certain economic and financial feasibility demonstrations relative to the proposed postmining land use and provide a planned implementation schedule.

- Operations on steep slopes to the extent that a variance is necessary to achieve a post mining land use of commercial, industrial, residential, or public use (including recreational facilities). In addition, the resulting landform must improve the condition of the watershed.

- Remining operations on sites where the amount of reasonably available spoil is insufficient to eliminate the highwall.

- Operations on sites with overburden that is either too thick or too thin to achieve AOC.

- Operations for which a departure from AOC restoration requirements receives approval as part of an experimental practice.

Internet Service

Question 54. We have noticed your excellent web-site with which you communicate your programs to the public, the States and industry. Please provide a summary description which explains the amount of resources you are expending on the Internet, the number of visitors you serve, the printing or mailing costs that you may be reducing because of increased

Internet service, and other aspects of this matter.

ANSWER:
In the Fall of 1996 OSM began operating its web site as a prototype by providing 40 pages of frequently requested information. Today, the site is visited by approximately 1,000 people daily (30,000-35,000 hits daily) and has become the most widely used method of getting OSM information. Much of the success is directly attributable to daily updating and the clear objective of providing answers to questions that are repeatedly asked by citizens, state program staff, and those from the coal industry. The web site has become the central focus for OSM constituents to get information, ask questions, and provide comments.

The staff and dollar resources to provide our web site are extremely small compared to the benefits. Since the web service began, 95 percent of the web site development and maintenance has been done by one staff person as a peripheral duty. Approximately one to two hours of staff time is devoted daily to answering questions and filling requests for specific printed and video materials. The web server is a surplus work station that has had minor memory and hard disk upgrades. Maintenance of the server is performed by the Wide Area Network Administrator as part of the overall agency computer support. OSM has received literally hundreds of "thank-you messages" from people praising the quick and substantive e-mail response to their requests.

The single biggest cost savings was eliminating the copying and mailing associated with information requests. Since OSM is a regulatory agency, there are a great number of requests for specific documents and statistics that are out-of-print or are on one sheet of a 100 page document. In the past, a staff person had to locate the document, copy it, and mail it to the requestor. Since 1978 when OSM began there have been approximately 2000 of these requests annually. Use of the web site has completely eliminated the staff time, xerox, and postage costs associated with this activity.

However, the non-monetary gains are the greatest benefit of the web site. Citizen involvement is at the very root of the Surface Mining Law implementation. In January 1998, OSM reported that using the web site resulted in more information distributed that year then in the previous 19 years. Since that time the web service has continued to grow and users currently download about five times the volume of information we did two years ago. Use of the web site provides more timely distribution and increased availability of our information.

Question 55. Please provide a discussion of Internet security issues for your agency. What are you doing to prevent outside users from damaging or accessing your data? What additional security actions need to be taken as you bring more of your business functions onto the web?

ANSWER:

OSM is balancing the challenge of maintaining a network environment that is secure against internal and external disruptions while meeting its objective of sharing information with the public. Network security is one of the most pressing issues facing both OSM and other government agencies. The Inspector General conducted an audit in OSM to evaluate the general and application controls over its automated information systems. The audit report identified 16 weaknesses and

provided 38 recommendations for improving the general controls over the automated information systems. OSM is currently working toward implementing these 38 recommendations, including development of System Security Plans and Risk Assessments for all of its mission critical systems, and publication of a Security Directive to provide detailed guidance on system security procedures to be followed in the agency.

Over the past six months, OSM has had intrusions and attempted intrusions from hackers both inside and outside of the country. As a result, OSM has installed firewalls to prevent outside users from accessing and/or damaging data. These firewalls have been successful in providing protection from hacking incidents. OSM continues to install firewalls to provide further protection of its systems.

To protect OSM's financial systems, all computers hosting OSM financial systems require users to have user id's with passwords. Passwords are required to be changed at regular intervals. In most cases, third party security/user authentication software is installed on top of the operating system security as an additional layer of security. All users are required to complete a Computer Access Registration Form signed by the user, the user's supervisor, and system owner. User id's are monitored and deactivated due to lack of use.

OSM runs a state of the art firewall (Check Point Firewall I) on its Sun Solaris operating system. The firewall is monitored daily and logs selected events. It has over thirty different rules and is very restrictive to included selected IP addresses and email servers.

OSM will be migrating to FTS2001 later this year, using the MCI network. The design of the OSM/MCI network will enable OSM's firewalls to protect its entire network from hackers and illegal intrusions. OSM will ensure that all automated audit functions are operational and perform continual monitoring of its automated audit files. Software is being installed to both detect and document all attempts at intrusion into the network. This software will also prevent illegal searches and administrative access to the OSM network. These security actions will help protect critical information as the agency begins conducting more of its mission critical functions on the web.

Question 56. Please provide the Committee with a list of your top three web sites which may be useful to the public for environmental education.

ANSWER:

Please see the following web sites.

o www.osmre.gov/learn.htm Learning Gateway. This page provides an index to a series of educational pages (puzzles, tests, quizzes, games, and animated message) designed to be fun yet informative to students and others learning about the implementation of the Surface Mining Law.

o www.osmre.gov/ocphoto.htm Photo Library. A collection of captioned photos showing mining and reclamation under the Surface Mining Law.

o www.osmre.gov/coloring.htm Coloring Book. A collection of pages that show mining

and reclamation before and after the Surface Mining Law was passed. The pages are animated for web use or can be downloaded and printed for classroom use.

Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs

(131)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 2000.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

WITNESSES

ROYCE HANSON, NAPA FELLOW AND PANEL CHAIR, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
CAROL E. NEVES, STUDY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
KEVIN GOVER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INDIAN AFFAIRS
THOMAS M. THOMPSON, PRINCIPAL DEPUTY SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS
HILDA A. MANUEL, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
JOE CHRISTIE, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
DAVID A. GILBERT, BUDGET OFFICER, OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE
THEODORE R. QUASULA, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. REGULA. We have a lot of ground to cover this morning and I think it will be interesting to hear some of the challenges we have. We will start out with the National Academy of Public Administration, Mr. Hanson, then Mr. Gover, and then the new trustee.

Mr. Hanson, we look forward to your testimony.

Mr. HANSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am joined by Carole Neves, who is the study director at the Academy for this project.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to present the findings and recommendations of the report of the National Academy of Public Administration on management and administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The full text of our testimony has been given to you, so I am only going to highlight some of the important findings and recommendations.

Basically, the Academy study found that the management and administration of the BIA and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs are not adequately organized and staffed to carry out effectively their various trust and program responsibilities or to operate an effective and efficient agency.

Specifically, there is no existing capability to provide budget, human resources, policy, and other management assistance to the Assistant Secretary and to the Bureau. The staff do not receive adequate management and administrative training. The BIA does not have adequate standards to determine its staffing and other administrative and resource requirements. The strategic planning, annual performance planning, and program analysis are not insti-

tutionalized. And important manuals and other administrative handbooks are out of date.

The panel made specific recommendations to deal with each of these problems and I will emphasize here only the most basic of those recommendations.

First, to ensure that the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs has the capacity to lead the Bureau and to hold its components accountable for their performance, we recommended three things. First, the establishment in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of a Policy, Management, and Budget Office that reports directly to him. The Office should include a comptroller unit with program analysis, budget, and accounting groups, a plans and policy group, a human resources group to deal with work force issues and services, an information resources planning group charged with creating and maintaining Bureau-wide information systems, and an equal employment opportunity group.

Secondly, the Assistant Secretary should utilize more fully the working group of the Domestic Policy Council in a strategic way to coordinate and harmonize programs for American Indians and Alaskan Natives.

Third, there should be a recognition that the three service-providing organizations—the Bureau, the law enforcement, and the education components—are independent, operating entities and each should report directly to the Assistant Secretary and have responsibility and authority to provide programs and services to handle its own administrative functions.

The second major category of recommendations dealt with the establishment of managerial discipline in the Bureau and to bring it into compliance with GPRA's focus on results that make a difference in the lives of Native Americans. So we recommended that the Assistant Secretary strengthen the Bureau's strategic planning and annual performance plan to meet GPRA requirements, to establish a system of management and performance reviews of key managers and staff, and to use modern information technology to update, disseminate, and keep current BIA manuals and operating handbooks.

We estimated that the implementation of these recommendations will require approximately 50 positions in the Washington headquarters. The headquarters operation cannot be effective without adequate support staff in the agency and area offices. The amount of staff needed in the field we felt can really be determined only after very careful work force analysis to assess the existing capabilities and deficiencies in each of the offices. Our research staff and the panel estimated that this may entail as few as 150 or as many as 200 positions when the recommendations of the report are fully implemented.

The panel emphasized that the management and administrative reforms we propose should not be undertaken on faith by the Department, by OMB, or by the Congress. Tangible results should be demanded and the Assistant Secretary should be held accountable for their achievement. One of the first tasks of the new management staff that we recommended should be the development of management milestones to achieve tangible results such as: getting a clean audit in a reasonable period of time, to be able to produce

credible and well-documented estimates of program requirements, to reduce friction among the program and service units of the Bureau, and an end to the perception that some tribes hold that central service units are unresponsive.

Performance measures should be established consistent with GPRA that allow the Assistant Secretary to hold program directors accountable for their performance as managers of the services and resources that are allocated to them.

There should be clear policies and guidelines for employees to follow in the performance of their trust, program delivery, and oversight responsibilities. One of the tests would be mechanisms for better coordinated Indian policy across all relevant Federal agencies and increased confidence among the tribes that moving to self-determination and self-governance will not result in neglect of Federal responsibilities.

Finally, as a measure to improve and ensure accountability, we have recommended that the Assistant Secretary prepare an annual progress report to the Secretary and to Congress on the implementation of the recommendations, the effect of the changes on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Bureau, and the reasons for progress or the lack thereof.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The statement of Mr. Hanson follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

ROYCE HANSON

PANEL CHAIR AND ACADEMY FELLOW

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

BEFORE THE

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE

ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

CONCERNING

A REPORT BY THE

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

TITLED

"A STUDY OF MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION:

THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS"

MARCH 8, 2000

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present findings and recommendations which appeared in the National Academy of Public Administration's (the Academy) 1999 report on management and administration in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

For a number of years the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in the Department of the Interior (DOI) has experienced administrative and management problems that have constrained its ability to carry out its mission. To assist it in addressing these problems, BIA asked the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) to conduct a comprehensive study of its management, organizational structure, and administration. The intent was to identify and recommend remedies that would improve the quality, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness of BIA's operations.

My testimony will address first the problems with BIA's management and organizational structure and second, the problems with its administrative systems.

THE BUREAU'S MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS

Managing for Success

The Academy believes the current management and administration of the BIA are not fully adequate to meet all of its trust responsibilities to American Indians and Alaska Natives, to carry out the numerous statutory responsibilities, and to operate an effective and efficient agency. Specifically, there is no existing capability to provide overarching budget, human resources, policy, and other types of management assistance to the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs and the Bureau. Neither the Office of the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs nor the Bureau has the internal staff capabilities that typically support managerial and administrative excellence.

The Academy panel determined that the foremost requirement is for the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs to have the staff support necessary to lead BIA, particularly in the areas of planning, budgeting, human resources management, and information resource management (IRM).

- The Academy panel recommended that the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs immediately establish a Policy, Management, and Budget Office that reports to him and provides him the following staff support:

    - a comptroller unit, consisting of three groups: (1) a program analysis group to analyze the appropriateness and effectiveness of programs and services designed to fulfill BIA's mission; (2) a budget development and execution group to prepare the budget and to track expenditures; and (3) an accounting group to operate BIA's financial accounting system;

- a plans and policy unit, responsible for developing BIA management policies and directives, as well as strategic and annual plans, and for preparing manuals and operating handbooks;

- a human resources unit, to handle development of policy and plans for managing BIA's workforce, including policy development and workforce planning, an employee development program, expertise in labor relations, and oversight of the delivery of personnel services;

- an information resource management (IRM) unit, responsible for developing policy and plans and operation of Bureau-wide information systems, as well as guidance on useful information technologies and planning for the future;

- an equal employment opportunity unit to manage BIA's equal employment opportunity (EEO) program.

As the primary federal advocate for Indians, the assistant secretary should be the focal point for assuring that potential new initiatives and existing programs are well coordinated and that resources are used to the maximum advantage.

- The Academy panel recommended that the assistant secretary utilize the working group of the Domestic Policy Council in a more strategically integrated way to coordinate and harmonize programs for American Indians and Alaska Natives, thus creating the possibility of more effective and efficient delivery of services.

Organizational Interaction

The Academy panel found that the three service organizations in BIA (Office of Indian Programs, Office of Indian Education Programs and Office of Law Enforcement Services) operate semi-independently through their own field organizations, which function largely separately, except that OIP provides some administrative support to OIEP and OLES. If the three service-providing organizations are to be held accountable for performing their missions, they need to have responsibility for providing their own administrative support.

- The Academy panel recommended that the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs recognize the three service-providing organizations as independent operating entities, with each reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary and each having responsibility and authority for providing programs and services and for handling its own administrative functions.

A Need for More Managerial Discipline

BIA has had difficulty fully satisfying the government's requirements for strategic planning and annual performance planning. Top leadership needs to embrace the intent of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and to develop comprehensive,

outcome-oriented strategic and annual performance plans that are focused on results that make a difference in the lives of Native Americans, and use those plans to drive the Bureau's decision-making.

To gain discipline in the workforce, individual employees need to understand the requirements of their job. Now, they lack guidance in the form of up-to-date policy and implementation manuals. To achieve managerial discipline, the Academy panel recommended that:

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should continue to strengthen BIA's strategic plan and companion annual performance plan to meet GPRA requirements. These plans should be supplemented with goals and performance measures in administrative and management arenas. The deputy commissioner, education and law enforcement directors, and area and agency managers need to participate in preparing the plans and should be held accountable for executing them.

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should establish a system of management reviews, performance measures, and regular reviews of BIA's performance. To provide better guidance to employees, the plans and policy unit of the proposed Policy, Management and Budget Office should develop and maintain manuals and handbooks that can be available to all employees through desktop computers.

- The BIA manual should be updated and kept current. Operating handbooks that clearly define the authorities and responsibilities of field personnel also should be developed. Modern information technology should be used to support interactive development of policy manuals and directives and their distribution to the field.

Management and Administrative Staffing Requirements

The study estimates that when fully implemented, the Academy panel's recommendations could require 40-50 administrative personnel in the new Policy, Management and Budget Office, in addition to those in the existing IRM and accounting units. The exact number of administrative staff positions in the 12 area and 83 agency offices will have to be determined by a careful workforce analysis. The study estimates that it will be on the order of 150 to 200 when the recommendations are fully implemented. A rough estimate of the total annual personnel cost once the recommendations are operational is expected to be in the range of $10 million to $15 million.

THE BUREAU'S ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

BIA has been unable to meet the basic requirements for administrative systems within the federal government. BIA does not, for example, have a unified approach to human resources management. The budget structure and process do not provide the information necessary to estimate or justify actual needs. The financial management

systems do not permit matching funding to changing requirements, and the BIA has been unable to obtain an unqualified audit. Since 1991 DOI has declared the procurement system a material weakness, but there has been little improvement.

Human Resources Management

Because of National Performance Review (NPR) streamlining efforts in 1994, BIA no longer has a human resource policy-making unit, and even its personnel experts are not sure what policies are in effect. BIA gives employee development almost no organized attention, nor does it systematically invest in staff training. Although BIA selects almost all its managers from inside, it has no succession plan or management development program. Many field staff are given significant collateral duties without training and support. To overcome the above-outlined deficiencies, the Academy panel recommended:

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should re-establish a human resources management unit of four to six people, headed by a human resources manager, in the proposed Policy, Management, and Budget Office. This unit should be responsible for establishing and maintaining a consistent approach to human resources management throughout BIA. The manager should have access to and participate with top management in decisions that affect BIA employees; should develop a strategic human resources management plan; and should identify the policies BIA is following and establish a mechanism for assuring they are applied consistently throughout the Bureau. This unit should ensure that:

    - BIA makes employee development one of its primary management objectives and provides the planning and resources to support training and development;

    - BIA begins succession planning and development to meet its managerial and executive needs;

    - BIA automates its personnel record-keeping so that summary information about employees is readily available and accessible;

    - BIA's qualification requirements for its jobs are sufficiently stringent that candidates who meet them will be able to do the job;

    - The units providing BIA personnel operations support are performing effectively.

Budget System

The basis for the allocation of BIA resources across the areas and tribes is a complex set of historical, demographic, political, and other factors. The distribution of funds has been a source of dissatisfaction because it does not seem equitable – it does not encompass the results of a needs assessment or priority-based allocation across tribes.

However, because of the complexities involved and a general belief that changing the distribution of funds would do little to better Indian welfare, BIA and the tribes have concluded that the existing TPA system should not be modified. The basis for the distribution of Indian Student Equalization Program (ISEP) funds is a complex formula driven by the number of students and the services they require (expressed as Weighted Student Units). Because TPA and ISEP are formula-driven, BIA has little discretion to direct funding to resolve problems or satisfy pressing needs. The Academy panel recommended that:

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should develop a budgeting system that has sufficient flexibility to support the equitable allocation of funds.

- The budget development and execution group in the comptroller unit of the proposed Policy, Management and Budget Office should work with the BIA and the tribes to develop the budget and document appropriate standards (or benchmarks) that can be used consistently in support of budget requests and in measuring performance in the delivery of programs.

Financial Management

DOI's Office of Inspector General has for several years provided a qualified audit opinion on BIA's financial statements because BIA could not provide adequate documentation or reliable accounting information to support the financial report balances. In addition, BIA had material weaknesses (insufficient internal control procedures) in several major accounts. BIA also was not in compliance with a number of laws and regulations. BIA has taken a number of corrective actions in the areas of accounting, prompt payments, financial documentation, property management, and information technology that may resolve many of the problems. The Academy panel recommended:

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should establish an accounting group in the comptroller unit of the proposed Policy, Management and Budget Office to work hand-in-hand with BIA management to (1) continue the drive towards a clean audit, (2) prevent the reoccurrence of material weaknesses, and (3) correct possible problems that go deeper than the issue of a clean audit (establish long-term solutions). Toward those ends the new office would be responsible for:

  - finalizing and improving a series of implementation plans for corrective actions on all audit issues and material weaknesses, supporting coordination and monitoring implementation using a report card system, maintaining important administrative processes and improving documentation of policy and procedures in tandem with that effort;

  - upon project completion, holding detailed retrospective meetings of management and accountable staff to discuss/document what went right and what went wrong (planned versus actual outputs and outcomes);

- Increasing current efforts to document all financial policy and procedures (with hands-on involvement by the area and agency offices) and get those documents out into the field;

- Correcting the serious shortage of administrative staff needed to perform financial duties (so many functions are collateral duties of overworked staff who lack adequate knowledge or training);

- Involving field offices more in the development of policy and procedures;

- Providing up-to-date computer software versions that are consistent across BIA;

- Increasing the level of coordination, follow-through, and communication among the different field offices.

Information Resource Management

BIA uses information technology far less than other government organizations and needs to aggressively pursue the development of information systems to increase the efficiency of its operations. BIA would benefit from a formal IRM user group to facilitate the management of IRM systems by establishing priorities and helping ensure that potential system applications are identified. BIA has put plans in place to address concerns in this area. While overall BIA seems to be moving forward effectively to address its IRM needs, there are "missed opportunities" it needs to address. One is that BIA management does not generate plans with performance measures. It is not using standard IRM techniques and activities to help with planning and control. There is little organizational participation in IRM planning or new product development. BIA has not consistently followed through on implementation of plans. Needed policies, procedures, and standards do not exist. The Academy panel recommended:

- The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs should establish a full-time chief information officer (CIO) in the proposed Policy, Management, and Budget Office to work hand-in-hand with management to bring the full benefits of information technology to BIA. The CIO would direct the activities of the Office of Information Resource Management (OIRM) and would be responsible for:

  - Creating an IRM users group with representatives of BIA management and operators to provide guidance in identifying potential information technology applications. Likewise, the CIO can use the users group to communicate new technologies that may be applicable to BIA;

  - Establishing a BIA-wide communication strategy to link the Bureau together;

  - Developing the requirements for information technology training.

Records Management

BIA depends upon records for virtually all aspects of its mission and is responsible for many historical documents. Here, too, BIA has major, long-standing problems. For example, widespread use of original documents for day-to-day reference places them at extreme risk. The environmental conditions for stored records range from passable to unacceptable. Records management is almost always a collateral, low-priority duty.

In recent years records management has become a particularly pressing issue at BIA because of the litigation over Indian trust fund management The litigation has led BIA to make extensive efforts to resolve the problems with trust management records. The Academy panel recommended:

- The CIO in the new Policy, Management and Budget Office should be responsible for BIA non-trust fund records management and should ensure that systems are up-to-date and reliable. The CIO should carry out the following recommendations:

    - establish records management policy and oversee the preparation of a records management policy implementation manual;

    - develop a BIA-wide plan to upgrade records management, building on the Trust Management Improvement Project;

    - establish accountability for records management in each major organizational element;

    - conduct an examination of the retention schedules for all types of documents and records to determine if they are still current and being applied consistently;

    - ensure that all its records management is integrated with the OST and is reviewed annually to determine that the integration is still valid.

Procurement Management

Attempts to improve BIA's procurement management have been ongoing for 25 years without success. In 1991 DOI declared the whole procurement system a material weakness. A survey of customers revealed considerable dissatisfaction with the procurement services being provided. Frustration with BIA's procurement organization runs high within DOI and among BIA customers. The long-standing nature of the problems and the organizational discord raise concerns about BIA's ability to correct the problems without dramatic action. Prompt resolution of these problems is essential. The Academy recommended:

- The assistant secretary should establish a procurement policy and quality assurance function within the proposed Policy, Management and Budget Office.

  - The assistant secretary should consider abolishing BIA's central procurement organization and contracting for procurement services from other sources within the government. If BIA contracts for these services, it should maintain the field's capability to meet procurement needs up to a reasonable limit (say, $100,000).

  - If central procurement is retained, the deputy commissioner should develop an action plan to correct the deficiencies identified in the recent DOI Acquisition Management Review. The assistant secretary and his staff should closely monitor implementation of the action plan and hold the deputy commissioner responsible for its implementation.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, the Academy thanks you for the opportunity to prepare this testimony on the BIA study, which is intended to result in more effective public management and to chart a path to meeting the needs and aspirations of Native Americans. The Academy is aware that improving governmental performance in a cost-effective manner is a central theme of your subcommittee. The Academy is impressed by your interest in results-oriented management and your ability to bring the concept to life in a number of agencies. BIA will experience some pain in facing up to its problems, but the Academy panel believes progress will be made if the Congress and administration are willing to invest in the recommendations in the report.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

We will have Mr. Gover's testimony, and then we may have some questions for both of you.

Mr. Gover, we are happy to welcome you. As you have observed, you have a challenge, but we would like to hear from you, however you choose to present your issues.

OPENING STATEMENT OF MR. GOVER

Mr. GOVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When I came on board as the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, I learned to my dismay the scope of the management and administration problems we had. Of course, looking back it is easy to see a number of causes, not the least of which was the loss of personnel in 1996.

First of all, let me say that we appreciate NAPA's work. We appreciate your support of our contracting with NAPA to do this study. We learned a number of very important things.

A number of the findings were no surprise. We were well aware, of course, that we were not performing the way that we needed to. I think the result of that is that when we come before this committee and other committees of the Congress to ask for more resources or more authority, you are skeptical as to our ability to properly handle the authority and the resources you provide. That is why it is so important to me that we gain your confidence and the confidence of the entire Congress in our operation.

What NAPA identified that I had not realized completely is that when Congress created the Office of Indian Education Programs a few years back, what it had essentially done was to create another bureau. But it wasn't completely another bureau. It left a number of administrative and management functions sort of in the discretion of the Assistant Secretary and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. What we found is that fairly consistently the OIEP felt they were not being properly served by the BIA management and administration operation.

I had hoped when I first began to look at this issue that we would be able to find a way to maintain a single line organization in order to realize whatever savings we could in management and administration. I had hoped that we would not have to create another whole organization to manage these sorts of things in both parts of the Bureau. NAPA advises—and I now agree—that is not going to be possible and what we really do have to do is provide the resources, the authority, and then demand accountability from the managers in those separate line organizations.

NAPA also appreciated, in a way that I had not, that the ambiguity as to what the Assistant Secretary actually is and does creates its own set of management problems. If my office is treated like the other Assistant Secretaries in the building, then the Bureau never really does have the sort of accountability systems it needs. Each organization—the Office of Indian Education Programs, the Office of Indian Programs—reports to the Assistant Secretary, but the Assistant Secretary really is very much at the mercy, shall we say, of the line organizations because I have basically six staff to evaluate the entire operation of what is now a $1.9

billion operation. With all the case work we have to do with the tribes as they come in, there is very little time for this effort.

I do appreciate NAPA's recommendations and we intend to implement them.

Along those lines, we have begun the implementation of the NAPA recommendations. Frankly I had hoped that we would be able to report to you today that the Secretary has signed the reorganization of our office. That has not happened yet. The document is prepared and it is in the system. We expect that the Secretary will sign it in a matter of days. But I do think we will be able to complete that within the next couple of days.

RELOCATION

The second part of the empowerment program, if you will—and more accurately, the accountability program—is that we have to deal with the material weaknesses in our audits. Most of those exist in our Division of Accounting Management and our Office of Information Resource Management. Those two offices, and about 125 employees that work for them, were located in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

I do not know how that happened, and Bureau lore does not really explain how those organizations ended up in Albuquerque, but what I experienced personally as well as by managers was just a lack of responsiveness out of those offices that we attributed to the distance between the senior managers in the agency and the personnel who were responsible for executing these responsibilities. After due consideration and after consulting with both NAPA and with our senior managers, we decided that what was really called for was to bring those people back here where they could be directly supervised by the senior management in the agency so that we can begin to address all these accounting concerns.

Mr. REGULA. That is consistent with their recommendations, is it not?

Mr. GOVER. NAPA did not make a specific recommendation to that effect. They did make the observation that it may be necessary to make such a move in order to create the kind of accountability we are looking for. So we felt that we were on firm ground, based on the NAPA report, and based on our own observations of the unresponsiveness of those organizations to direct this to the most senior management in the agency.

Yes, I believe it is consistent with what NAPA had in mind.

It is very difficult to supervise employees that are literally 2,000 miles away. And it is hard for them to understand and even share the priorities that management puts forward. Our belief is that by bringing those organizations to the Washington area, putting our information resource management organization out on the Dulles corridor with its great capabilities in terms of information technology, and putting them under the direct supervision of people who then report directly to me, we will then begin to achieve results.

That is the rationale behind that move.

FIELD RESOURCES

The third element of the implementation has to be to put more resources into the field in the two line organizations, under the Deputy Commissioner in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and under the Office of Indian Education Programs. I cannot hold the managers accountable if I am not also giving them the resources to do what I have asked them to do. So our budget for next year does request funds to do exactly that, to put more resources into these two line organizations and out into the field as well as in my office to begin to carry out this program of accountability.

Mr. REGULA. Will that require an increase, or will that require reallocation of your funding?

Mr. GOVER. We will reallocate some of the funding, but it will also require an increase, which we have requested. NAPA is now conducting a workload analysis for us to tell us what is the best distribution of both the personnel and the financial resources. We expect that plan this spring, and that will guide our efforts in deploying these new resources.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to commend NAPA and thank them for their work. They grasped very quickly a very complex organization and maybe that was what was called for: an outside look to help us find our way to what may seem obvious to many observers. I think it is a strong report. We intend to implement virtually all the recommendations NAPA made. We thank them for their work and we thank you for your support of our commissioning NAPA to do this work.

[The statement of Mr. Gover follows:]

TESTIMONY
OF
KEVIN GOVER
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INDIAN AFFAIRS
ON THE
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION'S REPORT
ON
BIA MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
BEFORE THE
INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES SUBCOMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 8, 2000

INTRODUCTION

In late Fall of 1998, the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs (Assistant Secretary) and the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget of the Department of the Interior (DOI) discussed commissioning a study to establish a blueprint for improving the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) management and administrative systems. These discussions were expanded to include others within DOI and the Congressional Subcommittees for Interior's appropriations. The Appropriations Subcommittees encouraged us to do such a study and recommended employing the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA).

NAPA

NAPA is an independent, nonpartisan organization chartered by Congress to assist federal, state, and local governments in improving their effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability. For more than thirty years NAPA has assisted Federal agencies, Congress, state and local governments, and education and philanthropic institutions in addressing both short-term and long-term challenges, including: budgeting and finance, alternative structures, performance measurement, human resources management, information technology, devolution, strategic planning, and managing for results.

NAPA's Board of Trustees provides overall guidance and leadership. Virtually all NAPA activities are conducted through panels composed of NAPA Fellows and others with expertise in the area of examination. Projects are supported by executive and administrative staff, and project staff who work in program concentrations.

Since its founding in 1967, NAPA has focused the capacities of institutions to perform effectively. The Academy's framework of governance provides a formula for examining public management processes, functions, strategies, and institutions. The framework identifies four dimensions for evaluating systems and structures for meeting public needs: public purposes and strategies,

institutional roles and responsibilities, performance capacities, and change.

THE NAPA STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NAPA followed its usual practice of establishing an Academy Panel of Fellows to provide overall study direction and guidance, establishing an Academy Study Team of Academy staff, and acquiring other technical expertise needed to conduct the study and prepare recommendations. The study began in March 1999 and was completed in late August 1999. Interviews were conducted with 260 people, including 206 from within BIA and the Assistant Secretary's office, 24 tribal leaders, and others from government agencies and Congress. The interview comments were evaluated and contrasted with information gathered from BIA and observations of the interviewers.

NAPA found that, without additional personnel and major management and organizational reforms, the BIA will be unable both to fully meet its responsibilities to the 1.4 million American Indians and Alaska Natives it serves and to operate an effective and efficient agency. NAPA went on to say that BIA does not have the capacity to effectively perform basic federal functions of accounting, property management, human resources management, procurement, and information resources management. Further complicating matters at BIA is the fact that staff do not receive adequate training. Strategic planning, yearly performance reviews, and program analysis are not institutionalized. The Academy panel also pointed out the need for more managerial discipline and additional administrative personnel to help remedy these problems.

While the panel found serious management and administrative deficiencies at BIA, it points out that the agency is showing hopeful signs of improvement. Senior managers realize that in order to keep pace with the expanding needs and interests of the population BIA serves, they must address BIA's administrative and management shortcomings, enhance its effectiveness, and improve its efficiency.

NAPA made a variety of conclusions and recommendations for improvement of administration and management of BIA. The study findings are that 1) there is no existing capability to provide budget, human resources, policy, and other types of management assistance to the Assistant Secretary and the BIA, 2) staff does not have adequate training in management and administrative skills, 3) strategic planning and program analysis are not institutionalized, 4) policy manuals and implementation handbooks are out of date, and 5) the three service organizations in BIA operate semi-independently through their own field organizations, but only one element had resources for administrative support.

NAPA's foremost recommendation was that staff support be provided to the Assistant Secretary to lead BIA in planning, budgeting, finance, human resources and information resources management to begin correcting these deficiencies and managing for results.

NAPA also stated, "If the three service-providing organizations [Operation of Indian Programs, Office of Indian Education Programs and Office of Law Enforcement Services] are to be held accountable for performing their missions, they need to have responsibility for providing their own administrative support." This leads to the recommendation to place new administrative personnel

at all levels of the BIA's Education and Law Enforcement offices.

The results that NAPA believes implementing these recommendations will accomplish are:

- a clean financial audit within a reasonable period of time;
- well documented estimates of program requirements that are accepted by DOI, OMB and Congress as credible, regardless of the funding levels ultimately achieved;
- reduced friction between the program and service units of BIA, and an end to the perception among Tribes that BIA is unresponsive;
- clear policies and guidelines for employees to follow in the performance of their duties; and
- increased confidence among the Tribes that moving to self-determination and self-governance will not result in the neglect of Federal responsibilities.

DOI AND BIA IMPLEMENTATION

DOI and BIA embrace the recommendations of the report. While NAPA's findings are consistent with evaluations conducted by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and others who have reviewed or audited BIA activities, NAPA's report is unique in its recommendations.

Beyond these recommendations lies a considerable volume of work. Implementing NAPA's recommendations will require:

- Establishing an Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget that reports directly to the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs and is capable of providing direction for BIA's administrative operations, including budget, financial management, human resources management, information resources management, records management and procurement management.

  DOI and BIA with NAPA's assistance have prepared a draft Secretarial Order containing functional statements for subunits to establish this office. Component units will include the Chief Financial Officer, Chief Information Officer, Human Resources, and Policy and Planning. Position descriptions for the key positions have been prepared and are being evaluated by the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs' servicing personnel office in preparation for advertisement.

- Identifying the specific actions needed to improve BIA administrative systems so they meet management and regulatory standards.

  NAPA is assisting DOI and BIA in reviewing administrative systems to determine

problems and corrective actions. Management systems and controls are being reviewed for adequacy and consistency with other comparable organizations, and whether the systems and controls satisfy Federal agency requirements.

- Creating plans for improving administrative systems and establishing organizational responsibility for carrying out and monitoring plans.

  BIA's administrative systems have been reviewed, found wanting, and corrective action plans have been prepared in the past. However, limited resources and inadequate monitoring of past plans have resulted in incomplete corrective actions. DOI, BIA and NAPA will evaluate resources needed to complete actions and establish monitoring processes to assure completion.

- Creating management processes for assigning responsibility and holding people accountable for results.

  BIA will establish mechanisms to assign responsibilities and hold managers accountable for accomplishing goals to be established by the new office of the Assistant Secretary.

DOI, BIA and NAPA are identifying the staffing needs through workforce analyses to determine the optimal levels of staff for the new headquarters unit and the field organizations. The analysis will evaluate the types of positions needed, the number of positions needed, and where the positions should be located to provide the most efficient and effective service delivery.

The NAPA report and past OIG surveys confirmed that hands-on management, daily direction, and increased communications are essential for effective management and timely response and follow-up. The OIG found that the BIA was not in compliance with a number of statutes including the Chief Financial Office Act of 1990, the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, the Credit Reform Act of 1990, and the Prompt Payment Act. The longstanding nature of these material weaknesses has resulted in a qualified audit opinion for the BIA.

The NAPA report also found that the BIA used information technology far less than other government organizations and, specifically, recommended that the BIA aggressively pursue the development of information systems to increase the efficiency of its operations. One of the most important findings of the NAPA study in this area was the lack of senior management participation in Information Resources Management planning or new product development.

The geographic distance between BIA's Washington headquarters and its Albuquerque accounting management and information resources management operations greatly contributed to the BIA's predicament. We determined that relocation and consolidation of all BIA administrative operations to the Washington metropolitan area was a critical first step. We are confident that face-to-face, direct supervision of the accounting and information resources management staff will result in improved financial and information technology services.

The employees within the Division of Accounting Management were presented with a Notice of Transfer of Function on November 5, 1999, and the employees of the Office of Information Resources Management were notified on December 6, 1999. This notice provided background information on the decision to relocate the organizations and explained the transfer process and the rights of the employees as they proceed through the process. Employees were offered full relocation benefits with their acceptance to transfer with their current position. Understanding the difficulty in making such a decision, we provided the employees with an additional two weeks beyond what is required by regulations to make their decision. To date, approximately 50 of the 128 employees in both divisions have indicated they will transfer with their functions.

To further assist employees, BIA requested and received from Congress the authority to extend the Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment program to Albuquerque employees affected by the transfer of functions. Because the FY 2000 Interior appropriations act was not enacted until November 17, 1999, a narrow window (until December 31, 1999) was available through which employees could benefit from Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (VSIP) of up to $25,000. The BIA had to move swiftly to notify the employees of the transfer of their functions to insure they had the option to participate in VSIP. Thirty-one (31) employees have retired and received the VSIP.

BIA management is assisting employees impacted by the relocation. We are currently working with the Census Bureau, which is interested in hiring available BIA employees who have chosen not to transfer. We have issued hiring restrictions to all our offices within the Albuquerque commuting area to afford displaced employees hiring priority. In addition, the employees are eligible for the Office of Personnel Management's Career Transition Assistance Program making them eligible for special hiring priority in all Federal agencies.

NAPA Funding

I want to thank this Subcommittee for providing early retirement and voluntary resignation authority and necessary funding to implement NAPA in 2000. In FY 2000 Congress appropriated $5,249,000 for the implementation of the NAPA recommendations, including the establishment of the Office of Policy and Planning. A significant portion of this funding will be used for the move and reestablishment of the Division of Accounting Management and Office of Information Resource Management in the Washington, D.C. area as discussed above. While the transfer of function is not complete, we estimate the relocation costs will total $3.8 million (this is $240,000 higher than shown in the FY 2001 Budget Justifications). These one-time expenses will include moving personnel household and office files from Albuquerque, and establishing new office operations in the Washington, D.C. area. Our Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments alone totaled $775,000. In addition to transferring functions, it is my priority to use the remaining FY 2000 funds to establish the recommended Policy, Management and Budget (PMB) office, and fill the key positions of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for PMB, the Chief Financial Officer, the Chief Information Officer, the Director of Policy and Planning, and the Chief Human Resources. Once these positions have been filled, these senior managers will begin planning and developing internal procedures and long-term plans for their respective areas.

While actions on the NAPA recommendations will improve BIA's administrative management, I believe that the process of implementation should not be done hastily. I want the senior managers who will be responsible for the final implementation of the NAPA recommendations to be fully involved in all decisions on staffing levels and selection of personnel. However, NAPA staff will continue to evaluate workforce needs in terms of the number and kind of positions that will make BIA most efficient while I search for key staff.

The President's FY 2001 Budget requests a total of $9,249,000 to fully staff the PMB offices and begin funding improved field operations. We are estimating that when the workload analysis is completed that this level of funding will be sufficient to fully fund the centralized portion of education operations administrative support, partially fund the education administration in field offices, and allow full funding of administrative support to the law enforcement field organization. Funding will also be used to begin placing additional finance, property and procurement specialists through the field structure of the non-education offices at the region and agency level.

CONCLUSION

DOI and BIA intend to continue to keep the Committee apprised of the NAPA implementation efforts and to implement the changes we have discussed today. We will continue to use NAPA's expertise as consultants and advisors during this implementation. We will establish and hire staff for the new office within the Assistant Secretary's office during this fiscal year. This staff will participate in the design of the field organization and develop the necessary policies and procedures for the new field structure to properly operate. The request for funding for FY 2001 will allow the BIA to make progress toward filling field positions. We will let the development of policies and procedures, and workload analysis drive the number of additional field staff to be hired and the locations for placement. I believe that the DOI and BIA have an opportunity to significantly improve BIA's efficiency and effectiveness, and to increase accountability throughout the organization.

This concludes my remarks on the NAPA report. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

As I understand you, you see the NAPA report as a blueprint for reorganization of the Bureau.

Mr. GOVER. Yes.

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. REGULA. This question is on the current status, and the answer is whether you are underway in implementing their recommendations at this time.

Mr. GOVER. We are well underway. I would have liked to have been a little further along, but I think we are moving very aggressively in that direction. Certainly by the end of this fiscal year we will have established the institutions that NAPA calls for, and then in 2001 we can begin to implement the line authorities that are necessary to hold managers accountable and to provide the resources in the field that are going to be necessary to meet our obligation.

Mr. REGULA. Will you fill these positions in-house, or will you go outside for the administrative functions that they outline?

Mr. GOVER. I intend to advertise for each position. I expect that we will get some applications from in-house. Hopefully we will also be able to attract some new talent to the Department.

Mr. REGULA. Are the NAPA recommendations consistent with GPRA?

Mr. GOVER. Very much so. NAPA is basically saying that we now have no proper capabilities to report results from the programs that we operate. They are correct. And one of the problems is that we do not have the internal capabilities to provide that kind of accounting.

There is another whole series of problems that arise from the self-determination and self-governance policy in that we have only limited ability to request information from the tribes to tell us how Federal dollars are being spent. That is something that we want to analyze very carefully with this new staff capability that we are developing and come back to the Congress and the tribes and show some areas where we think we need more accountability at the local level. But in the meantime, we can certainly make the BIA-operated programs very accountable to the Committee.

Mr. REGULA. You are saying that you want oversight on the expenditure of funds as they are allocated to the tribes. Is that correct?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, sir. We want oversight.

Mr. REGULA. And accountability?

Mr. GOVER. And accountability. We are not looking to control how the tribes spend the funds except in the sense that these funds are being spent for the authorized purposes. I cannot tell you today from the information the tribes are required to submit to us on an annual basis that in fact those funds are being spent for the authorized purposes. And we really need to take a careful look at that.

The problem is that the tribes will immediately interpret this as an attempt to go back to the bad old days when the Bureau of Indian Affairs told them what to do with every single dollar. I can only emphasize that that is not what we want to do and that we

have to find a middle ground where we can both tell the Congress where we spent the money, what we accomplished, what remains to be done, and what it is going to cost. We cannot do that right now.

Mr. REGULA. Would you contemplate at least summarizing the NAPA recommendations and distributing them to the tribal leadership so they understand where you are coming from?

Mr. GOVER. We distributed the report to each tribe and frankly did not get a lot of feedback on it, interestingly enough. What I have done with the tribes is to ask the National Congress of American Indians to set up a working group to work with us on what we are calling reporting and accountability. Ideally, we will be able to simply negotiate with the tribes the kind of reporting and accountability that is necessary for us and for you to evaluate program performance in the field.

The Deputy Commissioner has funded that task force to assist us in that effort. I am fairly hopeful that we will be able to work it out with the tribes without involving the Congress. We will certainly be reporting to the Committee and the authorizing committees the results of that work.

Mr. REGULA. Is there any language we could include that would be helpful to you? You may want to submit something for the record on that. Sometimes it is helpful to be able to point to something when trying to get a desirable response.

Mr. GOVER. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will think about that and get back to you in writing.

Mr. REGULA. Is it your impression that the BIA is moving in the direction you have recommended in your report?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, that is correct. We do think that there is great receptivity by the Assistant Secretary and the Department to implement these recommendations.

Mr. REGULA. As I understand it from the staff, you went out into the field and talked to people there. What was your impression? Do you think there will be a willingness to try to work with the recommendations? I am talking about on the part of the employees in the field and the tribal leaders.

Mr. HANSON. Let me ask Dr. Neves to respond to that because she and others were directly involved with the field work.

Ms. NEVES. It is my impression that the people working in the field are very receptive. They were receptive not only to have us come and listen to what they had to say and take an interest in the work they are doing, but they are clearly overworked, understaffed, and we found them to be very capable and competent. I think they are looking for help and will be willing to do what is necessary from their side to make this work.

As you might guess, I think they are concerned about the distribution of those 200 people. Once the workload analysis is done, I think they will feel more comfortable with the recommendation.

NAPA'S IMPACT

Mr. REGULA. One last question.

If these recommendations are implemented, what will be the impact on the average individual out in the tribes? How will their

quality of life be improved? What is your opinion if we can get these recommendations put in place and implemented?

Ms. NEVES. I think the provision of services will be improved measurably. One of the things that is important to understand and which we did not include in our report are the programmatic needs. They are huge. When you have a social case worker with a load of 140, you need to address the program side also. We addressed the administrative needs.

In reports issued by the BIA and the tribes, there are countless examples of the lack of resources on the programmatic side. I think to really make a difference you need a combination of resources on the administrative side of the house as well as the programmatic side. There I think we are talking about a very large amount of resources.

If you look at law enforcement, education, the provision of social services, natural resources—and it can go on and on. This is a growing population and a population whose needs have not been adequately addressed for decades.

Mr. HANSON. I would just add, Mr. Chairman, from the panel's perspective, to address these program needs effectively there have to be—from the Bureau's perspective—credible estimates of what those needs are. From your perspective, you need those credible estimates. They cannot be made without the kind of administrative support that we have recommended for both the headquarters and field offices.

Mr. GOVER. I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. That is the idea here. I do not look to see that my legacy will be that I was a budget hawk, but I do believe that we owe you and we owe the Congress a very careful accounting of the dollars you give us before we come back and ask for more. This has to come first. We have to get those systems in place so that year after year, regardless of who is sitting in this chair, that person can come to you with numbers that are real and based on real evidence out in the field. We do not have that capability right now.

Mr. REGULA. You are really saying that if the administrative structure is improved in conformance with these recommendations that it ultimately will translate into a better quality of life for your constituency?

Mr. GOVER. I believe that. I believe it will take some time for that to happen, before these improvements show up out in the field.

Mr. REGULA. I understand that.

Mr. GOVER. But the essence of the NAPA report is accountability. Right now, I do not have the ability to hold the program managers accountable in any meaningful way against identifiable performance measures. I believe once this oversight organization is in place—oversight and policymaking—that that will in fact improve the delivery of services on the reservation, whether or not we get more resources from the Congress.

Mr. REGULA. That is a positive note. I think you both agree that these objectives are consistent with GPRA.

Mr. GOVER. Yes.

Mr. HANSON. Yes, sir.

Ms. NEVES. Yes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Dicks?

Mr. DICKS. I want to welcome all the witnesses here today.

Mr. Hanson, I am sorry that I was not here for your presentation, but I got a chance to take a look at it and our staff has reviewed it. Of course, I, too, am troubled by the conclusions of the report.

"Current management and administration of the BIA are not adequate to meet all its trust responsibilities to American Indians. The BIA has had difficulty satisfying the Government's requirements for strategic planning and annual performance planning. BIA has been unable to meet basic administrative requirements. It does not have a unified approach to human resources. The budget structure does not provide the information necessary to estimate actual needs. The financial management systems do not permit matching funding to requirements. There is not an unqualified audit. Since 1991, procurement has been identified as an area of material weakness. BIA procurement improvement efforts have been ongoing for 25 years without success. There is no human resources succession plan or management development program. BIA uses information technology far less than other Federal agencies. In the area of record management, the BIA has major longstanding problems."

I would like to ask one thing.

Mr. Hanson, you say here that they need additional people but you do not want them to get the people until they have made the commitment to make the change.

Does that paraphrase this accurately?

Mr. HANSON. Well, in a sense, yes. We take it that they have made the commitment to make that change. To establish the systems that are necessary to correct these problems, they really have to have additional people.

One of the problems that the Assistant Secretary has pointed out to you is that he has six people in his office to manage this entire operation. He needs the kind of policy, program analysis, budget, human resources, information resources staff that makes it possible to collect, assemble, analyze data, prepare budgets, establish performance goals, develop a strategic plan, and have the kinds of information available to him that makes it possible for him to hold the operating parts of the Bureau accountable for their performance.

Without that, he is engaged in a good guessing game, which is about as good as you can put it.

Mr. DICKS. I understand that we are waiting for the Secretary to sign this order requiring that these changes be made. It is one thing to sign an order and require things to be changed. It is another thing to do it.

Is that true?

Mr. HANSON. Of course.

Mr. DICKS. Just signing the order is not going to get this job done.

BUDGET INCREASES

I understand that your budget requires 596 additional FTEs to the BIA and a 10 percent increase in its operating budget. Is that correct?

Mr. GOVER. That is correct. Not all of that, of course, is necessary for implementation of the NAPA recommendations.

Mr. DICKS. How do you separate the request?

Mr. GOVER. About an additional $4 million we are looking for——

Mr. DICKS. An additional $4 million on top of this?

Mr. GOVER. No, over fiscal year 2000. The Committee gave us $5 million last year to begin implementation of the NAPA study. Our current estimates—and of course we are still working on the workload analysis—our current estimates are still consistent with the request for next year, which would give us, in essence, $9 million over fiscal year 1999 to conduct these administrative functions.

BUREAU COMMITMENT

Mr. DICKS. One other statement made here was particularly troubling. "The Academy's concern stems from the lack of core capability in the management of the Bureau and the lack of proactive, consistent, and committed leadership within BIA and the Department."

Will this order and the additional funds enable you to provide consistent and committed leadership within BIA and the Department?

Mr. GOVER. It is difficult for me to answer that in light of the fact that I will only be here another year. But I can assure you that we are committed to this effort.

One of the problems has always been that there has never been in the Bureau of Indian Affairs a very stable system of rewarding good management. That is part of what has to change.

We know that with this $9 million and with the secretarial order—which is important in the sense that I have no authority to go out and start hiring this new Chief Information Officer or Chief Financial Officer and the other people NAPA recommends until the Secretary has told me that I can—that is the significance of the order. That is why we need it so badly.

As soon as that is done, we have already prepared the position descriptions and we are ready to run them through the system and start hiring these folks.

Congressman, all I can tell you is that I am committed to it. I believe we can start a ball rolling that regardless of who my successor is, they will be unable to stop it. Certainly with this committee's oversight and with the Resources Committee's oversight, we will be able to keep this train on the track.

Mr. DICKS. Do you plan to recruit people from outside BIA or outside the Department of Interior? Are you going to hire people from within the agency?

Mr. GOVER. I would expect that we will do both. We are going to advertise these positions per the Civil Service requirements. I expect that some people who are currently within the agency will apply. Certainly in those circumstances where they are the best

qualified, we will hire them. But it is of great concern to us that we attract new talent into the Department to carry out these functions.

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DICKS. One area that was also mentioned—hopefully not being redundant—on page 13 of the executive summary, the NAPA report states, "BIA gives employee development almost no organized attention, nor does it systematically invest in employee training."

Will this be part of the area that you will address under the order? Trying to do a better job of training your own people?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, sir. One of the positions NAPA recommends is a Human Resources Director to develop exactly those policies, including training and succession planning, so that we do always have capable people in line to take over as people leave the agency. That is not the case right now. The personnel capabilities at the Bureau are almost zero. We contract with other agencies in the Department to do our personnel work because we basically lost our human resources office in the 1996 RIFs.

SELF-DETERMINATION

Mr. DICKS. Under self-determination, a grant is given to the tribe and they use that money to manage their programs, correct? How would you explain it better?

Mr. GOVER. I would say that we provide the resources for the tribes themselves to carry out programs that we otherwise would be providing on the reservations.

Mr. DICKS. Do we have good information about how that money is being spent?

Mr. GOVER. No, we do not. Not the kind of information I would like to come before this committee with.

SINGLE AUDITS

Mr. DICKS. Thus far it is not auditable. Is that correct?

Mr. GOVER. It is auditable, and they do submit single audits every year in accordance with the law. The single audits, though, do not tell you very much.

First of all, they tell you almost nothing about program results. What they do say is whether or not the Federal dollars are being spent for Federal purposes, in essence. But one of the things we are finding out is even where we find that a tribe is not spending money for the appropriate purposes, we have very little leverage to force compliance. Our basic option under the statute is to take the program away. That is not a meaningful alternative for us.

Mr. DICKS. Take away the whole self-determination program?

Mr. GOVER. Exactly.

Mr. DICKS. An all or nothing remedy?

Mr. GOVER. That is exactly right. And we need some more tools.

This year we began withholding from tribes that were not in compliance with the Single Audit Act their contract support funds. I have met with a number of them and they say that I have no authority to do that. I say that it is a close call under the law. I do

not know if I do or not, but I am going to do it because I do not think they will be able to convince any decisionmaker that they should be able to violate the Single Audit Act and still get their money.

Mr. DICKS. When you say "single audit"—what does that mean?

Mr. GOVER. That is the unified audit that recipients of Federal funds—be they States, localities, or Indian tribes—must submit to the United States to account for the Federal dollars they have received. It is unified so that it combines all the agencies.

Mr. DICKS. Do you have auditors that go out and check verify this is the way the money was spent?

Mr. GOVER. I have an audit and evaluations staff that eventually receives the audits submitted by independent auditors. The tribes have to retain independent auditors to provide reports to us. That audit staff then reviews those. Where we see problems, we follow up. Quite often the Inspector General will direct us to pursue certain issues that arise in the review of the single audits.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. DICKS. Are we finding a lot of problems?

Mr. GOVER. There are problems, yes. Certainly when we do identify them we have been very aggressive in trying to resolve those over the past couple of years.

The problem is much less with the accountability for the Federal dollars. We are relatively confident that the level of misappropriation is not a major concern. The real problem is that even though we know it is spent for Federal purposes, we have no idea what sorts of results are being achieved in the field.

Mr. DICKS. And accountability is the problem. If you look at the statistics, there are still a lot of problems in Indian country in terms of unemployment, educational attaintment, and other areas that are much more serious than in society in general.

Mr. GOVER. Much more serious. And even though we can see progress, we have no notion whether that is because of the work that we are doing and the work the tribes are doing with Federal dollars. So it gives us very little ability to properly allocate resources.

Mr. DICKS. What are we going to do to address that problem? How do we get a handle on it?

Mr. GOVER. First of all, we are working with the tribes and have asked the tribes to form a group to work with us on this reporting and accountability issue. The tribes have been very forthcoming, I must say, about participating because they see that it is in their interest to provide that kind of information to you. So we will pursue that.

If we find that that is not enough and that voluntary compliance by the tribes is not enough, I would assume that one of my successors will be coming to you and asking you to take a look at the authorizing statute, P.L. 93–638.

I guess I will just be candid since I will not be here again.

Mr. DICKS. We always expect you to be.

Mr. GOVER. Congress went a little overboard in making sure that the Bureau of Indian Affairs stayed out of the tribes' business under this law. I perfectly understand the reasons that it did so.

But by telling the Bureau that they cannot make regulations regarding any program requirements and that sort of thing, it leaves us with virtually no authority to direct how services are delivered on the reservation. Somewhere there is a better balance, I believe. The Bureau should not be telling these local communities that they will do this and they will do that. However, we need the ability to get that information and bring it to you to show how these dollars you are giving us are being spent. Right now, we do not have that authority.

Mr. DICKS. So you think there may be a necessity—unless you can work this out with the tribes—to have possible some additional authority?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKS. And that will be controversial?

Mr. GOVER. Very.

TRUST RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. DICKS. How are we doing on natural resource programs? This has been a concern in my area—timber and other issues—where there is a trust responsibility to the tribes. This is another area that is mentioned in the report.

Mr. GOVER. It is, and we face many challenges in that area. All of this litigation and the great tumult over our execution of the trust responsibility in the past demonstrates the kind of problems we have.

We have undertaken a massive reform program that is proceeding and is beginning to yield results. There is no question that we have a lot of work left to do. What we have realized in the course of going through and trying to clean up what has happened in the past is that if we do not increase the resources that we are devoting to these programs, 5 years hence we will be back in the same situation we are in now. What is required is not only to design, establish, and implement these systems, but get highly qualified people to operate them. Then and only then will we be meeting our trust responsibility to the tribes for these resources.

Mr. DICKS. And we have heard from the Secretary about the problems with the recordkeeping and the various lawsuits. How long do you think it will take us before we see real progress on all these issues? Will it be 5 years, 10 years, 15?

Mr. GOVER. We are seeing real progress now, but we have sort of started at the bottom. We can begin making progress immediately, and we are. We are very hopeful that by the end of 2004 we will be able to present to the Congress a reformed trust management system. Meanwhile, it obviously is taking place piecemeal. It will go into effect bit by bit. We have twelve different projects that are part of the overall effort. In each case we are making progress—some faster than others.

But the main projects we have to complete are the Trust Fund Accounting System, TFAS, and the Trust Assets and Accounting Management System. If we can successfully deploy those, our field personnel will have the tools they need to do this job correctly.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

OFFICE RELOCATION

Mr. REGULA. Reform is the watchword these days.

I understand on March 6 the plaintiffs in the Cobell case filed suit to get a temporary restraining order against moving the Office of Information Resource Management to Washington. This is inconsistent with the recommendations of NAPA, if I understand it correctly. Would you agree?

Ms. NEVES. NAPA did not explicitly say to move the office here, nor did it say not to. NAPA believes that that is the Assistant Secretary's decision.

However, NAPA saw advantages to moving the office here, having face-to-face contact, and enhancing the responsiveness of the people working in that area. A lot of it depends on the style of the individual administrator. A lot of it depends on how far decentralization has taken part. A lot of it depends on whether you have strong integrative mechanisms to tie together an organization in Albuquerque with Washington. NAPA feels some of those elements are definitely missing.

In this lawsuit, it is my understanding that there is some misunderstanding about what NAPA said and what NAPA did not say. But we were at times persuaded to believe that face-to-face communications would be very useful in order to better manage this agency.

Mr. HANSON. The specific recommendation of the panel appears on page 45 of the report.

Mr. REGULA. That would be directed at this question, then?

Mr. HANSON. Yes.

Mr. REGULA. Will the Department appeal this decision?

Mr. GOVER. First, we will comply with the decision. The judge said that we were not to move information that is now housed at the Office of Information Resource Management in Albuquerque until we have provided a satisfactory plan for the security of that data. And we will supply——

Mr. REGULA. The transition? Or once it is here?

Mr. GOVER. Both.

But the irony is that one of the criticisms both the Inspector General and NAPA had of our IRM operation is that there is inadequate security now. We believe security will be improved when we bring it back into a proper facility and a proper direction by the Central Office.

But of course we will comply with what the judge has said. We have taken irrevocable personnel actions to cause the move of the personnel associated with that office. In fact, some of them are probably in their cars on their way here as we speak. So we are sort of at a point of no turning back. But the judge has imposed conditions on that move that we believe are reasonable. It is probably easier simply to comply than to go through the trouble and turmoil of an appeal.

INFORMATION SECURITY

Mr. REGULA. What kind of information do they have that would be top secret or be a concern?

Mr. GOVER. It is not top secret information. It is information having to do with the economic interests of individual account holders in our IIM system. It is Privacy Act material that we have responsibility to keep secret and not to share with those who are not otherwise authorized to have such information.

The judge felt that we had not gone far enough—and I am working on second-hand information myself here—in our contract requirements with the contractor to assure the security of that information. We have already talked to the contractor. We will amend the contract as per the court's directions, and we will submit the security plan the judge has asked us for.

SYSTEM MANAGEMENT

Mr. REGULA. This is the contractor that manages the information system on behalf of BIA?

Mr. GOVER. No, it is actually a contractor we brought on to help us specifically with the move. But in order to do that, they are going to have to have access to this Privacy Act material and that creates certain requirements on them. The court has made that clear to us and we will comply.

Mr. REGULA. Your plan is to move, but to do this you will have to adjust to the order of the court, which has set certain parameters that you need to meet as a prerequisite of moving OIRM?

Mr. GOVER. Of moving the information, yes.

Mr. REGULA. The office would have to go with it, right?

Mr. GOVER. The plan was to move the people here, to get them set up and organized with their own system. Meanwhile, we would use a contractor out in the field to keep the system running while they are transitioning.

Mr. REGULA. Do you have any problems with the present operation?

Mr. GOVER. Oh, my. We have a number of problems.

As I indicated earlier, they have been identified as a material weakness by our auditors. There is inadequate security for the information they manage. There are inadequate controls and inadequate policies and procedures, which is why we need a Chief Information Officer that is directly supervising this office in order to get the kind of results we expect.

Mr. REGULA. Do you have one now?

Mr. GOVER. No, we do not. In the Trust Management Improvement Project, we are finding out that we still have field personnel who are operating on old DOS operating systems. They do not even use a Windows system. They are still using the control keys. They do not know how to use a mouse. They do not know how to point and click. They do not know what a pop-up menu is.

Frankly, these are all new terms to me, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOVER. But for modern management, this is old stuff. So our IRM operation fails to take advantage of the kind of technology that is available to do our job. That is what NAPA identified and it has to stop.

Mr. REGULA. The records aren't really computerized in the sense that you can recall them instantly?

Mr. GOVER. That is correct. We keep some current data on the system, but we still have field personnel—another thing NAPA

pointed out—getting into files and using the original conveyances from as much as 100 years ago in paper records in their offices. That is not how people do business today.

Mr. REGULA. You do the accounts where you show the leasehold revenues that flow to the tribes. Wouldn't the tribes want you to have these records in good shape because it affects the access money coming to them?

Mr. GOVER. The tribes do want it in good shape, and they have been very supportive of our efforts in that regard.

Some tribes have not been cooperative in the sense that they want to keep those records on their reservation because they are very concerned that they might be lost, destroyed—and who can blame them for having that concern? But it is up to us to persuade them that we are going to take good care of those records.

Mr. REGULA. Does the tribe have a set and you have a master set?

Mr. GOVER. Unfortunately, no. There is a set. Some are in the possession of the tribes and others in our possession, depending on whether or not the tribes have taken over these functions. There may be duplicate records of various sorts, but not kept systematically as duplicates.

Mr. REGULA. No consistent system? Sort of on a tribe-by-tribe basis as to how the records are maintained?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, I am sure that is true. That is why we have as an element of the Trust Improvement Project a records management project.

Mr. REGULA. Do you agree with this?

Mr. HANSON. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Just speaking personally for a moment, there are two kinds of administrative problems: some are problems and some are messes. What Mr. Gover has is a mess. He really has to have the power to correct it.

Mr. REGULA. I think this is a good point to move on to the Special Trustee.

Mr. Dicks, do you have any further questions?

Mr. DICKS. No, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you very much for doing the report and for being here today. I think it is clear that it has resonated well with the Assistant Secretary trying to move the Department in the right direction. We appreciate your thoughtful response to the request.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Thompson, you are the Acting Trustee?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am actually the Principal Deputy.

Mr. REGULA. You are in charge of the "mess" he described. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON. I was a little afraid to come up here when he mentioned "mess" but we can report some improvements to the mess we inherited.

Mr. REGULA. We look forward to your testimony. Your entire statement will be placed in the record and you can summarize as you choose.

OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. THOMPSON. I will do that quickly. Let me just change the theme a little bit here.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to present the OST budget. The budget we present is for the entire trust reform effort for the Department with a couple of exceptions. The request is about $95 million, about the same level as last year.

We basically have a couple of major changes. The actual reform dollars amount is going down a little bit from $65 million to about $58 million and we are asking for additional funds to support the Indian land consolidation effort that Kevin has running now. We would like to increase that effort to buy down the fractionated interest.

We also support the need for additional money and staff in the field for BIA. We are bringing major reforms to trust management in Indian country, but without additional staff we will see those regress to the condition that we are trying to fix right now. Kevin needs additional help out there and we support his budget request in that arena.

Again, the request that you see this year supports the emphasis and the importance of trust reform to the Administration, to Secretary Babbitt, and to Kevin and I.

Let me mention some of the things we used the money for that you gave us last year. We do have some successes to report.

TRUST REFORM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Later this month we will complete the conversion of all the BIA regions to the new Trust Fund Accounting System, which means that all the 270,000 odd accounts and all the investment money is under a commercial standard trust system. It is operated by a company in Pennsylvania for us, and they are doing a very good job. That is the first major piece we were trying to do.

In addition, Kevin's people have piloted the Trust Accounting and Asset Management System that will manage the land, the trust assets in the BIA. That has been piloted in the Rocky Mountain Region and we expect to make a decision shortly to extend that to at least the land title portion of the BIA in the next few months.

We have done a lot of data cleanup. You have heard a lot about that, but there is still more to do. The condition of the records we spoke of just a moment ago, obviously. In the records management area, we have consolidated our effort into a single office that supports both OST and BIA. We hired a very seasoned and highly respected records specialist from the Department of State and he has now brought his staff on board and is moving—to answer Mr. Dicks' question, we think you will see significant changes in the records arena over the next 3 years. We have a very extensive program and a lot of milestones and made a lot of commitments.

I would also say that BIA is well on its way to eliminating the appraisal backlog we have uncovered in the trust reform effort. We have just published a new High Level Implementation Plan. That is the Plan that we use to manage the effort overall.

This Plan is much more robust than the Plan we did 2 years ago. It has a lot more detail and a lot more milestones, if you will. The first Plan had about 134 critical steps; this one has over 220. So we are basically showing everybody our hand and where we are going to go.

REFORM TIMEFRAME

Mr. REGULA. How long will it take you to implement this?

Mr. THOMPSON. A lot of this work you will see in the next 2 years, but there are some pieces of it that will run out to 2003 and 2004. To finish up the policies and procedures is going to take a little longer. As I mentioned, the records piece probably will not be done until 2002. Some of the systems will not be finished until 2002. It is a massive effort. We are dealing with over 4,000 people in BIA alone, probably 400 sites across the country, and millions upon millions of pages of records. And we are also spending a lot of time responding to the court, to be frank. A lot of the time in the last 6 months has been spent responding to the court, supporting the court effort. The same people who are doing the trust reform are doing the work for the court and also trying to carry on their day-to-day jobs.

We were a little ambitious in our scheduling and we have had to change the plan to reflect that in some cases.

As I said, there is a lot of work that has been done and there is more that needs to be done.

I would like to mention one final thing. As you know, Mr. Slonaker has been nominated by the President to be the Special Trustee. The hearing in the Senate is scheduled for the 22nd of March. We hope they will move quickly in confirming him. I particularly look forward to having Mr. Slonaker sitting here instead of me.

[The statement of Mr. Thompson follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT
of
THOMAS M. THOMPSON,
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS
before the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
March 8, 2000

Introduction

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to present the President's FY 2001 budget request for the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians (OST). The total FY 2001 request for the OST accounts is $95 million, about the same level as FY 2000 enacted. This request includes an increase of $7.5 million for Indian Land Consolidation that is offset by a $7.4 million reduction in OST operations that are non-recurring or shifted to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The combined OST and BIA budget requests reflect the continued emphasis the Administration and the Secretary place on implementation of Indian Trust Asset Reform efforts and the resources needed to sustain the operational and organizational improvements initiated in previous years. Improvements in systems, operations and policies are critically needed to ensure the Federal Government meets its fiduciary obligations to Indian tribes and individual American Indians. New systems linking the management of underlying trust assets and the financial accounts are expected to begin operations in late 2000 to ensure that collections and payments are accurate.

The BIA requests a $35.1 million increase for trust management functions, including real estate services, probate, cadastral surveys, and land titles and records programs. These increases are absolutely crucial to ensure that the trust management improvements we are implementing are institutionalized and maintained in the long term.

Eliminating Indian trust management deficiencies continues to be the highest management priority for the Department. Secretary Babbitt has testified repeatedly to our commitment to resolve the decades-old trust fund management issues. This Committee provided significant help in solving this problem by fully funding our FY 2000 budget request. As a result, the Department has been able to make progress in implementing much-needed reform efforts.

Indian Trust Management Reform Progress

In line with the commitment we made to you last year, conversion of individual Indian accounts to the new Trust Fund Accounting System will be completed by May. The BIA has piloted the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System in one location and expects to begin deploying the land title functions of the system to other locations late this spring. Some additional accomplishments include:

- Publishing a revision to the High Level Implementation Plan (HLIP), which outlines progress made toward completing improvements in trust management and lays out additional steps that must be taken to reach the goals and objectives that we have established. Significant headway has been made in establishing new trust management and financial systems that will handle the hundreds of thousands of records that are the foundation of a reliable trust management program.

- Implementation of the Trust Funds Accounting System (TFAS), suitable for both Tribal and IIM accounts, will be operational nationwide in all BIA and OST Regional Office locations by May 2000.

- Significant Data Clean up activities have been completed in OST. Similar efforts are underway in BIA. Both OST and BIA will continue data clean-up in support of the new systems.

- BIA is well on the way to eliminating appraisal backlogs this year.

- Probate backlogs will be addressed through probate re-invention efforts and additional staffing in both BIA and OHA.

- Additional Records Management staff has been hired, records management training is ongoing and assessments of BIA records storage locations will begin this year.

- Additional staff is being hired to address Internal Control issues and manage the overall training programs.

- Joint efforts are also underway to address policies and procedures.

It should be noted that Department-wide, staff who are responsible for these accomplishments continue to be heavily involved in providing support to the *Cobell v Babbitt* litigation, while also carrying on their day-to-day responsibilities. Many of the initiatives are supported or accomplished by contractors. We estimate that approximately 65% of the funds provided for trust management improvements will be obligated through contracts.

FY 2001 Budget Request

The 2001 budget includes a comprehensive proposal to continue ongoing trust management improvements, institute permanent and lasting changes in trust management functions in BIA, and resolve land ownership fractionation, which is one of the root causes of trust management problems.

For Program Operations, Support and Improvements, $80.4 million is requested, which includes $58.4 million needed for continued implementation of the trust management improvement activities of OST, BIA, and the Office of Hearing and Appeals. These funds will be used to operate the trust fund and trust asset and accounting management systems, address account data problems, and further reduce backlogs in trust asset processing functions. The Department has installed and is operating a Trust Funds Accounting System (TFAS), suitable for both Tribal and IIM accounts. The Department also is piloting and will begin installation of a standardized, commercial off-the-shelf land management system technology, referred to as Trust Asset and Accounting Management System (TAAMS), which will replace the aging BIA trust asset management systems and land title and records and minerals royalty systems

Another $19.6 million is required to support day-to-day financial trust activities at the Office of Trust Funds Management (OTFM), including the field staff and support services. Included in the request is an additional $726,000 for increased staffing and support costs to sustain improvements in various trust operations activities within OST, $580,000 for Office-wide fixed costs such as pay raises and increased space costs paid to the General Services Administration, and $423,000 for increases in other administrative support contract costs.

A total of $2.5 million is requested to fund the Office of Trust Litigation Support, a net decrease of $2.7 million from FY 2000 due to decrease in requirements for funding tribal settlement support activities and ongoing litigations efforts.

Executive Direction

For Executive Direction, $ 2.2 million is requested, an increase of $496,000 above FY 2000. The immediate Office of the Special Trustee will need additional staff to oversee and coordinate trust improvements Department-wide as the pace and scope of improvements accelerate. This requests includes $250,000 for support of the InterTribal Monitoring Association and $85,000 for the Advisory Board. These groups advise the OST on trust funds matters.

Land Consolidation

Our FY 2001 budget requests $12.5 million for the Indian Land Consolidation Program, an increase of $7.5 million above the FY 2000 enacted level. We need to expand the pilot land acquisition program to consolidate fractional interests and support the reopening and acquisition of "*Youpee*" interests in allotted Indian lands. In 1999, BIA implemented a pilot program on three reservations in Wisconsin and by the end of 2000 will have acquired over 36,000 fractional interests in allotted Indian lands. The 2001 request will allow us to acquire up to 40,000 additional fractional interests. Resolving land ownership fractionation is key to trust reform efforts. While funded under OST, BIA will continue to lead implementation.

One final note Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, the President has recently submitted to the Congress the nomination of Mr. Thomas N. Slonaker to serve as Special Trustee for American

Indians. The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs has scheduled a confirmation hearing on his nomination for Wednesday, March 22, 2000. We hope the Senate will confirm Mr. Slonaker quickly, so he can join the Departmental effort to address Indian trust management reform.

This concludes my opening statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be pleased to answer questions of the Subcommittee.

SUNSET OF TRUSTEE'S OFFICE

Mr. REGULA. I take it the trustee's office will be out of business.

Mr. THOMPSON. It will probably be in business until 2004, because that is what the schedule calls for. The trustee's job is to make sure that——

Mr. REGULA. Do you think you will meet that schedule?

Mr. THOMPSON. I believe we can meet that schedule, yes.

BIA TRUST INCREASES

Mr. REGULA. The Bureau's budget proposes significant increases for real estate services, probate, survey, and land record improvement. Have you developed a long-term plan to eliminate this backlog and get these records up to date?

Mr. THOMPSON. That request is the one I mentioned earlier. It is about $35 million, 250 new staff all dedicated to the trust management area in the BIA. It is critically needed. We find the people are overworked, they are stretched, and there is work that is not getting done.

The long-term plan to fix those things is contained in the High Level Implementation Plan. You will see very specific pieces of work broken down about how to tackle areas of probate, appraisal, and cleaning up the backlog of data in both OST and BIA.

Mr. GOVER. In addition, Mr. Chairman, one of the things the judge asked us to supply was a plan for the adequate staffing of all the trust functions in both OST and BIA. We did so, and that plan calls for us to examine exactly the issue you just described—how many people it will take to do this right.

LAND OWNERSHIP RECORDS

Mr. REGULA. If I understand it correctly, the information on who owns what, who is owed what—all of that is in a somewhat chaotic condition. Your mission is to get deed records corrected, probate records to establish ownership of land, to establish the distribution of revenues to the proper landowner—is that essentially the case?

Mr. THOMPSON. That pretty well sums it up, but I have lots of help because Kevin gets to do a lot of this work in the BIA.

Mr. REGULA. So it is a team effort?

Mr. THOMPSON. Absolutely a team effort. In fact, this effort involves five different bureaus and offices within the Department of Interior—the Minerals Management Service, the Office of the Special Trustee, the Bureau of Indian Affairs——

Mr. REGULA. Because in some way they impact on the land management, either in leasing or——

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

FRACTIONATED SHARES

Mr. REGULA. Are you dealing with the fractionated shares issue?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, sir. In fact, we asked Congress for quite a bit of money to continue working on that. We have now spent all the money we were given in fiscal year 1999 in the pilot project in the Great Lakes Region and we had enormous success. My figures are now about a month old, but we found that we purchased 16,000 fractionated interests for about $4 million. I forget the statistics,

but that allowed us to close a couple thousand accounts that we will no longer have to bear responsibility for.

Given what it costs us year by year for OST to even have these accounts open—and remember, these are accounts that are generating virtually no money to the beneficiaries—just to keep those open, there is a significant savings to the Government to no longer have to maintain those accounts.

Mr. REGULA. And the Government will get the value of the royalties represented by those fractional interests. Am I correct?

Mr. GOVER. The idea is that we will be repaid out of income that is produced by these interests that we get. Having said that, I do not want to suggest that we are going to get this money back dollar for dollar. We are also finding that a number of these lands do not generate any income, never have and probably never will.

Mr. DICKS. Could we do more of this? Are there more of these accounts that we could do if you had the money to settle with the individuals?

Mr. GOVER. Absolutely. That is why we are looking to expand the program.

Mr. DICKS. How much could you use?

Mr. GOVER. We do not know the entire universe yet. We know we will spend the $5 million we have for fiscal year 2000 with no problem. And I believe we have asked the Congress for $12.5 million next year. We have had no shortage of willing sellers and there is certainly no shortage of tiny interests that need to be bought out rather than to try to continue to manage them with all this expense.

Mr. DICKS. Is there a report being done on this particular subject?

Mr. GOVER. Mr. Chairman, I will provide such a report.

[The information follows:]

LAND CONSOLIDATION PROGRAM

In addition to the $12.5 million requested in the budget of the Office of Special Trustee for an expansion of the Land Consolidation Program, the Bureau conservatively estimates that it would cost approximately $500 million to eliminate the fractionated ownership problem associated with individually owned trust and restricted lands. It is important to emphasize that the problem of fractionated ownership is essentially a problem of the Federal Government and not that of Indian Tribes. Fractionation affects lands held in trust or restricted status by the United States for individual Indians and, therefore, administered and managed by the Federal Government.

As of February 2000, the Bureau has acquired 18,956 undivided interests (90 percent of the interests are less than two percent) approximately 11,000 acres at a cost of $4.5 million under its Indian Land Consolidation Pilot program operated on three reservations under the administrative jurisdiction of its Midwest Regional Office.

Mr. DICKS. It seems to me that if we are spending a couple billion dollars on trying to get these records straightened out—if we can eliminate a number of these accounts it seems to me that ought to be able to help us somewhat in dealing with the problem.

Mr. GOVER. We believe it is an excellent long-term solution to this problem.

Mr. DICKS. I would rather take $2 billion and use it to settle the claims than try to—it seems to me, to be a better investment, to try to settle these claims.

How many more years is this going to take?

Mr. GOVER. To get the systems back the way they are supposed to be, as Tom indicated, should be by 2004. But that does not resolve——

Mr. DICKS. That is another $8 billion.

Mr. GOVER. Well, no.

TRUST REFORM BUDGET

Mr. THOMPSON. Can I put some numbers on the table about what the cost is?

To date——

Mr. DICKS. So $2 billion is the entire operating budget for the whole period of time?

Mr. GOVER. For the whole BIA. That includes everything in——

Mr. DICKS. How much of that $2 billion is for the trust accounts?

Mr. THOMPSON. Sir, I can tell you what we have spent to date and what you have appropriated to date for trust reform.

From 1997 through today in our request it is going to be about $200 million for the reform effort.

Mr. DICKS. I feel better.

Mr. GOVER. However, Congressman, you have touched on an important issue. The likelihood is that we owe some people some money for what has gone on in the past. We can go about that in one of two ways. We can actually try to audit each and every one of these accounts at some phenomenal expense, or we can try to find another solution. As you say, I would much rather pay the accountholders than spend it trying to audit the accounts.

Mr. DICKS. If it makes more sense, why wouldn't we try to do that? Would the people who are owed this money cooperate?

Mr. GOVER. We have a process underway now where we are going to go to the reservations and ask that very question: Here are a set of options, which one makes the most sense to you? Literally, to the accountholders. We do not know what the answers are going to be, but the point is to learn what exactly the question is you are asking. What do they want us to do?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, don't you think that if we can work out a settlement to minimize the amount of money going to people auditing these accounts, and these people would be satisfied, that that would be a better way to handle this instead of auditing thousands—how many accounts are there?

Mr. THOMPSON. There are 300,000 accounts.

Mr. REGULA. It sounds like a good management tool.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you for allowing me to interrupt, Mr. Chairman. I do have one additional question.

On March 3 there was an AP article stating that it would take much longer to come up with the computer system to manage funds held in trust for the Indian community. The article further states that there are some severe development problems and there is no longer a time table to have it up and running nationwide.

Could you please comment on these serious charges? Is this true?

Mr. THOMPSON. What they are referring to——

Mr. DICKS. Rex Hackler, a spokesman for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, did not return calls on Thursday.

Mr. GOVER. Congressman, let me leap to our defense here.

First of all, as it happened, Mr. Hackler was out sick that day, so in fact he did not return phone calls. I thought that was kind of a cheap shot, frankly.

We do not agree with the assertions that were made. Certainly, as Mr. Thompson testified, as we learn more and more about these systems we are finding that our original schedule was very, very ambitious and probably too optimistic. That does not change the fact that we have made remarkable progress in the development of this system.

In fact, the system itself works. The software system works. That is not really the problem. The problem is that the data that exists in the field is on such antiquated systems and in such various conditions of disarray. That is the challenge, to convert that data into the system.

The great irony here is that at the same time the folks that are making these types of accusations are telling us to slow down and put good data into the system—and we are now slowing down so we can ensure the integrity of the data—and then they say that we are not meeting our schedule. So we are damned if we do and damned if we don't on that.

Mr. DICKS. But is there a possibility of getting all good data at this point?

Mr. GOVER. We will probably never get 100 percent accurate data going all the way back to the initiation of the system. That is correct.

SETTLEMENT

Mr. DICKS. Has anyone approached the judge about a settlement on this matter? Is the Justice Department and the Department of the Interior trying to settle this case?

Mr. GOVER. We did, sir.

Mr. DICKS. And the judge would not settle it?

Mr. GOVER. The judge was very interested in seeing the case settled. In fact, we had a settlement effort under the guidance of a mediator and it was unsuccessful.

Mr. DICKS. Can you explain why it was unsuccessful?

Mr. GOVER. Unfortunately, Congressman——

Mr. DICKS. You are a distinguished member of the bar. What happened?

Mr. GOVER. I am a member of the bar.

Mr. DICKS. Distinguished, maybe? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOVER. We made an agreement with the plaintiffs when we began the effort to settle the case that we would not discuss the details. And we remain under court order not to do so.

I think it is fair to say that we tried, they tried, and we were just too far apart to settle it at that point. We remain open to further discussions on any aspect of this and are hopeful that at some point in the not-too-distant future there will be another effort to simply settle the case.

Mr. DICKS. Who is the plaintiff's lead lawyer on this? Is it an individual or a group of lawyers?

Mr. GOVER. A group of lawyers.

Mr. DICKS. Anybody in charge? One name in this article was Keith Harper, a Cherokee lawyer representing——

Mr. GOVER. He is one of the attorneys for the case on that side, yes.

Mr. DICKS. But is there any one law firm or anybody who is really the lead on the litigation?

Mr. GOVER. It seems to be a team effort, Congressman. There are three different law firms involved. Depending on the issue, we may see one firm or we may see another.

Mr. DICKS. But it seems to me that this is the kind of case that would—with all this uncertainty and over 150 years of data—it would seem that the Government could come up with a fair settlement. It seems to me that would make good sense.

Mr. GOVER. I agree with that.

Mr. DICKS. Then you need a system for the future to do this job appropriately. Do the best you can to recreate the records. But if it is going to be this expensive, then it seems to me there should be another effort to try to settle this thing.

Mr. GOVER. We agree with you.

Mr. DICKS. I think it would be a good thing for this Administration to attempt before it leaves office.

Mr. GOVER. I take your words to heart and we will make another effort at it.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

We have to deal with the budget yet.

We appreciate your coming, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Slonaker, I think you realize there will be something to do when you get confirmed. There are a few challenges left for you. We wish you well in your Senate experience in 2 weeks. Thank you for a good job thus far. You have a big challenge.

Mr. Gover, now you can tell us why you need more money. [Laughter.]

OPENING STATEMENT OF MR. GOVER

Mr. GOVER. Mr. Chairman, I can be very brief now. We have discussed so many issues.

FY 2001 BUDGET PRIORITIES

We basically are looking at four priority areas in our fiscal year 2001 budget request. Far and away the largest element of the increase we have requested from the Congress is in the area of school construction. Our school system is simply in terrible condition. It is really not acceptable that a country with the resources that ours has, and a Federal Government that is responsible for only two school systems in the end, that one of those school systems should be in such bad condition in terms of its physical plant.

We have been heartily criticized by the Congress and others for not making requests that are adequate to begin to attack this problem in a systematic way. We have tried to step up this year and really begin a comprehensive attack on this problem. So that is the majority of our request.

Let me introduce the people who just joined us. Hilda Manuel is the Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Joe Christie is the Acting Director of the Office of Indian Education Programs, so I will refer all difficult questions to them.

Another area in which we have asked for increases is in trust management. As we move forward with our trust reform effort what we find is that the cleanup and the reform of the system is not going to be enough. The reality is—as NAPA notes and as Mr. Thompson noted and as Judge Lambert noted—we just do not have enough people in the field to do the job we are responsible for doing, and that if we do not do it we are legally liable for any failures.

So this is the first year we have requested major increases in our ongoing trust program. It is absolutely necessary that we begin to get those resources or else future administrations and future Congresses will find themselves inheriting the situation we have inherited.

The second area is in the area of housing improvement. We have basically asked you to double our budget for the Housing Improvement Program. The Housing Improvement Program goes to the most needy people on the reservations. These are folks that could not even qualify to get into the HUD low rent program and could not even begin to qualify for the mutual home ownership program that HUD operates. So these folks are not served by the Department of Housing and Urban Development because they are so very poor.

The tribal leaders that we worked with identified a need in excess of $800 million for this program area alone. I did not come to you with those numbers because I did not find that the analysis behind them was solid enough, but I am confident that we are talking about several hundred million dollars of need in this area. And this is something that we have not really focused on during my time here. So we ask you for that increase.

The final major increase we requested is in the area of law enforcement. As the Committee well knows, the Congress has been very generous with us for the last 2 years in the area of law enforcement in response to the crisis that exists in Indian Country. If you are a Native American in this country, it is two and a half times more likely that you will be the victim of a violent crime than if you were not an Indian according to the latest Justice Department statistics. So it is essential that we continue to expand the law enforcement presence on the reservations.

This year we are asking for about $18 million in new money to continue to expand our police services on the reservation. This would be on top of the increases we have requested before. This is year three of the Administration's 4-year effort to try to upgrade law enforcement on the reservations. In fact, we are putting more and more and more officers into the field. The problem, of course, is that as we begin to experience success, we are making more arrests, that creates more cases, that creates more people that we have to jail. So we have increasing needs in those areas as well.

Mr. REGULA. Does it have a deterrent effect on crime?

Mr. GOVER. I cannot say that yet. The way money gets spent in the Government, there seems to be a lag between the time you give it to us and the time we begin to see results in the field. But we will get you whatever information we do have on that.

[The information follows:]

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS LAW ENFORCEMENT—DETERRENTS TO CRIME

The additional resources the Congress has provided for the Presidential Initiative on Improving Law Enforcement in Indian Country have been used to invigorate and strengthen the police presence in Indian Country. An increased police presence creates a strong deterrent to crime.

Just a few years ago, many calls to police departments for service in Indian Country were not answered and officers were required to patrol alone due to insufficient resources. As a result of increased funding provided through the Initiative, additional trained officers have been hired and are available to respond to calls and develop proactive crime prevention strategies. As more officers are hired, police departments are becoming increasingly involved with programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) and Gang Resistance Education And Training (G.R.E.A.T). These programs help police officers develop rapport with young people and their communities, and reduce the likelihood that they will engage in crime. In addition, police managers are implementing community-oriented policing strategies, to draw on the problem-solving skills of other service providers and citizens in their communities.

The Bureau's FY 2001 request for an additional $18.8 million in law enforcement funding would help build on these proactive efforts to reduce crime and allow the Bureau to continue its collaborative law enforcement efforts.

I think we are actually going to see an increase in the crime rate, but only because we are arresting more criminals than we have in the past. So the statistics may be deceptive. But certainly the anecdotal information I receive from the field indicates that law enforcement is becoming more aggressive and more pervasive on the reservation and certainly badly needed.

EDUCATION

Let me just mention a couple of other items briefly from our education budget.

We asked for funds to increase our Family And Child Education program. It is an early childhood development program that currently operates at 22 sites. We would like to expand that to 44 because we are getting some very strong results. The heart of the program is to bring parents into the school to work with their young people and really involve them in the education of their children. Given the results we are having at the schools where the program exists, we would like to expand it.

The second is a program that we call the Therapeutic Residential Dorms Model. What we are asking is for money to fund six pilot sites at boarding schools to begin to address some severe social and psychological problems that we see.

Mr. REGULA. What percentage of the Native American school population is in boarding schools versus living at home?

Mr. CHRISTIE. That would be 10,000 out of the 50,000 that we serve, so about 20 percent.

Mr. GOVER. In these boarding schools, we find that we end up primarily with troubled young people. These are not model students. They are not the kids that come from very stable family environments. In fact, they are very likely to have had previous experiences with the criminal justice system, certainly have already failed in their local public or tribal school. Quite often we are dealing with alcohol and substance abuse issues, whether in the child or in the family. Often we are dealing with domestic violence or sexual abuse.

We get these kids in a very damaged condition. All we are able to do is provide them a warm bed, warm meals, and a basic in-

structional program. Right now we have no availability to provide them the kind of therapy, emotional, and psychological services that are required if we are going to rescue these young people. If they fail in our schools, the next stop is juvenile detention or jail, whether it be a tribal jail or the Federal prisons.

I have a long presentation that I make about this in general, but I think we have inherited the legacy of a horribly misguided boarding school policy at the beginning and through the middle of this century. So now we are dealing with the children and grandchildren of people who themselves were abused or dehumanized in the boarding school system that we operated earlier in this century.

Mr. REGULA. Your boarding school operation is not necessarily because of distance. It may be because of lack of family stability and they are put in the boarding school.

Mr. CHRISTIE. That is correct. Geographic isolation is not the issue anymore. Less than .5 percent would be for that reason. The rest of it is socioeconomic, physical abuse, mental health problems, family and home problems.

Mr. REGULA. It makes your job a challenge.

Mr. GOVER. It makes it virtually impossible right now while we are unable to offer anything beyond the very basic instruction program that any school could provide.

As I said, these young people are slipping away from us. They will become burdens on the Government—both the tribal government and the Federal Government—in years to come if we cannot intervene at an earlier stage and try to get them on a path that will lead them into productive and useful lives.

Mr. Chairman, those are the highlights of the request we have made this year. Obviously, we have asked for a large increase. We are part of a larger Administration initiative to improve our services to Indian Country. In our budget, we tried to focus on needs that are basically indisputable, things that we know need to be done, areas where we carry a legacy of failure. We would like to reverse that legacy and begin to address some of these issues.

We know it is a lot of money. We know the constraints under which the Committee operates. But we certainly ask for and appreciate your assistance in trying to deal with some of these very serious human issues that exist in Indian Country.

[The statement of Mr. Gover follows:]

OPENING STATEMENT

OF

KEVIN GOVER
ASSISTANT SECRETARY - INDIAN AFFAIRS

ON THE

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 8, 2000

INTRODUCTION

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I am Kevin Gover, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs at the Department of the Interior. It is my pleasure to be here today to present the President's FY 2001 budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).

The President's budget for FY 2001 is a component of the overall Administration initiative to infuse an additional $1.2 billion into Indian Country to respond to the overwhelming needs of the First Americans. The Administration's Native American Initiative will provide $9.4 billion to strengthen Indian communities through improved health, education, housing, economic development, and other programs in more than 45 Federal entities.

To respond to these needs, the BIA is proposing a substantial increase that, if passed, will allow us to replace six crumbling schools on reservations, provide programs to help reservation residents stay safe and strong, and find ways to use the resources of the Federal Government to create jobs and opportunity on the reservations.

FY 2001 BUDGET OVERVIEW

The FY 2001 budget request for the BIA is $2.2 billion in current appropriations, an increase of $332 million above the FY 2000 enacted level. The budget emphasizes the need to strengthen our schools through quality education within structurally sound and adequately equipped and maintained school facilities, protect our communities through increased law enforcement personnel on reservations, and continue trust reform improvements.

EDUCATION

Last month, the BIA released the new priority list, the Education Facilities Replacement Construction Priority List, which replaces the 1993 Priority List. The new list is comprised of three

schools from the old List which have yet to receive funds for construction and 10 new schools. The first six schools from the List are included within the BIA's $300.5 million request for Education Construction, the largest amount ever requested for this category. The request is $167.3 million over the 2000 funding level, an increase of 126 percent.

While most educational facilities are built to function for 30 years, over 45 percent of these buildings range from 30 years old to 100 years old. The budget request provides for increased construction, equipment and rehabilitation of school facilities for more than 50,000 Indian students who attend the BIA's 185 schools. Schools may be operated directly by the BIA or by Tribal organizations under the *P.L. 100-297* grants.

Research has demonstrated that placing instructional and residential programs in facilities that do not meet health and safety codes distract from the educational program. The cost estimate of the BIA's backlog work needed to abate critical deferred maintenance backlog deficiencies in education facilities currently exceeds $800 million. To respond to these needs, the BIA's request includes an increase of $103.4 million over the 2000 enacted level to address critical health and safety concerns at existing education facilities. This request will fund both maintenance and improvement and repair projects which will reduce the deferred maintenance backlog while improving the physical environment for learning.

To attain a good education, the Indian leaders of tomorrow have to have the ability to get to school. Many Indian Country roads are badly in need of repair and in a state of deterioration. The budget request includes an increase of $5.3 million for Road Maintenance. This increase will help with student transportation as well as improve access for emergency vehicles.

The 185 schools funded by the BIA comprise one of only two school systems managed by the Federal Government; the other school system is managed by the Department of Defense. BIA schools are located in remote locations across the nation in buildings which are deteriorating around students. For the classroom, the BIA is seeking an additional $39.7 million for School Operations, $2.9 million for Tribally Controlled Community Colleges, and $2.2 million for Scholarships.

The BIA is focusing on providing programs which make a difference in a student's life. An increase of $6.8 million is requested to double the number of FACE (Family and Child Education) programs from 22 to 44 sites. This invaluable program benefits both students and their families. The FACE program is a family literacy program that serves families and their children from birth through grade 3 and is culturally relevant for the communities it serves. The evaluation of the program demonstrates that students who participate in FACE score significantly higher on standardized tests of reading and mathematics than children who do not participate in the program. Over 350 adults have gained their GED or high school diploma and over 1,000 adults have gained employment as a result of their participation. Parents indicate that participation in FACE has helped them to become more involved in their child's education, a strong indicator for a child's success in school.

The BIA is also seeking an additional $8.2 million to implement the Therapeutic Residential Model (TRM) at 6 pilot sites. The TRM is a program to address the multitude of individualized services for high risk students attending BIA-funded boarding schools. Over 10,000 students attend BIA boarding schools. They are the highest risk students due to economic conditions and home environments. The BIA is not adequately staffed to meet their needs. The request will allow the

BIA to establish the 6 pilot programs which will result in positive changes in attitudes, behavior and academic performance of Indian youth attending BIA-funded boarding schools.

The request also includes $3.0 million for the School Statistics Initiative. This program will allow the Bureau to gather important data on its schools in order to improve the quality of education. Also, it will make it possible for the Bureau to report to the Congress on such important indicators as student achievement, retention rates, transfers between schools, and student drop out rates. Finally, it will make it possible to automate the Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) which will ensure schools quicker access to their funds and greater accountability of student funding data.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The FY 2001 budget request seeks an increase of $18.9 million for law enforcement in Indian Country. Crime, specifically violent crime involving young people, continues to rise significantly in Indian Country. The funding increases for law enforcement over the past two fiscal years for the *Presidential Initiative on Law Enforcement in Indian Country* have begun to address the tremendous Indian Country crime problem.

There has been a positive effect over the past two years with the increased law enforcement funding the Congress has provided for the *Initiative*. Community and proactive policing has been instituted and officers now have modern weapons and state of the art bullet proof vests. Many old police vehicles with over 100,000 miles have been replaced and the Indian Police Academy training capability has doubled. There has definitely been progress. To continue these steps forward, the BIA's requested increase of $18.9 million will be used to assist Tribes in retaining COPS-funded police officers, staff detention facilities, provide 24-hour radio dispatch service, and improve two-way radio communications through conversion to narrow band technology.

As BIA's partner in the *Initiative*, DOJ has provided grants funds to Tribes for the construction of critically needed detention facilities. Realizing that DOJ has no mechanism to staff these facilities, the BIA has agreed to request staffing dollars for these new jails. The need for detention space has increased dramatically with the additional police officers on the streets which naturally means more incarcerations. This in turn necessitates more detention personnel.

TRUST IMPROVEMENTS

A total increase of $35.1 million is requested for trust management improvement reforms in the BIA. Efforts underway are a continuation of the joint effort between the BIA and the Office of Special Trustee (OST) on implementation of the Secretary's *High Level Implementation Plan* (HLIP) for the Trust Management Improvement Project (TMIP). In FY 2001, the BIA will continue to work with the OST and the Department to improve the administration and management of its trust responsibilities. Funding for the BIA's HLIP sub projects is requested under OST. The HLIP is centered on 11 major sub projects that will update trust systems, policies, practices, and procedures and make one-time investments to reduce backlogs. As part of the overall effort to remedy the fundamental cause to Indian trust management, an increase of $7.5 million is requested under OST to expand the Indian Land Consolidation program.

To ensure trust management reforms are sustained, the BIA's requested increase includes program funding increases for several trust programs. These additional resources are critical to ensuring that accumulated trust management problems being corrected under HLIP do not reoccur. The BIA's

budget request includes a $12 million increase for on-going real estate services to improve real property management services and ensure timely processing of transactions (i.e., sales, acquisitions, rights of way). To assist in protecting trust resources, an increase of $5.3 million is proposed to perform cadastral surveys. Additional increases include: $2.2 million increase for real estate appraisals to ensure compliance with appraisal standards and timely completion of appraisals; a $3.0 million increase for Probate to provide sufficient staff for probate functions; and an increase of $4.8 million for the Land Titles and Records Office to ensure land records are kept current. For general trust services, a 4.0 million program increase is requested to provide technical support to Tribes and ensure compliance with complex environmental and cultural resource requirements. An increase of $2.0 million is also requested to expedite the processing of Alaska allotments.

OTHER TRIBAL SUPPORT

The request also includes an increase of $3.5 million for Contract Support to bring the total funding level to $128.7 million. This increase will allow the BIA to meet approximately 88 percent of the reported need. The BIA is also seeking to replenish the Indian Self Determination Fund ($5.0 million) for new and expanded contracts or compacts.

As part of the Administration's *New Market* initiative, the BIA is seeking $2.0 million for Technical Assistance Grants to provide in-depth technical assistance to Tribes and individual Indians to establish, acquire, or expand for-profit businesses on or near Federally recognized Indian reservations. This assistance would include market feasibility studies, development of business plans, best use yield studies and management contracts. Tribes and Indian entrepreneurs will be provided technical assistance at an average cost of $15,000 each. Implementing this program will allow the BIA to assist 113 Indian businesses succeed in Indian communities.

As part of a multi-agency, cross-cutting effort to implement a recent court-ordered Federal subsistence fishery program to bring Alaska into compliance with the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the BIA is requesting $500,000 for Alaska Subsistence. In response to a recent Ninth Circuit Court ruling, the Federal Government must now assume management responsibility for subsistence fisheries in all navigable waters on and adjacent to Federal conservation units in Alaska. The BIA's role will focus on ensuring that input from Native entities is received and considered by the National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management in establishing fishing seasons and regulations covering approximately 102,000 miles of rivers and streams and about half of Alaska's inland waters. Support would be provided to the Bureau's Alaska Region and to the State of Alaska. Input from Tribal governments would occur through a bottom-up process and network.

CONCLUSION

With the separate hearing on the BIA's implementation of the National Academy of Public Administration's recommendations and our request for an increase of $4.0 million, this concludes my remarks about the BIA budget request for FY 2001. I am attaching to my testimony a portion of the Overview from the BIA's budget justification which provides a more complete breakdown of budget categories.

I will be happy to answer any questions.

ATTACHMENT

Tribal Priority Allocations (TPA)

TPA provides the principal source of funds for local units of Tribal Government, most of which are small and lack independent resources to meet the increasing costs of Tribal government operations. Because of Congressional funding levels in 1996 and 1997, Tribal governments are falling increasingly behind in their ability to maintain services to Indian communities and families. Tribes depend on TPA funds for basic necessities and services such as child welfare, scholarships, Tribal courts, natural resource management, and other programs critical to improving the quality of life and the economic potential of the reservations. The Congress has given the Tribes the flexibility to prioritize the limited funds among TPA programs according to their unique needs and circumstances. TPA supports the goals of Indian self-determination by providing Tribes with the choice of programs provided as well as the means of delivery, either by the Tribe or the Bureau.

Beginning with FY 1998, TPA comprises nearly half of the Bureau's operating budget. For FY 2001, the TPA activity is funded at $761.2 million, an increase of $60.5 million over the FY 2000 Enacted level, which will help Tribes address some of the unmet needs in these basic programs.

This budget submission includes $5 million for the Indian Self Determination Fund to replenish funds for new and expanded programs contracted under the authority of *Public Law 93-638*, as amended. The moratorium imposed by the Congress for FY 1999 on any new or expanded contracts, compacts or grants under the *638* authority stalled the ability of the Bureau to fulfill its mission of promoting self- determination on behalf of Tribes. Increased Tribal contracting/compacting activity in FY 2000 (due to the lifting of the moratorium) is expected to continue throughout FY 2001.

An increase of $3.5 million is requested for Contract Support over the 2000 Enacted level for on-going self-determination agreements. It is estimated that 88 percent of need will be met in FY 2001 at this level of funding. The Bureau covered 88 percent of need in FY 1999 and expects to cover 90 percent of need in FY 2000.

An increase of $1.5 million is requested for Tribal Courts, a necessary component to ensuring the success of the *Presidential Initiative on Law Enforcement in Indian Country*. In FY 2000, the Congress provided a $20.0 million increase to address the woefully inadequate law enforcement resources in Indian Country. With this second year investment in the multi-year *Initiative*, it continues to open the door to halting the escalating crime rates in Indian Country. While Bureau and Tribal law enforcement personnel take the criminals off the street, it is also important to handle the increased demand for judicial services to keep the criminals off the street. Funding for Tribal Courts goes hand in hand with ensuring that Indian Country law enforcement efforts are strengthened by adequate court systems. Funds will also be used to implement provisions of *Public Law 103-176*, the Indian Tribal Justice Act.

An increase of $1.0 million is requested for Adult Care Facility Rehabilitation to bring four Bureau-funded adult long-term care facilities on the Navajo Reservation to standard condition. Once the standard is attained, the facilities are eligible for funding of their operation and maintenance costs

from the State Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs. The initial investment of $1 million will result in a potential savings to the Bureau which can be utilized for other high priority needs. An increase of $16.1 million is requested for the Housing Improvement Program (HIP) to serve low-income eligible Indian families or individuals. The Bureau has revised the HIP methodology to concentrate on serving those most in need, regardless of the category of HIP services they may require. This will allow the Bureau to serve an estimated 437 additional families for a total of about 985 families served.

An increase of $2.2 million is requested for Scholarships to increase Tribes' ability to provide assistance to their Indian youth seeking to improve their futures through increased education. Along these lines, the Bureau is requesting an increase of $5.1 million for the Road Maintenance program. Part of the challenges to obtaining an education in Indian Country is the basic ability for students to be able to get to school as many reservation roads are a monumental challenge due to rough surfaces and at times impassable roads caused by insufficient funding. The Road Maintenance program is the only Bureau program which preserves the Bureau's system of roads and bridges that provide access to reservation lands, not only to schools, but to jobs and health care facilities. While the Department of Transportation's Highway Trust Fund provides funds for road construction, it does not provide funds for road maintenance.

To support the Trust Fund Improvement Project, the Bureau's TPA request includes a total of $13.8 million in Trust Services funding for FY 2001 as follows: Trust Services, General ($1.6 million); Real Estate Services ($7.0 million); Real Estate Appraisals ($2.2 million); and, Probate ($3.0 million).

In FY 2001, the Bureau will continue to operate as a highly streamlined and decentralized agency with maximum resources going to Tribal programs. The Bureau anticipates that more than half of the FY 2001 operating budget will be spent directly by Tribes that elect to operate various Bureau programs under self-determination contracts, grants, or self-governance compacts.

Since the founding of the Nation, the Congress has funded specific Indian education programs in response to treaty requirements and Federal statutes. Current Indian Education programs are governed by a number of laws including the Snyder Act, the Johnson O'Malley Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Act, the Tribally Controlled Schools Act, the Education Amendments of 1978, Goals 2000 and the Improving America Schools Act. Collectively, these laws are aimed at ensuring quality education for Indian youth and improving the long-term employment and economic opportunity on reservations.

Other Recurring Programs

The prominent theme for the new millennium described by the President is the education of our children. The Bureau is responsible for the only major domestic elementary and secondary education system operated by the Federal Government. As such, it is incumbent that this system reflects the high standards President Clinton has set for all education. In support of this Presidential priority, the Bureau's FY 2001 budget request includes a significant investment in Indian education. The request for School Operations, which will fund 185 schools and dormitories serving more than 50,000 elementary and secondary students in 23 States, is $506.6 million, an increase of $39.7 million over the FY 2000 Enacted level. The increase will ensure that schools can deliver quality education and provide safe and adequate transportation for an estimated increase in enrollment.

Included in the increase is $6.8 million to expand the number of sites for the Early Childhood Development FACE program and $8.2 million for implementation of the Therapeutic Residential Model pilot program at selected Bureau dormitories. Increases are also proposed in facilities operations and administrative cost grants to encourage the continuation of schools going into grant status and under Tribal control.

The budget increases operating grants to the 25 Tribally controlled community colleges by $2.9 million over FY 2000. The colleges have been successful in providing Indian youth with college degrees and futures of professional employment. They also promote entrepreneurship on reservations.

An increase of $500,000 is also requested for Alaska Subsistence activities to meet the Secretary's responsibilities in implementing a recent court-ordered Federal subsistence fishery program in the State of Alaska. This is a multi-agency, cross-cutting activity to establish fishing seasons and regulations covering approximately 102,000 miles of rivers and streams and about half of Alaska's inland waters.

Non-Recurring Programs
To meet the Bureau's long-term goal of improving the quality of life in Tribal communities, $2.0 million is requested to establish Technical Assistance Grants to provide technical assistance to Tribes and individual Indians to establish, acquire or expand for-profit businesses on or near reservations. Investment today in helping Tribal communities to become more resourceful will facilitate and strengthen Tribal self determination. Additionally, an increase of $5.3 million is requested for Real Estate Services to strengthen the Bureau's trust management functions.

Central Office Operations
An increase of $500,000 is requested for the Trust Services line item to strengthen the Bureau's trust management programs at the Headquarters level. To continue implementation of the recommendations of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), an increase of $4.0 million is requested in FY 2001 to continue implementation of the recommendations at the Central Office level and to begin to provide resources to Field sites.

Regional Office Operations
An increase of $13.7 million is proposed for trust management improvement efforts at the Regional level: Trust Services, General ($1,900,000); Real Estate Services ($5,000,000); Land Titles and Records Offices ($4,800,000); and Land Records Improvement ($2,000,000).

Special Programs and Pooled Overhead
To continue the momentum forward for the *Presidential Initiative to Improve Law Enforcement in Indian Country*, a program increase of $16.0 million is requested for the third year of this multi-year initiative. The rate of violent crime victimization of American Indians is higher than that of other U.S. racial or ethnic subgroups and more than twice the national average. Continued infusion of monies is necessary to improve the quality of life on Indian reservations. A program increase of $115,000 is requested for the Indian Police Academy to expand its training courses to respond to the influx of new trainees hired under the *Initiative*. To offset the Congressionally-mandated earmark of funds for enforcement activities, an increase of $100,000 is requested for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. To strengthen the efforts of the Crownpoint Institute of Technology, an increase

of $1.3 million is requested in FY 2001. To improve the reporting capabilities and improve overall educational abilities, the Bureau is requesting an increase of $3.0 million for the School Statistics Initiative. An additional $500,000 is requested for the American Indian component of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, a partnership effort with the Department of Education. To respond to priority needs of Tribes on a nationwide basis, the Bureau is proposing to eliminate funding for the National Ironworkers Training Program.

Construction

The Bureau's request for the Construction appropriation is $365.9 million, of which $300.5 million, or 82 percent, is dedicated to education construction. This is the largest request for education construction, with an additional $167.3 million, or 126 percent, over the FY 2000 enacted level. The Bureau will continue the emphasis on Tribal contracting for projects, providing support from the Bureau's Office of Facilities Management and Construction until the Tribes and Agencies are fully trained to take over the construction contracting challenge.

The Replacement School Construction program funds replacement of older, unsafe, and dilapidated schools on reservations. More than 50,000 Indian students attend 185 Bureau-owned or -funded schools in eligible Indian communities. School replacement priorities are based on a new priority list of 13 schools, which is comprised of the last 3 uncompleted schools from the old priority list published in 1993 and 10 new schools. In 2001, a total of $126.149 million is requested for Advanced Planning and Design ($5,000,000) and to complete construction of the first 6 schools — several that serve multiple Tribes, on the new priority list:

Tuba City Boarding School, Arizona
Second Mesa Day School, Arizona
Zia Day School, New Mexico
Baca Community School, New Mexico
Lummi Tribal School, Washington
Wingate Elementary School, New Mexico

These six schools have structural and code deficiencies that threaten student safety and are not equipped with modern educational tools. Up to $30 million of the replacement school construction funding may be used for Tribal participation in the President's FY 2001 School Construction Modernization Initiative. These funds may be used by Tribes or Tribal consortia to ensure the repayment of principal on school modernization or other taxable bonds. Tribes that issue bonds to lenders could claim a tax credit for the life of the bond in lieu of interest. Any of the six schools slated for replacement in 2001 could exercise this option.

The education facilities improvement and repair program is funded at $174.3 million, an increase of $104.0 million over 2000 enacted, to address critical health and safety concerns at existing education-related facilities. This request will fund maintenance and major and minor repair projects to reduce the significant backlog of needed repairs.

For the second year, the budget requests no new funding for Public Safety and Justice construction within the Bureau request. New detention centers on reservations will receive funds from the Department of Justice's appropriation as part of the *President's Initiative on Law Enforcement in Indian Country.*

Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians
This program provides payments to meet Federal requirements for legislated settlements. The FY 2001 budget request includes $34.026 million for payments for settlements resolving long standing Tribal claims to water and lands. Of this amount, $8 million is proposed for the Rocky Boy's Indian Water Rights Settlement for compact administration, economic development, and future water supply activities. The majority of the remaining funds are proposed for the Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement, $24.9 million, to maintain the payment schedule as required by law.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Mr. REGULA. Your role would be somewhat custodial as opposed to being an educator.

Mr. CHRISTIE. In the dorms, that is correct.

Mr. REGULA. But the dorms are operated under your bureau? It is a total package.

Mr. CHRISTIE. That is correct.

Mr. REGULA. Do you get children only of school age?

Mr. CHRISTIE. Our FACE program moves into the home at birth and deals with the parents up to age three. Then we bring them into a center-based program. Then we move them from that center-based program into kindergarten. But from then on they are in our schools in both day schools—which means they can live at home and go to school. in our peripheral dorms where we have a dormitory adjacent to a public school, and in our own reservation dorms where they can stay in the community and move back and forth—but a large segment of them live 7 days a week in those dorms—and then our schools of last resort are our off-reservation boarding schools where everybody is in the dorms and everybody has these major mental health, behavior, and social problems.

Mr. REGULA. I see your report card for 1998 showed improvement in key statistics. Is this a real improvement in student performance? Is it reflected this year?

Mr. CHRISTIE. The data that we collected from the last school session—165 out of 173 schools have been collected—preliminarily it shows about a 2 percent increase in our language arts achievement. Our math achievements are staying virtually the same. Our attendance rates have gone up and our drop-out rates have gone down.

So it is good. It is not where we want it to be, but it is moving in the right direction.

Mr. REGULA. Do you have a problem getting teachers?

Mr. CHRISTIE. Yes, sir, we do. As you know, nationwide there is a major teacher shortage. We are paying the DOD rates in our Bureau-operated schools, which allows us to be very competitive. Then we are allowed geographic and other additions to those salaries to attract teachers. We are having a major problem in attracting enough special education teachers.

Mr. REGULA. Does your Department have supervision over the students who go to the non-Indian schools but are paid for by the BIA on a tuition basis? Do you have any impact on those? If these students go off-reservation to non-Indian operated school, then you lose any jurisdiction. Is that correct?

Mr. CHRISTIE. That is correct. Our ISEP Program funds Bureau-operated, grant, and contract schools. They can be either on-reservation or off-reservation according to where they are located. We have jurisdictional control over those, but we have reporting problems under our P.L. 100–297 grants that is similar to the problems with P.L. 93–638 contracts because our legislation does not allow us to go in to monitor and evaluate the actual education program there.

But if they go to a public school, where 90 percent of the Indian students in the United States go, the only program we have for

public schools is the Johnson O'Malley Program, which is in the TPA part of the budget and is run locally by the tribe and by the local education parent committees. But all the rest of the schools, whether parochial or public, are out from under our control.

Mr. REGULA. But 90 percent of the potential student body goes to the public schools?

Mr. CHRISTIE. That is correct. Out of about 500,000 school-age Indian children, we have about 50,000; 450,000 go to public schools or parochial schools.

Mr. REGULA. Ms. Manuel, you are in charge of programs other than education. Can you give us some success stories?

LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRESS

Ms. MANUEL. I am very proud of our law enforcement initiative. As the Assistant Secretary has indicated, we are beginning our third year. Although it is the third year, I think it will take—when you take into account the recruitment, the training, and actually putting the officers on the street, it will take us another year or two before we actually start seeing the results of the initiative.

TRUST MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

I am also very engaged in the Trust Management Improvement Project. In that regard, this last go-around where we spent a great deal of time revising the High Level Implementation Plan—I am particularly proud of the fact that the Bureau has come quite a long way from 2 years ago when we were just beginning to appreciate the magnitude of the problems and what we were seeking to address with the High Level Implementation Plan.

As Mr. Thompson indicated, in the backlog area we are now actually going to be seeing the light at the end of the tunnel in that the appraisal backlog will be brought to a manageable level.

I am looking forward to the implementation of the Probate Reinvention Lab recommendations, and in particular putting in place the attorney decisionmakers at the ten Regional Offices that have the largest volume of probate backlogs, bringing on probate specialists, paralegals—the skills that we need to start moving these cases through the system and over to the Administrative Law Judge.

The commitment is there. Now we need to bring on additional staff. As you have heard from testimony this morning, the same people are doing collateral duty.

Mr. REGULA. Do you support the NAPA recommendation?

NAPA SUPPORT

Ms. MANUEL. Absolutely. I knew that it was there. I have been at the Bureau 10 years, in my present position 5 years. It has been frustrating, to say the least, to try to bring some reform to the organization and all it took was to have a credible organization come in and confirm everything we have been saying for years.

Mr. REGULA. This should give you some leverage now to make some of these improvements.

Ms. MANUEL. Exactly.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Dicks?

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DICKS. On your school construction budget, you are asking for very substantial increases.

How much of the fiscal year 1999 and fiscal year 2000 construction funding has been obligated as of this time?

Mr. GOVER. I have to apologize, Congressman. I do not know the answer, but I will provide it in writing.

[The information follows:]

BIA EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

As of September 30, 1999

Program	Allotment	Total Obligations	Balance	% Obligated
EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION	96,551,590	68,466,993	28,084,597	70.91%
Advance Planning and Design	1,099,169	526,644	572,525	47.91%
School Replacement Construction	21,717,425	15,855,745	5,861,680	73.01%
Employee Housing	4,972,324	4,286,669	685,655	86.21%
Education Facilities Improvement and Repair	68,762,671	47,797,935	20,964,736	69.51%
Total	96,551,590	68,466,993	28,084,597	70.91%

NOTE: As the Construction program is a no-year appropriation, funds allotted include appropriations for FY 1999 (enacted) and the carryover amount(s) from FY 1998.

Mr. DICKS. Does anyone here know it?

Mr. GOVER. In the last couple of years, Congressman, we have been able to spend—as I recall, in 1998, we committed over 100 percent of what had been appropriated because we are still pulling out of previous years. This year I believe we fell just short of 100 obligation.

Mr. DICKS. Some people have suggested that if you did a phased funding—in other words, you could do more schools if you budgeted over a 2-year period than requiring all the money to be put up front. Have you thought about that?

Mr. GOVER. We have thought about it. The way we are directed to prepare our budget, it was not an option that was presented to us. But certainly if the committee wants to work on such an approach, we are amenable and would look forward to working on it with you.

BUDGET CYCLE

Mr. REGULA. Would a 2-year cycle for budgeting and appropriations make your job more effective? And would you be able to be more efficient?

Mr. GOVER. I believe that it would. I have been reading about that proposal. I think it is an excellent idea. I would just add that, of course, things come up in the course of 2 years that one would not anticipate.

Mr. REGULA. We have supplemental appropriations bills, as you well know.

Mr. GOVER. I do support that idea.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

I yield back.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Mr. DICKS. The average cost per school in your budget request is $21 million. That is very high.

Mr. GOVER. It is very expensive.

Mr. DICKS. Is it because of the rural nature? We have the same problem in military construction of housing. One of these had a price tag of almost $40 million. The cost per square foot was well over $200, more than double the average cost for building public schools elsewhere in the country.

Tell us why.

Mr. GOVER. I think the cost of building schools is simply going up because of a number of new requirements like the ADA requirements, the special education requirements, and a variety of other education reform initiatives that do create new structural requirements in these buildings.

I think the heart of the matter, though, really is the rural location and the fact that we build one school at a time. We get no advantages of having a major ongoing construction program that would allow us to contract long-term at better prices than others could get. We are building schools in Chinle, Arizona, and places even more remote than that as opposed to some of the more urban or less rural locations. I believe that is responsible for most of the additional costs we seem to incur.

Mr. DICKS. Are these competitively bid?

Mr. GOVER. The tribes can contract to build these schools. And they are entitled to the contract if they ask us for it. However, they in turn are required to bid at least most elements of the project.

Mr. CHRISTIE. And we don't have sewer systems and water systems to hook into, so we have to create our own sewer systems and water systems as part of these construction efforts.

CONTRACT OVERSIGHT

Mr. DICKS. Last year numerous questions were raised about construction practices at the Lac Courte Oreilles school. What have you done to assure that the type of problems that occurred at this school will not happen again?

Could you explain for the record what did happen?

Mr. GOVER. We had some severe cost overruns at Lac Courte Oreilles and compounded by the fact that the tribe built a much larger school than the Congress had authorized or that we had authorized for them. So they had built a building much bigger than the one we had agreed to and then were looking to us for more money that went beyond what we had already agreed to.

Mr. DICKS. Sounds like defense contractors. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOVER. I think the idea was sort of possession being nine-tenths of the law. It made sense to them to be aggressive.

We have since resolved the matter with Lac Courte Oreilles. The tribe actually has accepted the responsibility and the cost for finishing that school.

Mr. DICKS. So it will be finished?

Mr. GOVER. It will be finished.

Mr. DICKS. And then equipped?

Mr. GOVER. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. I understand one of the problems was that they built the school but had no money left to put any equipment into it.

Mr. GOVER. That is correct. That is the cost that I just talked about.

In order to avoid those kinds of problems in the future and at this Committee's urging, we did put together an oversight plan that involves empowering some of our field managers, training them to oversee these kinds of projects, and to evaluate up front rather than later in the process the capabilities of the tribes to monitor this kind of construction so that we can put them in a category that will describe how much oversight we need to expend in any given situation. We are hopeful that that will avoid situations of that type in the future.

SCHOOL OPERATIONS

Mr. DICKS. According to your budget, the average expenditure per weighted student is $3,685 at BIA facilities. The average cost per student nationally is about $6,800. How do these numbers relate to each other?

Mr. GOVER. Not very well, frankly. I think probably the larger number—the $6,800—probably includes construction costs or something because the number we work with is about $5,300 or $5,500, which we think represents the expenses that go into the ongoing operation of the school.

Regardless of how you do it, we come in considerably behind the national average in terms of dollars spent per student. A weighted student unit is not necessarily a student. A particular student might actually equal 1.8 WSUs because we add factors of disabilities, special education needs, and that sort of thing.

But we are about $1,000 per student behind the national average in our judgment.

STUDENT COUNT

Mr. DICKS. Do you have authority to oversee student counts at contract or compact schools?

Mr. GOVER. Yes, we do. I must say we have not done a particularly good job of that in the past. I believe that is changing under Joe Christie's leadership and we are beginning to crack down on how those counts are conducted.

We were finding that the schools were inflating their enrollments and their student counts in some very creative ways. We have identified many of those ways and are stopping those practices.

I think the problem here, Mr. Chairman, in all honesty, is that we have not exercised the authority we have as aggressively as we should. That is about to change. We are going to issue some new regulations on the conduct of the student count to again see that this sort of thing is not going on.

TRIBAL COLLEGES

Mr. DICKS. There was an increase of $2.9 million for the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges. How will these funds affect the per student funding level? We still have a major shortfall here, correct?

Mr. GOVER. It will leave us well behind the national average. It closes the gap only a small amount between what Tribal Community Colleges receive and what is expended on, say, a northern Virginia community college.

LAW ENFORCEMENT REQUEST

Mr. DICKS. Your budget request again identifies reducing violent crime in Indian Country as a critical need. We understand that you have set specific goals for reducing so-called class one crimes over a 5-year period beginning last year.

Would you review for the committee where we are, starting in terms of rates of crime and what goals are being set?

Mr. GOVER. Mr. Chairman, maybe we can supply that for the record, or we have our director of law enforcement services here.

[The information follows:]

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
LAW ENFORCEMENT – CRIME RATES AND PROGRAM GOALS

The Bureau's ultimate goal for its law enforcement programs in Indian Country is to reduce the incidence of crime. An $18.8 million increase is requested for FY 2001 to continue efforts to reduce crime. Specifically, the FY 2001 increase would allow the Bureau to hire and adequately equip 50 new dispatchers, 125 additional detention officers, and 100 tribal and Bureau law enforcement officers. The Bureau anticipates that these additional positions will help reduce the Indian Country crime rate from 2,323 to 2,300 crimes per 10,000 inhabitants. The Bureau's long-term goal is to reduce the 1998 Indian Country crime rate for Class I and Class II offenses by 7 percent by 2005. Between FY 1998 and FY 1999, the number of crimes per 10,000 inhabitants was reduced from 2,371 to 2,347. The Bureau plans to reduce the crime rate by two percent (to 2,300) in FY 2001 if the requested law enforcement resources are provided.

In the short term, the Bureau recognizes that an increase of reported crime is possible. As more law enforcement officers are hired and deployed, police departments will be available to provide assistance in a more timely and effective manner. This, in turn, is likely to lead to increased detection and more successful arrests. However, the Bureau does anticipate a decline in crime in Indian Country by 2005.

To improve law enforcement services and preserve public safety in Indian Country, the Bureau is taking proactive steps to prevent crime. The Bureau's management philosophy and Indian Police Academy training programs emphasize the benefits of community-oriented policing concepts. Law enforcement professionals are being trained to work with communities to develop innovative and collaborative approaches for preventing crime. However, community-oriented policing depends on having a sufficient number of well-trained and well-equipped law enforcement officers.

There are many theories about why crime has decreased outside of Indian Country, many which identify the flourishing economy and more police and community-oriented policing practices as leading elements. To reach its crime reduction goals, the Bureau believes that these same elements must be present in Indian Country before a significant reduction of crime occurs. Additional law enforcement resources, coupled with improved economic and social resources, will help create safer communities throughout Indian Country.

Mr. DICKS. Well, let the Director say a word or two. He has been back there waiting eagerly. [Laughter.]

Mr. QUASULA. My name is Ted Quasula, Director of BIA Law Enforcement Services. I am certainly pleased to provide some remarks. Thank you.

Specifically to your question, we will get you more specific information, but we just started out with this program for increasing law enforcement in Indian Country. Like education, we are in the process of hiring. Our requirements are such that not too many people get to become cops. You have to undergo a stringent background check, various tests, and what not. We are starting to hire, as are tribes.

As the Assistant Secretary said earlier, violent crime in Indian Country is much higher than off-Indian Country. The age of the Indian is very young. We have a number of young people approaching the age where there is a tendency to commit crime. Between 1997 and 1998 calendar years, according to the records provided by tribes and the BIA field offices, we have had a 56 percent increase in violent crime, Part One of the FBI annual crime report, which is terrible. We are way behind the curve as far as sufficient and adequate staffing out there. We are playing catch-up. We do not have our 1999 figures yet, but we will shortly. But from all indications, crime is continuing to increase, particularly violent crime involving young people.

Mr. DICKS. Part of this crime effort is shared with the Department of Justice. Their fiscal year 2001 budget for Indian law enforcement increases from $57 million to $139 million. How are these activities coordinated?

Mr. GOVER. Very closely. We participate with Justice and Justice tries to fill the gaps that we are unable to fill. For example, in the construction of detention facilities, their COPS programs is supplementing our efforts to put more officers on the street. They are also targeting, for example, tribal courts, some drug law enforcement issues that we are unable to reach, and child protection issues. So we are trying not to spend money twice. We are trying to go forward in locked step with a unified program.

TIMBER-FISH-WILDLIFE PROGRAMS

Mr. DICKS. I was disappointed that your budget did not continue funding for the timber, fish, and wildlife program which Congress funded last year with $4 million. Is that based on budgetary constraints?

Mr. GOVER. I assume so, Congressman. We certainly agreed with you that that was an important program and sent it forward into the process. When it came out the other end, it was not there.

FORESTRY

Mr. DICKS. I can just tell you that those are very good programs. We have very serious problems under the Endangered Species Act in the Pacific Northwest, which is why we are trying to fund this. We will try to continue this.

Finally, there is no current forest plan in place that will allow harvesting of timber?

Mr. GOVER. That is correct.

Mr. DICKS. How long does it take to get a forest plan in place? And there is no money in the budget.

Mr. GOVER. That's the larger obstacle. If we had the people, we could do them really fast.

Mr. DICKS. BIA has to do them?

Mr. GOVER. BIA or the tribes have to do it. It can be one or the other.

Mr. DICKS. Was this a shock? Did this come out of the blue or did the tribes know this was going to happen?

Mr. GOVER. It came as a shock to me. I do not know what the tribes knew about it. I was surprised to hear that we were unable to harvest timber without such a plan. We are scrambling right now to deal with this contingency and to start getting plans in place where they do not already exist.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. As a follow-up, is there a lot of harvestable timber out there on Indian lands that as a matter of good management ought to be harvested?

Mr. GOVER. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. And a lot of it is being and has been harvested.

Mr. REGULA. But it cannot be done now, can it?

Mr. DICKS. If they have a forest plan——

Mr. REGULA. Do some of the tribes have forest plans?

Mr. GOVER. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. They want to know what their sustainable harvest can be.

Mr. REGULA. It makes sense.

Mr. DICKS. And for good environmental reasons, too.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Nethercutt?

REPLACEMENT SCHOOL PRIORITY LIST

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome to you all.

I would like to ask about the issue of priority for replacement school construction.

Until 1992, BIA revised its priority list each year. The Paschal Sherman School in my district in eastern Washington is a good example of how the rankings were changed. In 1982, the school was ranked 14th on the priority list. By 1985, the school's ranking increased to number three. After 1985, the school dropped off the list. It didn't appear again until this year. Now it is ranked 12th out of 13. Just 2 months ago, we had a fire at that school, an electrical fire. This is a very serious need we have. We need a replacement school. I think we feel as if we have been jockeyed back and forth, up and down, and around with respect to being on the list, or not on the list, and why we were not on the list. If we were number three, why is it not fully constructed by now?

So, please tell me what is happening with respect to this priority list. If we are 12th of 13, are we going to stay that way? Or could we be number one in 2 months?

Mr. GOVER. I have to give you just a little history.

When Congress froze the list in 1992 and told us to stop having a new list every year because of exactly the complaint that you are presenting. So we did. That left us with a list of 16 schools. In a

sense, it was arbitrary because you have to ask why the 1992 list as opposed to 1991 or 1993, but that is what happened. This business of changing the list every year needed to stop. We have stuck to that list since that time.

We are now about to complete it. The first three schools on the new list you just mentioned are the last three on the old list.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. The old list as of 1992?

Mr. GOVER. That is right.

The new list that we developed—we did an application process and told every school in the country that if they wanted to apply now was their chance. Paschal Sherman competed successfully.

I will commit to you that I do not intend to change that list and I would encourage the Committee to tell us not to change that list so that again we can work our way through the current list, get it done, and then start looking to yet another list.

I certainly understand the frustration. There are so many schools out there that are in a dangerous condition right now. I hate not being able to say that I can take care of all the problems, but the reality is that we cannot.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I understand.

I appreciate your willingness to stay with the list and not take people off when they get to number three. That was difficult for us out west.

DETENTION FACILITIES

The same is true with respect to law enforcement and correction facilities, detention facilities for the tribal organizations. We were on the list for a detention center—I understand that goes through the Department of Justice with respect to construction.

Mr. GOVER. It does now.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I am wondering to what extent the Colville Tribe is listed or not listed or in line to get some detention facilities for adults in our tribe.

Mr. GOVER. I would like to let Mr. Quasula respond.

Mr. QUASULA. We have one list in law enforcement. Colville is number eight. The first five projects have been completed. Number six, the tribe got tired of waiting on us and built it themselves. So we are at number seven, and number eight is Colville.

Justice awarded out of their fiscal year 1999 funds to Colville for detention construction about $4.5 million, which is short of what is really required. The tribe has to leverage considerably.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. What communications are ongoing with respect to their ability to raise that additional money or to get the additional assistance? Do you know the status as we sit here?

Mr. QUASULA. I think just about every project DOJ has funded, tribes have come to us saying, would you pay a percentage of this? Of course, our construction dollars are zero and that is not what they want to hear.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Well, that is a very real problem. We talk about law enforcement, and the community policing is another one that we really need in our region, as well as other regions of the country in tribal areas.

I would hope you would be thoughtful about it. Maybe it is up to us to try to decide how we can provide some additional assist-

ance—and that is a challenge—but this is a serious problem in Indian Country.

Mr. QUASULA. It is a real issue.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you.

Mr. Moran?

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

RECOGNITION OF TRIBES

First of all, I want to thank the BIA for providing technical assistance to us in the effort to introduce legislation granting sovereignty to eight tribes in Virginia. This is an unbelievable history. These are the original tribes that first met the colonial settlers—Chief Powhatan and Pocahontas were members of those tribes—since that first contact, Virginia made it illegal to be a Native American. Between 1912 and 1966, it was punishable by imprisonment if you were to describe yourself as American Indian or Native American. In fact, you could not get your baby out of a hospital unless you described them as "colored" in those days.

So it was impossible to sustain their claims, even though their claims date back to the kings of England in the 17th and 18th century. It was an illegal usurpation of their rights. But it is going to be very difficult now because obviously the lands have been settled and there are people who are afraid that they may use their sovereignty for gambling on those lands. I am sure that some Indian tribes are going to oppose it because it means dividing up the pie even further. But it is the right thing to do.

In fact, if I can, I would like to introduce a couple of articles on these tribes into the record.

Would that be all right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REGULA. Without objection, the referenced articles will appear in the record.

[The information follows:]

AUTOSVA
RCN doesn't mean you have the right one.

Our search engine is back!
Search
Virginia/Metro
Weekly archive
Feature Columns
Today's Headlines
News Updates
The Wire
Virginia AP Wire
Virginia Lottery
Virginia Weather
Va. News Network
Real Estate
Book Reviews
Weddings
GO TO THAT SECTION
These sections are updated once a week. Choose a section and click on the button!
Kitchen Potato

VIRGINIA/METRO RICHMOND

'Documentary Genocide' / Families' surnames on racial hit list

BY PETER HARDIN
Times-Dispatch Washington Correspondent

Sunday, March 5, 2000

Dr. Walter Ashby Plecker spent decades

trying to deny the existence of Indians in Virginia A half-century after his death, the damage is still being undone.

Long before the Indian woman gave birth to a baby boy, Virginia branded him with a race other than his own.

The young Monacan Indian mother delivered her son at Lynchburg General Hospital in 1971. Proud of her Indian heritage, the woman was dismayed when hospital officials designated him as black on his birth certificate. They threatened to bar his discharge unless she acquiesced.

The original orders came from Richmond generations ago.

Virginia's former longtime registrar of the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Dr. Walter Ashby Plecker, believed there were no real native-born Indians in Virginia and anybody claiming to be Indian had a mix of black blood.

In aggressively policing the color line, he classified "pseudo-Indians" as black and even issued in 1943 a hit list of surnames belonging to "mongrel" or mixed-blood families suspected of having Negro ancestry who must not be allowed to pass as Indian or white.

With hateful language, he denounced their tactics.

" . . . Like rats when you are not watching, [they] have been 'sneaking' in their birth certificates through their own midwives, giving either Indian or white racial classification," Plecker wrote.

Twenty-eight years later, the Monacan mother's surname still was on Plecker's list. She argued forcefully with hospital officials. She lost.

Today, the woman's eyes reveal her lingering pain. She consulted with civil rights lawyers and eventually won a correction on her son's birth certificate.

"I don't think the prejudice will ever

stop," said the woman, who agreed to talk to a reporter only on condition of

anonymity.

She waged a personal battle in modern times against the bitter legacy of Plecker, who ran the bureau from 1912 to 1946. A racial supremacist, Plecker and his influential allies helped shape one of the darkest chapters of Virginia's history. It was an epoch of Virginia-sponsored racism.

A physician born just before the Civil War, Plecker embraced the now-discredited eugenics movement as a scientific rationale for preserving Caucasian racial purity. He saw only two races, Caucasian and non-Caucasian, and staunchly opposed their "amalgamation."

After helping win passage in 1924 of a strict race classification and anti-miscegenation law called the Racial Integrity Act, Plecker engaged in a zealous campaign to prevent what he considered "destruction of the white or higher civilization."

When he perceived Indians as threats to enforcing the color line, he used the tools of his office to endeavor to crush them and deny their existence.

Many Western tribes experienced government neglect during the 20th century, but the Virginia story was different: The

Indians were consciously targeted for mistreatment.

Plecker changed racial labels on vital records to classify Indians as "colored," investigated the pedigrees of racially "suspect" citizens, and provided information to block or annul interracial marriages with whites. He testified against Indians who challenged the law.

Virginia's Indians refused to die out, although untold numbers moved away or assumed a low profile.

Now, eight surviving tribes recognized by Virginia in the 1980s are preparing to seek sovereign status from the U.S. government through an act of Congress. About 3,000 of the 15,000 Indians count-

ed in Virginia in the 1990 census were indigenous to the state, experts say

As they bid for federal recognition, more Indian leaders are talking openly about the injustice of Plecker's era. They gave a copy of his 1943 "hit list" to Virginia members of Congress along with other data in support of their bid.

Modern scholars have studied Plecker and the racial integrity era. Their findings contributed to this article. Yet he's not widely known today.

"It's an untold story," said Oliver Perry, chief emeritus of the Nansemond Tribe.

"It's not that we're trying to dig him up and re-inter him again," said Gene Adkins, assistant chief of the Eastern Chickahominy Tribe.

"We want people to know that he did damage the Indian population here in the state. And it's taken us years, even up to now, to try to get out from under what he did. It's a sad situation, really sad."

Said Chief William P. Miles of the Pamunkey Tribe: "He came very close to committing statistical

genocide on Native Americans in Virginia."

Chief G Anne Richardson of the Rappahannock Tribe spoke bluntly: "Devastation. Holocaust. Genocide.

"Those are the words I would use to describe what he did to us," she said. "It was obvious his goal was the demise of all Native Americans in Virginia. . . . We were not allowed to be who we are in our own country, by officials in the government."

For people of Indian heritage, Plecker's name "brings to mind a feeling that a Jew would have for the name of Hitler," said Russell E. Booker Jr., Virginia registrar from 1982 to 1995. That view "certainly is justified."

Indeed, one of Plecker's most chilling letters mentioned Adolf Hitler -- and not unfavorably.

"Our own indexed birth and marriage records showing race reach back to 1853," Plecker wrote U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier in 1943. "Such a study has probably never been made before.

"Your staff member is probably correct in his surmise that Hitler's genealogical study of the Jews is not more complete."

Plecker also used haunting rhetoric in publishing a brochure on "Virginia's Vanished Race" a month before his death in 1947. He asked, "Is the integrity of the master race, with our Indians as a demonstration, also to pass by the mongrelizations route?"

Confronting an era

On wooded Bear Mountain, miles up a country road outside Amherst, a visitor finds more evidence of the new willingness to confront Plecker's era head-on.

It's the historical center of the Monacan Indian Nation. A one-room log schoolhouse dating to the 1870s is standing. Also there are a simple white church and a small ancestral museum with a new sign proclaiming "History Preserved is Knowledge Gained."

Tribal activist and researcher Diane Shields digs into her files and pulls out for a visitor a dozen manila folders with photocopies of Plecker's letters covering two decades.

The Monacans acknowledge the stigma and pain, the second-class status, the lack of economic opportunity and the inferior education inflicted upon them and other Virginia tribes.

Indian children were relegated to substandard "colored" schools. Their parents, wanting to keep an Indian identity, often declined to send them there. Some tribal children studied in lower grades at reservation schools or church-sponsored schools like the one at Bear Mountain.

Even in this history of oppression, some Monacans have found a value· a common identity.

"It's a horrible thing, what he did to the Indian people," Shields said of Plecker. "But you know what? It gives me a sense of belonging -- because I'm grouped with my own people.

"It kind of backfired with Plecker. He pushed the Indian people closer and gave us an identity."

Her brother, Johnny Johns, is a tribal leader and electrical technician. He's 51. Enrolled at Lynchburg College at midlife, he's been learning about the eugenics movement. Johns, whose surname was on Plecker's "hit list," regards him in two ways.

First, there's "the horror, the terror." Yet he believes Plecker "did us a favor, because the list of [Indian] names is there. We know who we are. It's a two-edged sword, a duality."

Monacan Chief Kenneth Branham, 47, remembers shunning by whites when Indian children were first allowed into public elementary school in the 1960s. School bus drivers sometimes refused to transport them.

Plecker was cruel, Branham believes. But "he kind of drew us together. We were a tightknit group, because there was nobody else we could associate with."

His tribe, which has grown dramatically in recent years to about 1,100 enrolled members, is using federal grant money to document its history. The Monacans are making their comeback with people like Shields and Johns, who were drawn back from beyond Virginia to their family and tribal roots, the place they now call home.

Among them is Indian activist Mary B. Wade, who learned only in the late 1980s about her Monacan heritage from an uncle in Maryland. Now she's secretary of the Virginia Council on Indians, a state government advisory panel.

The Monacan tribe owns more than 100 acres on and near Bear Mountain and dreams of buying hundreds more, developing a retirement home and a day-care center.

These Amherst Indians won recognition from the General Assembly in 1989, five years after Lynchburg pediatrician Peter Houck laid out a Monacan genealogy for what was once called a lost tribe. Houck detailed his findings in a book, and the recognition has contributed to a spirit of resurgence among the Monacans.

Indian people of Amherst and adjoining Rockbridge counties were a special target of Plecker.

He wrote in a 1925 letter, "The Amherst-Rockbridge group of about 800 similar people are giving us the most trouble, through actual numbers and persistent claims of being Indians. Some well-meaning church workers have established an 'Indian Mission' around which they rally."

Across the state in eastern Virginia, home for tribes that once

made up the Powhatan Confederation, Plecker evokes diverse reactions from Indian leaders.

"He was just determined to get rid of us," said Chief A. Leonard Adkins, 73, of the Chickahominy Tribe. "It was hard to believe that a man could do what he did and get away with it."

A Chickahominy midwife was threatened by with imprisonment by Plecker if she didn't stop putting 'Indian' on birth records, Adkins said. She decided to stop her midwifery rather than buckle under to him or risk a prison term.

During Plecker's era, a number of Indians didn't admit to their cultural heritage or pass down traditions to

their children. It was easier for many to adapt to white society, said Chief Barry Bass of the Nansemond Tribe.

"There's probably a lot who have gone to their grave who still didn't admit they were Indian. That's where it hurt," said Bass, the acting chairman of the Virginia Council on Indians.

Plecker wrote in a 1924 state-published pamphlet, "Eugenics in Relation to the New Family," that there were no true Indians in Virginia who didn't have some black blood. He later refined this to apply to "native-born people in Virginia calling themselves Indians."

His 1943 letter alluding to "rats . . . 'sneaking' in their birth certificates" claimed that mixed-blood groups were intent above all on "escaping negro status and securing recognition as white, with the resulting privilege of attending white schools and ultimately attaining the

climax of their ambitions, marrying into the white race "

Plecker misunderstood the Indians' culture, said Dr Helen C. Rountree, an anthropoligist and Virginia Indian expert recently retired from Old Dominion University. Those whom she studied in eastern Virginia believed that if they married a white, the children would be Indians, Rountree wrote in her book, "Pocahontas's People."

These Indians did not want to be "white," she wrote, although they wanted access to the better facilities available to whites and the freedom to marry whites to avoid inbreeding.

In drawing his conclusions, Plecker relied heavily on old birth and death records that indicated only whether an individual was white or nonwhite, said former registrar Booker.

"There was no place to register 'Indian.' Nonwhite was later taken to mean black, by Plecker and by the Racial Integrity Act," Booker said.

To Booker, the racial integrity era amounted to what today would be called "ethnic cleansing." Or "documentary genocide."

"He was convinced he was one of the chosen," Booker said of Plecker. "He was the original martinet."

The Plecker letters

Plecker left a major paper trail.

He gave carbon copies of hundreds of his official letters, neatly typed on "Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Health" stationery, to John Powell, a Richmond-born concert pianist and an outspoken advocate for race-purity measures in Virginia.

Today, the letters offer a rare record of a bureaucrat intruding in individual lives, harassing and intimidating citizens, bullying local officials and stamping out civil rights.

The correspondence is housed in a collection of Powell documents at the University of Virginia's Alderman Library. Powell graduated Phi Beta Kappa from U.Va. at age 18. He became an internationally known pianist and lectured in U.Va.'s music department.

In one letter, Plecker wrote a Lynchburg woman in 1924

to correct a supposedly false birth report for her child, which had been signed by a midwife.

"This is to give you warning that this is a mulatto child and you cannot pass it off as white," he wrote. Plecker apprised her of the new "one-drop" rule, which defined a white person as having "no trace whatsoever of any blood other than Caucasian."

"You will have to do something about this matter and see that this child is not allowed to mix with white children," Plecker admonished. "It cannot go to white schools and can never marry a white person in Virginia.

"It is an awful thing."

To a woman he knew to be from a "respectable" white family in Hampton, Plecker voiced surprise that she would ask about a license to marry a man of mixed African descent.

"I trust . . . that you will immediately break off entirely with this young mulatto man," he wrote.

Plecker threatened a Fishersville woman with prosecution in 1944 for a birth record he contended hid her Negro lineage.

"After the war it is possible that some of these cases will come into court We might try this one. It would make a good one if you continue to try to be what you are not," Plecker warned.

His writing supports the view of leading scholars that Indians were a secondary, not primary, target of the eugenics movement in Virginia.

"The attack on persons of African descent laid the foundation for the attack against the American Indian community in Virginia as a mixed-race population," wrote an anthropologist, Dr. Danielle Moretti-Langholtz of the College of William and Mary, in a dissertation on the political resurgence of Virginia's Indians.

Plecker was vehement about preserving the color line.

"Two races as materially divergent as the white and the negro, in morals, mental powers, and cultural fitness, cannot live in close contact without injury to the higher," he told an American Public Health Association session in 1924. "The lower never has been and never can be raised to the level of the higher."

Plecker went on, "We are now engaged in a struggle more titanic, and of far greater importance than that with the Central Powers from which we have recently emerged," he added. "Many scarcely know that the struggle which means the life or death of our civilization is now in progress, and are giving it *A1*

no thought."

He concluded, "Let us turn a deaf ear to those who would interpret

Christian brotherhood to mean racial equality."

Rise to power

He had risen to become Virginia's first registrar at a time when segregationist Jim Crow laws and attitudes already were securely in place in the South.

In the eugenics movement, Plecker and allies found a basis in "science" for their extremist thinking, according to scholars who have studied him.

Plecker was born April 2, 1861, in Augusta County. He died at age 86 in August 1947 when he failed to look before crossing the street on Chamberlayne Avenue in Richmond and was hit by a car.

Schooled at Hoover Military Academy in Staunton, he attended the University of Virginia and graduated with a degree in medicine from the University of Maryland in 1885. For about 25 years, he practiced as a country doctor After joining the health department of Elizabeth City County, now the city of Hampton, he set up a system for keeping health records and vital statistics, earning that county a national reputation.

In 1912, he came to Richmond to help state officials organize the Bureau of Vital Statistics, and he was tapped as its first registrar. Births, deaths and marriages would have to be reported to the bureau

"He was a pioneer in the health of the newborn," said former registrar Booker, who as a youngster delivered the newspaper to Plecker's Richmond home. "He wrote what I thought was an outstanding book for midwives."

Plecker was drawn to the eugenics movement, which held that society and mankind's future could be improved by promoting better breeding.

He was among eugenics adherents who believed in the supremacy of white genetic stock, the inferiority of other races and the threat that mixing with the white race would lead to decline or destruction.

To push for law to preserve "racial integrity," Plecker teamed with Powell and Tennessee-born Earnest S. Cox, author of a book titled "White America."

Powell was a leading founder of the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America, an all-male, native-born group started in Richmond in September 1922 and a year later claiming to have 25 posts statewide. Plecker was a member.

Its goals were preservation of Anglo-Saxon ideals and "the supremacy of the white race in the United States of America without racial prejudice or hatred," according to its constitution.

"This was the Klan of the aristocracy -- the real gentleman's Klan," said J. David Smith of Longwood College, a eugenics expert.

Newspaper accounts at the time detailed a link with former Richmond KKK members. The Richmond Lodge of the KKK seceded in 1922 from the national organization, according to news accounts. A lawyer for some of the former Klansmen said the national group was judged to be a "rampant anti-Catholic organization instead of an organization to maintain white supremacy."

"The Ku-Klux Klan in Richmond organized the Anglo-Saxon Clubs of America, and the local organization is known as Richmond Post, No 1," the lawyer went on to say in The Times-Dispatch.

Powell wrote in correspondence later that the Anglo-Saxon Clubs had "no connection whatever" with the KKK and were "in no sense unfriendly to the Negro."

In 1924 the General Assembly adopted race-punty legislation championed by the Anglo-Saxon Clubs and promoted by Plecker, Cox and Powell It would stand until a landmark 1967 ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Racial Integrity Act was one of the nation's strictest It defined white person for the first time, using the "one-drop rule," and went beyond earlier state law against inter-marriage by making it illegal for whites to marry any nonwhites, including Asians.

However, the law permitted persons with one-sixteenth American Indian blood and "no other non-Caucasic blood" to be classified as white. That was a nod to descendants of Pocahontas, some of whom counted themselves among "first families" of Virginia.

Some leading state newspapers, including The Times-Dispatch and The Richmond News Leader, endorsed the race-purity goals.

The Times-Dispatch editorialized in 1924 that race intermingling would "sound the death knell of the white man. Once a drop of inferior blood gets in his veins, he descends lower and lower in the mongrel scale."

This newspaper also gave Powell a platform, publishing two years later a 13-part series of his articles titled "The Last Stand" and describing what he called Virginia's declining racial purity.

Plecker, meanwhile, lent support for black separatist Marcus Garvey's back-to-Africa movement.

Plecker kept trying to narrow loopholes in the Virginia law The legislature agreed in 1930 to define "colored" people as those "in whom there is ascertainable any Negro blood."

Framers of the Racial Integrity Act found "a convenient façade" for their race prejudices in the "pseudo-science of eugenics," said Paul A. Lombardo, a eugenics expert who teaches at the University of Virginia law school.

Lombardo wrote, "The true motive behind the [act] was the maintenance of white supremacy and black economic and social inferiority -- racism, pure and simple."

Enforcing the act

In his more than 30 years as registrar, Plecker stood up to those who disagreed with him, urged him to back off, or got in his way. They included courageous Indians, a Virginia governor and federal officials.

Some people were imprisoned for violating the Racial Integrity Act, but a number of junes wouldn't convict. There were legal challenges to the act and Plecker's enforcement, but it took the U.S. Supreme Court in 1967 to

void Virginia's anti-miscegenation law.

Two of the earliest challenges came in Rockbridge County in 1924. A circuit judge upheld in the first case the denial of a marriage license for an Indian woman to marry a white man. But in the second case, he set the eugenics backers reeling.

Judge Henry W. Holt heard expert testimony from Plecker before ruling in favor of an Indian woman who had challenged the denial of a license for her to wed a white man.

Holt found no evidence that the woman, Atha Sorrells, was of mixed lineage under a reasonable interpretation of the new law. He questioned its constitutionality and the legal meaning of the term Caucasian.

"Half the men who fought at Hastings were my grandfathers. Some of them were probably hanged and some knighted, who can tell? Certainly in some instances there was an alien strain. Beyond peradventure, I cannot prove that there was not," he wrote in his opinion.

Drawing on "Alice in Wonderland," he added, "Alice herself never got into a deeper

tangle."

John Powell shot back with a pamphlet, published by the Anglo-Saxon Clubs, titled "The Breach in the Dike: an Analysis of the Sorrels Case Showing the Danger to Racial Integrity from Intermarriage of Whites with So-Called Indians."

Holt's ruling was not appealed, however. An assistant state attorney general warned that the act might be declared unconstitutional.

Absalom Willis Robertson, the Rockbridge commonwealth's attorney, represented the state. A former state senator, Robertson would rise to fame as a congressman and U.S. senator for 34 years. A conservative Democrat, he was known as an expert on federal finances.

On civil rights, Sen. Robertson opposed

the progressive stands of the national Democratic Party and was involved in the filibuster over civil rights legislation in 1963. His son, Republican Pat Robertson, is the conservative television evangelist who founded the Christian Coalition and, in 1988, ran for president.

In an October 1924 letter, Plecker personally had asked A.W. Robertson to represent Virginia "if your charge is not too great, and the Governor will pay the bill."

Gov. E. Lee Trinkle, too, had written Robertson.

"Willis, this law is a new one and I regard it of vital importance. There are a great many of our real substantial white people who fought hard for the Bill and are doing all they can to help out in this situation over the State."

Asking what Robertson would charge if he were to represent the state, Trinkle added, "I know that you will be more than reasonable because you, like the rest of us, are interested in this movement."

When Plecker sought to have the race-purity law toughened the following year, the governor advised moderation.

Trinkle wrote Plecker, urging him to "be conservative and reasonable and not create any ill feeling if it can be avoided between the Indians and the State government.

"From reports that come to me," Trinkle added, "I am afraid sentiment is moulding itself along the line that you are too hard on these people and pushing matters too fast."

Plecker didn't yield.

The registrar tried to tell U.S. Census officials how to list Indians and urged Selective Service officials not to induct them as whites.

A number of Virginia Indians, struggling to retain their identity, battled to be inducted with whites in World War II, a position Plecker opposed. Through various petitions and channels, the Indians met inconsistent results.

Three Rappahannock men who refused induction with blacks were prosecuted and sentenced to prison, but they later were allowed to pass the war years by laboring in hospitals as conscientious objectors. Yet in a federal court in western Virginia, a judge sided with seven Amherst County Indians who resisted induction as Negroes.

Finally the government, after years of wrangling, generally deferred to registrants to choose their race, an Indian victory that some scholars believe helped pave the way for the civil rights movement.

In the same period, Plecker wrote a letter to Powell that reflected a defeat -- and Plecker's own authoritative gamesmanship.

Plecker had begun putting "corrections" on the backs of birth certificates issued by his bureau before 1924 to remove the designation "Indian."

A prominent Richmond attorney, John Randolph Tucker, representing two Amherst County Indians challenged Plecker's standing to "constitute himself judge and jury" by making such a change and threatened court action.

Plecker yielded temporarily.

"This is the worst backset which we have received since Judge Holt's decision," he confided to Powell on Oct. 13, 1942. "In reality I have been doing a good deal of bluffing, knowing all the while that it could not be legally sustained. This is the first time my hand has absolutely been called."

The "backset" didn't last long.

The General Assembly voted in 1944 to allow the registrar to put on the backs of birth, death or marriage certificates data that would correct erroneous racial labels on the front.

Plecker died in 1947. But his legacy survived. Not until 13 years after the Warren Court's landmark 1954 desegregation decision in Brown vs. Board of Education was the intermarriage ban in Virginia's Racial Integrity Act overturned.

Saying Virginia's anti-miscegenation law was based on racial distinctions, the Supreme Court concluded, "There is patently no legitimate overriding purpose independent of invidious racial discrimination which justifies this

classification.

"The fact that Virginia prohibits only interracial marriages involving white persons demonstrates that the racial classifications must stand on their own justification as measures designed to maintain white supremacy."

In 1975, Virginia repealed its racial definition and segregation laws.

Lasting damage

Virginia tribes preparing to seek federal recognition as sovereign nations have told officials in Washington about the lasting damage sustained in the Plecker era, three centuries after Virginia's "first people" encountered the European settlers.

A bill being drafted by Rep. James P. Moran, D-8th, would ask Congress to grant federal recognition.

Gene Adkins of the Eastern Chickahominy said it may take beyond the current generation of Virginia Indians to correct the wrongs of Plecker's era.

"We're getting [more] advantages, but we still don't have the same advantages today of the white population," Adkins said.

Telling the story of Plecker's mistreatment of the Indians could open more doors, Adkins said.

"It boils down to this: More people will be sympathetic to what we're trying to do."

Call Peter Hardin at (202) 662-7669, or e-mail him at phardin@media-general.com

---

© 2000, Richmond Newspapers Inc.



Terms and Conditions & Privacy Policy ADVERTISE with us
© 2000, Richmond Newspapers Inc.



Richmond Times-Dispatch timesdispatch.com
HEADLINES | VIRGINIA/METRO | BUSINESS | SPORTS | FLAIR | EDITORIALS | OBITUARIES
CLASSIFIED | COSMOS | YELLOW PAGES | AFFILIATES | SPECIAL SECTIONS | WEATHER
WHAT'S NEW: PLUS Food Gen. Assembly JobsVa.com Virtual Job Fair The Archives
Dislike? realestate.com

Our search engine is back!
Search

Virginia/Metro
Weekly archive
Feature Columns
Today's Headlines
News Updates
The Wire
Virginia AP Wire
Virginia Lottery
Virginia Weather
Va. News Network

Real Estate
Book Reviews
Weddings
GO TO THAT SECTION
These sections are updated once a week. Choose a section and click on the button!

KITCHEN DESIGNWORKS

VIRGINIA/METRO RICHMOND

Seeking Sovereignty / Indians face barriers, see benefits in quest

BY PETER HARDIN
Times-Dispatch Washington Correspondent

Monday, March 6, 2000

Centuries ago, Indian tribes in Virginia

were among the first to sign treaties with England.

Yet the U.S. government doesn't recognize

those tribes today.

The era of Virginia's Racial Integrity Act and Dr. Walter Ashby Plecker, the state official who used it to besiege Virginia's Indians, is over.

But Virginia's Indians still are working to overcome the legacy of Plecker's efforts to wipe out their existence on paper.

Virginia's Native Americans claim a long history that includes the legendary Chief Powhatan and his daughter, Pocahontas, darling of Disney filmmakers and schoolchildren.

Yet they lack the formal government-to-government relationship with the United States that is held by more than 550 other tribes nationwide.

Rep. James P. Moran, D-8th, is drafting a bill for the federal government to extend this recognition as "sovereign nations" to eight Virginia tribes

With federal recognition would come not only sovereignty but also eligibility for certain U.S. government programs for American Indians. The Clinton administration has proposed spending $9.4 billion on American Indians in its new budget.

In Congress, Moran's expected bill may face political barriers. Staunch gambling foes, for example, fear it ultimately could lead to casino gambling in the Old Dominion.

For Virginia's Indians, winning federal recognition would be a landmark along the road back from age-old displacement and the contemporary "statistical genocide" that one leader said was waged by Plecker, head of the Bureau of Vital Statistics from 1912 to 1946.

Plecker sought to deny the Indians' existence on grounds that theyhad a mix of black blood and were trying to "pass" as white. He manipulated birth records,

bullied citizens and joined with other influential leaders of that era to advocate the white race as superior.

Chief William P. Miles finds ludicrous the idea that his Pamunkey Tribe, located on one of the nation's oldest reservations, needs to petition the federal government for recognition.

He said in disbelief, "Amongst all tribes that would aspire to seek federal recognition -- you read about our tribe in the history books because of Pocahontas!"

Carl Custalow, assistant chief of the Mattaponi Tribe, believes that federal recognition is due.

"We were one of the first tribes to ever sign a treaty [with England], to come in contact with the Europeans," Custalow said.

As he spoke, he was looking out the picture window of his new brick ranch home at a sweeping panorama of the Mattaponi River, which runs by the tribe's three-centuries-old reservation in King William County.

Only 62 people live on the 150-acre reservation, but plans are under way for expansion: buying 2,000 adjoining wooded acres, building a cultural center and a new museum, even a traditional Mattaponi village.

Access to U.S. funds for tribal projects would help, along with federal money needed for Indian health care and education, Custalow said. A retired insurance claims superintendent, he's 55 and the only reservation resident with a college degree.

Virginia's Indians generally are more prosperous and face lower unemployment than their counterparts nationally. The 1990 Census found 31 percent of American Indians living in poverty, the highest of any ethnic group, in Virginia, the figure was closer to 13 percent.

Other leaders from Virginia's eight state-recognized tribes echo similar reasons for seeking recognition: sovereignty, college tuition grants, health care, housing programs and respect.

"This whole nation is built on the backs of the Virginia Indian people. It's time this great nation recognizes the ancestors and the descendants of the original people here," said Diane Shields, an activist with the Monacan Indian Nation in Amherst County.

Yet an uphill fight awaits descendants of the native people who encountered the first European settlers in Virginia.

Casino gambling?

On Capitol Hill, controversy over Indian gaming looms as a roadblock

Federally recognized tribes have raised billions of dollars for economic development by establishing gaming in the past decade. But foes contend that Indian gaming leads to family ruin and corruption.

Virginia tribal leaders, a number of them affiliated with the Baptist church, have said that they don't want to set up gambling casinos. Some tribes already have rejected outside offers.

"The Mattaponi interest is to preserve our heritage and culture. We don't want to

be known as Casinoland," the Mattaponi's Custalow said about gaming sales pitches that his tribe turned away.

Chief Miles of the Pamunkey said: "As far as I'm concerned, we'll never have it. It would change our way of life forever to have a casino on the reservation."

Despite such assurances, Rep. Frank R. Wolf, a Virginian and one of the foremost gambling foes in Congress, has vowed strong opposition to the expected bill.

"Publicly, privately, I would do everything I can to oppose it," promised Wolf, who represents Northern Virginia's 10th District.

Wolf, an influential senior Republican in the GOP-controlled House, is chairman of an Appropriations subcommittee and sponsored the bill that created a national commission to study gambling in America.

He said he feared that federal recognition could open the door to casino gambling and ultimately to corruption in a state known for clean government.

Although Virginia doesn't permit casino gambling, Wolf voiced concern over unexpected results that might arise from granting federal recognition. Tribes have gone to court to establish gaming rights, he noted.

Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte, R-6th, shares Wolf's concerns and is leaning against supporting the bill. His district includes the Amherst County-based Monacans.

Virginia Gov. Jim Gilmore, another Republican, is watching the gambling issue too. "We certainly care about the quality of life of the people in the Indian communities in Virginia," he said.

But he does not want to see "the ability to extend Indian gaming into the commonwealth, which places gambling outside of the purview of the regulation of Virginia. We already have enough."

The economic lure of commercial gaming for Indians, facing high poverty and unemployment rates across the country, has proven strong.

In 1988 Congress set up a regulatory framework called the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. From $212 million in 1988, tribal gaming revenue grew more than thirtyfold to $7.4 billion last year.

About one-third of federally recognized tribes, or 185 out of 558, now offer gaming, according to the National Indian Gaming Association. The 20 largest Indian gaming centers take in more than half the total revenue.

Tribes sponsoring gambling are required to plow profits back into tribal services and economic development. Some tribes have found a valuable funding source this way, but "Indian gambling has not been a panacea for the many economic and social problems that Native Americans continue to face," the National Gambling Impact Study Commission reported last year.

To conduct casino gambling, tribes are required to forge a compact with states. Lawsuits have arisen. In some states, tribes have opened casinos without a compact, according to the gambling study commission.

It is unclear whether Virginia tribal leaders will be able to deflect opposition over gaming.

Chief G. Anne Richardson of the Rappahannock Tribe said gambling isn't an

issue, and it's unfortunate that some gambling foes want to make it one. When a type of gambling is barred by a state, the tribes may not engage in it, she said.

Rep. Moran, who is drafting the federal recognition bill, said tribal members have told him they believe gambling is evil. Moran doesn't believe he can satisfy gambling foe Wolf, but he's intent on introducing the bill anyway.

Moran said he promised to do so to Thomasina Jordan, a friend, Indian activist and then-chairwoman of the Virginia Council on Indians, the day before she died last year.

"It's a compelling human rights case," Moran said. "These people were shamefully discriminated against, had their rights usurped illegally, without authority. The only motivation was just pure racism. It was really criminal, and it needs to be rectified."

These other hurdles could face Virginia's tribes in Washington:

Election-season politicking. When control of the White House and House of Representatives is at stake, politics can easily subvert many important bills.

Indian country politics can be fierce. There is a threat that some federally recognized tribes may resist watching the federal "pie" for Indians sliced up further by recognizing new tribes.

Clinton administration support isn't guaranteed.

Virginia's tribes have chosen to go to Congress rather than pursue an expensive and burdensome administrative route through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Even Kevin Gover, assistant Interior secretary for Indian affairs, conceded it could take as long as 25 years for a tribe to proceed through this route. Gover wants to improve the process but still prefers that tribes follow that procedure.

"We don't usually favor" tribes seeking recognition from Congress, Gover said, "because it is a shortcut of a longer process of research and examination."

He did not take a stand on the Virginia tribes' bid.

"We would want to do some of our own research. If we see very little doubt these tribes are historic tribes, then we well might support the legislation," he said.

The administrative route requires extensive documentation of tribal history. Virginia tribes could be handicapped by Plecker's campaign to eradicate them on paper.

Given bureau backlogs and falsification or manipulation of records by Virginia officials, "it's a certainty that none of the current members of the tribes in Virginia would live" long enough to see their petitions processed, said Karl A. Funke, a Maryland lawyer and Chippewa representing other tribes.

The bureau's route has drawn scathing criticism from a number of lawmakers and Indian activists. In October 1998, the House of Representatives defeated a bill to give the recognition process to an independent commission.

Growing awareness

Virginia's tribes aren't federally recognized in part because of the way history unfolded.

Their ancestors had treaty relations with the British crown before the founding of the United States and were a peaceful people when the new nation was born, said Arlinda F. Locklear, a Lumbee Indian and Maryland lawyer.

"There was no occasion for the United States to deal" with the Virginia tribes, said Locklear, who has worked with the Pamunkey tribe.

It was in the 1980s, after the civil rights and national Indian movements, that eight Virginia tribes became more active politically and won recognition from the state Capitol. Several other tribes have been rebuffed in their intial steps toward state recognition.

By 1990 there were about 3,000 indigenous Virginia Indians out of 15,000 American Indians counted in the statewide census, according to scholars.

In some ways, Virginia continues to see increasing awareness of its Indian population and heritage.

In eastern Virginia, a regional official with the Army Corps of Engineers signaled last month that he intends to recommend denial of a permit for a new reservoir sought by Newport News in King William County because it would hurt the Mattaponi Indians and the environment.

The reservoir would take water from the Mattaponi River, and the Indians fear it could destroy their way of life and even their tribe. Their prolonged battle is not over, however.

At the College of William and Mary, an American Indian Resource Center is in the planning stages, including teacher-training institutes and an archive of Virginia Indian documents.

At Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, a Native American Studies program is being set up.

In Richmond, state archaeologist Dr. M. Catherine Slusser is proposing ways for Virginia tribes to bypass a tangle of federal procedures and get back for reburial the remains of their ancestors that were dug up years ago.

And the General Assembly, responding to Monacan concerns, adopted a bill in 1997 to allow Indians to change their birth records more easily and show their ancestry accurately. These and other steps reflect a departure from the days when Plecker's white supremacist views were embraced by top state officials.

However, a number of Indian leaders are convinced the struggle goes on for respect and understanding of an Indian identity.

Planners of a "Celebration 2007" commemoration to mark the 400th anniversary of the founding of a permanent settlement at Jamestown were urged by tribal leaders last fall to use a different label.

"It's not a celebration for me," said Richardson of the Rappahannock Tribe. "It was an invasion of our country."

Tribal representatives watching from a gallery at the state Capitol were offended last winter when the House of Delegates discussed its resolution in favor of federal recognition for Virginia's tribes.

Some delegates began imitating Indian drumbeats by pounding on their desks.

"A colonial mentality still exists among some of the Virginia lawmakers," said

Richardson.

Later, the House passed the measure 95-5.

"Totally violated"

Nokomis Fortune Lemons of King and Queen County is an outspoken Indian who thinks her own brush with the law underscores the importance of federal recognition.

Federal agents arrived unannounced at her home in August with a search warrant, she said. They seized eagle feathers she had used in traditional and ceremonial dancing.

The feathers had been gifts to her and had a special religious symbolism, Lemons said. She's chief of the Rappahannock Indian Tribe, a different group from Richardson's.

"I was totally devastated," said Lemons, who later was prosecuted in federal court. "If a person is raped, I think I'd feel the way that person felt. The gifts given to me were totally violated."

Lemons pleaded guilty to illegal possession of eagle feathers. She was sentenced to probation and fined $500.

She got in trouble because only members of federally recognized tribes may apply to the government for a permit to possess feathers of eagles, which are an endangered species.

Her tribe not only isn't federally recognized, it also does not have state recognition. It has been seeking that status.

An official with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office in Richmond said three or four similar cases are prosecuted in Virginia each year, when they're brought to authorities' attention.

Lemons, 39, still is simmering with disgust.

"If the federal government says you're not Indian," she concluded, "state recognition doesn't mean a thing!"

She's stopped dancing, too.

"I can't bring myself to go into a dance circle without being in tune with my atmosphere, my religion and my people."

Original claim

Johnny Johns, council chief with the Monacan Indians, supports federal recognition for the Virginia tribes but finds the proce-dure absurd.

"To me, it's the opposite of what it should be, 180 degrees out of phase.

"We were an established culture. Why do we have to be recognized by the ones who came later? Shouldn't it be the other way around?"

Call Peter Hardin at (202) 662-7669, or e-mail him at phardin@media-general.com

State recognition

Virginia's legislature recognized eight indigenous Indian tribes in the 1980s:

Mattaponi and Pamunkey: With two of the oldest reservations in the country, these two tribes were recognized in 1983. The Mattaponi Tribe has a 150-acre reservation on the Mattaponi River in King William County. The Pamunkey has a 1,200-acre reservation in King William County on the Pamunkey River and claims the legendary Chief Powhatan and Pocahontas among its own.

Also recognized in 1983: The Chickahominy, based in Charles City County; the Eastern Chickahominy, based in New Kent County; the Upper Mattaponi, with headquarters in King William County; and the Rappahannock, with headquarters in King and Queen County.

In 1985: The legislature recognized the Nansemond, living around Norfolk, Chesapeake and Virginia Beach.

In 1989: State lawmakers recognized the Monacan Indian Nation of Amherst County.

© 2000, Richmond Newspapers Inc.



© 2000, Richmond Newspapers Inc.

TUITION ASSISTANCE

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Last year, Congressman Davis, Delegate Norton, and I introduced legislation that granted children of the District of Columbia the ability to get reimbursed for in-state tuition if they went to college out of State because there was insufficient higher education opportunities in the District of Columbia. So they could get the same tuition that Virginia, for example, would offer its residents and likewise for Maryland.

Do you think it is possible that that kind of approach could be used to obtain more affordable higher education opportunities in the States outside of Indian reservations for residents of the reservations?

Mr. GOVER. We had that thought when we first heard about the legislation, and yes I do. It would allow us to stretch very, very scarce scholarship dollars that we allocate to the tribes much further. And I am sure the tribes would welcome that sort of initiative.

Mr. MORAN. You would think. And you would think it would be a reasonable, fair, and affordable thing to do.

Mr. REGULA. If you clear that with the authorizers, we might consider putting it on our bill.

Mr. MORAN. Wonderful. Terrific.

Mr. REGULA. That can sometimes be a challenge, though.

Mr. MORAN. I understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is worth pursuing.

INDIAN COUNTRY TOUR

Mr. Chairman, has the committee gone out to visit Indian reservations like Pine Ridge and so on?

Mr. REGULA. Not as a committee. I have done it personally.

Mr. MORAN. I know you have.

Mr. REGULA. Would you like to visit one?

Mr. MORAN. I think it might be useful. I know the President was moved when he saw the conditions at Pine Ridge. It might be helpful to put it together.

Mr. REGULA. That's a big responsibility we have. You were not here earlier, but I reported that the taxpayer spends $9 billion on Indian programs. We have about $4 billion in our bill, but Ag, HUD, and a whole host of other bills have programs they fund, as well. So it is a major policy expenditure.

Mr. MORAN. I know you have gone to see them, but maybe more of us ought to go with you.

Mr. REGULA. That's a suggestion.

Mr. MORAN. I think most of the questions I would have asked have already been addressed, so I am not going to take up your time. We will have other opportunities and obviously I am in support of the recipients of the BIA's efforts and funds.

That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CONCLUSION

Mr. REGULA. Well, I think, Mr. Gover, you can see that the Committee is sensitive to the problems, and I think you are, too. I think

the NAPA report provided a good blueprint. It is going to take some funding, and we are well aware of that. But if we can enhance the quality of life of the Native Americans, we have all done a good deed. I am sure that is part of your goal.

Mr. GOVER. Mr. Chairman, we should all assume this is my last appearance before this Committee and that I will not be presenting the 2002 budget, but let me just say what a pleasure it has been and how much we appreciate the support we have gotten. I hope to leave my successor a much stronger organization than I inherited. If I am able to do so, that is very much the work of this committee more than my own.

Mr. REGULA. Thank you. I think it has been a team effort. It takes leadership in your Department and it takes our sensitivity to what you are trying to do. It is bipartisan, as you can well see. That has been the goal of all of us because particularly the young people on the reservations depend on us. Their future is in our hands in many respects.

Is family life, which is so fundamental, improving on reservations? We hear a lot about family and family life.

Mr. GOVER. I suppose it depends on which reservation you are talking about. In some places we are seeing the families really reemerge, restrengthen themselves, and provide the kind of guidance to the young people that is necessary. In other places, they have not yet turned the corner. In fact, we get increasing indications of family not just dysfunction, but family violence and the sexual abuse of children is on the increase in some communities. So there is good news and bad news.

You have to remember that the United States set out at the turn of this century to destroy the Indian family. That was essentially what the policy was. We shipped off the young people to boarding schools, we denied them their languages, we denied them their usual cultural practices—all of which were very much constructed around the family. So what we inherit today is the legacy of some terribly misguided policy.

Mr. REGULA. I think what you are saying illustrates the importance of leadership in your positions. But we in turn have to give you the support you need to provide that leadership. We thank you all for what you have done and for your testimony today and for taking a sense of responsibility.

With that the subcommittee is recessed until this afternoon, when we hear from the Smithsonian on its fiscal year 2001 budget request.

[Additional questions for the record follow:]

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
HEARING QUESTIONS

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

FY 2000 Appropriations	$1,869,052,000
FY 2001 Request	$2,200,965,000
Difference	+$331,094,000
FY 2000 Staffing	9,141
FY 2001 Staffing	9,737
Difference	+596

NAPA/BIA Reorganization

Question 1. This Committee and the Department commissioned a study of the Bureau of Indian Affairs management capabilities by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) to address long standing management problems within the Bureau. The NAPA study was tasked with providing recommendations for improving the quality, efficiency, and cost effectiveness of the Bureau's operations. You have already stated that you generally agree with the NAPA recommendations. Are there recommendations that you do not agree with?

Answer: The only recommendation that the Bureau did not agree with was for Law Enforcement to become an independent operating entity reporting directly to the Assistant Secretary. However, the Bureau does agree that Law Enforcement should have its own administrative funds to support the program.

Question 2. One of the most startling findings of the NAPA study was that many of the basic administrative functions that are necessary for effective management, and that exist in other organizations, are absent in the Bureau. For example, NAPA concluded that, "there is no existing capability to provide budget, human resources, policy, and other types of assistance to the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs and the Bureau". Is it your plan to establish these functions in the Bureau?

Answer: To effectively address administrative functions, NAPA recommended establishing a new Deputy Assistant Secretary position with four major offices reporting to this position: Chief Financial Officer, Chief Information Officer, Office of Policy, Planning and Performance, and a Human Resources Policy Office. The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs has agreed to this recommendation and a Secretarial Order was recently authorized to establish these offices. The Assistant Secretary is committed to filling these offices which would provide direct staff support.

Question 3. I understand that you have contracted with NAPA to develop an implementation plan to deal with the adoption of the NAPA recommendations. What is the current status of this implementation plan?

Answer: A draft action plan is presently circulating within the Bureau. This action plan will be implemented within annual budget requests and available funding. In order to meet organizational changes and requirements, the plan will require changes as they occur.

Question 4. What are the costs associated with full implementation of the NAPA report?

Answer: The total estimated cost for implementing the NAPA report will not be available until NAPA completes its workload analysis. It is expected the analysis will be available in May, 2000.

Question 5. The Congress has already provided $5 million for NAPA implementation in fiscal year 2000. How have/will these funds been used?

Answer: The funds provided by the Congress in FY 2000 are being used primarily for costs associated with relocating two major offices from Albuquerque, NM, to the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. This includes $700,000 in payments for buy-out authority and severance pay under the special authority provided by the Congress. In addition, the Bureau plans to use a portion of the funds to staff key positions under the newly established Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Question 6. Does the Department and the Office of Management and Budget support your efforts to address the Bureau's management deficiencies through adoption of the NAPA recommendations?

Answer: The Secretary of the Interior clearly supports the Bureau's efforts to address management deficiencies by adopting NAPA's recommendations. The Office of Management and Budget's support is evidenced by the additional $4 million for NAPA implementation in the Bureau's FY 2001 President's Budget. The Bureau intends to continue to keep the Administration and the Congress informed on the status of these efforts.

Question 7. What steps have you already taken to establish the new Office of Policy, Management, and Budget (PMB) in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs? When do you expect this office to be up and running?

Answer: A Secretarial Order which establishes the new Office of Policy, Management, and Budget has been signed by the Secretary. With the Order in effect, the Bureau will commence recruitment as all necessary documents, including position descriptions, are ready for filling the key positions in the new offices.

Question 8. How many additional people will be required to staff the new PMB office?

Answer: An estimated 11-15 additional employees will be hired to staff the new PMB Office.

Question 9. Will newly established administration positions be filled from within the Bureau or do you intend to recruit from a broader pool?

Answer: Some positions will be filled within the Bureau, however, some key senior level positions may be recruited from a broader pool.

Question 10. Will these newly established positions be subject to Indian preference?

Answer: The newly established positions in the Assistant Secretary's Office will not be subject to Indian preference; however, the agency will hire as many qualified Indian candidates as possible.

Question 11. The NAPA recommendations for reorganizing the Bureau consists of three independent program organizations: Indian Education, Law Enforcement, and the organization that delivers all other Indian programs under the Deputy Commissioner for Indian Affairs. Do you intend to formalize this organizational structure?

Answer: The Bureau does not agree with setting up Law Enforcement as an independent organization. The Law Enforcement Director will continue to report to the Deputy Commissioner. Furthermore, the Bureau does not intend to change the current law, 25 U.S.C. 2006(a), which establishes line authority directly from the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs to the Director of Indian Education Programs.

Question 12. Will implementing the NAPA recommendations assist the Bureau in program oversight? If so, please explain how.

Answer: The Bureau's implementation of NAPA's recommendations will reduce the amount of time that specialized program staff now have to devote to administrative functions so that they can perform the kinds of program oversight and monitoring that should occur. The new staff under the Deputy Assistant Secretary-PMB will provide policy, planning and performance assistance and will coordinate program as well as management reviews.

Question 13. You recently moved two administrative units, accounting management and information resource management from Albuquerque to the Washington D.C. area. How will this move improve the management of the Bureau?

Answer: Combining these Central Office-level administrative functions in one location will enhance staff performance and accountability. The Bureau agrees with both the NAPA and various General Accounting Office reports that hands-on-management, daily direction, and increased communications are essential for effective management. The Bureau is confident that direct supervision of the accounting and information resources management staff will facilitate management and lead to improvement in the provision of these essential program services.

Question 14. Will any additional moves be needed?

Answer: Yes, the only additional move that is expected at this time is to relocate some of the administrative functions related to property, contracting and information resources management

from the Washington Headquarters to the Reston Administrative Center. This move will free up additional office space at the Washington Headquarters for the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs' new staff.

Question 15. NAPA stated in its study that Indian Affairs staff is stretched very thin and increases may be needed in administrative staffing beyond those needed to establish the new organizational elements. Do you support this recommendation? If so, what level of resources do you think you will need?

Answer: Yes. The Bureau supports the recommendation to add administrative staffing beyond what exists today. Most of the Bureau's administrative functions performed in the Regions and Agencies are collateral duties assigned to program staff. Currently, NAPA is doing a workload analysis; it anticipates having a report in May. At that point, the Bureau will have a better idea of its true resources need based on national standards.

Question 16. What administrative functions do you believe need to be done in-house, and what administrative functions will you contract out to other organizations?

Answer: This is one of the areas that NAPA is reviewing as it does the workload analysis. NAPA will be using some of the best business practices and seeing how they can be applied to the Bureau's administrative functions.

Question 17. You recently contracted with the Department's National Business Center (NBC) to provide accounting services. What specific services will NBC be providing?

Answer: At the present time, NBC is performing all the accounting functions performed by the former Division of Accounting Management as only two people chose to relocate from Albuquerque, NM, to Reston, VA. The Bureau is in the process of hiring qualified and trained system accountants as it is the Bureau's goal to take back these functions within the next five years. NBC will continue to do the operational and payment component of accounting until staff are hired and trained on the financial reporting aspect of accounting.

Question 18. How will contracting with NBC for this function improve the Bureau's management capability as opposed to having Bureau staff performing this function?

Answer: The five-year plan is for the Bureau to be performing all of its accounting functions. In order for this to be accomplished, the Bureau must first recruit and train new employees.

Question 19. How are Bureau field elements reacting to the changes you are proposing?

Answer: There hasn't been a negative response from the field. NBC has been very responsive to the field staff in this transition.

Question 20. How are the tribes reacting to your proposed management changes?

Answer: The complaints the Bureau received came from some of the New Mexico Tribal leaders, as the majority of the employees in the Division of Accounting Management were from the New Mexico Tribes. The Bureau has not received complaints from other Tribal leaders.

Question 21. Has the Bureau amended its 2001 performance plan to contain administrative goals and performance measures that are consistent with NAPA recommendations?

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan includes administrative goals that address improving management and material weaknesses, key components of the NAPA study. Examples of the Bureau's FY 2001 management improvement goals include: reduce an additional 30 percent of the basis for qualifications to the Annual Financial Report; bring prompt pay performance up to 97 percent; and distribute a customer service survey to measure customer satisfaction with the Office of Tribal Services and begin corrective actions.

Question 22. What material weaknesses still exist at the Bureau, and what actions have been taken toward correcting and preventing reoccurrence of material weaknesses?

Answer: The Bureau has outstanding material weaknesses in the following areas: Irrigation Operations and Maintenance; Real Property Management and Accounting; Acquisition Management; Facilities Management; General Controls Over Automated Information Systems; Debt Collection; and Records Management. The Office of the Special Trustee has taken the lead role in directing, organizing and correcting the deficiencies in records management as detailed in Chapter 8 of the February, 2000, High Level Implementation Plan for the Trust Management Improvement Project. Information on the identified problems, actions taken, and actions planned for the other weaknesses is provided below.

Material Weakness: Irrigation Operations and Maintenance

Establishment of irrigation assessment rates, collection, recording, investment, and utilization of irrigation receipts are inadequate. Operations and maintenance (O&M) receivable balances have not been kept current, and billing and debt collection processes have not been consistently followed.

Without regulations which establish the Bureau's authority to levy rates adequate to recover the full cost of providing irrigation water and maintaining irrigation systems, and without consistent implementation of debt collection processes, the receipts are inadequate to fund maintenance and replacement of plant, property, and equipment necessary for the safe operation of the projects.

Recent Actions Completed:

- Two separate revisions to 25 CFR 171 have been prepared to (1) define the authority for administering irrigation projects, and (2) establish the Bureau's authority to recover the full costs of operating the projects. The two sections of this rule are under review by Bureau management.

- The Power and Irrigation Reconciliation Team (PIRT) completed O&M reconciliation efforts at 12 of the 17 projects. As of March, 2000, PIRT anticipates that O&M reconciliations will be completed at all projects by the end of FY 2001.

- Centralized mailing of project bills was completed for the 1999 irrigation season by the Irrigation and Power Liaison and Compliance Section (IPLCS) in Albuquerque, NM.

- The Bureau developed a debt collection work plan that will be used by all irrigation projects to process delinquent O&M charges. The plan is intended to clear up the existing delinquent debts and also ensure that future debts are handled in a consistent and timely manner. Initial tasks under the plan have been implemented and final actions on the delinquent debt portion of the plan are scheduled to be completed by the end of the year.

- The Bureau has written off those debts over 10 years old as the time for collection has expired.

Planned Actions:

- Publish the revised 25 CFR 171 Subparts A and B as a Proposed Rule.

- Refer other delinquent debts to the Department of Treasury for further collection action.

- Publish 25 CFR 171 Subparts A and B as a Final Rule.

- Reconcile past O&M receivables at the remaining projects and bring all accounts to a current status.

- Develop an Operations Handbook for each project to provide project personnel with the necessary procedures to operate the project and keep the O&M assessments and collection processes up to date in the future.

Material Weakness: Real Property Management and Accounting

The Bureau has not reconciled the differences between balances reported in its general ledger and in its subsidiary ledger for real property. The Bureau has not completed annual inventories of real property and adjusted the subsidiary ledger accordingly. The Bureau does not have written policies and procedures to ensure accuracy of the real property accounts.

On-site inventories and manual adjustments to the subsidiary ledgers and general ledger that were reported have essentially corrected the weakness as described. Adjusting entries to the subsidiary ledgers and general ledger have been made and work is now focused on maintaining the accuracy of real property accounts. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) audit report on the Bureau's FY 1997-1998 financial statements (99-I-937) indicated certain deficiencies in supporting documentation. Accordingly, the Bureau's emphasis is on verification of data, maintenance of records, and development or enhancement of documentation.

Recent Actions Completed:

- The Bureau conducted sample surveys of land parcels to ensure that supporting documentation is on file at the Regional Offices and Irrigation Projects and reconciled land records to the general ledger. By the end of the fiscal year 1999, Bureau officials had accompanied OIG auditors to verify the accuracy of real property, equipment, and construction-in-progress data at 19 sites.

- *FlashPoint*, a Windows graphic user interface software program with drop down screens and query capabilities, was developed in prototype form to simplify the data entry process at the field level. Modifications to existing procedural manuals are necessary, as is specific training to field property staff personnel (see Planned Actions).

- Validated all Bureau land in the Fixed Asset Sub-System (FAS).

- Partially completed the validation of Buildings and Equipment related to grant and contract schools to determine ownership of assets. Additional work is needed to develop procedures covering property and equipment in the possession of grantees (Tribes or Tribal schools) who decline to accept ownership from the Bureau (see Planned Actions).

- Corrected invalid building values, acquisition dates, and square footage measurements.

- Developed Management Reports to monitor field transactions activity. Edits were installed in FAS to facilitate this process.

- Finalized Property Management Handbooks on Inventory Procedure; Real Property (FAS); and Data Entry, Personal and Real Property. Consolidated these materials into an Administrative Handbook on Policies and Procedures that was distributed to all Regional Offices and is available on the Bureau's website.

Planned Actions:

- Develop new procedures to facilitate construction-in-progress data entry into FAS.

- Finalize the development of computer screens and complete implementation of *FlashPoint*. Revise procedural handbooks to reflect *FlashPoint* changes and conduct necessary training on the changes for field personnel.

- Develop additional procedures covering property and equipment in the possession of grantees (Tribes or Tribal schools) who decline to accept title from the Bureau.

- Resolve "useful life" issues in the FAS to the extent that building values are affected.

Material Weakness: Acquisition Management

The procedures and agency specific guidelines and organization structure are inadequate/ insufficient to properly administer the Bureau's procurement and contracting functions in the following area: Award Process; Conflict of Interest; Buy Indian Program; Closeout of *Public Law 93-638* Contracts; Property Management under Contracts; and ADP Procurement. The financial

statement audits performed by the Office of Inspector General have indicated that this lack of guidance extends to recording and accounting for construction-in-progress and to reviewing contract undelivered orders.

Recent Actions Completed:

- Part 13, Indian Self-Determination, of the Indian Affairs Manual was issued which provides for an Awarding Official Certification System to ensure appropriate training of individuals who serve as awarding officials of *Public Law 93-638* grants and contracts. Handbooks for contract retainage, contract close-out, construction-in-progress, and undelivered orders have been prepared.

- The Bureau's Division of Contracts and Grants Administration completed the Departmental Functional Review - Quality in Contracting Review.

- The Bureau's Division of Contracts and Grants Administration met with the Office of Facilities Management and Construction (OFMC) to review the deficiencies noted in the Department's Draft Acquisition Management Review which included improving the level of teamwork, communication, and cooperation between contracting and program staff.

- The Bureau implemented the Department's Electronic Acquisition System (IDEAS). Although the last in the Department to implement IDEAS, the Bureau benefitted by using the latest versions of IDEAS software which will result in greater uniformity and consistency Bureauwide.

Planned Actions:

- Issue formal guidance through the Indian Affairs Manual.

- Implement performance appraisal standards for all contracting personnel.

- Establish a Bureau Acquisition Review Board under the supervision of the Chief, Division of Property and Acquisition Management, to review selected procurement actions and provide technical assistance to Regional Office commercial contracting staff.

- Perform Acquisition Management Reviews in four regions. Perform a follow-up Quality in Contracting Review at OFMC.

- Publish Regulations on the Buy Indian Act.

Material Weakness: Facilities Management

The lack of proper maintenance and repair of facilities has created health and safety hazards in Bureau schools and other facilities, including employee housing. The deficiencies in Bureau schools, law enforcement detention centers, and other facilities could adversely affect the health and/or safety of the occupants.

Recent Actions Completed:

- To ensure that accurate deferred maintenance data is entered into the Facilities Management Information System (FMIS), a backlog validation and condition assessment project was started in January, 1999, to identify repair and code deficiencies in schools, detention centers and other Bureau-owned facilities. The remaining locations will be completed in FY 2000.

- Condition assessments continue to be conducted on all Employee Housing units as a part of the Bureauwide project to validate and assess the deferred maintenance backlog for all Bureau-owned or funded facilities. As a part of the condition assessment project, the inventory information such as building count and utilization and ownership status will be updated from the 1991 and 1994 Employee Housing surveys.

- The training committee, established to plan for Bureauwide training on FMIS, is continuing to work on training schedules, instructor selection, training site selection and training materials.

Planned Actions:

- Implement Employee Housing Committee recommendations to set guidelines and standards for the operation and maintenance of the Quarters program.

- Complete field testing and implementation of FMIS.

- Complete inventory and assessment of conditions of all Bureau-owned employee quarters.

Material Weakness: General Controls Over Automated Information Systems

The Bureau's general controls over its automated information systems are ineffective. Specifically, an effective security program has not been implemented; controls over access, software development and changes, segregation of duties, and system software are inadequate; and a service continuity plan has not been developed or implemented.

Recent Actions Completed:

- The Bureau identified staff in sensitive and critical information technology positions and initiated background investigations to obtain the required security clearances.

- The Bureau improved the physical access to the Operations Service Center and reconfigured the facility to separate the computer operations room.

- The Bureau developed a Continuity of Operations Plan, which has been reviewed by the Department, and obtained off-site storage for backup media.

- The Bureau awarded a contract to perform risk assessments of the Bureau's automated information systems and to classify the Bureau's computer resources.

- The Bureau has initiated actions to relocate the Operations Service Center to the Washington metropolitan region from Albuquerque, NM, in order to improve management oversight of these critical functions.

Planned Actions:

- Develop an approved Bureau's information technology security plan.
- Develop and submit to the Bureau a strategic plan for the Division of Information Resources Management.
- Develop and issue formal policies, standards, and procedures for computer operations.

Material Weakness: Debt Collection

Bureau regulations, procedures, and guidelines are inadequate, obsolete, outdated, or otherwise insufficient to properly administer current debt collection functions. The Bureau does not consistently or routinely pursue the collection of debts in an aggressive and timely manner as required by the Debt Collection Act of 1982, as amended in 1996.

Responsibility for the Bureau's debt collection activities is divided among the Office of Management and Administration, the Office of Economic Development, the Office of Trust Responsibilities' Division of Water and Land Resources, and the 12 Regional and 83 Agency and Field Offices.

The Office of Inspector General's financial statement audits have reported that debt collection deficiencies existed primarily in the following: identification, billing, and collection of irrigation and power debt; identification of unbilled receivables; and referral of eligible debt to the Department of the Treasury in accordance with the 1996 amendments to the Debt Collection Act.

Recent Actions Completed:

- The Division of Accounting Management prepared a debt collection procedures handbook.
- The Office of Trust Responsibilities centralized irrigation and power bills at the Irrigation Power Liaison and Compliance Section using National Irrigation Information Management System (NIIMS) data and developed a plan for the write off of old debts or the cancellation of debt collection activities where the debt cannot be supported.
- The National Business Center (NBC) will review NIIMS and the Federal Financial System (FFS) activity monthly to reconcile any out-of-balance accounts. These deficiencies will be corrected as discovered. The two projects that have not yet converted to NIIMS are to reconcile/validate their bills in FFS on a monthly basis. A formal validation will occur annually.
- The Colorado River power project reconciled its accounts receivable balance with FFS.

- The Office of Economic Development (OED) centralized debt collection at Headquarters and hired a Debt Collection Coordinator. Debt collection policies and procedures for OED were developed.

- As of September 30, 1999, the Bureau had referred over $3.7 million to the Departments of Treasury and Justice and other debt collection agencies. In addition it had mailed 60-day letters to approximately 2,270 debtors, who owe a total of $3.8 million, giving them final notice that their debt will be referred to the Department of Treasury. In December, 1999, an additional $2.4 million of delinquent debt was sent to Treasury.

- The Bureau now has an automated interface with the Department of Treasury that allows more efficient referral of delinquent debts.

Planned Actions:

- Complete the conversion of all irrigation projects to NIIMS and interface all projects with FFS.

- Develop routine reconciliations for Irrigation and Power subsidiary ledgers to the general ledger.

- Complete reconciliation of construction debts at remaining irrigation projects.

Question 23. What progress has been made toward achieving clean annual audits?

Answer: In FY 1999, the Bureau was informed by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that significant improvements have been made in the Bureau's annual audit. It is anticipated that an official report from the OIG will be available by the middle of May, 2000.

Question 24. How will you build into this reorganization process measures of accountability to allow both the Bureau, the Department, and the Congress a mechanism to measure the success or failure of this effort?

Answer: Establishing the new organizational structure of a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget will institutionalize accountability at the highest level in the Bureau. A new office of Policy, Planning and Performance will be instituted under the Deputy Assistant Secretary. For the first time, the programs will have adequate oversight and monitoring in addition to mandatory program reviews. Performance standards of senior managers will be revised to hold them accountable.

BIA/OST Trust Reform

Question 25. Last year the number one Bureau priority was to adequately fund trust reform efforts in both the BIA and the Office of the Special Trustee. This years budget request includes an increase of $35 million for trust programs in BIA. Is this still your highest priority?

Answer: Yes, the requested increase of $35.1 million for trust programs is the Bureau's highest priority. Through FY 2000, Congress has appropriated $133.8 million for trust reform efforts, and in FY 2001, the Office of the Special Trustee has requested $58.4 million to continue implementing the Secretary's HLIP which will update trust systems, policies, practices and procedures and make one-time investments to reduce backlogs. To ensure that these trust reforms are sustained, the Bureau has requested basic funding increases of $35.1 million for several trust programs. The problems being corrected under HLIP are, in part, attributable to inadequate staffing of Bureau trust management functions. Without permanent investments in Bureau trust management staff, the new systems cannot be properly operated, data quality will deteriorate, policies and procedures will not be adhered to and backlogs will reoccur.

Question 26. The Bureau's budget proposes significant increases for real estate services, probate, cadastral survey, and land record improvement activities. Has the Bureau developed long term plans for reducing and eliminating the backlogs that exist in these areas?

Answer: The requested increases for Real Estate Services, Probate, and Land Titles and Records Offices will address critical staff shortages within these program areas. While the proposed increases will reduce backlogs, the additional investments are needed to: (1) sustain trust management improvements being implemented under the Department's High Level Implementation Plan for the Trust Management Improvement Project; and (2) improve the timeliness of real estate services transaction processing (e.g., sales and acquisitions). Inadequate staffing has caused an increasing number of carry over transactions from year to year. Consequently, only those transactions that are time sensitive, critical, and pressing are processed in a given year. The additional staff will assure the timely processing of the transactions.

The requested increase for cadastral surveys under Real Estate Services (Non-Recurring Programs) will be made available to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) through an inter-agency agreement. BLM has by statute the authority to perform surveys of Indian and Federal lands. The majority of Indian lands need to be surveyed to establish the property boundaries. Many Tribal lands require resurveys because of the age of the survey monuments, other were performed by contracted surveyors whose products and services were of poor quality, and some were fraudulent. Annual funding levels of approximately $2 million have provided an estimated 800 miles of surveys. Additional resources are needed to make progress against the backlog of priority work.

Question 27. Please provide an analysis that details the funding streams and time lines associated with eliminating these backlogs.

Answer: The Department's High Level Implementation Plan outlines the funding streams and timelines associated with eliminating identified backlogs in probate, appraisals and trust asset processing backlogs (Bureau data cleanup). The non-Youpee probate backlog is scheduled to be eliminated by December, 2002; and the Youpee backlog is scheduled to be completed by September, 2004. Post-deployment data cleanup for TAAMS is scheduled for completion in 2003. The known appraisal backlog in the Rocky Mountain Region is expected to be eliminated in August, 2000. For cadastral surveys, there is an estimated backlog of $30 million in priority needs.

Because of the condition of the Bureau's existing trust management systems and staff shortages, additional backlogs are likely to be identified as TAAMS is implemented and real estate services transaction processing is improved.

Question 28. In the probate area there was an effort to reengineer how probate cases are processed. What is the status of this effort?

Answer: The Department of the Interior's Indian Probate Reinvention Lab evaluated and redesigned the Indian probate process to ensure timely preparation of cases, adjudication of ownership, and distribution of trust property, so heirs promptly receive trust assets and income to which they are legally entitled. The Lab examined the process from a multi-agency perspective of the Bureau and the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA), focusing initially upon the Bureau. A Departmental Management Advisory Group approved the Lab's recommendations for the first phase of its evaluation in September, 1999. Since the Lab's review of OHA was limited, the Lab recommended that a second phase focus on streamlining the Indian probate process within OHA. The Departmental Management Advisory Group approved the second phase of recommendations in November, 1999.

The Lab recommended redesign of the Department's existing probate program in a manner that would delegate decisions to the lowest level, eliminate non-value added steps, and reduce the processing time from the official notice of death to the issuance of the Administrative Law Judge's decision, from 3-6 years to 18 months. The new system provides two avenues to the potential heirs for expediting probate cases:

- Decisions by Attorney Decision-makers. If the case meets fixed criteria and heirs do not object, the case will be decided by a Bureau attorney decision-maker without a hearing. The Bureau attorney decision-maker will make on-the-record decisions in those cases that meet specific criteria and will be decided without a hearing.

- Decisions by Administrative Law Judges. Cases may go before an administrative law judge (ALJ). Potential heirs and devisees will also be given an opportunity to indicate preferred alternate methods of decision-making by the administrative law judge, including: (1) in-person hearing, (2) on-the-record decision, (3) video conferencing for areas that are difficult to access frequently, and (4) on a limited basis, teleconference.

The Bureau and OHA have worked jointly to develop a master action plan that supports the implementation of the Lab's recommendations. A summary of that action plan is reflected in the Secretary's High Level Implementation Plan. In the meantime, steps have been taken to streamline probate processing, such as the August 24, 1999, *Federal Register* notice which raised the threshold on cash summary distributions from $1,000 to $5,000 for Bureau Superintendent adjudication. Also, in February, 2000, the Bureau drafted regulations that establish the policies and procedures for the Bureau probate program and the duties of the Bureau attorney decision-makers and paralegal specialists.

Question 29. How is your budget request consistent with this reengineering effort?

Answer: Even with a more simplified process, additional staffing and funding resources are required to effectively eliminate the probate backlog and perform ongoing probate functions. To implement the HLIP in FY 2001, the Office of the Special Trustee (OST) has requested a total of $58.4 million, of which $6 million is currently identified for the probate backlog subproject. Additionally, the Bureau is requesting a basic funding increase of $3 million for probate under the Tribal Priority Allocations activity for HLIP implementation and to phase in permanent staffing for the probate program. The 2001 cost estimate for implementing the probate subproject has recently increased due to increased staffing needs and project costs. The Department is currently evaluating FY 2000 and FY 2001 costs for both trust reform and litigation activities to determine if these increased costs (and unbudgeted litigation costs) can be met within existing appropriations and the FY 2001 budget request. The FY 2001 request will be used to annualize costs of new staff scheduled to be hired in FY 2000, including additional Administrative Law Judges, attorney decision-makers, paralegal specialists, and other support staff. Funds will also support the costs of temporary ALJs and/or Indian probate judges to eliminate the Bureau's backlogs in posting probate orders and preparing probate information (presumptive heirs and inventories of trust assets) for OHA for adjudication; and support costs of new OHA offices in Billings, MT, Bismark, ND, Rapid City, SD, and Phoenix, AZ.

Question 30. What is being done in the data cleanup area to ensure some level of accountability i.e., audit of data quality, standard data formats, etc.?

Answer: The Bureau's data cleanup contractor has created an independent data review team that will select a statistically significant sample of each office's data inventory and determine a data readiness index. The index is based on the completeness, timeliness and accuracy of every mandatory field required for the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System (TAAMS). In addition, the Bureau has contracted with an independent observer to audit and verify that the data is being maintained in a proper fashion at selected sites once TAAMS has been implemented. Typically, the audit will occur after a period of six months after the data cleanup contractor has concluded its efforts.

Question 31. What is the Bureau or the Department doing to secure additional administrative law judges per the language carried in last years bill?

Answer: Early in 1999, the Department sought the assistance of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to locate Federal ALJs who could be detailed to OHA to eliminate the probate backlog. OPM surveyed all Federal agencies, and advised OHA that the Social Security Administration (SSA) might have some ALJs that could be made available. After extensive discussion between the two agencies on an interagency detail, the Department learned on February 24, 2000, that the SSA ALJs would not be made available. Accordingly, the Department expects to exercise the language carried in last year's bill to hire temporary Indian probate judges. OHA will be advertising for the temporary Indian probate judges within the next 30 days. The Bureau is drafting the position description for its attorney decision-maker positions that will process Indian probate cases; it is expected that these positions will be recruited in the near future.

Question 32. In addition to the backlog issues, you are proposing an increase of $7.5 million for the Indian Land Consolidation program. Why are you proposing to shift this program from a pilot project to a mature program?

Answer: While the Midwest Region project will continue in FY 2001, the program is being expanded to cover additional activities, including supporting the administrative costs associated with redetermining and redistributing escheated "Youpee" interests; acquiring "Youpee" interests from willing sellers; and potentially expanding the acquisition program to additional reservations. We also anticipate enactment of the Indian Land Consolidation Amendments of 2000 (S.1586) will provide permanent authority for reducing the fractionated ownership of trust lands. Curing the problem of fractionated ownership of allotted Indian lands is absolutely crucial to long-term trust management reform. For these reasons, the Administration has dropped the word "pilot" from the program name.

The Supreme Court ruled in *Youpee v. Babbitt* that the escheat provision of Section 207 of the Indian Land Consolidation Act was unconstitutional. This section provided that interests owned by individual Indians that were less than two percent escheated upon their death to the Tribe having jurisdiction of the land. Due to the Court's ruling, the Secretary of the Interior by Order dated February 19, 1999, directed the Bureau to return the escheated interest from the Tribes to the legal heirs and devisees. Consequently, these escheated interest must be re-distributed to the legal heirs or devisees of the deceased owner. One of the options that will be explored with the increase in funding will be the purchase of the interests from the legal heirs or devisees.

Question 33. How successful was the pilot program?

Answer: The Bureau considers the pilot program under the Midwest Regional Office to have been very successful. When the pilot was established in 1999 on the reservations of the Bad River Band, Lac Courte Orielles Band, and Lac du Flambeau Band, approximately 100,000 fractional interests of 2 percent or less were identified for these reservations. Between April, 1999, and February, 2000, the Bureau acquired 18,956 undivided fractional interests (90 percent of the interests are less than 2 percent) approximating 11,000 acres at a cost of $4.5 million on behalf of the Tribes for the three reservations. Acquisition of these fractional interests should avoid 476 future probates (cost savings of nearly $1 million) and eliminate 198 current IIM accounts (annual cost savings of $8,000 in service bureau costs). Additional savings accrue from avoiding costs associated with further fractionation (probate and IIM systems costs), as reduced costs of land and lease records administration, leasing and sales activities, and non-service bureau costs of trust accounting and investment activities.

Question 34. How are you proposing to allocate funds for the Indian Land Consolidation program in fiscal year 2001 and beyond?

Answer: In FY 2001, funds will continue to be allocated to the Bureau's Midwest Regional Office for continuation of the acquisition of fractional interests on the three reservations that constituted the pilot; administrative costs for purchasing the interests that must be redetermined and redistributed to the legal heirs and devisees pursuant to the Court's ruling; and, potentially expanding the acquisition program to other reservations. Consideration will also be given to expanding the acquisition program beyond FY 2001 as the Bureau believes that it will have

gathered sufficient data from the acquisition program to support implementation of the program to other reservations.

Question 35. What level of resources would be required to have a significant impact on consolidating Indian land holdings?

Answer: It would cost approximately $500 million to eliminate the fractionated ownership problem associated with individually owned trust and restricted lands.

Question 36. Is the Bureau and the Department still seeking legislative language to address the longer-term heirship issues?

Answer: Yes. On November 4, 1999, the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs testified before the Joint Hearing of the House Resources Committee and the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, on S. 1586, the Indian Land Consolidation Act of 1999. This legislative proposal more fully addresses the problems of the fractionated ownership of Indian lands. Its resolution is critical to the economic viability of Indian Country and the successful implementation of the Department of the Interior's ongoing efforts to implement trust reform. The Senate Indian Affairs Committee favorably reported the bill out of Committee on March 22, 2000. The Department supports S.1586 and urges passage by the Congress this year. The Bureau believes that without a legislative resolution of the fractionation problem, the ever quickening growth of fractionation will outpace any efforts to implement meaningful trust reform.

Question 37. From the Bureaus perspective how successful have you been in testing, and implementing the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System (TAAMS)?

Answer: The software vendor has conducted two formal system tests, in September, 1999, and in November, 1999. Those tests indicate steady progress in the reduction of system errors and the continued evolution of TAAMS to meet user needs. It should be noted that because TAAMS is being developed in a prototyping environment, system tests are performed continually by the software vendor. In February, 2000, a thorough User Test was conducted by the Bureau that clearly documents user support for TAAMS. The user test results illustrate that system acceptance increases very quickly as users become more familiar with TAAMS. The User Test also demonstrated a high rate of accuracy on those transactions processed in comparison with the legacy systems. The small number of errors discovered during the User Test related to three areas: (1) system bugs, (2) data errors and (3) missing code tables. Those errors will be corrected prior to deployment being initiated to other sites. A second User Test on April 17 confirmed successful mitigation of these issues.

To ensure that TAAMS has national support, as well as pilot site support, the software has been reviewed by a team of program experts from around the country, including Tribal representatives. A limited number of recommendations have been made which are currently being implemented by the software vendor.

In the Rocky Mountain (Billings) Region pilot, emphasis has shifted from software development to an analysis of the data resident in the TAAMS database. This additional review will ensure

that the first data conversion was completed properly and that all data has been correctly mapped in the pilot site.

Question 38. When do you expect TAAMS to go from the testing stage to the deployment stage?

Answer: A final User Test was conducted in April, 2000, to test cleanup of bugs found in the February, 2000, User Test, to incorporate the final recommendations by the national panel of title experts and to make adjustments to improve the performance of TAAMS. The TAAMS deployment schedule calls for the first deployment occurring in May, 2000, when each Bureau Land Titles and Records Office (LTRO) will have an initial deployment of a limited number of TAAMS licenses. In an April 28, 2000, letter to the Appropriations Committees, the Secretary stated his intention to initiate deployment of the title function at eight LTROs beginning in May, 2000. The plan is to have all LTROs fully deployed by December, 2000.

Deployment consists of the physical installation of TAAMS software on the desktop. Implementation occurs after deployment once the site personnel have thoroughly inspected its data and are comfortable with using TAAMS as the "system of record". It is conceivable that some offices may take longer to implement than others when taking their individual circumstances into consideration. It is expected that this decision will occur in a relatively short period of time in some sites and may take up to 120 days in other sites.

Question 39. What are the results of the latest independent evaluation of the system?

Answer: The independent verification and validation (IV&V) contractor has prepared a list of recommendations and risk mitigation strategies that they believe, if implemented "deployment beyond Billings [now Rocky Mountain Region] could proceed with minimized risk and a reasonable assurance of success." The Bureau has prepared a satisfactory response to these recommendations, and in many cases, had already initiated actions that would meet the recommendations of the IV&V contractor.

An IV&V was performed on the TAAMS disaster recovery program. The recovery test was successful.

Question 40. I understand that that you will be deploying TAAMS in a phased approach. Phase one is the implementation of the land titie records portion of the system. What is he rational for taking such an approach?

Answer: The original deployment plan for TAAMS was designed around the concept of doing a pilot deployment at all the sites in the Billings Area [now Rocky Mountain Region]. The pilot test was to include all functionality to test the system in its entirety. After a successful pilot test, the full deployment would be done geographically by Area over the next two years. Changing deployment to a functional orientation was based on the following benefits:

- A major TAAMS function would be operational nationally (i.e., LTROs) much earlier in the process rather than waiting for all 12 Regional Offices to implement all functions consistently nationwide.

- Simplify data conversion by focusing on Land Records Information System (LRIS) data only. The combined LRIS/IRMS conversion has been the source of many difficulties in the Billings conversion.

- Consolidating the training effort on title functions would allow us to mix staff from a number of offices into the same class.

- Data cleanup will focus on the title data, and the Bureau will be able to provide a more concentrated effort on one singular data set.

- The Bureau would be able to eliminate cost and use of one system (LRIS) early in the TAAMS deployment.

Question 41. With implementation of TAAMS at the Land Title Records Offices are you able to secure qualified personnel to work at these locations.

Answer: There are currently eight Land Title and Records Offices (LTROs) located at Regional Offices. With sufficient funding, the LTROs can hire additional qualified personnel to keep pace with the expanding workload. The Bureau is requesting an increase of $4.8 million in FY 2001 to increase the number, the training, and the skilled title staff.

Question 42. Has the Bureau initiated a TAAMS training program for field personnel?

Answer: The software and service bureau contractor (Artesia Data Systems, a subsidiary of Applied TerraVision Systems) has been conducting training for staff from the Rocky Mountain Regional Office (formerly Billings Area Office) in Dallas, Texas. Based on initial pilot feedback, a new contractor has been retained to enhance the training efforts. The NATEC, Inc. has created and distributed surveys that have provided new insights into the Bureau's training challenges. For example, the Bureau has learned that approximately 25 percent of its staff require some remedial training in the use of "Windows" software. The Bureau has also redesigned the training program to provide some informal pre-training information to trainees to familiarize them with TAAMS concepts and to increase their comfort level once actual hands-on training is initiated. NATEC will also undertake a Bureauwide informational effort to ensure that all employees understand the importance and criticality of TAAMS.

Question 43. Will training occur at both the regional and tribal level?

Answer: Staff from all levels within the Bureau, including Headquarters, Regional Offices, Agencies/Field Offices, and the Tribes, will be required to attend TAAMS training. Training will be adapted for all levels of Bureau staff, including clericals, program staff, mid-level managers, Field Representatives, Superintendents and Regional Directors.

Question 44. The OST budget- includes $250,000 for ITMA, what specific products has/will ITMA produce in support of the trust reform effort?

Answer: The InterTribal Monitoring Association (ITMA) is a Tribal membership organization that provides the Special Trustee with advice on reconciliation of past trust funds activity and

implementation of trust reform. ITMA works with the Office of the Special Trustee as well as the Office of the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs on ongoing and new trust reform issues. Recently, OST and the Bureau requested that ITMA provide assistance and input in the development and the review of the draft Trust Principles and fractionation legislation, as well as provide communication and assistance on trust reform issues to the Tribes.

Question 45. Does OST have sufficient staffing to adequately address trust reform efforts, especially in the areas of accounting and computer services? If not, what resources would be required?

Answer: Assuming that the additional staffing and funds requested in the FY 2001 budget are provided, the OST believes that it will have sufficient staff at the field and operating level to address its trust reform efforts. Personnel are being hired for the immediate Office of the Special Trustee to provide oversight and respond to Departmental and Court requirements. We will continue to examine staffing needs as trust improvement projects are further implemented or as new requirements are identified. Any additional requirements identified as a result of planned staffing studies will be addressed in future budget requests.

The Bureau is also requesting additional funding in FY 2001 in real estate services, probate, cadastral survey, and land record improvement activities to provide for additional staffing to institutionalize and maintain trust improvements. These increases in the Bureau are also critically needed to comprehensively meet trust reform needs (see answer to question 26).

Question 46. What are the costs associated with a full reconciliation of both tribal and IIM accounts going back 100 years?

Answer: Cost estimates to perform full reconciliations for both Tribal and IIM accounts are not currently available. Additionally, what constitutes a "full reconciliation" is subject to a variety of different legal and policy interpretations. While no cost estimates are available on a reconciliation of this scope, the Department spent $21 million reconciling Tribal accounts for the 20 year period from 1972 to 1992. Ultimately, the Tribal reconciliation effort was brought to conclusion to meet deadlines set forth in the Indian Trust Reform Act.

Based on past experience, the Department knows that the costs to locate and reconcile records from earlier time periods is significantly more expensive for IIM accounts. In 1992, in conjunction with the Tribal Reconciliation effort Arthur Anderson provided at the Department's request, an estimate for the costs of performing a reconciliation of the scope contemplated for Tribal accounts. Arthur Anderson estimated that between $108 and $281 million would be needed to complete a similar 20 year IIM account reconciliation. Additional information collected since these estimates were developed indicates that the costs could be well in excess of $300 million. Moreover, in the *Cobell* litigation, plaintiffs contend that the Government is required to perform a common-law style historical accounting that reconciles each credit or debit transaction that was or should have been made to each IIM account from the beginning of the IIM trust. The costs to perform such an accounting, or account reconstruction, would be difficult even to estimate, and would surely vastly exceed the $300 million estimated for a more limited reconciliation.

Question 47. What alternative options is the Department looking at other than a full reconciliation?

Answer: On April 3, 2000, the Department published a notice in the *Federal Register* to gather information from IIM account beneficiaries and the public to determine the most reasonable methods for providing account holders with information to evaluate their accounts and determining whether there are discrepancies due to past management practices.

This notice describes some alternative approaches and invites identification of other constructive alternatives. The Department recognizes it is possible that no single alternative will serve the interests of all types of account holders. Accordingly, an approach could be designed that integrates principles from various alternatives to provide a combined methodology depending on the characteristics of the accounts, including size of the account, region of the country, and nature of the underlying assets producing income for the account.

Examples of Alternatives include:

Transaction-by-Transaction Reconciliation

The most precise and extensive information possible would be developed by attempting to undertake a transaction-by-transaction reconstruction of each account. This would involve attempting to research all transactions that have occurred in each account in order to try to locate documents which could demonstrate each transaction was correct and then applying appropriate verification procedures to the reconstruction. This would be the most time consuming and expensive approach. For example, the Department's experience in the *Cobell* litigation suggests that researching and cataloging the millions of documents that would be required would very likely cost hundreds of millions of dollars and take many years. Furthermore, the reconciliation of over one thousand Tribal accounts in the early 1990's consumed $20 million and left the final amounts still in question due to missing documents and other difficulties encountered in the reconciliation process. Given the enormous scope and costs of an account-by-account, transaction-by-transaction reconstruction, it is likely to be cost prohibitive.

Limited Reconciliation

Another approach could be to perform a more limited reconciliation for a fixed period of time, which would allow some reasonable conclusions to be drawn to apply to the remaining historical period. This is similar to the approach taken by Arthur Andersen for the Tribal reconciliation project. Applying this approach to the IIM accounts would include a search for selected documentation to confirm data that was contained in the electronic systems used from approximately the mid-1980's to the mid-1990's. This information would be used to develop an error rate based on that comparison. This error rate could then be used to estimate whether account holders had experienced losses and to arrive at a formula for compensation. Although this would be less expensive than a search for all transaction documents, there would still be significant costs associated with this process due to the fact that it involves reconstructing accounts for a particular period of time through extensive research (Arthur Anderson estimated the cost of this approach for the IIM accounts as somewhere between $108 million and $281 million).

Sampling

Another approach could involve using statistical sampling to calculate potential losses. One example methodology could be to use a statistically relevant sample of accounts, transactions, or tracts of land to support a reasonable inference about the accuracy of past account transaction activity.

It may also be useful to mix a sampling approach with a more precise transactional analysis based on the general criteria of the likelihood of loss. Under this approach, a sampling methodology could be used for groups of accounts that are unlikely to have many losses (such as accounts which do not have much income) and a more precise, individualized analysis for accounts where the potential for significant loss is greater. For example, a loss amount for accounts with historical annual income of less than $100 may be broadly estimated through sampling, while accounts with annual income over $100,000 may be analyzed on an individual basis. More extensive sampling could be used for accounts in between these ranges.

Analysis of Current Account Data

Another approach might be to use data currently collected and tracked electronically on individual accounts to determine if the past level of account activity is consistent. Since the information that is currently tracked is more extensive and more readily available than information on the past, this analysis would both provide some context for the historical information and allow some conclusions to be drawn as to its accuracy.

Payment Formula

Another approach could be to define a formula to quantify a "rough justice" payment to each account holder. Such a formula could be based on a variety of factors including the amount of money that has flowed through the account each year, the number of years the account has been open, the location of the account, and the type of assets that produced revenue for the account. To counter-balance the lack of precision in this process, the formulas could be weighted to resolve uncertainty in favor of the beneficiary. While this approach lacks precision in determining past losses, the major advantage of this approach is that it is relatively simple to administer, could be done fairly quickly, and would be the least expensive methodology to implement.

Question 48. What is the status of the first law suit dealing with "fixing the system"?

Answer: The case *Cobell v. Babbitt* is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The District Court bifurcated this case into "that aspect which seeks to institute new trust management practices, often referred to as 'fixing the system' and that aspect which seeks to obtain an accounting or approximation thereof and to correct the accounts of the members of the plaintiff class, often referred to as 'correcting the accounts'". The 'fixing the system trial', or trial one, concluded in July, 1999, and the Court issued its order on December 21, 1999. The Court order focused upon the Department's compliance with statutory trust duties embodied in the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (the Act). Specifically, the Court order requires the Department to promptly establish written policies

and procedures to render an accurate accounting of the Individual Indian Monies (IIM) trust in the following four areas: 1) collecting from outside sources missing information; 2) retention of IIM-related trust documents; 3) computer and business systems architecture; and, 4) staffing of trust management functions. Furthermore, the Court relied upon the representations made by government witnesses at trial and the Secretary's High Level Implementation Plan.

To ensure that the Department is diligently taking steps to rectify the breaches that the Court found, the Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter for a period of five years. The Department submits quarterly reports on actions taken to correct the breaches set forth in the Memorandum Opinion of the Court. Plans have been prepared to remedy the four breaches identified by the court, including completing a workforce planning study and developing a systems architecture plan. A revised High Level Implementation Plan was approved in February, 2000, and contains updates on the 11 subproject activities. The Department also reports quarterly to the Court on the progress toward achieving the milestone tasks enumerated in the HLIP. The Court has not yet set a date for trial two, that aspect of the case which deals with "correcting the accounts." Discovery for trial two is ongoing.

Question 49. Why have you appealed part of the judges decision? What is the current status of the appeal?

Answer: On January 3, 2000, the Department of Justice filed a Petition for Permission to Appeal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1292 (b) and Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. In the petition, two controlling questions have been posed to the Court:

> "1. Where the responsible agency has not yet addressed issues regarding the scope and methods of reconciliation and accounting to IIM account holders as required by the 1994 Act, does the Administrative Procedure Act permit a court to declare, in the first instance, that the 1994 Act requires defendants to provide plaintiffs with an accurate accounting of all money in the IIM trust "without regard to when funds were deposited," and to set down remaining accounting issues for a trial, rather than allow the agency to determine these matters, in the first instance, with review to take place upon completion of the agency action?"
>
> "2. Did the district court err in compelling defendants, on the basis of a finding of unreasonable delay, to come into compliance with specific trust reform requirements that are not spelled out in statute?"

On February 14, 2000, the United States Court of Appeals granted permission to appeal, scheduling argument for September, 2000.

General Budget

Question 50. Does your budget request full funds uncontrollable costs?

Answer: The budget request fully funds the increases in the Bureau's uncontrollable costs for GSA Rentals, Intra-Governmental Payments and Pay Raises. However, the January, 2001 pay raise was calculated before the Presidential Policy pay raise amounts were available to the Department of the Interior. The amounts cited in the budget request for pay raise costs were

based on raises of 4.4 percent and 3.9 percent respectively, rather than the actual 4.8 percent for January, 2000 and the President's request of 3.7 percent for January, 2001. The Office of Budget provided the correct amounts to the Appropriations Subcommittees on March 23, 2000. The adjustment resulted in a $353,000 decrease in the Bureau's pay costs.

Question 51. Your budget request proposes an increase of $16 million for the housing improvement program, 105 percent over the 2000 enacted level. What is the rational for such a large increase?

Answer: The Bureau's housing program is a safety-net program that serves the neediest of the needy American Indian and Alaska Native families with substandard living conditions and who have no other resource for housing assistance. In recent years, the HIP has been funded at $18.5 million, which includes approximately $4 million in the Self-Governance line item, annually. This amount represents only about five percent of the current identified need. The FY 2001 request for an additional $16 million would bring the HIP funding level to $34.5 million, including a Self-Governance portion. With the proposed increase, the HIP will be funded at over nine percent of the identified need.

The Bureau believes the HIP housing need is reaching critical levels. As the Bureau switched from housing inventories to eligible applicants, the new data provided the $301 million estimate of HIP needs that was reported in the FY 2001 budget document. Due to the more accurate identification of need and a more efficient distribution system (discussed below), the Bureau is placing a priority on making progress on the housing needs in Indian Country.

The Bureau is implementing a new methodology for the distribution of the HIP funds. Funding was formerly distributed to the Regions based on the total housing inventories, regardless of the need of individuals. Consistent with the Bureau's notices to Tribes in 1999 and 2000, the Bureau is basing the FY 2000 fund allocations solely on eligible applicants. The FY 2000 HIP appropriation will be distributed from Regions to Tribes with identified eligible applicants – housing inventories will not be used as a basis for the distribution. This policy shift is intended to provide housing improvement services more directly to the "neediest of the needy" in Indian Country.

Question 52. What substantive criteria did the BIA use for determining housing improvement needs, other than tribal consultation?

Answer: The Bureau has established program eligibility standards identified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 25 CFR 256. They include: 1) membership in a Federally recognized American Indian or Alaskan Native village; 2) living in an approved Tribal service area; 3) an annual income that does not exceed 125 percent of the Department of Health and Human Services' Poverty Income Guideline; 4) present housing is substandard; 5) the applicant meets specific ownership requirements for the assistance needed; 6) the applicant has no other resource for housing assistance; and, 7) the applicant has not received program assistance after October 1, 1986, for repairs and renovation, replacement, or down payment assistance.

The process for determining program eligibility requires the determination of the type of program service required by the applicant. For purposes of identifying program funding needs, repair and

renovation costs (category B under 25 CFR 256.7) were established based on the program category limit of $35,000 for each applicant requiring this type of service. Replacement and provision of housing costs (category C under 25 CFR 256.7) were established using HUD's Development, Construction and Equipment needs for a two-bedroom dwelling based on the geographic location of each applicant requiring this type of service.

Question 53. What is the relationship between the Bureau and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in terms of providing new housing stock, replacement housing, renovation of old housing stock, and repairs of existing housing units?

Answer: The Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Office of Native American Programs provides housing assistance on Indian reservations through the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA). To the extent possible, HUD provides American Indian and Alaskan Native families with home ownership and low-income rental opportunities. Therefore, grant funds are provided to Federally and non-Federally (State) recognized Tribes.

By contrast, the Bureau's Housing Improvement Program (HIP) provides grant funds to American Indian families that are members of a Federally recognized Tribe. Housing service is provided to Indian families within the exterior boundaries of a reservation (or approved service area) without regard to Tribal affiliation. The HIP is charged with serving the neediest of the needy and serves the very low-income Tribal members that are below HUD's income level requirements for home ownership and who are on waiting lists for subsidized rental housing. Under HIP, to target the very low-income recipients, the annual household income cannot exceed 125 percent of the HHS Poverty Income Guidelines. For example, under HIP, the income of a family of four cannot exceed 125 percent of $16,700, or $20,876, while under income limits established by NAHASDA the income limit for a family of four is $38,250.

HIP provides housing repairs and renovations of existing homes, construction of a modest replacement home, or construction of a modest home for families who do not own a home but have ownership or lease of sufficient land suitable for housing. HUD generally provides funds for new construction, but through the Modernization Program, repair and replacement is also available. While both HIP and HUD provide single family housing for those who can demonstrate that they have a home ownership interest in the unit, HUD also allows multi-family units and usually accommodates rentals. HUD also requires some form of rent (determined by each Tribe) that may not exceed 30 percent of the monthly-adjusted income of such family. The HIP does not require a recipient to pay rent.

Question 54. I see that you intend to build 385 new homes as part the increased funding for HIP. I thought this program provided funds for repair and renovation while HUD provided funds for new homes. Under the HIP program what has been the historical trends for new housing units verses repair and restoration of existing housing units?

Answer: In prior years, the Bureau has concentrated on repair and renovation of existing homes, in an attempt to help a greater number of people. With the new methodology, the Bureau is attempting to assist those most in need, reflecting their housing assistance needs. As the distribution of FY 2000 funds is currently underway, the precise number of repair and

renovations projects versus new and replacement homes in both FY 2000 and FY 2001 is uncertain.

Question 55. Is there greater demand under HIP for new homes, or for repair and renovation of existing housing stock?

Answer: The demand for new and replacement homes verses repair and renovation projects is uncertain for both FY 2000 and FY 2001. However, preliminary information from Tribes indicates that there is a greater need for new and replacement homes.

Question 56. Once again you are proposing to establish a pilot program to repair adult care facilities on the Navajo reservation. Shouldn't this activity be funded through the Indian Health Service?

Answer: The Bureau's Welfare Assistance funds cover the cost of the care of eligible recipients residing in the adult care facilities. The vast majority of the individuals residing in these facilities are mentally and physically handicapped and in need of the institutional and custodial care that is provided by the Bureau's program. These individuals are not receiving medical treatment from the Indian Health Service.

Question 57. Are there other adult care facilities in Indian country that need to be repaired? If so, what costs are associated with these other adult care facilities?

Answer: There are other reservations in Arizona and Nevada that have Bureau-funded adult care facilities. The Bureau decided to initiate the pilot program on the Navajo reservation because the majority of these facilities (35 of the 46 facilities) are located there. The estimated cost to rehabilitate all of the existing adult care facilities is unknown; a survey will need to be completed prior to determination of an estimate.

Question 58. The Committee finds it interesting that the BIA requested an increase of $8 million for contract support costs while the Indian Health Service requested an increase of $40 million. Do you know why there is such a large difference between the two agencies?

Answer: Both the IHS and the Bureau requested additional Contract Support funding for FY 2001 to help Tribes administer contracted programs efficiently and effectively. Contract Support is essential to ensuring Tribes have the resources necessary to build strong and stable Tribal governments and exercise their authority as sovereign nations.

The IHS request for an additional $40 million for contract support costs is needed to provide for new assumptions of IHS programs under self-determination agreements and to increase Contract Support funding payments for existing contracts to meet about 90 percent of the need of eligible costs. The Bureau's request for an additional $8 million in Contract Support funding will allow the Bureau to meet approximately 100 percent of the eligible costs for new contracts and approximately 88 percent of the need for existing contracts. Since IHS Contract Support payments are higher on average than the Bureau payments, due to the different method each agency uses to calculate Contract Support, the FY 2001 IHS funding request for Contract Support is higher than the Bureau's request.

Question 59. Under TPA you have requested an increase of $2.8 million for higher education scholarships. How can the Committee be assured that this increase will in fact be allocated for the scholarship program, and will not be viewed by the tribes as a pot of money that can be reprogrammed to other uses?

Answer: The increase will allow approximately 950 additional students to be awarded financial assistance. The Tribes have the flexibility of shifting funds within their total TPA allocation to meet changing priorities. Tribal Priority Allocations (TPA) is critical to the Tribes' goal of achieving self-determination and economic stability. The present TPA process allows the Tribes to reprogram appropriated funds from one program to another based on Tribally determined priorities. Therefore, the Bureau cannot guarantee that higher education scholarship appropriated funds will not be reprogrammed to any other Tribal program account.

Question 60. In recent discussions with the U.S. Forest Service, the Committee was informed that the Solicitor had issued an opinion that no timber can be harvested from Indian lands unless the tribe has a current forest management plan in place. What are the ramifications of such a decision?

Answer: In enacting the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act of 1990 (NIFRMA), the Congress recognized the need to adequately plan for the long-term management of Indian forest resources. Thus, the Bureau is concerned that timber harvesting will be adversely impacted by the lack of approved forest management plans.

The referenced Solicitor's opinion states that NIFRMA requires that a forest management plan be completed. The opinion notes, however, that failure to harvest and sell timber because a plan has not been completed may be inconsistent with the Bureau's trust responsibility with regard to management of Indian forest resources. To assist Tribes which do not yet have a plan or have only an outdated plan, the Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs has issued a new policy allowing the acceptance of abbreviated interim plans and allowing the extension of existing plans. This includes an expanded effort to consolidate partnership opportunities with other Federal and State agencies that can assist with planning needs.

Question 61. For some tribes timber production is an important source of income for economic development. Therefore, if tribes with timber resources need forest management plans, why is this not included in the your budget request?

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 budget requests $38.4 million for Tribes' forestry programs, including $21 million in Tribal Priority Allocations and $16.4 million in Non-Recurring Programs. These funds are available to support forest planning, management, development, and other related activities.

Question 62. What level of resources would be required to fully address this problem?

Answer: The FY 1999 Status of Forest Management Inventories and Planning Report documents a recurring annual funding need of $6.9 million to satisfy the minimum planning mandate of the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act of 1990.

Question 63. I understand that the Bureau has requested assistance from USDA's Forest Service to help secure resources for the development of forest management plans. What is the status of this effort?

Answer: In cooperation with the Forest Service, the Bureau is exploring the possibility of assisting Tribes in planning through the Forest Stewardship Program (FSP). The Forest Service is currently working on new policy direction on the Stewardship program in order to facilitate more assistance to the Tribes, but it must also be recognized that the Forest Service does not have sufficient funding in the FSP to meet Tribal needs. To better serve the Tribes through the FSP, an amendment to the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 may be necessary.

Additionally, the Bureau has explored partnerships with several Federal and State agencies as well as the private sector to find ways to efficiently and effectively address the need for Indian forest resource planning. Through this effort, the Bureau's Office of Trust Responsibilities has established a mutually beneficial interagency agreement with the USDA's Forest Management Service Center in Fort Collins, Colorado. The Service Center is responsible for national development, maintenance, and user training of the Forest Services' Forest Vegetation Simulator model.

Question 64. What level of resources do you believe the Forest Service can dedicate to this effort?

Answer: Under the agreement, as outlined in the previous response to question 63, Tribes and Bureau field offices have direct access to state-of-the-art forest computer modeling assistance.

Law Enforcement

Question 65. This is the third year you are requesting significant increases ($18 million) for your law enforcement program. With this increase the total law enforcement program would be over $157 million. What is the total need cost associated with this program?

Answer: On January 20, 1998, the President received from the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General a report entitled, *Report of the Executive Committee for Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvements - Final Report to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior*. The *Report* was prepared after a series of consultation sessions with Tribal leaders. It described the state of law enforcement in Indian Country and recommended options to improve what it described as a "public safety crisis" in Indian Country.

The report identified the single most glaring problem for law enforcement in Indian Country as a shortage of resources. The *Report* calls for a funding level of $585 million to make public safety services in Indian Country comparable to the rest of America. The *Report* also calls for 4,290 sworn officers. Today, there are 2,380 officers due, in part, to the Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing (COPS) grant program which has provided 1,100 officers in the past few years. While progress has been made, the COPS program provides competitive grants for a period of only three years. Once the COPS grants expire and if Tribes are not financially able to pick up the costs, the number of sworn officers will decrease.

Question 66. How will these funds be allocated to the field?

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 budget includes a $16.0 million program increase for the law enforcement initiative. This increase would be allocated in the following manner: $5.5 million to hire 100 additional police officers, $1.5 million to hire 50 dispatchers, $4.0 million to hire 125 detention officers, and $5.0 million to convert police radio equipment to narrow band systems.

The Bureau's law enforcement funds will be made available directly to existing Tribal contracts, Tribal self-governance compacts, and to Bureau-operated law enforcement programs. The Bureau's Office of Law Enforcement Services conducted a law enforcement needs assessment earlier this fiscal year with input from Tribes. The results determined that many Tribal and Bureau programs had only one to three officers to provide 24-hour service. Most Tribal and Bureau jails were being operated with one person serving as jailor, dispatcher, cook and receptionist. Hundreds of police vehicles had in excess of 100,000 miles and many officers carried outdated weapons, with few officers being issued bullet-proof vests. Since nearly every law enforcement program has a serious shortage, the Bureau distributes the funds as widely as possible using distribution factors such as Tribal enrollment, land base, crime statistics, and current staffing levels.

Question 67. I see that the Department of Justice (DOJ) is requesting $34 million for detention center construction. What percentage of the total need does this represent?

Answer: The Department of Justice (DOJ) is requesting $34 million for Indian Country detention center construction in FY 2001. These funds would be used to help offset Tribal detention facilities replacement and repair costs and not for the 34 Bureau-owned and -operated detention facilities. The Bureau had a needs assessment performed in 1995-1996 of the 34 Bureau owned and operated facilities, which indicated a need of $113 million to rehabilitate 21 facilities and replace 13 facilities. The Tribally-owned facilities have not been assessed and thus, at present, there is no way of knowing their total need. However, we assume that Tribal detention facilities do have a great need. Funding provided by DOJ for its selected Tribal projects covers less than half of the cost of construction; Tribes are required to come up with the balance of funds. Essentially, those Tribes that cannot afford matching funds will not receive DOJ grants funds. In many cases, these are the Tribes with a great need for new facilities.

Question 68. Are the construction funds allocated to the highest-priority construction projects similar to the way school construction is funded?

Answer: DOJ administers its competitive detention center construction grant program to Tribes based on its own determination of criteria for funding. In FY 1999, DOJ provided a total of $34 million for 11 construction projects; the grants provided less than one-half of the needed construction funding cost. Tribes must provide funds for the balance from other sources. For FY 1999, the Bureau's 1993 priority list for detention center construction was considered by DOJ but funding was based on DOJ's ranking criteria and did not follow the Bureau's ranking order.

Question 69. Are any DOJ construction funds being allocated to detention centers that are owned by the BIA? If not, how does the Bureau intend to address these unfunded needs?

Answer: While DOJ funds Tribal detention projects through its grant program, the Bureau is not eligible for these grants as another Federal agency. Unless the Bureau is provided funds for detention center construction in its appropriations, there are no funds available to address the 34 Federally-owned detention facility needs.

Question 70. How successful have your efforts been in reducing the crime rate in Indian country? Please provide statistics by category.

Answer: From 1998 to 1999, the overall crime rate in Indian Country has risen 8.7 percent. This rise in crime is based on a number of factors. The number of new officers provided through the *Presidential Initiative* have begun to make an impact in Indian Country by making more arrests. Further, since some DOJ grant programs are tied to crime reporting, numerous Tribes have improved their reporting of crimes. Better reporting may be partially responsible for the reported crime increase. The Bureau anticipated an increase in the crime rate before any reduction could be realized. The consolidated Bureau/Tribal law enforcement 1998 and 1999 Annual Law Enforcement Program Report is being provided which outlines crime statistics by category.

The Bureau's GPRA performance materials contain several law enforcement goals. For example, in FY 2001, the Bureau plans to reduce the Indian Country crime rate from 2,323 crimes per 10,000 inhabitants to 2,300 crimes per 10,000 inhabitants. To accomplish this annual goal, the Bureau will track the number of officers hired, the percentage of cases cleared, and the number of personnel trained at the Indian Police Academy. Another example is the Bureau's FY 2001 goal to strengthen the capacity of Tribal courts by implementing a three-stage plan. To accomplish this goal, the Bureau is tracking the number of training sessions provided, developing better funding criteria, and conducting assessments of Courts of Indian Offenses.

Question 71. The Bureau has requested an additional $1.3 million for Tribal Courts. How will these funds be distributed under the TPA line item?

Answer: The additional $1.3 million requested for Tribal Courts will be used to implement provisions in the Indian Tribal Justice Act, specifically:

- In partnership with the National Indian Tribal Court Judges Association, $200,000 will be used to initiate Tribal judicial conferences, 25 U.S.C. 3614;

- The remaining $1.1 million will be used for base support funding for Tribal justice systems, including Courts of Indian Offenses, 25 U.S.C. 3613. Funds will be equally distributed among Federally recognized Tribes currently receiving court funds through the Tribal Priority Allocation process. These funds may be used for the purposes set forth in Section 3613(b), and funds earmarked for Tribes served by Courts of Indian Offenses will be used by the Bureau to improve those courts.

Question 72. I understand that there is a real need in Indian country for tribal court facilities. Do you know the what the level of demand is for court houses?

Answer: There are over 275 Tribal Courts throughout Indian Country. Most Tribal Court facilities were built in the 1970s, need either renovation or replacement, and do not meet

Department of the Interior
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1998 & 1999 Annual Law Enforcement Program Report

Part One Offenses	1998 Total Number of Actual Offenses	1999 Total Number of Actual Offenses	% Change 1998 vs 1999
HOMICIDE			
- Murder and non-negligent manslaughter	93	118	26.9%
- Manslaughter by negligence	81	63	-22.2%
FORCIBLE RAPE			
- Rape by force	456	488	7.0%
- Attempt to commit forcible rape	67	115	71.6%
ROBBERY			
- Firearm	55	70	27.3%
- Knife or cutting instrument	39	16	-59.0%
- Strong-arm; hands, fists, feet, etc.	159	100	-37.1%
- Other dangerous weapon	7	10	42.9%
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT			
- Firearm	290	725	150.0%
- Knife or cutting instrument	284	383	34.9%
- Other dangerous weapon	507	929	83.2%
- Hands, fists, feet, etc.	5,390	6,624	22.9%
BURGLARY			
- Forcible entry	3,846	4,126	7.3%
- Unlawful entry, no force	544	663	21.9%
- Attempted forcible entry	168	688	309.5%
LARCENY - THEFT (except motor vehicles)	6,685	7,157	7.1%
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT			
- Autos	1,539	1,866	21.2%
- Trucks and buses	59	125	111.9%
- Other vehicles	68	106	55.9%
ARSON			
- Structural	341	337	-1.2%
- Mobile	16	23	43.8%
- Other	63	161	155.6%
TOTALS	20,757	24,893	19.9%

Department of the Interior
Bureau of Indian Affairs
1998 & 1999 Annual Law Enforcement Program Report

Other than Part I Offenses	1998 Total Number of Offenses	1999 Total Number of Offenses	% Change 1998 vs 1999
Assaults (no weapons)	9,687	12,250	**26.5%**
Forgery/Counterfeiting	427	775	**81.5%**
Fraud	645	842	**30.5%**
Embezzlement	183	176	**-3.8%**
Stolen Property (Buying, Receiving, Possessing)	2,702	3,420	**26.6%**
Vandalism	9,675	10,833	**12.0%**
Weapons (carrying, possessing, etc.)	2,084	3,200	**53.6%**
Prostitution/Commercialized vice	16	17	**6.3%**
Sex Offenses	1,539	1,707	**10.9%**
Drug Abuse Violations (sell, manufacture, possess)	4,381	5,521	**26.0%**
Gambling	41	24	**-41.5%**
DWI	15,967	16,735	**4.8%**
Liquor Laws	11,652	11,674	**0.2%**
Drunkenness	48,545	40,713	**-16.1%**
Disorderly Conduct	20,493	22,711	**10.8%**
ARPA Violations	22	16	**-27.3%**
All other Offenses	161,796	190,554	**17.8%**
Suspicion	12,202	6,599	**-45.9%**
Curfews/Loitering - 18 Age	5,715	4,467	**-21.8%**
Runaways - 18 Age	3,394	3,617	**6.6%**
TOTALS	**311,166**	**335,851**	**7.9%**

requirements under present law enforcement/judicial mandates. Tribes have utilized Economic Development funding to build police department and judicial services facilities and have also used bond financing and borrowed private funds in isolated cases. In addition, certain Tribes have rental space for their Tribal Court staff in municipal facilities because Tribal facilities are not Bureau-owned/maintained. The Bureau does not have inventories and cost estimates for new construction, renovation, and maintenance.

Education

Question 73. The Bureau provided a report card for 1998 that showed improvement in key statistics on student performance from the previous year. Do these indicators show an improvement in student performance for 1999?

Answer: School report cards are developed by schools at the end of each School Year (SY). The Bureau completed an analysis for the school report cards for FY 1998 (SY 1998-1999) April 07, 2000. In order to show overall improvement, the number of students scoring in the "proficient" level of performance must increase from one year to the next. An analysis of the 173 school report cards submitted for SY 1998-99 indicates that students scoring in the "proficient" level of performance in math was 43 percent, compared with 41 percent in SY 1997-98. For Language Arts, the percentage of students scoring in the "proficient" level remained consistent at 41 percent for SY 1997-98 and SY 1998-99.

An indicator such as Accreditation, indicates that in SY 1997-98, 96 percent of Bureau schools were accredited, compared to SY 1998-99 where 98 percent or 169 schools were accredited. The Bureau is working with the non-accredited schools to assist them in obtaining accreditation. Another indicator, Average Daily Attendance Rate, improved from 90 percent in SY 1997-98 to 91 percent for SY 1998-99. The indicator Yearly Enrollment Retention Rate, also improved from 95 percent in SY 1997-98 to 99 percent in SY 1998-99.

Question 74. Once again you are proposing a significant funding increase in school operations based on anticipated increases in enrollment. Yet, student enrollment declined in 1998 and again in 1999. Why then does the Bureau expect increases in FY 2001?

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 request for school operations seeks several program increases to meet distinct program needs. The $16.8 million increase for ISEP will help the Bureau meet the estimated .5 percent increase in student enrollment for SY 2001-2002. The ADM and WSU count for SY 1999-2000 decreased slightly due to the Bureau's more stringent enforcement of school attendance boundaries and verification of student eligibility criteria. The requested ISEP increase would also be used to match the teacher pay scale adopted for the Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS), authorized by the Department of Defense Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act. The DoDDS pay scale is used as an incentive for Bureau-funded schools to recruit and retain quality teachers at isolated, remote locations. The $2.2 million increase in transportation is needed to upgrade vehicles to meet national and State transportation standards, to fund mandated bus driver training, certification and to fuel buses which travel more than 15.5 million miles per year. The school operations funding request also includes increases for administrative cost grants, to meet 80 percent of the need, education facilities operations, and 2 early childhood development programs.

Question 75. The proposed increase for the ISEP will provide $3,685 per weighted student unit. How does this compare to non-Indian schools?

Answer: According to the Department of Education's 1999 Digest of Education Statistics, the actual total expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance was $6,962 in School Year 1995-96 and $7,299 in School Year 1996-97. If the Bureau's ISEP funding total was simply divided by the number of students, the Bureau's actual expenditure per pupil would have been $5,436 ($259,013,000/ 47,646) in School Year 1995-96 and $5,341 ($262,833,000/49,213) in School Year 1996-97.

However, weighted Students Units (WSUs) do not equate to the per pupil funding approach utilized by most public schools. The Bureau's funding formula for core instructional programs – the Indian Student Equalization Program (ISEP) - assigns different educational activities and grade levels different weights, which reflect the relative costs associated with various programs. This formula approach helps ensure that students with special needs (i.e.: Intense Bilingual and Gifted and Talented) receive a proportionately greater amount of funding. Therefore, while the Bureau takes into consideration the number of students being served, its method of using weighted factors necessitates the use of great caution when making comparisons with public school funding.

A second difficulty with comparing the Bureau's student funding to public school per pupil funding is determining the specific costs to take into consideration. The Bureau's ISEP program funds core instructional costs in the 185 Bureau-funded schools. Several other programs in the Bureau's budget provide education-related funding as well, for items such as transportation, scholarships and early education programs.

Additional problems that surface when trying to compare public and Bureau expenditures per student concern the unique programs and requirements of Bureau-funded schools, such as:

- Bureau-operated schools are required by statute to pay their teachers according to the salary schedule for the Department of Defense Dependents Schools.

- The majority of Bureau-funded schools are small schools located in rural locations, far from one another. The remote location reduces the economy of scale public school systems usually enjoy, and leads to greater costs in many areas, including student transportation and food service.

- The Bureau's school system operates dormitories that serve approximately 20 percent of the 50,000 students.

In summary, comparing the Bureau's ISEP funding to public school expenditures is problematic. The Bureau-funded schools provide unique services and have unique regulations.

Question 76. Your budget request for education programs includes an increase of approximately $15 million for the early childhood development program, a 268 percent increase? What is happening in Indian country that would call for such a large increase?

Answer: The increase is actually designed for two initiatives the Bureau is requesting funds to implement that it firmly believes will improve student achievement, student retention rates, and overall success rates of its students.

The first initiative is a $6.8 million increase that will allow the Bureau to expand the Family and Child Education (FACE) program from 22 to 44 schools. The FACE program was started in 1990 based on research that demonstrated for each dollar spent on early childhood and family literacy programs, six dollars were saved on remediation, welfare, and teen pregnancy. It is a two dimensional education program that provides services such as early childhood educational programs to start children with the best possible skills in life, while parents are provided training to help enhance their parenting skills, education and literacy. The current FACE programs have demonstrated measurable improvement in student readiness for entry into kindergarten and first grade.

The second initiative requests $8.2 million to implement the Therapeutic Residential Model (TRM) pilot at six sites. These sites will be comprised of two on-reservation residential facilities, two off-reservation residential facilities, and two peripheral dormitories. These residential facilities enroll a large population of students who are considered high risk. Many of these students have been exposed to physical abuse and neglect, have abused drugs, alcohol, and have engaged in unsafe behavior. In some schools, as many as 80 percent of the students are on probation from the juvenile court system, 40 percent or more are chemically dependent, and the majority of these students are children of alcoholics and from dysfunctional families. Given the current funding levels, the boarding schools do not have the human resources to meet the critical and diverse needs of these students. In fact, each school is funded as though it does not enroll high-risk students. As a result, the high-risk students are not provided appropriate care. The Bureau is proposing to start the six pilot sites in FY 2001 that will provide mental health personnel as well as social workers, health care personnel, and support staff to meet the holistic needs of the high-risk students. The staff will be comprised of nurses, counselors, social workers, clinical psychologists, and trained residential support staff. The staffing will reflect each school's student population. The provision of appropriate staff and clinical personnel will provide the compensatory assistance that could bring achievement levels closer to normal norms and prepare students for post secondary education or employment. It is estimated that a small school of 200 students will require approximately an additional $700,000, while a large boarding school will require over $2 million to implement a pilot TRM program.

Question 77. Do the schools receive any early childhood funding through the Department of Health and Human Services or through the Department of Education or is the entire program funded through the Bureau?

Answer: The Bureau does not receive early childhood funding from either the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Education for funding the initiative. The FACE initiative is funded exclusively by the Bureau.

Question 78. I see that approximately $8 million is in your budget to develop a new pilot program for a "therapeutic residential model". Why is there a need for a new program for students that are in on-and-off reservation dormitory settings?

Answer: The Therapeutic Residential Model will be piloted at six sites. These residential facilities enroll a large population of students who are considered high risk. Many of these students have been exposed to abuse and neglect, have abused drugs, alcohol, and have engaged in unsafe behavior. In some schools, as many as 80 percent of the students are on probation from the juvenile court system, 40 percent or more are chemically dependent and the majority of these students are children of alcoholics and from dysfunctional families. Given the current funding levels, the boarding schools do not have the resources to meet the critical and diverse needs of these students. In fact, each school is funded as though it does not enroll high-risk students. As a result, high-risk students are not provided appropriate care. With the TRM, selected facilities will be able to provide mental health personnel as well as social workers, health care personnel, and support staff to meet the holistic needs of the high-risk students. The staff will be comprised of nurses, counselors, social workers, clinical psychologists, and trained residential support staff. The staffing will reflect each school's student population. The provision of appropriate staff and clinical personnel will provide the compensatory assistance that could bring achievement levels closer to normal norms and prepare students for post secondary education or employment.

Question 79. You are requesting a $4 million increase in administrative cost grants. Is this request being proposed so that the Navajo Nation can compact or contract out the remaining schools on its reservation? If not, how will these funds be allocated?

Answer: No. The increase is not specifically for the Navajo Nation to grant the remaining schools located on its reservation, however, the availability of funding in Administrative Cost Grants and in ISEP have considerable influence on decisions made by Tribes/School Boards.

The Bureau anticipates 12 additional schools will convert to grant status over the next two years. The current funding level for FY 1999 (SY 1999-00) is at approximately 84 percent of the formula need. The requested increase in FY 2001 will allow the Bureau to fund approximately 80 percent of the need identified by the Administrative Cost Grant formula, provided that there are no additional requests for converting to Grant status other than those already identified.

Question 80. How many schools have made a firm commitment to contract or compact out their schools in fiscal year 2000 and 2001?

Answer: Presently there are two schools that have made a commitment to contract/grant, one for FY 2000 and one in FY 2001. It should be noted that, historically, schools decide to convert to grant status in late spring of each year, therefore the exact number is not known at this time. The Bureau anticipates an additional 12 schools will contract or grant for school operations over the next two years. For SY 2001-2002, the Bureau projects that 133 schools will be operated under contract or grant status.

Question 81. There is an increase of $2.9 million for the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges. How will these funds affect the per student funding level?

Answer: Title I provides funding to all 24 Bureau-funded Tribally Controlled Community Colleges and is based upon the Indian Student Count (ISC). Title II provides funding to Dine Community College and is based upon need. Historically, Titles I and II have received approximately a 75/25 percent split respectively of funding.

An increase of Title I appropriations for operational grants to Tribal Colleges and Universities will result in an increase from the FY 2000 level of $3,439 per Indian Student Count (ISC) to approximately $3,540 per ISC in FY 2001, based on an expected 5 percent increase in the ISC.

Question 82. The Committee is very concerned that the Bureau is not providing adequate oversight during student count week? Has the Bureau developed a common policy to address this oversight issue?

Answer: The Bureau agrees that it does not provide sufficient oversight of $352 million appropriated for ISEP and Student Transportation. The Bureau's Office of Indian Education Programs (OIEP) has developed the "Indian Equalization Program Student Membership Certification and Review Guide" and is developing a more stringent student certification process. OIEP provides a standard process of training school administrators in proper procedures for the student count prior to the actual student count period in the fall. A series of training sessions will be held this fall for all school administrators and Education Line Officers. In addition, OIEP has a formal process for the student count verification of the student count data provided through a post audit validation. OIEP has initiated a three-year cycle whereby each year one third of the schools will receive a 100 percent audit of student count by the responsible Education Line Officer, thus assuring that every school will receive a 100 percent audit every three years. OIEP is also considering cross-auditing of schools by Education Line Officers. Beginning in SY 2000-01, OIEP will be initiating a second review and audit of ISEP student count by having a 10 percent sample completed for each of the schools that have received a 100 percent audit.

Question 83. Do you have the authority to oversee student counts at contract or compact schools?

Answer: Yes, the Bureau has the authority for the student count certification process for all Bureau-funded schools.

Question 84. For the record please provide examples that demonstrate student count problems that are in need of Bureau oversight?

Answer: As a result of more emphasis being placed on conducting accurate student count certifications this past school year, the following problems were identified and addressed by the Bureau:

- Schools count 100 percent of their students in Intense Bilingual, Gifted/Talented, and Exceptional Child programs (Special Education). (The possibility of 100 percent of a student body being both educationally handicapped and Gifted/Talented is so remote as to be impossible, as is the likelihood of all students being appropriately placed in every program).

- Residential Schools counting 100 percent of their student home living enrollment for Intense Residential Guidance funding.

- Schools counting students enrolled in public schools as being enrolled in their school.

- Schools falsifying student transportation mileage.

- Schools counting students for Special Education services but failing to provide the services.
- Schools operating academic programs for only 175 days but being funded for 180 days of school.
- Schools enrolling and counting students outside of established attendance boundaries.
- Schools counting students that were not in attendance during count week.
- Schools putting both academic and residential students into the dorms for one night in count week to increase residential numbers.
- Schools operating between three and five nights of residential programs but receiving funding for seven nights.

The regulations for the Indian School Equalization Formula student eligibility are in the process of being reissued to strengthen the accountability for student eligibility in the following manner:

- Requiring attendance by students one week before and one week following the designated count week; the current requirement is attendance for only one day during count week.
- Pro-rating funding for students who are counted for residential funding to allow for funding based on the number of days the student actually receives services; the current requirement is attendance in a residential program for only one night during count week. (The residential component was originally established for a seven night per week program. Some schools are providing residential services for as little as three, four, or five nights while other schools are providing services seven nights per week).
- Pro-rating funding for academic programs of less than 180 days unless they meet the total hours of instruction for 180 days of school.
- Consolidating Intense Residential Guidance (IRG) into the residential base and requiring that each school develop and implement a Comprehensive Residential Resource Plan (CRRP) for the Dorms. This will form the foundation for the TRM initiative.
- Consolidating Bilingual into the Academic base.
- Placing a cap on Gifted/Talented not to exceed the national average as computed by the Department of Education.

Question 85. Last year numerous questions were raised about construction practices at the LacCourte Orreilles school. What have you done to assure that the types of problems that occurred at this school never happens again?

Answer: In response to the questions raised during the FY 2000 appropriations hearing and a March, 1999, audit report (No. 99-I-363), the Bureau has incorporated the following criteria to

strengthen the eligibility determination process: pre-assess the grantee's risk rating; establish payment schedules based upon grantee qualifications and demonstrated performance; implement on-site quarterly inspections; and, provide specialized training to the grants officers responsible for monitoring construction grants. On May 14, 1999, the *Plan to Ensure the Integrity of School Construction Grants* was provided to the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, which includes more detail on how the recommendations will be implemented to improve the administration and monitoring of construction grants. Specific legislative amendments were recommended in this plan.

Question 86. Are there legislative impediments that prevent the Bureau from holding schools accountable for there actions, and to allow for Bureau oversight?

Answer: The Bureau's ability to assure that Tribal and school boards are held accountable for the use of Federal appropriated funds and program accomplishments have been limited as a result of language contained in *Public Law 93-638* and *Public Law 100-297*. This legislation outlines the Bureau's authority to negotiate and monitor construction projects and annual operations and maintenance programs. However, as a result of the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies' 1998 inquiry regarding the Lac Courte Oreilles School construction project, a report entitled *Plan to Ensure the Integrity of School Construction Grants* was developed and submitted to the Congress in May, 1999. The *Plan* identified a number of administrative actions the Bureau planned to take in strengthening control over the construction grant process. This approach depends on Tribal collaboration. The plan has been implemented. Also contained in the *Plan* was a section entitled "Congressional Action Required" which contained specific language changes to existing *Public Law 100-297* school grant legislation.

Public Law 100-297 also prohibits the Bureau from developing regulations that would permit the Bureau to develop education program oversight and accountability for grant schools. The legislation limits the Bureau's oversight of grant schools to an annual report that essentially provides for financial accountability only. It is the Bureau's position that all Bureau-funded schools need to be held to high standards. This can only be accomplished by conducting comprehensive reviews at each school to determine the effectiveness of the delivery of the quality of the education program and support services received by the children served. The annual report does not measure the quality of the education program. The most important education measures such as achievement, retention, and drop out rate are not addressed by the Single Audit Act, yet these performance indicators are at the core of a school's mission.

Question 87. What does the Bureau do if a tribe fails to file under the Single Audit Act?

Answer: A number of steps are taken beginning with a notification to the Tribe that sanctions will be imposed if their audit is not received within a specified period of time. If the delinquency is not corrected, the Bureau eliminates the option of advance lump-sum payments and puts the Tribe on a monthly payment schedule. If the situation remains unresolved, all Contract Support payments are withheld.

Question 88. Does the Bureau analyze the information in the Single Audit Act reports, and if so, what does it do with this analysis?

Answer: The Office of Audit and Evaluation reviews each of the audit reports and frequently identifies issues that were inadequately addressed in the auditor's report. The results of this review are sent to the Tribe and to the awarding official for response and resolution.

Question 89. Do Single Audit Act reports provide enough information to the Bureau from an accountability and oversight perspective?

Answer: The Single Audit reports alone do not provide sufficient information, nor are they designed to be the only accountability and oversight mechanism. The audits are not due until nine months after the close of the grantee's fiscal year, therefore, the information is not timely. Further, the audit reports provide no information as to program accomplishments. To address the timeliness of financial information, most grantees are required to submit quarterly financial reports to the awarding official. Program performance reports and on-site visits by the awarding officials are also used to ensure that the objectives of the awards are being met.

Education Construction

Question 90. What is the status of the Bureau's deferred maintenance backlog?

Answer: As of January, 2000, the estimated cost to repair and improve all existing Bureau facilities was over $1 billion. Included in this estimate was approximately $802 million for education facilities, $56 million for law enforcement facilities, $72.2 million for general administration facilities, and $100.2 million for all Bureau employee quarter facilities. These estimates are dynamic since the Bureau's Facilities and Construction Operations and Maintenance (FACCOM) system is frequently updated as field users complete projects and discover new deficiency items. In addition, a contractor has completed 100 percent of the physical on-site backlog validation of existing structures and is now in the process of estimating the cost to repair and improve the deficiencies identified during the on-site validation. The backlog estimate of over $1 billion reflects approximately 25 percent of the validation estimates and the remaining cost estimates are anticipated to be completed by the contractor by the end of FY 2000. Also, this estimate does not include any replacement school construction costs. Therefore, the $1 billion estimated backlog is considered low and a more accurate number will be available at the end of FY 2000.

Question 91. What is the status of BIA's conversion from FACCOM to FMIS?

Answer: The operational delivery for the base system and the Facilities Management Information System (FMIS) is scheduled for the third quarter of FY 2000. Training and implementation of the base system will begin in the fourth quarter of FY 2000. Field installation, system maintenance, and training will continue in FY 2001. As FMIS is implemented, further enhancements to the base system will be incorporated during FY 2001 to increase the capabilities of the system. FACCOM will remain operational throughout the conversion to FMIS; it will cease operation when the new FMIS is fully deployed.

Question 92. In January, 2000, the BIA issued a new priority list for school replacement construction. What was the process for determining this new list?

Answer: In 1998, the Bureau began preparations for developing a new Education Facilities Replacement Construction Priority List, including the acceptance and evaluation of applications from Tribes who wished to have schools placed on the priority list. Schools placed on the List as of FY 1993, that were not fully funded for construction by FY 2000, specifically projects 13, 15, and 16, did not have to submit applications for ranking on the new Priority List and are retained in order at the top of the new Priority List as projects 1 through 3.

The Bureau published a notice in the *Federal Register* on November 17, 1998, (63 FR 63942) requesting comments on the draft revised instructions and criteria, entitled "Instructions and Application for Replacement School Construction, 1999." The new instructions governed the priority ranking process for construction of replacement education facilities and the criteria used in ranking applications. Comments were received relating to administrative requirements and responsibilities; definitions of ranking criteria; evaluation of applications; and cost sharing. The comments were reviewed and incorporated into the final instructions and criteria as appropriate by a team comprised of Tribal representatives and Bureau employees from the Bureau's Office of Indian Education Programs and the Office of Facilities Management and Construction. The Bureau proceeded with using the final revised application instructions and criteria on February 26, 1999. Copies of the final revised instructions and criteria were sent to all Bureau schools and schools that receive Bureau funds under contract or grant. The Bureau held Tribal consultation meetings on the revised process. The Bureau's Education Line Officers offered training to applicants at all schools under their administrative jurisdiction on how to complete applications using the revised instructions and ranking criteria. Tribes and Bureau-funded school boards received advance written notices of training session dates, times, and locations for Tribes and schools under their jurisdictions. The Bureau published another notice in the *Federal Register* (64 FR 14936) on March 29, 1999, calling for applications based on the revised instructions and ranking criteria. The Bureau accepted applications beginning June 28, 1999, and used the criteria in the revised instructions to review and evaluate all applications that were received on or before the deadline of July 16, 1999. After the application period closed, a 12-member Replacement of School Evaluation Committee, comprised of officials from the Bureau, Tribes, the Department of Education, and the Department of Defense, reviewed 105 applications and ranked 96 applications. These applications were ranked according to the new criteria and 10 schools were placed on the FY 2000 Priority List. Thirteen schools are now listed in the Education Facilities Replacement Construction Priorities List as of FY 2000 which was published in the *Federal Register* (Volume 65, Number 20) on January 31, 2000.

Question 93. The Bureau is requesting an increase of $63 million for replacement school construction. This funding level would complete construction of the remaining schools on the old priority list, and three schools from the new list for a total of six schools. Given the historically large unobligated balances carried forward in the construction account, how can you ensure the Committee that you can construct these six schools during fiscal year 2001?

Answer: Since much of the construction funding would be provided to Tribes through grant or contracting authority and since additional funding was requested for construction management staff the Bureau believes this funding would be obligated in a timely manner. The construction awards on four of the six schools requested in the President's FY 2001 budget will be implemented through *Public Law 100-297* school grants or *Public Law 93-638* self-determination

contracts/compacts. The Tribes and Tribal organizations are able to implement design and construction faster than the Bureau since it is the only school project they are managing. The Bureau has been managing multiple projects with limited staff resources. The facilities staff was severely impacted by the FY 1996 Reduction-In-Force action caused by budgetary reductions. The Bureau's FY 2001 request includes an increase in the Construction account for program management to hire 20 FTE to assist in the increased construction and operations and maintenance program activities associated with the funding increase requested in Education Construction. To be able to accelerate school replacement, make progress on reducing the backlog for construction and facilities improvement and repair programs, and ensure adequate contract, grant, and compact monitoring, increased staff is critical. The additional FTE would also allow the Bureau to continue to improve the monitoring of *Public Law 100-297* Tribally controlled school grants and *Public Law 93-638* contracts.

Question 94. Given the extreme length of time it took to finish the schools on the old construction priority list, why would you propose to fully fund six schools in FY 2001, when you could fund twice as many if you adopted a phased approach? How many schools could be constructed if the schools were phased in over a two year period?

Answer: OMB Circular A-11, Principals of Financing, requires that capital improvements, if phased, must provide a useable segment when completed. When full funding is not provided, it often results in higher planning costs and higher acquisition costs. This concerns the Bureau, especially when there is no guarantee of receiving appropriation for the second phase of the construction. Tribes are reluctant to enter into a construction contract/compact without a guarantee from the Federal Government that funds will be provided in the subsequent year. Additionally, 31 USC Section 1341 (a) prohibits an officer or employee of the United States Government from entering into a contract or obligation for the payment of money before an appropriation is made unless authorized by law. Construction contractors may be reluctant (risk avoidance) to enter into full construction contracts with Tribes and Tribal organizations if full funding is not available when their construction contract is awarded. Although phased funding may allow more schools to begin construction, the total number of schools replaced would not increase.

Question 95. Your Budget request for Facilities Improvement and Repair (FI&R) is $171 million, an increase of $103 million over the enacted level. Why would you propose a larger increase for FI&R rather than replacement school construction?

Answer: There are 185 Bureau schools in the Bureau's school system. Of these 185 schools, approximately one third of them require replacement and approximately two thirds of them require extensive improvement and repair. The Bureau recognizes that in order to substantially reduce the backlog, an aggressive facilities improvement and repair program and replacement school construction program must proceed simultaneously. In light of the great need to conduct repairs essential to preserving the health and safety of students, and the limited availability of funds, a larger request for FI&R funding was submitted.

Question 96. How will these FI&R be allocated?

Answer: FI&R projects are identified by facility users, Regional Office facility staff, and the Office of Facilities Management and Construction (OFMC), taking into consideration the economic feasibility for repairs and addressing as many of the deficiencies at a location as practical. The projects are further prioritized on a Bureauwide basis, using a computerized formula that evaluates the seriousness of the deficiencies and the relative risks of those deficiencies to facility users. A detailed description of the projects that are recommended for funding is found in the Bureau's FY 2001 budget justification submission (pages BIA-247 through BIA-261).

Question 97. Under education FI&R, $10 million is requested for the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute for a new science building. Why is this considered an FI&R project rather than an education construction project?

Answer: The Replacement School Construction program primarily funds the total replacement of an existing Bureau-funded school. The SIPI project will provide a 54,000 square foot science technology building as a facility improvement, and not an entire replacement school, consistent with previous Congressional guidance.

The FY 1991 Senate Report 101-534 states, "With respect to the facility requirements of the post secondary schools (SIPI and Haskell), the committee concurs with the recommendation of the House that master plans, rather than priority ranking process for educational facilities, be used to address the comprehensive facility requirements at these locations." SIPI has completed a master plan to address its facilities needs in view of its increasing enrollment and program requirements to properly educate its students in technical skills. Therefore, capital needs at the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (SIPI) are being addressed separately from the replacement school construction priority setting process.

Question 98. With the very large increases in funding in the construction account, how will the Bureau handle the additional workload?

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 request includes an increase in the Education Construction Facilities Improvement and Repair (FI&R) and in the General Administration/Construction Program Management program to ensure adequate management of additional funds and to assist with administrative responsibilities. This will allow the Bureau to hire 20 FTE to handle the increased construction and operations and maintenance program activities associated with the funding increases. To accelerate school reconstruction, reduce the backlog for all the construction and facilities improvement and repair programs, and ensure adequate contract, grant, and compact monitoring, increased funding for additional staff is critical. The additional FTE would also allow the Bureau to continue to improve the monitoring of *Public Law 100-297* grants.

Question 99. A number of tribes have expressed interest in constructing replacement schools based on a cost share partnerships between the tribe and the Bureau. How many proposal of this type have you received, and what is the Bureau's policy with respect to cost share construction projects?

Answer: During the Bureau's solicitation for replacement school applications in July, 1999, six out of the 105 applicants indicated an interest in creating Federal/Tribal school construction partnerships. Presently, the Bureau has not issued a policy nor defined any procedures regarding the sharing of construction costs with Tribal groups. The Bureau expects to develop policy regarding cost sharing in the third quarter of FY 2000. During the application solicitation period, the Tribes and school boards were presented with the idea of "partnering" as an alternative means of financing school construction. The Bureau explained it was necessary to consider the possibility of Federal/Tribal construction partnerships since several Tribes had shown an interest in using the method to construct their replacement schools. The Bureau emphasized that applicants showing an interest in partnerships would not acquire any more points than applicants who did not wish to use partnering. Two schools on the new replacement school priority list, Santa Fe Indian School and Conehatta Elementary, expressed an interest in cost sharing.

Question 100. Do you think it is prudent to fund these cost share partnership projects if the school in question in not on the school construction priority list?

Answer: The Bureau, in its consultation with the Tribes, emphasized that "need for replacement" would be the determining factor in preparing the Bureau replacement school construction priority list. The entire replacement school application solicitation and evaluation process implemented by the Bureau in 1999 sought to determine which schools were in most need of replacement. Therefore, the Bureau does not intend to fund those schools, through cost sharing or other means, which are not on the Bureau's school replacement priority list. Funding of schools not on the Bureau's priority list would be unfair to the Tribes who made the list, disregard the priority setting process, and make questionable any use of a school construction priority ranking.

Question 101. Have you considered setting up a pilot project to see if these cost share partnership projects are feasible?

Answer: The use of a pilot project has been discussed by the Bureau but no final conclusions or recommendations have been reached. The Bureau expects to develop policy regarding cost sharing in the third quarter of FY 2000.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
ADDITIONAL HEARING QUESTIONS

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Trust Issues

Question 1. I understand on March 6, 2000, the plaintiffs in the Cobell case have filed suit to get a temporary restraining order against moving the Office of Information Resource Management (OIRM) to the Washington area. Why don't you finds the issues raised in this suit compelling reasons not to move this office?

Answer: The Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) focused on ensuring that electronic and hard copy confidential individual Indian trust records and other information in the custody of the Office of Information Resources Management (OIRM) are protected and preserved. The TRO was intended to focus exclusively on protection and preservation of information as it related to the contractors associated with the OIRM move.

Ironically, the issues surfaced as a result of the TRO provide even more justification for the move. OIRM deficiencies identified by the contractor found that systems applications fail on a daily basis, reports to the Treasury Department of checks that have been written have not been sent since at least January; there currently exist no published standards or procedures; metrics are lacking for measuring application code changes, requirements documentation, data center run times or recovery help calls received; no run books exist for the data center; Unisys software has not been updated since installation two years ago; and, most importantly, no written operating procedures or security manuals existed in the current work environment. The current OIRM organization is in dire need of a complete management and programmatic overhaul. These security and operational deficiencies must be addressed immediately and they cannot be sufficiently addressed in Albuquerque, NM.

At the time that the TRO was filed, a number of OIRM employees were already en route to the Washington area for a March 13 reporting date in Reston, VA. It was decided that it would be least disruptive to those employees and their families who elected to move to proceed as originally planned.

Question 2. Are there problems with current OIRM operations?

Answer: In 1997, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) found the Bureau's general controls over its automated information systems at OIRM were not effective. The OIG made numerous recommendations and a follow up report in June, 1998, stated that general control weaknesses previously identified continued. Despite having concurred with the recommendations, OIRM had failed to address six of the additional recommendations by September, 1998. In March, 1999, management went to Albuquerque to compel OIRM to address every recommendation outlined in the OIG report. Despite this directive, many of the material weaknesses identified by the OIG remain unaddressed.

The OIRM is not in compliance with major Federal information technology (IT) statutes, government-wide policies and procedures and OMB circulars. There is a dearth of system documentation, procedures, policies and other standard required documentation for management of automated systems. As a result, the Bureau systems are very fragile, subject to frequent interruption and result in lost productivity. There is no strategic IT plan, no capital assets inventory, no business and systems architecture, no documented and established network topology – all standard requirements for an IT organization. The move to Reston is intended to ensure these problems are addressed.

Question 3. What do you intend to gain from the OIRM move?

Answer: The Bureau hopes to close the gap between the present situation and the requirements for a compliant, efficient and effective IT operation. The decision to relocate OIRM from Albuquerque to Reston originated with the Executive Committee for the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) Implementation, a committee instituted to make decisions on the implementation of the NAPA report. Based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, the Assistant Secretary - Indian Affairs determined that the geographic distance between the Bureau's Washington Headquarters and its Albuquerque accounting and information resources management operations greatly contributed to the Bureau's accounting and management problems and increased a sense of isolation from ongoing priority management initiatives. Thus, the Assistant Secretary determined that relocation and consolidation of all Bureau administrative operations to the Washington metropolitan area was a critical first step toward resolving longstanding management problems at OIRM.

Question 4. What were the reasons behind the decision to relocate administrative functions from New Mexico to the Washington, DC area?

Answer: The relocation and realignment was determined to be necessary to strengthen the management and effectiveness of OIRM in the performance of its duties. In late Fall, 1998, Assistant Secretary Gover commissioned a study by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) to establish a blueprint for improving the Bureau's management and administrative systems. NAPA completed its study of the Bureau in late August, 1999. NAPA found that without additional personnel and major and organizational reforms, the Bureau would be unable to fully meet its responsibilities to the 1.4 million American Indians and Alaska Natives it serves and to operate an effective and efficient agency. One of the most important findings of the NAPA study in this area was the lack of senior management participation in information resource management planning or new product development. The NAPA report stated, "With these changes, it is likely that geographical consolidation of the planning, policy, and evaluative elements of some organizations, such as...information resource management...in Washington, D.C., will be desirable".

Question 5. How will the use of the contractor Interior Systems, Inc. assist BIA in fulfilling its responsibilities?

Answer: Interior selected an experienced contractor, Interior Systems, Inc. (ISI) to manage the move of OIRM and the Division of Accounting Management. ISI then subcontracted with its subsidiary PRT Group. PRT Group's senior manager responsible for the OIRM relocation

project has had extensive experience conducting moves of data centers, applications and help desks, including successful relocation projects for ABC, IBM and General Electric. The contractor is used to assist in the planning and execution of the move. The basic approach consisted of four steps: 1) having ISI/PRT contractors working side by side with OIRM staff in Albuquerque to learn system operation; 2) the OIRM staff who chose to would relocate to Reston, VA, and ISI/PRT contractors would continue to operate the Albuquerque office; 3) the relocated OIRM employees, along with ISI/PRT contractors, would establish a parallel data center in Reston; and, 4) only when the Reston data center was able to take over all OIRM functions would it do so and the Albuquerque facility would then be shut down.

Question 6. What precautions have been taken to insure that the contractor will treat the relocated documents and data with appropriate attention to the privacy interests of the Bureau's customers?

Answer: First, the Bureau hired a professional contractor with significant IT experience, and the contract includes Privacy Act requirements. Second, the contractor has prepared a Bureau Security Operations Plan specifically designed to provide a protocol for the datacenter relocation and the maintenance and support of the current Bureau applications and operations environment. The Plan identifies security precautions that will be instituted for protecting the data during the transfer from Albuquerque to Reston, specifically addressing: 1) relocation schedule, 2) data security and transition phases; 3) document security and transition; and, 4) on-going data security management. Third, a Security Officer has been detailed to Albuquerque to ensure the security of the data and documentation. Finally, Interior's Information Technology Security Manager, also an IT Security Officer, has been working in OIRM's Albuquerque office to advise the Bureau on security implementation. Based upon what the Bureau has found in OIRM, the Bureau believes that the data will be better protected from accidental loss or misuse by a third party, with the contractor (ISI) operating the data center, than with the existing Bureau staff.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
ADDITIONAL HEARING QUESTIONS
CONGRESSMAN DICKS

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Question 1. The largest single increase in your Indian budget is for school construction. We have heard estimates of the current school construction backlog of between $800 million and $2 billion. What is the best estimate of the most critical needs?

Answer: As of January, 2000, the estimated cost to repair and improve all existing Bureau facilities was over $1 billion. Included in this estimate was approximately $802 million for education facilities, $56 million for law enforcement facilities, $72.2 million for general administration facilities, and $100.2 million for all Bureau employee quarter facilities. These estimates are dynamic since the Bureau's Facilities and Construction Operations and Maintenance (FACCOM) system is frequently updated as field users complete projects and discover new deficiency items. In addition, a contractor has completed 100 percent of the physical on-site backlog validation of existing structures and is now in the process of estimating the cost to repair and improve the deficiencies identified during the on-site validation. The backlog estimate of over $1 billion reflects approximately 25 percent of the validation estimates and the remaining cost estimates are anticipated to be completed by the contractor by the end of FY 2000. Also, this estimate does not include any replacement school construction costs. Therefore, the $1 billion estimated backlog is considered low and a more accurate number will be available at the end of FY 2000.

Question 2. The $300 million construction request is more than double last year's construction budget of $123 million. FY 2000 funding is double the 1999 level. Do you have the management resources on board to handle increases of this magnitude over a two-year period? (*Note: FY 1999: $60.4 million; FY 2000: $133.2 million; FY 2001 request: $300.4 million*).

Answer: The Bureau's FY 2001 request includes an increase in the Education Construction Facilities Improvement and Repair (FI&R) and in the General Administration/Construction Program Management program to ensure adequate management of additional funds and to assist with administrative responsibilities. This will allow the Bureau to hire 20 FTE to handle the increased construction and operations and maintenance program activities associated with the funding increases. To accelerate school reconstruction, reduce the backlog for all the construction and facilities improvement and repair programs, and ensure adequate contract, grant, and compact monitoring, increased funding for additional staff is critical. The additional FTE would also allow the Bureau to continue to improve the monitoring of *Public Law 100-297* grants.

Question 3. The request includes funds for six new schools, three leftover from your 1993 priority list and three newly identified projects. How many more schools are on your current list of facilities needing replacement and what would be the additional cost of replacing all schools on the list.

Answer: Thirteen schools are listed on the Education Facilities Replacement Construction Priority List, which was published in the *Federal Register* (Volume 65, Number 20) on January 31, 2000. There are seven schools on the list needing replacement in addition to those requested by the Bureau in its FY 2001 request. The estimated cost of replacing the seven remaining schools on the priority list is approximately $150 million. Since no planning or design has been completed for these seven schools, this cost estimate is very preliminary.

Question 4. According to your budget the average expenditure per "weighted student" is $3,685 at BIA facilities. The average cost per student nationally is about $6,800. How do these numbers relate to each other?

Answer: According to the Department of Education's 1999 Digest of Education Statistics, the actual total expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance was $6,962 in School Year 1995-96 and $7,299 in School Year 1996-97. If the Bureau's ISEP funding total was simply divided by the number of students, the Bureau's actual expenditure per pupil would have been $5,436 ($259,013,000/ 47,646) in School Year 1995-96 and $5,341 ($262,833,000/49,213) in School Year 1996-97.

However, weighted Students Units (WSUs) do not equate to the per pupil funding approach utilized by most public schools. The Bureau's funding formula for core instructional programs – the Indian Student Equalization Program (ISEP) - assigns different educational activities and grade levels different weights, which reflect the relative costs associated with various programs. This formula approach helps ensure that students with special needs (i.e.: Intense Bilingual and Gifted and Talented) receive a proportionately greater amount of funding. Therefore, while the Bureau takes into consideration the number of students being served, its method of using weighted factors necessitates the use of great caution when making comparisons with public school funding.

A second difficulty with comparing the Bureau's student funding to public school per pupil funding is determining the specific costs to take into consideration. The Bureau's ISEP program funds core instructional costs in the 185 Bureau-funded schools. Several other programs in the Bureau's budget provide education-related funding as well, for items such as transportation, scholarships and early education programs.

Additional problems that surface when trying to compare public and Bureau expenditures per student concern the unique programs and requirements of Bureau-funded schools, such as:

- Bureau-operated schools are required by statute to pay their teachers according to the salary schedule for the Department of Defense Dependents Schools.

- The majority of Bureau-funded schools are small schools located in rural locations, far from one another. The remote location reduces the economy of scale public school systems usually enjoy, and leads to greater costs in many areas, including student transportation and food service.

- The Bureau's school system operates dormitories that serve approximately 20 percent of the 50,000 students.

In summary, comparing the Bureau's ISEP funding to public school expenditures is problematic. The Bureau-funded schools provide unique services and have unique regulations.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
ADDITIONAL HEARING QUESTIONS
CONGRESSMAN SKEEN

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Question 1. Currently New Mexico has two groups which are petitioning the Secretary of Interior through the Branch of Acknowledgment and Research for tribal recognition. Please provide the current status on these petition by the Piro/Manso/Tiwa Tribe of the Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe and the Canocito Band of Navajos?

Answer: The Piro/Manso/Tiwa Indian Tribe of the Pueblo of San Juan de Guadalupe (Petition #5) is 7th on the Bureau's "Ready, Waiting for Active Consideration"(petition is on hold until staff become available to work on it) list. The Canocito Band of Navajos (Petition #114) has submitted partial documentation and a technical assistance review letter is being developed by the Bureau's Branch of Acknowledgment and Research.

Question 2. I understand you have proposed a revision in the process for tribal recognition. How might this proposal impact the two New Mexico groups?

Answer: The Assistant Secretary-Indian Affairs published a notice in the *Federal Register* on February 11, 2000, describing changes in the internal processing of Federal Acknowledgment petitions. Due to these changes, all petitioning groups will feel the impact as the Bureau progresses in reducing the current delays. The purpose of these changes is to allow the Department to make acknowledgment decisions in a more timely manner.

Question 3. How did you arrive at this new process and what input did you receive from Native Americans?

Answer: The Bureau's Office of Tribal Services, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, through workshops and meetings, developed the internal administrative procedural changes to alleviate the current delays in decisions by speeding up the acknowledgment process within the framework of the existing regulations. Thus, formal consultation with Tribes was not required. An agency may change its procedures and implementation of its own regulations where these changes do not contradict or alter the regulations. These revised procedures do not change the acknowledgment regulations, they instead provide a different means of implementing the existing regulations. The petitioner still has the burden of proof in meeting the seven mandatory criteria. The *Federal Register* notice is to advise petitioners, interested parties, and the public of these changes. The acknowledgment process is based on the regulations in 25 CFR Part 83, first issued in 1978 and revised in 1994. No specific legislation established the acknowledgment process.

Question 4. Currently the National Park Service is in the process of implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. What is the role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in this implementation?

Answer: The Bureau works closely with the Department, who coordinates activities and sets policy for all its bureaus on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. In Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, the Bureau has budgeted within available funds, $247,000 each year for its Museum Property program. Within this program are the preservation efforts of artworks and artifacts. Inventories of artifacts and skeletal remains of Indian individuals have been performed in compliance with NAGPRA. In order to identify funds specifically for this process, the Bureau is in the process of prioritizing funds and anticipates that approximately $100,000 could be committed to NAGPRA in FY 2000. The Bureau plans to commit $200,000 in FY 2001 within available funding. Within the FY 2001 available funds, the following activities are planned:

- Develop policies and procedures for Museum Property by mid-fiscal year.
- Hire a physical anthropologist by May, 2000. This person will be responsible for interaction with the Tribes, submitting *Federal Register* notices to the National Park Service, and repatriate the human remains as soon as possible, taking into account the needs of the culturally affiliated Tribes.
- Complete the NAGPRA survey with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers for the southwest region of the United States and all States adjoining and east of the Mississippi River.

Department of the Interior

Office of Special Trustee for American Indians

Editor's note: The Committee held a combined hearing for the Office of Special Trustee and the Bureau of Indian Affairs on March 8, 2000. The transcript of that hearing begins on page 131. The written statement for the record by the Office of Special Trustee begins on page 167.

Department of the Interior

Office of Insular Affairs

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
FY 2001 QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS

General

1. Your budget justification stresses that the financial problems of insular governments have reached a crisis stage and must be addressed by the Federal government. If financial assistance is not the solution, then what specific actions are you taking to reverse this alarming trend which has worsened so dramatically the past 4 years?

   Answer: Many of the problems in the insular areas result from an overdependence on insular government spending to bolster the economy. This includes Federal financial assistance. There may be areas, such as technical assistance and investment in infrastructure, where additional Federal funding would be helpful. The greatest need, however, is change in local policies and systems to create an environment to attract business. This would include better infrastructure such as schools and dependable utilities. More importantly, there needs to be a policy and regulatory climate within the insular areas that attracts rather than drives away business investment. The Federal government can help in this area. As part of the new economic development initiative launched by the White House Interagency Group on Insular Areas, Federal agencies have been asked to look for possible legislative or administrative changes they can endorse that will spur economic development in the islands.

2. Do you have any new, creative or innovative ideas on how to assist the insular governments and their peoples?

   Answer: We don't believe the ideas mentioned above are particularly new or creative. What we are doing now that is new and creative is to marshall the resources of the Federal government in an Interagency Group on Insular Areas so as to better coordinate Federal assistance efforts and Federal policies. We hope to institutionalize this initiative so it continues on into future Administrations.

3. Last year your budget justification stated that, in general, systemic changes are needed and that higher operating subsidies would thwart such change. Yet, the major change in your new budget is increased compact impact aid for Guam and an advance appropriation for construction in the Virgin Islands. What caused you to change your earlier position?

   Answer: Our position has not changed. The impact aid to Guam is for construction of needed infrastructure, similar to the proposed assistance for the Virgin Islands. We see these as investments, rather than operating subsidies, which will ultimately help attract economic development.

How are you going to encourage systemic changes which may actually turn things around?

Answer: There are two ways to encourage systemic changes that come to mind. One is a unified Federal position that there will be no bailouts. There are still numerous island residents, including high level government officials and business and labor leaders, who believe their government's financial problems will ultimately be solved by a major Federal outlay of money, regardless of what they do locally. So they avoid making difficult local decisions and allow the situation to worsen on the premise that a Federal bailout is likely, and in fact is more probable if the situation deteriorates. Along with a clear Federal policy is a need for technical assistance. We should demand clear standards and accountability and offer outside help and expertise as long as the insular government officials accept responsibility for meeting those standards.

4. On March 1, 2000, you issued a press release concerning the President's Interagency Group on Insular Areas meeting at the Old Executive Office Building here in DC. You suggested that this process culminated in at least 15 short term items. Please provide a summary of each of these 15 items and suggest what funding is involved, especially funding provided through the OIA and through insular governments.

Answer: Following is a summary of each of the fifteen items the insular governments asked the Administration to review. We are presently finalizing these items and will provide a report to the insular governments shortly. At this time, we do not view any of these items as requiring additional Federal appropriations. For the most part, they are administrative in nature and designed to improve communications and to better identify and utilize existing Federal programs.

1. Assistance for Economic Planning - The narrowly-based economies of the insular areas, coupled with their lack of growth over the past several years, warrant effective development planning. This includes careful strategies and adequate resources to broaden the private sector. None of the areas have sufficient expertise to develop long range plans. Technical assistance should be provided for economic development planning.

2. Include the Islands in Federal Trade Missions - Export and import businesses in the insular areas, already made vulnerable by poor economies, are affected by overall U.S. trade agreements. Their inclusion in Federal trade missions would enhance the potential for economic growth by enticing new investors, developing new industries, and creating jobs.

3. Include the input of islands in re-negotiation of tax treaties; formulate a replacement for the Foreign Sales Corporations (FSC) tax program - The insular areas are not included in U.S. tax treaties. They feel this places them at an economic disadvantage. Programs like the FSC arising from the World Trade Organization negotiations impact the islands and can result in substantial loss of revenue.

4. Review of visa requirements and eligibility, reimbursement for costs of housing smuggled aliens, Bureau of Prison debt, habitual residence regulations - The location and isolation of the islands make them attractive targets for the smuggling of illegal aliens. CNMI, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have housed these aliens, sometimes without timely reimbursement, in special camps and prisons at the request of the Federal

Government. Federal immigration laws should be reviewed to address issues of reimbursement and the status of Micronesians under habitual residence regulations.

5. Job training assistance - Sustainable economic growth in the insular areas requires the reinvigoration of current industries and the development of new ones. A skilled labor force, whether newly prepared or retrained, is essential. Federal assistance for job training, as it applies to the territories, should be reviewed and better coordinated.

6. Review of Interior Inspector General's approach in insular areas - Over the years, Interior's Inspector General has made several recommendations for changes in insular area management controls that were not implemented. Greater interaction between the Inspector General's Office and the insular governments ultimately could benefit local financial conditions and improve Federal/insular area relationships.

7. Inclusion in New Markets Initiative, Empowerment Zones - Finding solutions to improve weak insular economies requires innovative strategies. Designation of insular areas as enterprise/empowerment zones and inclusion in the President's New Markets Initiative can assist with revitalizing depressed economies and stimulate growth.

8. Apply US statistical programs in insular areas - The insular areas do not have the capability to systematically generate reliable data that are necessary for sound economic planning and development.

9. Review of Ritidian issues and Saipan Mitigation bank requirements - Although only Guam and the CNMI have specifically raised issues related to ownership or the return of Federally-owned lands, the issue also affects other insular areas. Federal-insular discussions often do not adequately address the concerns of the insular areas. Federal environmental regulations affect land use and local development needs. The Department of the Interior will discuss options related to the use of Ritidian Point with the Government of Guam and will review environmental mitigation issues and offer alternatives to the CNMI Government.

10. Leverage construction funds and technical assistance on VI wastewater facilities - Although only the U.S. Virgin Islands has asked for assistance in finding funding sources to improve solid waste and wastewater management, the issue is applicable to all insular areas. Development and implementation of remedial and proactive action management plans would likely require technical assistance related to environmental issues, as well as operations and maintenance concerns.

11. Implement full environmental procedures and improve public outreach on Tanapag, CNMI PCB issues - Remediation of PCB contamination in and around Tanapag Village began ten years ago and soil testing is still continuing. The health hazards to residents are potentially serious but the real extent of problems is unknown. Federal and local agencies will cooperate to ensure all remediation issues are fully addressed.

12. Consider waiver of Federal insurance requirements for concrete buildings - The Stafford Act requires that applicants have insurance for all infrastructure that are eligible for future community disaster loan assistance. The availability of such insurance, particularly for

concrete buildings, poses a significant financial concern for the economically-strapped insular areas.

13. Increase coordination among Federal grant agencies to improve island grant management capabilities, accountability and processes - The insular areas historically have had difficulty in meeting Federal grant accounting and reporting requirements. Financial management controls and efficient government-wide management systems are still in developmental stages. Technical assistance is essential to further that growth.

14. Include the insular areas in the Department of Transportation's bilateral aviation agreements - To the extent that reciprocal landing rights agreements between the United States and foreign countries impact the insular areas, insular concerns should be adequately represented in the negotiations.

15. Disposal of Federal Lands on Insular Areas - The small size of the insular areas makes land ownership a critical issue for development and growth. The islands, at a minimum, would like notification when Federal lands are declared excess.

5. Last year you requested $1,000,000 for coral reef work but now for FY 2001 you are requesting only $500,000. You state that over half of the nation's coral reefs are in the insular areas and that these coral reefs are tremendously important. Why did your request decrease?

Answer: OIA considers the coral reef initiative to be a high priority for the insular areas and the Department of the Interior. Over the past several years, OIA has worked with the island governments to develop strategies and plans for improving protection and management of coral reef ecosystems in each of the insular areas. Priority needs include research, monitoring, management, restoration, education and outreach as summarized in the recently revised U.S. All Islands Coral Reef Initiative Strategy (1999). In FY 2000, Congress reduced by half the President's request for $1,000,000 to support the islands' coral reef initiative strategy. The President's FY 2001 request for $500,000 reflects the continued commitment of OIA to the coral reef initiative in the face of the reduced FY 2000 appropriation and against other program requests deemed to be higher priority in FY 2001.

6. Overall the Federal government is requesting over $10 million for the coral reef initiative although only $500,000 is directed to the OIA. Shouldn't the Federal government focus its resources on those areas where coral reefs are most abundant and most important to the local economy and ecology such as the territories and the Freely associated States?

Answer: OIA has long recognized that healthy coral reef resources are the cornerstone of the economy and environment of island communities, from the U.S. Virgin Islands to Guam. The Department agrees that a significant portion of Federal funding for the coral reef initiative should be directed to the insular areas which contain some of the most important coral reef ecosystems in the Nation and on which local communities depend. The Department will continue to seek funds to support coral reef management and protection activities in the insular areas. The coral reef-related needs in the territories, as identified in the "U.S. All Islands Coral Reef Initiative Strategy," do exceed the OIA budget request.

However, there are many serious problems and needs in the territories competing for limited Federal assistance. The Administration believes the OIA budget reasonably balances the need for increased coral reef protection with the other compelling, and perhaps more urgent, needs of the insular areas; in particular, the problems of impact of Compact in Guam, and the fiscal crisis in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

It should also be pointed out that some of the coral reef protection funding in the NPS budget is targeted to park units in the U.S. territories. The 2001 request includes $225,000 for coral reef protection at the National Park of American Samoa; $300,000 for Virgin Islands National Park; and $156,000 for War in the Pacific National Historic Park. This certainly does not obviate the need for OIA funding, as these few park units represent only a fraction of the coral reef resources in the insular areas. However, some of the activities funded by the NPS, such as public outreach and education, would also help improve the protection of corals outside park unit boundaries.

7. What is being accomplished with the $500,000 provided in FY 2000 for coral reef work?

Answer: The $500,000 is being used to support a variety of programs and projects identified in the U.S. All Islands Coral Reef Initiative Strategy (Strategy). The Strategy was updated in October 1999 at the request of the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force with financial assistance from OIA. The Strategy identifies a broad scope of action for continuing the islands' long-term coral reef conservation strategy and improving the management and protection of coral reefs in the U.S. islands. The Strategy includes more than 50 projects totaling approximately $5 million.

8. The Committee is pleased with the scientific progress and potential at the University of Guam. What level of funding have you requested, and provided in the recent past, for the coral reef scientific and educational work at the University of Guam? Please summarize this work and indicate its potential value.

Answer: In FY2000, OIA provided $300,000 to establish the Marine Resources Pacific Consortium (MAREPAC), a new consortium coordinated through the University of Guam, to promote regional cooperation on marine resource use, management and preservation among the Pacific Islands of American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, and Yap), the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Guam and the Republic of Palau. The establishment of MAREPAC is a milestone in the development of cooperative regional efforts to share resources and expertise, provide training and education, and promote the sustainable use of marine resources. An outgrowth of the Coral Reef Initiative, MAREPAC has tremendous potential to build bridges among the regional community-based environmental organizations, regional marine resource management agencies, institutions of higher education (the College of the Marshall Islands, the College of Micronesia-FSM, Northern Marianas College, Palau Community College and the University of Guam) and research facilities.

9. Your Inspector Generals office keeps on producing reports which document financial mismanagement by various US territorial governments. To what extent do you plan on

backing up some of these findings with substantive proposals to enforce proper use of Federal funds?

Answer: We don't believe the Inspector General audits portray a very objective or broad picture of financial management in the islands; although we agree with their general assertion that there are serious financial problems in the insular governments. Virtually all of the audits being done by our Inspector General auditors are of local funds and they are performed in two locations, Guam and the Virgin Islands. Only a handful of audits have been performed in the past several years in American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands or the freely associated states. Most of the audits of Federal funds are performed by private certified public accounting firms under the requirements of the Single Audit Act. These single audits are reviewed by the Inspector General and then the recommendations are distributed to the affected Federal agencies for resolution. Under Federal law, they must be and are resolved. In 1992 when there was a much greater IG presence in the territories, a joint OMB-Department of the Interior task group determined that the risk of waste fraud and abuse in the insular governments was not of sufficient magnitude to warrant a "high risk" designation, as is the case with a number of other Federal programs.

Hawaiian Natives

10. What has been your role or that of your assistant secretaries at encouraging activities to provide favored funding for Hawaiian natives? To what extent should Hawaiian natives as a group be treated similarly or differently from native Americans? What contacts or relationships have you or your assistant secretaries had with persons involved with Hawaiian independence activities?

Answer: On November 23, 1993, the 103rd Congress adopted as Joint Resolution 19, P.L. 103-150, the Apology Resolution, which, inter alia, urges the President of the United States to acknowledge the ramifications of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i and to "support reconciliation efforts between the United States and the Native Hawaiian people." On March 10, 1999, Senator Daniel K. Akaka (D-HI) wrote to Attorney General Janet Reno and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt requesting the designation of officials to address the reconciliation process as called for in the Apology Resolution. Attorney General Reno designated Mark Van Norman, Director, Office of Tribal Justice, to represent the Department of Justice, and Secretary Babbitt appointed John Berry, Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget, to represent the Department of the Interior in the reconciliation efforts.

In December 1999, Mr. Berry and Mr. Van Norman began the reconciliation process with a series of formal meetings on all the major islands of Hawaii. They visited Native Hawaiian communities to observe programs established to benefit Native Hawaiians and held informal discussions with Native Hawaiians. With the information gathered during these meetings and the volumes of written materials received from members of the public on various issues of importance to Native Hawaiians, Mr. Berry and Mr. Van Norman are preparing a report that addresses reconciliation issues. It should be released in the near future. It would be premature to respond further until the report is released, at which time we will provide you

with a complete copy.

11. Recent newspaper accounts suggest that the Clinton administration will establish a Native Hawaiian Office. Would this be in the OIA? Would you use any funds provided for the OIA for this new function? What funding do you anticipate for any Native Hawaiian office in the Department of the Interior?

Answer: On March 14, 2000, at a Census 2000 forum at the East-West Center, on the campus of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Senator Daniel K. Akaka mentioned that the U.S. Department of the Interior may establish an office for Native Hawaiian issues. Some of the testimony gathered from the Native Hawaiian reconciliation meetings in December 1999 also called for the establishment of an office on Native Hawaiian issues in the Department.

At this time, it would be premature to determine whether an office for Native Hawaiian issues will be created in the Department of the Interior and whether this office will be located in the Office of Insular Affairs (OIA). A report and recommendations from the December 1999 Native Hawaiian reconciliation meetings are under consideration at this time and will be made available to the committee as soon as they are completed.

Virgin Islands

12. Last year the Secretary of the Interior indicated to the government of the Virgin Islands that he would help provide resources for long-term economic growth if they met mutually agreed performance standards. What are these specific performance standards?

Answer: The Virgin Islands agreed to the following performance standards in a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the Governor and the Secretary in October 1999:

a. prepare a five-year financial recovery plan;
b. in its 2000 budget, reduce overtime by 50 percent from the 1999 baseline, reduce payroll expenditures by 5 percent from the 1999 baseline, and implement a hiring freeze;
c. reduce agencies' expenditures by 10 percent, implement 50-50 cost sharing of retirement and health insurance premiums, and eliminate 5 paid holidays;
d. limit FY 2000 expenditures to $432.1 million;
e. achieve structural balance to the General fund budget by FY 2003;
f. maintain balanced budgets after FY 2003;
g. complete the FY 1998 single audit by March 31, 2000;
h. complete all subsequent financial statements within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year; and complete the single audits within nine months; and
i. implement a training plan for all key managers on administration of Federal grants.

13. What progress has the Virgin Islands government made at meeting these performance standards?

Answer: Some of the standards are imposed on future actions. Several require specific actions to be taken in fiscal year 2000. On those, we do not have specific status reports; but we are now at the mid-year point and will be performing a status review in the next few weeks. Several performance standards, such as the fiscal year 1998 single audit, appear to be behind schedule. The five-year plan, a key performance measure, has been drafted; although plan implementation is far more important than plan development.

When will progress be made?

Answer: Progress is being made but probably not in accordance with agreed upon schedules. If it is determined that standards are not being met on schedule, the Department will have to decide whether it should impose sanctions for non-compliance. The major sanction at this point would be to place a hold on the fiscal year 2000 construction grant of $5.4 million. A committee directive that the Virgin Islands develop and "implement" performance standards was made a condition of the grant. We have asked the Governor to submit a mid-year status report on each of the standards by mid-May.

14. You have requested a $1,000,000 increase in funding for the technical assistance function, but all of this is focused for the Virgin Islands. Why is assistance for the Virgin Islands more important than assistance for any of the other insular governments?

Answer: Assistance for the Virgin Islands is not more important than assistance for the other insular areas. In order to provide the Virgin Islands additional assistance to help implement financial performance standards, we are proposing an increase in the budget so we do not take funding away from other islands. Once the initial year is over and implementation of the standards is progressing satisfactorily, we propose to use this money for economic development initiatives in the other islands.

15. What projects do you expect to accomplish in the Virgin Islands with the increased technical assistance funds?

Answer: One specific project is a performance standard by which the Department pledges to help train key Virgin Islands employees in Federal grants administration. Another likely project will be technical expertise to review and suggest improvements for future collective bargaining agreements.

16. The Committee needs to have a more thorough explanation of your request for an advance appropriation for the Virgin Islands infrastructure. Why should this Congress tie the hands of the next with a promise for construction funds?

Answer: We believe this is a situation where an advance appropriation is appropriate. Our pledge of major financial assistance is predicated on the Virgin Islands implementing a number of mutually agreed financial reforms. An advance appropriation is a clear indication to the Government of the Virgin Islands that the Federal government will honor its bargain to provide financial assistance in exchange for financial management improvements; but we must have proof that the standards are being met before we provide the money. We have further tried to protect Federal interests by including language which states the funding will

lapse at the end of fiscal year 2002 if the conditions aren't met.

17. What construction projects would you fund with the advance appropriation for the Virgin Islands?

Answer: The Virgin Islands is not in compliance with a number of Federal regulations or other requirements, particularly with regard to housing and treatment of prisoners and environmental protection. They have tentative plans for specific projects in the areas of wastewater treatment and solid waste management. EPA is planning to put an enforcement order in place in the very near future on the St. Thomas landfill. This will require the Government of the Virgin Islands to correct deficiencies or face daily fines for non-compliance.

How do you know that these are a priority?

Answer: The proposed language in the appropriations bill states that the funds are for "Federally ordered or mandated critical infrastructure needs..." This precludes using the money for any project that does not have a Federal nexus and is not a Federal priority.

18. Is there a capital investment plan which is up-to-date and approved by the Secretary and the government of the Virgin Islands?

Answer: No, there is not and there is no statutory requirement for such a plan. However, that type of plan is less important with respect to projects in the Virgin Islands because we are limiting, by law, our assistance to projects that have a specific Federal nexus.

19. Is the government of the Virgin Islands currently able to meet its payroll each pay period and is it able to pay its creditors in a timely fashion?

Answer: They are currently meeting their payroll. One of the purposes of their bond issue last year was to pay past-due accounts to creditors. We understand however that additional creditors are still being identified, which will further exacerbate their financial condition.

20. Does the Virgin Islands government have a plan to reduce the size and cost of its payroll and expenses?

Answer: The Virgin Islands fiscal recovery task force recently completed a draft plan for fiscal reform that includes reductions in the payroll.

What do you think of the current plan?

Answer: The plan is good and is an accurate and forthright assessment of the situation. We are waiting, however, for a final version to be released. We understand that changes are

being made based on comments from the business community, labor leaders and government officials.

American Samoa

21. What key policy changes will you pursue during FY 2001 to assist the fiscal problems in American Samoa?

Answer: Fiscal year 2000 should yield a plan for financial improvements in the American Samoa Government. Fiscal year 2001 will focus on implementing the plan. The plan is required as a prerequisite to a Federal loan (with repayment from American Samoa's tobacco settlement proceeds) authorized last year by Congress. We also expect to have by fiscal year 2001 a report from the American Samoa Economic Commission chaired by former Governor Waihee of Hawaii and comprised of other distinguished members.

22. Last year the Congress passed legislation which allows the American Samoan government (ASG) to get a large, direct loan using their tobacco settlement escrow fund as repayment. What steps has the ASG taken to implement this loan?

Answer: In late February, the Governor indicated he would like to proceed with the loan and presented the Office of Insular Affairs with a draft Memorandum of Understanding and loan agreement. We are currently reviewing the loan agreements and also awaiting for American Samoa to identify the list of creditors and begin development of a financial recovery plan. Additional meetings with the ASG are planned for the first week of May.

23. The tobacco loan legislation requires the ASG to develop a comprehensive fiscal recovery plan. What components will you require this plan to cover? Who will determine if the plan is sufficient?

Answer: The plan should show actual revenue and historical data for the past two to three years so we have a good baseline and then show projections for the future that will yield a balanced budget by fiscal year 2003. Revenue enhancements and expenditure reductions will have to be specifically identified and explained. The determination as whether the plan is sufficient will be based on feasibility. We would need to be convinced that specific proposals can be accomplished, both fiscally, administratively and politically. We will rely primarily on our own skilled employees to review the plan; but we could also use an outside expert for a second opinion. We would also rely heavily on feedback from the American Samoa community, including business, the press, the legislature and residents.

24. What is the status of the ASG current debt? To what extent would the direct loan help erase this debt?

Answer: We believe ASG current unfunded liabilities are at least $30 million. We expect to have a full accounting from ASG in the next few weeks. The direct loan will erase about

two-thirds of those liabilities.

25. Is the ASG taking any serious steps to reduce its payroll size and expenditures to make them more in line with income?

Answer: At this time we have not seen any evidence of steps to reduce the payroll size. The Governor has created a Territorial Office of Fiscal Reform that has a task of developing a financial recovery plan with revenue enhancements and cost cutting measures. It seems likely that cost cutting measures would include payroll reductions.

26. The Congress has previously directed that $4,000,000 in capital improvement funds be withheld until and unless financial improvement steps are taken. We understand that steps have not been taken and that the FY 1997 funds are still being held. Why has this not worked?

Answer: The primary reason it has not worked is that there is little or no political consequence for not meeting the conditions attached to this money. It's as if the money were never appropriated.

What do you recommend the Congress do with these funds?

Answer: We recommend that Congress release this money for needed infrastructure and shift sanctions to the operations grant.

Should we rescind them?

Answer: No, we would recommend either releasing the money or reprogramming it to meet other territorial needs.

27. Your budget request includes $23,054,000 for ASG operations, the same funding as previous years. Given the poor performance, why should the ASG be rewarded with consistent funding? What would you recommend if the Committee were to make a portion, say $10,000,000, of the operations appropriation contingent upon the ASG meeting financial recovery plan implementation benchmarks?

Answer: We think that would be a good idea and would like to work with the Committee on a procedure that would make it work effectively. The key to an effective system would include clear and easily understood reporting requirements and reasonable actions that ASG would be required to take to have the funds released. All of ASG's financial problems can't be solved quickly. It will take several years; but we should be able to measure continuous progress. The worst situation would be to do nothing. The next worst situation would be to create conditions or a withholding system that makes compliance virtually impossible and would give an appearance that the Federal government rather than local leadership is responsible for any negative outcomes.

Guam

28. Please provide a summary of the major steps you have undertaken to measure and assess the impact of the Compact on territories as well as on Hawaii.

Answer: We have for the last three years, submitted reports to the Congress on the impact of the Compact. These reports detail the numbers of migrants, as required in Public Law 99-239. These numbers are determined through censuses of Micronesians performed with assistance from the Bureau of the Census and funded by OIA. We have also included estimates by the insular areas and Hawaii, of costs incurred by those governments for services to Compact migrants.

29. Please provide your best guess as to what the cost of compact impact is to the Pacific territories and to Hawaii.

Answer: Guam, the CNMI, and Hawaii have submitted estimates for the gross costs (excluding any economic or tax benefits derived from Micronesian residents) of providing services to Micronesians. Based on those submissions, we believe a reasonable estimate of those costs are as follows for the indicated years:

Guam, 1997	$12.8 million
CNMI, 1997	6.6 million
Hawaii, 1999	11.6 million
Total	$31.0 million

These costs are for public education and health and welfare only, and do not include other services such as performed by the justice system, fire and police protection and utilities.

30. Why have you requested only that Guam receive compact impact funding when other governments, such as the CNMI, have a similar problem?

Answer: There are several reasons. Guam has done the best job documenting impacts and impact costs. The data indicates Guam is experiencing the greatest impact. Hawaii is authorized to receive appropriations under the Compact of Free Association Act (Public Law 99-239); but the OIA appropriation that funds impact aid is entitled Assistance to Territories and generally provides funding for grant assistance to the U.S. territories and freely associated states. We must ensure anything provided to the State of Hawaii is not done at the expense of important program assistance for the territories. In the case of the CNMI, the impact is less, they have greater control over immigration policies, and they are already receiving significant guaranteed assistance that can be used to mitigate the impact.

31. Please provide a detailed list of past compact impact funding and describe what activities have been funded in Guam and the CNMI.

Answer: In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $2,495,000 for impact compact reimbursement to Guam. The funds were reimbursed by DOI to Guam in March 1995. This was a strict reimbursement transaction and there were no requirements for Guam to account

for how these funds were used. From fiscal year 1996 through 1999, Guam received an annual capital improvement grant of $4,580,000. In fiscal year 2000, Guam received an annual capital improvement grant of $7,580,000. Thus far, the following projects have been approved:

$ 420,000 Hospital Equipment
$ 600,000 Anao Point Waterline
$ 300,000 Adelup Renovation
$ 900,000 Talofofo Multi-Purpose Gym
$ 900,000 Yona Multi-Purpose Gym
$ 10,000 Mataguac Waterline Project
$ 700,000 Yigo Road Project
$ 750,000 Agat Multi-Purpose Gym
$ 340,000 Lupog Water Project
$2,600,000 Chalan Pago Sewer Project
$ 650,000 Tumon Bay Police Precinct Facility
$ 100,000 Agat Multi-Purpose Gym
$1,800,000 Financial Management Computer System
$ 300,000 Yigo Road Project
$ 950,000 Agat Multi-Purpose Gym
$1,300,000 Yigo Multi-Purpose Gym
$ 150,000 Asbestos Removal Project
$ 230,000 Tumon Police Precinct
$2,500,000 Financial Management Computer System
$ 700,000 Windward Hills Waterline Project
$ 75,000 Antenna Tower Project
$ 750,000 Ambulances
$ 510,000 DPW Packer Dump Trucks
$1,500,000 Guam Waterworks Capital Equipment

There remains $6,125,000 unallocated in FY 2000 grant funds. We expect the Governor to submit plans for the remaining money within the next two months.

Technical assistance activities associated with Compact impact include:

GUAM	
Impact information/educational program (1991)	$451,000
Verification of compact impact (1992)	$161,650
Mitigation of compact impact (1992)	$592,440
Mitigation of compact impact (1993)	$594,900
Mitigation of compact impact (1994)	$600,000
Baseline study of Palauans on Guam (1996)	$ 45,000
Analysis of compact impact costs (1997)	$ 75,000
Census of Micronesians (1997)	$ 60,000
CNMI	
Mitigation of compact impact (1992)	$394,960

Mitigation of compact impact (1994)	$400,000
Census of Micronesian migrants (1997)	$ 30,500

Annually executed reimbursable support agreements with the U.S. Census Bureau also include compact impact-related activities to analyze data on migrants from the freely associated states.

32. Once funds are advanced to Guam for compact impact, how does the process work? What controls do you have, or does Guam have, that the funds are used for genuine activities caused by the impact of freely associated states residents?

Answer: The funds are not advanced. An annual grant is awarded and, in accordance with the grant terms and conditions, the Governor of Guam must submit individual project plans to OIA for our review and approval. Once the project is approved, work begins and Guam submits drawdown requests for reimbursement on an as-needed basis. Quarterly financial reports and brief narratives are required. The Guam project manager must submit these reports to the Guam Office of Administration and Bureau of Budget and Management Research (BBMR). If the Guam Office of Administration or BBMR has any questions, they must be answered by the project manager prior to Guam submitting the drawdown request to our office.

33. Is it true that the compact impact funds advanced to the Government of Guam are essentially made available directly to the governor and are spent at his sole discretion?

Answer: The funds are not advanced. They are obligated by way of a grant to the Governor. Although current law does not require the Governor to obtain approval from the Guam legislature, he still must submit plans to our office for our review and approval before funds can be expended.

34. What legislative oversight occurs in Guam with respect to the use of the compact impact funds?

Answer: (The following response was provided by the Government of Guam) The Guam legislature has not conducted any oversight over the use of Compact Impact funds.

35. What would be the impact of requiring the Guam legislature to appropriate the compact impact funds once the US government advances the funds to the Guam government?

Answer: OIA's understanding is that there are differences in priorities between the Governor and the legislature as to the use of the money. If the Guam legislature is required to appropriate impact funds, it's likely that some of the projects funded would be different.

What is your position on resolution number 60 of the Guam legislature, approved 28 April, 1999, which deals with this issue?

Answer: OIA has not seen resolution number 60. We asked for input from the Governor's office on this question and the response from the Director of the Bureau of Budget and

Management Research was that they also were unfamiliar with the resolution. They did note, however, that Guam's organic act states, "*Appropriations, except as otherwise provided in this Act, and except such appropriation as shall be made from time to time by the Congress of the United States, shall be made by the Legislature.*" When the issue of oversight by the Guam legislature has been raised, the response has always been this quote from the organic act which is interpreted as preventing the legislature from re-appropriating Federal funds. From a policy perspective, the Department does not believe Guam can change the purpose of the Federal appropriation; but we have no objection to any internal Guam process that better defines or controls the use of the funds, whether or not that includes the Guam legislature.

36. Your budget justification suggests that your technical assistance activities may help with financial problems caused by the Asian financial crisis. What specific activities are these? What additional funding and projects have you requested for FY 2001?

Answer: The weakened economies of the insular areas require fiscal belt-tightening, the initiation of reforms for effective government operations, and the development of initiatives to broaden their revenue base. In this regard, technical assistance has helped the governments to develop data needed for strategic planning; streamline and improve their tax systems; re-organize financial accounting systems for greater efficiency; receive targeted training in performance-based budgeting and fiscal management; and explore agricultural opportunities.

Coral reef demonstration projects have aided the protection and preservation of fragile ecosystems, explored eco-tourism as a viable option, and attract significant new research dollars. In partnership with the Asian Development Bank, the Office of Insular Affairs has funded the placement of resident economic management policy advisors in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, to help the governments institute broad reforms for sustainable development.

Through the White House Interagency Group for Insular Affairs (IGIA), formed by President Clinton in August 1999, the Office of Insular Affairs has been able to work with the islands' chief executives in identifying economic development needs and leveraging increased Federal assistance. Technical assistance enabled the compilation of considerable information on Federal grants applicable to, but not received by the insular areas. Many of these programs directly and indirectly affect economic development potential.

OIA is requesting an increase of $1.0 million to assist the insular areas to identify and implement financial reforms and economic development efforts. Although technical assistance will focus on the U.S. Virgin Islands in FY 2001, the funds will be used to help all of the insular governments in subsequent years.

37. If the Asian financial crisis is so substantial in its effects on the western pacific territories, why is your entire increase requested for technical assistance focused on the Virgin Islands?

Answer: Although all insular areas face serious economic problems, the U.S. Virgin Islands is teetering precariously on the brink of insolvency. Mounting debt from years-long deficit spending is taking a toll on the Government's ability to meet payroll and other expenses. Reasons for the Virgin Islands' fiscal crisis include the inability to recover from two

hurricanes that caused massive destruction; ever-expanding public sector employment; and a soft, very narrowly-based private sector.

Internal control deficiencies recently led the U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services to categorize some grants to the Virgin Islands as "high risk," a move that potentially jeopardizes the territory's ability to secure future grant assistance for critical infrastructure. In February 2000, the U.S. Treasury notified the territory that it would garnish Federal grant payments to repay the U.S. Justice Department for housing prisoners transferred to Federal prisons after Hurricane Hugo damaged local facilities. The Virgin Islands has been unable to make regular payments over the years and still owes $9.5 million on the debt.

Our focus on the Virgin Islands in FY 2001, provides the U.S. Government with greater positive leverage to quickly enforce appropriate cost-cutting measures and fiscal reforms. It also forestalls the creation of some type of Federal control board. If the situation is left unresolved, deterioration will continue and culminate in serious social problems.

Assistance is conditioned on the Government's meeting mutually agreed performance standards. Those fiscal recovery standards were developed by the joint Federal-Virgin Islands Economic Revitalization Task Force.

38. A recent audit report by the DOI Inspector General finds that the Government of Guam has misdirected over $5 million in Federal funds (audit report No. 00-I-172, Jan. 2000). What steps is the Office of Insular Affairs taking to see that some of the recommendations of the OIG are implemented by the government of Guam?

Answer: This audit was concerning U.S. Department of Defense contract funds awarded to Guam to provide public education services for Defense dependents residing on U.S. military installations in Guam. The Inspector General questioned over $5 million based on the fact that this money was not used specifically and exclusively for educational purposes. The audit recommendations simply state that Guam return the money to the Defense Department and develop a monitoring process for the use of remaining Defense contract funds. The issue is Guam's interpretation of Defense contract terms rather than poor financial practices. Therefore, the Inspector General did not request any input from the Department of the Interior, but rather referred the report to the Contracting Officer of the Department of Defense for a determination on the allowability of the questioned costs of $5.4 million and for resolution of the matter.

39. Would it be appropriate to withhold future appropriations to the Government of Guam until and unless the OIG recommendations mentioned above are resolved?

Answer: No, we don't believe that would be appropriate. The Inspector General only makes recommendations. When the recommendations involve Federal funds, it is the responsibility of the affected agency, the Department of Defense in this case, to resolve the issue. The relevant agency has authority to recover the money, if they determine that is the proper course of action. The point is that the Inspector General has made a recommendation concerning Federal money and there is a longstanding Federal process for resolving audit

recommendations. It is a process that agencies cannot ignore, so this issue will be resolved. In the case of Guam and the other U.S. territories, the more difficult question is how to deal with recommendations from the Inspector General that do not involve Federal funds. This is the majority of Inspector General recommendations and their authority to look at local funds is unique to the territories. There is no comparable Federal authority to force compliance with recommendations that do not involve Federal money even if the recommendations are determined to be valid.

40. Please ask the Governor of Guam to provide a response as to why they are not implementing the recommendations made by the OIG in this report.

Answer: (The following response was provided by the Government of Guam) The Governor of Guam and the Guam Attorney General have submitted responses to the Inspector General. The Governor's latest letter to the Inspector General was dated March 6, 2000. Guam disputes the findings, contending that the Defense contract funds were merely in fulfillment of a contract to provide educational services for which the Government of Guam would receive a dollar amount per student. Guam contends that this was simply a service that DOD agreed to pay for, and a service that was delivered. Our office contacted the Inspector General on April 14, 2000. The Inspector General is preparing another letter to the Governor and will provide a copy to our office.

41. H.R. 755, the Guam Restitution Act, would provide funds for persons harmed during World War II. Do you support this act? What would it cost to implement the first 3 years and would the necessary funds need to come from the Interior appropriations bill?

Answer: The only detailed estimate on this legislation we have seen was prepared approximately 4 years ago by the Congressional Budget Office. They estimated total costs would range from $50 million to $100 million. We also understand Congressman Underwood's Office gave an estimate of $40 million, although we have not seen the detail behind that estimate. We understand that HR 755 was recently withdrawn and substituted with a proposal that will establish a Commission that will review claims and make recommendations.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI)/ Covenant Grants

42. What is the status of the CNMI capital improvement master plan? What is the current backlog in federal capital improvement funds that have not been used. What are the conditions that limit the expenditure of these funds? What progress has the CNMI government made during the past year at obligating CIP funds for important projects?

Answer: The CNMI capital improvement plan required by the Third Special Representatives agreement continues to be the guide for projects and appropriations made by the CNMI government. As anticipated, a few legislative changes and shifts in priorities have been made, but the CNMI executive branch remains committed to its implementation. Projects approved in the past year have followed the plan.

$121,140,000 in Federal funds have been appropriated for the CNMI since 1993. Of this total, approximately $70 million has been approved for specific projects and approximately $38 million has been expended. For several years, the use of this money was delayed by a Governor who was not making any effort to use the money or to develop a plan, a prerequisite for all funds granted since 1996. The primary factor that is limiting the current expenditure of these funds is the limited number of CNMI employees available to develop, contract and manage the projects. To help resolve this problem, OIA has indicated that a limited amount of the funding may be used to hire temporary engineers or construction management firms to make the process more effective. All project plans submitted to the Department for review in the past year have been approved.

In the past year the CNMI government has obligated approximately $12 million for new project contracts. Some of this amount is for architectural and engineering studies for ensuing large construction projects. Improvement to the existing prison and design of new prison facilities are the largest projects started in the past year.

43. The CNMI agreed with the Bush administration in 1992 to match federal infrastructure aid with local funds. Currently that match is 50/50. Are there any other insular areas making a similar commitment to increased self-sufficiency?

Answer: Currently, the CNMI is the only one of the insular governments that matches infrastructure grants from the Office of Insular Affairs. All islands that participate in our operations and maintenance improvement program pay a 50/50 match on those grants. In the fiscal year 2001 budget request, we are proposing a 50 percent match be imposed on infrastructure grants to the Virgin Islands, starting with fiscal year 2002.

44. Last year the Congress provided a one-time deferral of some of the CNMI capital improvement funding but this year your budget request recommends going back to the previous formula for these cost-share construction funds. What is the basis for your recommendation to provide the full CIP funding?

Answer: There are two reasons for our proposal to provide full CIP funding. One is a recognition of the Federal commitment and the fact we cannot continue to defer that commitment. The second basis is that the CNMI is accelerating its expenditure rate. Last year for the first time, the CNMI disbursed more than $11 million in Federal cash, so annual disbursements are now exceeding new budget authority.

What adverse situations might exist if some of the Covenant section 702 funds were deferred again?

Answer: It is possible the CNMI could be prepared to move on major new projects and not have sufficient grant authority to enter into contracts. There are two major contracts that need to be signed in the near future. One is for the new prison facility and the other is for the closing of the existing landfill and opening of its replacement. If these major projects are divided into multiple parts, rather than a single contract, the costs to the CNMI and the Federal government could increase significantly.

45. Please ask the Governor of the CNMI to provide, for the record, short summaries of:
a. capital improvement project funding situation
b. compact impact, including needs, past Federal assistance, CNMI expenditures.
c. PCB contamination at formerly used defense sites of the US Government at the Village of Tanapag.

Answer: The Governor of the CNMI sent the Department a letter detailing the following.

Capital improvement project funding: The CNMI has identified and appropriated local funds to match all the federal funds appropriated to date but $2 million. The remaining amount will be matched this fiscal year upon completion of a pending bond issue expected in July 2000. The total appropriations by the CNMI legislature on CIP projects amounts to $95.4 million for the last twelve months, $47.6 of which represents local funds.

Compact impact: The CNMI estimates the cumulative cost of Compact impact at between $80-$108 million. They report they have received $2,791,560 in reimbursements. The CNMI counts 3,118 freely associated states citizens in its population. The major services impacted are public health, public schools, public safety , the public defender and youth services.

PCB Contamination: The CNMI has 25 contaminated sites according to the Department of Defense/ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The village of Tanapag has two of the most highly contaminated sites, including a PCB capacitor site and a fuel tank farm with 43 leaking, corroded 55,000 gallon to .5 million gallon steel tanks. The capacitors were deposited by USDOD in the 1960's. PCB leakage in the capacitors was not "discovered" until 1988. At that time, USEPA recommended an inventory, possible evacuation and considered long-term effects probable.

The capacitors were removed in 1988 by CNMI officials with guidance from USEPA. USEPA began discovery activities to search for the Responsible Party. However, no removal actions to secure contaminated areas were undertaken and the contaminated soil remained in place until the USACE performed remediation in 1991 and 1998. However, no coordination between Federal agencies regarding appropriate authorities, protocols, regulations and standards occurred, and USACE performed the remediation to incorrect clean-up standards and without appropriate protocol. This mistake was not identified by USEPA until late 1999 after USACE completed remediation of the village and characterization of the Lower Base Cemetery.

Tanapag residents have over twenty-five years of unknown and unregulated exposure to PCBs, dioxin, and contaminants from the fuel tanks and military dumpsites. Areas of contamination include residences, the local cemetery, a schoolyard, a Headstart Center, and the town hall. Evidence suggests the population has been exposed to highly contaminated soils and possible pure PCB product. Water and food resources have never been tested for contamination. To date, neither a risk assessment nor an epidemiological study has ever been performed.

In the past year, CNMI Department of Public Health (DPH) and community concerns prompted increased involvement of Federal agencies including USEPA and the Agency for Toxic Substance Disease Registry (ATSDR). DPH prepared a PCB exposure survey and sampling of resident's blood serum levels. The CNMI Division of Environmental Quality is responding to community concerns and coordinating with USEPA and USACE. USEPA plans sampling activities in Tanapag, reviews data for National Priorities List scoring, and began risk assessment discussions. ATSDR is considering assisting with DPH exposure studies. CNMI's requests for assistance from USACE have not been met.

Compact of Free Association:

46. What is the status of discussions regarding updating the Compact of Free Association for the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and for the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI)?

Answer: The first round of talks with both nations were held last fall, as mandated by the Compact of Free Association Act (Public Law 99-239). The second round with the FSM is scheduled for April 25-28, and with the RMI sometime this summer.

47. We understand that the government of the FSM has made proposals for future assistance in the form of establishing some kind of trust fund over time. What is being discussed at this time and what is the timeline for completing these negotiations?

Answer: The FSM has made a proposal for a trust fund to provide annual operations assistance in lieu of direct annual U.S. assistance. A U.S. response to the broad concept is expected in time for the April talks. It will take several future rounds and several months to actually negotiate the details of an agreement on future U.S. assistance. Such details may include the size, structure and other characteristics of a trust fund, if there is agreement on the need for such a fund.

48. We understand that a new RMI government was recently elected and that this has had a major impact on negotiations. Has there been any beginning to discussions between the U.S. and the RMI?

Answer: There have been several informal discussions, but no formal discussions are scheduled at this time.

What issues do you anticipate as being central to these discussions?

Answer: The U.S. has indicated its interest is seeing the RMI's economic development strategy for advancing economic self-sufficiency before there can be substantive talks, because the purpose of U.S. assistance under the Compact is to support such a plan.

49. Your budget justification suggests strongly that the OIA should maintain the primary fiduciary responsibilities of future compact agreements. Yet, during the previous 15 years the DOI has provided very little oversight to the allocation of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Why should the DOI remain central to this intergovernmental assistance rather than have the assistance operate like other State-department managed programs?

Answer: Part of the expertise of the Department of the Interior is the management of domestic programs, including grant-type financial assistance. The current financial relationships and procedures under the Compacts of Free Association were negotiated by the State Department in the early 1980s more closely followed a foreign aid model. They contained very few conditions and no meaningful reporting requirements or enforcement mechanisms. This was done over the strong and well-documented objections of the Department of the Interior. With the advent of new negotiations, the DOI is again insisting that grant-type conditions, controls and reporting requirements must be attached to any new assistance. This time, the State Department appears to be in full agreement. We believe the Office of Insular Affairs, over the past 15 years, has an exceptional record for controlling its grant projects and protecting against waste, fraud and abuse. In addition, the Department of the Interior has much more familiarity with the people, programs, cultures and economies of Micronesia because of its longer history working in the area and the fact we don't reassign our personnel every two to three years.

50. You have indicated that the Interior Department has three major concerns for the compact renegotiation; the first was mentioned above, your concern that DOI be the lead Federal agency. Please summarize your concerns and explain what long-term staffing would be required to implement fully the policies you are recommending.

Answer: As you stated, our first concern is that DOI remain the lead agency for financial assistance. The lead on consular services and government-to-government relationships, such as matters of foreign policy, should rightfully remain under the State Department. Our second concern is that the financial assistance be conditioned and contain enforcement mechanisms as opposed to the unconditional assistance that was provided for the first 15 years. Our third concern is that issues regarding immigration policy and impact aid for U.S. territories be resolved as part of the new negotiations. As to long-term staffing needs, it is premature to discuss specific staffing needs. If the new Compact assistance is provided under more of a grant-type regime, it will require additional resources to manage and administer the assistance. The Department has begun to address the staffing issue this year with a request for additional staff associated with grants management; but a staffing proposal specifically tied to the Compact funding cannot be developed until we have a better idea of how the new assistance will be structured.

51. You have suggested that the immigration provisions of the Compact are among the most important issues to renegotiate. What policy would you recommend?

Answer: We would make two recommendations in the immigration area. One would be a requirement for better tracking of Micronesian immigrants, including the possibility of some pre-screening and the carrying of identification. The second recommendation would be a policy that sufficiently reimburses U.S. territories and states for the costs associated with Micronesian immigration.

52. Did the OIA provide the State Department with assistance as directed by the Congress last year?

Answer: OIA has been very involved in supporting the negotiation process. We are currently recruiting for a full-time analyst to assist in this work. However, even without the new position filled, we are offering assistance at a rate that will be close to one full-time equivalent.

What is the form of this collaboration?

Answer: We have one person who works part-time (up to fifty percent per week and full-time while on travel); we have several employees who are working on an occasional basis on issues associated with the negotiations; and we are recruiting for a full-time analyst to work with the State Department for the remainder of the negotiation process. That job should be filled within the next 30-45 days.

What additional collaboration is needed in FY 2001 and beyond?

Answer: The current and planned level of collaboration should be sufficient. The negotiation of the Compact assistance is the responsibility of the State Department. The Department of the Interior is a major participant in the Interagency Group on Freely Associated States and, as the agency responsible for financial dealings, has a major interest in the negotiations.

53. What is the status of the Enewetak support program.

Answer: The $1.1 million Enewetak support program continues to provide for food and commodities for the people of Enewetak ($486,000), operation of Enewetak's ship ($91,000), operation of the agricultural field station and agricultural rehabilitation ($532,000), and support for the atoll's Majuro office ($42,000). The program provides the necessary food resources to allow the Enewetak community to live on the atoll.

What is the status of the people of Enewetak?

Answer: Agricultural rehabilitation is progressing, but the local food production remains insufficient to feed the population of about 800 people. The people of Enewetak remain dependent on this program.

What has happened to the one-time appropriation of funds to provide equipment to help with land reclamation for agricultural production?

Answer: The one-time appropriation in FY 1999 of $410,000 was used to purchase and transport two backhoes and two flatbed trucks, to pay for labor on the agricultural rehabilitation project and to assist in the purchase of a new vessel to transport food and commodities to the atoll. Expenditures on the new vessel were not anticipated, but were required when the existing vessel sank. $169, 500 was expended, with additional insurance

funds, on the purchase of the vessel *KILA*. All of the equipment remains in use.

Territorial Assistance:

54. You have requested continuing the technical assistance funding at the 2000 level with the addition of $1,000,000 for the Virgin Islands. What projects were you contemplating in your original request submitted to the Office of Management and Budget that are now excluded?

Answer: In our request to the Office of Management and Budget, the amount requested for technical assistance is identical to the amount included in the President's Budget. In fiscal year 2001, the proposed increase of $1 million would be utilized to assist the Virgin Islands in the development and implementation of meaningful fiscal reforms essential to their future financial stability. We are requesting to retain these funds in future fiscal years to assist all of the insular governments in their fiscal reform and economic development efforts.

55. Similarly, your maintenance assistance request is held at the 2000 level. What work will not be done due to this reduction?

Answer: Our maintenance assistance program has been held constant for several years now. We have adapted our program to the funding available. Because we require a 50/50 match in this program, we are able to accomplish more than some of our other technical assistance activities. The downside of the matching requirement is that there are some island activities that cannot meet the matching requirement and therefore do not participate in the program and receive its benefits. This is a concern and we are looking for ways to deal with this issue.

56. Please explain why you are asking for two new FTE's next year?

Answer: We are asking for two additional FTE's to improve our capability to monitor and manage grant assistance to the governments. A high priority of the new Compact negotiations is to shift the funding from a cash giveaway program to managed grants; but it will require more help. The additional FTEs are the beginning of the process to bolster our management capability. One of the two FTEs will be a professional position and the other will likely be a technician.

57. What is the real danger that the large investment of federal funds in the territories to construct capital improvements will be lost due to inadequate maintenance of facilities?

Answer: There are numerous examples where infrastructure has been lost due to poor maintenance. A report done in 1990 on capital improvement project deficiencies in the Trust Territory documented that most of the deficiencies in the infrastructure were the result of poor maintenance. Design and construction errors totalled $11 million and Federal funds were appropriated in 1990 and 1991 to correct the problems. Maintenance-related problems were several times that amount. The best answer to the question is that infrastructure in the islands probably lasts only half as long as infrastructure in the States. Since the Federal government pays for much of this infrastructure, it is in our best interest to lengthen the useful life of projects we fund.

58. Please provide a brief overview of capital maintenance needs in the territories. To what extent is there a backlog in deferred maintenance?

Answer: The maintenance of infrastructure is directly related to the availability of funding. Independent electric, water and wastewater utilities, particularly those with ratemaking authority, have the best maintained infrastructure. The next best maintenance is probably occurring in insular governments that have larger budgets, such as Guam in particular, the Virgin Islands, the CNMI and Palau. Maintenance is generally poor in utilities when they are government owned. This includes most of the utilities in the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia. Finally, basic infrastructure such as schools and hospitals are poorly maintained in the poorer islands such as the Marshalls, the Federated States of Micronesia and American Samoa.. Maintenance is the responsibility of local governments, so the amount of resources dedicated to maintenance is a local decision. In some areas, (schools, hospitals and public buildings in the FSM, Marshall Islands and American Samoa) essentially all maintenance is deferred. The total deferred maintenance in all of the territories and freely associated states is certainly several hundred million dollars. Our maintenance assistance program does not pay for direct maintenance. Instead it provides training, equipment and other tools that help the governments improve their institutionalized capacity to maintain infrastructure. Our best successes have been in the utilities. We are now concentrating efforts on hospitals and schools in Micronesia and American Samoa. One thing that our experience has shown us over the years is that there is no substitute for good management, particularly if management has some degree of independence. This is particularly evident in American Samoa where the utilities are very well maintained, and government-owned and managed facilities are poorly maintained.

59. Please provide a summary list of maintenance assistance projects that occurred during FY 1997-2000.

Answer: The information follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS
Grant Management System

Summary Sheet

Project Number	GR #	Sub Project Title	Grant Title	Fiscal Year	Grant Type	Amount Awarded	Amount Drawndown	Balance Remaining
OMIP-ASG-2000-1	GR000085	ASG/Airport Engineer	2000 - American Samoa Government	2000	OMIP	$30,000.00	$842.00	$29,158.00
OMIP-ASG-2000-1	GR000085	ASG/ASCC O&M Training	2000 - American Samoa Government	2000	OMIP	$45,000.00		$45,000.00
OMIP-ASG-2000-1	GR000085	ASG/DOE / Operations & Maintenance	2000 - American Samoa Government	2000	OMIP	$229,000.00		$229,000.00
OMIP-ASG-2000-1	GR000085	ASG/DPW Road Maintenance System	2000 - American Samoa Government	2000	OMIP	$60,000.00		$60,000.00
OMIP-LBJ-2000-1	GR000087	ASG/O&M/Environmental Training	2000 - LBJ Hospital	2000	OMIP	$30,000.00		$30,000.00
OMIP-ASG-2000-1	GR000085	ASG/Seaport Engineer	2000 - American Samoa Government	2000	OMIP	$30,000.00	$584.00	$29,416.00
OMIP-LBJ-2000-1	GR000087	ASG/Staff Development II	2000 - LBJ Hospital	2000	OMIP	$44,000.00		$44,000.00
OMIP-ASPA-2000-1	GR000039	ASPA/Ebeye	2000 - OMIP/ASPA	2000	OMIP	$200,000.00	$200,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-ASPA-2000-2	GR000095	ASPA/Pacific Linemen Training	2000-ASPA Pacific Linemen Training	2000	OMIP	$220,035.00		$220,035.00
OMIP-ASPA-2000-3	GR000086	ASPA/Power Distribution System	2000 - OMIP/ASPA	2000	OMIP	$45,000.00		$45,000.00
OMIP-ASPA-2000-3	GR000086	ASPA/Septic Tank	2000 - OMIP/ASPA	2000	OMIP	$25,000.00		$25,000.00
OMIP-ASPA-2000-3	GR000086	ASPA/Water Lab Implementation	2000 - OMIP/ASPA	2000	OMIP	$25,000.00		$25,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-2000-2	GR000102	CNMI/Buddy System Training Prog.	2000 - Buddy System Training Prog	2000	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR000038	CNMI/Computer Feasibility	2000 - OMIP/CNMI	2000	OMIP	$30,000.00		$30,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-2000-1	GR000094	CNMI/Solid Waste Management	2000-CNMI Solid Waste Management	2000	OMIP	$96,000.00		$96,000.00
	RU000058	COE/Army Cory of Engineers	2000-Army Corp of Engineers	2000	OMIP	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-ROP-2000-2	GR000099	Palau/Buddy System Training Prog.	2000 - Buddy System Training Prog	2000	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00
OMIP-ROP-2000-1	GR000078	Palau/Joint Training Project	2000-Palau Community College	2000	OMIP	$75,000.00		$75,000.00
OMIP-PPA-2000-1	GR000051	PPA/HRD Assessment	2000 - PPA/HRD Assessment	2000	OMIP	$25,000.00	$13,750.00	$11,250.00
OMIP-RMI-2000-2	GR000103	RMI/Buddy System Training Prog.	2000 - Buddy System Trainig Prog.	2000	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00
Totals.....						**$1,354,035.00**	**$315,176.00**	**$1,038,859.00**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS
Grant Management System

Summary Sheet

Project Number	GR #	Sub Project Title	Grant Title	Fiscal Year	Grant Type	Amount Awarded	Amount Drawndown	Balance Remaining
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Training Officer	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$25,000.00		$25,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Training Room	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$13,000.00		$13,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Wastewater Operator	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Water Education	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$4,000.00		$4,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Water Leak Detection	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$50,000.00		$50,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Water Operator Train	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
OMIP-FSM-COM-99-1	GR910148	FSM/Kosrae Campus	FSM-College of Micronesia	1999	OMIP	$43,000.00		$43,000.00
OMIP-FSM-COM-99-1	GR910148	FSM/Pohnpei Campus	FSM-College of Micronesia	1999	OMIP	$121,000.00		$121,000.00
OMIP-FSM-COM-99-1	GR910148	FSM/Yap Campus	FSM-College of Micronesia	1999	OMIP	$50,000.00		$50,000.00
OMIP-GUAM-99-1	GR910082	Guam/GWA/Comptroller	Guam/Guam Waterworks Authority	1999	OMIP	$38,826.06	$38,826.06	$0.00
OMIP-GUAM-99-1	GR910082	Guam/GWA/Engineering Aide	Guam/Guam Waterworks Authority	1999	OMIP	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-GUAM-99-1	GR910082	Guam/GWA/Management Analyst	Guam/Guam Waterworks Authority	1999	OMIP	$21,173.94	$21,173.94	$0.00
OMIP-GUAM-99-1	GR910082	Guam/GWA/Training Liaison Off.	Guam/Guam Waterworks Authority	1999	OMIP	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-GUAM-99-2	GR910083	Guam/Land Status Info. Sys.	OMIP/Guam/Land Status Info. Sys.	1999	OMIP	$235,000.00		$235,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Am/Fm/GIS Mapping System	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$30,000.00	$1,897.50	$28,102.50
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Bucket Truck	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Dept Health/Essential Repairs	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$20,000.00		$20,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Dept Health/Facilities Mn. Train	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Dept Health/Maintenance Mgt	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$25,000.00		$25,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Dept Trans/New Aggregate Srcs	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$20,000.00		$20,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Dept Trans/Port Trust Fund	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Hot Work Tools	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$17,500.00	$840.35	$16,659.65
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Lineman Staff Training	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$15,000.00	$11,283.61	$3,716.39
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Okat UG Feeder and Training	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$47,500.00	$21,056.36	$26,443.64
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Overhaul Generators and Training	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$35,000.00	$23,831.45	$11,168.55
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Prepayment Meters	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$0.00
OMIP-KOS-99-1	GR910143	Kosrae/Training Within Industry	Kosrae State Government	1999	OMIP	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
OMIP-KOS-99-2	GR910142	Kosrae/Upgrade Computers for Mapping	Kosrae Utility Corporation	1999	OMIP	$14,000.00	$4,621.11	$9,378.89

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS
Grant Management System

Summary Sheet

Project Number	GR #	Sub Project Title	Grant Title	Fiscal Year	Grant Type	Amount Awarded	Amount Drawndown	Balance Remaining
OMIP-LBJ-99-1	GR910037	American Samoa/LBJ Hospital	OMIP/American Samoa LBJ Hospital	1999	OMIP	$140,000.00	$120,350.00	$19,650.00
OMIP-LBJ-99-4	GR910088	American Samoa/LBJ/Strategic Plan/Train	OMIP/LBJ/Strategic Plan/Train	1999	OMIP	$75,000.00	$75,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-ASG-99-3	GR910038	ASG/Dept Education	OMIP/ASG/Dept Education	1999	OMIP	$40,000.00	$8,400.00	$31,600 00
OMIP-ASPA-99-6	GR910166	ASPA/Micronesian Water Trn.	OMIP/ASPA/Micronesian Water Trn.	1999	OMIP	$146,142.00	$146,142 00	$0.00
OMIP-ASPA-99-5	GR910157	ASPA/Pacific Island Drought	ASPA/Pacific Island Drought	1999	OMIP	$35,000.00	$35,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-ASPA-99-2	GR910039	ASPA/Water/Wastewater/Train/SCADA	OMIP/ASPA/Water/Wst/Trn/SCADA	1999	OMIP	$180,000.00	$180,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Department of Education	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$135,000.00		$135,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk EPA Water Quality Monitoring	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$18,000 00		$18,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Health Services Health Mnt. Trn.	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Health Services Mnt. & Finance	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$20,000.00		$20,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Health Services Need Assess.	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$5,000 00		$5,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Health Services Pediatric Ward	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$32,500.00		$32,500.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Planning & Stat. - Road Drainage	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$100,000 00		$100,000.00
OMIP-CHUUK-99-1	GR910146	Chuuk Planning & Stat. - State Engineer	FSM-Chuuk State Government	1999	OMIP	$35,000.00		$35,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR910068	CNMI/Biomed Equip. Trn.	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$22,000.00		$22,000 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR910068	CNMI/CIP Data Base	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$13,000.00		$13,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-4	GR910073	CNMI/Computer Aided Facility	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$60,000.00		$60,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR910068	CNMI/Computer Feasibility	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$50,000.00		$50,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-3	GR910120	CNMI/CPA PORTS POLICE TRNG.	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$6,738.00	$6,738.00	$0.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Educational News	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$12,000.00		$12,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Electrical Power Trn	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$10,000.00		$10,000.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-4	GR910073	CNMI/Electrical Survey	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$40,000 00		$40,000 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR910068	CNMI/Fixed Asset	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$85,000.00		$85,000 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-3	GR910120	CNMI/Loading Bridge Train	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$7,000.00		$7,000 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-1	GR910068	CNMI/Plant Engineer	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$58,000.00		$58,000 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-3	GR910120	CNMI/Power Generator Trn	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$20,000.00	$5,835.00	$14,165 00
OMIP-CNMI-99-3	GR910120	CNMI/Rescue/Fire Fight Trn	OMIP/CNMI	1999	OMIP	$28,262.00		$28,262.00
OMIP-CNMI-99-2	GR910093	CNMI/Supervision Train	OMIP/CNMI/	1999	OMIP	$15,000.00		$15,000.00

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS
Grant Management System

Summary Sheet

Project Number	GR #	Sub Project Title	Grant Title	Fiscal Year	Grant Type	Amount Awarded	Amount Drawndown	Balance Remaining
OMIP-ASPA-98-1	GR800081	ASPA/Buddy System	OMIP/ASPA	1998	OMIP	$315,682.00	$281,068.65	$34,613.35
OMIP-MICRO-98-1	GR800082	ASPA/Micronesian Water Training	OMIP/ASPA	1998	OMIP	$372,518.00	$372,517.85	$0 15
OMIP-CHUUK-98-2	GR800072	CHUUK/Construction Tech Asst	CHUUK/Construction Tech Asst	1998	OMIP	$90,000.00	$90,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-CHUUK-98-1	GR800071	CHUUK/CPUC	CHUUK/CPUC	1998	OMIP	$135,000.00	$130,895.04	$4,104.96
OMIP-CNMI-98-1	GR880002	CNMI/Solid Waste Mgt	CNMI/Solid Waste Mgt	1998	OMIP	$100,000.00	$42,025.00	$57,975.00
OMIP-KOS-97-1	GR800052	Kosrae/State School Facilities	Kosrae/State School Facilities	1998	OMIP	$150,000.00	$141,407.00	$8,593.00
OMIP-PALAU-98-2	GR800068	Palau/Mgt Audit PUC	Palau/Mgt Audit PUC	1998	OMIP	$70,577.00	$0.00	$70,577.00
OMIP-PALAU-98-1	GR800069	Palau/Ministry of Educ. Main. Chief	Palau/Ministry of Educ. Main. Chief	1998	OMIP	$70,000.00	$0 00	$70,000.00
OMIP-POHN-97-2	GR800045	Pohnpei/Facilities Repairs	Pohnpei/Facilities Repairs	1998	OMIP	$100,000.00	$0.00	$100,000.00
OMIP-POHN-97-1	GR800044	Pohnpei/Hospital Repair Study	Pohnpei/Hospital Repair Study	1998	OMIP	$30,000.00	$0.00	$30,000.00
OMIP-POHN-97-5	GR800042	Pohnpei/O&M Engineer	Pohnpei/O&M Engineer	1998	OMIP	$30,500.00	$0.00	$30,500.00
OMIP-POHN-PUC-97-4	GR800046	Pohnpei/PUC Water & Sewer	Pohnpei/PUC Water & Sewer	1998	OMIP	$285,000.00	$54,892 00	$230,108.00
OMIP-POHN-PUC-97-6	GR800041	Pohnpei/PUC Yr 5	Pohnpei/PUC Yr 5	1998	OMIP	$462,000.00	$323,495.00	$138,505.00
OMIP-POHN-97-3	GR800043	Pohnpei/Solid Waste	Pohnpei/Solid Waste	1998	OMIP	$100,000.00	$0.00	$100,000 00
OMIP-VI-98-1	GR840443	USVI/Public Works/Schools/Hosp.	USVI/Public Works/Schools/Hosp.	1998	OMIP	$273,500.00		$273,500.00
OMIP-YAP-97-1	GR800049	Yap/Public Service Corp. Yr 2	Yap/Public Service Corp. Yr 2	1998	OMIP	$257,500.00	$257,500.00	$0.00
Totals.....						**$2,842,277.00**	**$1,693,800.54**	**$1,148,476.46**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSULAR AFFAIRS
Grant Management System

Summary Sheet

Project Number	GR #	Sub Project Title	Grant Title	Fiscal Year	Grant Type	Amount Awarded	Amount Drawndown	Balance Remaining
OMIP-ASPA-96-1	GR700104	ASG/ASPA/Buddy System	ASG/ASPA	1997	OMIP	$94,874.00	$94,873.51	$0.49
OMIP-PALAU-97-5	GR700210	Palau/Hospital Maint. Consult.	Palau/Hospital Maint. Consult.	1997	OMIP	$31,550.00	$31,500.00	$50.00
OMIP-PALAU-97-1	GR700206	Palau/OMIP Coordinator	Palau/OMIP Coordinator	1997	OMIP	$29,700.00	$29,700.00	$0.00
OMIP-PALAU-97-3	GR700208	Palau/Palau Community College	Palau/Palau Community College	1997	OMIP	$155,250.00	$138,599.50	$16,650.50
OMIP-PALAU-97-2	GR700207	Palau/Water Meter/Leak Detec.	Palau/Water Meter/Leak Detec.	1997	OMIP	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-PALAU-97-4	GR700209	Palau/Water/Wastewater Eng.	Palau/Water/Wastewater Eng.	1997	OMIP	$32,000.00	$0.00	$32,000.00
OMIP-RMI-ENEW-97-1	GR700107	RMI/Enewetak Elementary	RMI/Enewetak Elementary	1997	OMIP	$44,000.00	$44,000.00	$0.00
OMIP-RMI-97-1	GR700163	RMI/Marshalls DPW Yr 2	RMI/Marshalls DPW Yr 2	1997	OMIP	$187,250.00	$184,500.04	$2,749.96
Totals.....						**$674,624.00**	**$623,173.05**	**$51,450.95**

60. With respect to the impending depletion of the prior service trust fund, the Department was directed in FY 1999 to recommend a unified course of action in time for the fiscal year 2000 appropriations process. What progress are you making on this Congressional direction? Has a recommendation been made? What is it?

Answer: In response to the Congressional directive, the heads of government of the four affected insular areas signed a letter indicating they are all united in supporting a U.S. appropriation to cover all future program costs. The Administration has considered this issue in the last three budget processes. The Administration's current position, based on its review of the documentation and history of the program, is that an additional appropriation is not justified and there is no U.S. commitment for additional appropriations. The Administration's position is reflected in the absence of a funding proposal. The issue will likely be raised once again in the fiscal year 2002 budget process.

Brown tree snake program:

61. Last year you received a large increase for this program. What additional work is being done with this increased funding?

Answer: The additional funding is being used for construction of barriers. We are working on projects with the CNMI government for a barrier at the Saipan port, with the Government of Guam for a barrier at the airport, with the Department of Defense for barriers at three different military sites on Guam and Hawaii, and with the State of Hawaii for a possible barrier enclosure at the Honolulu airport.

62. What are some of the social, economic and ecological problems that the snakes have caused on Guam?

Answer: The major social impacts are snake bites and the attendant fear it creates, along with inconveniences to residents and visitors who sometimes are confronted by the snakes. The major economic effects are caused by power outages and agricultural losses, particularly chicken farming. The ecological impacts have been well-documented. Approximately nine species of birds have been extirpated from Guam and other species are threatened, including species of geckos and skinks, which can result in major increases of insect populations.

63. To what extent has the brown tree snake become established on Saipan?

Answer: There have been enough sightings on Saipan that we are reasonably certain a small population of brown tree snakes is established.

What control efforts are currently underway on Saipan?

Answer: On Saipan we use dog teams to inspect incoming cargo from Guam; we have traps placed around the perimeters of the air and sea ports, and we have a fairly extensive public education campaign. We are working with the CNMI to help fund barrier construction for a compound at the Saipan seaport, where incoming cargo can be placed until it is inspected.

What do you plan to spend on brown tree snake control in the CNMI if you are funded at the request?

Answer: We expect to spend about $275, 000 on operations activities and up to $100,000 on barrier construction.

64. What activities, specifically, would be forgone if the brown tree snake program was funded at the FY 1999 level again next year?

Answer: The development of our annual action plan is a collaborative effort so it is difficult to say precisely what work would not be performed. Most likely targets for reduction would be barrier construction and external research, which focuses primarily on biocontrols.

65. How many brown tree snake sightings have occurred on Hawaii? Is it thought that these snakes came from Guam?

Answer: There have been seven confirmed sightings in Hawaii and there is no reasonable doubt these snakes came from Guam.

66. What could be the economic and ecological impact of the brown tree snakes on Hawaii if they were to become established in a similar fashion as they are on Guam?

Answer: What has occurred on Guam would be increased by a magnitude of tenfold or more. While economic impacts could eventually be serious in terms of power outages and effects on agriculture and tourism, the ecological damage would be extreme. It would certainly rank among the greatest ecological disasters of U.S. history.

67. What funding has the State of Hawaii put into this effort?

Answer: The State of Hawaii does not match Federal spending; but one could reasonably estimate they have put several hundred thousand dollars into the effort over the past decade.

How much is Hawaii planning to contribute in FY 2001?

Answer: To the best of our knowledge Hawaii has no specific programs or cost centers to gather information on brown tree snake spending, but education efforts and routine program management in their Departments of Agriculture and Natural Resources would be in the tens of thousands of dollars.

Why does the State of Hawaii use different search protocols than the Federal government?

Answer: There is no absolute best method for search protocols. The situation is significantly different in Hawaii where they are looking for snakes entering on very specific identified cargo originating on Guam; and in Guam where they are concerned with finding snakes on any outgoing cargo, regardless of destination, and merely identifying all of the cargo is a major challenge.

Department of the Interior

Office of the Solicitor

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

HOUSE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Fiscal Year 2001

PROGRAM AND UNCONTROLLABLE INCREASES

Question: For the record, list your program and uncontrollable increase request in priority order.

Answer: The following are our program and net uncontrollable cost increases, in priority order:

Uncontrollables	$1,381,000
Conversion of reimbursable positions	$2,375,000

BUDGET REQUEST FOR CONVERSION OF REIMBURSABLE POSITIONS

Question: The budget request includes an increase of $2,375,000 to transfer 19 FTE currently funded under reimbursable arrangements to direct appropriations? Where is this funding increase offset within the Department? If it is not, why not?

Answer: The President's Budget does not include specific offsets reflecting a transfer of the 19 FTE's currently funded by Interior bureaus to the Solicitor's Office direct appropriation. However, the budget reflects funding levels that the Administration believes are necessary for bureau programs, including funds that the bureaus have been spending on legal support but that would now be available for direct program costs.

Question: If it is not offset, how will the Department insure that the bureaus will not subsequently use that funding for new reimbursable arrangements, effectively increasing the size of the Office of the Solicitor?

Answer: We are committed to reversing the trend of the last several years of increasing reliance on the bureaus to fund legal positions which was necessitated by relatively static funding for the Solicitor's Office during a time of increased demand for legal services. If the requested increase is approved, the funds now being used by the bureaus to pay for the 19 reimbursable positions will be applied to the bureaus' high priority program needs and will not be available to fund additional reimbursable positions for the Office. This is not to say that there are no circumstances under which the Office would accept funding for additional reimbursable positions in the future. If a bureau were to undertake some significant initiative that required unanticipated levels of legal support, new reimbursable arrangements could be needed for the Office to carry out the additional legal work. We

intend to scrutinize such requests very carefully, however; in fact, we have recently turned down bureau offers to fund new positions in our Office.

ATTORNEY ATTRITION

Question: The budget request refers to high staff turnover within one Division. How does turnover of attorneys in the Office compare with attorney turnover rates for Offices of the Solicitor or General Counsel in other departments and independent agencies government-wide (excluding the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice)?

Answer: The Office of Personnel Management has provided us with the following information for FY 1999, showing the turnover rates for all agencies with at least 100 attorneys, excluding the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice. (See next page.) The first column of figures indicates each agency's average level of attorney employment throughout the year; the second column shows the total number of resignations, retirements, and transfers out of the agency during that period; and the third column shows the turnover rate, calculated by dividing the number of separations by the average employment level and multiplying the result by 100 (to give a percentage figure).

Our FY 1999 turnover rate of 6.6 percent was the 7th highest out of the 24 agencies shown. It also represented an increase over our FY 1998 turnover rate of 5.9 percent. While we do not have figures for the years prior to FY 1998, our sense is that our turnover rate has increased appreciably in the last few years. Particularly alarming was our experience with the Division of Indian Affairs, which lost 10 attorneys out of a staffing level of 29 during FY 1998-99, for an average turnover rate of 17 percent per year.

Agency	Average Employment	Separations	Turnover Rate
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	152	29	19.1
Federal Trade Commission	417	49	11.8
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,045	112	10.7
Federal Communications Commission	292	27	9.2
Small Business Administration	231	16	6.9
Department of Treasury	2,447	163	6.7
Department of the Interior	**302**	**20**	**6.6**
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	427	26	6.1
General Services Administration	117	7	6.0
National Labor Relations Board	661	39	5.9
Department of State	107	6	5.6
Department of Veterans Affairs	712	39	5.5
Dept. of Housing and Urban Development	336	18	5.4
Department of Education	229	12	5.2
Department of Energy	439	21	4.8
Department of Health and Human Services	336	15	4.5
Social Security Administration	1,293	57	4.4
Department of Transportation	517	23	4.4
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	491	21	4.3
Department of Labor	570	18	3.2
Environmental Protection Agency	938	30	3.2
Department of Commerce	619	18	2.9
Department of Agriculture	227	6	2.6
Merit Systems Protection Board	122	2	1.6
Totals	**13,027**	**774**	**5.9**

Department of the Interior

Office of the Inspector General

STATEMENT OF EARL E. DEVANEY - INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

I appreciate this opportunity to provide testimony in support of the fiscal year 2001 President's Budget for the Department of the Interior's Office of Inspector General (OIG). This budget request reflects a new direction and a renewed commitment to combating fraud, waste, abuse and mismanagement in the Department of the Interior.

While we continue to be one of the smallest OIG offices of all Cabinet-level Departments, we nevertheless have responsibility for oversight of a Department with more than 70,000 employees and one of the largest revenue generating Departments in the Federal Government. Through our audit and investigative activities we are playing a critical and more visible role in responding to demands for greater accountability of taxpayer dollars and for *achieving results*.

The OIG budget request for fiscal year 2001 is $28,859,000 which includes a modest programmatic increase of $1,263,000 for audit and investigations' activities and $1,510,000 to cover uncontrollable cost increases, such as mandatory employee pay increases.

The funding we request will greatly assist us in rebuilding our discretionary audit activity, which has diminished to a mere 13% in 1999, and advance a more pro-active approach to our investigations. We intend to focus on the highest priority issues that will have the greatest impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of Departmental programs and operations, and help lead the Department toward meeting its strategic and performance goals and challenges.

AUDITS

The OIG Audits activity is requesting a program increase of $618,000 in its FY 2001 budget. This programmatic increase would support Audit activities that address the most serious management issues identified by the OIG, the General Accounting Office, the Department, and the Congress. These funds would be used for contracting out audits such as those related to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 and the Clinger-Cohen Act (information technology) and/or to hire additional auditors to conduct discretionary audits which encompass programs with a high financial or programmatic improvement impact.

With 87% of our audit resources dedicated to mandated or Congressionally-requested areas, we fall short of addressing all critical activities of the Department. Our FY 2001 budget request would add five additional auditors to provide more comprehensive audit review and oversight of high risk/high impact Departmental programs and operations.

INVESTIGATIONS

OIG Investigations is requesting a program increase of $645,000 in its FY 2001 budget. The requested funds would support five additional investigators and would be targeted specifically toward three Departmental programs that we have identified as high risk/high impact: underpayment of royalties, fraud in tribal programs, and grant and contract fraud.

Historically, investigations in these areas have been initiated in response to complaints or referrals. These investigations are complex, sensitive, and extremely resource intensive. Unfortunately, they have typically resulted in civil judicial or administrative action, rather than criminal prosecution. In order to effect greater deterrence against fraud in these areas, we must proactively pursue alleged fraud as a crime, in violation of Federal criminal statues. We have begun that shift in focus, with an eye toward demonstrating the seriousness of these offenses through aggressive investigations and referrals for criminal prosecution.

Underpayment of Royalties/Royalty Management Program Initiative

The Department's Minerals Management Service supervises a royalty program that collects approximately $4 billion in royalty payments to the Federal Government each year. This is one of the Federal Government's greatest sources of non-tax revenues, and these revenue collections have been identified by the OIG as one of the Department's long standing "Top Ten" management problems. Our investigators work closely with our auditors to identify the most serious problems that may serve as the basis for criminal investigations.

Tribal Investigations

The OIG is recognized as the primary organization to investigate white-collar crimes in tribal programs and operations. With more than 550 tribes throughout the continental United States and the U.S. Trust Territories, we are responsible for oversight of approximately $220 million in federal grants made to the tribes and investigation of violations involving the grant funds. Investigations of tribal programs and operations are one of our top priorities, given the historical prevalence of fraud in tribal programs. Within the past year, the OIG has been asked by several U.S. Attorneys' Offices to add investigative resources to combat fraud in tribal programs and activities.

Grant and Contract Fraud

The Department's Bureaus obligate more than $3 billion annually for grants and contracts. Given the large amount of funds from taxpayer dollars involved in the grants and contracts program, the potential for fraud in this area is immense. We will be coordinating with our audit counterparts, who will be examining contracts and grants to tribal governments, Bureau contractors, and the insular area islands, to affirmatively develop information that may uncover fraudulent activity.

CONCLUSION

The mission of Inspectors General has remained virtually unchanged since the passage of the Inspector General's Act in 1978. The environment in which we operate, however, has changed dramatically. While the Federal Government is continually streamlining its internal operations, it also endeavors to provide and produce superior service and results to its customers.

Since arriving at the Department of the Interior's Office of Inspector General in August 1999, I have made significant organizational and personnel changes to create greater opportunity for success in our mission and for achieving outcome-oriented results. We have numerous success stories as a result of our work and we continue to make significant progress in leading the Department in meeting its strategic goals and mission objectives.

In order to provide effective oversight of Departmental programs, as well as meet expanding legislative requirements and respond to increasing Congressional and Departmental requests for assistance, I ask that you give serious consideration to this modest budget increase. We are committed to providing valuable and timely information and assistance to the Congress, the Administration, Departmental managers, and the taxpayers and we will continue to work diligently to create an accountable Department of the Interior that works better and cost less, provides superior customer services, and achieves results.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our budget request. This concludes my testimony for the Office of Inspector General.

The audits of bureau and departmental financial statements are wholly represented in the "Financial Management" category. Financial statement audits also address "Maintenance", "Waste Management" and "Revenue Collections". However, we have not distributed that effort among these categories for the purposes of this report.

Limited audit effort was directly expended in 1999 toward "Range Monitoring" or "Land Exchanges" following significant audit effort in 1997 and 1998 in these categories. Further auditing in these areas is pending implementation of the recommendations that resulted from our 1997 and 1998 efforts.

"Automated Land Records System" was newly added to our "Top Ten" list in December 1999. A new system is under development by BLM, but is not far enough along for us to conduct a pre-installation review.

Question: Are you satisfied with the distribution of effort? If not, please explain how you would readjust priorities to better target your efforts.

Answer: **AUDITS** We are dedicating the bulk of our audit resources to mandated and Congressionally-requested areas, leaving only 13% of our audit resources available for discretionary audits. We are not satisfied with this distribution of effort. Unfortunately, we have little or no room for readjustment of priorities, absent dramatic change to the way we conduct business. For example, we are exploring a pilot contract for one of the bureau financial statement audits (with OIG oversight), an effort that will free up to six auditors to conduct discretionary audits.

Clearly, with 87% of our audit resources dedicated to mandated or Congressionally-requested areas, we cannot provide more coverage of the top 10 and for other critical activities of the Department absent an increase in resources. Our FY 2001 budget requests resources for five additional auditors to provide more comprehensive audit review and oversight of Departmental programs and operations.

INVESTIGATIONS The new Inspector General was not satisfied with the distribution of investigations efforts and has taken steps to redirect them. Historically, our investigative program has been reactive, predicating investigations on information received from various sources, including the U.S. Congress, DOI officials and employees, other Federal agencies, OIG audits, the general public, and anonymous sources. As a result, the investigations effort did not pro-actively identify program vulnerabilities and fraud by directing investigative resources toward areas determined to be most susceptible. Indeed, these would include the Department's top ten most serious management challenges, as well as high-impact Department programs and operations.

To address this concern about distribution of investigative resources and to meet the challenges that lie ahead, we have reduced our case inventory by closing cases that do not significantly impact the Department's programs and operations. We have realigned our organizational

Additional Committee Questions Submitted for the Record

Office of Inspector General

Top Ten Management Problems within the Department of the Interior

Question: The budget justification refers to a few issues that are in the "Top Ten" list of management problems in the Department. Please provide this list for the record.

Answer: The "Top Ten" list of Management Problems in the Department of the Interior is provided as Attachment 1.

Question: For each issue on the "Top Ten" list, what percentage of your budget is used to address that issue? For each of these issues, are they addressed through mandatory audits, requested audits, or discretionary audits/investigations.

Answer: Below is a schedule which shows the percent of Audit and Investigation efforts in relation to the total OIG budget. Designation of mandatory, requested or discretionary applies to audits only. Investigations do not carry these designations. A list identifying the source of investigations opened in Fiscal year 1999 is provided as Attachment 2.

Management Problem	Percent of Budget	Audits Category
1. Management of Indian Trust Funds	2.1%	Mandatory
2. Maintenance	4.4%	Mandatory
3. NPS Housing	0.6%	Discretionary
4. Financial Management	46.3%	Mandatory
5. Waste Management	1.5%	Mandatory
6. Revenue Collections	11.1%	Mandatory, Discretionary, and Requested
7. Inspection & Enforcement of Fluid Minerals	1.0%	Discretionary
8. Range Monitoring	1.3%	Discretionary
9. Land Exchanges	1.7%	Discretionary
10. Automated Land Records System	0.0%	n/a
TOTAL	**70.0%**	

Presently, the OIG effort directed toward "Management of Indian Trust Funds" includes oversight of the annual audit of Indian Trust Funds and Individual Indian Money Accounts performed by an independent accounting firm under contract to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and audits related to trust lands.

structure to provide better investigative coverage of the Department's bureaus and financial resources.

Consistent with our performance goals, we will join our audit counterparts in identifying and thoroughly examining one of the Department's high impact programs during this fiscal year. To maximize our investigative coverage and presence, we have begun to establish task forces with other Federal law enforcement agencies throughout the continental United States and the U.S. Territories. We have also undertaken a more aggressive outreach and crime-awareness effort within the Department, emphasizing not only detection of crime, fraud, waste and abuse but prevention as well.

Uncontrollables

Question: Is funding uncontrollable increases your highest priority? If not, what is?

Answer: We view both our uncontrollables and our program increase request as the highest OIG budget priorities. Funding for uncontrollable costs is critical, as it allows us to keep pace with our FY 2000 performance. This is particularly important in that we received only half of the requested uncontrollable costs in FY 2000 ($600,000 of the needed $1,128,000). In order to absorb these uncontrollable costs, we have made considerable adjustments to such budget items as travel, training, equipment and services that support OIG personnel. Coupled with relatively flat funding and reduced FTEs over the past 7 years, the OIG funding base has been gradually eroding. Reversal of this trend, by providing all of the requested budget increases, will ensure more effective oversight of Departmental programs and activities, particularly in areas we have identified as high risk/high financial impact and in areas we and the General Accounting Office have identified as the most serious management challenges facing the Department.

Full-Time Employment

Question: How does your funding and FTE level compare with the Inspector General offices in other Departments of equivalent size or complexity?

Answer: Attachment 3 shows DOI/OIG as one of the two smallest cabinet level Department OIG's, based on funding and FTEs, while our responsibility is to provide oversight for one of the larger non-Defense Federal Government employers and the largest revenue collection Department outside of the U.S. Treasury. This is an imbalance that must be corrected. Funding the FY 2001 President's Budget request is a first step in adjusting this imbalance.

Question: If funded, your request for 10 additional FTE would give you an 11% increase over the FY 1999 level. How does this fit with the Administration's initiative to make Government small and more efficient?

Answer: The OIG is requesting an additional 10 FTEs in FY 2001, which is a modest 3.8 percent increase over our estimated FY 2000 level of 265. The 11 percent increase over FY 1999 reflects our effort to respond to unusually high attrition during 1998 and 1999. This followed a

significant streamlining effort within the OIG from October 1, 1992, until September 30, 1999 during which our FTE dropped 27 percent from 339 to 248, in keeping with the Administration's initiative.

The OIG mission, however, is to detect and prevent fraud, waste, abuse and mismanagement and to promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness in Departmental programs. As our organization diminished in size through streamlining, our responsibilities did not. The additional FTE will greatly assist us in rebuilding our discretionary audit activity and advance our pro-active investigative approach. .

Question: If there are insufficient funds to cover this proposed FTE increase, are there any constraints that would keep you from shifting resources from low priority investigations to higher priority investigations or audits?

Answer: The OIG appropriation is personnel intensive. Over eighty percent of the OIG appropriation goes toward salary and benefits for the current staff. The remainder of the appropriation is critical for direct support of our professional workforce such as office space, computers, supplies, travel and training. A budget so personnel intensive provides no flexibility to fund additional auditor and criminal investigator positions from other existing resources.

In order to maximize our present resources, we have eliminated all "low priority" audits or investigations. Even with our efforts focused on highest priority matters, however, areas worthy of audit or investigative coverage continue to go unaddressed.

Minerals Management Service Embezzlement

Question: The Committee was recently informed about an employee who embezzled $395,000 from the Minerals Management Service over a period of three years. What are you doing with MMS and the Department to ensure that this does not happen again?

Answer: During an audit of the financial statements of the Minerals Management Service (MMS) for fiscal year 1998, we found that MMS had not performed monthly cash reconciliations for any of its 13 funds. As a result, we requested that MMS complete the reconciliations. While conducting the reconciliations, MMS discovered the embezzlement and referred the matter to our office. When the embezzlement was suspected, MMS immediately contacted the OIG. MMS also took immediate action to correct the internal control weaknesses that allowed the embezzlement to occur.

We completed an investigation into the embezzlement of Federal Funds totaling $395,991. During the investigation, we found that a lack of management control permitted a GS-13 accountant at the Minerals Management Service (MMS) to use the MMS accounting system, the U.S. Treasury Electronic Certification System, and passwords of former or current employees to steal the money. Inadequate controls included no separation of duties, no cash reconciliations, and no management reviews.

We immediately briefed MMS financial management officials on the results of the investigation and the cause of the embezzlement and made recommendations to improve controls. We scheduled a presentation for the next Departmental Chief Financial Officers' Council meeting on how officials can prevent and detect fraud and offered assistance to the Chief Financial Officers' Council in developing an embezzlement prevention program.

Finally, we will be issuing a report to MMS addressing the internal controls over its accounting system which makes recommendations to institute management controls to safeguard the assets of MMS. We will determine whether these controls are functioning properly during our annual audits of MMS's financial statements.

Attachment 1

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

UPDATE OF THE TEN MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES FACING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
(as of December 1, 1999)

1. **Management of Indian Trust Funds**
2. **Maintenance**
3. **National Park Service Housing**
4. **Financial Management**
5. **Waste Management**
6. **Revenue Collection**
7. **Inspection and Enforcement of Fluid Minerals**
8. **Range Monitoring**
9. **Land Exchanges**
10. **Automated Records System (Land and Minerals)**

Note: This list is not ranked in any order of significance of sensitivity, dollar impact, management risk, or potential for fraud.

ATTACHMENT 1

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
Washington, D.C. 20240

DEC - 1 1999

Honorable Fred Thompson
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In your September 22, 1999, letter to the Office of Inspector General, you requested that we provide a current assessment of the most serious management problems facing the Department of the Interior. In response to your request, we are providing a summary (Enclosure 1) of the 10 most serious management problems based primarily on our audits and on material weaknesses reported by the Department in its fiscal year 1998 Accountability Report and by bureaus and offices in their fiscal year 1998 Annual Assurance Statements on Management Controls. The 10 key management problems are essentially the same as those reported last year, although the lack of an effective and efficient automated land and minerals record system has replaced Year 2000 Readiness. Further, the management problems are not ranked in any order of significance of sensitivity, dollar impact, management risk, or potential for fraud. The summary includes a reference to recent audit reports and audits we are conducting or planning to conduct during fiscal year 2000 that are related to these problem areas. The planned audits are indexed to our fiscal year 2000 Audit Workplan Summary (Enclosure 2). In addition, we are providing copies of our two most recent Semiannual Reports (April and October 1999) for your information (Enclosures 3 and 4, respectively).

We have been informed by Department officials that Interior is providing a summary of the actions taken to address the 10 key management problems to you. In regard to Interior bureau responses to our audit recommendations, we are providing a summary of audit recommendations made and resolved as of September 30, 1999 (Enclosure 5), which indicates that stateside bureaus have resolved 87 percent of our audit recommendations and that Insular Area Governments have resolved 58 percent of our audit recommendations.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of assistance. If you have any questions concerning our response, please contact me at (202) 208-5745 or Ms. Mary Adler, Deputy Inspector General, at (202) 208-4243, or Mr. Robert J. Williams, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, at (202) 208-4252.

Sincerely,

Earl E. Devaney
Inspector General

Enclosures (5)

cc: Secretary of the Interior

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

September 22, 1999

The Honorable Earl E. Devaney
Inspector General
Department of the Interior
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Mr. Devaney:

For the past two years, you and other inspectors general have responded to our requests for information on what you consider to be the 10 most serious management challenges facing your agency. The information you provided has been extremely valuable in focusing Congressional and agency attention on mission-critical management problems and stimulating action to resolve them. Given the value of this information, we respectfully request that you update your earlier responses. We also request additional information on programs within your agency that may not be accomplishing their intended results.

Update of 10 most serious management problems

Please provide your current assessment of the most serious management challenges facing your agency based on the work of your office, your general knowledge of agency operations, and other relevant information. These challenges might include agency operations that are particularly vulnerable to fraud, waste, error, or mismanagement, or agency programs and activities that otherwise pose significant risks. As in the past, we suggest the number 10 only as an approximation. Feel free to specify more or fewer items if that would present a more accurate picture of your agency's most serious management challenges.

We ask that you include a summary description of each item, together with references to reports by your office and any other sources on which you rely. In addition, please identify and briefly describe any significant open audit recommendations by your office that address these items. It would be helpful if you could include a brief assessment of whether and to what extent the agency is making progress toward resolving the challenge, including how it is responding to audit recommendations.

We are interested in knowing what positive progress agencies are making to address many of the major management problems that have been identified in the past. Therefore, we ask that you describe how your current list compares to the lists you sent us in previous years. For example, if items have been resolved, please describe briefly what steps the agency took to resolve them. For items that remain, please briefly explain what steps the agency is taking to resolve them.

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Programs not achieving intended results

In addition to the economy and efficiency concerns that underlie our request for information on major management problems, we are concerned about the effectiveness of agency programs--i.e., whether they are achieving their intended results. Accordingly, we also request that you identify, based on your work and knowledge of agency operations, any programs that, in your judgment, have had questionable success in achieving results. This would include (among others) programs providing ineffective subsidies, programs that suffer from poor targeting or design, or programs that simply are not managed in a way that best promotes accomplishment of results.

\- - - - -

Once again, we plan to use your response to inform and assist future Congressional oversight and legislation, including deliberations on the fiscal year 2001 budget. To allow time to process the information most effectively, particularly in planning for next year, we ask that you respond not later than December 1.

As always, we appreciate the inspector general community's invaluable assistance and support.

Sincerely,

Fred Thompson
Chairman
Senate Governmental Affairs
Committee

Dick Armey
House Majority Leader

Dan Burton
Chairman
House Government Reform
Committee

Pete Domenici
Chairman
Senate Budget Committee

John Kasich
Chairman
House Budget Committee

ENCLOSURE 1

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
LIST OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR'S 10 MOST SERIOUS MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

1. **Management of Indian Trust Funds.** The Department reported "Inadequate Management of Trust Funds" as a mission critical material weakness in its fiscal year 1998 Accountability Report. General Accounting Office (GAO) and Office of Inspector General(OIG) audits and reviews by independent accounting firms also indicate that management of Indian Trust Funds is a continuing problem.

The Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians manages a total of $3 billion of funds in trust, $2.5 billion for Indian tribes, and $500 million for individual Indians. The trust funds are an accumulation of payments of claims and judgment awards, investment income, and revenues from 56 million acres of trust land. Revenues are derived principally from leases for mineral extraction, grazing, and timber. Reviews by the GAO and OIG and independent accounting firms have identified long-standing serious and continuing problems in the management of the trust funds. According to the former Special Trustee, mismanagement and neglect have allowed the trust management systems, record-keeping systems, and risk management systems to deteriorate over a 20- to 30-year period and become obsolete and ineffective. Since 1990, the trust programs were often seriously understaffed and underfunded. The result was that the Government increasingly was unable to keep pace with the rapid changes and improvements in technology, trust systems, and private industry's most effective practices. We believe that these problems will continue until reforms, such as the High Level Implementation Plan, are fully funded and implemented.

Update

On July 31, 1998, the Special Trustee for American Indians issued the High Level Implementation Plan designed to correct/update information in the individual Indian money accounting system and in the land title and land management systems and to address weaknesses in records management, training, policy and procedures, and internal controls. The plan provides information on 13 sub-projects, the responsible bureaus and offices, supporting tasks, critical milestones, work plans, resource estimates, and accountable officials. The estimated budget for the plan, which covers fiscal years 1997 through 2000, is $147.4 million. The Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget chairs regularly scheduled meetings, which are attended by representatives of OIG and GAO, to discuss the status and progress of the implementation of the plan.

In July 1998, GAO initiated a review of the High Level Implementation Plan. The objectives of the review were to (1) determine whether the plan addresses the key issues related to the Department's management of Indian trust funds and resources, (2) determine whether the plan includes measurable goals for dealing with each of these issues, (3) evaluate whether the implementation steps outlined in the plan are sufficient for achieving the issue-related goals, and (4) identify any implementation issues that have not been adequately addressed

in the implementation plan. The review was requested by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

According to the GAO (Report No. GAO/AIMD-99-53, issued April 1999, and Report No. GAO/AIMD-99-238T, issued July 1999), the Department does not have reasonable assurance that its plan for improving Indian trust operations provides an effective solution for addressing long-standing management weaknesses. Specifically, the Department has not properly analyzed its information technology needs that are essential to the overall success of the plan, and until the Department develops an information systems architecture addressing all of its trust management functions, it cannot ensure that its information systems will not duplicate or be incompatible or will optimally support its needs across all business areas. Further, the Department also does not know whether its acquisition of a new service for managing Indian assets and land records (Trust Accounting and Asset Management System) will be cost effective in meeting trust management needs. Before deciding to contract with a service vendor, the Department did not adequately define important service requirements or sufficiently analyze technical alternatives, nor did the Department take the steps needed to minimize acquisition risks. In particular, it did not develop a risk management plan, ensure that the vendor's system could work with the Department's data and systems, or establish realistic project time frames. Thus, the Department faces an unnecessarily high risk that the service will not meet its general business and specific performance needs, and it lacks the means for dealing with this risk.

An independent public accountant issued a qualified opinion on the Indian trust funds financial statements for fiscal year 1997 because cash and overnight investments could not be independently verified, cash balances were materially greater than those reported by the U.S. Treasury, major deficiencies in the accounting systems' controls and records caused the systems to be unreliable, and certain beneficiaries of trust funds disagreed with balances recorded by the Office of Trust Funds Management and had filed or were expected to file claims against the Office. These conditions prevented the cash and trust funds balances and the receipts and disbursements from being audited. In addition, a potential liability to the Federal Government exists because of lawsuits filed concerning the Government's fiduciary responsibilities.

A report on the audit of the fiscal year 1998 financial statements for Indian trust funds has been completed by an independent public accounting firm and is in the final report writing phase. The fieldwork for the audit of the fiscal year 1999 financial statements is in process.

In July 1999, GAO initiated a review of the Department's Trust Asset and Accounting Management System (TAAMS). The objectives of the ongoing review are to (1) determine whether Interior has implemented disciplined software acquisition processes in such areas as requirements development, risk management, and system testing to reduce the risks associated with TAAMS; (2) review the testing process, including Interior's pilot, to

determine whether the testing results can be used for assessing TAAMS suitability to meet Interior's requirements; and (3) determine whether Interior is establishing needed policies and procedures for implementing TAAMS and adequate internal controls for assuring adherence to the new policies and procedures. The review was requested by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan

- "Oversight of Audit of Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1999 for the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians Tribal Individual Indian Monies, and Other Special Trust Funds Managed by the Office of Trust Funds Management." As required by Section 10 of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Bulletin 93-06, the OIG will (1) ensure that the audit conducted by the independent external auditors is performed in accordance with the requirements of the Bulletin, (2) provide technical advice and liaison to agency officials and the independent external auditors; and (3) monitor and report on management's progress in resolving audit findings reported by the independent external auditors (page 15 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Trust Management Improvement Project, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians." The objective of the audit is to evaluate the progress of the Office of the Special Trustee in implementing the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System (TAAMS). Specifically the audit will determine whether the System will meet stated objectives of a trust accounting and asset management system and whether the System will have adequate automated information system general and application controls to ensure data integrity (page 17 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000). Since the GAO initiated a review of the TAAMS in July 1999, we will coordinate any audit work with the GAO audit team.

2. **Maintenance.** The Department reported "Inadequate Departmentwide Maintenance Management Capability" as a mission critical material weakness and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) "Irrigation Operations and Maintenance" and "Facilities Program" as material weaknesses in its fiscal year 1998 Accountability Report. OIG audit reports also indicate that maintenance is a continuing problem within four bureaus in the Department.

Based on OIG audit reports, we determined that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), National Park Service (NPS), BIA, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) had inadequate management controls and insufficient funding to effectively manage their maintenance activities. Consequently, the inventory of needed facility repairs and rehabilitations has increased significantly in recent years. The reported backlogs of maintenance projects for these bureaus totaled $3.7 billion for fiscal year 1999. OIG and GAO testimonies and audit reports also concluded that (1) BLM had not implemented adequate controls to ensure that the data in its maintenance system were reliable; (2) the NPS backlog estimate of $6.1 billion was unsupported, overstated, and that it did not have a routine systematic process for determining the amount of the maintenance backlog; (3) individuals live, work, and study in BIA buildings that are unsafe and/or unsanitary and that the poor condition of BIA's educational facilities, detention centers, and irrigation projects resulted from insufficient funding for maintenance and repairs; failure to hold individuals responsible for ensuring that deficiencies were corrected; failure to assess, bill and collect maintenance charges; and inadequate preventive maintenance; and (4) OIG could not determine whether FWS backlog data were accurate or that the established controls were effective because the Service had not prepared supporting documentation for estimated maintenance costs.

The Department and its bureaus were required to disclose financial information on deferred maintenance in their fiscal year 1998 financial statements in accordance with Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board Statement No. 6, "Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment," and OMB requirements.

Update

OIG has addressed the issue of the reliability of bureau-reported financial data for deferred maintenance estimates, costs, and internal controls over transactions, by evaluating the bureaus' implementation of Statement No. 6, Office of Management and Budget requirements, and Departmental guidance. The OIG audits of the estimated deferred maintenance costs of the six bureaus reported that complete and reliable financial information needed on the maintenance backlog for accounting purposes and for budgetary funding requests was not available and that previously reported internal control weaknesses still existed.

In April 1999, the OIG Auditor's Report on the Department of the Interior Financial Report for fiscal years 1998 and 1997, which include the Consolidated Statements of Financial Position and Net Cost of Operations, stated that the weaknesses in the Department's and bureaus' (BLM, NPS, BIA, and FWS) controls over deferred maintenance was a reportable condition. In accordance with OMB Bulletin 98-08, OIG reviewed the internal controls related to transactions and other data that support the reported information on deferred maintenance in the bureaus to determine whether the transactions were properly recorded, processed, and summarized. OIG found that formal policies for conducting periodic condition assessment surveys and computing deferred maintenance funding estimates needed to be established by the Department and the bureaus to promote consistency and accuracy. In addition, the supervisory and monitoring controls over deferred maintenance reporting required strengthening to ensure that the deferred maintenance estimates are supported by adequate documentation.

In September 1999, OIG issued two audit reports on deferred maintenance, as follows:

- "Deferred Maintenance, National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Reclamation" (No. 99-I-874), dated September 28, 1999. The report stated that the bureaus' deferred maintenance cost estimates, as reported in their fiscal year 1998 financial statements, were not completely reliable because they (1) were based on different assumptions; (2) were not supported with adequate documentation; (3) included, in some cases, costs for projects that did not meet the Federal financial standard for deferred maintenance; and (4) did not include all deferred maintenance costs. These deficiencies occurred because the bureaus had not addressed all of the significant issues relating to defining deferred maintenance, had not conducted the condition assessments needed to identify all deferred maintenance projects and related costs, and had not established adequate controls over deferred maintenance data.

- "Deferred Maintenance, National Park Service" (No. 99-I-959), dated September 30, 1999. The report stated that NPS's deferred maintenance cost estimates were not developed in accordance with Federal accounting standards and Departmental guidance. The deficiency occurred because NPS had not conducted all needed condition assessments of its assets, documented the assessments and the estimated project costs, or established adequate controls over the deferred maintenance data reporting/recording process.

Ongoing Audits:

- "Audit of Replacement School Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs" (Assignment No. W-IN-BIA-001-99D).

- "Deferred Maintenance, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service" (Assignment No. E-IN-FWS-001-98). We issued the draft audit report in October 1999.

Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan:

- We plan to review deferred maintenance costs reported within each of the six bureaus' financial statements (BIA, NPS, BLM, FWS, USGS, and BOR) for fiscal year 1999 (pages 45, 35, 57, 29, 99, and 85 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Maintenance and Repair of Indian Schools, Bureau of Indian Affairs." The objective of the audit is to determine whether BIA conducted its school maintenance and repair activities efficiently and effectively (page 55 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Facilities Maintenance, Bureau of Reclamation". The objective of the audit is to determine whether BOR maintained its facilities in accordance with Departmental and BOR requirements (page 96 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

3. National Park Service Housing. The Department reported the "Needs Assessment and Cost of Constructing New Housing" as a mission critical material weakness for NPS in its fiscal year 1997 and 1998 Accountability Reports. Recent OIG and GAO audit reports and testimony indicate employee housing continues to be a problem area.

NPS provides Government housing to approximately 5,200 employees throughout the National Park System. NPS has stated that many of these housing units are in "poor" condition and that the "substandard housing" puts NPS employees and their families at "physical risk".

In the December 1996 audit report "Costs of Construction of Employee Housing at Grand Canyon and Yosemite National Parks" (No. 96-I-224), we concluded that NPS was not effectively managing its housing construction program to ensure that the limited funds available for employee housing were used in a cost-effective manner. Specifically, at two parks, we found that NPS incurred high construction costs to build "quality, energy-efficient single family homes." On October 29, 1997, the Inspector General testified before the House Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, that at Yosemite National Park, the average housing unit cost $584,000 to construct, and at Grand Canyon, the average housing unit cost $390,000 to construct. However, comparable housing in areas near the two parks was considerably less expensive. For example, the cost of comparable private sector housing near Yosemite ranged from $102,000 to $250,000, and the cost of comparable private sector housing near Grand Canyon ranged from $115,000 to $232,000.

The GAO also found deficiencies in NPS's management of its employee housing program. Specifically, in testimony on NPS's employee housing issues before the House Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, GAO said that NPS did not adequately assess its need for employee housing units, granted broad discretion to park managers, and lacked centralized oversight of its housing program. The October 29, 1997, testimony also noted that NPS had "inconsistencies in how [the NPS employee housing program] is managed" and stated that there were "questions about whether housing decisions are being made in the best interest of the agency".

Update

In March 1999, the GAO testified to Congress (GAO/T-RCED-99-119) about NPS's progress in implementing its commitments made in October 1997. GAO testified that in 1997, NPS issued a revised employee housing policy, began a park-by-park housing needs assessment pursuant to the new policy, and hired two contractors to perform the assessment. GAO testified that park managers and regional officials disagreed with the contractors' findings that NPS had 522 more housing units than it needed, which raised serious concerns about the credibility of future housing initiatives and related funding requests.

We issued a survey report on NPS housing, "Employee Housing Rental Income, National Park Service" (No. 99-I-919), dated September 30, 1999. The report stated that NPS provided housing to employees who did not qualify for housing according to the existing NPS policy. At three parks visited, we identified 52 housing units that were occupied by ineligible employees. These employees were provided 30 housing units at two parks because NPS had determined that housing was not available within a 1-hour commute (or 2-hour round-trip commute). We determined that the employees were ineligible for the housing because the distances between the parks and available local housing were less than a 1-hour one-way or a 2-hour round-trip commute. At another park, employees were provided 22 housing units because the park management allowed ineligible employees to reside in available park housing pending the completion of the NPS's housing needs assessment studies.

The OIG audit of employee housing planned for fiscal year 1999, which was to determine whether the NPS justified its need for additional employee housing and for major renovation/rehabilitation of employee housing facilities, was not conducted due to the GAO review and testimony and because of a significant reduction (a $2 million reduction from $12 million to $10 million in fiscal year 2000) in the funding level proposed for construction planning in accordance with National Academy of Public Administration recommendations.

4. Financial Management. Our audits have found that the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the insular area governments have been unable to adequately account for revenues and expenditures associated with their operations.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. OIG issued a qualified opinion on the Bureau's financial statements for fiscal year 1998 (Report No. 99-I-937). The opinion was qualified because we were unable to obtain adequate assurance as to the amounts reported in the financial statements for 13 accounts reported in the financial statements (receivables and the related revenue, advances, allowance for doubtful accounts, and bad debt expense; construction-in-progress; land improvements, buildings, other structures and facilities, equipment, and related accumulated depreciation and depreciation expense; and undelivered orders) and the effect that these accounts have on the overall net position, change in financial position, budgetary resources and outlays, and related notes to the financial statements. In addition, we identified internal control weaknesses that we consider to be reportable conditions related to the accounts receivable and interest receivable accounts, construction-in-progress account, land improvements account, buildings account, other structures and facilities account, equipment account, general controls over automated information systems, deferred maintenance, stewardship reporting, and financial information integrity reviews. The reportable conditions related to the accounts receivable and interest receivable accounts, construction-in-progress account, land improvements account, buildings account, other structures and facilities account, equipment account, undelivered orders, general controls over automated information systems, and financial information integrity reviews are material weaknesses. We also identified specific issues concerning noncompliance with the Chief Financial Officers Act of 199C, the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996, the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996, the Credit Reform Act of 1990, and the Prompt Payment Act.

Ongoing Audits

- "Audit of Financial Statements for Fiscal Year 1999, Bureau of Indian Affairs " (Assignment No.C-IN-BIA-002-99-R)

Insular Area Governments. Our audits have shown that long-standing financial management deficiencies continue to exist in the U.S. insular areas. Specifically, to varying degrees, the insular area governments have been unable to (1) properly account for financial resources, including Federal grant funds, and report timely on their overall financial condition; (2) control expenditures and ensure that procurement transactions are made in accordance with existing competitive procurement requirements; and (3) properly account for and collect taxes and other amounts that they are owed. We found deficiencies in the insular areas as follows:

- The Government of the Virgin Islands had not fully complied with the Single Audit Act of 1982. As of September 30, 1999, the single audit reports for fiscal years 1995, 1996, and 1997 had not been issued, and a joint Inspector General task force was trying to work with Government officials to have the single audit for fiscal year 1998 started and completed expeditiously to provide Federal funding agencies with current information on the status of their grant funds. Meanwhile, the Government has been suffering severe cash flow problems, which has resulted in the accumulation of debt totaling close to $1 billion, including amounts owed for income tax refunds, payments to vendors, negotiated salary increases to employees, Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster assistance loans, and accumulated operating deficits. The new Administration was making attempts to cut the size and cost of the Government. Recent OIG audits disclosed that the Government (1) had not effectively collected unemployment insurance taxes totaling more than $18.5 million (No. 99-I-148), delinquent loans to members of the Government Employees Retirement System totaling about $5.3 million (No. 99-I-261), and real property taxes totaling at least $15.4 million (No. 99-I-379); (2) did not implement policies and procedures to restrict the hiring of political appointees to positions that, by law, should be part of the Personnel Merit System and did not ensure that the number of Government employees was reduced by the levels required by an early retirement law (No. 99-I-365); and (3) did not effectively manage, account for, and use Federal Transit Administration grants totaling $2.8 million (No. 99-I-701). The Virgin Islands received $255.9 million in Federal grants during fiscal year 1998 (latest available).

- The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands did not adequately control and account for Federal and local funds. Recent OIG audits disclosed that (1) the Public School System did not use competitive procurement requirements to make purchases totaling more than $500,000 that were funded by Federal grants and could not locate equipment valued at almost $200,000 that was purchased with Federal grant funds (No. 99-I-147) and (2) the Office of the Governor made expenditures from the Governor's discretionary fund that exceeded legislative appropriations by almost $6.5 million and improperly reprogrammed appropriated funds totaling more than $400,000 (No. 99-I-356). The Northern Mariana Islands received $39.3 million in Federal grants during fiscal year 1998 (latest available), and the most recent single audit report (for fiscal year 1997) included a qualified opinion.

- The Government of Guam, although it provides the best level of overall financial management of the insular areas, needs to make further improvements. Our audit reports continue to disclose evidence of inadequate accounting for Federal funds and noncompliance with procurement laws. A recent multi-segment audit of the Guam Department of Education disclosed that the Department (1) paid substitute teachers at least $21,000 for hours not worked, hours worked on nonschool days, and hours that were not adequately supported by required documents (No. 99-I-13); (2) did not ensure that Federally funded travel costs totaling at least $47,000 were adequately supported (No. 99-I-255); and (3) did not adequately control program income of about $32,000 or adequately account for and support

expenditures totaling about $2 million for a Federally funded after-school program (No. 99-I-455). Guam received $265.8 million in Federal grants during fiscal year 1998 (latest available), and the most recent single audit report (for fiscal year 1997) included a qualified opinion.

- The American Samoa Government continues to face financial management problems and receives operating subsidies through the Office of Insular Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior. These subsidies total about $23 million annually. The most recent single audit of the American Samoa Government, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1993, resulted in a disclaimer of opinion because of serious financial management deficiencies. Although we did not conduct any audits of American Samoa Government operations during fiscal year 1999, our 1998 audit report (No. 98-I-653) on a legislative renovation project disclosed that the project was allowed to expand from a $78,000 roof repair project to a comprehensive $1 million building renovation project without proper planning, construction oversight, or use of competitive procurement. We plan to conduct an audit of the assessment and collection of taxes by the American Samoa Government during fiscal year 2000. American Samoa received Federal grants of $90.7 million during fiscal year 1998 (latest available).

- The Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands did not have effective controls over Federally funded loan programs. In the Federated States, the Rural Development Loan Program, which was funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and jointly operated by the Department and the Federated States, did not ensure that recipients of home loans totaling more than $700,000 used the loans for houses that met program requirements and/or would be used for noncommercial, personal residency purposes (No. 99-I-953). The Marshall Islands Development Bank (1) used Compact funds totaling about $13.7 million to issue commercial loans without adequate assurance that the loans were for purposes that conformed to approved economic development plans and that the borrowers had the capability to repay the loans, (2) did not enforce collection on additional Compact funded loans totaling about $4.1 million that were delinquent, and (3) did not adequately account for outstanding Trust Territory loans totaling about $380,000 (No. 99-I-952). The most recent single audit reports of all three Compact States (for fiscal year 1997) included qualified opinions.

Related Audit Reports

We issued eight grant and financial-related audit reports in fiscal year 1999, including:

- "Federal Transit Administration Grants, Department of Public Works, Government of the Virgin Islands" (No. 99-I-701)

- "Medicaid Program, Department of Health, Government of the Virgin Islands" (No. 99-I-957)

- "Federal Grant Program Travel Activities, Department of Education, Government of Guam" (No. 99-I-255)

- "Management of Federal Grants, Public School System, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands" (No. 99-I-147)

- "Discretionary and Reprogrammed Funds, Office of the Governor, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands" (No. 99-I-356)

- "Legislature Renovation Project, Legislature of American Samoa, American Samoa Government" (No. 98-I-653)

Other audits relating to deficiencies in financial management in the insular areas issued during fiscal year 1999 include:

- "Unemployment Insurance Program, Department of Labor, Government of the Virgin Islands" (No. 99-I-148)

- "Marshall Islands Development Bank, Republic of the Marshall Islands" (No. 99-I-952)

Ongoing Audits

We have five ongoing grant and financial-related audits, which include:

- "Head Start Program Grants, Department of Human Services, Government of the Virgin Islands (Assignment No. V-IN-VIS-008-99)

- "U.S. Department of Defense Contract Funds, Department of Education, Government of Guam" (Assignment No. N-IN-GUA-004-97(E))

- "Management and Oversight of Selected Construction Projects, Republic of Palau", (Assignment No. N-IN-PAL-002-99)

Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan

Additional grant and financial-related audits in the fiscal year 2000 workplan include:

- "Public Assistance Program Grants, Department of Human Services, Government of the Virgin Islands" (page 132 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000)

- "Management of Federal Grants, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Government of Guam" (page 107 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000)

- "Assessment and Collection of Taxes, American Samoa Government" (page 119 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000)

5. Waste Management. The Department's land management agencies face a major challenge in cleaning up sites contaminated by hazardous materials, abandoned mine sites, oil and gas wells, leaking underground storage tanks and pipelines, and illegal dumping. The cleanup costs to the Department have not been determined because of the unknown nature and extent of possible contamination and because the liability of the Department for cleanup in relation to other parties has not been established. However, the potential liability to the Department could be significant. For example, FWS has identified approximately 18 major sites and 10 minor sites on national wildlife refuges and hatcheries with estimated costs of remediation ranging from $103 million to $120 million. Based on an evaluation of its inventory of 3,000 abandoned mines and 727 abandoned oil and gas wells, the Park Service estimated costs of remediation at approximately $165 million. BLM estimated that over 70,000 abandoned mine sites could exist on BLM-administered land for which its estimated cleanup liability is not known. BOR has identified several potential environmental cleanup responsibilities, including abandoned mines and vehicle maintenance facilities, and has estimated that its potential cleanup liability ranges from $20 million to $91 million. Finally, BIA estimated that its cleanup liability for known sites is $66 million and that it needs approximately $100 million for studies and evaluations to identify other sites and to determine associated estimates of cleanup costs. The Department has focused its efforts on establishing policies and procedures for waste management, establishing a system to prioritize waste management sites, and seeking funds to correct identified sites.

Update

Beginning with the financial statements for fiscal year 1997, the Department implemented the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board Statement No. 5, "Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government," which requires the identification and recognition of environmental cleanup costs. Our audit of the fiscal year 1998 and 1997 financial statements included an evaluation of the Department's and the bureaus' processes for identifying and estimating future potential liability for these cleanup costs. The Department recognized an estimated liability of $275 million in fiscal year 1998 and $223 million in fiscal year 1997 "for sites where the Department either caused contamination or is otherwise related to it in such a way that it may be legally liable for cleanup of the hazard, and the environmental cleanup liability is probable and reasonably estimable." The estimated liability excludes estimates of future mineral site restorations for which Interior will voluntarily undertake remediation without legal responsibility. We did not take exception to the reported amounts.

Related Audit Reports

- "Department of the Interior Consolidated Principal Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997" (No. 98-I-442)

- "Auditors Report on Department of the Interior Financial Report for Fiscal Years 1998 and 1997" (No. 99-I-438)

Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan

- "Hazardous Materials Management" - The objective of the audit is to determine whether BLM satisfactorily implemented recommendations made in our 1992 and 1993 reports and managed its Hazardous Materials Management Program effectively. (Fiscal Year 1999 Workplan, page BLM-5, which is a carryover in the Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan)

- "Oil Spill Response Research Program" - The objective of the audit is to determine whether MMS has been operating the Oil Spill Response Research program in an economical and efficient manner and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations and Service policies and procedures. (Fiscal Year 1999 Workplan, page MMS-9, which is a carryover in the Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan)

- "Mining Law Administration" - The objective of the audit is to determine whether the (1) public lands subject to mining activity were managed by BLM in accordance with the applicable laws, rules, and regulations and (2) "grandfathered" mineral patent applications were processed in a timely manner. (Fiscal Year 1999 Workplan, page BLM-3, which is a carryover in the Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan)

6. **Revenue Collections.** The Department's bureaus are involved in numerous activities that generate revenues for the Federal Government. The revenue-generating activities include mineral lease collections (MMS), water use repayments (BOR), reclamation fees (Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement), and resource and material sales and user fees (BLM, FWS, and NPS). In fiscal year 1998, Departmental bureaus collected revenues in excess of $8 billion. The revenue collected by each bureau for fiscal year 1998 (latest available) is as follows:

Bureau	Amount (in millions)
Minerals Management Service	$6,066
Bureau of Reclamation	631[1]
Geological Survey	344
National Park Service	285
Office of Surface Mining	282
Multiple Office	231
Bureau of Land Management	226
Bureau of Indian Affairs	218
Fish and Wildlife Service	124
Total	$8,407

Despite collecting over $8 billion in revenues, the Department's bureaus can improve operations of activities that generate revenues and enhance revenue collections. The following paragraphs identify several specific revenue-related issues for possible action by individual bureaus.

An audit report on the MMS's processing of notifications for the Stripper Oil Well Property Royalty Rate Reduction Program (No. 99-I-782) found that the Service did not timely confirm notifications it received and did not timely input the confirmed rates or review differences in the royalty rates confirmed with the royalty rates paid for properties participating in the program. As a result, we believe that royalties may have been underpaid by as much as $3.5 million, excluding interest.

An audit report on the MMS's royalty-in-kind demonstration pilots (No. 99-I-371) in the Gulf of Mexico to test gas and in Wyoming to test oil noted that the pilots will provide MMS

[1]BOR changed its method of reporting MMS exchange revenue. Exchange revenues are inflows of resources to a Government entity that the entity has earned. In fiscal year 1997, BOR reported MMS exchange revenue as revenue. To comply with Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standard No. 7, "Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources," BOR, in fiscal year 1998, is reporting this revenue as another financing source.

with the knowledge and practical experience to implement a permanent royalty-in-kind system for those particular regions and products. However, because the United States oil and gas industry operates in distinct regions, we believe that the limited geographic coverage and products included under the pilot program will not provide a conclusive royalty-in-kind feasibility assessment for all Federal oil and gas production.

An audit report on offshore oil and gas rental revenues (No. 99-I-387) found that MMS has an opportunity to increase rental revenues by an estimated $2.4 million to $26 million for leases that will be issued between April 1, 1999, and December 31, 2000, by changing the terms of these leases before they are sold to require rental payments during periods of royalty relief.

A followup audit report (No. 98-I-250) on the recovery of irrigation investment costs by the Bureau of Reclamation, found that by revising its irrigation assistance repayment policy, the Bureau could significantly increase revenues. Under Bureau policy, irrigation assistance, that is, the repayment by power users of the irrigation construction costs beyond the ability of water users to pay, is recovered after the repayment of the power investment. Our 1989 report (No. 90-05) concluded that as a result of this policy, an estimated $1.2 billion of additional revenues would not be collected over the repayment periods of the respective projects.

In "Concessions Contracting Procedures, National Park Service" (No. 99-I-626), we stated that the Park Service did not reissue expired concession contracts and permits in a timely manner, periodically adjust concessioners' fees as required by the Concessions Policy Act, and compute fees for the use of park facilities (including housing that was assigned to concessioners). We identified potential additional revenues of more than $4 million that might be obtained from implementation of recommended concession fee increases and from the assessment of rental fees for concessioners' use of park housing. We also identified lost revenues of about $1.3 million from delays in reissuing expired concession contracts and from the application of lower than recommended franchise fee rates.

In "Miscellaneous Receipts, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service" (No. 00-I-50), we stated that the Service, without authorization, had assessed mineral rights holders fees for the mitigation of potential damages from their oil and gas exploration activities on five national wildlife refuges in Louisiana and Texas. Further, the Service had retained and used the fees improperly by having the fees (about $6.8 million from fiscal years 1990 through 1998) deposited into Fish and Wildlife Foundation and contributed funds accounts or having the fees paid to vendors for refuge supplies and services.

Related Audit Reports

- "Followup of Recommendations Concerning Utility Rates Imposed by the National Park Service" (No. 98-I-406)

- "General Controls Over the Automated Information Systems, Royalty Management Program, Minerals Management Service" (No. 98-I-336)

- "Drainage Protection Program, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-358)

- "Administration of Revenues Due From Helium Produced on Federal Leases, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-395)

- "Processing Notifications for the Stripper Oil Well Property Royalty Rate Reduction Program," Minerals Management Service (No. 99-I-782).

Ongoing Audits

- "Stripper Oil Well Property Program, Bureau of Land Management" (Assignment No. C-IN-MOA-001-98-B)

- "Supporting Documentation for Operators Participating in the Stripper Oil Well Property Royalty Rate Reduction Program, Bureau of Land Management and Minerals Management Service" (Assignment No. C-IN-MOA-001-98(C))

- "Indian Royalty Disbursement Process, Minerals Management Service and Bureau of Indian Affairs" (Assignment No. C-IN-MOA-002-99)

- "Oil and Gas Transportation and Gas Processing Allowances, Mineral Management Service" (Assignment No. C-IN-MMS-003-99)

- "Followup of Recommendations Concerning Repayment of Municipal and Industrial Water Supply Investment Costs, Bureau of Reclamation" (Assignment No. W-IN-BOR-001-99 (D))

Update

The audits "Processing and Monitoring Right-of-Way Grants, Bureau of Land Management," "Royalty Management Reengineering Initiative, Minerals Management Service," and "Fire Protection Agreements with State and Local Governments, Bureau of Land Management" were in our fiscal year 1998 and 1999 workplans, but were not conducted because of higher priority audits. We plan to conduct the "Royalties on Tax Credits for Nonconventional

Fuels, Minerals Management Service" (included in the fiscal year 1999 audit workplan) during fiscal year 2000.

Fiscal Year 2000 Workplan

- "Impact of Deepwater Royalty Relief Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-58), Minerals Management Service." The objective of the review is to determine whether the criteria and process used to extend royalty relief to companies were in compliance with the requirements and intent of the Royalty Relief Act. The scope of the review will include examination of offshore oil and gas leases awarded prior to the November 1995 Act that have been approved for royalty relief (page 71 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Followup of Negotiated Royalty Settlements, Minerals Management Service." The objective of the audit is to determine whether MMS satisfactorily implemented the recommendations made in our September 1996 audit report on negotiated royalty settlements and whether any new recommendations are warranted. The audit will consist of a review of selected settlements, including multiple (global), single, Federal onshore and offshore, state, and Indian oil and gas (page 73 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Royalties on Tax Credits for Nonconventional Fuels, Minerals Management Service." The objective of the audit is to determine whether MMS initiated the collection of royalties from monetized tax credits on nonconventional fuels (page 75 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Use of Fee Demonstration Program Revenues, National Park Service." The objective of the audit is to determine whether NPS has ensured that (1) Recreation Fee Demonstration Program revenues were used properly and were used to supplement rather than replace funding for maintenance and other critical NPS needs; (2) sufficient actions were taken to limit the amount of revenues used to collect fees; and (3) required procedures were followed for safeguarding, depositing, and recording fee revenues (page 37 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Use of Fee Demonstration Program Revenues, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service." The objective of the audit is to determine whether FWS has ensured that (1) Recreation Fee Demonstration Program receipts were used properly and that Program revenues were used to supplement rather than replace funding for maintenance and other critical FWS needs and (2) receipts were collected in a cost-effective manner and deposited and accounted for properly (page 23 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

- "Billing and Collection Procedures for Recovering Reimbursable Costs of Water Projects, Bureau of Reclamation." The objective of the audit is to determine whether the BOR's billing and collection procedures for recovering reimbursable costs for BOR projects

were effective and in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and contract terms (page 90 of the Audit Workplan Summary for fiscal year 2000).

7. **Inspection and Enforcement of Fluid Minerals.** The Department reported the failure to effectively inspect fluid minerals and enforce related requirements as a mission critical material weakness in its fiscal year 1997 Accountability Report. BLM reported in its FY 1998 annual assurance statement, required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, that the material weakness in this activity was corrected. However, our ongoing audit of the Stripper Oil Well Property Royalty Reduction Program disclosed that BLM was not providing sufficient oversight of operators to ensure that information on production of oil was correct. Specifically, BLM was not adequately reviewing the information on the "Monthly Report of Operations" (Form MMS-3160) prepared by operators of Federal onshore leases. The production information on this form is used to calculate reduced royalty rates for leases participating in the Program. As a result, royalties may have been underpaid by as much as $43 million.

BLM is responsible for enforcing regulations involving the development, production, and abandonment of Federal and Indian oil and gas onshore leases. At the end of 1998, there were about 20,000 producing onshore oil and gas leases on Federal lands and about 3,750 producing leases on Indian lands. Revenues from onshore oil and gas activities were $873 million for 1998 (latest available). Because of the significance of this activity and the weakness in the inspection of production days reported by operators of stripper wells, we believe further improvements are needed in the inspection and enforcement program.

Related Audit Reports

- "Drainage Protection Program, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-358)

- "Rangelands Improvement Program, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-677)

Ongoing Audits

- "Supporting Documentation for Operators Participating in the Stripper Oil Well Property Royalty Rate Reduction Program, Bureau of Land Management and Minerals Management Service" (Assignment No. C-IN-MOA-001-98)

- "Bonding for Oil and Gas Wells on Indian Trust Lands, Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs" (Assignment No. C-IN-MOA-001-99)

In addition to our ongoing audits, we will evaluate the need for an audit of the actions which the Bureau has taken to correct deficiencies in the inspection and enforcement activity and, if appropriate, schedule an audit to determine whether the weaknesses have been corrected.

8. Range Monitoring. The Department reported "Inadequate Range Monitoring" as a mission critical material weakness in its fiscal year 1997 and 1998 Accountability Reports. In addition, our prior and recent audit reports indicate that inadequate range monitoring continues to be a problem and has a significant effect on the rangelands and cultural resources for which BLM is responsible.

The BLM's Rangeland Management Program involves managing ecosystems to ensure their health, natural diversity, and long-term productivity. Rangeland management activities include administering livestock grazing permits, supporting wildlife habitats, serving wild horse and burro needs, promoting watershed health, and maintaining and improving the condition of rangelands to serve a variety of uses and values. BLM authorizes about 10 million animal unit months of livestock use annually to about 17,000 operators on grazing allotments encompassing 164 million acres in the western states. These operators graze about 3.7 million head of livestock. By contrast, there are only about 44,500 wild horses and burros on Bureau land. In its budget for fiscal year 2000, BLM requested $67.2 million for range management and an additional $10 million for rangeland improvements. BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Program has not achieved the appropriate management levels of wild horse and burro populations, which has prevented BLM from achieving a natural ecological balance on the range. In addition, BLM has not ensured that animals removed from the range and placed in its Adopt-a-Horse program are receiving humane care. According to BLM, high priority grazing allotments are not consistently monitored, which has resulted in many grazing decisions being delayed and in many grazing decisions that are not being adequately documented with monitoring data. In addition, BLM was not using consistent monitoring techniques, which resulted in inadequate range monitoring data. Finally, BLM's range monitoring activities have been impacted by a 1997 Interior Board of Land Appeals decision that required environmental impact and land use conformance reviews before livestock grazing permits or leases can be re-authorized.

Related Audit Reports

- "Rangelands Improvement Program, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-677)

- "Cultural Resource Management, Bureau of Land Management" (No. 99-I-808)

During fiscal year 2000, we will monitor the status of BLM's actions to correct the weaknesses in range monitoring. If actions are completed by October 2000, as planned, we will schedule an audit for fiscal year 2001 to evaluate the corrective actions.

9. **Land Exchanges.** The Department reported "Administration of the Nevada Land Exchange Appraisal Process" as a material control weakness in its fiscal year 1997 Accountability Report. The Department reported " Management and Oversight of the Land Exchange Program" as a material control weakness in its fiscal year 1998 Accountability Report as recommended in our 1998 followup audit report on land exchanges in Nevada.

BLM conducts land exchanges under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Public Law 94-579) and the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act (Public Law 100-49). The Congress has emphasized the use of land exchanges and fee purchases to acquire lands containing resource values of public significance and to improve the manageability of Federal land by consolidating its land ownership. OIG audits of land exchanges in 1991, 1992, 1996, and 1998 found that the Bureau has historically experienced problems in administering land exchanges in accordance with established standards and procedural controls. Specifically, a 1998 followup report of Nevada land exchange activity reported that BLM's efforts to establish and follow controls to ensure that Nevada land exchanges were processed in full accordance with applicable laws, regulations and procedures was generally unsuccessful for the exchanges reviewed. As a result, OIG found that the Nevada State Office lost about $18.2 million on three exchanges.

Update

One issue from the 1998 followup report remains unresolved; namely, that BLM should establish a moratorium on land exchanges in the State of Nevada until it establishes and empowers a "land exchange review team" which includes non-BLM representatives and personnel having a thorough knowledge of the appraisal process to review proposed exchanges. Although BLM established a review team, we do not believe that the team as currently constituted and authorized provides sufficient independence and expertise to ensure that future exchanges will be processed in full accordance with applicable laws, regulations, and procedures.

Ongoing Related Audits

- "Utah Land Acquisitions and Exchange Activities, Bureau of Land Management" (Assignment No. W-IN-BLM-002-98)

10. Automated Records System. The lack of an automated land and minerals records system hinders effective and efficient management of resources by BLM. In the 1980's the BLM began a modernization project to develop an automated system to support processing lands and minerals information, including leases, mining claims, rights-of ways, and other realty issues. The system was also intended to replace and maintain millions of existing historical and current records of land use authorizations, which were deteriorating paper records. The system, known as the Automated Land and Mineral Record System (ALMRS) was also intended to use spatial based technology to merge case records with survey records and other resource data to graphically display needed resource management information. The expenditures for ALMRS totaled about $440 million from fiscal years 1983 through 1999.

The ALMRS software was formally tested in October 1998. Based on this operational test and evaluation, the Bureau determined that the ALMRS was not ready for deployment. The test results showed that users found the ALMRS to be inefficient, slow, difficult to use, and labor-intensive. ALMRS was also characterized as poorly integrated into the BLM's business processes, of limited value relative to the evolution of technology, and generally did not meet user expectations. BLM stated that some of the causes of these ALMRS deficiencies were the lack of user involvement, over-optimistic project scope and schedule, impractical technology selection, poor contractor guidance, and overall inadequate project management.

ALMRS, as initially envisioned, has been significantly scaled back. BLM is currently studying its "enterprise architecture" by reassessing the current and desired relationships among its business practices. The target architecture is planned to be identified and documented by April 2000. This will create BLM's vision for the future by aligning its automated applications and information technology with BLM's business practices. BLM's new projected time line for delivering land and resources information integrated with the target architecture has been set for 2004 to 2005.

Related Audit Reports

- "Major Management Challenges and Program Risks, Department of Interior" (GAO/OGC-99-9)

- "Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives: Land Management Systems: Major Software Development Does Not Meet BLM's Business Needs " (GAO/T-AIMD-99-102)

- "Land Management Systems: Major Software Development Does Not Meet BLM's Business Needs " (GAO/AIMD-99-135)

Enclosure 5

SUMMARY OF OIG AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS MADE AND RESOLVED* FOR THE 2-Year PERIOD ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

Organization	Total Rec.	Resolved	Unresolved	Percent Resolved
Bureau of Indian Affairs	108	87	21	81%
Bureau of Land Management	43	41	2	95%
Bureau of Reclamation	63	59	4	94%
Fish and Wildlife Service	16	16	0	100%
Geological Survey	37	37	0	100%
Minerals Management Service	33	33	0	100%
Multi-Office	13	10	3	77%
National Park Service	47	27	20	57%
Office of Surface Mining	2	2	0	100%
Office of the Secretary	11	11	0	100%
Subtotal - Bureaus	**373**	**323**	**50**	**87%**
American Samoa	5	5	0	100%
Federated States of Micronesia	9	4	5	44%
Guam	60	29	31	48%
Marshall Islands	11	7	4	64%
Northern Mariana Islands	15	14	1	93%
Virgin Islands	186	107	79	58%
Subtotal - Insular Areas	**286**	**166**	**120**	**58%**
Total	**659**	**489**	**170**	**74%**

*Includes internal audit reports which contained recommendations. Does not include contracts, grants, or ICP reports.

ATTACHMENT 2

CASES OPENED IN FY99

SOURCE	
BIA	13
BLM	2
BOR	1
MMS	1
NPS	2
Solicitor's Office (SOL)	2
USGS (USG)	2
DOI employee (XEE)	34
Congressional (CON)	3
DOD	1
DOJ	11
DOL	2
FBI	6
Govt. of Guam (GGU)	3
Govt. of Northern Marianas (GNM)	4
HHS	1
HUD	4
OIG Investigations (JII)	2
Anonymous Hotline (JZA)	3
Hotline (JZZ)	4
OIG	5
Other (OOO)	9
State and Local Police (POL)	3
State and Local Prosecutors (SLP)	2
Anonymous (XAA)	9
Confidential Source (XCC)	5
News Media (XNN)	1
Private Citizen (XPP)	14
TOTAL	149

INSPECTOR GENERAL COMMUNITY
FY 1999

Attachment 3

Rank by Funds	Department Cabinet Agencies	Funding Direct\Reimb. **(Dollars in Millions)**	FTE's
1	Defense	$133	1,224
2	Treasury	138	1,287
3	Housing and Urban Development	82	705
4	Agriculture	68	753
5	Labor	61	423
6	Social Security Administration	56	462
7	Justice	51	404
8	Transportation	45	442
9	Health & Human Serv (except SSA)	43	342
10	Veterans Administration	38	362
11	Education	31	285
12	Energy	30	266
13	State	28	277
14	**Interior**	**26**	**248**
15	Commerce	22	218

g:\bfdocs\IGVSDEP3.WK4\03/27/2000\09:46 AM

Department of the Interior

Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Program

Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Program

1. **How many settlements were completed in FY 1999 and how does that compare with the previous two years? Please describe the progress made in assessments and restorations underway in 1999 compared to 1998 and 1997.**

A total of 22 settlement agreements were reached during FY 1999, compared with 15 in FY 1998 and 14 in FY 1997. Included in the FY 1999 total were significant settlements at Saginaw River, MI (estimated value: approx. $28 million); Grand Calumet River, IN (estimated value: approx. $25 million); Tampa Bay oil spill, FL ($3.0 million); and a partial settlement at the Clark Fork, MT site (estimated value: approx. $20 million). It should be noted that the values shown above reflect the estimated total value of the settlement, and may include the estimated value of lands to be acquired as part of the settlement agreement, restoration actions to be undertaken by the responsible parties, and natural resource damages paid to co-trustees.

For damage assessments, a total of 16 projects were provided funding in FY 1999 (including five new projects), while another 15 ongoing cases were able to subsist on prior years' funding. For FY 1998 and FY 1997, comparable numbers were 15 and 13, and 16 and 19, respectively. These numbers reflect damage assessment projects which received funds from the Restoration Program, and do not include projects or sites funded solely by bureau funds. (NOTE: Our response to a similar question last year incorrectly stated the FY 1998 number of projects subsisting on prior years' balances as 29 projects. The correct number is 13.)

A total of 59 restoration projects were underway in FY 1999, compared with 47 in FY 1998 and 36 in FY 1997. These numbers reflect restoration actions funded with settlement dollars held within the Restoration Fund, and are a combination of sites where assessment activities were funded with Restoration Program funds, bureau funds or the Coast Guard Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund or any combination thereof.

2. **What effect will the "across-the-board rescission" of $26,000 have on your ability to conduct damage assessments, complete settlements, and restore habitats?**

The across-the-board rescission was applied proportionately to both damage assessments ($20,000) and program management ($6,000). The impact of this reduction on damage assessments is expected to be marginal, as it accounts for less than one-half of one percent of the appropriated damage assessment funds. However, it should be noted that long-term impacts on completing settlements or conducting restoration actions could be noticeable, in the sense that reduced funding may translate into fewer studies or analyses conducted, potentially weakening the Department's settlement negotiating position and ultimately, the restoration actions that are carried out using settlement funds.

3. **The "Damage Assessments" activity shows level funding. To what extent will assessments be curtailed in order to absord fixed cost increases?**

We estimate that the damage assessment projects we are able to fund are marginally curtailed (roughly1 to 2 percent) in order to absorb fixed cost increases. The Restoration Program calculates pay-related fixed cost increases at the aggregate level, and those program-wide increases are reflected on the Program Management line item. To date, bureau and office financial reports have not provided the detailed information necessary to discriminate between damage assessment projects and program management in order to calculate pay-related fixed costs at the line item level. However, it should be noted that while such salary-based fixed cost increases related to assessment projects are budgeted on the Program Management line item, they are used in a variety of ways which directly support the assessment projects, such as development of case settlement guidance, database development, cost recovery, and training.

4. **The FY 2000 request proposed to nearly double the funding for Damage Assessments compared to FY 1999. The Congress was able to provide a limited funding increase. The FY 2001 request is for flat funding at the FY 2000 enacted level. Did you overstate the need for funding last year?**

The Restoration Program is most appreciative of the increase provided by the Congress for FY 2000. Last year's request level of $6.3 million for damage assessments was not overstated. It was, and continues to be, a realistic estimate of the total resources needed to more fully address the number of damage assessment cases which require attention, including potential costs related to preparing for litigation at three sites.

5. **The budget justification shows a substantial decrease in the line for "other services." In addition to the changes in charges for the departmental working capital fund, what accounts of this decrease? What "other services" will not be provided? If they will be provided through some other means, please explain how.**

The decrease is primarily the result of anticipated reductions in dredging costs associated with the Saginaw River, MI restoration project. The settlement included nearly $9 million for dredging activities to be conducted, beginning in early spring of 2000 and are expected to finish in FY 2001. The dredging will be more than 50 percent complete at the start of FY 2001. Further, FY 2000 costs are higher due to start-up expenses, and a longer seasonal window of opportunity in which to conduct the dredging.

6. **The map and chart on p.11 depict three sites that do not have a symbol identifying damage assessment or restoration action in progress. What is going on at those sites (Seal Beach, CA; Sand Springs, OK; Sampit River, SC)?**

The three sites in question were sites funded in FY 1992, the first year of the Restoration

Program's existence. Damage assessment activities at these three sites were terminated at an early stage due to lack of demonstrable injury or lack of a viable responsible party. Any remaining unspent funds were withdrawn from these projects and reallocated to other projects. Lessons learned from these three sites have influenced and helped shape the development of project selection criteria since that time.

7. **Last year you stated for the record that a working group was attempting "to inventory, evaluate, and quanitify restoration success". Describe the status of these efforts. When will these activities translate into measures of restored habitats and enhanced populations of trust species?**

There are a number of separate but related efforts currently underway in this area. We are currently gathering completed restoration plans as part of the inventory and to use as sample documents for use by our field practitioners. In addition, we have reviewed all of our settled accounts in the Restoration Fund to determine which are active in restoration and which are not. For those sites that are not active, we are asking case managers to identify the impediments to the implementation of restoration.

The Restoration Handbook continues to be developed. This will provide the field with the appropriate methods to evaluate completion and success of restoration. This is important because in many instances simply constructing or modifying habitat does not constitute restoration.

Tying all these efforts together will be the Restoration Program's database. Once developed and implemented this database will provide the framework to systematically document and track performance data more closely tied to environmental outcomes. Together, the database and the restoration standards being developed will allow the Program to monitor performance in meaningful terms. It is difficult to estimate when this will be completed due to competing resource needs, but we continue to make progress in all these areas.

8. **The budget justification includes a table that shows receipts and transfers in permanent appropriations. Please explain the large year to year variability and how you make reliable long-term operational plans in light of such variability.**

The variability in receipts and transfers result from several factors that are outside of the Department's control. Receipt estimates are made each year using the best and most current information available, but many factors can come into play to disrupt those estimates. The first is the unpredictable pace at which damage assessment cases and settlement negotiations occur. There have been many instances where settlement negotiations that were previously unproductive or stagnant may suddenly revive and result in settlement, or conversely, an imminent settlement agreement may be derailed by third-party challenges or appeals, or by issues raised in the public comment period.

The second major factor impacting receipt and transfer estimates is the timing of trustee

council actions which direct and govern the uses and distribution of settlement funds. The most notable of these is the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council, who directs the deposits and transfers of *Exxon Valdez* oil spill settlement funds through the Restoration Fund. The Trustee Council develops work plans and funds projects on an annual basis. Additionally, large and small parcel land acquisition projects (often in the millions of dollars) may happen at any point of the year, depending upon the willingness of the sellers and the availability of settlement funds. The Trustee Council directs funds to be sent from a court registry account to the Restoration Fund on an as-needed basis, and directs the subsequent allocation or transfer of those funds. With the exception of the annual *Exxon Valdez* restoration projects workplan, the Restoration Program is often times afforded little advance notice that a trustee council is going to move settlement funds into or through the Restoration Fund.

9. **The chart on p. 13 is similar to a chart provided last year and continues to show the DOI Restoration Fund increasing at a tremendous rate. With so much money in the Fund, what would be the effect of eliminating annual appropriations and operating solely on recovery funds?**

Eliminating appropriations will invite the demise of the Restoration Program, as less than 7 percent of the cumulative recoveries to date can be used to fund damage assessments and program managment activities. This is, on average, less than $1 million per year. Over 93 percent of the funds received to date are for site-specific restoration or future assessment of injured natural resources and are the result of court actions which direct that such funds are to be used only to carry out these actions. The Restoration Program has no discretion to use restoration settlement funds in any manner other than for restoration actions at each respective site which generated the recovery.

10. **What constraints exist for moving these trust funds into restoration projects? To what extent would you recommend legislative or policy revisions to provide greater flexibility in expending the restoration funds for on-the-ground restoration?**

In most damage assessment scenarios there are a number of complexities that make swift implementation and completion of restoration difficult. These include, but are not limited to: coordination with other trustees who may have participation in the damage assessment and settlement negotiations; preparation of the restoration plan; compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act; identification of suitable restoration sites/projects; compliance with local zoning requirements; the public involvement process; and the limited number of personnel to conduct or oversee the restoration. Currently, there are no legislative revisions we would recommend. We have undertaken a review of our extant policies and policy needs to identify any problem areas.

Currently, the biggest constraint is the lack of staff in the bureaus to carry out the restoration actions. Bureaus receive no base funding for the personnel they use to conduct damage assessments, negotiate settlements, or to plan and implement restoration.

Inherent conflicts arise when personnel are faced with the choice of starting on a restoration project or pursuing additional damage assessments which often have a statute of limitations running. In addition, these personnel have responsibilities beyond those in the damage assessment and restoration program in their respective bureaus.

Department of Health and Human Services

Indian Health Service

(361)

Indian Health Service
House Interior Appropriations
Committee Questions for the Record

Fixed Costs

Question: No funds are included in your budget request for medical inflation and other fixed cost increases (other than pay increases). What do you estimate those additional costs will be in fiscal year 2001? Please provide details for each budget subactivity.

Answer: We estimate that the cost of providing across-the-board increases for medical and non-medical inflation would be $52,048 million in FY 2001.

	FY 2000 1/ Approp.	Non-Medical	Medical	Inflation Amount
SERVICES:				
Hospital/Health Clinics	550,089	2,129	17,525	19,654
Dental Health	35,969	42	1,338	1,380
Mental Health	28,277	20	1,066	1,086
Alcohol/Substance Abuse	87,051	29	3,338	3,367
Contract Health Services	410,442	328	15,399	15,727
Clinical Services Total	1,111,828	2,548	38,666	41,214
Public Health Service	14,776	48	487	535
Health Education	6,679	134	13	147
Comm. Hlth Representative	40,960	6	1,586	1,592
Immunization Alaska	725	0	27	27
Preventive Health Total	63,140	188	2,113	2,301
Urban Health	28,808	3	1,118	1,121
Indian Health Professions	28,360	5	1,096	1,101
Tribal Management	2,390	51	0	51
Direct Operation	17,579	301	134	435
Self-Governance	8,845	8	329	337
Contract Support Cost	238,781	0	0	0
Total Services	1,499,731	3,104	43,456	46,560
FACILITIES:				
Maintenance & Improvement	48,125	233	1,439	1,672
Sanitation Facilities	86,896	1,625	372	1,997
Facilities Construction	42,531	0	0	0
Facil. & Envir. Hlth Support	49,438	632	755	1,387
Equipment	14,243	145	287	432
Total Facilities	241,233	2,635	2,853	5,488
TOTAL, IHS	1,460,207	5,739	46,309	52,048
Fully Fund Medical Inflation				
President's Budget				
TOTAL NEED				

1/ Inflation factors are only applied to the funds within each line item which are not used for salaries.

Question: What is the impact on your ability to provide health services if you absorb your fixed cost increases? Please provide detailed analysis for the record.

Answer: Our budget request was formulated based on the goal of restoring access to health services, which addresses fixed costs, and on the goal of reducing the gap in health disparities between American Indians and Alaska Natives and other Americans. It is really the combination of this 2-pronged approach that allows us to improve health status. If the increase entirely covered fixed cost increases funding would have come at the expense of needed program increases to address health disparities. Given the amount of additional funding requested (+9.6% over FY 2000) we believe the distribution between fixed costs and program increases is appropriate.

IHS Services

Question: How long do IHS patients need to wait for services now?

Answer: While a comprehensive study on waiting times for appointments and services has not been done, anecdotal reports indicate that it is not uncommon for patients to wait 2 or more months for appointments for routine care or to spend half a day waiting for care on a walk-in basis. In the extreme, some patients may wait 6-8 hours for a walk-in appointment only to be told to return the next day or go to the emergency room.

Anecdotal information also indicates that waiting times for appointments for other and specialty care, e.g., dental, optometry, and podiatry provided at IHS and tribal clinics or hospitals, average 3-6 months. In the extreme, the Phoenix Area reports a dental appointment waiting list over 2 years long. Waiting times for contract health services referrals vary according to priority and availability of resources. Many programs are operating on a Priority I basis which means that care that is not urgent or emergent is delayed until funds become available or the patient's health deteriorates to the point that the situation meets the urgent/emergent criterion. Patients without personal resources or alternate resources may have to wait several months or even years for such services to be approved. The refraction, routine mammogram, orthodontic, ultrasound examination, arthroscopy, physical therapy, dental hygiene, elective orthopedic and podiatry evaluation services are some examples of cases that are deferred.

Question: What level of services are you able to provide to the IHS service population as compared with health services for the U.S. population as a whole?

Answer: The (LNF) study, which is still in consultation, identifies needs for health service comparable to the health benefits in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP) – that is, it estimates the costs of similar personal health benefits for Indian people. The study estimates that $2,980 per person is required to assure IHS user FEHBP health benefits including typical deductibles/co pays. The IHS appropriation provides approximately 60% of these costs.

Hospitals and Clinics

Question: What level of need are you meeting with the hospital and clinics budget for fiscal year 2000? How will that change, assuming the budget request for fiscal year 2001?

Answer: The (LNF) study, which is still in consultation, identifies needs for health services comparable to the health benefits in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP) – that is, it estimates the costs of similar personal health benefits for Indian people. The preliminary report provided by the LNF Workgroup show that existing federal funding for personal medical services is approximately 60 percent.

Other Health Service Programs

Question: At what level of need are each of the other programs funded in fiscal year 2000 and what level of need will be funded assuming the 2001 request:

Dental Services
Mental Health
Alcohol and Substance Abuse
Contract Health Care
Public Health Nursing
Health Education
Community Health Representatives
Urban Health
Indian Health Professions
Tribal Management
Maintenance and Improvement
Sanitation
Facilities and Environmental Health Support
Equipment

Answer: Substantial portions of Dental, Mental Health, Alcohol and Substance Abuse, and Contract Health Care line items support personal medical services. The preliminary results from the LNF Workgroup show a 60 percent LNF percentage for all personal medical services. The balance of these programs supports public health and community preventive programs. The LNF workgroup has not addressed community/public health programs. A more current estimate is not available.

Urban Health - Based upon the RRM study of 1992, the Urban program in FY 1999 was funded at a 22 percent of unmet need. The (LNF) study, which is still in consultation, identifies needs for urban health services comparable to the health benefits in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP); that is, it estimates the costs of similar personal health benefits for Indian people. The first set of results and report show that FY 2000 IHS funding for urban services is approximately 4 percent. That is, the appropriation for the existing Urban Indians, in 34 sites, is about 4 percent of the

amount which would be needed to purchase their health coverage with a health insurance plan similar to the FEHBP. We believe that the FY 2001 IHS level will also be approximately 4 percent level of need funded.

Indian Health Professions - We currently fund 15% (226) of the new applications for the scholarship program in FY 1999. With the funding increase requested for FY 2001, we anticipate that we will fund approximately the same proportion of new applications because of the increase in tuition and related costs for the schools.

For the loan repayment program, we fund approximately half of the applications received from people who are either already working at Indian health facilities or have declared their intention to begin working at such a facility this year. We anticipate that this will be true for next year, as well.

Tribal Management Grant – The Tribal Management Grants are competitive grants awarded to tribes and tribal organizations to develop their capacity to manage their own programs. This is achieved through two project types: (1) planning projects focuses on strategic planning such as creating a tribal specific health plan, and (2) health management development projects focuses on the development of their internal systems such as billing, personnel, or internal controls.

In FY 1999, 72 eligible grant applications were received, 40 were approved, and 22 were funded. The Agency anticipates that a similar number of grants could be funded under the FY 2001 request.

Maintenance & Improvement (M&I) - The Building Research Board of the National Research Council states that an appropriate annual budget for routine maintenance and repair would be in the range of 2 to 4 percent of the current replacement value of the facilities (totaling $1.859 billion for IHS). The older the facility, the higher the percentage. Assuming a 4 percent need ($74 million) since IHS facilities are relatively old compared to private sector facilities, the current routine maintenance funding level ($24 million) constitutes a 32 percent level of need funded (LNF). Consistent with overall facility needs, the budget request includes an increase of $1.97 million for Maintenance & Improvement. This increase would be used to reduce the Backlog of Essential Maintenance, Alteration, and Repair rather than for routine maintenance, and therefore does not effect its LNF. The funding requested in Facilities Support (under the Facilities and Environmental Health Support budget activity) in FY 2001 will be used to meet the staffing needs related to M&I projects.

Sanitation Facilities Construction (SFC) – In 1999 the funding level for new and like new housing is at a level of need of approximately 70%. The funding for the backlog of facilities for existing homes has been historically funded at approximately 60% of the need, based on the goal of meeting all current feasible sanitation facilities needs for existing homes in 10 years. With the proposed funding for the year 2001 it is expected that these levels of need will remain approximately the same. A portion of the funding requested in Environmental Health Support in FY 2001 Support (under the Facilities

and Environmental Health Support budget activity) will be used to meet the staffing needs related to SFC projects.

Equipment – The IHS has a biomedical equipment inventory valued at $306,000,000. The level of need for scheduled replacement of the $306,000,000 of laboratory, x-ray, and other biomedical equipment is based on an average 6-year useful life, which is based upon the American Hospital Association publication *Estimated Useful Lives of Depreciable Hospital Assets*. Based on this data IHS uses an average of 6 years; therefore, about 16% of the inventory should be replaced each year. This replacement cost is about $50,000,000. Currently, the equipment funds about $10,000,000 for the medical equipment replacement program.

Equity

Question: How many service units are funded by the Indian Health Service and how many of those service units are funded below 40% of need?

Answer: The Level of Needed Funded (LNF) study identifies health needs to Indian people that are comparable to Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP). As you know, the IHS is still consulting with Indian country about the draft LNF findings. The draft results, based on the LNF Workgroup's study, show 19 service units are funded below 40% of need when measured using the expected costs of a FEHBP benefits package. Because IHS is recomputing the LNF results (see explanation below) with more recent IHS user counts, the exact number of service units below 40% may change.

Question: How do you calculate level of need?

Answer: The (LNF) study, which is still in consultation, identifies needs for health services comparable the health benefits in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan (FEHBP) – that is, it estimates the costs of similar personal health benefits for Indian people. The study employs an actuarial approach. The average FEHBP cost per beneficiary is adjusted for risk factors of IHS users – age, sex, lower health status. The study estimates that $2,980 per person is required to assure IHS users FEHBP health benefits including typical deductibles/copays. By extrapolating older AI/AN data, the study estimates that Medicare, Medicaid, and private insurance accounts for 25% of this cost for IHS users. After deducting 25% for other coverage, the study concluded that the IHS appropriation would cover 60% of the net remaining cost. The LNF study did not address the level of need for non-medical health programs such as public health and sanitation facilities.

Question: Please provide funding information by service unit for those units funded at less than 40% of need.

Answer: The final estimates for individual service units will not be available until June 2000 because the IHS is currently updating the analysis with more recent user counts.

We anticipate, however, that the final results will be similar to initial findings. The initial draft findings show $43 million is needed to raise service units up to a minimum of 40% of need and $288 million is needed to raise them to 60%.

Question: What additional funds would be required to bring each of those service units to 40% level of need funding?

Answer: The IHS is recomputing the LNF analysis with more recent user data. The initial draft results show $43 million is needed to raise service units to a minimum of 40% of need. The final estimates for individual service units will not be available until after data updates are done in May 2000.

Question: To what extent does measurement of need at the service unit mask underfunding at certain locations? Please provide details for the record.

Answer: We do not have data to reliably determine LNF for small populations (locations) within service units. The LNF study uses an actuarial (statistical) approach to estimate expected costs which can reliably predict costs if the population is sufficiently large. When the population becomes too small, the cost estimates become less reliable – random variations in service utilization, for instance, can cause costs in a given year to differ significantly from the statistical average. However, we recognize that statistical averages can mask variations within the service unit population, but are unable to reliably measure within service unit variations.

Indian Health Care Improvement Fund

Question: How are you allocating the $11 million provided for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund in fiscal year 2000?

Answer: In FY 2000, $10 million was provided for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund. The LNF workgroup has proposed an equity formula that targets all increases to service units below 60% of need (the IHS average). The equity formula is still under consultation with Indian tribes. Although most tribal comments find the "actuarial" approach to identifying comparable health needs as credible, tribes hold decidedly mixed views about an "equity" formula. Based on consultation comments, the IHS is currently recomputing the LNF results with more recent user counts and will consider giving more weight to health status and remoteness costs in the equity formula. We anticipate making a final determination on an equity formula after recomputing results and after completion of consultation.

Question: Your request includes $8 million for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund in 2001. How will these funds be distributed?

Answer: Once an equity formula is determined following completion of tribal consultation, we anticipate using that formula in subsequent years. The formula would be recomputed annually to consider the latest user counts and funding availability data.

Pharmacist Interns

Question: Last year the Congress added funding to institute a pharmacist intern program. How are these funds being used?

Answer: Six pharmacy residency programs/positions have been funded for FY 2000. Positions will be encumbered effective July 1, 2000. Funds for this year are being used to recruit residents, provide training for residency preceptors, purchase required equipment, and purchase reference materials. Funds will also be used for accreditation fees, moving costs for pharmacy residents and salaries of pharmacy residents. For FY 2000, some funds will also be used to support summer pharmacy interns. A part-time residency coordinator will also be funded to facilitate the development and implementation of the pharmacy residency programs.

Question: How many interns will be supported by this program and at what locations will they be placed?

Answer: Six residents will be supported using these funds. The residency positions will be located at:

Alaska Native Medical Center, Anchorage, AK
Phoenix Indian Medical Center, Phoenix, AZ
USPHS Indian Hospital, Whiteriver, AZ
W.W. Hastings Indian Hospital, Tahlequah, OK
USPHS Indian Hospital, Claremore, OK
USPHS Indian Hospital, Sante Fe, NM

Question: What does the budget assume with respect to continuing the program in fiscal year 2001?

Answer: The budget assumes that funding is recurring.

Question: Is the demand for this program greater than available funds? If so, how many more interns could you use and what would the additional positions cost?

Answer: Qualified applications for the residency sites/positions in FY 2000 exceeded the number which could be funded. At least three or four additional residency programs could developed with appropriate funding. Approximate cost per pharmacy resident is $55,000 per year.

Question: What locations would be potential candidates if additional pharmacy interns were available?

Answer: The I/T/U has a substantial number of sites which could accommodate pharmacy residency training programs. This year, more applications for training sites were submitted than were selected. Additional residency training sites might include:

Phoenix Indian Medical Center
Cherokee (NC) Indian Hospital
Warm Springs Indian Health Center (Oregon)
Carl Albert Indian Hospital (Tribal facility - Ada, Oklahoma)

Health Professional Shortages

Question: What are your most extreme shortfalls in health professionals? (doctors, dentists, pharmacists, etc.)

Answer: Our biggest shortage is dentists, followed closely by podiatry and medical imaging. More than 25% of Indian health dental positions, 25% of podiatry positions, and 24% of imaging positions are vacant. Pharmacy may become a problem. Nursing and optometry also have the potential to become problems.

Question: For the record, please provide an estimate of health professional staffing shortages by category (doctors, dentists, pharmacists, etc.) and explain what you are doing to address these shortages.

Answer: Our current estimated vacancy rates for a number of professions are as follows:

Estimated Vacancy Rates for Selected Health Professions
March 2000

Profession	Vacancy Rate
Physician	10%
Dentist	25%
Nurse	11%
Pharmacist	13%
Optometrist	14%
Podiatrist	25%
Physical Therapist	7%
Medical Imaging[1]	24%
Engineer	6%
Dietitian	10%
Physician Assistant[2]	

[1]Includes Radiologic Technology, Mammography, Ultrasound, and Computerized Tomography.
[2]We do not have a good idea as to the number of PA positions or vacancies because many facilities utilize PA's and nurse practitioners interchangeably.

Health professions related to providing mental health services (psychiatry, psychology, social work, etc.) are important components of the Indian health program but we do not have good information regarding the vacancy rates for them. We are preparing a report to the Congress that will contain much more complete data than those contained in the above table. It will include the mental health professions. We hope to have the report completed within 6 months.

Activities to address these shortages include, but certainly are not limited to, the following:

- Establishing and maintaining a World Wide Web site that contains information regarding health professional needs at IHS, tribal, and urban Indian health facilities;
- Visiting health profession training programs to discuss opportunities in Indian health;
- Attending national, state, and local health profession association meetings to inform attendees about opportunities in Indian health;
- Accepting health professions students and residents in training positions at IHS facilities;
- Establishing internship arrangements between IHS facilities and health profession training programs;
- Advertising in professional journals;
- Attending health fairs at colleges;
- Attending high school career days;
- Adding funds to the IHS Loan Repayment Program
- Establishing special salary rates under the Title 38 authority
- Establishing a memorandum of agreement with the U.S. Army to assist in recruiting dentists;
- Direct mailings to practicing and student health professionals;
- Establishing four Dental Clinical and Support Centers, whose activities will include addressing the issues of recruitment and retention, with funds provided in the FY 2000 appropriation;
- Establishing workgroups of professionals to address the issues of recruitment and retention;
- Surveying current employees to see what attracted them to Indian health and what has made them stay on or may incline them toward leaving;
- Working with the National Health Service Corps to make Indian health facilities eligible to employ NHSC scholarship recipients; and
- Encouraging high school and college students to enter the health professions.

Question: Are there similar programs, like the pharmacist intern program, that could be used to address these shortfalls? Please provide some examples for the record.

Answer: The IHS currently accepts students and residents from a number of health professions each year. These people gain experience in their professions, with the IHS system, and in rural community health. Our hope is that they will decide to return to Indian health upon completion of their training. A considerable number of them do.

Two mechanisms for supporting these students are the Junior and Senior COSTEP (Commissioned Officer Student Training and Extern Program) programs. These programs commission students for short periods (junior COSTEP's for up to 120 days in a calendar year, seniors for their last academic year). Junior COSTEP's incur no service obligation as a result of their experience. Senior COSTEP's do because the government pays their salary, tuition, and fees for their last year of school. The obligation is twice the length of support.

The IHS Scholarship Program also has an extern program that is authorized by section 105 of P.L. 94-437, as amended. Priority for participation is given to IHS scholarship recipients but if money is left over after they are all in the program, the remaining money is made available to other programs for the purpose of supporting students who wish to obtain experience at an Indian health facility.

Question: To what extent does the loan repayment program address the health professional shortfall situation?

Answer: The loan repayment program has been a very successful recruitment and retention tool. The following table shows that there has been a significant increase in the average length of service of a number of health professionals over the past 8 fiscal years. While we cannot say that the loan repayment program has been the only factor in this increase, it is clearly a major one.

Average Length of Service
Selected Professions
Indian Health Service, 1992 and 1999

Year	Dentist	Nurse	Optometrist	Pharmacist	Physician	Physician Asst.
1992	8.01	8.32	9.2	9.7	5.52	17.09
1999	9.19	9.89	9.94	10.54	7.29	15.51

A second major factor in the effectiveness of the loan repayment program is the increasing level of education-related debt of health care providers. The following table shows that the average debt level of successful loan repayment applicants has nearly doubled over the past 5 fiscal years. Higher debt level equates to longer service in that it takes longer to pay the debt off or down to a comfortable level.

IHS Loan Repayment Program
Proportion of Successful Applicants Funded
FY 1996 - FY 2000

Year	Matched Applicants Funded (Percent)	Matched Applicants Average Debt Level
1996	58	$32,366
1997	54	$38,782
1998	47	$51,909
1999	40	$58,633
2000	46	$64,047

Another indicator of loan repayment program effectiveness is the number of contracts that are extended beyond the initial 2-year period. The following table shows this information for the program since its inception in FY 1988.

Indian Health Service
Loan Repayment Program
Contract Awards & Extensions
FY 1988 - FY 2000

Year	Awards	Extensions	% Awards That Are Extensions
1988	85	0	0
1989	196	0	0
1990	153	20	13
1991	87	19	22
1992	182	38	21
1993	258	19	7
1994	253	14	6
1995	277	20	7
1996	258	43	17
1997	253	42	17
1998	256	52	20
1999	223	59	26
2000	280	61	22

Even though the FY 2000 program was funded at the same level it has been for the past several years, the number of awards increased dramatically. This was possible because we revised the program's benefits for FY 2000. In previous years, participants received a maximum of $30,000 per year, with an additional 31% of the award amount going to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for tax offset (maximum possible annual award = $39,300). For FY 2000, we made the decision to revise the benefits to a maximum of $20,000 per year, with 20% going to the IRS. This revision was made to increase the numbers of dentists and pharmacists, particularly, accepted into the loan repayment program. This was a priority because of serious shortages in both professions throughout Indian health programs.

Question: Should existing programs, such as loan repayment, be expanded to address these shortfalls? If so, which ones?

Answer: Both the loan repayment and scholarship programs should be expanded. In FY 1999, the scholarship program funded only 15% of the qualified applicants. In FY 2000, the loan repayment program funded 46% of its qualified applicants. Indian people suffer the consequences of these limitations because we cannot attract all of the professionals necessary to provide the comprehensive care needed to ensure the mental and physical health of the community.

The two programs complement one another. Loan repayment accepts applicants who have already completed their training and are ready to begin working. Scholarships

work from the beginning of a person's professional education, helping them in three ways:

(1) to obtain additional (compensatory) education that will enable them to have a higher probability of success in the rigorous academic requirements of the health professions;
(2) to experience the preparation for their chosen profession in a way that helps them to decide whether they have made the right choice; and
(3) to obtain the professional education they have chosen.

The scholarship also benefits the community in that it supports community members who wish to obtain higher education, then return home to provide health professions services. As community members, they understand the culture from the time they enter on duty and tend to remain in the area.

In combination, the programs are very effective recruitment and retention tools. The initial loan repayment contract is for 2 years. The possibility of extending their contracts until their loans are either paid off or reach a level at which the participant believes they can continue to make the payments even though they are in a new job keeps participants in Indian health programs. Since the loan repayment program was begun, the average length of service of IHS health professionals has increased substantially.

The scholarship program has also had a positive impact on the staffing of Indian health programs. As the following table shows, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of Indian health professionals working in Indian health programs since the first graduates began to enter on duty.

Indian Health Service Professional Staff
9/30/81 vs 9/30/99

Date	Total Professionals	Indian Professionals	% of Staff That is Indian	Change
9/30/81	4,257	697	16	
9/30/99	6,269	2,058	33	Total professional staff has grown by 47%. Indian professional staff has grown by 195%. Proportion of professional staff that is Indian has increased by 106%.

The scholarship program serves the Indian community in two ways. It is an instrument of both health care improvement and community development. By providing trained health care professionals who come to Indian communities to provide health care, it improves the health of individual community members. Because these providers are Indian people, they also serve as role models for community members. Many have also

served as mentors to youth in the community who are interested in science and the health professions. By virtue of their having grown up in a reservation environment, many also bring an experiential understanding of many community problems and thus do not need to be exposed to them for as long as many non-Indians in order to understand their extent and import.

Question: To what extent do you have authority to offer special bonuses or special pay rates to attract health professionals in shortage categories?

Answer: We have the following authorities for special bonuses and pays:

Personnel System		Pay	Amount	Eligible Professions
Civil Service	Title 5	Recruitment Bonus	Up to 25% of base pay	All
		Retention Allowance	Up to 25% of base pay	All
		Relocation Bonus		
		Physician Comparability Allowance	Up to 25% of base pay	All
			Up to $30,000 per year	Physicians
Civil Service	Title 38[1]	Dental Special Pay (Consists of several components)	Up to $40,000 per year	Dentists
Civil Service	Title 38	Physician Special Pay	Up to $91,500 per year	Physicians
Civil Service	Title 38	Premium Pay	Multiples of employees' base overtime rate	Employees who provide direct patient care services or have been determined to be providing a service incident to direct patient care services
Civil Service	Title 38	Special Salary Rates	Permits agencies to review national salary rates for various professions and make adjustments in order to increase their competitiveness in the job market	All
Civil Service	Title 5 & Title 38	Incentive Special Pay[2]	Up to $36,000 per year	Physicians
Civil Service & Commissioned	Title 5 & Title 38	Additional Incentive Pay	Up to $2,000 per year	Any civil service or commissioned corps employee, except

Corps				commissioned physicians, dentists, optometrists, and veterinarians, who work in hard-to-fill sites
Civil Service & Commissioned Corps	Title 5 & Title 38	Retention Bonus	Up to $25,000 per year	Physicians and nurses who work in hard-to-fill sites and have worked for the IHS for 3 or more years
Commissioned Corps		Accession Bonus	$5,000 (1-time payment. Recipient must agree to serve for 4 years.)	Nurses
Commissioned Corps		Nurse Anesthetist Special Pay	$6,000 per year	Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists
Commissioned Corps		Accession Bonus	$30,000 (1-time payment. Recipient must agree to serve for 4 years.)	Dentists
Commissioned Corps		Variable Special Pay	Up to $7,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Dentists
Commissioned Corps		Additional Special Pay	Up to $15,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Dentists
Commissioned Corps		Board Certified Pay	Up to $6,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Dentists
Commissioned Corps		Variable Special Pay	Up to $12,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Physicians
Commissioned Corps		Board Certified Pay	Up to $6,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Physicians
Commissioned Corps		Incentive Special Pay	Up to $36,000 per year (Depends on specialty and duty station)	Physicians
Commissioned Corps		Multi-Year Retention Bonus	Up to $14,000 per year (Depends on specialty and length of contract)	Physicians

Commissioned Corps		Board Certified Pay	Up to $6,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Physicians
Commissioned Corps		Non-Physician	Up to $5,000 per year (Depends on length of service)	Speech Pathologists/ Audiologists, Dietitians, Health Physicists, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists, Optometrists, Pharmacists, PhysicianAssistants, Podiatrists, Psychologists, Social Workers, Nurse Anesthetists, Nurse Practitioners, Nurse Midwives
Commissioned Corps		Engineering and Scientific Career Continuation Pay	$3,000 per year	Engineers and Scientists with from 3-11 years of service
Commissioned Corps		Special Pay for Optometry Officers	$100 per month	Optometrists
Commissioned Corps		Special Pay for Veterinary Officers	$100 per month	Veterinarians

[1]The IHS has had the authority to use certain provisions of the Department of Veterans Affairs personnel system (Title 38), since December of 1993.

[2]Section 116 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (P.L. 94-437, as amended) authorizes the IHS to pay the incentive special pay authorized for commissioned officer physicians to civil service physicians serving in hard-to-fill positions.

Question: Are such special bonuses or special pay rates available elsewhere in government but not to IHS? If so, where are they available and what additional funding and authority would you need to take advantage of such programs?

Answer: We have used Title 38 authorities to attract and keep physicians and have recently begun to offer it to dentists. We are exploring the use of these authorities in other occupations such as pharmacists.

Podiatry Program Plan

Question: What have you done to comply with the Committee's direction to work with the National Institutes of Health, the American Podiatric Medical Association and other groups to develop a plan of action to augment and strengthen your podiatry care program and address the Service's shortage of health professionals in the podiatry field?

Answer: The Indian Health Service (IHS) is communicating directly with the American Podiatric Medical Association (APMA) through the Chief Clinical

Consultant, IHS Podiatry, who is also the Chairperson of the APMA Committee on Indian Health (COIH). This individual attends the APMA Annual Meetings, APMA Board of Trustees Meetings when invited, and APMA COIH conference calls. The IHS is working with the Center for Disease Control in Gallup New Mexico at the National Diabetes Prevention Center. This $3 million program is partnered with the Gallup Indian Medical Center (GIMC). A full time podiatrist has recently been hired to work with the IHS Diabetes Program at GIMC as a component of this partnership. In addition, the Director of the IHS Diabetes Program is participating in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Diabetes Working Research Group to develop research questions relevant to primary, secondary and tertiary complications of diabetes in American Indians and Alaska Natives (AI/AN). There is a cooperative relationship between NIH and the Podiatry Program at the Phoenix Indian Medical Center (PIMC) in which questions of clinical relevance are being developed and applied to existing databases. The NIH has solicited grant proposals from the IHS in order to make additional funds available to prospectively study lower extremity disease in AI/AN People in order to improve future care and outcomes. The PIMC Podiatry Department, in cooperation with the Diabetes Center of Excellence, has responded positively to the NIH solicitation. Groundwork has been laid for cooperative relationships.

Question: What does your 2001 budget assume with respect to addressing the shortage of podiatrists?

Answer: The IHS budget for FY 2001 assumes continued funding for approximately 30 existing full-time podiatry positions. Additional podiatry positions may be added if funding becomes available within the existing clinical services budget. In making decisions about adding services at the local level, the IHS must balance the needs of new and existing programs.

Question: How big a problem is diabetes-related amputations in Indian country?

Answer: The magnitude of the diabetes-related lower extremity amputation problem for all AI/AN People is difficult to quantify. The incidence of diabetes-related lower extremity amputation varies from tribe to tribe, as does the incidence of diabetes mellitus. The ability to establish accurate incidences of amputations for individual tribes is complicated by the fact that many AI/AN People have amputations done at non-IHS facilities resulting in reporting errors. Through work done by NIH, the IHS Diabetes Program, and individual IHS podiatry programs, the IHS is aware that diabetes related lower extremity amputations are a critical problem among diabetic AI/AN People. The IHS is also aware that education/prevention/intervention programs have been very effective in reducing the incidence of amputation at the Phoenix Indian Medical Center, Hu Hu Kam Memorial Hospital, the Red Lake facility, the Anchorage Native American Medical Center and the Billings Area. Since October 1999, the IHS has hired 5 additional podiatrists as part of the continuing effort to reduce the incidence of amputation in this diabetes-prone population.

Question: Ideally, how many additional podiatrists do you need and what is the associated cost?

Answer: Recruitment and retention of podiatrists is a critical problem for IHS. Based on pilot evaluations of podiatrist to patient ratios done at existing podiatry programs in the Indian Health Service, 100 additional podiatrists are needed. Estimates are based on the most current active user populations and diabetic populations for IHS. Costs associated with hiring additional podiatrists include: $100,000 per year in salary and benefits $60,000 per year for a podiatry technician and secretary/clerk/nursing support; $120,000 per year for specialty equipment such as x-ray units, podiatry exam chairs, vascular testing units, clinic and surgical instruments, as well as specialty supplies for diabetic foot care. An additional $20,000 per year would be required to to pay for student loans which average $140,000 for new IHS podiatrists being hired. In making budget requests the IHS must balance the need for additional podiatrists against the need for other health care specialists.

Question: To what extent would a podiatrist intern program, similar to the pharmacist intern program, help and what would be the cost of such a program?

Answer: A 3-year podiatry residency-training program, as is standard for other physician residency training programs, would require funding for 3 consecutive years. As with the single year pharmacy residency, the 3-year podiatry residency would provide a training opportunity for the podiatrists and a recruitment and evaluation opportunity for the IHS. The cost to train a podiatry resident is estimated to be $350,000 per person and would be very beneficial is based in IHS facilities.

Distribution of Increases

Question: Why haven't you provided the Committee with the required report on the distribution of funding increases in fiscal year 2000 - due 3 months ago?

Answer: The table below shows the proposed distribution of FY 2000 program increases. The narrative is still being developed.

FY 2000 Budget Allocation (Dollars in Thousands)			
	NET Approp'n	**Cong'l Earmk**	**Recommended Allocation Method**
Program Increases			
Operation of Alaska Facilities	2,245	XX	Allocated to AK per Appropriation language for lease costs
EPI Center	184	XX	Earmarked $100k for Portland Epi Ctr; Equal distribution of $84k to remaining 3 Epi Ctrs w/concentration on infectious diseases per Appropriation language
Pharmacy Residency Program	368	XX	7 to 8 competitive awards (I/T/U eligible)
Shoalwater Tribe Infant Mortaility	267	XX	Distribute to Tribe through Title III Compact
Diabetes-Joslin Center	920	XX	Contract with Joslin Center

Dental Health	2,500	XX	$1.0M for Support Ctrs (4 competitive tribal awards); $1.0M for Dental loan repayment; $400k for 12 competitive awards to address the Oral Health Priorities or Healthy People 2010; $100k for Dental RPMS system enhancement
Mental Health	500		5 competitive awards to support White House MH Initiative
*Contract Health Services	14,000		$840k set aside for New Tribes (LNF=60%); $13.16M to distribute by formula (workload, YPLL, CHS dependency)
Info/Telecom Systems	2,000		$1.0M telecom upgrades; $1.0M RPMS enhancements: tribal priorities
Public Health Nursing	2,500	XX	Earmarked 1 PHN position for Havasupai, AZ ($100k est.); $2.4M for competitive awards (I/T) to address health priorities
*Ind.Hlth Care Impr. Fund	10,000		Distribute with tribal consultation
Urban Indian Health	937		$650k for Info.Technology Systems Development; $287k to Urban Ctrs based on Tier 1 priorities (client referral to outside providers)
Maintenance & Improvement	2,500	XX XX	Earmarked $1.0M for Talihina Environmental Remediation; Earmarked $500k for Demolition of Designated Facilities; $1.0M to reduce BEMAR
Fac.& Environmental Hlth Support/ Injury Prevention	4,000		$1.475M Injury Prevention competitive awards; $2.525M to distribute by workload formula for Facilities & Environmental Health Support
Sanitation Facilities	1,500		Distribute based on need per Sanitation Deficiency System
Equipment	1,000	XX	Earmarked $500k for Ambulance; $500k for TRANSAM
Total, Program Increases:	$45,421		

* Indicates items to be allocated pending briefing on allocation process with the Director of IHS.
Congressional Guidance: Fixed Cost increases should be distributed across the board. Other program increases should not automatically be distributed on a pro rata basis.

Question: When will you transmit the required report to the Committee?

Answer: The report is in the final stages of development and should reach the Committee shortly.

Staffing of New Facilities - Parker River, AZ Clinic

Question: Why are no funds requested for staffing and operations at the Parker River clinic in Arizona?

Answer: The construction of the Parker, Arizona Health Center is not scheduled to be completed until FY 2002.

Question: What do you estimate is required for staffing and operating this new facility in fiscal year 2001? Please provide details by budget subactivity for the record.

Answer: IHS has not developed an estimate for staffing and operating this new facility for FY 2001. At this time, it is not IHS practice to request staffing in advance of the fiscal year a health center will open.

Question: Are there any other new facilities that do not include the necessary staffing and operations funds for fiscal year 2001? If so, what are they and what additional funding is necessary?

Answer: No, there are no other new facilities that require staffing and operations funds for FY 2001.

Question: The tribe has told the Committee that the an additional $1.5 million, above the budget request, is needed to complete the Parker River facility in fiscal year 2001. Why weren't these funds included in the request?

Answer: The IHS is working with the Colorado River Indian Tribes to determine if additional funds are needed as a result of the project being funded over 3 fiscal years rather than 2 fiscal years.

Self-Determination Contracts and Self-Governance Compacts

Question: How many new and expanded self-determination contracts and compacts are you funding in fiscal year 2000? Please provide information by contract and compact for the record including the distribution of the associated contract support costs.

Answer: In accordance with IHS Circular 2000-01, tribes can apply for new and/or expand contracts up to July 3, therefore, this report cannot be developed at this time.

Question: At what level of need are contract support costs funded for new and expanded contracts and compacts in fiscal year 2000?

Answer: We will be able to provide the list of distribution after July 3, 2000.

Question: At what level of need are contract support costs funded for continuing contracts and compacts in fiscal year 2000?

Answer: The IHS is not able to identify the level of need funding for contract support costs for continuing contracts and compacts at this time.

Question: What do you estimate the need will be for contract support costs associated with new and expanded contracts and compacts in fiscal year 2001?

Answer: The FY 2001 budget request provides $269 million, a $40 million increase for Contract Support Cost. This increase will first be used to provide CSC for new assumptions of IHS programs under self-determination agreements. The estimated

funding level of new and expanded contracts and compacts in FY 2001 is $12.5 million. However, since contracting and compacting is a tribal option, the amount actually needed could be higher. To the extent the $40 million is not needed for new assumptions, it will be used to increase CSC funding for existing contracts.

Contract Health Services

Question: How much of your shortfall in Contract Health Services would be addressed with the $41 million increase requested for fiscal year 2001?

Answer: The President's FY 2001 President's budget provides an increase of $41 million for Contract Health Care funding. Of this increase, $34 million will be used to address health status disparities and provide funding to new tribes. The additional funds will partially address CHS demands associated with deferred services, denied claims as well as funding newly recognized tribes. The actual amount of the CHS shortfall cannot be determined.

Question: To what extent would the increase improve the level of need funded compared with the level of need funded in fiscal year 2000?

Answer: The increase for fiscal year 2001 will begin to improve the level of need funded addressing such factors as CHS dennials and increased billed cost per service driven by medical inflation and other factors. With the increase in funding requested, IHS will be able to provide 1,460 additional hospital days, 57,200 additional visits to doctors and dentists, travel costs for 3,700 additional one-way trips and a 50 percent increase in funding for the Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund.

Shoalwater Bay Infant Mortality

Question: What is the current situation with respect to the infant mortality problems experienced by the Shoalwater Bay Tribe in Washington?

Answer: The recent problem for adverse outcomes of pregnancy was a high rate of miscarriages in the years 1997 and 1998. The CDC investigated and verified that the rate of miscarriages was high, and statistically higher than the expected rate. The rate of miscarriages apparently went down in 1999, but the numbers are small and the data are preliminary.

The Shoalwater Bay Tribe, Pacific County Health Department, Washington State Department of Health, Shoalwater Bay Health Concerns Advisory Committee (chaired by an IHS physician-researcher) that is organized by the tribe, and others (including IHS) have been working together to intervene. The Tribe has established a permanent tracking system for pregnancies and their outcomes, based on the IHS data system. The County is developing a tracking system for its pregnancies, because it is concerned that it might have a miscarriage rate higher than usual.

Question: What are you doing with the funding added to the budget in fiscal year 2000 for the Shoalwater Bay Tribe?

Answer: Funding of $267,000 has been allocated to the Tribe who is using it to implement some of the recommendations made by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the EPI-AID E99-29 Report.

Question: What do you assume with respect to funding for the Shoalwater Bay Tribe in fiscal year 2001 and how does that compare with funding in fiscal year 2000?

Answer: The FY 2001 budget request does not include an increase specifically for the Tribe, the $267,000 provided in FY 2000 is recurring, however. Also included in the budget request is $1.4 million for the expansion of existing tribal epidemiology centers, including the Northwest Portland Area Indian Board Epidemiology Center. This Center is a potential source of support for the Tribe's infant mortality research activities.

New Tribes Funding

Question: What total amount of funding is included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request for new tribes funding and how does that breakdown by tribe?

Answer: The President's Budget for FY 2001 proposes an increase of $40,916,000 in contract health care funding. Of the increase, $6 million would increase the Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund by 50 percent and the remaining $33,916,000 would address health status inequities, equitable delivery of health care services, and funding for newly recognized tribes.

We do not anticipate there will be any new tribes that attain Federal recognition in FY 2001, as the Bureau of Indian Affairs has not identified any specific Indian groups that are likely to attain recognition at this time. New tribes attaining recognition in FY 2001 will be brought into the system at 60% level of need per previous instructions from the Congress.

Question: What new tribes have been recognized and what funding would be required to fund each of them at 60% level of need?

Answer: At this time, it appears that the Cowlitz tribe will officially receive Federal recognition in May 2000 (i.e., fiscal year 2000). The amount of funding needed to bring the Cowlitz tribe into the Indian Health Service system at 60% of level of need would be $1,338,400. This calculation was based on an estimated tribal membership of 1,577.

Question: The Cowlitz Tribe recently received Federal recognition. What do you assume with respect for funding for this tribe in fiscal year 2000 and in 2001?

Answer: The Federal recognition of the Cowlitz as a new tribe will not become official until May 2000. The amount of funding needed to bring the Cowlitz tribe into the Indian Health Service system at 60% of level of need is $1,338,400. This calculation was based on an estimated tribal membership of 1,577.

In anticipation of the recognition of the Cowlitz tribe, the Congress appropriated sufficient new funding (i.e., $1,338,400) in the contract health care activity in fiscal year 2000 to fund the Cowlitz based on the above calculation of need.

Question: The Cowlitz Tribe has proposed to take over an existing clinic and, using a combination of Service money and foundation grant funding, provide services to its members through that clinic. What is the Service's position on that proposal?

Answer: The funding for new tribes in recent years, including funding already appropriated for the Cowlitz tribe, has been provided in the contract health care (CHS) budget activity. CHS funding cannot be used to operate a clinic.

It is likely that the Cowlitz tribe may ultimately decide to contract under the authority of the Indian Self-Determination Act (ISDA), P.L. 93-638, as amended. The redesign authority of the ISDA would enable the Cowlitz to develop a health services program that is responsive to the needs of its members. The IHS is committed to working with the Cowlitz tribe in the development of a health program that addresses tribal priorities.

Question: What impediments, if any, are there to implementing the Cowlitz proposal? Please provide details for the record.

Answer: It is difficult to identify potential impediments without having full knowledge of the intricacies of the Cowlitz proposal. Once the Cowlitz tribe officially attains Federal recognition, the IHS will work with the tribe to assist it in realizing its aspirations with respect to health care programming. At that time, any impediments with the Cowlitz proposal can more readily be identified and communicated to the Congress.

Indian Health Facilities Maintenance

Question: How big is the maintenance backlog at your hospitals and clinics?

Answer: The current identified Backlog of Essential Maintenance, Alteration, and Repair (BEMAR) at IHS and tribal facilities is approximately $446 million

Backlog of Essential Maintenance. Alteration, and Repair (BEMAR)

		AB	AN	AQ	BE	BI	CA	NA	NS	OK	PH	PO	TU	Subtotal
1	Patient Care	156,635	601,811	318,050	118,181	301,100	841,624	248,000	67,977	1,155,835	8,623,825	0	1,130,000	$ 13,563,000
2	Fire & Life Safety	1,164,291	19,447,962	244,250	637,237	477,000	1,017,539	591,601	271,133	5,536,840	5,081,692	97,189	156,170	$ 34,723,000
3	Safety	208,717	475,983	286,210	445,190	218,418	581,469	34,900	164,631	216,563	2,562,766	8,748	48,090	$ 5,252,000
4	Environmental Quality	1,588,102	8,806,334	420,073	338,361	144,250	85,750	165,192	188,452	1,043,856	3,649,871	165,550	33,365	$ 16,629,000
5	Program Improvements	12,722,178	9,882,285	2,363,330	96,495	10,545,600	891,256	5,485,110	3,461,730	19,307,735	21,492,496	60,198	1,208,245	$ 87,517,000
7	Handicapped	1,631,996	1,729,789	629,230	883,928	122,000	186,576	1,016,360	60,051	505,311	1,723,229	246,296	57,975	$ 8,793,000
8	Energy Management	471,948	1,307,773	920,399	316,485	117,000	18,420	295,007	137,945	999,588	1,785,297	48,540	159,100	$ 6,578,000
	Subtotal:	17,943,867	42,251,937	5,181,542	2,835,877	11,925,368	3,622,634	7,836,170	4,351,919	28,765,728	44,919,176	626,521	2,792,945	$ 173,054,000
11	Structural	973,034	4,846,762	1,292,956	507,193	31,000	103,767	4,820,485	878,178	3,181,890	5,827,288	320,996	2,409,500	$ 25,193,000
12	Mechanical	871,154	5,625,458	1,903,228	1,334,686	0	400,731	3,970,350	734,887	6,476,056	6,875,858	196,515	233,560	$ 28,622,000
13	Electrical	219,026	2,019,780	497,638	151,725	0	276,168	1,098,500	62,777	3,040,203	11,893,498	44,100	30,790	$ 19,334,000
14	Utility	5,130	897,850	22,400	36,125	46,500	0	656,935	70,870	58,000	313,552	6,000	1,144,670	$ 3,258,000
15	Grounds	2,689,284	261,710	346,277	135,153	1,305,750	7,080	3,728,116	444,205	1,065,618	4,394,817	100,094	1,625,240	$ 16,103,000
16	Quarters	88,590	10,748,049	164,000	119,200	2,440,438	0	2,963,554	76,841	19,845	11,328,406	0	1,474,720	$ 29,424,000
17	RP Installed Equipment	21,880	40,000	0	375,150	0	0	0	66,730	0	1,139,120	0	250	$ 1,643,000
	Subtotal:	4,868,098	24,439,609	4,226,499	2,659,232	3,823,688	787,746	17,237,940	2,334,488	13,841,612	41,772,539	667,705	6,918,730	$ 123,577,000
	Seismic	3,313,213	38,871,438	20,160,240	0	136,109	0	28,440,383	6,495,147	17,010,818	29,634,552	932,137	4,132,992	$ 149,127,000
	Jan 13, 2000 Total:	26,125,178	105,562,984	29,568,281	5,495,109	15,885,165	4,410,380	53,514,493	13,181,554	59,618,158	116,326,267	2,226,363	13,844,667	$ 445,759,000

January 2000

Question: Is the backlog growing? If so, at what rate?

Answer: The current backlog is an increase of $57 million over the previous year. The BEMAR grew at a rate of approximately 13% last year.

Question: What do you estimate would be a reasonable backlog?

Answer: There are several different types of projects that are incorporated in the Backlog of Essential Maintenance, Alteration, and Repair. At this time IHS does not have a detailed evaluation for what would be a reasonable backlog. Deferred maintenance projects are complex enough that it takes about a year between the time the project is identified and work can begin. Consequently, a 2-year deferred maintenance cycle would exist without any constraints on available funding. At the current funding level, the IHS devotes approximately $14 million per year towards corrections of deferred maintenance. An optimal backlog would contain approximately 2 years deferred maintenance project funding; based on the current funding level this would be $28 million.

Question: What funding would you require annually to reach that level over a 10-year period? How does that compare with the current funding level? Please explain the assumptions associated with your estimate.

Answer: Based on assumptions made in the previous answer about an optimal backlog, maintenance and improvement funding for the specific purpose of decreasing the BEMAR to $28 million would require approximately $116 million annually over 10 years.

• Routine Maintenance (4 percent of replacement value)	$ 74 million
• Existing BEMAR Reduction ($446 million - $28 million/10)	$ 42 million
TOTAL ANNUALLY	$116 million

This estimate assumes that a routine maintenance funding level of $74 million (currently $24 million) would keep the BEMAR from increasing. Also, this estimate does not include inflationary costs, space increases, as well as increases due to aging of the facilities. It also does not include any of the decreases which do occur when health care facilities are replaced by new facilities.

Equipment

Question: Why is there a $2.1 million reduction to the base budget for equipment?

Answer: Non-recurring Y2K funding was provided in FY 1999 to replace medical equipment that was not Y2K compliant.

Question: What will be the impact of such a reduction?

Answer: In FY 1999, Y2K funds did replace about 1,600 direct patient care biomedical devices at a cost of $22 million. These devices varied from ultrasound units to x-ray units, laboratory blood/gas analyzers, biomedical device management systems, and patient monitoring systems.

Question: How big is your equipment needs backlog and, at the rate of funding proposed in fiscal year 2001, how long will it take to eliminate that backlog?

Answer: The current total medical equipment inventory is valued at approximately $306 million. In order to replace the medical equipment inventory on a 6-year replacement cycle it would require annual funding of approximately $50 million. At a funding level of $12 million with approximately $8 million used for replacement of medical equipment, it will take approximately 38 years to replace the current inventory.

Sanitation/Water and Sewer Facilities

Question: What is the total backlog of need for sanitation (water and sewer) projects in Indian country?

Answer: As of the end of FY 1999, there was a total need of approximately $1.753 billion for the provision of sanitation facilities to serve all existing Indian and Alaska Native homes and communities. Of this total of all projects, the following is required for each type of facility:

Water	$972 million
Sewer	$637 million
Solid Waste	$124 million
Operation and Maintenance Technical Assistance	$20 million
Total:	$1.753 million

Question: Of that amount, how much have you determined to be economically feasible projects?

Answer: Of the total need, $770 million was considered technically and economically feasible. The breakdown of the feasible need is:

Water	$408 million
Sewer	$260 million
Solid Waste	$91 million
Operation and Maintenance Technical Assistance	$11 million
Total:	$770 million

Question: Why isn't the backlog declining, given the large amount of funding we have devoted to this program over the past several years?

Answer: Several factors account for the increased cost of eliminating the backlog. These include materials and labor cost increases, newly recognized tribes, population growth, costlier environmental regulations, aging sanitation systems, and an emphasis on the cleanup of open dumps (as a result of the passage of the Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup act of 1994). Approximately $43-45 million of the IHS' $90-plus million appropriation annually goes toward addressing the backlog. Funds from other agencies, states and tribes have helped to keep the backlog from growing significantly.

According to IHS year-end data, 737 homes were renovated/constructed but still waiting for sanitation facilities. This is due to very strong housing programs on some reservations, which recently have undertaken successful business enterprises. These businesses provided improved wages and attracted tribal members back to reservations, resulting in the construction of new homes at unprecedented rates. In addition, housing on the Navajo reservation continues to be constructed at rates that out paced IHS funding to provide them with sanitation facilities.

Question: At the rate we are funding these projects, when will the backlog begin to decline?

Answer: The FY 2001 budget request provides $96.7 million for Sanitation Facilities Construction, a 5 percent increase over FY 2000. The IHS devotes approximately $45 million per year for projects to address the feasible sanitation deficiency backlog of need (with the remainder of the funds being used for sanitation facilities to serve new and like-new housing). At the current rate of funding level, there would be no significant increase in the backlog as long as contributions from tribes and other agencies continue and funding increases associated with materials and labor are provided.

Question: For the record, please provide your priority list of sanitation construction projects that will be funded if the fiscal year 2001 budget request is adopted.

Answer: Attached are Area priority lists of all of the sanitation facilities construction projects needed to serve the backlog of existing homes and communities, based on end of fiscal year 1999 data (projects funded in fiscal year 2000 have been removed from the lists). The lists are organized in the current priority order for each IHS Area and Identified by State, Project Number (includes state abbreviation), Project Name, Priority, Total Cost, and Cumulative Cost. Lines were drawn on each Area's list to show the approximate projected funding level of each Area based on a fiscal year 2001 budget request of various amounts to serve these needs. Each line is identified with a national funding amount expressed in millions of dollars. This estimated Area funding level and the specific projects shown above that projected funding level line may change at the end of fiscal year 2000.

Priority List

Question: What minimum amount would be needed to initiate construction of the Pinon, AZ clinic in fiscal year 2001 and what would you do with the funds?

Answer: With a minimum funding of $3,500,000, construction could start for the site work, including the site utilities connections, earthwork, and piers and foundation. This work would take approximately 6 months to complete.

Question: Please provide the same information for the Red Mesa, AZ clinic.

Answer: With a minimum funding of $2,500,000, construction could start, after completion of the design, for the site work, including the site utilities connections and the sewage lagoon. This work would take approximately 6 months to complete.

Question: What additional project costs will be required if you don't initiate construction at Pinon or Red Mesa in fiscal year 2001? Please provide details by facility for the record.

Answer: If IHS does not initiate construction at Pinon and Red Mesa in FY 2001 there may be a need for additional funds to update the designs and equipment requirements. Also, cost estimates may change based on the construction market for the year funding is provided.

Question: What would it cost to initiate design for each of the following in fiscal year 2001 the St. Paul, AK clinic, the Metlakatla, AK clinic and the Sisseton, SD clinic?

Answer: It would cost the following to initiate design for each of the following projects:

St. Paul, AK - $2,128,000
Metlakatla, AK - $1,417,000
Sisseton, SD - $2,330,000.

Question: How many small ambulatory care facilities do you plan to fund with the $2.5 million requested for fiscal year 2001?

Answer: Pursuant to the authorizing legislation, grants may be awarded for 4 types of construction projects: (1) modernization of an existing facility; (2) expansion of an existing facility; (3) replacement of an existing facility; and (4) a new facility. Grants may cover up to 100 percent of the project cost, or a lesser amount. So, the number of projects that could receive a portion of the $2.5 million requested for grants will depend on the type of projects submitted and the funding levels requested. The IHS hopes to be able to provide grant assistance for approximately 3-5 projects.

Question: If the Committee were to recommend doubling the funding for small ambulatory care facilities, how many would be funded? Please explain the assumptions associated with your answer

Answer: The number of projects that could be funded will depend on the type of projects submitted and the funding levels requested. If the funds were doubled, the IHS would hope to be able to double the number of projects receiving grants (6 to 10 projects).

Question: Is it correct that no additional staffing or operational costs would be required as a result of funding small ambulatory care facility construction? Please explain.

Answer: Since the authorizing legislation authorizes the IHS to award grants only for construction of health care facilities owned and operated by other than the IHS, the IHS does not have responsibilities for staffing costs. However, if supportable space is increased, there will be additional M&I and operational costs.

Fort Defiance, AZ Hospital

Question: Of the $40.1 million requested to continue construction of the Fort Defiance, AZ hospital, how much is for hospital construction and how much is for construction of staff quarters?

Answer: Of the $40.1 million requested, $38.7 million is for hospital construction and $1.4 million is for design of the staff quarters.

Question: What have you done to work with the tribe to control the cost of staff quarters construction?

Answer: The IHS has had discussions with the Navajo Nation regarding methods to reduce the cost of providing the needed staff quarters, including the Nation's potential financial participation in the project. At this time, IHS is proceeding under the assumption that all funding for the quarters project will come from appropriations but that cost savings can be achieved in ways described in the answers to the next questions.

Question: If you were to construct uniform building code-approved modular housing for staff quarters what would it cost and how does that compare with "stick built" housing?

Answer: The IHS plans, designs, and constructs its staff quarters to conform with the standards provided in the guidelines of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-45, *"Rental and Construction of Government Quarters"*. Based on a July 1998 study IHS has estimated the use of modular units that meet OMB standards would cost approximately the same as a design-build approach for small projects unless

a manufacturer had "off-the-shelf" modular units that closely matched the government's requirements.

If the IHS used a design-build contract, it is estimated that there will be a 25 percent reduction in project cost. Use of modular housing units would be an option the contractor would be allowed. However, based on studies of design-build projects for housing, the design-build concept would generate cost savings only when a large number of repetitive units are in the project and the project value exceeds $9 million.

Staff Quarters Construction

Question: Why doesn't the budget include funding for staff quarters on the priority list?

Answer: This situation is of potential concern for the remote health care facilities, where private sector housing is not available. However, other facility priorities have precluded the IHS from including funding for all needed IHS staff quarters in the priority list in the recent past. The President's FY 2001 request did include funds for the design of the Fort Defiance staff quarters project. IHS will continue to work with tribes to explore alternative financing options and the most cost effective ways to address staff quarters on the priority list, particularly quarters for health care facilities in remote locations where private sector housing may not be available

Question: What are you doing to comply with Committee direction on developing a unified approach to staff quarters construction, which addresses the staff quarters priority list in the same way as quarters associated with new construction?

Answer: In response to quarters management concerns raised by the 1990 Office of Inspector General's (OIG) report, the IHS revised its prioritization process for quarters construction. One specific concern of the OIG was that the IHS had been completing the construction of health care facilities in remote locations without additional housing for new staff. To address this concern, the IHS has since included the quarters as part of new and replacement health care facility construction projects, with the intention of synchronizing the design and construction of quarters with the facilities construction so additional housing is available when the facility opens.

To address additional staff quarters for existing health care facilities, the IHS will continue to look for alternative methods for addressing the quarters listed on the current Quarters Construction Priorities System. Because of this concern raised by the Committee and the desires of the tribes participating in the P.L. 94-437 reauthorization process to revise the IHS health care facilities priority methodologies, the IHS is starting a dialogue with tribes to look at a unified approach to prioritizing all health facilities and quarters construction.

Question: What are you doing to work with the tribes on an approach to staff quarters construction that makes maximum use of uniform building code-approved modular housing and alternative financing options?

Answer: For planning and designing staff quarters, the IHS follows the policy and administrative guidance provided in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-45. The IHS uses a Program Justification Document for Staff Quarters (PJDQ) for justifying, planning, and specifying space requirements for quarters projects in conformance with the OMB circular. Likewise, the IHS uses a Program of Requirements for Staff Quarters (PORQ) to specify housing construction requirements in conformance with the standards in the OMB Circular.

Modular housing units that meet OMB standards, as included in the approved PJDQ and PORQ, will be used when proven to be more economical.

IHS has had discussions with the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation in Bethel about alternative financing options for the 79-unit Bethel hospital staff quarters project. The Corporation is developing a proposal.

Question: When do you expect to have this new approach to staff quarters construction formalized and in use?

Answer: New or replacement health care facility projects now on the respective inpatient and outpatient health care facilities priority lists include the associated staff quarters needs. The only projects currently on the Quarters Construction Priority List are projects for additional staff quarters for existing health care facilities.

As described in previous answers, the IHS is working with individual tribes to achieve funding for the quarters projects on the current IHS priority lists. A new formalized approach to staff quarters, which affects all IHS health care facilities project priority methods, will involve formal tribal consultation. By attempting a variety of different approaches with the quarters projects on the current priority list, IHS and the tribes can evaluate them and develop the best long-term strategy.

Question: What would be the costs and savings of construction staff quarters at Red Mesa, Fort Defiance, Pinon and Zuni, if they were packaged and bid as one project?

Answer: If multiple staff housing projects for one geographical region are packaged under one contract, a cost savings resulting from economies of scale could be achieved because the larger quantity of similar structures to be constructed. These savings would be realized only if funds are appropriated in such a manner as to prevent breaks in the quarters construction activities. There may also be a beneficial cost savings if the quarters were available in time for the construction workers to use them while they were constructing the health care facility.

Hospital and Clinic Construction

Question: How many hospitals and clinics are currently on your facilities priority list?

Answer: There are 4 inpatient facilities and 11 outpatient facilities on the health care facilities construction priority lists. These lists represent only the identified highest priority needs and do not address the complete unmet need for health facilities construction in Indian country.

Question: For the record please provide a copy of your priority list, including the status and funding profile for each facility.

Answer: The attached Health Facilities Construction Program Status Report provides the status of all active projects, including the priority lists

Priority List, Status, and Funding Profile
($000)

FACILITY	Prior to FY 00	FY 00 Approp	FY 01 Pres Bug	Status Remarks	Total Cost *
Planning Studies	$0	$0	$0		$1,000
Inpatient Facilities b/ c/					
Ft Defiance, AZ Hosp 1/	$19,832	$24,285	$40,115	Construction	$126,044
Winnebago, NE Hosp 2/	$2,697	$9,714	$12,286	Construction	$42,238
PIMC System, AZ Hosp 3/	$225	$0	$0	Planning	$266,736
Barrow, AK Hosp 4/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$95,000
Outpatient Facilities b/ c/					
Parker, AZ HC 5/	$3,617	$9,714	$7,578	Construction	$20,909
Ft. Yuma, AZ HC 6/	$0	$0	$0	On Hold	$6,524
Pinon, AZ HC 7/	$1,927	$0	$0	Under design	$39,128
Red Mesa, AZ HC 8/	$755	$2,000	$0	Under design	$53,718
Pawnee, OK HC 9/	$0	$0	$1,745	Design	$15,676
St. Paul, AK HC 10/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$14,500
Metlakatla, AK HC 11/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$18,724
Sisseton, SD HC 12/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$23,303
Clinton, OK HC 13/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$13,114
Dulce, NM HC 14/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$13,844
SanSimon(Westside),AZ HC 15/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$13,398
Quarters b/					
Bethel, AK Qtrs (79) 16/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$41,676
Zuni, NM Qtrs (19) 17/	$0	$920	$0	Design	$4,662
Wagner, SD Qtrs (10) 18/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$2,368
Ft. Belknap, MT Qtrs(29) 19/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$7,687
Kayenta, AZ Qtrs (62) 20/	$0	$0	$0	Design	$16,135
Regional Treatment Centers					
PHX-Nevada Satellite 21/	$515	$0	$0	Design/const	$2,201
S. California YRTC 22/	$0	$0	$0	PJD Devel.	$6,544
N. California YRTC 23/	$0	$0	$0	PJD Devel.	$6,771
Joint Venture Construction Program (Section 818e)					
Health Centers 24/	$2,552	$0	$0	Equip2-3/yr.	$77,552
Dental Units 25/	$5,498	$1,000	$1,000	New/repl. Unit	$22,498
Small Ambulatory Care Facility Grants (Sect. 306)					
	$0	$0	$2,513	4-8/year	$62,513
Non-IHS Funds Renovation Projects (Sect. 305)					
	$0	$0	$0	Equip 3-7/yr.	$10,000
Special Projects					
King Cove, AK 26/	$2,500	$0	$0		
Hopi Qtrs. (Polacca), AZ 27/	$0	$2,760	$0		
TOTAL	$40,118	$50,393	$65,237		$1,024,463
TOTAL UNFUNDED FY2001 - Outyears			$65,237		$939,212

* Based on mid-point of construction using current year dollars.

a/ Does not include Maintenance & Improvement, Environmental Remediation and Demolition, Environmental Assessment, Biomedical Equipment , or staff support which are also part of this budget request.

b/ This represents facilities on the current IHS Facilities Construction Priority Lists Additional facilities will be added to the Priority Lists in FY 2000.

c/ In locations where staff quarters are needed to support the health facility, the footnote specifies the estimated cost for the number of quarters to be built with the health care facility

1/ Reprogrammed: $1,650 planning (FY 85). Appropriated: $2,204,000 planning, design and utilities construction (FY 88); $2,626,000 design (FY 92); $15,000,000 design update and construction (FY 99), $24,285,000 construction (FY 00). Total cost includes $31,885,000 estimate for 156 quarters units. FY 2001 request includes $1,400,000 to design quarters

2/ Appropriated: $50,000 planning (FY 89), $300,000 for planning/design (FY 94), $1,397,000 design (FY 95), $950,000 desig (FY 99) $9,714,000 for construction (FY 00).

3/ Appropriated: $150,000 planning (FY 89). Reprogrammed: $74,405 planning from Sacaton Hospital (FY 94). Total cost for PMIC system includes the medical center, hostel, and 3 satellite outpatient facilities: Medical Center - $190,741,000, Hostel - $3,091,000 Central Ambulatory Care Center (ACC) - 34,666,000, East Valley ACC - $16,686,000, Northwest ACC - $21,552,000.

4/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for site acquisition, design, and construction.

5/ Reprogrammed: $50,000 for engineering analysis (FY 87), Appropriated: $693,000 planning and design (FY 88), $374,000 design (FY 95), Tribe funded design completion. Appropriated: $2,500,000 construction (FY99); $9,714,000 construction (FY00).

6/ Appropriated: $667,000 planning and design (FY 89), Withdrew $ -667,000 (FY 96).

7/ Appropriated: $50,000 planning and design (FY 89), $840,000 design (FY 90), $1,037,000 design (FY99). Total cost includes $16,296,000 for 62 quarters units.

8/ Reprogrammed: $9,218 for planning (FY 85), Appropriated: $746,000 planning and design (FY 91); $2,000,000 design (FY 0 Total cost includes $23,251,000 for 93 quarters units.

9/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design.

10/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction. Total cost includes $4,667,000 for 12 quarters units.

11/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction. Total cost includes $5,868,000 for16 quarters units.

12/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction. Total cost includes $6,388,000 for 24 quarters units.

13/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction

14/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction.

15/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction.

16/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction. Total cost includes $5,046,000 for 27 quarters units. Forty will be built in Phase I. Need for remaining 39 will be evaluated in Phase I.

17/ Appropriated: $920,000 for Phase I (FY00)

18/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction

19/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction.

20/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction

21/ Appropriated: $515,000 planning and design (FY 87).

22/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction.

23/ Appropriated: $-0-. Funds needed for design and construction.

24/ No funds have been appropriated for this authorization. A previous demonstration appropriation totaling $2,552,000 was use for projects in Poteau, OK and Warm Springs, OR which were funded by: Appropriated: $1,500,000 [services appropriation (FY 91), $1,052,000 [facilities appropriation] (FY 93) to equip, supply, operate & maintain facilities.

25/ Appropriated: $1,000,000 (FY 94), $998,000 (FY 95), $1,000,000 (FY 96), $1,000,000 (FY 97), $500,000 (FY 98), $1,000, (FY 99) $1,000,000 (FY 00).

26/ Funded through Department of Interior and transferred to IHS for the clinic.

27/ Appropriated: $2,760,000 (FY 00) to reduce the debt incurred by the tribe in providing staff quarters to meet housing needs 'associated with the health center.

Question: How many additional new and replacement facilities do you estimate you would need if you were to respond fully to the hospital and clinic needs of Indian country? Please explain.

Answer: The IHS has never performed the detailed analysis required to determine the full extent of the need for renovation, expansion, or replacement of all health care facilities serving American Indians and Alaska Natives. However, in 1994, IHS estimated the cost of facilities required to adequately support the delivery of health care in Indian Country at $3.2 billion. This estimate was based on the age and condition of IHS health care facilities and information from IHS Area Facilities Master Plans.

In that estimate, IHS noted that 14 hospitals and 18 health centers were either on the Health Care Facilities Construction Priority List or being considered for placement on it. Most of these facilities would replace existing facilities and some would be constructed as new facilities where none had previously existed. Also, IHS estimated that it would need to replace an additional 8 hospitals and 41 health centers and renovate or modernize another 16 hospitals, 82 health centers, and 284 health stations. At that time IHS did not believe it would be necessary to build any new hospitals; however, it estimated, based on the existing Area Facility Master Plans, that an additional 12 new health centers and 21 new health stations would be needed.

Type Construction	Facilities on or Being Considered For The Priority Lists in 1994	Facilities Not Prioritized in 1994
Replacement Hospitals	14	8
Replacement Health Centers	15	41
Renovate and Modernize Hospitals	0	16
Renovate and Modernize Health Centers	0	82
Renovate and Modernize Health Stations	0	284
New Hospitals	0	0
New Health Centers	3	12
New Health Stations	0	21
TOTAL	32	464

Since 1994, four health centers have been fully funded and one hospital was replaced by a tribe that is not reflected in the 1994 information above.

Question: What do you estimate it would cost to construct these additional facilities?

Answer: The total cost to develop the infrastructure was estimated in 1994 to be approximately $3.2 billion. These costs do not include on-going operation and maintenance or health care staffing costs.

Question: What was the impact of the 8% reduction to certain facilities construction projects, which was assessed in response to the 0.38% government-wide reduction? Please provide details by facility for the record.

Answer: The reduction to certain facilities construction projects included $80,000 for the Zuni, NM staff quarters project, and $240,000 for the Hopi Quarters assistance project. We estimate that this will result in one less staff quarter at the Zuni, NM location and $240,000 less available for Hopi quarters in FY 2000.

Question: What are you doing to work with the tribes on an approach to hospital and clinic construction that goes beyond the current priority system and includes consideration of alternative financing options and the needs of small tribes?

Answer: The President's budget request includes funding for the Small Ambulatory Grants program to address the needs of small tribes who have chosen alternative financing options. The IHS is planning to have formal tribal consultation to begin the development of new priority systems that address the congressional concerns expressed in the FY 1999 Conference Bill Report.

Question: When do you expect to have this: new approach to the facilities priority system incorporated in your budget formulation?

Answer: It is anticipated that FY 2000 will be needed to develop the structure required for a FY 2001 analysis. The current target is to be able to include the upgraded system in the FY 2003 budget formulation process.

Joint Ventures

Question: Why doesn't your budget address the advisability of reinstituting a joint venture facilities construction program wherein the tribes fully fund construction of a hospital or clinic and the Service provides the necessary equipment and operating funds?

Answer: The FY 2001 Budget is committed to supporting access to health care services and improving the health status of Native Americans. The Budget provides a total of $65.237 million for Health Care Facilities Construction and includes investments to fully-fund the final phases of construction for the Fort Defiance Hospital ($38.715 million) and the Parker Health Clinic ($7.578 million). In addition, the Budget also provides for the continuation of a second-phase construction of the Winnebago Hospital ($12.286 million), the design of the Fort Defiance Staff Quarter ($1.4 million), the design of the Pawnee Health Center ($1.745 million), modular dental units ($1 million), and Small Ambulatory Grants ($2.513 million). These and other budget priorities precluded the inclusion of the Joint Venture Program in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Before moving ahead on any new Joint Venture projects in the future, IHS will need to examine the following issues:

(a) Find a way to integrate and prioritize joint ventures with the IHS Facilities Construction Priority Lists.

(b) Ensure that long term costs associated with staffing and operations are consistent with IHS standards for providing health care facilities and services to Federally Recognized American Indians and Alaska Natives can be accommodated by future funding levels.

(c) Assure that funding committed to Joint Venture projects addresses priority needs for health care facilities and the delivery of health care services with the highest relative need.

The IHS will be addressing its entire health facilities construction priority system starting this year. How the Joint Venture Construction Program will be integrated with the existing IHS health facilities construction priority system will be addressed during the methodology development.

Question: How many tribes have expressed an interest in participating in such a program?

Answer: Although the IHS has not formally requested input from tribes, the IHS is aware of a coalition comprised of 11 tribes (Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, Ho-Chunk Nation, Jicarilla Apache, Kaw Nation, Klamath Tribe, Nez Perce Tribe, Oneida Tribe, St. Croix Chippewa, Sisseton Wahpeton, Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold, and Tohono O'Odham) who are promoting funding of this authority. Additional tribes, including Navajo Nation have expressed interest.

Question: What amount of funding did you request for such a program in your original request to the Department of Health and Human Services and how much was included in the request to the Office of Management and Budget?

Answer: The FY 2001 Budget is committed to supporting access to health care services and improving the health status of Native Americans. The Budget provides a total of $65.237 million for Health Care Facilities Construction and includes investments to fully-fund the final phases of construction for the Fort Defiance Hospital ($38.715 million) and the Parker Health Clinic ($7.578 million). In addition, the Budget also provides for the continuation of a second-phase construction of the Winnebago Hospital ($12.286 million), the design of the Fort Defiance Staff Quarters ($1.4 million), the design of the Pawnee Health Center ($1.745 million), mobile dental units ($1 million), and Small Ambulatory Grants ($2.513 million). The requests to the Department of Health and Human Services and to the Office of Management and Budget included $15 million for FY 2001. However, our request was not bounded by

restrictions and priority setting across the government. We are fully supportive of the priorities set in the FY 2001 Budget which included a $230 million increase for IHS.

Question: How much do you estimate each joint venture agreement would cost?

Answer: Facilities construction funding is only a small piece of the long-term financial commitment associated with Joint Venture. For instance, if Congress initially funds $15 million for equipment for Joint Venture projects in year 1, subsequent additional appropriations of about $22 million per year, to the total of $440 million for 20 years, will have to be available to address the IHS responsibilities to staff and operate these facilities.

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE
SANITATION DEFICIENCY SYSTEM - SDS
PRIORITY LIST

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: AB						
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0201	SPIRIT LAKE MR&I SERVICE LINES/RESERVOIR	1	$500,000	$500,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0401	PR SCATTERED WELLS AND STDFs	2	$36,000	$536,000	10
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40486-0101	BELCOURT WASTEWATER TREATMENT	3	$475,000	$1,011,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60816-0201	ROSEBUD LIFT STATION	4	$250,000	$1,261,000	20
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08547-0101	FT THOMPSON LAGOON EXPANSION	5	$1,000,000	$2,261,000	
NEBRASKA	NE87999-0301	OMAHA SCATTERED SITES	6	$40,000	$2,301,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD42687-0101	LOWER BRULE WATER	7	$90,000	$2,391,000	
NEBRASKA	NE87351-0101	WINNEBAGO SEWER REPAIRS	8	$150,000	$2,541,000	
NORTH DAKOTA	ND53520-0701	TRENTON WASTEWATER UPGRADE	9	$350,000	$2,891,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20611-0101	GREEN GRASS WATER SYSTEM	10	$120,000	$3,011,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20624-0101	BLACKFOOT SEWER SYSTEM	11	$90,000	$3,101,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0401	WHITE HORSE SEWER SYSTEM	12	$175,000	$3,276,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD47715-0101	CORN CREEK LAGOON	13	$200,000	$3,476,000	45
NORTH DAKOTA	ND53999-0101	TRENTON INDIV WATER TREATMENT	14	$150,000	$3,626,000	
NORTH DAKOTA	ND28427-0101	WHITE SHIELD EAST LAGOON SYSTEM	15	$160,000	$3,786,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60813-0101	OKREEK LIFT STATION	16	$150,000	$3,936,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20606-0101	BEAR CREEK INDIV. WATER & SEWER	17	$100,625	$4,036,625	
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40999-0202	TURTLE MTN INDIVIDUAL SEWER	18	$150,000	$4,186,625	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60816-0102	ROSEBUD LAGOON - PHASE II	19	$600,000	$4,786,625	60
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60816-0101	ROSEBUD LAGOON PHASE I	20	$600,000	$5,386,625	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0205	ROSEBUD SCATTERED HOMES, PH 5	21	$375,000	$5,761,625	75
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20999-0101	CHEYENNE RIVER SCATTERED PH I	22	$663,000	$6,424,625	
NORTH DAKOTA	ND31446-0201	BRESLIN SUBDIV WATER & SEWER	23	$250,000	$6,674,625	
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15580-0101	WAKPALA WASTEWATER TREATMENT	24	$325,000	$6,999,625	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20999-0102	CHEYENNE RIVER SCATTERED PH 2	25	$242,000	$7,241,625
IOWA	IA86001-0101	SAC & FOX SOLID WASTE EQUIPMENT	26	$100,000	$7,341,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67870-0101	IRON LIGHTNING WATER SYSTEM	27	$120,000	$7,461,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56790-0001	WOUNDED KNEE SEWER	28	$283,000	$7,744,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67872-0101	RED SCAFFOLD INDIV H20 & SEWER	29	$27,000	$7,771,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15999-0202	STANDING ROCK INDIVIDUAL - PHASE 2	30	$250,000	$8,021,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD11560-0101	GREENWOOD LAGOON ABANDONMENT	31	$75,000	$8,096,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08546-0001	FT THOMPSON WATER SYSTEM	32	$700,000	$8,796,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67873-0201	THUNDER BUTTE INDIV H20 & SEWER	33	$87,000	$8,883,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67873-0101	THUNDER BUTTE SEWER	34	$100,000	$8,983,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0304	PINE RIDGE SCATTERED W&S, PH 4	35	$880,000	$9,863,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD42687-0201	SCATTERED EXISTING HOMES	36	$150,000	$10,013,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20614-0101	LAPLANT INDIV WATER & SEWER	37	$240,000	$10,253,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27414-0101	MANDAREE SEWAGE TREATMENT	38	$230,000	$10,483,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67872-0201	RED SCAFFOLD SEWAGE SYSTEM	39	$60,000	$10,543,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67870-0201	IRON LIGHTNING INDIV WTR & SWR	40	$43,000	$10,586 625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67866-0303	BRIDGER WATER TANK	41	$100,000	$10,686,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0305	PINE RIDGE SCATTERED W&S, PH 5	42	$557,000	$11,243,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54761-0002	LAKE TRAVERSE SOLID WASTE	43	$275,000	$11,518.625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60816-0103	ROSEBUD LAGOON - PHASE III	44	$600,000	$12,118,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60808-0001	HE DOG SEWER SYSTEM	45	$200,000	$12,318,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0306	PINE RIDGE SCATTERED W&S, PH 6	46	$790,000	$13,108,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD50731-0101	FLANDREAU COMMUNITY WATER	47	$150,000	$13,258,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20611-0201	GREEN GRASS INDIV WTR & SEWER	48	$53,000	$13,311,625
NEBRASKA	NE87346-0101	MACY TRANSFER STATION EQUIPMENT	49	$150,000	$13,461,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43502-0101	FORT YATES SEWAGE TREATMENT	50	$500,000	$13,961,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43501-0201	CANNONBALL RESERVOIR	51	$300,000	$14,261,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43501-0101	CANNONBALL SEWAGE TREATMENT	52	$305,000	$14,566,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40999-0103	TURTLE MTN SOLID WASTE-PH 3	53	$1,000,000	$15,566.625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40486-0201	BELCOURT TK LIFT STATION RENOVATION	54	$40,000	$15,606,625

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0103	SPIRIT LAKE SOLID WASTE PH 3	55	$1,200,000	$16,806,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD61830-0101	ABANDON 3 LAGOONS (ROSEBUD)	56	$40,000	$16,846,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67867-0101	CHERRY CREEK WATER SYSTEM	57	$120,000	$16,966,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD67866-0101	BRIDGER INDIV WATER & SEWER	58	$85,000	$17,051,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27999-0101	FORT BERTHOLD SOLID WASTE	59	$300,000	$17,351,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27414-0001	MANDAREE WATER SYSTEM	60	$110,000	$17,461,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD99999-0104	CHEY RIVER SOLID WASTE PHASE 4	61	$100,000	$17,561,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD99999-0103	CHEY RIVER SOLID WASTE PHASE 3	62	$770,000	$18,331,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD99999-0102	CHEY RIVER SOLID WASTE PHASE 2	63	$1,500,000	$19,831,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD99999-0101	CHEY RIVER SOLID WASTE PHASE 1	64	$1,520,000	$21,351,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60815-0101	RING THUNDER LAGOON	65	$150,000	$21,501,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60806-0101	MISSION-ANTELOPE WATER SYSTEM	66	$400,000	$21,901,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56783-0101	PINE RIDGE LAGOON, FINISH	67	$600,000	$22,501,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD47719-0001	SWIFT BEAR SEWER	68	$125,000	$22,626,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27999-0301	FT BERTH INDIV. WATER TREATMENT	69	$150,000	$22,776,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56791-0001	WAKPAMNI WATER AND SEWER SYSTEM	70	$200,000	$22,976,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56773-0001	CALICO RURAL WATER SYSTEM	71	$340,000	$23,316,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15574-0201	LITTLE EAGLE WATER STORAGE	72	$100,000	$23,416,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54999-0001	LAKE TRAVERSE GROUNDWATER PH 2	73	$7,500,000	$30,916,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54761-0101	LAKE TRAVERSE SCATTERED SITES	74	$400,000	$31,316,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54761-0001	OLD AGENCY SEWER EXTENSION	75	$225,000	$31,541,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08999-0004	CROW CREEK O&M	76	$75,000	$31,616,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND13999-0401	TWIN BUTTES RURAL WATER	77	$386,000	$32,002,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03363-0102	TOKIO/WOOD LAKE WATER & SEWER	78	$820,000	$32,822,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0307	PINE RIDGE SCATTERED W&S, PH 7	79	$1,275,000	$34,097,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56785-0001	RED SHIRT LAGOON	80	$100,000	$34,197,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56784-0001	EVERGREEN WATER	81	$140,000	$34,337,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD03526-0001	ALLEN WATER TANK	82	$300,000	$34,637,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0303	ROSEBUD SOLID WASTE PHASE 3	83	$500,000	$35,137,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0204	PINE RIDGE OTHER DUMP CLOSURES	84	$600,000	$35,737,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0203	PINE RIDGE DUMP CLOSURE	85	$613,000	$36,350,625

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08999-0101	SCATTERED EXISTING HOMES	86	$350,000	$36,700,625
NEBRASKA	NE54320-0301	SANTEE FIRE HYDRANTS	87	$100,000	$36,800,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40999-0304	TURTLE MTN RW EXPANSION-PH 4	88	$10,000,000	$46,800,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND13390-0101	TWIN BUTTES SEWER (EAST)	89	$300,000	$47,100,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD35848-0001	POTATO CREEK WATER	90	$200,000	$47,300,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND53520-0501	TRENTON WATER SYSTEM	91	$125,000	$47,425,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43999-0301	CANNONBALL INTERMEDIATE BOOSTER STATION	92	$200,000	$47,625,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43505-0101	SOLEN RURAL WATER CONNECTION	93	$550,000	$48,175 625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43502-0201	FORT YATES WATER STORAGE	94	$685,000	$48,860,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56999-0202	PINE RIDGE SW COLLECT&TRANSFER	95	$650,000	$49 510,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD35849-0103	WANBLEE - LAKOTA FUND HOMES	96	$353,000	$49 863,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND13390-0201	TWIN BUTTES SEWER (WEST)	97	$130,000	$49,993,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD42687-0301	LOWER BRULE SEWER MAIN REPAIRS	98	$45 000	$50,038 625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20612-0001	ISABEL COMMUNITY WATER	99	$950,000	$50,988,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20611-0301	GREEN GRASS SEWER SYSTEM	100	$100,000	$51,088,625
NEBRASKA	NE87346-0001	OMAHA RURAL WATER IMPROVEMENTS	101	$450,000	$51,538,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0304	ROSEBUD SOLID WASTE PH 4	102	$500,000	$52,038,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08547-0401	GINGWAY HOUSING SEWER	103	$200,000	$52,238,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43999-0401	STANDING ROCK WELL ABANDONMENT	104	$200,000	$52,438,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40999-0401	TURTLE MTN SCATTERED	105	$300,000	$52,738 625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0203	SPIRIT LAKE MR&I WTP	106	$1,750,000	$54,488,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0202	ST MICHAEL MR&I RESERVOIR	107	$500,000	$54,988,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD99999-0202	TRI-COUNTY RURAL H2O SYS -PH 2	108	$4,650,000	$59,638,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56792-0001	SHARPS CORNER WATER & SEWER	109	$160,000	$59,798,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56773-0002	CALICO WATER & SEWER FACILITIES	110	$220,000	$60,018,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20607-0201	EAGLE BUTTE SEWER STUDY	111	$40,000	$60,058,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15577-0201	BEAR SOLDIER RURAL WATER CONNECTION	112	$160,000	$60,218,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15574-0301	LITTLE EAGLE WATER MAIN EXTENSION	113	$80,000	$60,298,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND53520-0601	TRENTON O&M	114	$125,000	$60,423,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27412-0001	FT BERTHOLD UTIL. COMMISSION	115	$100,000	$60,523,625

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEBRASKA	NE87349-0101	WINNEBAGO RWS FEASIBILITY STUDY	116	$75,000	$60,598,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0305	ROSEBUD SOLID WASTE PH 5	117	$400,000	$60,998,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD45702-0002	VEBLEN LAGOON REPAIRS	118	$150,000	$61,148,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD45702-0001	VEBLEN SEWER SYSTEM REPAIRS	119	$125,000	$61,273,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD11999-0002	YANKTON UTILITY ORGANIZATION	120	$100,000	$61,373,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND13390-0501	TWIN BUTTES BOOSTER STATION RENOVATION	121	$100,000	$61,473,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03358-0102	FORT TOTTEN HYDRAULIC LOOP	122	$375,000	$61,848,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0101	ROSEBUD SEPTIC TANK PUMPER TRUCK	123	$100,000	$61,948,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56789-0001	WOLF CREEK WATER & SEWER SYSTEM	124	$275,000	$62,223,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD56784-0002	PORCUPINE SEWER SYSTEM	125	$500,000	$62,723,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD18596-0001	ENEMY SWIM TANK REPAIRS	126	$225,000	$62,948,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20614-0201	LAPLANT SEWER SYSTEM	127	$150,000	$63,098,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD20607-0001	EAGLE BUTTE INDIV SEWER SYSTEM	128	$293,000	$63,391,625
NEBRASKA	NE87999-0201	OMAHA SEPTIC TANK PUMPER	129	$125,000	$63,516,625
NEBRASKA	NE87346-0201	MACY SEWER MAIN REPLACEMENT	130	$100,000	$63,616,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0601	SPIRIT LAKE O & M	131	$150,000	$63,766,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD35848-0102	POTATO CREEK SEWER	132	$275,000	$64,041,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD26651-0001	MILK'S CAMP WATER/SEWER SYSTEMS	133	$400,000	$64,441,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD45698-0002	RED IRON STANDPIPE REPAIRS	134	$200,000	$64,641,625
NEBRASKA	NE54320-0201	SANTEE WATER MAIN EXTENSION	135	$200,000	$64,841,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60821-0001	UPPER CUT MEAT SEWER	136	$200,000	$65,041,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND53520-0401	TRENTON SEWER SYSTEM EXPANSION	137	$187,000	$65,228,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND43999-0101	STANDING ROCK O&M	138	$600,000	$65,828,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15999-0303	SOUTH GRAND RIVER RURAL WATER EXTENSION	139	$2,000,000	$67,828,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54763-0101	PEEVER FLATS TANK	140	$250,000	$68,078,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54759-0101	LONG HOLLOW TANK	141	$250,000	$68,328,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD60999-0003	ROSEBUD RURAL WATER SYSTEM	142	$8,000,000	$76,328,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54761-0100	OLD AGENCY WATER MAIN EXTENSION	143	$150,000	$76,478,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03356-0101	CROW HILL COMMUNITY SEWER	144	$225,000	$76,703,625
NEBRASKA	NE87351-0201	KELLY SITE STORAGE TANK	145	$300,000	$77,003,625

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03362-0101	ST MICHAEL LAGOON RELOCATION	146	$995,000	$77,998,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD45702-0101	VEBLEN SOUTH WATER SYSTEM	147	$200,000	$78,198,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND28999-0101	WHITE SHIELD MR&I WATERLINES	148	$220,000	$78,418,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD11565-0101	SOUTH WAGNER HOUSING WATER TANK	149	$200,000	$78,618,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08545-0002	BAD NATION COMMUNITY SEWER	150	$645,000	$79,263,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND40999-0303	TURTLE MTN RW EXPANSION -PH 3	151	$400,000	$79,663,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND27999-0501	FOUR BEARS MR&I SERVICE LINES	152	$1,100,000	$80,763,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15999-0302	FT YATES TO KENEL PIPELINE	153	$3,000,000	$83,763,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD08546-0002	CROW CREEK SCATTERED WATER	154	$275,000	$84,038,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD34658-0001	STEPHAN COMMUNITY WATER SYSTEM	155	$1,400,000	$85,438,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD42683-0001	LOWER BRULE WATERLINE EXTENSION	156	$1,750,000	$87,188,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03362-0201	ST MICHAEL COMMUNITY BUILDING	157	$10,000	$87,198,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD54756-0001	FINLEY HGTS WATER STORAGE TANK	158	$250,000	$87,448,625
NORTH DAKOTA	ND03999-0204	SPIRIT LAKE MR&I EXTENSIONS	159	$9,490,000	$96,938,625
SOUTH DAKOTA	SD15999-0301	KENEL PIPELINE	160	$1,500,000	$98,438,625

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: AL						10
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0804	JICARILLA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT	1	$600,000	$600,000	20
NEW MEXICO	NM19167-0401	MESCALERO Drainfield Replacements	2	$72,000	$672,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0501	ISLETA Septic System Replacement	3	$233,000	$905,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM19163-0101	MESCALERO Elk-Silver Spring Treatment	4	$145,000	$1,050,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM26308-0401	SAN I LAGOON EXPANSIONS	5	$614,000	$1,664,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0202	NAMBE SEWAGE LAGOON EXPANSIONS	6	$430,000	$2,094,000	
COLORADO	CO34029-0302	Water Treatment Plant Improvement	7	$34,000	$2,128,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0501	SF NEW WATER SOURCE	8	$270,000	$2,398,000	
COLORADO	CO42063-0501	WATER STORAGE TANK REPLACEMENT	9	$325,000	$2,723,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM29365-0301	TAOS-AS-BUILT PREP. & TOOLS	10	$80,000	$2,803,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23256-0102	SANTA ANA Water System Improvements	11	$60,000	$2,863,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM21214-0801	SJ - KENNEDY WATER TANK	12	$270,000	$3,133,000	
COLORADO	CO42063-0401	LAGOON NO 1 REPAIR	13	$55,000	$3,188,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0201	SF WATER STORAGE TANK	14	$300,000	$3,488,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0501	COCHITI Sewer System Assessment	15	$75,000	$3,563,000	45
NEW MEXICO	NM21215-0301	SC-SOUTH SEWER EXTENTION	16	$130,000	$3,693,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM33396-0103	LAGUNA Water Storage and Chlorination	17	$513,000	$4,206,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23254-0101	SANDIA Backup Water Supply	18	$118,000	$4,324,000	
COLORADO	CO34029-0101	IGNACIO PEAK LAGOON ABANDONMENT	19	$219,000	$4,543,000	60
NEW MEXICO	NM26307-0501	POJ NORTH VILLAGE SEWER EXT	20	$360,000	$4,903,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0801	SF HAGAN ROAD WATER & SEWER	21	$600,000	$5,503,000	75
NEW MEXICO	NM33394-0703	LAGUNA Paraje Sewer System Improvements	22	$523,000	$6,026,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM21214-0201	SJ-AS-BUILT PREPARATION	23	$52,000	$6,078,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM01009-0101	ISLETA Los Charcos Backup Well	24	$174,000	$6,252,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23256-0301	SANTA ANA As-Built Drawings	25	$40,000	$6,292,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM23248-0101	JEMEZ Water Transmission Line	26	$314,800	$6,606,800	
NEW MEXICO	NM26311-0501	TESUQUE LAGOON UPGRADE	27	$100,000	$6,706,800	
NEW MEXICO	NM26311-0301	TESUQUE AS-BUILT PREPARATION	28	$60,000	$6,766,800	
NEW MEXICO	NM26307-0201	POJ AS-BUILT PREPARATION	29	$60,000	$6,826,800	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0301	ZIA Pumphouse Modifications	30	$58,500	$6,885,300
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0502	COCHITI Water/Sewer Line Replacement	31	$168,400	$7,053,700
NEW MEXICO	NM32011-0601	SANTA ANA Ceremonial Pueblo	32	$50,000	$7,103,700
NEW MEXICO	NM23254-0401	SANDIA Community Asbuilts	33	$40,000	$7,143,700
NEW MEXICO	NM23248-0201	JEMEZ Sewer System Extension	34	$100,000	$7,243,700
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0501	RADIO TELEMETRY FOR WATER SYSTE	35	$37,000	$7,280,700
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0701	ACOMA Anzac-McCarty Solid Waste Center	36	$95,000	$7,375,700
NEW MEXICO	NM29365-0201	TAOS-STORAGE TANK PAINTING	37	$180,000	$7,555,700
NEW MEXICO	NM26308-0102	SAN I TANK REPLACEMENT	38	$103,000	$7,658,700
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0203	NAMBE SEWAGE LAGOON EXP. PH 2	39	$100,000	$7,758,700
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0101	COCHITI Pumphouse Replacement	40	$85,000	$7,843,700
NEW MEXICO	NM33395-0802	LAGUNA Seama Pumphouse Improvements	41	$123,000	$7,966,700
NEW MEXICO	NM33395-0801	LAGUNA Seama Village Wate System	42	$158,000	$8,124,700
NEW MEXICO	NM19172-0104	MESCALERO Windmill Well # 2 Improvements	43	$51,500	$8,176,200
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0202	PIC-SOLID WASTE CONTAINERS	44	$15,000	$8,191,200
NEW MEXICO	NM23257-0101	SD DOMINGO WATER AND SEWER	45	$330,000	$8,521,200
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0702	Altitude Valves (Three Tanks Locations)	46	$52,500	$8,573,700
NEW MEXICO	NM19999-0102	MESCALERO Solid Waste Landfill	47	$805,000	$9,378,700
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0301	ZUNI WSL & SSL Replacements	48	$687,000	$10,065,700
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0204	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	49	$191,000	$10,256,700
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0205	ISLETA Westside WL Replacement	50	$103,000	$10,359,700
COLORADO	CO42063-0701	TOWOAC AS-BUILTS	51	$51,400	$10,411,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0504	ACOMA Drainfield Replacements 4	52	$250,000	$10,661,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0401	SF I&I REMEDIATION	53	$150,000	$10,811,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0102	COCHITI Flush Hydrant Replacement	54	$20,000	$10,831,100
NEW MEXICO	NM26308-0201	SAN I AS-BUILT PREPARATION	55	$60,000	$10,891,100
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0302	NAMBE AS-BUILT PREPARATION	56	$60,000	$10,951,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23257-0201	SD COMMUNITY SEWER	57	$285,000	$11,236,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21215-0201	SC-AS-BUILT PREPARATION	58	$52,000	$11,288,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33396-0107	LAGUNA Valley Water Improvements	59	$211,000	$11,499,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33390-0901	LAGUNA Mesita Drainfield Replacements	60	$676,000	$12,175,100

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM33006-0101	ACOMA Skyline Wastewater Treatment	61	$1,500,000	$13,675,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23256-0103	SANTA ANA Water Storage	62	$150,000	$13,825,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23254-0502	SANDIA Sewer System Improvements	63	$269,000	$14,094,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23248-0601	JEMEZ Water Meter Project	64	$160,000	$14,254,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0601	RODEO GROUND CMTY SEWER SYS	65	$419,000	$14,673,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0202	ACOMA Baca Ranch Water Well	66	$5 000,000	$19,673,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0501	SF AS-BUILT PREPARATION	67	$40,000	$19,713,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0202	SF STORAGE TANK PAINTING	68	$50,000	$19,763,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0401	COCHITI As-Built Preparation	69	$40,000	$19,803,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33396-0106	LAGUNA As-Builts	70	$100,000	$19,903,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33390-0903	LAGUNA Mesita Storage Tank Improvements	71	$10,000	$19,913,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21214-0102	SJ-WATER METER INSTALLATION	72	$261,000	$20,174,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0406	Water Sys Balance (east-west cross-tie)	73	$262,000	$20,436,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0502	12" WATER TRANSMISSION LINE	74	$384,000	$20,820,100
NEW MEXICO	NM19190-0301	MESCALERO Whitetail Water Source	75	$245,000	$21,065,100
NEW MEXICO	NM19167-0402	MESCALERO Drainfield Replacements 2	76	$130,000	$21,195,100
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0301	ISLETA Westside I & I Remediation	77	$140,000	$21,335,100
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0207	ISLETA Westside WL Replacement	78	$70,000	$21,405,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0304	ZIA Well Abandonment	79	$20,000	$21,425,100
	UT19441-0401	REPLACEMENT OF SOUTH PUMPHOUSE (#1)	80	$94,000	$21,519,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21214-0601	SJ-LOWER PUEBLO SEWER	81	$275,000	$21,794,100
NEW MEXICO	NM01008-0202	ISLETA Chical Waterline Replacement	82	$251,000	$22,045,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0503	COCHITI Sewer System Renovation	83	$170,000	$22,215,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0103	COCHITI Water Meter Installation	84	$75,000	$22,290,100
	UT19441-0301	AS-BUILT OF COMMUNITY SAN. FAC	85	$33,000	$22,323,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33395-0401	LAGUNA Seama Sewer System Improvements	86	$546,000	$22,869,100
NEW MEXICO	NM33393-0602	LAGUNA Paguate Water Storage Improvement	87	$106,000	$22,975,100
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0101	SF EAST SIDE SEWER SYSTEM	88	$850,000	$23,825,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0701	JICARILLA WATER METERS	89	$381,000	$24,206,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0502	SOLID WASTE FOR REMOTE SITES	90	$168,000	$24,374,100

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0402	UPGRADE CLAY SEWER LINES	91	$260,000	$24,634,100
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0101	SEWER MAIN EXT FOR IND SITES	92	$85,800	$24,719,900
NEW MEXICO	NM19999-0103	MESCALERO Dump Closure	93	$1,878,000	$26,597,900
NEW MEXICO	NM19172-0105	MESCALERO Windmill PRV Replacement	94	$60,000	$26,657,900
NEW MEXICO	NM19167-0201	MESCALERO North Springs WM Replacement	95	$200,000	$26,857,900
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0203	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	96	$207,900	$27,065,800
NEW MEXICO	NM01008-0204	ISLETA Chical Wateline Replacement	97	$226,000	$27,291,800
NEW MEXICO	NM01008-0203	ISLETA Chical Wateline Repacement	98	$230,000	$27,521,800
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0101	PIC-WATER MAIN LOOP	99	$38,000	$27,559,800
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0401	ZIA Lift Station Modifications	100	$33,000	$27 592,800
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0302	ZIA Renovate Water Storage Tank	101	$100,000	$27,692 800
	UT19441-0501	REPAIR WHITE MESA LAGOONS	102	$130,000	$27.822.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33392-0202	LAGUNA Old Laguna/Seama Water Storage	103	$185,000	$28,007,800
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0305	FENCING CARPENTER CIRCLE TANK	104	$11,000	$28.018.800
NEW MEXICO	NM19190-0302	MESCALERO Whitetail Water Storage	105	$110,000	$28.128 800
NEW MEXICO	NM19167-0103	MESCALERO I & I Rehabilitation	106	$250,000	$28 378.800
NEW MEXICO	NM19163-0102	MESCALERO Elk-Silver Storage Tank	107	$230,000	$28.608.800
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0502	ISLETA Septic System Replacements	108	$101,000	$28 709.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33394-0701	LAGUNA Paraje Community Sewer System	109	$853,000	$29.562.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33393-0604	LAGUNA Paguate Sewerline Extension	110	$202,000	$29.764.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33391-0301	LAGUNA New Laguna Lift Station	111	$209,000	$29,973,800
NEW MEXICO	NM19166-0101	MESCALERO Carrizo Backup Well	112	$245,000	$30.218.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33006-0201	ACOMA Skyline Water Looping	113	$150,000	$30.368.800
NEW MEXICO	NM33005-0101	ACOMA Anzac Sewage Disposal	114	$299,000	$30,667,800
NEW MEXICO	NM33393-0605	LAGUNA Paguate Water Source Backup	115	$312,000	$30,979,800
NEW MEXICO	NM23254-0201	SANDIA O & M Training	116	$15,000	$30.994.800
NEW MEXICO	NM21214-0401	SJ-NY & CHAMITA WATER TANK	117	$120,000	$31.114.800
COLORADO	CO42063-0301	REGULATE CMTY WATER PRESSURE	118	$114,000	$31,228,800
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0301	PIC-AS-BUILT PREPARATION	119	$40,000	$31.268.800
NEW MEXICO	NM26307-0601	POJ LAGOON LINER	120	$525,000	$31,793,800
NEW MEXICO	NM21215-0401	SC - TANK PAINTING	121	$180,000	$31,973,800

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0601	ZUNI WSL & SSL Replacements	122	$62,000	$32,055,800
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0104	PIC - WATER METERS	123	$40,000	$32,095,800
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0401	NAMBE STORAGE TANK REPLACEMENT	124	$158,000	$32,253,800
NEW MEXICO	NM33394-0702	LAGUNA Paraje Water System Improvements	125	$133,000	$32,386,800
NEW MEXICO	NM33389-0108	LAGUNA Encinal Water Storage Tank	126	$216,000	$32,582,800
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0502	PIC-LAGOON EXPANSION PH 2	127	$180,000	$32,762,800
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0805	JICARILLA O&M EQUIPMENT (Sewer)	128	$358,100	$33,120,900
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0207	ZUNI Sewer System O & M training and equ	129	$373,000	$33,493,900
NEW MEXICO	NM01009-0102	ISLETA Los Charcos Pumphouse	130	$52,000	$33,545,900
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0601	ACOMA Residential Water Meters	131	$750,000	$34,295,900
NEW MEXICO	NM33005-0301	ACOMA Anzac Waterline Replacement	132	$24,000	$34,319,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0402	ZIA Sewerage System Evaluation	133	$170,000	$34,489,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23257-0401	SD COMMUNITY SEWER EXTENSION	134	$200,000	$34,689,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0701	SF WATER METERS	135	$900,000	$35,589,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23255-0301	SF O&M EQUIPMENT & TRAINING	136	$50,000	$35,639,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0301	COCHITI Lift Station Upgrade	137	$82,000	$35,721,900
	UT19441-0201	WHITE MESA SOLID WASTE (LANDFILL CLEANUP	138	$340,000	$36,061,900
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0304	REPLACE WATER STORAGE TANK	139	$306,000	$36,367,900
NEW MEXICO	NM19172-0102	MESCALERO Windmill Distribution	140	$200,000	$36,567,900
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0206	ISLETA Westside WL Replacement	141	$321,000	$36,888,900
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0401	ACOMA Water System Improvements	142	$298,000	$37,186,900
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0101	NAMBE WATER METERS	143	$175,000	$37,361,900
NEW MEXICO	NM21215-0202	SC-O&M TOOLS AND EQUIP . FENCE	144	$37,000	$37,398,900
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0401	WATER MAIN UPGRADE	145	$925,000	$38,323,900
NEW MEXICO	NM19172-0201	MESCALERO Mud Canyon WM Replacement	146	$146,000	$38,469,900
COLORADO	CO42063-0201	UTE MTN UTE O & M EQUIPMENT	147	$109,000	$38,578,900
NEW MEXICO	NM26306-0301	NAMBE O&M EQUIPMENT & TRAINING	148	$126,000	$38,704,900
NEW MEXICO	NM21215-0102	SC-WATER METER INSTALLATION	149	$400,000	$39,104,900
NEW MEXICO	NM29362-0401	PIC-O&M EQUIPMENT & TOOLS	150	$25,000	$39,129,900
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0404	JICARILLA SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM REHAB	151	$3,190,000	$42,319,900

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0501	ZUNI Lagoon Expansion	152	$1,094,000	$43,413,900
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0801	ACOMA Alaska Sewer Extension	153	$280,000	$43,693,900
NEW MEXICO	NM23248-0801	JEMEZ Hydrant & Gate Valve Replacements	154	$36,500	$43,730,400
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0407	NORTH-SOUTH PRESSURE WATERLINE	155	$964,000	$44,694,400
NEW MEXICO	NM19172-0103	MESCALERO Apache Summit Booster Pump	156	$200,000	$44,894,400
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0206	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	157	$1,028,600	$45,923,000
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0205	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	158	$593,600	$46,516,600
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0201	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	159	$276,000	$46,792,600
NEW MEXICO	NM33381-0101	ACOMA Skycity Sewage System	160	$182,000	$46,974,600
NEW MEXICO	NM01085-0401	ISLETA Northside Sewer Extension	161	$520,000	$47,494,600
NEW MEXICO	NM19190-0303	MESCALERO Whitetail WM Replacement	162	$144,000	$47,638,600
NEW MEXICO	NM19190-0103	MESCALERO Fence Canyon Water Improvement	163	$255,000	$47,893,600
NEW MEXICO	NM19163-0103	MESCALERO Elk-Silver Water Main	164	$498,000	$48,391,600
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0806	Jicarilla O&M Water System	165	$451,000	$48,842,600
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0703	Automate Water System Controls	166	$466,400	$49,309,000
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0405	Water Distribution Sys Replace/Upgrade	167	$9,533,000	$58,842,000
NEW MEXICO	NM21208-0403	JICARILLA SEWER COLLECTION STUDY	168	$1,000,000	$59,842,000
NEW MEXICO	NM33384-0301	ACOMA O & M Training	169	$248,000	$60,090,000
NEW MEXICO	NM26311-0201	TESUQUE TANK REMOVAL	170	$19,000	$60,109,000
NEW MEXICO	NM33396-0104	LAGUNA Hydrant & Valve Replacements	171	$163,000	$60,272,000
NEW MEXICO	NM17144-0202	ZUNI Sewer System Improvements	172	$1,187,950	$61,459,950
NEW MEXICO	NM23246-0701	COCHITI Solid Waste Project	173	$90,000	$61,549,950
NEW MEXICO	NM33396-0105	LAGUNA Zoning Assistance	174	$55,000	$61,604,950
NEW MEXICO	NM23256-0901	SANTA ANA Tank Access Road	175	$10,000	$61,614,950
NEW MEXICO	NM23261-0303	ZIA Hydrant Replacements	176	$24,000	$61,638,950
NEW MEXICO	NM23257-0301	SD HYDRANT AND GV REPLACEMENT	177	$130,000	$61,768,950
	UT19441-0403	WHITE MESA WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	178	$400,000	$62,168,950

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area:	**AN**					
ALASKA	AK15450-0001	SOUTH NAKNEK - Sewer improvements	1	$150,000	$150,000	
ALASKA	AK24844-0003	CHEVAK - West Loop (Non-HUD)	2	$1,761,000	$1,911,000	
ALASKA	AK16508-0102	TOKSOOK BAY - Force Main Replace	3	$450,000	$2,361,000	10
ALASKA	AK16496-0004	KWIGILLINGOK- W/S/SW/OM	4	$1,720,000	$4,081,000	20
ALASKA	AK16482-0002	AKIACHAK - Piped Water & Sewer, E. Loop	5	$1,263,000	$5,344,000	
ALASKA	AK17556-0101	NIKOLAI - Individual Homes	6	$126,350	$5,470,350	
ALASKA	AK02025-0001	SAXMAN - Water Treatmt/Storage	7	$280,000	$5,750,350	
ALASKA	AK22754-0101	SHUNGNAK - W&S Improvements	8	$1,247,000	$6,997,350	
ALASKA	AK16493-0003	KIPNUK- W,S, & SW Improvements	9	$1,940,000	$8,937,350	45
ALASKA	AK16489-0003	GOODNEWS BAY - Piped Wtr. & Swr	10	$2,428,200	$11,365,550	
	AK08143-0102	ALASKA - Statewide SWTR Upgrades	11	$900,000	$12,265,550	
ALASKA	AK20707-0102	FORT YUKON - Water Improvement	12	$780,000	$13,045,550	
ALASKA	AK18608-0001	HUGHES - W&S community improvements	13	$488,900	$13,534,450	
ALASKA	AK12291-0001	PORT GRAHAM - Water (SWTR)	14	$314,400	$13,848,850	
ALASKA	AK17547-0002	GRAYLING - Main Ext./Serv. Conn	15	$70,000	$13,918,850	60
ALASKA	AK14382-0001	SAND POINT - Water Trtmt Plant	16	$2,600,000	$16,518,850	
ALASKA	AK12285-0001	NANWALEK - Water (SWTR)	17	$249,750	$16,768,600	
ALASKA	AK22750-0101	NOATAK - Water Well	18	$525,000	$17,293,600	75
ALASKA	AK18602-0001	EVANSVILLE - individual wtr & swr	19	$386,225	$17,679,825	
ALASKA	AK23790-0002	KOYUK - Water Tank/WTP	20	$275,000	$17,954,825	
ALASKA	AK14372-0002	KING COVE - Water treatment plant	21	$1,324,400	$19,279,225	
ALASKA	AK24855-0001	PITKAS POINT - Wtr & Swr Improv	22	$1,190,000	$20,469,225	
ALASKA	AK22742-0101	BUCKLAND - Water Source/Community Sewer	23	$800,000	$21,269,225	
ALASKA	AK16501-0001	NEWTOK - FTH for 4 homes	24	$307,500	$21,576,725	
ALASKA	AK16486-0002	CHEFORNAK - Flush-n-Haul	25	$1,430,000	$23,006,725	
ALASKA	AK24854-0003	PILOT STATION - W&S Extensions	26	$1,810,000	$24,816,725	
ALASKA	AK24850-0003	KOTLIK - Bulk Fuel/WST	27	$926,000	$25,742,725	
ALASKA	AK14380-0102	SAINT PAUL- Water Improvements	28	$2,045,000	$27,787,725	
ALASKA	AK20708-0001	STEVENS VILLAGE - Community Sewer	29	$319,500	$28,107,225	
ALASKA	AK14367-0001	CHIGNIK LAKE - Indiv Wtr/WST	30	$706,000	$28,813,225	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK22752-0001	POINT HOPE - Truck Haul System	31	$3,175,000	$31,988,225
ALASKA	AK18613-001	MANLEY - Individual water and sewer	32	$308,000	$32,296,225
ALASKA	AK15422-0101	ALEKNAGIK - Sewer & Solid Waste	33	$479,000	$32,775,225
ALASKA	AK08158-0001	MENTASTA LAKE - Water & Sewer	34	$1,047,500	$33,822,725
ALASKA	AK08147-0001	GAKONA - Scattered	35	$262,500	$34,085,225
ALASKA	AK08144-0001	COPPER CENTER - Scattered	36	$262,200	$34,347,425
ALASKA	AK24857-0001	ST MARYS - SWS & Sewer Improve.	37	$910,000	$35,257,425
ALASKA	AK16488-0003	EEK - Flush-n-haul Phase I/Solid Waste	38	$5,858,050	$41,115,475
ALASKA	AK23802-0001	UNALAKLEET - Water Source/Distribution	39	$1,525,000	$42,640,475
ALASKA	AK23791-0002	LITTLE DIOMEDE - Water & SW	40	$390,000	$43,030,475
ALASKA	AK20709-0003	VENETIE - Water & Sewer Haul	41	$3,030 000	$46,060,475
ALASKA	AK01001-001	CRAIG - Water treatment/storage	42	$450,000	$46,510,475
ALASKA	AK24849-0002	HOOPER BAY - WTP for pipes	43	$1,600,000	$48,110,475
ALASKA	AK23786-0103	GOLOVIN - Wash/WTP Upgrade	44	$476,000	$48,586,475
ALASKA	AK22749-0101	KOTZEBUE - Water/Sewer Improvements	45	$3,118,000	$51,704,475
ALASKA	AK18606-0103	GALENA - Water System Expansion	46	$300,000	$52,004,475
ALASKA	AK16490-0001	KASIGLUK - SW/Well/Watering pt/Sewage Lg	47	$1,464,750	$53,469,225
ALASKA	AK23798-0101	SHISHMAREF - Partial Piped Wtr	48	$414,100	$53,883,325
ALASKA	AK23796-0005	SAVOONGA - Piped W&S - HUD	49	$0	$53,883,325
ALASKA	AK16495-0002	KWETHLUK - WST/Sewage Lagoon	50	$2,266,000	$56,149,325
ALASKA	AK14369-0001	FALSE PASS - Water/Sewer System	51	$770,600	$56,919,925
ALASKA	AK08153-0001	TAZLINA - Scattered	52	$262,500	$57,182,425
ALASKA	AK17560-0001	SHAGELUK - FT&H - Solid Waste	53	$725,000	$57,907,425
ALASKA	AK16483-0106	AKIAK - Water Loop 2	54	$1,330,000	$59,237,425
ALASKA	AK08142-0001	CHISTOCHINA - Scattered	55	$262,500	$59,499,925
ALASKA	AK22752-0002	POINT HOPE - Truck Haul Sys II	56	$1,935,000	$61,434,925
ALASKA	AK24841-0003	ALAKANUK - Solid Waste	57	$400,000	$61,834,925
ALASKA	AK18606-0104	GALENA - SW Transfer Site	58	$240,000	$62,074,925
ALASKA	AK16494-0002	KONGIGANAK - Washeteria Rehab	59	$1,164,000	$63,238,925
ALASKA	AK15439-0101	NAKNEK - Water & Sewer for 5 homes	60	$186,000	$63,424,925
ALASKA	AK15425-0001	DILLINGHAM - Indiv Wtr and Swr	61	$750,500	$64,175,425

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK23804-0001	WHITE MOUNTAIN - Sewer service lines	62	$605,000	$64,780,425
ALASKA	AK17553-0001	MCGRATH - Ind sewer	63	$365,700	$65,146,125
ALASKA	AK17541-0001	ANIAK-In-House Plmb & S. Connec	64	$730,000	$65,876,125
ALASKA	AK16495-0005	KWETHLUK- Service Area 4	65	$1,562,400	$67,438,525
ALASKA	AK16495-0004	KWETHLUK - Service Area 2	66	$1,500,000	$68,938,525
ALASKA	AK16495-0003	KWETHLUK - Service Area 1	67	$1,500,000	$70,438,525
ALASKA	AK15438-0002	MANOKOTAK - Water Supply	68	$920,000	$71,358,525
ALASKA	AK15433-0002	KOLIGANEK - Solid Waste/Water/O&M	69	$675,000	$72,033,525
ALASKA	AK20704-0102	CHALKYITSIK -Piped wtr & swr	70	$3,434,400	$75,467,925
ALASKA	AK16505-0001	DOT LAKE - Water & Sewer	71	$168,750	$75,636,675
ALASKA	AK18619-0004	RAMPART - HUD wtr & swr	72	$0	$75,636,675
ALASKA	AK16505-0001	OSCARVILLE - Water/Sewer Haul	73	$1,170,000	$76,806,675
ALASKA	AK01002-0102	HYDABURG - Lead & Copper	74	$200,000	$77,006,675
ALASKA	AK22752-0004	POINT HOPE HUD piped utilities*	75	$1,400,000	$78,406,675
ALASKA	AK17562-0001	STONY RIVER - Indv Wtr/Swr/SW	76	$1,180,000	$79,586,675
ALASKA	AK17543-0002	CROOKED CREEK SWDS & Access Rd	77	$704,000	$80,290,675
ALASKA	AK16511-0001	ATMAUTLUAK - W&S Upgrades/SWS Closure	78	$5,011,500	$85,302,175
ALASKA	AK15452-0101	TWIN HILLS - Water & Sewer	79	$371,000	$85,673,175
ALASKA	AK20706-0001	EAGLE VILLAGE - Truck Haul System	80	$1,417,000	$87,090,175
ALASKA	AK16511-0004	ATMAUTLUAK - Flush-n-haul Phase 3	81	$1,557,700	$88,647,875
ALASKA	AK16511-0003	ATMAUTLUAK - Flush-n-haul Phase 2	82	$1,557,700	$90,205,575
ALASKA	AK16511-0002	ATMAUTLUAK - Flush-n-haul Ph 1/SWS E.W	83	$1,557,700	$91,763,275
ALASKA	AK22741-0001	AMBLER - Sewage Lagoon & WTP	84	$2,865,000	$94,628,275
ALASKA	AK18619-0003	RAMPART - Hauled water & sewer	85	$1,184,000	$95,812,275
ALASKA	AK18618-002	NULATO - Lower Townsite W&S	86	$1,860,000	$97,672,275
ALASKA	AK17561-0001	SLEETMUTE - Water & Sewer	87	$2,170,000	$99,842,275
ALASKA	AK16488-0004	EEK - Flush-n-haul & SWS Phase 2	88	$1,790,250	$101,632,525
ALASKA	AK14361-0001	AKUTAN - Water Source	89	$505,000	$102,137,525
ALASKA	AK24852-0001	MTN VILLAGE - Wtr & swr improve	90	$408,000	$102,545,525
ALASKA	AK22754-0102	SHUNGNAK - Sewer Improvements	91	$850,000	$103,395,525
ALASKA	AK18609-0002	HUSLIA - Water Main	92	$826,550	$104,222,075

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK18601-0004	ALLAKAKET HUD - Water & Swr Svc to Homes	93	$0	$104,222,075
ALASKA	AK17552-0001	LOWER KALSKAG - Water & Sewer	94	$817,000	$105,039 075
ALASKA	AK13323-0001	AKHIOK - Water & Sewer	95	$668,975	$105,708,050
ALASKA	AK22749-0103	KOTZEBUE - Solid Waste	96	$3,000,000	$108,708,050
ALASKA	AK22747-0105	KIVALINA - HUD	97	$0	$108,708,050
ALASKA	AK18621-0001	TELIDA - Ind water & sewer	98	$200,000	$108,908,050
ALASKA	AK18607-0001	HEALY LAKE - Ind wtr & swr	99	$634,000	$109,542,050
ALASKA	AK14382-0002	SAND POINT - Solid Waste	100	$725,000	$110,267,050
ALASKA	AK08152-0103	TATITLEK - Solid Waste	101	$60,400	$110,327,450
ALASKA	AK06107-0101	YAKUTAT - Solid Waste	102	$385,000	$110,712,450
ALASKA	AK01003-03	KLAWOCK - Dam/water source improvements	103	$455,000	$111,167,450
ALASKA	AK24852-0002	MTN VILLAGE - Solid Waste Site	104	$580,000	$111,747,450
ALASKA	AK24849-0003	HOOPER BAY - Wtr Trans. Line	105	$2,450,000	$114,197,450
ALASKA	AK23800-0105	STEBBINS - HUD homes	106	$0	$114,197,450
ALASKA	AK23800-0103	STEBBINS - Piped Utilities	107	$1,563,000	$115,760,450
ALASKA	AK23785-0002	GAMBELL - Solid Waste	108	$499,000	$116,259,450
ALASKA	AK22751-0102	NOORVIK - Lagoon Improvements	109	$260,000	$116 519,450
ALASKA	AK22750-0102	NOATAK - In-House Plumbing	110	$769,000	$117,288,450
ALASKA	AK18611-0102	KALTAG Master Plan	111	$200,000	$117,488,450
ALASKA	AK17541-0002	ANIAK - Solid Waste Site Fence	112	$175,000	$117,663,450
ALASKA	AK16500-0003	NAPASKIAK - ATV W&S Haul	113	$2,530,000	$120,193,450
ALASKA	AK13327-0001	LARSEN BAY - Water Plant	114	$1,000,000	$121,193,450
ALASKA	AK01002-01	HYDABURG - Solid Waste and O&M	115	$209,500	$121,402,950
ALASKA	AK23808-0001	COUNCIL - O&M	116	$10,000	$121,412,950
ALASKA	AK23801-0002	TELLER - Solid Waste	117	$433,000	$121,845,950
ALASKA	AK23784-0103	ELIM - Solid Waste/Sludge Disp.	118	$612,000	$122,457,950
ALASKA	AK17558-0001	RED DEVIL - Water & Sewer (ind)	119	$550,000	$123,007,950
ALASKA	AK17551-0001	LIME VILLAGE - WTP Wash rehab	120	$150,000	$123,157,950
ALASKA	AK17549-0001	HOLY CROSS - Solid Waste/Water	121	$540,000	$123,697,950
ALASKA	AK16495-0009	KWETHLUK - Service Area 5	122	$967,200	$124,665,150

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK16495-0008	KWETHLUK - Service Area 3	123	$1,971,600	$126,636,750
ALASKA	AK16495-0006	KWETHLUK - Service Area 7	124	$1,748,400	$128,385,150
ALASKA	AK14374-0001	NELSON LAGOON - Wtr Trtmnt Impr	125	$417,800	$128,802,950
ALASKA	AK12292-0001	SELDOVIA - Water Source/Trtmt	126	$1,553,000	$130,355,950
ALASKA	AK06107-0102	YAKUTAT - WST Replace/Distribution Upgra	127	$793,000	$131,148,950
ALASKA	AK06104-0002	KLUKWAN - Solid Waste	128	$161,000	$131,309,950
ALASKA	AK03042-0002	KAKE - Solid Waste/O&M	129	$428,000	$131,737,950
ALASKA	AK24856-0001	RUSSIAN MISSION - WTP & 2nd Well	130	$831,000	$132,568,950
ALASKA	AK24846-0001	EMMONAK - Solid Waste	131	$1,050,000	$133,618,950
ALASKA	AK22753-07	SELAWIK - WTP Improvements	132	$200,000	$133,818,950
ALASKA	AK21721-0001	ANAKTUVUK PASS - Solid Waste	133	$525,000	$134,343,950
ALASKA	AK20703-0002	BEAVER - Water & Sewer	134	$2,155,800	$136,499,750
ALASKA	AK20701-0001	ARCTIC VILLAGE - sew & intake	135	$293,500	$136,793,250
ALASKA	AK19662-004	BIRCH CREEK - HUD Water and Sewer	136	$0	$136,793,250
ALASKA	AK18622-003	TANANA - Solid Waste	137	$525,000	$137,318,250
ALASKA	AK18612-0002	KOYUKUK - W & S haul - community items	138	$1,440,000	$138,758,250
ALASKA	AK16508-0003	TOKSOOK BAY - Solid Waste	139	$400,000	$139,158,250
ALASKA	AK12291-0002	PORT GRAHAM - Solid Waste	140	$158,100	$139,316,350
ALASKA	AK08152-0102	TATITLEK - Sewer Project	141	$260,000	$139,576,350
ALASKA	AK04061-0101	ANGOON - Solid Waste/O&M	142	$420,000	$139,996,350
ALASKA	AK02024-0103	METLAKATLA - Solid Waste	143	$1,394,000	$141,390,350
ALASKA	AK23798-0103	SHISHMAREF - Solid Waste	144	$168,000	$141,558,350
ALASKA	AK23797-0001	SHAKTOOLIK - Water Improvements	145	$650,000	$142,208,350
ALASKA	AK22749-0104	KOTZEBUE - Native Service, W&S4	146	$1,016,000	$143,224,350
ALASKA	AK21728-0001	WAINWRIGHT - Solid Waste	147	$1,010,000	$144,234,350
ALASKA	AK20707-0104	FORT YUKON - Solid Waste	148	$875,000	$145,109,350
ALASKA	AK20707-0103	FORT YUKON - Water & Sewer	149	$4,008,000	$149,117,350
ALASKA	AK19670-0003	NORTHWAY - Solid Waste	150	$440,000	$149,557,350
ALASKA	AK18617-0002	NENANA - Solid Waste	151	$440,000	$149,997,350
ALASKA	AK18612-003	KOYUKUK - W&S Haul - individual service	152	$506,000	$150,503,350
ALASKA	AK17563-0002	TAKOTNA - Water, Sewer Improvements	153	$651,000	$151,154,350

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK16490-0102	KASIGLUK - Water/Sewer Haul Sys	154	$3,850,000	$155,004,350
ALASKA	AK15448-0001	PORT HEIDEN - Water & Sewer	155	$513,000	$155,517,350
ALASKA	AK15441-0102	NEW STUYAHOK - Sewer Lagoons	156	$553,800	$156,071,150
ALASKA	AK12295-0001	TYONEK - Surface Water Trtment	157	$1,450,000	$157,521,150
ALASKA	AK12285-0002	NANWALEK (ENGLISH BAY) - Solid Waste	158	$153,450	$157,674,600
ALASKA	AK24859-0106	SHELDON POINT - Service lines	159	$810,000	$158,484,600
ALASKA	AK24859-0103	SHELDON POINT - Lagoon	160	$720,000	$159,204,600
ALASKA	AK24856-0002	RUSSIAN MISSION - Solid Waste	161	$374,000	$159,578,600
ALASKA	AK23795-0103	ST MICHAEL - Piped Utilities	162	$1,200,000	$160,778,600
ALASKA	AK20705-0003	CIRCLE - HUD Haul System	163	$0	$160,778,600
ALASKA	AK20705-0002	CIRCLE - Haul System	164	$465,000	$161,243,600
ALASKA	AK18611-0101	KALTAG - Solid Waste	165	$350,000	$161,593,600
ALASKA	AK17556-0102	NIKOLAI - Solid Waste	166	$139,500	$161,733,100
ALASKA	AK13331-0002	PORT LIONS - Solid Waste	167	$265,000	$161,998,100
ALASKA	AK12295-0002	TYONEK - Solid Waste	168	$228,000	$162,226,100
ALASKA	AK23804-002	WHITE MOUNTAIN - Solid Waste	169	$400,000	$162,626,100
ALASKA	AK23791-0103	LITTLE DIOMEDE - Water Storage Tank	170	$1,000,000	$163,626,100
ALASKA	AK22751-0103	NOORVIK - Solid Waste	171	$600,000	$164,226,100
ALASKA	AK17547-0003	GRAYLING - Water Storage/Service	172	$630,000	$164,856,100
ALASKA	AK16498-0003	MEKORYUK - W&S Loop 1	173	$2,664,000	$167,520,100
ALASKA	AK16485-0001	BETHEL - W&S Extension	174	$1,800,000	$169,320,100
ALASKA	AK16483-0107	AKIAK - Sewer Loop 2	175	$1,077,000	$170,397,100
ALASKA	AK14392-0001	UNALASKA - Water Trmt Plant	176	$410,000	$170,807,100
ALASKA	AK13329-0001	OLD HARBOR - Water Treat./O&M	177	$905,800	$171,712,900
ALASKA	AK08145-0001	COPPER VALLEY - Scattered	178	$677,500	$172,390,400
ALASKA	AK02024-0102	METLAKATLA - Sewer Collection Upgrades	179	$1,600,000	$173,990,400
ALASKA	AK01003-04	KLAWOCK - Solid Waste/O&M Improvements	180	$227,500	$174,217,900
ALASKA	AK23800-0106	STEBBINS - Solid Waste	181	$382,000	$174,599,900
ALASKA	AK23798-0102	SHISHMAREF - Water/Sewer Haul	182	$1,520,000	$176,119,900
ALASKA	AK23786-0104	GOLOVIN - Water & sewer - 14 homes	183	$530,000	$176,649,900
ALASKA	AK22746-0002	KIANA - Solid Waste	184	$600,000	$177,249,900

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK18608-0003	HUGHES - Water & Sewer - house service	185	$1,626,800	$178,876,700
ALASKA	AK23795-0104	ST MICHAEL - Piped Utilities (HUD)	186	$0	$178,876,700
ALASKA	AK22741-02	AMBLER - Water and Sewer	187	$850,000	$179,726,700
ALASKA	AK19666-0102	DOT LAKE - Solid Waste	188	$70,000	$179,796,700
ALASKA	AK18607-0002	HEALY LAKE - Solid Waste	189	$81,500	$179,878,200
ALASKA	AK15442-0102	NONDALTON - Solid Waste	190	$304,000	$180,182,200
ALASKA	AK14362-0001	ATKA - Water SWTR Upgrade	191	$708,000	$180,890,200
ALASKA	AK03042-0003	KAKE - Sludge disposal/Sewer upgrade	192	$915,000	$181,805,200
ALASKA	AK24858-0003	SCAMMON BAY - SWTR improvements	193	$676,000	$182,481,200
ALASKA	AK24858-0002	SCAMMON BAY - Close SWDS	194	$500,000	$182,981,200
ALASKA	AK24855-0002	PITKAS POINT - Piped W&S	195	$2,475,000	$185,456,200
ALASKA	AK23800-0104	STEBBINS - Vacuum Sewer system	196	$2,002,000	$187,458,200
ALASKA	AK22753-06	SELAWIK - Solid Waste	197	$1,090,000	$188,548,200
ALASKA	AK22749-0102	KOTZEBUE - Water/Sewer Projects	198	$17,500,000	$206,048,200
ALASKA	AK20708-0102	STEVENS VILLAGE - Haul System	199	$1,443,750	$207,491,950
ALASKA	AK16500-0004	NAPASKIAK - Solid Waste	200	$850,000	$208,341,950
ALASKA	AK16499-0003	NAPAKIAK - Solid Waste	201	$650,000	$208,991,950
ALASKA	AK15442-0101	NONDALTON - Water improvements	202	$1,100,000	$210,091,950
ALASKA	AK14380-0103	SAINT PAUL - Solid Waste	203	$928,000	$211,019,950
ALASKA	AK01008-01	KASAAN - Solid Waste	204	$135,500	$211,155,450
ALASKA	AK23786-0108	GOLOVIN - Solid Waste	205	$138,000	$211,293,450
ALASKA	AK23786-0107	GOLOVIN - HUD - 28 homes	206	$0	$211,293,450
ALASKA	AK20704-0104	CHALKYITSIK - Solid Waste	207	$370,000	$211,663,450
ALASKA	AK18615-02	MINTO - Community W&S upgrades	208	$1,460,000	$213,123,450
ALASKA	AK17552-0002	LOWER KALSKAG - Solid Waste	209	$550,000	$213,673,450
ALASKA	AK17549-0002	HOLY CROSS - Ghost Creek Subdiv	210	$250,000	$213,923,450
ALASKA	AK16501-0002	NEWTOK - Water/Sewer Haul Sys	211	$2,350,000	$216,273,450
ALASKA	AK16495-0007	KWETHLUK - Service Area 6	212	$1,264,800	$217,538,250
ALASKA	AK16485-0002	BETHEL - W&S Improvements	213	$2,800,000	$220,338,250
ALASKA	AK15424-0001	CLARKS POINT - Lagoon Rehab.	214	$412,000	$220,750,250
ALASKA	AK03042-0001	KAKE - Water Source/Trans Line	215	$3,200,000	$223,950,250

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK24859-0105	SHELDON POINT - Loop 2	216	$1,582,000	$225,532,250
ALASKA	AK24859-0104	SHELDON POINT -Loop 1	217	$1,220,000	$226,752,250
ALASKA	AK24850-0106	KOTLIK - Community Solid Waste	218	$500,000	$227,252,250
ALASKA	AK23803-0103	WALES - Solid Waste	219	$680,000	$227,932,250
ALASKA	AK23803-0002	WALES - Water & Sewer	220	$4,780,000	$232,712,250
ALASKA	AK22744-01	DEERING - Solid Waste	221	$450,000	$233,162,250
ALASKA	AK21733-0002	NUIQSUT HUD piped utilities	222	$1,000,000	$234,162,250
ALASKA	AK20704-0103	CHALKYITSIK - HUD piped water and sewer	223	$0	$234,162,250
ALASKA	AK16509-0002	TLLUKSAK - Solid Waste	224	$740,000	$234,902,250
ALASKA	AK16499-0002	NAPAKIAK - Piped Wtr and Swr	225	$5,650 000	$240,552,250
ALASKA	AK23801-0001	TELLER - Piped Water & Sewer	226	$12,700,000	$253,252,250
ALASKA	AK23786-0106	GOLOVIN - Water & Sewer - 6 homes	227	$560,000	$253,812,250
ALASKA	AK23786-0105	GOLOVIN - Water & Sewer - 10 homes	228	$560,000	$254,372,250
ALASKA	AK22754-0103	SHUNGNAK - Solid Waste	229	$630,000	$255,002,250
ALASKA	AK20714-0002	KAKTOVIK HUD piped utilities*	230	$1,005,000	$256,007,250
ALASKA	AK18624-0002	ALATNA - Water & Sewer Service to Homes	231	$1,545,000	$257,552,250
ALASKA	AK18618-003	NLLATO - Solid Waste	232	$612,000	$258,164,250
ALASKA	AK17560-0002	SHAGELUK - ATV FT&H	233	$2,560,000	$260,724,250
ALASKA	AK17553-0002	MCGRATH - Piped water & sewer	234	$1,250,000	$261,974,250
ALASKA	AK16509-0001	TLLUKSAK - Water & sewer	235	$5,150,000	$267,124,250
ALASKA	AK16503-0002	NUNAPITCHUK - Solid Waste	236	$1,020,000	$268,144,250
ALASKA	AK15451-0003	TOGIAK - O&M	237	$20,000	$268,164,250
ALASKA	AK15438-0003	MANOKOTAK - Solid Waste	238	$605,000	$268,769,250
ALASKA	AK14361-03	AKUTAN - Water Storage Tank	239	$500,000	$269,269,250
ALASKA	AK06103-003	HOONAH - O&M Upgrades	240	$40,000	$269,309,250
ALASKA	AK24861-0003	MARSHALL - O&M Project	241	$20,000	$269,329,250
ALASKA	AK24850-0004	KOTLIK - W&S for E Side	242	$2,250,000	$271,579,250
ALASKA	AK22741-0003	AMBLER - Solid Waste	243	$425,000	$272,004,250
ALASKA	AK21722-0001	BARROW piped utilities*	244	$103,460,000	$375,464,250
ALASKA	AK20709-0004	VENETIE - Solid Waste	245	$510,000	$375,974,250
ALASKA	AK18603-0001	CANTWELL - Solid Waste	246	$130,000	$376,104,250

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK18601-0003	ALLAKAKET - Water & Sewer Svc to Homes	247	$3,850,000	$379,954,250
ALASKA	AK17559-0002	CHUATHBALUK - Solid Waste Site	248	$456,000	$380,410,250
ALASKA	AK17543-0003	CROOKED CREEK - ATV Haul System	249	$2,065,000	$382,475,250
ALASKA	AK16494-0004	KONGIGANAK - Piped W&S	250	$6,150,000	$388,625,250
ALASKA	AK16494-0003	KONGIGANAK - Solid Waste	251	$665,000	$389,290,250
ALASKA	AK16493-0004	KIPNUK - Flush-n-Haul W&S Syste	252	$9,625,000	$398,915,250
ALASKA	AK10225-0001	EKLUTNA - Indiv. Water/Sewer	253	$165,000	$399,080,250
ALASKA	AK22742-0102	BUCKLAND - Solid Waste	254	$360,000	$399,440,250
ALASKA	AK18609-03	HUSLIA - Solid Waste	255	$700,000	$400,140,250
ALASKA	AK16507-0102	TUNUNAK - Solid Waste	256	$770,000	$400,910,250
ALASKA	AK16502-0004	NIGHTMUTE - Solid Waste	257	$522,000	$401,432,250
ALASKA	AK16501-0103	NEWTOK - Solid Waste	258	$525,000	$401,957,250
ALASKA	AK16483-0108	AKIAK - Well Abandonment	259	$60,570	$402,017,820
ALASKA	AK15429-0001	IGIUGIG - O&M	260	$10,000	$402,027,820
ALASKA	AK24858-0004	SCAMMON BAY - Washeteria	261	$1,395,000	$403,422,820
ALASKA	AK24850-0105	KOTLIK - Washeteria	262	$1,000,000	$404,422,820
ALASKA	AK23802-0002	UNALAKLEET - Transmission Line	263	$3,500,000	$407,922,820
ALASKA	AK23797-0002	SHAKTOOLIK - Solid Waste	264	$484,000	$408,406,820
ALASKA	AK22747-0003	KIVALINA - Water & Sewer	265	$9,569,500	$417,976,320
ALASKA	AK21734-0003	ATQASUK piped utilities*	266	$14,000,000	$431,976,320
ALASKA	AK21733-0001	NUIQSUT piped utilities*	267	$11,786,000	$443,762,320
ALASKA	AK20714-0001	KAKTOVIK piped utilities*	268	$6,036,000	$449,798,320
ALASKA	AK18619-005	RAMPART - Solid Waste	269	$322,000	$450,120,320
ALASKA	AK18617-0001	NENANA - Piped wtr & swr	270	$1,824,800	$451,945,120
ALASKA	AK17542-0002	ANVIK Comm W/S/SW/O&M Imprv.	271	$645,000	$452,590,120
ALASKA	AK16507-0103	TUNUNAK - Piped Water & Sewer	272	$7,630,000	$460,220,120
ALASKA	AK16498-0004	MEKORYUK - W&S Loop 2	273	$1,590,000	$461,810,120
ALASKA	AK15444-0002	PEDRO BAY - Scattered	274	$442,400	$462,252,520
ALASKA	AK14377-0001	PERRYVILLE - Sewer Improvements	275	$1,800,000	$464,052,520
ALASKA	AK14361-02	AKUTAN - Water Treatment Plant	276	$700,000	$464,752,520
ALASKA	AK16488-0006	EEK - Piped water & sewer	277	$4,150,000	$468,902,520

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK16488-0005	EEK - WST & WTP Upgrade	278	$4,210,000	$473,112,520
ALASKA	AK13327-0002	LARSEN BAY - Solid Waste	279	$510,000	$473,622,520
ALASKA	AK23785-0001	GAMBELL - Piped Water & Sewer	280	$4,924,000	$478,546,520
ALASKA	AK19673-0002	TETLIN - Solid Waste	281	$283,000	$478,829,520
ALASKA	AK19672-0106	TANACROSS - Solid Waste Improvements	282	$510,000	$479,339,520
ALASKA	AK18615-03	MINTO - Solid Waste improvements	283	$380,000	$479,719,520
ALASKA	AK17550-0001	UPPER KALSKAG - O&M Project	284	$10,000	$479,729,520
ALASKA	AK14375-0001	NIKOLSKI - WTP Improvements - SWTR	285	$467,200	$480,196,720
ALASKA	AK14366-0104	CHIGNIK LAGOON - O&M Project	286	$10,000	$480,206,720
ALASKA	AK17561-0002	SLEETMUTE - Solid Waste	287	$500,000	$480,706,720
ALASKA	AK17560-0004	SHAGELUK - Piped w&s house serv	288	$2,160,000	$482,866,720
ALASKA	AK15455-0003	KOKHANOK - O&M	289	$20,000	$482,886,720
ALASKA	AK18608-0002	HUGHES - Solid Waste	290	$405,600	$483,292,320
ALASKA	AK16505-0002	OSCARVILLE - Solid Waste	291	$300,000	$483,592,320
ALASKA	AK22753-0005	SELAWIK - W&S W-3, I-3east service area	292	$3,700,000	$487,292,320
ALASKA	AK21727-0001	POINT LAY piped utilities*	293	$5,550,000	$492,842,320
ALASKA	AK20701-0002	ARCTIC VILLAGE - Solid Waste	294	$437,000	$493,279,320
ALASKA	AK22747-0104	KIVALINA - Solid Waste	295	$600,000	$493,879,320
ALASKA	AK14374-0002	NELSON LAGOON - Solid Waste	296	$112,000	$493,991,320
ALASKA	AK23793-0102	NOME - O&M	297	$10,000	$494,001,320
ALASKA	AK18602-0102	EVANSVILLE - O&M	298	$10,000	$494,011,320
ALASKA	AK15428-0001	EKWOK - Solid Waste	299	$275,000	$494,286,320
ALASKA	AK14362-0002	ATKA - Solid Waste	300	$330,000	$494,616,320
ALASKA	AK15441-0001	NEW STUYAHOK - O&M	301	$60,000	$494,676,320
ALASKA	AK15430-0002	ILIAMNA - Solid Waste	302	$227,000	$494,903,320
ALASKA	AK13330-0001	OUZINKIE - CT Tank	303	$777,000	$495,680,320
ALASKA	AK23803-0001	WALES - Piped Water & Sewer system	304	$1,550,000	$497,230,320
ALASKA	AK20701-0003	ARCTIC VILLAGE - Water & Sewer	305	$4,638,000	$501,868,320
ALASKA	AK16510-0001	TUNTUTULIAK - Piped Wtr. & Swr.	306	$11,525,000	$513,393,320
ALASKA	AK15448-0002	PORT HEIDEN - Solid Waste	307	$187,000	$513,580,320
ALASKA	AK15444-003	PEDRO BAY - Solid Waste	308	$265,000	$513,845,320

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK17551-0002	LIME VILLAGE - Solid Waste	309	$270,000	$514,115,320
ALASKA	AK15422-0102	ALEKNAGIK - O&M	310	$30,000	$514,145,320
ALASKA	AK13325-0002	KARLUK - Solid Waste	311	$300,000	$514,445,320
ALASKA	AK22752-0003	POINT HOPE piped utilities*	312	$39,670,000	$554,115,320
ALASKA	AK21734-0002	ATQASUK HUD piped utilities*	313	$1,800,000	$555,915,320
ALASKA	AK21722-0002	BARROW HUD piped utilities*	314	$1,800,000	$557,715,320
ALASKA	AK18611-003	KALTAG - Water and Sewer Service	315	$465,000	$558,180,320
ALASKA	AK17559-0003	CHUATHBALUK - Piped Wtr. & Swr.	316	$9,650,000	$567,830,320
ALASKA	AK08141-0001	CHENEGA - Water Treatment	317	$1,400,000	$569,230,320
ALASKA	AK24854-0105	PILOT STATION - W&S to 37 homes	318	$1,914,995	$571,145,315
ALASKA	AK24849-0004	HOOPER BAY - piped W&S	319	$15,250,000	$586,395,315
ALASKA	AK20705-0001	CIRCLE - Solid Waste	320	$379,600	$586,774,915
ALASKA	AK16506-0001	PLATINUM - Solid Waste	321	$624,000	$587,398,915
ALASKA	AK16497-0005	QUINHAGAK - Piped water & sewer	322	$10,550,000	$597,948,915
ALASKA	AK18620-0002	RUBY - Piped Water & Sewer	323	$4,250,000	$602,198,915
ALASKA	AK15447-0001	PORTAGE CREEK - Water Pt./Privy	324	$130,000	$602,328,915
ALASKA	AK22746-03	KIANA - Water & Sewer Extensions	325	$1,650,000	$603,978,915
ALASKA	AK16485-0003	BETHEL - Water & Sewer	326	$71,150,000	$675,128,915
ALASKA	AK13325-0001	KARLUK - Water & Sewer	327	$1,021,000	$676,149,915
ALASKA	AK02024-0104	METLAKATLA - water/O&M (Annette)	328	$710,000	$676,859,915
ALASKA	AK24859-0107	SHELDON POINT - Solid Waste	329	$618,000	$677,477,915
ALASKA	AK16500-0005	NAPASKIAK - Piped W&S	330	$8,100,000	$685,577,915
ALASKA	AK16486-0003	CHEFORNAK - Piped Wtr & Swr	331	$10,030,000	$695,607,915
ALASKA	AK18624-0003	ALATNA - Solid Waste	332	$320,000	$695,927,915
ALASKA	AK16490-0103	KASIGLUK - Piped Water & Sewer	333	$15,100,000	$711,027,915
ALASKA	AK15452-0103	TWIN HILLS - Solid Waste	334	$600,000	$711,627,915
ALASKA	AK15440-0001	NEWHALEN - Solid Waste	335	$384,000	$712,011,915
ALASKA	AK15424-0002	CLARKS POINT - Solid Waste	336	$600,000	$712,611,915
ALASKA	AK14379-0002	ST. GEORGE - Solid Waste	337	$7,030,000	$719,641,915
ALASKA	AK13323-0002	AKHIOK - Solid Waste	338	$428,000	$720,069,915
ALASKA	AK24854-0004	PILOT STATION - W&S to 5 homes	339	$1,141,806	$721,211,721

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ALASKA	AK19662-0003	BIRCH CREEK - Water & Sewer Svc to Homes	340	$1,645,000	$722,856,721
ALASKA	AK16511-0005	ATMAUTLUAK - Piped Wtr & Swr	341	$12,005,000	$734,861,721
ALASKA	AK16503-0003	NUNAPITCHUK - Piped Wtr & Swr	342	$10,339,000	$745,200,721
ALASKA	AK16502-0005	NIGHTMUTE - Piped Water & Sewer	343	$10,050,000	$755,250,721
ALASKA	AK16501-0104	NEWTOK - Piped Water & Sewer	344	$12,025,000	$767,275,721
ALASKA	AK16496-0105	KWIGILLINGOK - Piped water & se	345	$16,100,000	$783,375,721
ALASKA	AK16493-0005	KIPNUK - Piped W&S	346	$9,837,000	$793,212,721
ALASKA	AK23798-0104	SHISHMAREF - Piped Wtr & Swr	347	$12,250,000	$805,462,721
ALASKA	AK14369-0002	FALSE PASS - Solid Waste	348	$205,600	$805,668,321
ALASKA	AK20708-0103	STEVENS VILLAGE - Solid Waste	349	$820,000	$806,488,321
ALASKA	AK16505-0003	OSCARVILLE - Piped Wtr. & Swr	350	$1,825,000	$808,313,321
ALASKA	AK14371-0001	IVANOF BAY - Solid Waste	351	$430,000	$808,743,321
ALASKA	AK17560-0003	SHAGELUK - Wtr & Swr infrastruc	352	$4,100,000	$812,843,321
ALASKA	AK19662-0002	BIRCH CREEK - Solid Waste	353	$519,000	$813,362,321
ALASKA	AK17563-0003	TAKOTNA - Solid waste	354	$395,000	$813,757,321
ALASKA	AK17543-0004	CROOKED CREEK - Piped Wtr & Swr	355	$13,150,000	$826,907,321
ALASKA	AK14375-0002	NIKOLSKI - Solid Waste	356	$310,000	$827,217,321
ALASKA	AK15453-0001	UGASHIK - Solid Waste	357	$308,000	$827,525,321
ALASKA	AK15446-0001	PILOT POINT - Solid Waste	358	$600,000	$828,125,321
ALASKA	AK17551-0003	LIME VILLAGE - Piped Wtr & Swr	359	$7,700,000	$835,825,321
ALASKA	AK15447-0002	PORTAGE CREEK - Solid Waste	360	$205,000	$836,030,321
ALASKA	AK15452-0102	TWIN HILLS - Water Distribution System	361	$3,000,000	$839,030,321
ALASKA	AK15437-0001	LEVELOCK - Solid Waste	362	$400,000	$839,430,321
ALASKA	AK17558-0002	RED DEVIL - Solid Waste	363	$330,000	$839,760,321

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: BE						10
MINNESOTA	MN04068-0A01	RED LAKE Lagoon	1	$600,000	$600,000	20
MICHIGAN	MI17022-0301	SAULT STE MARIE Scattered PH 1	2	$146,000	$746,000	
MINNESOTA	MN03056-0601	WHITE EARTH Scattered	3	$117,000	$863,000	
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0101	LEECH LAKE Study - Onigum Water & Sewer	4	$4,000	$867,000	
WISCONSIN	WI45353-0401	ONEIDA (Ridgeland) Community Sewer	5	$290,000	$1,157,000	45
WISCONSIN	WI45353-0301	ONEIDA (Ridgeland) Site 2 to Site 1 Wate	6	$449,000	$1,606,000	60
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0202	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 1	7	$377,000	$1,983,000	75
MINNESOTA	MN69252-0201	BOIS FORTE (Indian Pt) New Well	8	$71,000	$2,054,000	
WISCONSIN	WI59982-0101	STOCKBRIDGE MUNSEE(Mohican) Force Main	9	$65,000	$2,119,000	
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0301	BOIS FORTE(Nett Lake) Water Treatment	10	$172,000	$2,291,000	
MICHIGAN	MI37027-0101	SAGINAW CHIPPEWA (Mt Pleas) Scattered	11	$23,000	$2,314,000	
MICHIGAN	MI24999-0301	LITTLE TRAVERSE Scattered	12	$38,000	$2,352,000	
MICHIGAN	MI14999-0301	POKAGON POTAWATOMI Scattered	13	$54,000	$2,406,000	
WISCONSIN	WI02878-0B01	BAD RIVER Scattered	14	$90,000	$2,496,000	
MINNESOTA	MN16116-0D01	GRAND PORTAGE Scattered	15	$52,000	$2,548,000	
MINNESOTA	MN69247-0203	BOIS FORTE(Vermillion) Water/Sewer Ext 1	16	$22,000	$2,570,000	
MINNESOTA	MN64226-0101	LOWER SIOUX Well Abandonment	17	$44,000	$2,614,000	
MICHIGAN	MI51999-0401	LITTLE RIVER BAND Scattered	18	$75,000	$2,689,000	
WISCONSIN	WI58964-0A01	LCO (New Post) Water Storage & Distribut	19	$140,000	$2,829,000	
WISCONSIN	WI07894-0202	ST. CROIX(Hertel W.) Water Ext-Sand Lake	20	$417,000	$3,246,000	
MINNESOTA	MN69252-0101	BOIS FORTE(Indian Pt) Sewer Feasibility	21	$9,000	$3,255,000	
MINNESOTA	MN04064-0101	RED LAKE (Little Rock) Community Water	22	$443,000	$3,698,000	
MINNESOTA	MN03056-EP01	WHITE EARTH (Pine Point) Schools	23	$0	$3,698,000	
MICHIGAN	MI27028-0B01	LVD(Watersmeet) Lake Sewer	24	$119,000	$3,817,000	
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0402	LDF (Wayman Ln) Community Sewer	25	$98,000	$3,915,000	
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0208	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 7	26	$14,000	$3,929,000	
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0206	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 5	27	$24,000	$3,953,000	
MINNESOTA	MN03056-0501	WHITE EARTH(Chip Ranch)Water Main PH1	28	$17,500	$3,970,500	
WISCONSIN	WI40999-0601	MENOMINEE Scattered Sites	29	$45,000	$4,015,500	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0701	MILLE LACS Scattered Sites	30	$66,000	$4,081,500
WISCONSIN	WI40937-0202	MENOMINEE (Keshena) Water Improvements	31	$70,000	$4,151,500
WISCONSIN	WI21916-0601	MOLE LAKE Pumphouse	32	$100,000	$4,251,500
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0101	BOIS FORTE (Nett Lake) Sewer/Force Main	33	$85,000	$4,336,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0201	LEECH LAKE (Bena) Tubbs Replacement	34	$60,000	$4,396,500
MINNESOTA	MN69247-0207	BOIS FORTE(Vermillion) Water/Sewer Ext 3	35	$20,000	$4,416,500
WISCONSIN	WI40937-0401	MENOMINEE(Keshena) Lagoon Expansion	36	$400,000	$4,816,500
MINNESOTA	MN64226-0401	LOWER SIOUX Replacement of Filter Media	37	$17,000	$4,833,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0203	LEECH LAKE (Oak Point) Tubbs Replacement	38	$70,000	$4,903,500
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0203	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 3	39	$86,000	$4,989,500
MICHIGAN	MI55033-0A01	HANNAHVILLE Scattered	40	$28,000	$5,017,500
WISCONSIN	WI04887-0501	RED CLIFF Closure Plan	41	$20,000	$5,037,500
MINNESOTA	MN69247-0206	BOIS FORTE(Vermillion) Water/Sewer Ext 2	42	$46,000	$5,083,500
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0H01	LDF AC Water Main Replacement	43	$800,000	$5,883,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0E03	LEECH LAKE (Tract 33 & 34) Water PH3	44	$120,000	$6,003,500
MICHIGAN	MI07012-0101	KEWEENAW BAY (Zeba) Watermain	45	$156,000	$6,159,500
WISCONSIN	WI58999-0101	LCO (K-Town) Intertie	46	$200,000	$6,359,500
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0209	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 8	47	$253,000	$6,612,500
MICHIGAN	MI17022-0101	SAULT STE MARIE (St. Ignace) Comm Well	48	$72,000	$6,684,500
MICHIGAN	MI07012-0501	KEWEENAW BAY Scattered Sites	49	$35,000	$6,719,500
MINNESOTA	MN48189-0101	MILLE LACS (N. Vineland) Water Storage T	50	$346,000	$7,065,500
MICHIGAN	MI07011-0B01	KEWEENAW BAY (Johnson Rd) Dump	51	$6,000	$7,071,500
WISCONSIN	WI45346-0A01	ONEIDA (Site II) Pumphouse	52	$150,000	$7,221,500
WISCONSIN	WI07894-0203	ST CROIX(Hertel W) Water Ext-Eagle Fea	53	$159,000	$7,380,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0E04	LEECH LAKE (Tract 33 & 34) Water PH4	54	$375,000	$7,755,500
WISCONSIN	WI59982-0D01	STOCKBRIDGE MUNSEE Scattered	55	$16,000	$7,771,500
WISCONSIN	WI02878-0101	BAD RIVER Scattered Well Abandonment	56	$14,000	$7,785,500
MINNESOTA	MN44175-0101	WHITE EARTH (Naytah) Water Main	57	$213,000	$7,998,500
WISCONSIN	WI57325-0201	HO CHUNK (Indian Mission) Pumphouse Rplc	58	$200,000	$8,198,500
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0601	MILLE LACS Special Waste Collection	59	$40,000	$8,238,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0E02	LEECH LAKE (Tract 33 & 34) Water PH2	60	$325,000	$8,563,500

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0B01	FOND DU LAC Scattered	61	$171.000	$8,734,500
MINNESOTA	MN04067-0A01	RED LAKE(Redby) Water Improvements	62	$249.000	$8,983,500
WISCONSIN	WI58999-0A01	LCO (Black Bear) Monitoring Well	63	$20.000	$9,003,500
WISCONSIN	WI07893-0101	ST. CROIX (Danbury) Community Water	64	$364.500	$9,368,000
MINNESOTA	MN04064-0102	RED LAKE(Little Rock) Water Services	65	$386.000	$9,754,000
MICHIGAN	MI51999-0301	LITTLE RIVER BAND Scattered #2	66	$86.000	$9,840,000
MICHIGAN	MI27028-0F01	LVD (Watersmeet) Watermain Loop	67	$103.000	$9,943,000
MICHIGAN	MI17021-0B01	BAY MILLS Scattered	68	$13.000	$9,956,000
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0301	LDF Main Sewer System	69	$20.500	$9,976,500
WISCONSIN	WI58964-0301	LCO (New Post) Community Sewer	70	$484,000	$10,460,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0301	LEECH LAKE (Inger) Water Treatment	71	$30.000	$10,490,500
MINNESOTA	MN48189-0B01	MILLE LACS (N Vineland) Sewer Ext.	72	$670.000	$11,160,500
MINNESOTA	MN04068-0C01	RED LAKE Scattered	73	$76.000	$11,236,500
WISCONSIN	WI58999-0301	LCO Scattered Well Abandonment	74	$60.000	$11,296,500
WISCONSIN	WI57325-B01	HO CHUNK (Indian Heights) Well	75	$35.000	$11,331,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0E05	LEECH LAKE (Tract 33 & 34) Water PH5	76	$131.000	$11,462,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0401	LEECH LAKE (Inger) Watermain Replacement	77	$45.000	$11,507,500
WISCONSIN	WI21916-0101	MOLE LAKE Sewer System Phase I	78	$205.000	$11,712,500
WISCONSIN	WI04887-0801	RED CLIFF Scattered Sites	79	$55.000	$11,767,500
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0501	BOIS FORTE Well Abandonment	80	$30.000	$11,797,500
MINNESOTA	MN64226-0301	LOWER SIOUX Water Meter Installation	81	$39.000	$11,836,500
MICHIGAN	MI07012-0201	KEWEENAW BAY (Larsse) Sewer Infiltration	82	$174.000	$12,010,500
WISCONSIN	WI64986-1201	LDF (W. Flambeau L.) Community Wells	83	$16.000	$12,026,500
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0201	LDF Water System Study	84	$28.000	$12,054,500
WISCONSIN	WI07894-0101	St. CROIX (Hertel W.) Community Sewer	85	$975.000	$13,029,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1205	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 5	86	$128.000	$13,157,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1204	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 4	87	$28.000	$13,185,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1203	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 3	88	$67.000	$13,252,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1202	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 2	89	$89.000	$13,341,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1201	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 1	90	$82.000	$13,423,500
MICHIGAN	MI17022-0401	SAULT STE. MARIE Scattered PH 2	91	$220.000	$13,643,500

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MINNESOTA	MN69252-0203	BOIS FORTE (Indian Pt) Water Distributio	92	$22,000	$13,665,500
MINNESOTA	MN48189-0102	MILLE LACS (N Vineland) Water Main Ext	93	$398,000	$14,063,500
MICHIGAN	M155033-0C01	HANNAHVILLE Community Sewer	94	$8,000	$14,071,500
MICHIGAN	M117021-0C01	BAY MILLS (Lakeshore) Water Extension	95	$500,000	$14,571,500
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0501	MILLE LACS (E. Lake) Lagoon Renovation	96	$80,000	$14,651,500
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0101	MILLE LACS (Lake Lena) Solid Waste	97	$34,000	$14,685,500
MINNESOTA	MN48189-0601	MILLE LACS(TIMBER H) WASTEWATER	98	$359,000	$15,044,500
MINNESOTA	MN48189-0501	MILLE LACS (E Vineland) Water Main Ext	99	$156,000	$15,200,500
MINNESOTA	MN16116-0F01	GRAND PORTAGE(Lower Bay Rd) Sewer	100	$385,000	$15,585,500
WISCONSIN	W164986-0A01	LDF Scattered	101	$18,000	$15,603,500
WISCONSIN	W157990-0B01	HO-CHUNK (Blue Wing) Community Water	102	$375,000	$15,978,500
WISCONSIN	W140939-0101	MENOMINEE (Zoar) Water Source Study	103	$20,000	$15,998,500
WISCONSIN	W102878-0201	BAD RIVER (Diperville) Pumphouse	104	$150,000	$16,148,500
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0701	BOIS FORTE (Nett Lake) Water Main Replac	105	$510,000	$16,658,500
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0205	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 4	106	$556,000	$17,214,500
MICHIGAN	M155033-0101	HANNAHVILLE Casino Lane Water Extension	107	$105,000	$17,319,500
WISCONSIN	W140999-0501	MENOMINEE Scattered Sites Study	108	$20,000	$17,339,500
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0102	LEECH LAKE Onigum Water & Sewer System	109	$830,000	$18,169,500
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1206	WHITE EARTH Water Main Phase 6	110	$289,000	$18,458,500
WISCONSIN	W164986-1301	LDF Water Plant Emergency Power	111	$49,000	$18,507,500
WISCONSIN	W164986-1001	LDF Sewage Lagoon Study	112	$28,000	$18,535,500
WISCONSIN	W164986-0D01	LDF Scattered #2	113	$18,000	$18,553,500
WISCONSIN	W140999-0A01	MENOMINEE Facilities Study	114	$100,000	$18,653,500
WISCONSIN	W121916-0401	MOLE LAKE Solid Waste Facility W/S	115	$20,000	$18,673,500
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0102	BOIS FORTE(Nett Lake) Sewer Main Replace	116	$127,000	$18,800,500
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0203	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 2	117	$851,000	$19,651,500
MICHIGAN	M127028-0G01	LVD (Watersmeet) Generators for LS & PH	118	$56,000	$19,707,500
WISCONSIN	W107999-0101	ST CROIX(Round Lake) Community Water	119	$555,000	$20,262,500
WISCONSIN	W104887-0502	RED CLIFF Dump Closure	120	$250,000	$20,512,500
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0201	MILLE LACS (E. Lake) Solid Waste	121	$23,000	$20,535,500
MINNESOTA	MN16116-0C01	GRAND PORTAGE Water Main Valves	122	$24,000	$20,559,500

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MICHIGAN	MI17021-0201	BAY MILLS (Plantation Rd) Water & Sewer	123	$275,000	$20,834,500
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0701	LDF Water System SCADA	124	$34,000	$20,868,500
WISCONSIN	WI07989-0301	ST CROIX(Maple Plain) Lagoon	125	$443,250	$21,311,750
WISCONSIN	WI04887-0101	RED CLIFF Water Meter Installation	126	$71,600	$21,383,350
WISCONSIN	WI57375-0101	HO CHUNK (Winnebago Ht) Pumphouse	127	$175,000	$21,558,350
WISCONSIN	WI40999-0301	MENOMINEE (Middle Village) Water Improv	128	$140,000	$21,698,350
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0801	LEECH LAKE (Ball Club) Water Extension	129	$375,000	$22,073,350
MINNESOTA	MN03056-0201	WHITE EARTH Wastewater Discharge Structu	130	$43,000	$22,116,350
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0E01	LDF Main Water System Turbine	131	$33,000	$22,149,350
WISCONSIN	WI45352-0201	ONEIDA (Ridgeland) Comm Water PH1	132	$500,000	$22,649,350
WISCONSIN	WI21916-0202	MOLE LAKE Landfill Closure	133	$108,000	$22,757,350
MICHIGAN	MI28999-X101	GRAND TRAV (Peshawbestown) Water Main	134	$0	$22,757,350
MICHIGAN	MI28999-0101	GRAND TRAV (Peshawbestown) Water Meters	135	$31,000	$22,788,350
MICHIGAN	MI27028-0D01	LVD (Watersmeet) Community Lift Station	136	$178,000	$22,966,350
WISCONSIN	WI04887-0904	RED CLIFF O&M Safety Equipment	137	$16,500	$22,982,850
MINNESOTA	MN16116-0601	GRAND PORT(Reservation River) Water	138	$146,000	$23,128,850
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0601	LEECH LAKE (Ball Club) Water Looping	139	$72,000	$23,200,850
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0801	LDF Sewer System SCADA	140	$79,000	$23,279,850
MINNESOTA	MN69245-1101	BOIS FORTE (Pulmquist) Wells	141	$30,000	$23,309,850
WISCONSIN	WI07999-0A01	ST. CROIX(Round Lake) Community Sewer	142	$581,250	$23,891,100
WISCONSIN	WI07893-0A01	ST CROIX(Danbury) Community Sewer	143	$569,500	$24,460,600
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1101	WHITE EARTH Community Sewer	144	$192,000	$24,652,600
WISCONSIN	WI45353-0202	ONEIDA (Hillside) Community Water PH2	145	$180,000	$24,832,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0A01	BOIS FORTE Scattered	146	$117,000	$24,949,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0201	BOIS FORTE (Nett Lake) Water Mains	147	$58,000	$25,007,600
MINNESOTA	MN09076-0207	FOND DU LAC Regional Water System PH 6	148	$316,000	$25,323,600
MICHIGAN	MI28999-X201	GRAND TRAV (Orchard) Water Main	149	$0	$25,323,600
MINNESOTA	MN03056-0502	WHITE EARTH(Chip Ranch)Water Main PH2	150	$30,000	$25,353,600
WISCONSIN	WI57375-0B01	HO-CHUNK Scattered	151	$100,000	$25,453,600
WISCONSIN	WI45353-0501	ONEIDA (Hillside) Community Sewer	152	$161,000	$25,614,600
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0202	LEECH LAKE (Old Agency) Tubbs Replacemen	153	$180,000	$25,794,600

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MINNESOTA	MN04068-0601	RED LAKE Watermain Ext Hwy 89	154	$229,000	$26,023,600
WISCONSIN	WI64986-1101	LDF (Little Pines) Sewer Extension	155	$408,000	$26,431,600
WISCONSIN	WI59982-0201	STOCKBRIDGE MUNSEE (Red Springs & River)	156	$2,759,000	$29,190,600
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0401	MILLE LACS (Apple Orchard) Water Main Ex	157	$19,000	$29,209,600
MICHIGAN	MI55033-0602	HANNAHVILLE Solid Waste Closure	158	$157,000	$29,366,600
MICHIGAN	MI17022-0B01	SAULT STE. MARIE Scattered PH 3	159	$9,000	$29,375,600
WISCONSIN	WI58968-0101	LCO(Signor) Community Water System	160	$163,000	$29,538,600
WISCONSIN	WI64986-0601	LDF (Cemetary Rd) Sewer Extension	161	$780,000	$30,318,600
WISCONSIN	WI21916-0501	MOLE LAKE Water Tower Painting	162	$44,000	$30,362,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-1001	BOIS FORTE (Palmquist) Water Plant Repla	163	$350,000	$30,712,600
MINNESOTA	MN16116-0501	GRAND PORTAGE(Hollow Rock) Water	164	$169,000	$30,881,600
MINNESOTA	MN69252-0102	BOIS FORTE(Indian Pt) Sewer System	165	$374,000	$31,255,600
MINNESOTA	MN48999-0301	MILLE LACS (Hinkley to Barry) Water Main	166	$714,000	$31,969,600
MINNESOTA	MN69252-0202	BOIS FORTE (Indian Pt) Pumphouse Rehab	167	$220,000	$32,189,600
MICHIGAN	MI27028-0C01	LVD (Rifle Range Road) Watermain Exten	168	$127,000	$32,316,600
MINNESOTA	MN03056-1001	WHITE EARTH Sewer Lagoon Improvements	169	$2,022,000	$34,338,600
MINNESOTA	MN11093-0901	LEECH LAKE (Ball Club) SCADA	170	$50,000	$34,388,600
WISCONSIN	WI40999-0202	MENOMINEE(Trailer Court) Individual Sys	171	$120,000	$34,508,600
WISCONSIN	WI45353-0203	ONEIDA(Sand Hill) Community Water PH3	172	$230,000	$34,738,600
WISCONSIN	WI40999-0401	MENOMINEE (Red Wing) Individual Systems	173	$140,000	$34,878,600
MICHIGAN	MI28999-X301	GRAND TRAV (Benzie) Community Water	174	$0	$34,878,600
WISCONSIN	WI04887-0901	RED CLIFF O&M Septic Tank Pumper	175	$60,000	$34,938,600
MICHIGAN	MI28999-X501	GRAND TRAV (Antrim County) Water System	176	$0	$34,938,600
MICHIGAN	MI28999-X401	GRAND TRAV (Charlevoix) Community Water	177	$0	$34,938,600
WISCONSIN	WI40937-0301	MENOMINEE (Keshena) W/S Main Replacement	178	$4,500,000	$39,438,600
WISCONSIN	WI40938-0201	MENOMINEE (Neopit) W/S Main Replacement	179	$3,600,000	$43,038,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-1301	BOIS FORTE (Palmquist) Water Distributio	180	$0	$43,038,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-1201	BOIS FORTE (Palmquist) Water Tower	181	$0	$43,038,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0901	BOIS FORTE (Nett L.) Water Exp for Futur	182	$25,000	$43,063,600
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0801	BOIS FORTE (Nett Lake) O&M	183	$325,000	$43,388,600

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MINNESOTA	MN69245-0601	BOIS FORTE (Nett L. & Palmquist) Water C	184	$2,230,000	$45,638,600

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: BI						
WYOMING	WY07760-0301	ARAPAHOE GREAT PLAINS LAGOON ABAND	1	$30,000	$30,000	
MONTANA	MT44504-0601	Lame Deer Area Dump Closures	2	$100,000	$130,000	
MONTANA	MT44500-0201	ASHLAND CANISTER SITE	3	$40,000	$170,000	
MONTANA	MT24999-0601	FLATHEAD FAILED DRAINFIELDS	4	$82,000	$252,000	
MONTANA	MT02010-0101	MUDDY CLUSTER LAGOON RENOVATION	5	$80,000	$332,000	10
MONTANA	MT24270-0101	ARLEE COMMUNITY WATER	6	$485,000	$817,000	20
MONTANA	MT02998-0301	CROW RES WIDE SOLID WASTE PH I	7	$400,000	$1,217,000	
MONTANA	MT24999-0501	FLATHEAD WELL ABANDONMENT	8	$40,000	$1,257,000	45
MONTANA	MT02003-0201	CROW AGENCY SEWER REPLACE PH I	9	$360,000	$1,617,000	
WYOMING	WY07768-0201	FT WASHAKIE LEAK DETECTION	10	$20,000	$1,637,000	
MONTANA	MT24274-0401	ELMO SEWER MANHOLE UPGRADE	11	$60,000	$1,697,000	
MONTANA	MT21999-0901	Rocky Boy RWS Additional Well	12	$152,000	$1,849,000	
MONTANA	MT18200-0101	Babb Community Sewer	13	$50,000	$1,899,000	60
MONTANA	MT02003-0202	CROW AGENCY SEWER REPLACE PH 2	14	$290,000	$2,189,000	
MONTANA	MT43475-0101	FORT KIPP LAGOON RENOVATION	15	$250,000	$2,439,000	75
WYOMING	WY07768-0301	FT WASHAKIE CONCRETE TANK REPAIR	16	$100,000	$2,539,000	
WYOMING	WY07760-0701	ARAPAHOE PUMPHOUSE & CHLORINE	17	$35,000	$2,574,000	
WYOMING	WY07767-0401	Ethete WTP Backwash ponds	18	$65,000	$2,639,000	
MONTANA	MT03999-0102	FT BELKNAP SOLID WASTE-PHASE 2	19	$200,000	$2,839,000	
WYOMING	WY07760-0501	Arapahoe Water Tank	20	$100,000	$2,939,000	
MONTANA	MT43999-0601	FT PECK SCATTERED WATER PH I	21	$60,000	$2,999,000	
MONTANA	MT21244-0201	SANGREY LAGOON REHAB	22	$200,000	$3,199,000	
MONTANA	MT21244-0101	SANGREY LIFT STATION	23	$60,000	$3,259,000	
MONTANA	MT44504-0101	LAME DEER LEAK DETECTION PH I	24	$68,000	$3,327,000	
MONTANA	MT18999-0701	BLACKFEET/GLACIER OPEN DUMPS I	25	$550,000	$3,877,000	
MONTANA	MT18203-0701	BROWNING LAGOON AMMONIA CONTROL	26	$350,000	$4,227,000	
MONTANA	MT18203-0301	BROWNING WATER LINE REPLACEMENT	27	$195,000	$4,422,000	
MONTANA	MT18203-0101	BROWNING SEWER I & I STUDY	28	$21,000	$4,443,000	
MONTANA	MT53621-0201	FRAZER - WATER TREATMENT	29	$400,000	$4,843,000	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MONTANA	MT02998-0401	CROW RES WIDE SOLID WASTE PH 2	30	$780 000	$5,623,000
MONTANA	MT44999-0201	NORTHERN CHEYENNE SOLID WASTE	31	$260,000	$5,883,000
MONTANA	MT02010-0201	Muddy Cluster Area Dump Closures	32	$85,000	$5,968,000
MONTANA	MT02002-0201	Busby Area Dump Closures	33	$125,000	$6,093,000
MONTANA	MT45990-0101	DIXON COMMUNITY SEWER	34	$39,000	$6,132,000
MONTANA	MT24999-0101	FLATHEAD RESERVATION AS-BUILTS	35	$125,000	$6,257,000
MONTANA	MT24990-0001	PACHE-UPGRD LAGOON & AERATION	36	$50 000	$6,307,000
MONTANA	MT21999-0701	ROCKY BOY SEWER STUDY	37	$75,000	$6,382,000
MONTANA	MT18999-0801	BLACKFEET INDIVIDUAL WATER OR SEWER	38	$182,000	$6,564,000
MONTANA	MT03999-0001	FT BELKNAP RURAL-WATER QUALITY	39	$337,500	$6,901,500
MONTANA	MT43999-0801	FT. PECK RURAL SEPTAGE DISPOSAL	40	$100,000	$7,001,500
MONTANA	MT24285-0002	SCHLEY WATER PH 2	41	$76 000	$7,077,500
MONTANA	MT21999-0F01	Rocky Boy RWS Hydraulic Analysis	42	$9,700	$7,087,200
MONTANA	MT21999-0501	NEWTOWN PUMPHOUSE/TELEMETRY	43	$90,000	$7,177,200
MONTANA	MT21999-0201	ROCKY BOYS RESER AS-BUILTS	44	$75 000	$7,252,200
WYOMING	WY07767-0601	ETHETE FIRE HYDRANTS	45	$45,000	$7,297,200
WYOMING	WY07767-0201	ETHETE PRV AND ARV REPLACEMENT	46	$75,000	$7,372,200
WYOMING	WY07760-0601	ARAPAHOE FIRE HYDRANTS	47	$25,000	$7,397,200
MONTANA	MT44504-0501	LAME DEER HOME LEAK REPAIR	48	$6,000	$7,403,200
MONTANA	MT44504-0401	LAME DEER/MUDDY CLSTR AS-BUILTS	49	$32,000	$7,435,200
MONTANA	MT44504-0301	LAME DEER PUMPHOUSE RENOVATIONS	50	$80,000	$7,515,200
MONTANA	MT18999-0301	BLACKFEET PUMPER TRUCK	51	$90 000	$7,605,200
MONTANA	MT18211-0101	Seville Lagoon Aeration	52	$75,000	$7,680,200
MONTANA	MT18209-0301	STARR SCHOOL - REPLACE HYDRANTS	53	$20,000	$7,700,200
MONTANA	MT02002-0101	ASHLAND/BIRNEY/BUSBY AS-BUILTS	54	$30,000	$7,730,200
MONTANA	MT24287-0001	TURTLE LAKE-LOOP MAIN/SAFETY	55	$52,000	$7,782,200
MONTANA	MT24284-0001	MISSION DAM-DIST.UPGRADE	56	$38,000	$7,820,200
MONTANA	MT44501-0101	BIRNEY LAGOON RENOVATION	57	$100,000	$7,920,200
MONTANA	MT44500-0101	ASHLAND LAGOON RENOVATION	58	$100,000	$8,020,200
MONTANA	MT43999-0201	FORT PECK RESERVATION AS-BUILT	59	$50,000	$8,070,200

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MONTANA	MT24999-0501	DOG LAKE WATER SYSTEM	60	$15,000	$8,085,200
MONTANA	MT21999-0103	ROCKY BOY SOLID WASTE TRANSPOR	61	$110,000	$8,195,200
MONTANA	MT21999-0102	RB SOLID WASTE COLLECTION	62	$125,000	$8,320,200
MONTANA	MT03991-5	FT BELKNAP AGENCY HYDRANT REPL	63	$35,000	$8,355,200
MONTANA	MT03991-4	FT. BELKNAP AGENCY BACKUP WATER	64	$78,000	$8,433,200
MONTANA	MT02007-0201	PRYOR BACKUP WELL	65	$105,000	$8,538,200
WYOMING	WY07991-0101	TROUT CRK TIE-IN TO FT WASHAKI	66	$135,000	$8,673,200
MONTANA	MT44500-0301	ASHLAND AREA DUMP CLOSURES	67	$145,000	$8,818,200
WYOMING	WY07760-0101	ARAPAHOE WATERMAIN REPLACEMENT	68	$30,000	$8,848,200
MONTANA	MT45990-0301	DIXON COMMUNITY WATER	69	$39,000	$8,887,200
MONTANA	MT45990-0201	DIXON-OLD AGENCY - PUMPHOUSE	70	$42,000	$8,929,200
MONTANA	MT43999-0001	FT. PECK SCATTERED WATER PH 2	71	$200,000	$9,129,200
MONTANA	MT02009-0001	WYOLA-LAGOON & SEWER	72	$249,000	$9,378,200
WYOMING	WY07767-0101	ETHETE WATER TANK REPAIR	73	$70,000	$9,448,200
MONTANA	MT18999-0201	ST MARY'S LAKE HOLDING TANKS	74	$11,000	$9,459,200
MONTANA	MT02007-0101	PRYOR- WATER STORAGE	75	$65,000	$9,524,200
MONTANA	MT37423-0201	HEART BUTTE WATER LINE	76	$65,000	$9,589,200
MONTANA	MT18203-0501	BROWNING WATER TANK -WEASELHEAD	77	$150,000	$9,739,200
MONTANA	MT02006-0201	LODGEGRASS-WATER STORAGE	78	$110,000	$9,849,200
WYOMING	WY07767-0501	ETHETE H2O LINE PLANT TO HSG	79	$200,000	$10,049,200
MONTANA	MT24280-0101	ST. IGNATIUS WATER UPGRADE	80	$195,000	$10,244,200
MONTANA	MT21999-0001	ROCKY BOY UTILITY COMMISSION	81	$50,000	$10,294,200
MONTANA	MT18202-0201	N. BLACKFOOT COMMUNITY WATER	82	$47,000	$10,341,200
MONTANA	MT03033-0101	HAYS TOWNSITE SEWER MAIN EXTENSION	83	$60,000	$10,401,200
MONTANA	MT43475-0001	FORT KIPP - WATER TREATMENT	84	$200,000	$10,601,200
MONTANA	MT44501-0201	Birney Area Dump Closures	85	$145,000	$10,746,200
MONTANA	MT32387-0001	EVARO-WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	86	$40,000	$10,786,200
MONTANA	MT24273-0101	DAYTON WATER SYSTEM	87	$10,000	$10,796,200
MONTANA	MT43472-0101	BROCKTON - WATER STORAGE	88	$250,000	$11,046,200
MONTANA	MT21999-1001	LOWER DRY FORK	89	$0	$11,046,200

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MONTANA	MT18999-4	BLACKFEET SOLID WASTE COLLECTION	90	$500,000	$11.546.200
MONTANA	MT02999-0201	Northern Cheyenne Individual Water	91	$28.000	$11.574.200
MONTANA	MT44999-0101	NORTHERN CHEYENNE UTIL COMM.	92	$125,000	$11.699.200
MONTANA	MT24999-0401	FLATHEAD DUMP CLOSURES PHASE 3	93	$60,000	$11.759.200
MONTANA	MT53621-0101	FRAZER WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	94	$250,000	$12.009.200
MONTANA	MT53621-0001	FRAZER - WATER STORAGE	95	$250,000	$12.259.200
MONTANA	MT43999-0701	FORT PECK-O&M EQUIPMENT PHI	96	$100,000	$12.359.200
MONTANA	MT03993-0001	JENNY GRAY - PUMPHOUSE	97	$60,000	$12.419.200
MONTANA	MT24991-0101	SAFETY BAY WATER SYSTEM	98	$21,000	$12.440.200
MONTANA	MT24274-0201	ELMO WATER DISTRIBUTION	99	$205,000	$12.645.200
MONTANA	MT44999-0001	NORTHERN CHEYENNE RWD - PHASE 2	100	$550,000	$13.195.200
MONTANA	MT02999-0001	NORTHERN CHEYENNE RWD - PHASE 3	101	$1,330,000	$14.525.200
MONTANA	MT02998-0101	PRYOR & WYOLA COMMUNITY O & M	102	$27,000	$14.552.200
MONTANA	MT21999-0C01	Rocky Boy RWS Ext. St. Pierre	103	$270,000	$14.822.200
MONTANA	MT21999-0B01	Rocky Boy RWS Ext. Williamson	104	$465,000	$15.287.200
MONTANA	MT21999-0601	ROCKY BOY RWS PH4 DUCK CREEK	105	$430,000	$15.717.200
MONTANA	MT18209-0101	STARR SCHOOL WATER STORAGE	106	$175,000	$15.892.200
MONTANA	MT24282-0101	CLARICE PAUL WATER	107	$50,000	$15.942.200
MONTANA	MT18203-0601	CUT BANK CREEK WATER SYSTEM	108	$8,000,000	$23.942.200
MONTANA	MT18203-0201	BROWNING DEPOT WATER LINE	109	$25,000	$23.967.200
MONTANA	MT03999-0301	SW TRANSFER SITE DODSON AREA	110	$40,000	$24.007.200
MONTANA	MT01999-0101	SW TRANSFER SITE BEAVERHEAD CREEK	111	$40,000	$24.047.200
MONTANA	MT18209-2	STARR SCHOOL LAGOON EXPANSION	112	$350,000	$24.397.200
MONTANA	MT02003-0102	CROW WATER PLANT EXPANSION	113	$1,500,000	$25.897.200
MONTANA	MT24274-0301	ELMO WATER RESERVOIR	114	$275,000	$26.172.200
WYOMING	WY07760-0401	ARAPAHOE INDUSTRIAL MERGER	115	$150,000	$26.322.200
MONTANA	MT21999-0D01	Rocky Boy RWS Ext. Post Plant	116	$256,000	$26.578.200
WYOMING	WY07767-0301	ETHETE-PLUNKETT RD LOOP	117	$80,000	$26.658.200
MONTANA	MT21999-0401	ROCKY BOY RWS PH3-PARKER CANYON	118	$250,000	$26.908.200

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
Area:	CA				
CALIFORNIA	CA49505-0101	STEWARTS POINT - WATER INTAKE	1	$185,000	$185,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-003	HOOPA SCATTERED	2	$216,000	$401,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45999-0102	REDDING DISTRICT SCATTERED	3	$200,000	$601,000
CALIFORNIA	CA23405-0902	ROUND VALLEY SCATTERED	4	$30,000	$631,000
CALIFORNIA	CA25413-0002	FT BIDWELL CWS UPGRADE	5	$350,000	$981,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0101	CAPTAIN JOHN	6	$300,000	$1,281,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12353-0302	YUROK UPRIVER WATER SYSTEMS	7	$200,000	$1,481,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45831-0102	PIT RIVER SCATTERED HOMES	8	$264,000	$1,745,000
CALIFORNIA	CA23405-0702	ROUND VALLEY RES - SOLID WASTE	9	$425,000	$2,170,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45999-0101	Redding Scattered	10	$305,000	$2,475,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12515-0202	TRINIDAD WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	11	$20,000	$2,495,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33442-0101	TORRES-MARTINEZ - MH PARKS	12	$0	$2,495,000
CALIFORNIA	CA17385-0001	UPPER LAKE DEWELL SYSTEM	13	$155,000	$2,650,000
CALIFORNIA	CA18839-0001	SUSANVILLE - U RANCH. IMPR	14	$85,000	$2,735,000
CALIFORNIA	CA10342-0001	COLD SPRINGS WATER SYSTEM	15	$280,000	$3,015,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33441-0701	SOBOBA SOLID WASTE	16	$153,000	$3,168,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12356-0302	COMMUNITY EXPLORATORY WELL DRILLING	17	$60,000	$3,228,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0501	HOOPA - RESERVATION SEWER	18	$160,000	$3,388,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37470-0701	MESA GRANDE - SOLID WASTE	19	$100,000	$3,488,000
CALIFORNIA	CA32426-0101	GREENVILLE INDIAN MISSION	20	$22,000	$3,510,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12353-0001	REQUA COMMUNITY WATER	21	$270,000	$3,780,000
CALIFORNIA	CA08333-0001	SMITH RIVER CWS UPGRADE	22	$285,000	$4,065,000
CALIFORNIA	CA08332-0002	RESIGHINI SW & OM	23	$70,000	$4,135,000
CALIFORNIA	CA49505-0702	STEWARTS POINT KASHIA - SOLID	24	$80,000	$4,215,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33442-0702	TORRES-MARTINEZ - SOLID WASTE	25	$250,000	$4,465,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33440-0701	SANTA ROSA SOLID WASTE	26	$142,000	$4,607,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45841-0101	REDDING RANCHERIA WW CONNECT	27	$0	$4,607,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37468-0701	LOS COYOTES - SOLID WASTE	28	$102,000	$4,709,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37461-0001	BARONA MISSION INDIANS	29	$65,000	$4,774,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
CALIFORNIA	CA34451-0001	CONSUMNES RIVER INDIAN ASSOC.	30	$155,000	$4,929,000
CALIFORNIA	CA23405-0101	ROUND VALLEY MAIN UPGRADE	31	$600,000	$5,529,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12356-0301	TABLE BLUFF SEPTIC TANK REPL.	32	$50,000	$5,579,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37477-0001	VIEJAS RESERVATION	33	$23,000	$5,602,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37471-0001	PALA LAGOON	34	$850,000	$6,452,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37469-0701	MANZANITA SOLID WASTE	35	$50,000	$6,502,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37462-0701	CAMPO SOLID WASTE	36	$35,000	$6,537,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33432-0701	AUGUSTINE - SOLID WASTE	37	$150,000	$6,687,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0002	HOOPA SCATTERED	38	$84,000	$6,771,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37476-0101	SYCUAN - ANCILLARY WATER	39	$95,000	$6,866,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33441-0001	SOBOBA RESERVATION	40	$325,000	$7,191,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37473-0003	RINCON ALLOTMENT 19C	41	$0	$7,191,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33440-0001	SANTA ROSA RES AS-BUILTS/O&M	42	$10,000	$7,201,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33433-0701	CABAZON - SOLID WASTE	43	$132,000	$7,333,000
CALIFORNIA	CA06327-0001	CORTINA	44	$80,000	$7,413,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45831-0702	PIT RIVER SOLID WASTE	45	$150,000	$7,563,000
CALIFORNIA	CA10341-0102	BIG SANDY - WATER	46	$90,000	$7,653,000
CALIFORNIA	CA23403-0001	LAYTONVILLE RANCHERIA	47	$60,000	$7,713,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0401	HOOPA VALLEY NEW WATER SOURCE	48	$4,500,000	$12,213,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37470-0201	MESA GRANDE - BLACK CANYON CWS	49	$0	$12,213,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33436-0702	MORONGO SOLID WASTE	50	$80,000	$12,293,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33436-0001	MORONGO RESERVATION	51	$270,000	$12,563,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12540-0102	BEAR RIVER WASTEWATER	52	$150,000	$12,713,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12540-0002	BEAR RIVER SOLID WASTE/O&M	53	$20,000	$12,733,000
CALIFORNIA	CA54512-0101	TULE RIVER - MCDARMET SYSTEM	54	$85,000	$12,818,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12353-0703	YUROK RESERVATION - SW & OM	55	$430,000	$13,248,000
CALIFORNIA	CA23403-61	LAYTONVILLE RANCHERIA - SOLID WASTE	56	$30,000	$13,278,000
CALIFORNIA	CA10341-01	BIG SANDY - SOLID WASTE	57	$50,000	$13,328,000
CALIFORNIA	CA45841-0102	REDDING RANCHERIA WATER	58	$0	$13,328,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33440-0001	SANTA ROSA RESERVATION	59	$132,000	$13,460,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
CALIFORNIA	CA37867-0701	JAMUL SOLID WASTE	60	$35,000	$13,495,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37473-0701	RINCON ALLOTMENT 19C-SOLID WASTE	61	$25,000	$13,520,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12356-0201	TABLE BLUFF SOLID WASTE/O&M	62	$20,000	$13,540,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0201	HOOPA VALLEY - WATERLINE UPGRA	63	$660,000	$14,200,000
CALIFORNIA	CA08347-0101	ELK VALLEY SEWER UPGRADE	64	$112,000	$14,312,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0301	HOOPA VALLEY - BALD HILL	65	$2,420,000	$16,732,000
CALIFORNIA	CA33434-0001	CAHUILLA RESERVATION	66	$2,000	$16,734,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12353-0303	McBETH ACRES WASTEWATER	67	$750,000	$17,484,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12354-0502	HOOPA - RESERVATION SEWER (2)	68	$3,000,000	$20,484,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37475-0702	SANTA YSABEL, TRACT I	69	$15,000	$20,499,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37464-0001	CUYAPAIPE COMM WATER SYS	70	$100,000	$20,599,000
CALIFORNIA	CA12352-0102	BLUE LAKE INDIVIDUAL W&S	71	$170,000	$20,769,000
CALIFORNIA	CA37462-0201	OLD CAMPO	72	$72,000	$20,841,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: NA						
NEW MEXICO	NM17447-0201	MANUELITO SOUTHWEST*	1	$2,793,000	$2,793,000	10
NEW MEXICO	NM17403-0501	BACA WELL & EXTENSIONS (P)	2	$1,893,000	$4,686,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM17003-0201	TSAYATOH SOUTH	3	$1,205,000	$5,891,000	
ARIZONA	AZ01026-1001	HOUCK PIGEON SPRING	4	$277,000	$6,168,000	20
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-0801	MULHOLLAND WELL-NAHODISHGISH INTER	5	$236,000	$6,404,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0101	CRYSTAL-SONSELLA SPGS	6	$474,000	$6,878,000	
NEW MEXICO	NM24604-0101	BLANCO CANYON NORTH*	7	$655,600	$7,533,600	
NEW MEXICO	NM23571-0601	COUNSELOR-DEER MESA	8	$368,660	$7,902,260	
NEW MEXICO	NM17467-0601	RED ROCK SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	9	$1,443,000	$9,345,260	
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0101	MARIANO LAKE SCATTERED	10	$2,123,000	$11,468,260	
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-0401	CROWNPOINT SOUTHWEST	11	$369,000	$11,837,260	45
NEW MEXICO	NM17422-0101	CHICHILTAH SOUTH PHASE I*	12	$2,211,800	$14,049,060	
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0201	CHURCHROCK SOUTH - PHASE I	13	$627,000	$14,676,060	
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0201	TSAILE EAST SCATTERED WATER*	14	$899,573	$15,575,633	
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0401	RED VALLEY SCATTERED	15	$713,220	$16,288,853	
ARIZONA	AZ01015-0601	TSELANI EAST - PHASE I	16	$1,054,000	$17,342,853	
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0701	HIGHLANDS SEWER EXTENSION	17	$266,420	$17,609,273	60
NEW MEXICO	NM17422-0102	CHICHILTAH SOUTH PHASE II	18	$2,211,800	$19,821,073	
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0201	BESHBITO EXTENSION	19	$1,736,300	$21,557,373	
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0102	JEDDITO MEMBER EXT. PH2	20	$1,720,700	$23,278,073	75
ARIZONA	AZ01902-0201	GANADO EAST EXTENSION	21	$369,000	$23,647,073	
UTAH	UT19815-0801	WHITE MESA CISTERNS	22	$169,000	$23,816,073	
UTAH	UT19815-0301	SLICK HORN CISTERNS	23	$80,000	$23,896,073	
NEW MEXICO	NM28341-0501	ALAMO SCATTERED	24	$383,000	$24,279,073	
NEW MEXICO	NM24616-0301	HUERFANO CISTERNS	25	$42,500	$24,321,573	
NEW MEXICO	NM24616-0101	CARSON SOUTH	26	$1,417,100	$25,738,673	
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0701	CRYSTAL-GREEN KNOB EXTENSION	27	$359,000	$26,097,673	
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0602	CRYSTAL LEAD/COPPER PHASE II	28	$150,000	$26,247,673	
NEW MEXICO	NM23572-0201	OJO ENCINO CISTERNS I	29	$132,500	$26,380,173	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM21550-0101	LYBROOK-EXCAVADA WASH	30	$1,031,575	$27,411,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0201	EAST LITTLEWATER EXTENSION	31	$1,041,000	$28,452,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17500-0501	BECENTI NORTH EXTENSION	32	$2,092,000	$30,544,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17487-0201	TWIN LAKES WATCHMAN EXTENSION	33	$337,000	$30,881,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17483-0501	TOHATCHI SCATTERED NTUA	34	$290,000	$31,171,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-0901	CROWNPOINT SOUTH CANYON EXT	35	$484,000	$31,655,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0A02	CHURCHROCK LEAD/COPPER PHASE II	36	$150,000	$31,805,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17414-0101	CASAMERO LAKE EXTENSION	37	$2,112,000	$33,917,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17408-0201	BREAD SPRINGS PINEHAVEN SYSTEM	38	$509,000	$34,426,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17402-0101	NAHODISHGISH-BECENTI INTERTIE	39	$562,000	$34,988,748
NEW MEXICO	NM17003-0301	TSAYATOH COALMINE	40	$996,000	$35,984,748
ARIZONA	AZ09997-0501	BLACK MESA SCATTERED NTUA	41	$41,480	$36,026,228
ARIZONA	AZ09997-0201	KITSILLIE EAST PHASE 2	42	$1,265,000	$37,291,228
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0501	JEDDITO SCATTERED NTUA	43	$165,920	$37,457,148
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0602	SHONTO LEAD PHASE II	44	$150,000	$37,607,148
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0601	PINON NORTH	45	$728,000	$38,335,148
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0501	PINON SCATTERED NTUA	46	$207,400	$38,542,548
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0202	KAYENTA-TSOSIE EXTENSION	47	$622,000	$39,164,548
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0201	WHITE VALLEY SCATTERED CISTERNS	48	$32,000	$39,196,548
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0501	FOREST LAKE SCATTERED NTUA	49	$103,700	$39,300,248
ARIZONA	AZ03121-B01	KAIBETO - N W. WELCH EXTENSION	50	$244,000	$39,544,248
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0301	SW KAIBETO-MORMAN RIDGE EXT	51	$993,293	$40,537,541
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0802	INSCRIPTION HOUSE LEAD PHASE II	52	$150,000	$40,687,541
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0501	COPPERMINE DEAD MONKEY WELL & W PT@	53	$260,000	$40,947,541
ARIZONA	AZ03104-1001	CAMERON SHADOW MTN. WELL & W PT @	54	$300,000	$41,247,541
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0801	BODAWAY GAP/CEDAR RIDGE SCAT H2O EXT	55	$169,000	$41,416,541
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0601	TSAILE/WHEATFIELDS SCAT NTUA	56	$124,440	$41,540,981
ARIZONA	AZ01902-0301	GANADO SCATTERED NTUA	57	$165,920	$41,706,901
ARIZONA	AZ01074-0102	GANADO-WOOD SPRINGS PHASE II	58	$1,198,000	$42,904,901
ARIZONA	AZ01070-0301	WHIPPORWILL SCATTERED NTUA	59	$82,960	$42,987,861

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ01067-0101	ST MICHAELS SUMMIT	60	$1,557,000	$44,544,861
ARIZONA	AZ01061-1001	TEECNOSPOS CISTERNS	61	$292,000	$44,836,861
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0201	SWEETWATER SCATTERED I	62	$335,000	$45,171,861
ARIZONA	AZ01056-0501	STEAMBOAT SCATTERED NTUA	63	$124,440	$45,296,301
ARIZONA	AZ01056-0301	STEAMBOAT CANYON TOP	64	$454,900	$45,751,201
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0102	SPIDER ROCK-CHINLE PHASE 2	65	$1,248,000	$46,999,201
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0101	SPIDER ROCK-CHINLE PHASE I	66	$1,453,000	$48,452,201
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0602	SAWMILL LEAD/COPPER PHASE II	67	$150,000	$48,602,201
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0501	SAWMILL SCATTERED NTUA	68	$124,440	$48,726,641
ARIZONA	AZ01050-0101	ST MICHAELS SCATTERED NTUA	69	$373,320	$49,099,961
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0601	ROUND ROCK/ROCK PT SCAT NTUA	70	$103,700	$49,203,661
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0601	OAK SPRINGS SCATTERED NTUA	71	$62,220	$49,265,881
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0501	NAZLINI SCAT NTUA	72	$62,220	$49,328,101
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0901	MANY FARMS SCATTERED (NTUA)	73	$248,880	$49,576,981
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0502	LUPTON COPPER/LEAD PHASE II	74	$150,000	$49 726 981
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0401	KLAGETOH SCATTERED NTUA	75	$124,440	$49,851,421
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0101	NAVAJO STATION ROAD-PHASE I	76	$348,100	$50,199,521
ARIZONA	AZ01026-1101	HOUCK - SANDERS WEST	77	$265,000	$50,464 521
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0801	HOUCK SOUTH PHASE I @	78	$1,079,000	$51,543,521
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0702	HOUCK/QUERINO COPPER/LEAD P II	79	$150,000	$51,693,521
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0301	HOUCK BURNTWATER WASH PHASE I @	80	$1,168,000	$52,861,521
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0301	FT DEFIANCE SCATTERED NTUA	81	$228,100	$53,089,621
ARIZONA	AZ01015-0701	TSELANI SCATTERED NTUA	82	$62,220	$53,151,841
ARIZONA	AZ01015-0301	BLACK MOUNTAIN EXTENSION	83	$1,323,000	$54,474,841
ARIZONA	AZ01014-0401	CORNFIELDS SCATTERED NTUA	84	$145,180	$54,620,021
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0701	CHINLE SCATTERED NTUA	85	$580,720	$55,200,741
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0401	Blackhorse Ext/Chilchinbeto N *	86	$402,000	$55,602,741
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0301	RAMAH RURAL SCATTERED	87	$226,000	$55,828,741
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0201	RAMAH/PINEHILL AREA	88	$2,457,000	$58,285,741
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0C01	WATERLN IMPROVE N & MESA FARM	89	$16,000	$58,301,741
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0401	SANOSTEE DRAINFIELD REPLACEMENT	90	$15,000	$58,316,741

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0501	CHURCHROCK-SUNDANCE SEWER	91	$850,000	$59,166,741
NEW MEXICO	NM17403-0401	HAYSTACK EAST UPGRADE	92	$1,072,000	$60,238,741
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0101	SHONTO ADD'L SOURCE-WHITE POST MISSION*	93	$300,000	$60,538,741
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1201	DILKON DEDICATED WATER MAIN	94	$251,000	$60,789,741
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0701	TUBA CITY SEWER MAINS & WATER CONNEC.	95	$91,000	$60,880,741
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0201	North Tuba City Upgrade	96	$770,000	$61,650,741
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0801	DIST 5 - TOLANI LK BLACK FALLS W PT @	97	$299,375	$61,950,116
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0502	COPPERMINE DEAD MONKEY WATER SYSTEM	98	$441,000	$62,391,116
ARIZONA	AZ03104-1002	CAMERON SHADOW MTN WATER SYSTEM	99	$535,600	$62,926,716
ARIZONA	AZ01066-0601	WHEATFIELD-WHITECONE W/L EXT	100	$448,000	$63,374,716
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0601	TNP DRAINFIELD REPLACEMENT	101	$36,000	$63,410,716
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0401	SWEETWATER DRAINFIELD REPLAC'M	102	$20,000	$63,430,716
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0901	RED VALLEY DRAINFIELD REPLACE	103	$15,000	$63,445,716
ARIZONA	AZ01034-0401	LUKACHUKAI SCATTERED	104	$547,000	$63,992,716
ARIZONA	AZ01030-0202	KINLICHEE NE	105	$1,212,000	$65,204,716
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0802	HOUCK SOUTH PHASE II	106	$247,429	$65,452,145
ARIZONA	AZ01009-0101	CEDAR POINT PHASE I @	107	$824,000	$66,276,145
ARIZONA	AZ01007-0101	GANADO-BURNWATER PHASE IX	108	$1,472,000	$67,748,145
UTAH	UT19815-C01	CASA DEL ECO MESA	109	$1,576,000	$69,324,145
UTAH	UT19815-0401	RED MESA SOUTH	110	$47,000	$69,371,145
NEW MEXICO	NM24645-0102	WHITEROCK WATER SYSTEM	111	$445,000	$69,816,145
NEW MEXICO	NM24641-0201	TWO GREY HILLS PHASE V CISTERN	112	$55,500	$69,871,645
NEW MEXICO	NM24630-0401	SHEEPSPRINGS EAST CISTERNS	113	$85,000	$69,956,645
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0201	YELLOWHILL TO TABLE MESA CISTERNS	114	$42,500	$69,999,145
NEW MEXICO	NM24628-0101	PUEBLO BONITO-CHACO CANYON	115	$804,500	$70,803,645
NEW MEXICO	NM24627-0101	OTIS SOUTH	116	$539,114	$71,342,759
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0401	BURHAM JCT/BURHAM RD CISTERNS I	117	$178,500	$71,521,259
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0201	NEWCOMB EAST CISTERNS I	118	$110,500	$71,631,759
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0501	CRYSTAL-MILKWATER PH. I CISTERN	119	$156,000	$71,787,759
NEW MEXICO	NM24601-0501	BECLABITO WHITNEY CISTERNS I	120	$176,000	$71,963,759

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM24413-0401	BURNHAM - SCATTERED CISTERNS I	121	$450,000	$72,413,759
NEW MEXICO	NM24413-0301	BURNHAM-HUNTER WASH CISTERNS I	122	$195,500	$72,609,259
NEW MEXICO	NM24413-0101	BURNHAM UPGRADE/EAST EXTENSION	123	$407,220	$73,016,479
NEW MEXICO	NM17464-0101	PUEBLO PINTADO-ALTO SOUTHEAST	124	$944,000	$73,960,479
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0401	MARIANO LAKE SCATTERED EXTENS.	125	$1,370,000	$75,330,479
NEW MEXICO	NM17447-0101	MANUELITO CHAPTER HOUSE AREA PH. I	126	$1,579,000	$76,909,479
ARIZONA	AZ09186-0201	KAYENTA SCATTERED CISTERNS	127	$561,000	$77,470,479
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0601	HARDROCK ISOLATED CISTERN	128	$35,200	$77,505,679
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0601	FOREST LAKE S.W WATER EXTEN.	129	$875,500	$78,381,179
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0802	DIST. 5 - TOLANI LK BLACK FALLS EXT PH I	130	$291,880	$78,673,059
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0901	KAIBETO GREY MESA CISTERNS	131	$149,000	$78,822,059
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0701	KAIBETO SCATTERED CISTERN	132	$88,000	$78,910,059
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0701	INSC HSE ISOLATED CISTERNS	133	$61,600	$78,971,659
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0201	GANADO-WIDE RUINS PHASE VI	134	$1,463,000	$80,434,659
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0101	GANADO-SANDERS PHASE V	135	$1,424,575	$81,859,234
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0301	SWEETWATER CISTERNS I	136	$60,400	$81,919,634
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0401	NW SAWMILL	137	$660,027	$82,579,661
ARIZONA	AZ01047-0301	ROUGH ROCK SOUTHEAST EXTENSION	138	$118,000	$82,697,661
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0801	RED VALLEY CISTERNS I	139	$42,500	$82,740,161
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0401	OAK SPRINGS BLK CREEK CISTERNS	140	$85,000	$82,825,161
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0301	OAK SPRINGS SUMMIT CISTERNS	141	$51,000	$82,876,161
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0901	HOUCK NORTHEAST	142	$276,000	$83,152,161
ARIZONA	AZ01014-0301	UPPER SUNRISE T. POST EXTENSION	143	$1,350,000	$84,502,161
UTAH	UT19815-0B01	RED MESA SOLID WASTE	144	$55,000	$84,557,161
UTAH	UT19808-0401	OLJATOH SOLID WASTE	145	$105,000	$84,662,161
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0501	RAMAH SUNSET VALLEY EXTENSION	146	$494,000	$85,156,161
NEW MEXICO	NM28341-0201	ALAMO SOLID WASTE	147	$100,000	$85,256,161
NEW MEXICO	NM24645-0301	WHITEROCK DUMP CLOSURE	148	$50,000	$85,306,161
NEW MEXICO	NM24623-0301	NASCHITTI SOLID WASTE	149	$75,000	$85,381,161
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0201	CRYSTAL SOLID WASTE	150	$75,000	$85,456,161

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM23573-0701	TORREON SOLID WASTE	151	$75,000	$85,531,161
NEW MEXICO	NM23571-0501	COUNCELOR SOLID WASTE	152	$25,000	$85,556,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17500-0401	BECENTI SOLID WASTE	153	$75,000	$85,631,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0401	WHITEHORSE LK DUMP CLOSURE	154	$50,000	$85,681,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17489-0301	CHICHILTAH DUMP CLOSURE	155	$50,000	$85,731,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17487-0501	TWIN LAKES DUMP CLOSURE	156	$75,000	$85,806,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17483-0401	TOHATCHI SOLID WASTE	157	$80,000	$85,886,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17480-0301	THOREAU SOLID WASTE	158	$20,000	$85,906,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0401	STANDING ROCK DUMP CLOSURES	159	$50,000	$85,956,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17475-0201	SMITH LAKE SOLID WASTE	160	$50,000	$86,006,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17470-0401	ROCK SPRINGS SOLID WASTE	161	$75,000	$86,081,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17465-0201	PUEBLO PINTADO SOLID WASTE	162	$100,000	$86,181,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17453-0201	MEXICAN SPGS SOLID WASTE	163	$50,000	$86,231,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17450-0201	RED LAKE NM SOLID WASTE	164	$75,000	$86,306,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0301	MARIANO LAKE SOLID WASTE	165	$50,000	$86,356,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17446-0401	LAKE VALLEY SOLID WASTE	166	$50,000	$86,406,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17426-0301	NAHODISHGISH DUMP CLOSURE	167	$50,000	$86,456,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-0701	CROWNPOINT SOLID WASTE	168	$75,000	$86,531,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17423-0601	COYOTE CANYON SOLID WASTE	169	$150,000	$86,681,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17414-0301	CASAMERO LAKE DUMP CLOSURE	170	$50,000	$86,731,161
NEW MEXICO	NM17408-0301	BREAD SPRINGS SOLID WASTE	171	$40,000	$86,771,161
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0401	CANONCITO SOLID WASTE	172	$75,000	$86,846,161
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0101	CANONCITO COMBINED & W P. @	173	$1,390,000	$88,236,161
ARIZONA	AZ09997-0401	KITSILLIE SOLID WASTE	174	$100,000	$88,336,161
ARIZONA	AZ09924-0301	SMOKE SIGNAL SOLID WASTE	175	$75,000	$88,411,161
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0301	JEDDITO SOLID WASTE	176	$75,000	$88,486,161
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0601	WHITE CONE SOLID WASTE	177	$55,000	$88,541,161
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0601	TEESTOH SOLID WASTE	178	$55,000	$88,596,161
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0701	SHONTO WELL - TALKER EXTENSION I @	179	$520,000	$89,116,161
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0201	SHONTO SOLID WASTE	180	$125,000	$89,241,161
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0701	PINON SOLID WASTE	181	$25,000	$89,266,161

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0601	KAYENTA DUMP CLOSURE	182	$305,000	$89,571,161
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0302	COMB RIDGE EXT/WATERING PT @	183	$683,000	$90,254,161
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0601	INDIAN WELLS SOLID WASTE	184	$230,000	$90,484,161
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0501	HARDROCK SOLID WASTE	185	$105,000	$90,589,161
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0301	FOREST LAKE SOLID WASTE	186	$75,000	$90,664,161
ARIZONA	AZ09153-0401	BLUE GAP SOLID WASTE	187	$75,000	$90,739,161
ARIZONA	AZ09033-0901	LOWER GREASEWOOD SOLID WASTE	188	$30,000	$90,769,161
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0106	WHITE MESA GOPHER SPRINGS EXT.	189	$519,000	$91,288,161
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0105	WHITE MESA - SLIM EXTENSION*	190	$826,000	$92,114,161
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0601	TOLANI LAKE SOLID WASTE	191	$75,000	$92,189,161
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0101	DIST. 5 - TOLANI LAKE PRICE EXTENSION	192	$349,489	$92,538,650
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0501	INSCRIPTION HOUSE SOLID WASTE	193	$75,000	$92,613,650
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0301	COALMINE MESA SOLID WASTE	194	$75,000	$92,688,650
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0701	BODAWAY GAP TRANSFER STAT/DUMP CLOSE	195	$50,000	$92,738,650
ARIZONA	AZ01070-0401	WHIPPOORWILL DUMP CLOSURE	196	$50,000	$92,788,650
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0801	TNP SOLID WASTE	197	$50,000	$92,838,650
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0101	SWEETWATER SOLID WASTE	198	$50,000	$92,888,650
ARIZONA	AZ01056-0201	STEAMBOAT SOLID WASTE	199	$92,500	$92,981,150
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0201	SAWMILL SOLID WASTE	200	$50,000	$93,031,150
ARIZONA	AZ01048-0401	ROUND ROCK SOLID WASTE	201	$180,000	$93,211,150
ARIZONA	AZ01047-0501	ROUGH ROCK SOLID WASTE	202	$75,000	$93,286,150
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0701	ROCK POINT SOLID WASTE	203	$100,000	$93,386,150
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0101	RED VALLEY SOLID WASTE	204	$55,000	$93,441,150
ARIZONA	AZ01042-0301	PINE SPRINGS SOLID WASTE	205	$30,000	$93,471,150
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0201	NAZLINI SOLID WASTE	206	$55,000	$93,526,150
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0401	LUPTON SOLID WASTE	207	$117,500	$93,643,650
ARIZONA	AZ01034-0301	LUKACHUKAI SOLID WASTE	208	$100,000	$93,743,650
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0201	KLAGETOH SOLID WASTE	209	$75,000	$93,818,650
ARIZONA	AZ01027-0201	HUNTERS POINT DUMP CLOSURE	210	$50,000	$93,868,650
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0601	HOUCK SOLID WASTE	211	$205,000	$94,073,650

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0401	FT DEFIANCE SOLID WASTE	212	$75,000	$94,148,650
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0401	DENNEHOTSO SOLID WASTE	213	$75,000	$94,223,650
ARIZONA	AZ01015-0501	COTTONWOOD TRANSFER STATION	214	$80,000	$94,303,650
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0701	CHILCHINBETO SOLID WASTE	215	$75,000	$94,378,650
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0402	CHILCHINBETO REDFACE WATERLINE EXT.	216	$904,000	$95,282,650
UTAH	UT19808-1301	TRAIN ROCK CISTERNS	217	$111,500	$95,394,150
UTAH	UT19808-0101	PIUTE FARMS SCATTERED CISTERNS	218	$610,000	$96,004,150
UTAH	UT19807-0301	DOUGLAS MESA SCATTERED CISTERNS	219	$292,474	$96,296,624
UTAH	UT19807-0201	EAGLE MESA LOOP CISTERNS	220	$112,490	$96,409,114
UTAH	UT19808-0201	MONTEZUMA CREEK CISTERNS	221	$53,000	$96,462,114
UTAH	UT19800-0103	ROCKWELL FLATS PHASE III	222	$700,000	$97,162,114
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0801	SHIPROCK NORTH HIGHWAY 666	223	$225,500	$97,387,614
NEW MEXICO	NM23573-0401	TORREON SOUTH EXTENSION	224	$2,119,000	$99,506,614
NEW MEXICO	NM17999-0101	NWNMRSWA TRANSFER STATION EQUIP.	225	$60,000	$99,566,614
NEW MEXICO	NM17445-0101	JONES RANCH	226	$2,590,000	$102,156,614
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-0201	CROWNPOINT NE (Tsai Yanal Kedi)	227	$625,600	$102,782,214
NEW MEXICO	NM17423-0501	COYOTE CANYON EAST CISTERNS	228	$960,000	$103,742,214
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0401	JEDDITO CISTERNS	229	$462,000	$104,204,214
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0901	SHONTO SCATTERED CISTERNS	230	$95,000	$104,299,214
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0702	SHONTO WELL - TALKER EXTENSION II	231	$480,000	$104,779,214
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0102	SHONTO COMM WATER AT WHITE POST MISS.	232	$696,000	$105,475,214
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0401	PINON SCATTERED PH 3 CISTERNS	233	$578,000	$106,053,214
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0301	PINON WEST	234	$699,000	$106,752,214
ARIZONA	AZ09166-1101	EL CAP WEST CISTERNS	235	$145,000	$106,897,214
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0401	KAYENTA EAST CISTERNS	236	$133,200	$107,030,414
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0305	COMB RIDGE-SPECK.STANLEY CISTERNS	237	$187,000	$107,217,414
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0303	COMB RIDGE-GRAY WHITEHORSE CISTERNS	238	$76,000	$107,293,414
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0401	FOREST LAKE CENTRAL WATER EXT.	239	$1,197,600	$108,491,014
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0201	FOREST LK SCATTERED CISTERNS	240	$568,000	$109,059,014

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0803	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS TOH ANIZAAD CISTE	241	$55,000	$109,114,014
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0701	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS SOUTH CISTERNS	242	$44,000	$109,158,014
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0201	White Mesa Scattered Cisterns	243	$181,500	$109,339,514
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0103	WHITE MESA SOUR WATER W PT @	244	$344,000	$109,683,514
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1001	TUBA CITY SCATTERED CISTERNS	245	$142,500	$109,826,014
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0901	TOLANI LAKE SCATTERED CISTERNS	246	$66,000	$109,892,014
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0803	DIST 5 - TOLANI LK BLACK FALLS II CISTE	247	$66,000	$109,958,014
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0801	KAIBETO LONG CANYON SCAT CISTERNS	248	$331,000	$110,289,014
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0401	N W KAIBETO - BENALLY CISTERNS	249	$66,000	$110,355,014
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0302	KAIBETO-MORMAN RIDG II EXT	250	$396,000	$110,751,014
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0203	INSCR. HSE. NORTH COMM. EXT	251	$970,000	$111,721,014
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0202	COPPERMINE SCATTERED CISTERNS	252	$1,030,000	$112,751,014
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0501	COALMINE MESA WATERLINE ONHIR EXT	253	$656,500	$113,407,514
ARIZONA	AZ03104-0501	CAMERON NORTH & WEST SCATT CISTERNS	254	$388,500	$113,796,014
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0501	BODAWAY Hidden Spring Cisterns	255	$187,500	$113,983,514
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0301	Bodawny Scattered Cisterns	256	$302,000	$114,285,514
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0501	BLACK ROCK-TSAILE CISTERNS (15)	257	$146,625	$114,432,139
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0401	BLACKROCK-TSAILE CISTERNS (32)	258	$312,800	$114,744,939
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0501	WIDE RUIN CISTERNS	259	$416,000	$115,160,939
ARIZONA	AZ01066-0801	BLACK ROCK EXTENSION	260	$836,600	$115,997,539
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0301	SAWMILL/SOUTHWEST CISTERNS	261	$380,000	$116,377,539
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0402	MANY FARMS LAKE PH3, CEDAR WATER	262	$762,000	$117,139,539
ARIZONA	AZ01026-1201	HOUCK - ALLENTOWN PHASE I @	263	$250,000	$117,389,539
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0301	DENNEHOTSO SCATTERED CISTERNS	264	$801,000	$118,190,539
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0101	GREASEWOOD FLATS CISTERNS	265	$390,700	$118,581,239
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0501	CHINLE REMOTE CISTERNS	266	$201,000	$118,782,239
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0901	CHILCHINBETO - HEWEY EXTENSION	267	$128,000	$118,910,239
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0601	CHILCHINBETO SCAT. CISTERNS	268	$588,000	$119,498,239
UTAH	UT19807-0101	MONUMENT VALLEY PASS EXT *	269	$1,596,000	$121,094,239
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0601	RAMAH/MOUNTAIN VIEW	270	$263,000	$121,357,239

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0A01	SOUTH SHIPROCK SCATTERED CISTER	271	$146,000	$121,503,239
NEW MEXICO	NM24612-0201	FRUITLAND DRAINFIELD FAILURES	272	$580,000	$122,083,239
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0301	SHONTO JUNCTION NW WATER EXT *	273	$208,000	$122,291,239
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0901	WHITE VALLEY WATERING POINT @	274	$345,000	$122,636,239
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0104	WHITE MESA SOUR WATER WEST EXT	275	$201,000	$122,837,239
ARIZONA	AZ01050-0201	ST MICHAELS-KARIGAN ESTAT SEWER	276	$196,000	$123,033,239
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0601	CHINLE DUMP CLOSURE	277	$405,000	$123,438,239
UTAH	UT19815-0901	SOUTHEAST CISTERNS I	278	$99,000	$123,537,239
UTAH	UT19815-0601	RED MESA SOUTHEAST CISTERNS I	279	$370,000	$123,907,239
UTAH	UT19813-0201	NAVAJO MT SCATTERED CISTERNS	280	$278,400	$124,185,639
UTAH	UT19812-0201	MEXICAN WATER S & N CISTERNS I	281	$884,000	$125,069,639
UTAH	UT19812-0101	TODAHAIDEKANI CISTERNS I	282	$804,000	$125,873,639
UTAH	UT19800-0201	ANETH CISTERNS-SCATTERED I	283	$1,058,000	$126,931,639
NEW MEXICO	NM28341-0301	ALAMO O&M	284	$700,000	$127,631,639
NEW MEXICO	NM24630-0101	SHEEPSPRINGS EXTENSION	285	$270,500	$127,902,139
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0201	WHITEHORSE LAKE EAST CISTERNS PH II	286	$694,000	$128,596,139
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0101	WHITEHORSE LAKE NORTH CISTERNS PH I	287	$387,000	$128,983,139
NEW MEXICO	NM17453-0101	ASAAYI/TODILTO WASH	288	$600,000	$129,583,139
NEW MEXICO	NM17419-0101	COALMINE 5 MNT CISTERNS	289	$181,000	$129,764,139
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0202	CHURCHROCK SOUTH - PHASE II	290	$670,000	$130,434,139
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0303	WHITE CONE SECOND FLAT MESA II CISTERNS	291	$101,000	$130,535,139
ARIZONA	AZ09190-0101	MOUNMENT VALLEY SW EXTENSIONS	292	$890,000	$131,425,139
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0801	SHONTO TALL MTN. WATER SYSTEM I @	293	$369,000	$131,794,139
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0902	WHITE VALLEY OFF DIST 4 SYSTEM	294	$279,000	$132,073,139
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0401	HARDROCK GOY/SLEEPY MTN CISTERNS	295	$398,124	$132,471,263
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1001	DILKON-PYRAMID BUTTE CISTERNS	296	$612,500	$133,083,763
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0501	DIST 5 - BIRDSPRINGS LONG CISTERNS	297	$94,600	$133,178,363
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0401	DIST 5 - BIRDSPRINGS RINCON BASIN CISTE	298	$127,600	$133,305,963
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0301	DIST. 5 - N. BIRDSPRINGS 2 CISTERNS	299	$50,600	$133,356,563
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0201	DIST. 5 - N. BIRDSPRINGS 1 CISTERNS	300	$46,200	$133,402,763

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0107	WHITE MESA SOUR WATER EAST EXT	301	$695,000	$134,097,763
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1301	TUBA CITY NW CWS UPGRADE I	302	$59,500	$134,157,263
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1101	DYNAMITE HILL EXTENSION	303	$94,000	$134,251,263
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0701	DIST 5 - TOLANI LAKE BELONE CISTERNS	304	$80,500	$134,331,763
ARIZONA	AZ03131-0101	RED LAKE CISTERNS	305	$207,000	$134,538,763
ARIZONA	AZ03123-0101	NAVAJO SPRINGS CISTERNS	306	$57,750	$134,596,513
ARIZONA	AZ03122-0101	Le Chee Scattered Cisterns	307	$425,500	$135,022,013
ARIZONA	AZ03121-1001	KAIBETO - MANN'S MESA EXTENSION	308	$282,000	$135,304,013
ARIZONA	AZ03110-0101	COW SPRINGS CISTERNS	309	$116,000	$135,420,013
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0401	TEEC NOS POS CISTERNS I	310	$114,000	$135,534,013
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0501	ROCK POINT REMOTE WATER EXTENS.	311	$2,100,000	$137,634,013
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0401	ROCK POINT NORTH CISTERNS	312	$126,500	$137,760,513
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0501	OAK SPRINGS EAST (TOP) CISTERNS	313	$156,000	$137,916,513
ARIZONA	AZ01037-0201	MEX W D. BLACKWATER CAMP CISTERNS	314	$84,000	$138,000,513
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0701	MANY FARMS LAKE EAST CISTERNS	315	$99,000	$138,099,513
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0201	POINT HILL CISTERNS	316	$272,999	$138,372,512
ARIZONA	AZ01017-0101	Cross Canyon Cisterns	317	$1,747,392	$140,119,904
ARIZONA	AZ01015-0401	TSELANI SCATTERED WATER EXTENS	318	$282,500	$140,402,404
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0801	CHINLE CENTRAL SEWER	319	$307,800	$140,710,204
ARIZONA	AZ01009-0102	CEDAR POINT PHASE II	320	$182,000	$140,892,204
UTAH	UT19999-0101	WESTWATER - BLANDING WATER EXT	321	$350,000	$141,242,204
UTAH	UT19813-0301	NAV MTN RAINBOW VILL'G SURFACE H2O TRTMT	322	$350,000	$141,592,204
UTAH	UT19806-0101	MONTEZUMA CREEK SOURCE	323	$40,000	$141,632,204
UTAH	UT19800-0401	ANETH LAGOON UPGRADE	324	$160,000	$141,792,204
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0801	RAMAH DUMP CLOSURE	325	$30,000	$141,822,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24641-0301	TWO GREY HILLS SOLID WASTE	326	$75,000	$141,897,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0601	SHIPROCK WATER TREATMENT PLANT	327	$1,430,000	$143,327,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0601	LITTLEWATER DUMP CLOSURE	328	$280,000	$143,607,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24625-0201	NENAHNEZAD DUMP CLOSURE	329	$205,000	$143,812,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-1101	NEWCOMB-TOADLENA INTERTIE	330	$77,000	$143,889,204

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0701	NEWCOMB DUMP CLOSURE	331	$155,000	$144,044,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24612-0301	FRUITLAND DUMP CLOSURES	332	$200,000	$144,244,204
NEW MEXICO	NM24601-0301	BECLABITO DUMP CLOSURE	333	$42,500	$144,286,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0601	LITTLEWATER DUMP CLOSURE	334	$65,000	$144,351,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17467-0301	RED ROCK DUMP CLOSURE	335	$35,000	$144,386,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17458-0501	PINEDALE DUMP CLOSURE	336	$15,000	$144,401,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17450-0101	RED LAKE FAILED DRAINFIELDS	337	$54,000	$144,455,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17447-0501	MANUELITO DUMP CLOSURES	338	$25,000	$144,480,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17444-0301	IYANBITO IRON TREATMENT	339	$200,000	$144,680,704
NEW MEXICO	NM17444-0201	IYANBITO DUMP CLOSURE	340	$92,500	$144,773,204
NEW MEXICO	NM17443-0201	CHURCHROCK - INDIAN VILLAGE WELL	341	$324,000	$145,097,204
NEW MEXICO	NM17424-1001	CROWNPOINT SEWER SYSTEM STUDIES	342	$200,000	$145,297,204
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-1001	CHURCHROCK SCATT DUMP CLOSURES	343	$45,000	$145,342,204
NEW MEXICO	NM17003-0101	TSAYATOH SCATT. DUMP CLOSURES	344	$75,000	$145,417,204
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0302	WHITE CONE SECOND FLAT MESA I	345	$1,117,000	$146,534,204
ARIZONA	AZ09158-0501	DILKON SOLID WASTE	346	$205,000	$146,739,204
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1302	TUBA CITY NW CWS UPGRADE II	347	$91,000	$146,830,204
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1201	TUBA CITY SCATTERED DUMP CLOSURES	348	$75,000	$146,905,204
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0801	TUBA WELLS PRESSURE SUST. VALVE	349	$20,000	$146,925,204
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0301	TUBA CITY ADDITNL. WATER SOURCE	350	$250,000	$147,175,204
ARIZONA	AZ03122-0401	LECHEE DUMP CLOSURE	351	$112,500	$147,287,704
ARIZONA	AZ03122-0301	LE CHEE LIFT STATION O & M	352	$50,000	$147,337,704
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0A01	KAIBETO-COMMUNITY WELL & SCADA I	353	$225,000	$147,562,704
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0B01	INSCRIPTION HOUSE WELL	354	$230,000	$147,792,704
ARIZONA	AZ03110-0301	Cow Spgs WATSON EXTENSIONS	355	$364,000	$148,156,704
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0301	COPPERMINE SOLID WASTE	356	$55,000	$148,211,704
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1402	LEUPP - GRAND FALLS EXTENSION	357	$220,700	$148,432,404
ARIZONA	AZ03104-0901	IRON & MANGANESE WATER TREATMNT	358	$500,000	$148,932,404
ARIZONA	AZ03104-0801	CAMERON DUMP CLOSURE	359	$50,000	$148,982,404
ARIZONA	AZ03104-0301	CAMERON CI - WELL & SCADA	360	$255,000	$149,237,404
ARIZONA	AZ01902-0501	GANADO DUMP CLOSURE	361	$75,000	$149,312,404

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ01073-0301	SAINT MICHAELS DUMP CLOSURE	362	$50,000	$149,362,404
ARIZONA	AZ01073-0201	WINDOW RK LOOP RD INTERCONNECT	363	$220,000	$149,582,404
ARIZONA	AZ01066-0401	WHEATFIELDS-TSAILE SOLID WASTE	364	$75,000	$149,657,404
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0A01	RED VALLEY N WELL RENOVATION	365	$50,000	$149,707,404
ARIZONA	AZ01042-0201	PINE SPRINGS WELL	366	$200,000	$149,907,404
ARIZONA	AZ01039-0101	BIG FREE WELL NAVAJO UPGRADE	367	$500,000	$150,407,404
ARIZONA	AZ01037-0301	JESS WHITE WATER SYSTEM	368	$60,000	$150,467,404
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0501	MANY FARMS SOLID WASTE	369	$75,000	$150,542,404
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0401	CHINLE WWTP IMPROVEMENTS	370	$154,000	$150,696,404
ARIZONA	AZ01004-0101	BLUE CANYON DAM	371	$2,500,000	$153,196,404
UTAH	UT19813-0401	NAVAJO MTN WATER SERVICE LINES	372	$80,000	$153,276,404
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0601	MARIANO LAKE EXTENSIONS PH. I	373	$2,154,000	$155,430,404
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0201	WHITE CONE NAAHTEE CANYON CISTERNS	374	$333,000	$155,763,404
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0101	WHITE CONE SCATTERED CISTERNS	375	$232,000	$155,995,404
ARIZONA	AZ09190-0201	MITCHEL BUTTE CISTERNS	376	$131,000	$156,126,404
ARIZONA	AZ09190-0102	MON VALLY SAGEBRUSH EXT & W PT.@	377	$179,000	$156,305,404
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0701	DIST 7- FLAT MESA CISTERNS	378	$301,000	$156,606,404
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0301	DIST 7-WATER BLOWING CISTERNS	379	$269,000	$156,875,404
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0101	DIST. 7-TEESTOH SCAT CISTERNS	380	$744,500	$157,619,904
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0903	INDIAN WELLS - FIVE BUTTES E. CISTERNS	381	$165,000	$157,784,904
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0901	INDIAN WELLS - FIVE BUTTES CISTRENS	382	$533,500	$158,318,404
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0801	INDIAN WELLS - TWIN PEAKS CISTERNS	383	$377,000	$158,695,404
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0202	INDIAN WELLS-PUEBLO CO II CISTERNS	384	$188,500	$158,883,904
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0201	INDIAN WELLS PUEBLO COLO EXT.	385	$250,000	$159,133,904
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0101	INDIAN WELLS SCAT CISTERNS	386	$667,000	$159,800,904
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1101	DILKON - CHIMNEY BUTTE CISTERNS	387	$489,500	$160,290,404
ARIZONA	AZ09158-0101	DILKON SCATTERED CISTERNS	388	$962,500	$161,252,904
ARIZONA	AZ09150-1001	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS REMOTE CISTERNS	389	$79,200	$161,332,104
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0801	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRGS MAIL BICHASHKEN CIST	390	$98,800	$161,430,904
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1201	DIST 7 - GW SOUTH WASH CISTERNS	391	$142,000	$161,572,904

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1101	DIST 7 - GW SPENCER CISTERNS	392	$171,000	$161,743,904
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1001	DIST 7 - JIMMIE EXTENSION CISTERNS	393	$185,500	$161,929,404
ARIZONA	AZ09033-0401	DIST. 7 - GW SCATTERED CISTERNS	394	$936,500	$162,865,904
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0501	TUBA CITY REGIONAL LANDFILL	395	$2,000,000	$164,865,904
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0102	DIST 5 - TOLANI LAKE PRICE II CISTERNS	396	$96,600	$164,962,504
ARIZONA	AZ03127-0401	NAVAJO MTN. ARIZONA CISTERNS	397	$350,000	$165,312,504
ARIZONA	AZ03127-0201	NAVAJO MTN PIUTE CANYON CISTERNS	398	$322,000	$165,634,504
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0A05	KAIBETO - N. HWY. 98 GESHIE EXTENSIONS V	399	$94,000	$165,728,504
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0A02	KAIBETO- N.E. GESHIE EXTENSIONS II	400	$162,000	$165,890,504
ARIZONA	AZ03118-0102	GRAY MTN NEEDMORE AREA CISTERNS	401	$388,000	$166,278,504
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0401	GREY CACTUS RD EXT CISTERNS	402	$789,000	$167,067,504
ARIZONA	AZ01066-0301	WHEATFIELDS SE EXT 2 CISTERNS	403	$217,500	$167,285,004
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0701	TEECNOSPOS/YELLOW ROCK	404	$438,000	$167,723,004
ARIZONA	AZ01056-0401	STEAMBOAT CANYON SOUTH CISTERNS	405	$348,000	$168,071,004
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0402	SAWMILL WHITE CLAY CISTERNS	406	$576,917	$168,647,921
ARIZONA	AZ01047-0202	ROUGH ROCK E PH 2 CISTERNS	407	$225,000	$168,872,921
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0801	NAZLINI WEST SCATTERED CISTERNS	408	$95,000	$168,967,921
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0301	CARSON MESA-M.F CISTERNS	409	$237,390	$169,205,311
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0102	NAVAJO STATION ROAD PHASE II	410	$343,000	$169,548,311
ARIZONA	AZ01016-0201	COVE SCATTERED WATER CONNECTION	411	$396,000	$169,944,311
NEW MEXICO	NM23571-0401	COUNSELOR LAGOON EXPANSION	412	$15,000	$169,959,311
ARIZONA	AZ09190-0103	MON. VALLEY - SAGEBRUSH EXT.	413	$218,000	$170,177,311
ARIZONA	AZ09158-0301	DILKON STANDING HORSE MESA	414	$381,000	$170,558,311
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0A03	KAIBETO - N.E GESHIE EXTENSION III	415	$143,000	$170,701,311
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0701	RAMAH PINEHILL SOUTH CISTERNS	416	$1,090,000	$171,791,311
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0401	RAMAH/GOAT HILL CISTERNS	417	$1,090,000	$172,881,311
NEW MEXICO	NM28341-0401	ALAMO LAGOON UPGRADE/EXPANSION	418	$0	$172,881,311
NEW MEXICO	NM24639-0101	LAKE VALLEY-TSAYA CYN. CISTERNS	419	$106,500	$172,987,811
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0901	SHIPROCK FARM AREA A CISTERNS	420	$161,000	$173,148,811
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0401	CRYSTAL-RED VALLEY CISTERNS	421	$61,000	$173,209,811

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0501	LITTLEWATER SOUTH CISTERNS	422	$745,650	$173,955,461
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0401	LITTLEWATER SW CISTERNS	423	$137,500	$174,092,961
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0301	LITTLEWATER NW CISTERNS	424	$213,000	$174,305,961
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0301	RINCON MARQUIS CISTERNS	425	$437,500	$174,743,461
NEW MEXICO	NM17483-0301	TOHATCHI CISTERNS	426	$212,600	$174,956,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0301	STANDING ROCK NE CISTERNS	427	$693,000	$175,649,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0201	STANDING ROCK SCATTERED CISTERN	428	$157,000	$175,806,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0101	STANDING ROCK SOUTH CISTERNS	429	$258,000	$176,064,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17446-0101	LAKE VALLEY NORTH CISTERNS	430	$665,000	$176,729,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17426-0201	NAHODISHGISH CISTERNS	431	$198,000	$176,927,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0902	CHURCHROCK NIHWIDLIZ CISTERNS	432	$273,000	$177,200,061
NEW MEXICO	NM17403-0301	BACA BLUEWATER LAKE CISTERNS	433	$349,600	$177,549,661
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0701	FOREST LAKE NORTH CISTERNS	434	$312,000	$177,861,661
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0A04	KAIBETO - N.E GESHIE EXTENSIONS IV	435	$204,000	$178,065,661
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1403	LEUPP - GRAND FALLS SCATT CISTERNS	436	$34,000	$178,099,661
ARIZONA	AZ01048-0501	ROUND ROCK WELL & WATERLINE	437	$555,115	$178,654,776
ARIZONA	AZ01048-0201	ROUND ROCK SCATTERED CISTERNS	438	$390,000	$179,044,776
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0801	ROCK POINT S. PH 2 CISTERNS	439	$667,200	$179,711,976
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0701	NAZLINI WEST CISTERNS	440	$187,300	$179,899,276
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0402	BEAUTIFUL VALLEY PHASE 2 CISTERNS	441	$396,000	$180,295,276
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0301	NAZLINE NORTH CISTERNS	442	$297,000	$180,592,276
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0401	MANY FARMS LAKE PH2	443	$478,960	$181,071,236
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0301	LUPTON SOUTH CISTERNS	444	$365,000	$181,436,236
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0201	LUPTON EAST - UPPER CISTERNS	445	$555,000	$181,991,236
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0301	TRANSWESTERN STATION CISTERNS	446	$382,200	$182,373,436
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0401	HOUCK NORTH CISTERNS	447	$335,000	$182,708,436
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0601	NEWCOMB INDIVIDUAL SEWER UPGRAD	448	$72,000	$182,780,436
NEW MEXICO	NM23573-0301	TORREON FAILED DRAINFIELDS	449	$133,000	$182,913,436
NEW MEXICO	NM17458-0401	PINEDALE FAILED DRAINFIELDS	450	$224,000	$183,137,436
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0601	CHURCHROCK FAILED DRAINFIELDS	451	$366,000	$183,503,436
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0801	WHITE CONE SHABI LAGOON	452	$16,000	$183,519,436

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0701	MITTENROCK DRAINFIELD REPLACE	453	$75,000	$183,594,436
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0101	SOUTHWEST BONITO CREEK	454	$189,000	$183,783,436
UTAH	UT19805-0101	FOX CAMP CISTERNS	455	$108,000	$183,891,436
NEW MEXICO	NM24645-0201	WHITEROCK CISTERNS	456	$608,000	$184,499,436
NEW MEXICO	NM24623-0102	WILSON EXTENSION CISTERN	457	$51,300	$184,550,736
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0301	CRYSTAL- HIGH NARBONA PASS CISTERNS	458	$221,000	$184,771,736
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0801	FOREST LAKE HUD LAGOON EXPANSION	459	$0	$184,771,736
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1302	DIST. 5 - CANYON DIABLO CISTERNS	460	$153,000	$184,924,736
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1201	DIST. 5 - LEUPP PADRE CANYON CISTERN	461	$306,000	$185,230,736
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1101	DIST 5 - LEUPP SAN FRANCISCO WASH CIST.	462	$221,000	$185,451,736
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1001	DIST. 5 - LEUPP WEST CISTERNS	463	$714,000	$186,165,736
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0101	COALMINE SCATTERED CISTERNS	464	$288,000	$186,453,736
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0103	SPIDER ROCK CISTERNS	465	$594,000	$187,047,736
ARIZONA	AZ01048-0601	ROUND ROCK SE/NW EXTENSIONS	466	$769,000	$187,816,736
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0601	CANONCITO ADDITIONAL SOURCE NTUA	467	$500,000	$188,316,736
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0501	CANONCITO WATER SYSTEM O&M	468	$140,000	$188,456,736
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0B01	TEECNOSPOS WATERLINE REPLACEMENT	469	$77,000	$188,533,736
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0201	Baby Rocks 1st Service-Dennehe*	470	$453,000	$188,986,736
NEW MEXICO	NM17467-0203	TWIN BUTTES WATER SYSTEM PH. III	471	$787,000	$189,773,736
NEW MEXICO	NM17467-0202	TWIN BUTTES WATER SYSTEM PH. II	472	$780,000	$190,553,736
ARIZONA	AZ09921-1201	WHITE CONE - ASHLEY EXTENSION	473	$230,000	$190,783,736
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0303	HOUCK NORTHWEST	474	$444,000	$191,227,736
ARIZONA	AZ09166-1001	EL CAP EAST WATERLINE EXT.	475	$510,000	$191,737,736
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0601	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS HWY 99 CISTERNS	476	$315,400	$192,053,136
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0901	ROCK PT NORTH PHASE 2 CISTERNS	477	$286,000	$192,339,136
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0202	Baby Rocks to Church Rk Ph II	478	$598,000	$192,937,136
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0602	CHINLE REGIONAL LANDFILL	479	$2,000,000	$194,937,136
NEW MEXICO	NM24634-0101	DEADMAN'S WASH-SOUTH HOGBACK	480	$165,000	$195,102,136
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0301	SANOSTEE SOUTH EXTENSION	481	$541,425	$195,643,561
NEW MEXICO	NM24623-0401	NASCHITTI WILDCAT SPRINGS EXTENSION	482	$1,572,000	$197,215,561

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17489-0201	WHITEWATER - CHICHILTAH	483	$3,946,000	$201,161,561
NEW MEXICO	NM17487-1001	TWIN LAKES WEST EXT PHASE II	484	$292,800	$201,454,361
NEW MEXICO	NM17447-0102	MANUELITO CHAPTER HOUSE AREA PH II	485	$483,000	$201,937,361
NEW MEXICO	NM17446-0301	LAKE VALLEY WEST EXTENSION	486	$556,000	$202,493,361
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0201	BODAWAY RED HILL EXTENSION	487	$360,600	$202,853,961
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0601	MITTENROCK NORTH	488	$504,260	$203,358,221
ARIZONA	AZ01026-1202	HOUCK - ALLENTOWN PHASE II	489	$128,000	$203,486,221
ARIZONA	AZ09186-0101	TSEGI KAYENTA WEST	490	$1,233,000	$204,719,221
UTAH	UT19815-0A01	RED MESA PUMPHOUSE	491	$31,000	$204,750,221
UTAH	UT19808-0901	OLJATOH-MONUMENT VALLEY SCADA	492	$90,000	$204,840,221
UTAH	UT19806-0501	MONTEZUMA CREEK LAGOON UPGRADE	493	$25,000	$204,865,221
UTAH	UT19806-0301	MONTEZUMA CREEK PUMPHOUSE	494	$40,000	$204,905,221
UTAH	UT19805-0201	MEXICAN HAT WATER TRMT POND NTUA	495	$45,000	$204,950,221
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-E01	MISC WATERLINE UPGRADES	496	$25,000	$204,975,221
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-D01	6" PIPELINE REPLACEMENT	497	$75,000	$205,050,221
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-1001	SHIPROCK WATER TRMT PLANT INTAKE NTUA	498	$1	$205,050,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0101	SHIPROCK WASTEWATER TRMT PLANT	499	$250,000	$205,300,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24630-0701	NORTH SHEEPSPRINGS TELEMETRY	500	$10,000	$205,310,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24630-0601	SHEEP SPRINGS WATERLINE REPLACE	501	$75,000	$205,385,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0801	SANOSTEE WELL	502	$270,000	$205,655,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0501	SANOSTEE-LITTLEWATER WST	503	$1,000	$205,656,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-1201	NEWCOMB WELL	504	$270,000	$205,926,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-1001	SHEEPSPRINGS/NEWCOMB INTERTIE	505	$42,000	$205,968,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0901	NEWCOMB WEST WELL RENOVATION	506	$30,000	$205,998,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0801	NEWCOMB WEST WATER STORAGE TANK	507	$5,000	$206,003,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24616-0201	DZ/CARSON WATER SOURCE NTUA	508	$340,000	$206,343,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24610-0101	FARMINGTON-SHIPROCK UPGRADE	509	$1,000,000	$207,343,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0801	CRYSTAL ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	510	$250,000	$207,593,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24601-0401	BECLABITO WATERLINE REPLACEMENT	511	$50,000	$207,643,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17489-0501	CHICHILTAH REGIONAL WATER SOURCE NTUA	512	$500,000	$208,143,222

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17487-0901	TWIN LAKES ADDITIONAL SOURCE NTUA	513	$300,000	$208,443,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17480-0601	THOREAU ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	514	$125,000	$208,568,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17480-0501	THOREAU TANK #1 MODIFICATIONS	515	$50,000	$208,618,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17480-0401	THOREAU/BACA WELL	516	$250,000	$208,868,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17475-0401	SMITH LAKE ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	517	$750,000	$209,618,222
NEW MEXICO	NM17443-0101	CHURCHROCK/IND V WATER TRTMNT	518	$500,000	$210,118,222
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0601	JEDDITO ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	519	$125,000	$210,243,222
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0801	PINON ADDITIONAL WATER SOURCE NTUA	520	$0	$210,243,222
ARIZONA	AZ09166-1201	KAYENTA SOLID WASTE HAUL TRUCK	521	$100,000	$210,343,222
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0901	KAYENTA ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	522	$0	$210,343,222
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0801	KAYENTA SCADA	523	$120,000	$210,463,222
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0801	HARDROCK-TALLSALT EXTENSION	524	$120,000	$210,583,222
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0701	HARDROCK SCADA	525	$50,000	$210,633,222
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0901	TUBA CITY WELL SCADA CONTROLS	526	$80,000	$210,713,222
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0601	TUBA CITY COMPOSITE AS-BUILTS	527	$80,000	$210,793,222
ARIZONA	AZ03135-0401	TUBA CITY O & M UPGRADE	528	$50,000	$210,843,222
ARIZONA	AZ03131-0401	RED LAKE SCADA	529	$100,000	$210,943,222
ARIZONA	AZ03122-0501	LE CHEE SCADA	530	$30,000	$210,973,222
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0401	COPPERMINE SCADA	531	$30,000	$211,003,222
ARIZONA	AZ03108-0A01	LEUPP COM. SEWER LAGOON CIP	532	$100,000	$211,103,222
ARIZONA	AZ03108-0901	LEUPP-DISTRICT 5 SCADA	533	$90,000	$211,193,222
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0601	BODAWAY O & M UPGRADE	534	$50,000	$211,243,222
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0801	TSAILE AC PIPE REPLACEMENT	535	$300,000	$211,543,222
ARIZONA	AZ01902-0401	GANADO REGIONAL WATER WELL NTUA	536	$0	$211,543,222
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0701	SAWMILL ADDT'L WATER SOURCE NTUA	537	$320,000	$211,863,222
ARIZONA	AZ01045-B01	MITTENROCK PUMPHOUSE IMPROVEMENTS	538	$50,000	$211,913,222
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0601	NAZLINI WELL	539	$200,000	$212,113,222
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0501	FT. DEFIANCE WATER SOURCE NTUA	540	$0	$212,113,222
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0601	DENNEHOTSO SCADA	541	$50,000	$212,163,222
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0801	CHILCHINBETO SCADA	542	$50,000	$212,213,222

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0802	SHONTO TALL MOUNTAIN WATER SYSTEM II	543	$440,000	$212,653,222
UTAH	UT19806-0401	MONTEZUMA CREEK NORTH EXTENSION	544	$384,000	$213,037,222
UTAH	UT19800-1101	MAIL TRAIL MESA	545	$500,000	$213,537,222
NEW MEXICO	NM24628-0102	PUEBLO BONITO-CHACO CANYON, PHASE II	546	$339,750	$213,876,972
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0201	CANONCITO POWERLINE EXTENSION	547	$243,000	$214,119,972
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0302	HOUCK BURNTWATER WASH PHASE II	548	$477,000	$214,596,972
ARIZONA	AZ01017-0102	CISTERN FOLLOW-UP	549	$8,000,000	$222,596,972
UTAH	UT19805-0301	MEXICAN HAT WATER SYSTEM STUDY NTUA	550	$0	$222,596,972
NEW MEXICO	NM17487-0801	TWIN LAKES REGIONAL WATER STUDY NTUA	551	$28,000	$222,624,972
NEW MEXICO	NM17483-0101	TOHATCHI TANK REPAIR	552	$30,000	$222,654,972
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0901	WHITE CONE TANK PAINTING	553	$31,000	$222,685,972
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0701	KAYENTA COMPOSITE AS-BUILTS	554	$80,000	$222,765,972
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0701	INDIAN WELLS TANK PAINTING	555	$30,000	$222,795,972
ARIZONA	AZ09158-0701	Dist 7 - Dilkon Tank Painting	556	$80,000	$222,875,972
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0701	SCADA SYSTEM EXPANSION NTUA	557	$0	$222,875,972
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0601	O&M SYSTEM WIDE OPTIMIZATION NTUA	558	$300,000	$223,175,972
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1401	LEUPP - GRAND FALLS WATERING POINT @	559	$375,000	$223,550,972
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0402	COALMINE MESA SALT WATER SYSTEM	560	$800,000	$224,350,972
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0401	COALMINE MESA SALT WATER WELL @	561	$638,000	$224,988,972
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0502	CANE VALLEY II	562	$252,000	$225,240,972
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0501	CANE VALLEY I (DOE) W PT. @	563	$1,389,000	$226,629,972
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0301	FARM AREA "A" SEWER EXTENSION	564	$1,506,000	$228,135,972
ARIZONA	AZ03127-0501	NAVAJO MTN. LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY	565	$0	$228,135,972
ARIZONA	AZ01024-0202	FT DEFIANCE INFEASIBLE WATER	566	$1,000,000	$229,135,972
NEW MEXICO	NM17444-0401	IYANBITO PLUMBING REPAIRS	567	$176,000	$229,311,972
UTAH	UT19800-0202	ANETH SCATTERED WATER EXTEN II	568	$2,000,000	$231,311,972
NEW MEXICO	NM23572-0202	OJO ENCINO EXTENSIONS II	569	$900,000	$232,211,972
ARIZONA	AZ03123-0103	Navajo Springs Well	570	$159,500	$232,371,472
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0503	CANE VALLEY N CISTERNS III	571	$310,000	$232,681,472

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17423-0301	BASS LAKE SYSTEM UPGRADE	572	$317,000	$232,998,472
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0402	ROCK PT NORTH PHASE II	573	$555,500	$233,553,972
ARIZONA	AZ09921-1101	WHITE CONE - MESA UPHILL	574	$175,000	$233,728,972
NEW MEXICO	NM01084-0102	CANONCITO RURAL	575	$1,250,000	$234,978,972
ARIZONA	AZ09921-1001	WHITE CONE - EAST EXTENSION	576	$290,000	$235,268,972
UTAH	UT19815-0902	SE CISTERN WATER LINE EXTNS II	577	$175,000	$235,443,972
UTAH	UT19815-0802	WHITE MESA WATERLINE EXTENSION	578	$417,000	$235,860,972
UTAH	UT19815-0602	RED MESA SOUTH EAST II	579	$669,000	$236,529,972
UTAH	UT19815-0402	RED MESA SOUTH WATERLINES	580	$136,000	$236,665,972
UTAH	UT19815-0302	SLICKHORN EXTENSION	581	$234,000	$236,899,972
UTAH	UT19812-0205	MEXICAN WATER SOUTH V	582	$730,000	$237,629,972
UTAH	UT19812-0204	MEXICAN WATER SOUTH IV	583	$800,000	$238,429,972
UTAH	UT19812-0203	MEXICAN WATER SOUTH III	584	$873,000	$239,302,972
UTAH	UT19812-0202	MEXICAN WATER NORTH II	585	$910,000	$240,212,972
UTAH	UT19812-0105	TODAHAIDEKANI NE V	586	$464,000	$240,676,972
UTAH	UT19812-0104	TODAHAIDEKANI SW IV	587	$1,000,000	$241,676,972
UTAH	UT19812-0103	TODAHAIDEKANI NW III	588	$216,000	$241,892,972
UTAH	UT19812-0102	TODAHAIDEKANI-JACK JONES II	589	$361,000	$242,253,972
UTAH	UT19808-1302	TRAIN ROCK WATERLINE EXTENSION	590	$254,500	$242,508,472
UTAH	UT19808-0103	OLJATOH SCAT EXT.	591	$1,200,000	$243,708,472
UTAH	UT19808-0102	PIUTE FARMS WATERLINE EXT.	592	$1,030,000	$244,738,472
UTAH	UT19807-0302	DOUGLAS MESA WATERLINE	593	$720,000	$245,458,472
UTAH	UT19807-0202	EAGLE MESA LOOP WATERLINE	594	$295,000	$245,753,472
UTAH	UT19806-0202	MONTEZUMA CREEK EXTENSION	595	$400,000	$246,153,472
UTAH	UT19805-0102	FOX CAMP WATER EXT.	596	$109,000	$246,262,472
NEW MEXICO	NM24645-0202	WHITEROCK EXTENSIONS	597	$2,875,000	$249,137,472
NEW MEXICO	NM24641-0202	TWO GREY HILLS PHASE V	598	$188,400	$249,325,872
NEW MEXICO	NM24639-0102	LAKE VALLEY-TSAYA CYN. EXT.	599	$1,160,000	$250,485,872
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0B01	INDIAN VILLAGE IMPROVEMENTS	600	$32,000	$250,517,872
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0A02	SOUTH SHIPROCK WATERLINE EXT.	601	$594,000	$251,111,872
NEW MEXICO	NM24631-0902	SHIPROCK FARM AREA A EXTENSION	602	$390,000	$251,501,872

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM24630-0402	SHEEPSPRINGS EAST EXTENSION	603	$548,000	$252,049,872
NEW MEXICO	NM24629-0202	YELLOWHILL TO TABLE MESA EXTENSION	604	$207,500	$252,257,372
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0402	BURNHAM JCT EXT./BURNHAM RD II	605	$522,000	$252,779,372
NEW MEXICO	NM24624-0202	NEWCOMB EAST II	606	$788,000	$253,567,372
NEW MEXICO	NM24623-0103	BLUEROCK-WILSON EXTENSION PHASE II	607	$172,000	$253,739,372
NEW MEXICO	NM24616-0302	HUERFANO WATERLINE EXTENSIONS	608	$200,000	$253,939,372
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0502	CRYSTAL-MILKWATER PHASE II	609	$678,480	$254,617,852
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0402	CRYSTAL-RED VALLEY WATER EXTENSION	610	$100,000	$254,717,852
NEW MEXICO	NM24608-0302	CRYSTAL- HIGH NARROWS PASS EXT	611	$927,200	$255,645,052
NEW MEXICO	NM24601-0502	BECLABITO WHITNEY EXTENSION II	612	$558,000	$256,203,052
NEW MEXICO	NM24413-0402	SERVICE FOR HOMES W/CISTERNS II	613	$1,800,000	$258,003,052
NEW MEXICO	NM24413-0302	BURNHAM-HUNTER WASH SYSTEM II	614	$617,000	$258,620,052
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0502	LITTLEWATER SOUTH EXTENSION	615	$1,197,224	$259,817,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0402	LITTLEWATER SW EXTENSION	616	$375,000	$260,192,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17503-0302	LITTLEWATER NW EXTENSIONS	617	$490,000	$260,682,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0302	RINCON MARQUIS WATER SYSTEM	618	$680,000	$261,362,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0202	WHITEHORSE LAKE EAST EXTENSIONS	619	$2,700,000	$264,062,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17491-0102	WHITEHORSE LAKE NORTH EXTN PH I	620	$475,000	$264,537,276
NEW MEXICO	NM17483-0302	TOHATCHI EXTENSIONS	621	$736,850	$265,274,126
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0302	STANDING ROCK NE EXTENSION	622	$1,445,000	$266,719,126
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0202	STANDING ROCK SCATTERED EXTENS	623	$1,250,000	$267,969,126
NEW MEXICO	NM17477-0102	STANDING ROCK SOUTH EXTENSION	624	$627,000	$268,596,126
NEW MEXICO	NM17470-0502	ROCK SPRINGS SCATT INFEASIBLE	625	$27,300	$268,623,426
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0602	MARIANO LAKE EXTENSIONS PH. II	626	$1,120,000	$269,743,426
NEW MEXICO	NM17446-0102	LAKE VALLEY NORTH EXTENSIONS	627	$879,000	$270,622,426
NEW MEXICO	NM17426-0202	NAHODISHGISH EXTENSIONS	628	$815,000	$271,437,426
NEW MEXICO	NM17423-0502	COYOTE CANYON EAST EXTENSION	629	$2,299,000	$273,736,426
NEW MEXICO	NM17419-0102	COALMINE 5 MNT INFEAS WATER	630	$371,500	$274,107,926
NEW MEXICO	NM17418-0903	CHURCHROCK NIHWIDLIZ EXTENSION	631	$420,000	$274,527,926
NEW MEXICO	NM17408-0202	BREAD SPRINGS PINEHAVEN EXT	632	$100,000	$274,627,926

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW MEXICO	NM17403-0302	BACA BLUEWATER LAKE EXTENSIONS	633	$575,000	$275,202,926
ARIZONA	AZ09997-0202	KITSILLIE EAST WATER EXTENSION	634	$308,000	$275,510,926
ARIZONA	AZ09923-0402	JEDDITO INFEASIBLE EXTENSIONS	635	$1,100,000	$276,610,926
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0304	WHITE CONE 2ND FLAT MESA II EXTENSION	636	$280,000	$276,890,926
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0202	WHITE CONE NAAHTEE CANYON EXTENSION	637	$625,000	$277,515,926
ARIZONA	AZ09921-0102	WHITE CONE SCATTERED EXTENSION	638	$501,600	$278,017,526
ARIZONA	AZ09190-0202	MITCHEL BUTTE WATERLINE	639	$231,000	$278,248,526
ARIZONA	AZ09186-0203	KAYENTA SCATTERED EXT	640	$1,400,000	$279,648,526
ARIZONA	AZ09186-0202	KAYENTA/BLACK MESA EXT	641	$1,038,000	$280,686,526
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0703	DIST 7 - FLAT MESA II EXTENSIONS	642	$400,000	$281,086,526
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0702	DIST 7- FLAT MESA I EXTENSIONS	643	$495,000	$281,581,526
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0302	DIST 7 - WATER BLOWING EXTENSION	644	$700,000	$282,281,526
ARIZONA	AZ09184-0102	DIST 7 - TEESTOH SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	645	$2,006,400	$284,287,926
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0902	SHONTO SCATTERED EXTENSION	646	$410,000	$284,697,926
ARIZONA	AZ09175-0402	PINON SCATTERED PHASE 4	647	$2,580,000	$287,277,926
ARIZONA	AZ09166-1102	EL CAP WEST WATERLINE	648	$538,000	$287,815,926
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0402	KAYENTA EAST EXTENSION	649	$344,740	$288,160,666
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0306	COMB RIDGE-SPECK/STANLEY EXT	650	$440,000	$288,600,666
ARIZONA	AZ09166-0304	COMB RIDGE-GRAY/WHITEHORSE EXT.	651	$162,000	$288,762,666
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0904	INDIAN WELLS - FIVE BUTTES E. EXTENSION	652	$420,000	$289,182,666
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0902	INDIAN WELLS - FIVE BUTTES EXTENSION	653	$1,270,000	$290,452,666
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0802	INDIAN WELLS - TWIN PEAKS EXTENSION	654	$880,000	$291,332,666
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0203	INDIAN WELLS-PUEBLO COLORADO II EXT	655	$713,000	$292,045,666
ARIZONA	AZ09164-0102	INDIAN WELLS SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	656	$1,531,200	$293,576,866
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0602	HARDROCK ISOLATED EXTENSION	657	$140,000	$293,716,866
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0402	HARDROCK GOY/SLEEPY MTN EXTENSION	658	$1,167,610	$294,884,476
ARIZONA	AZ09162-0202	White Valley off Dst. 1V Syst.	659	$142,000	$295,026,476
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0702	FOREST LAKE NORTH WATER EXT.	660	$555,500	$295,581,976
ARIZONA	AZ09160-0202	FOREST LAKE INFEASIBLE EXT.	661	$2,800,000	$298,381,976

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Comm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1104	DILKON-JOHN'S DRAW 2	662	$695,000	$299,076,976
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1103	DILKON-JOHN'S DRAW 1	663	$400,000	$299,476,976
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1102	DILKON-CHIMNEY BUTTE EXTENSION	664	$380,000	$299,856,976
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1003	DILKON-COYOTE WASH EXTENSION	665	$600,000	$300,456,976
ARIZONA	AZ09158-1002	DILKON - PYRAMID BUTTE EXT.	666	$980,000	$301,436,976
ARIZONA	AZ09158-0102	DILKON SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	667	$1,768,800	$303,205,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-1002	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS REMOTE EXTENSIONS	668	$264,000	$303,469,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0804	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS TOJI ANIZAAD EXT.	669	$413,200	$303,882,976
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0802	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRNGS MAII BICHASHKEH EXT	670	$633,600	$304 516,576
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0702	DIST 5 - BIRDSPRINGS SOUTH EXT.	671	$211,200	$304,727,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0602	DIST 5 - BIRDSPRINGS HWY 99 EXTENSION	672	$1,177,000	$305,904,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0502	DIST 5 - BIRDSPRINGS LONG EXTENSION	673	$250,000	$306,154,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0402	DIST. 5 - BIRDSPRINGS RINCON BASIN EXT	674	$550,000	$306,704,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0302	DIST. 5 - N. BIRDSPRINGS 2 EXTENSION	675	$152,000	$306,856,776
ARIZONA	AZ09150-0202	DIST 5 - N BIRDSPRINGS 1 EXTENSION	676	$165,000	$307,021,776
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1202	DIST 7 - GW SOUTH WASH	677	$360,000	$307,381,776
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1102	DIST 7 - GW SPENCER EXTENSION	678	$350,000	$307,731,776
ARIZONA	AZ09033-1002	DIST 7 - JIMMIE EXTENSION	679	$320,000	$308,051,776
ARIZONA	AZ09033-0402	DIST 7 - GW SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	680	$1,795,200	$309,846,976
ARIZONA	AZ03135-1002	TUBA CITY CISTERN UPGRADE	681	$525,000	$310,371,976
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0902	TOLANI LAKE SCATTERED EXTENSIONS	682	$340,000	$310,711,976
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0804	DIST. 5 - TOLANI LK BLACK FALLS II EXT	683	$270,000	$310,981,976
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0702	DIST. 5 - TOLANI LAKE BELONE EXTENSION	684	$264,000	$311,245,976
ARIZONA	AZ03132-0103	DIST. 5 - TOLANI LAKE PRICE II EXTENSION	685	$596,000	$311,841,976
ARIZONA	AZ03131-0102	RED LAKE SCAT. COMM WATER	686	$450,000	$312,291,976
ARIZONA	AZ03122-0102	Le Chee Scattered II	687	$1,100,000	$313,391,976
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0902	KAIBETO; GREY MESA EXTENSION	688	$385,000	$313,776,976
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0802	KAIBETO LONG CANYON WATER EXT	689	$795,000	$314,571,976
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0702	KAIBETO SCATTERED EXTENSION	690	$350,000	$314,921,976

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ03121-0402	N.W KAIBETO - BENALLY EXT	691	$216,000	$315,137,976
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0702	INSE HSE ISOLATED EXTENSIONS	692	$245,000	$315,382,976
ARIZONA	AZ03110-0103	COW SPRINGS WATER EXTENSION	693	$300,000	$315,682,976
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0204	COMMUNITY WATER EXT	694	$3,360,000	$319,042,976
ARIZONA	AZ03109-0203	COPPERMINE COMMUNITY SYSTEM - NORTH	695	$530,000	$319,572,976
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1404	LEUPP - GRAND FALLS SCATT EXTENSIONS	696	$316,000	$319,888,976
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1303	DIST. 5 - CANYON DIABLO EXTENSION	697	$280,000	$320,168,976
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1202	DIST 5 - PADRE CANYON EXTENSION	698	$845,000	$321,013,976
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1102	DIST. 5 - SAN FRANCISCO WASH EXT	699	$550,000	$321,563,976
ARIZONA	AZ03108-1002	DIST 5 - LEUPP WEST EXTENSION	700	$1,300,000	$322,863,976
ARIZONA	AZ03107-0102	COALMINE WATERLINE EXT	701	$1,056,000	$323,919,976
ARIZONA	AZ03104-0502	Cameron Scattered II	702	$1,629,000	$325,548,976
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0502	BODAWAY Hidden Springs Community	703	$334,400	$325,883,376
ARIZONA	AZ03103-0302	BODAWAY SCATT SYSTEMS UPGRADE	704	$980,000	$326,863,376
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0502	BLACK ROCK-TSAILE (15)	705	$737,000	$327,600,376
ARIZONA	AZ01910-0402	BLACK ROCK-TSAILE (32)	706	$1,022,000	$328,622,376
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0502	WIDE RUINS INFEASIBLE	707	$1,000,000	$329,622,376
ARIZONA	AZ01072-0402	GREY CACTUS RD EXT INF WATER	708	$1,424,000	$331,046,376
ARIZONA	AZ01066-0302	WHEATFIELDS SE EXT.2 INF WATER	709	$343,000	$331,389,376
ARIZONA	AZ01061-1002	TEECNOSPOS SCATTERED EXT.	710	$464,000	$331,853,376
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0302	SERVICE FOR HOMES W/CISTERNS II	711	$140,000	$331,993,376
ARIZONA	AZ01058-0202	SWEETWATER WATERLINE I	712	$1,243,000	$333,236,376
ARIZONA	AZ01056-0402	STEAMBOAT CANYON SO. INF. WATER	713	$600,012	$333,836,388
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0106	SPIDER ROCK-CHINLE PHASE 5	714	$226,800	$334,063,188
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0105	SPIDER ROCK-CHINLE PHASE 4	715	$105,000	$334,168,188
ARIZONA	AZ01054-0104	SPIDER ROCK-CHINLE PHASE 3	716	$494,900	$334,663,088
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0403	SAWMILL WHITE CLAY INFEAS WATER	717	$1,129,810	$335,792,898
ARIZONA	AZ01053-0302	SOUTH WEST INFEASIBLE CISTERNS	718	$1,500,000	$337,292,898
ARIZONA	AZ01048-0202	ROUND ROCK SCATTERED, PART II	719	$1,000,000	$338,292,898
ARIZONA	AZ01047-0203	ROUGH ROCK E PH 2 INFEAS. WATER	720	$380,370	$338,673,268

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0902	ROCK PT NORTH PH 2 EXTENSION	721	$289,000	$338,962,268
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0803	ROCK POINT SOUTH BOOST EXT. III	722	$300,000	$339,262,268
ARIZONA	AZ01046-0802	ROCK POINT S. WATER EXT. II	723	$941,000	$340,203,268
ARIZONA	AZ01045-0802	RED VALLEY SCATTERED II	724	$150,000	$340,353,268
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0502	OAK SPRINGS EAST (TOP)	725	$398,233	$340,751,501
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0402	OAK SPRINGS BLACK CREEK EXT PH	726	$339,000	$341,090,501
ARIZONA	AZ01041-0302	OAK SPRINGS SUMMIT EXT PH 2	727	$145,000	$341,235,501
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0802	NAZLINI WEST WATER EXTENSION	728	$350,000	$341,585,501
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0702	NAZLINI WEST WATER EXT II	729	$646,000	$342,231,501
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0403	BEAUTIFUL VALLEY PH2 INFEA EXT.	730	$580,230	$342,811,731
ARIZONA	AZ01040-0302	NAZLINI NORTH EXT INFEAS WATER	731	$671,440	$343,483,171
ARIZONA	AZ01037-0202	MEXICAN WATER D.BLACKWATER CAM	732	$217,000	$343,700,171
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0702	MANY FARMS LAKE EAST EXTENS	733	$200,000	$343,900,171
ARIZONA	AZ01036-0302	CARSON MESA-M. F. INFEAS WATER	734	$394,110	$344,294,281
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0302	LUPTON SOUTH EXTENSIONS	735	$476,000	$344,770,281
ARIZONA	AZ01035-0202	LUPTON EAST - UPPER EXTENSION	736	$806,000	$345,576,281
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0302	TRANSWESTERN ST RD INFEAS. WAT.	737	$644,000	$346,220,281
ARIZONA	AZ01031-0103	NAVAJO STATION ROAD-PHASE III	738	$949,000	$347,169,281
ARIZONA	AZ01026-0402	HOUCK NORTH EXTENSION	739	$690,000	$347,859,281
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0504	CANE VALLEY N COMMUNITY WATER IV	740	$660,000	$348,519,281
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0302	DENNEHOTSO SCAT. SYSTEM UPGRADE	741	$3,500,000	$352,019,281
ARIZONA	AZ01020-0102	GREASEWOOD FLATS EXTENSION	742	$850,000	$352,869,281
ARIZONA	AZ01012-0502	CHINLE WATER EXTENSIONS	743	$500,000	$353,369,281
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0606	CHILCHINBETO SINGER EXT	744	$133,748	$353,503,029
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0605	CHILCHINBETO NEPHEW EXT.	745	$129,230	$353,632,259
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0604	YOUNG EXTENSION - CHILCHINBETO	746	$525,000	$354,157,259
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0603	CHILCINBETO RURAL EXTENSION	747	$1,020,000	$355,177,259
ARIZONA	AZ01011-0602	CHILCHIN. SCAT. EXT.	748	$700,000	$355,877,259
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0702	RAMAH PINEHILL SOUTH EXTENSION	749	$1,970,000	$357,847,259
NEW MEXICO	NM33140-0402	RAMAH/GOAT HILL EXTENSION	750	$1,628,200	$359,475,459
UTAH	UT19813-0202	NAVAJO MTN - UT	751	$1,440,000	$360,915,459

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09180-0103	SHONTO WHITE POST MISSION SCAT EXT	752	$525,000	$361,440,459
ARIZONA	AZ03136-0202	White Mesa Scatt'd Distribution	753	$334,000	$361,774,459
ARIZONA	AZ03132-1001	TOLANI LAKE COMMUNITY SEWER EXT.	754	$500,000	$362,274,459
ARIZONA	AZ03127-0402	HAYSTACK EXTENSION - NAVAJO MTN.	755	$700,000	$362,974,459
ARIZONA	AZ03127-0202	NAVAJO MTN. PIUTE CANYON - NAV MISSION	756	$590,000	$363,564,459
ARIZONA	AZ03123-0102	Navajo Springs Rehab	757	$207,900	$363,772,359
ARIZONA	AZ03120-0A01	INSCRITION HSE CHAPT HSE LAGOON EXPAN	758	$1,150,000	$364,922,359
ARIZONA	AZ03118-0103	Gray Mountain CW Phase I	759	$1,225,000	$366,147,359
ARIZONA	AZ01061-0402	SERVICE FOR HOMES W/CISTERNS II	760	$309,000	$366,456,359
NEW MEXICO	NM17475-0301	CASAMERO CUP/SMITH LAKE INTER NTUA	761	$600,000	$367,056,359
NEW MEXICO	NM17448-0501	MARIANO LAKE ADDT'L SOURCE NTUA	762	$500,000	$367,556,359

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
Area: NS					
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0202	CHER-UPPER BIRDTOWN WATER STORAGE	1	$650,000	$650,000
MAINE	ME19019-0801	PENO-RIVER CROSSING	2	$110,000	$760,000
FLORIDA	FL22040-0002	SEMI-LIFT STATION REPLACEMENT	3	$150,000	$910,000
FLORIDA	FL06005-0501	SEMI-REFUSE COLLECTION VEHICLE	4	$60,000	$970,000
MAINE	ME29015-0103	PASI-KENNEBASIS RD FORCE MAIN	5	$130,000	$1,100,000
MAINE	ME29010-0901	PASP-SLUDGE DISPOSAL	6	$650,000	$1,750,000
FLORIDA	FL22040-0101	SEMI-SEPTIC TANK PUMPER TRUCK	7	$65,000	$1,815,000
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0207	CHER-SOCO AREA WATER STORAGE	8	$1,300,000	$3,115,000
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0105	CHER-BIRDTOWN SEWER MAINLINE REPL.	9	$30,000	$3,145,000
N CAROLINA	NC87574-0203	CHER-MINGUS CREEK PLANT ABANDONMENT	10	$15,000	$3,160,000
MAINE	ME29018-0402	PASI-ADDITIONAL LAGOON STORAGE	11	$485,000	$3,645,000
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0101	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	12	$146,260	$3,791,260
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0110	CHER-ADAMS CREEK SEWER REHAB, PH 1	13	$140,000	$3,931,260
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0107	CHER-441 SEWER UPGRADE	14	$800,000	$4,731,260
NEW YORK	NY09669-0303	SENE-HIGHBANKS CAMP DUMP PH3	15	$77,250	$4,808,510
NEW YORK	NY09669-0302	SENE-HIGHBANKS CAMP DUMP PH2	16	$182,310	$4,990,820
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0109	CHER-ACQUONI ROAD SEWER REPLACEMENT	17	$285,000	$5,275,820
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0205	CHER-LOWER SOCO WATERMAIN REPL	18	$300,000	$5,575,820
MAINE	ME02311-0301	MALI-SCATTERED WATER AND SEWER	19	$114,000	$5,689,820
FLORIDA	FL26050-0001	SEMI-REFUSE COLLECTION VEHICLE	20	$60,000	$5,749,820
FLORIDA	FL22040-0201	SEMI-SEWER MAIN EXTENSION	21	$120,000	$5,869,820
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0102	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	22	$106,090	$5,975,910
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0104	CHER-SOCO VAL SEWER MAIN REPL. PH 2	23	$300,000	$6,275,910
MISSISSIPPI	MS50999-0101	CHOC-TUCKER SEWER	24	$250,000	$6,525,910
MAINE	ME19019-0502	PENO-WWTP UPGRADE	25	$1,250,000	$7,775,910
NEW YORK	NY29875-0101	SENE-CATT WELL ABANDONMENT	26	$32,960	$7,808,870
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0113	CHER-DEWITT OWLE LIFT STATION UPGRADE	27	$15,000	$7,823,870
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0104	CHER-WWTP UPGRADE, PHASE 1	28	$110,500	$7,934,370

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0212	CHER-WTP UPGRADE	29	$500,000	$8,434,370
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0209	CHER-WTP GENERATOR	30	$125,000	$8,559,370
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0208	CHER-McCLAIN STORE RD WATER	31	$25,000	$8,584,370
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0302	CHER-ROUGH BRANCH BACK-UP POWER	32	$20,000	$8,604,370
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0202	CHER-OLD MISSION ROAD BOOSTER REPACEMENT	33	$15,000	$8,619,370
NEW YORK	NY31884-0305	STRE-WATER PLANT UPGRADE	34	$0	$8,619,370
NEW YORK	NY31884-0303	STRE-E RIVER PHASE 3 (ADDITION)	35	$818,850	$9,438,220
NEW YORK	NY09654-0301	SENE-JIM-TOWN FLLORIDATION	36	$11,330	$9,449,550
MISSISSIPPI	MS55999-0101	CHOC-LIFT STATIONS REHAB	37	$300,000	$9,749,550
NEW YORK	NY29876-0101	SENE-PLANK RD DUMP (@CREEK)	38	$10,197	$9,759,747
NEW YORK	NY29865-0401	SENE-BUSH RD DUMP (@CREEK)	39	$15,141	$9,774,888
NEW YORK	NY29865-0102	SENE-TIS DUMP #1 (MAIN) PH3	40	$77,250	$9,852,138
NEW YORK	NY29865-0101	SENE-TIS DUMP #1 (MAIN) PH1&2	41	$375,684	$10,227,822
NEW YORK	NY29865-0001	SENE-TIS WASTEWATER EFFL SYS	42	$158,620	$10,386,442
NEW YORK	NY09654-0103	SENE-JIM-TOWN DUMP #1 PH3	43	$77,250	$10,463,692
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0111	CHER-ADAMS CREEK SEWER REHAB, PH. 2	44	$100,000	$10,563,692
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0003	CHER-REFUSE COLLECTION VEHICLE	45	$150,000	$10,713,692
FLORIDA	FL13024-0106	MICC-BACKUP WATER WELL	46	$125,000	$10,838,692
FLORIDA	FL13024-0105	MICC-LOOP ROAD WATER STORAGE TANK	47	$375,000	$11,213,692
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0103	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	48	$117,500	$11,331,192
	TX31001-0108	ALAC-WEST SIDE SEWER PHASE II-NORTH	49	$457,740	$11,788,932
NEW YORK	NY29872-0102	SENE-TIS-NEWTOWN SEWER PH2	50	$463,500	$12,252,432
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0109	CHER-WASTEWATER SLUDGE PUMP	51	$15,000	$12,267,432
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0211	CHER-DOWNTOWN WATER STORAGE	52	$600,000	$12,867,432
S CAROLINA	SC46053-0202	CATA-SEPTIC SYSTEM & WELL RENOVATION	53	$100,000	$12,967,432
NEW YORK	NY13817-0201	SENE-MID-BUFFALO RD DUMP	54	$26,780	$12,994,212
NEW YORK	NY13817-0101	SENE-BUFFALO RD - WEST DUMP	55	$18,952	$13,013,164
NEW YORK	NY09669-0501	SENE-STEAMBURG OLD 17 DUMP 2	56	$29,458	$13,042,622
NEW YORK	NY09669-0402	SENE-STEAMBURG OLD 17 DUMP 1-2	57	$59,637	$13,102,259
NEW YORK	NY09654-0102	SENE-JIM-TOWN DUMP #1 PH2	58	$208,987	$13,311,246

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW YORK	NY09637-0101	SENE-CARROLLTON DUMP S OF RR	59	$46,041	$13,35?,287
NEW YORK	NY03619-0101	SENE-OIL SPRING DUMP	60	$23,175	$13,380,462
NEW YORK	NY29872-0103	SENE-TIS-PLANK RD SEWER PH3	61	$556,200	$13,936,662
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0108	CHER-WWTP UPGRADE, PHASE 3	62	$20,000	$13,956,662
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0110	CHER-FAILING DRAINFIELDS	63	$125,000	$14,081,662
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0108	CHER-FAILING DRAINFIELDS	64	$0	$14,081,662
LOUISIANA	LA02001-0202	COUS-WATERLINE LOOP	65	$113,000	$14,194,662
NEW YORK	NY09669-0101	SENE-STEAMBURG SEWER	66	$1,545,000	$15,739,662
NEW YORK	NY09666-0101	SENE-OLD SALAMANCA MUNI DUMP	67	$520,150	$16,259,812
FLORIDA	FL22040-0001	SEMI-REFUSE COLLECTION VEHICLE	68	$60,000	$16,319,812
NEW YORK	NY31884-0101	STRE-SEWERLINE (ST REGIS RD S)	69	$1,050,000	$17,369,812
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0112	CHER-OCONALUFTEE RIVER SEWER MAIN	70	$852,000	$18,221,812
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0106	CHER-WWTP SLUDGE PUMP TRUCK	71	$40,000	$18,261,812
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0213	CHER-WTP RAW WATER STORAGE	72	$550,000	$18,811,812
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0210	CHER-WTP TELEMETRY CONTROLS	73	$70,000	$18,881,812
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0207	CHER-LOWER SOCO STORAGE TANK	74	$600,000	$19,481,812
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0204	CHER-OLD MISSION RD WATER TANK	75	$65,000	$19,546,812
ALABAMA	AL27314-0201	CREE-NEW WELL CONSTRUCTION	76	$25,000	$19,571,812
NEW YORK	NY31884-0304	STRE-E RIVER PHASE 4 (TARBELL)	77	$345,050	$19,916,862
NEW YORK	NY29865-0301	SENE-TIS DUMP #3 (@CREEK)	78	$40,479	$19,95?,341
NEW YORK	NY09669-0201	SENE-STEAMBURG WASTE RECYCLE	79	$15,450	$19,9?2,791
NEW YORK	NY09663-0201	SENE-INDIAN HILL DUMP-EATON RD	80	$12,257	$19,985,048
NEW YORK	NY09663-0101	SENE-INDIAN HILL - EAST DUMP	81	$23,690	$20,008,738
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0001	CHER-SOLID WASTE TRAINING	82	$30,000	$20,038,738
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0105	CHER-ROUGH BR.(OLD SOCO RD)*	83	$228,000	$20,266,738
NEW YORK	NY29872-0101	SENE-TIS-NEWTOWN SEWER PH1	84	$782,800	$21,049,538
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0206	CHER-ROUGH BRANCH WATER HYDRANTS	85	$10,000	$21,059,538
MISSISSIPPI	MS55999-0303	CHOC-REMOVAL OF OLD WWTPS	86	$75,000	$21,134,538
MAINE	ME02037-0301	MMAC-CONNOR WATER AND SEWER	87	$160,000	$21,294,538
NEW YORK	NY09669-0601	SENE-ONOVILLE RD DUMP	88	$40,994	$21,335,532

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
NEW YORK	NY09654-0202	SENE-JIM-TOWN DUMP #2 PH2	89	$116,699	$21,452,231
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0101	CHER-OLD #4 RD SEWER EXT *	90	$264,800	$21,717,031
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0102	CHER-WASHINGTON CR. SEWER EXT.*	91	$183,500	$21,900,531
MAINE	ME19019-0402	PENO-CENTER STREET SEWER REPL	92	$45,000	$21,945,531
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0105	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	93	$200,000	$22,145,531
MISSISSIPPI	MS50200-0103	CHOC-LAGOON RENOVATION	94	$250,000	$22,395,531
MAINE	ME29010-0801	PASP-COMPACTOR TRUCK	95	$93,500	$22,489,031
LOUISIANA	LA51710-0402	CHIT-LIFT STATION FLUSH HYDRANTS	96	$10,500	$22,499,531
NEW YORK	NY09670-0201	SENE-DUMP BEYOND GORDON DR	97	$140,595	$22,640,126
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0301	CHER-LOCUST BRANCH RD W/S EXT*	98	$165,600	$22,805,726
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0101	CHER-BIGWITCH CRK SEWER EXT.*	99	$511,000	$23,316,726
MAINE	ME29018-0301	PASI-O & M CAPABILITY #1	100	$25,000	$23,341,726
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0103	CHER-OLD #4 ROAD SEWER EXT	101	$88,400	$23,430,126
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0204	CHER-BIG WITCH WATER EXT.*	102	$1,547,000	$24,977,126
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0203	CHER-WASHINGTON CR. WATER EXT	103	$276,000	$25,253,126
FLORIDA	FL13024-0107	MICC-MASTER METER VAULTS	104	$50,000	$25,303,126
NEW YORK	NY29865-0201	SENE-TIS DUMP #2 (@TREELINE)	105	$32,857	$25,335,983
NEW YORK	NY09670-0101	SENE-BURNING SPRINGS DUMP	106	$187,769	$25,523,752
NEW YORK	NY09655-0101	SENE-KILLBUCK DUMP	107	$124,630	$25,648,382
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0201	CHER-SPRING REPL WELLS	108	$300,000	$25,948,382
N CAROLINA	NC20999-0201	CHER-CHEROKEE CTY SPRING REPL.	109	$90,000	$26,038,382
	TX31001-0103	ALAC-EAST SEWER EXTENSION S.W	110	$75,800	$26,114,182
ALABAMA	AL27314-0101	CREE-SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT	111	$337,000	$26,451,182
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0103	CHER-UPPER WRIGHTS CRK SW EXT*	112	$383,900	$26,835,082
N CAROLINA	NC38999-0202	CHER-AMMONS RATTLER	113	$120,000	$26,955,082
MISSISSIPPI	MS40999-0101	CHOC-LAGOON EXPAN-STANDING PINE	114	$150,000	$27,105,082
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0104	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	115	$282,220	$27,387,302
FLORIDA	FL13024-0104	MICC-FIRE HYDRANT REPLACEMENT	116	$75,000	$27,462,302
	TX31001-0202	ALAC-EAST SIDE WATERLINE UPGRADE	117	$274,000	$27,736,302
NEW YORK	NY29854-0101	SENE-UPPER SULFUR SPRINGS DUMP	118	$113,815	$27,850,117
NEW YORK	NY09669-0801	SENE-HIGHBANKS TIRE PILE	119	$15,000	$27,865,117

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
MAINE	ME29018-0403	PASI-SPRAY PUMPS AND BUILDING	120	$93,000	$27,958,117
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0107	CHER-WWTP UPGRADE, PHASE 2	121	$750,000	$28,708,117
N CAROLINA	NC20999-0101	CHER-WILL SCOTT CR SEWER EXT.*	122	$100,000	$28,808,117
MISSISSIPPI	MS55999-0302	CHOC-JAMES BILLY SEWER LINE	123	$180,000	$28,988,117
MISSISSIPPI	MS50200-0201	CHOC-COMMUNITY WELL	124	$100,000	$29,088,117
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0202	CHER-OLD SOCO RD. WATER EXT.	125	$929,000	$30,017,117
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0103	CHER-SWIMMER BR. SEWER EXT *	126	$260,250	$30,277,367
MAINE	ME29014-0102	PASI-PETER D POINT FORCE MAIN	127	$550,000	$30,827,367
CONNECTICUT	CT06313-0106	PEQU-COMMUNITY WATER AND SEWER	128	$200,850	$31,028,217
S CAROLINA	SC46053-0401	CATA-O&M SUPPORT	129	$25,000	$31,053,217
NEW YORK	NY09654-0401	SENE-JIM-TOWN WELL HOUSE IMPRV	130	$30,128	$31,083,345
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0202	CHER-OLD SPRING LINE REPLCMNT	131	$180,000	$31,263,345
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0105	CHER-LAMBERT BR SEWER EXT.*	132	$354,000	$31,617,345
FLORIDA	FL13024-0108	MICC-COMPOUND IMPROVEMENTS	133	$75,000	$31,692,345
FLORIDA	FL11015-0003	SEMI-TRANSFER STATION	134	$0	$31,692,345
ALABAMA	AL27314-0102	CREE-SEPTIC TANK TRUCK	135	$100,000	$31,792,345
NEW YORK	NY29865-0501	SENE-4 CORNERS TIRE PILE	136	$5,150	$31,797,495
N CAROLINA	NC50510-0201	CHER-SWIMMER BRANCH WATERLINE*	137	$276,000	$32,073,495
FLORIDA	FL26050-0202	SEMI-WATER TREATMENT PLANT, PH I	138	$475,000	$32,548,495
	TX31001-0201	ALAC-WATER METER INSTALLATION	139	$65,000	$32,613,495
NEW YORK	NY31884-0201	STRE-SEWERLINE (RT 37 TO AHA)	140	$1,096,950	$33,710,445
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0301	CHER-LONG BRANCH W/S*	141	$399,000	$34,109,445
MAINE	ME19019-0303	PENO-HYDRANT UPGRADES	142	$115,500	$34,224,945
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0201	CHER-OWLE BRANCH WATERMAIN	143	$132,000	$34,356,945
N CAROLINA	NC87575-0102	CHER-McCOY BRANCH SEWER	144	$110,500	$34,467,445
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0205	CHER-MINK BRANCH WATERLINE	145	$110,500	$34,577,945
	TX31001-0203	ALAC-WEST SIDE WATERLINE UPGRADE	146	$327,000	$34,904,945
LOUISIANA	LA02001-0102	COUS-15 ACRES COMM SEWER*	147	$35,000	$34,939,945
	TX31001-0102	ALAC-LIFT STATION REPLACEMENT	148	$0	$34,939,945
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0106	CHER-JENKINS CREEK SEWER MAIN	149	$412,000	$35,351,945
	TX31001-0401	ALAC-UTILITY ORGANIZATION	150	$35,000	$35,386,945

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
N CAROLINA	NC87574-0202	CHER-UPPER BIG COVE WATERLINE	151	$1,641,000	$37,027,945
ALABAMA	AL27314-0103	CREE-ROLIN HILLS LIFT STATION	152	$10,000	$37,037,945
FLORIDA	FL11015-0002	SEMI-WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT, PHASE I	153	$0	$37,037,945
FLORIDA	FL11015-0001	SEMI-WATER TREATMENT PLANT, PHASE I	154	$0	$37,037,945
ALABAMA	AL27314-0002	CREE-SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION	155	$115,500	$37,153,445
NEW YORK	NY29999-0102	SENE-IRVING SEWER REHAB + EXT.	156	$618,000	$37,771,445
N CAROLINA	NC20999-0202	CHER-WILL SCOTT CR WATER EXT *	157	$163,000	$37,934,445
MISSISSIPPI	MS50200-0102	CHOC-BOGUE CHITTO W WATER II	158	$200,000	$38,134,445
	TX31001-0106	ALAC-WEST SCATTERED SEWER*	159	$375,000	$38,509,445
	TX31001-0105	ALAC-EAST SIDE SCATTERED SEWER*	160	$450,000	$38,959,445
NEW YORK	NY50251-0201	ONEI-WATER STORAGE TANK	161	$386,000	$39,345,445
N CAROLINA	NC50511-0104	CHER-19 NORTH SEWER EXT.*	162	$926,000	$40,271,445
MAINE	ME29018-0501	PASI-RECYCLE	163	$80,000	$40,351,445
FLORIDA	FL13024-0103	MICC-WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	164	$44,000	$40,395,445
MISSISSIPPI	MS55999-0202	CHOC-ELEVATED WATER TANKS, PR/BC	165	$200,000	$40,595,445
NEW YORK	NY09669-0701	SENE-STEAMBURG TIRE PILE	166	$11,845	$40,607,290
N CAROLINA	NC87572-0104	CHER-TOW STRING SEWER EXT.*	167	$477,500	$41,084,790
N CAROLINA	NC38999-0201	CHER-SNOWBIRD WATERLINE*	168	$1,096,000	$42,180,790
FLORIDA	FL26050-0201	SEMI-WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	169	$480,000	$42,660,790
	TX31001-0104	ALAC-EAST SIDE SEWER UPGRADE*	170	$143,200	$42,803,990

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area:	OK					
OKLAHOMA	OK57751-0A01	OSAGE/TOWN OF HOMINY RESERVOIR	1	$104,000	$104,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0H01	CHEROKEE/YOUNG EXTENSION	2	$33,000	$137,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0M01	CHEROKEE/SPADE MTN EXTENSION	3	$205,000	$342,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK68999-0006	CHEROKEE DL 4 & 5 SOUTH	4	$188,000	$530,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0005	POTAWATOMI/SU WIDE FAILING DRAINFIELDS	5	$35,000	$565,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK58999-0002	ITC/OTTAWA CO. IND W&S	6	$233,000	$798,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK45999-0C01	CHOCTAW MILLERTON WATERLINE EXT.	7	$176,000	$974,000	10
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0B02	POTAWATOMI/SU TRIBAL IND W&S	8	$98,000	$1,072,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK59775-0A01	PAWNEE/CLEVELAND WTR TREATMENT PLANT	9	$23,000	$1,095,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0D01	OSAGE/STRIKE AXE WATER EXTENSION	10	$36,000	$1,131,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0B01	CHEROKEE SALEM EXTENSION	11	$31,000	$1,162,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK38999-0L01	KIOWA/KIOWA CO SOLID WASTE I HIGH HAZ	12	$156,000	$1,318,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK36999-0103	PONCA/KAY CO. IND W&S	13	$43,000	$1,361,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK11193-0A01	CHEROKEE GRANDVIEW RWD #3 EXT.-MOODYS	14	$436,000	$1,797,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0J01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD&SWDD #3 WEST EXT.	15	$12,000	$1,809,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK56734-0S01	CREEK/BRYANT COMMUNITY SEWER	16	$64,000	$1,873,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK49659-0L08	CHEROKEE SPAVINAW DUMP	17	$50,000	$1,923,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L05	CHEROKEE LOST SPRING DUMP	18	$15,000	$1,938,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK63838-0B01	POTAWATOMI/ST. LOUIS RIVER CROSSING	19	$15,000	$1,953,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK19283-0A01	CREEK/OKMULGEE RWD #6-MOUNDS	20	$50,000	$2,003,000	20
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0C01	CHEROKEE/BETHEL ROAD	21	$189,000	$2,192,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK68999-0L02	CHEROKEE/ROCKY PT. WL EXT	22	$239,000	$2,431,000	
OKLAHOMA	OK63839-0L02	KICKAPOO-SHAWNEE SOLID WASTE	23	$18,500	$2,449,500	
OKLAHOMA	OK32426-0A01	CREEK/OKMULGEE CO. RWD #6-HOLDENVILLE	24	$5,000	$2,454,500	
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0J01	CHEROKEE/DRY CREEK EXTENSION	25	$165,000	$2,619,500	
OKLAHOMA	OK10178-0A01	CHICKASAW/SQWC-MILO-WOODFORD WLX	26	$161,000	$2,780,500	
OKLAHOMA	OK68902-0S01	CHEROKEE/VIAN SEWER	27	$100,000	$2,880,500	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK56739-0A01	CREEK/OKMULGEE CO RWD #1-SCHULTER	28	$50,000	$2,930,500
OKLAHOMA	OK52694-0L01	OTOE/RED ROCK SOLID WASTE-HIGH HAZARD	29	$32,000	$2,962,500
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0C01	CHEROKEE/MOUNTAIN GROVE WL EXT	30	$170,000	$3,132,500
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0D01	CHEROKEE/BIG BREWER WL EXT	31	$154,000	$3,286,500
OKLAHOMA	OK36999-0L01	PONCA/KAY CO SOLID WASTE-HIGH HAZARD	32	$20,000	$3,306,500
OKLAHOMA	OK32999-0B01	SEMINOLE/HUGHES RWD #5 EXT -A	33	$67,000	$3,373,500
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0I01	CHEROKEE/HUNGRY MTN EXTENSION	34	$168,000	$3,541,500
KANSAS	KS43999-0S01	KS POTAWATOMI SEWER & LAGOON REPAIR	35	$0	$3,541,500
OKLAHOMA	OK67885-0B01	SEMINOLE/BOWLEGS-LIMA RWD EXT.JESSE MT.	36	$47,000	$3,588,500
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0L01	IOWA/LINCOLN COUNTY SOLID WASTE	37	$50,000	$3,638,500
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0L00	SENECA-CAYUGA CEREMONIAL GRDS DUMP	38	$2,300	$3,640,800
OKLAHOMA	OK14999-0L01	A SHAWNEE/CLEVELAND CO SOLID WASTE	39	$20,000	$3,660,800
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0G01	CHEROKEE/TAHLEQUAH-TOWN BRANCH	40	$110,000	$3,770,800
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0B01	CHEROKEE/THOMPSON CORNERS W/L EXT	41	$272,000	$4,042,800
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0K01	CHEROKEE/TITANTIC EXTENSION	42	$332,000	$4,374,800
OKLAHOMA	OK59999-0L01	PAWNEE/PAWNEE CO SOLID WASTE HIGHAZARD	43	$23,000	$4,397,800
OKLAHOMA	OK55723-0C01	KICKAPOO/MURDOCK WATER LINE EXT.	44	$107,000	$4,504,800
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L07	CHEROKEE/BRUSH CREEK DUMP	45	$1,500	$4,506,300
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L06	CHEROKEE/CHEROKEE HEIGHTS RAVINE	46	$2,500	$4,508,800
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0B01	CHEROKEE/GRAY HOLLOW EXT	47	$58,000	$4,566,800
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0L04	SAC & FOX/ HIRAM STARR SOLID WASTE	48	$5,000	$4,571,800 45
OKLAHOMA	OK15242-0A01	CHICKASAW/PONTOTOC RWD #7 EXT.-TUPELO	49	$42,000	$4,613,800
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L07	CHEROKEE/GRACE HUDLIN RD DUMP	50	$4,100	$4,617,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L06	CHEROKEE/UMMERTESKEE DUMP	51	$3,500	$4,621,400
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L04	CHEROKEE/ELDON DUMP	52	$32,000	$4,653,400
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L03	CHEROKEE/HALLEY RD DUMP	53	$40,000	$4,693,400
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0L05	CHEROKEE/BEVER CHURCH DUMP	54	$2,500	$4,695,900

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
OKLAHOMA	OK55723-0L02	KICKAPOO/JONES & GARZA SOLID WASTE	55	$54,000	$4,749,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK19281-0S01	CREEK/MANNFORD SEWER EXTENSION	56	$34,000	$4,783,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK18999-0D01	CHEROKEE/RICEMAN HILL	57	$70,000	$4,853,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0A01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD#15 EXT TWIN POINTS	58	$181,000	$5,034,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK46999-0A01	CHEROKEE/MCINTOSH # 8 EXTENSION	59	$59,000	$5,093,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0F01	SAC & FOX/WAKOLE WATER EXTENSION	60	$80,000	$5,173,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK54707-0S01	CREEK/CASTLE COMMUNITY SEWER	61	$50,000	$5,223,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0A02	CHEROKEE/EAR BOB RD WL EXT.	62	$166,000	$5,389,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK32428-0S01	CREEK/SPAULDING COM SEWER	63	$70,000	$5,459,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK16999-0L02	COMANCHE/COMANCHECO. COL SOL. WSTE II	64	$50,000	$5,509,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0M01	CHEROKEE/QUALLS EXTENSION	65	$116,000	$5,625,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK08999-0L02	WICHITA/CADDO CO SOL WASTE II LOW/MOD H	66	$64,000	$5,689,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0A01	CHEROKEE/PINEY-OAK GROVE	67	$63,000	$5,752,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK01053-0S01	CHEROKEE/STILWELL SOUTHSIDE SEWER	68	$250,000	$6,002,900	60
OKLAHOMA	OK68999-0B01	CHEROKEE/BRUSHY WL EXTENSION	69	$209,000	$6,211,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK46621-0A02	CREEK/STIDHAM COMMUNITY W&S	70	$351,000	$6,562,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK17999-0L01	COMANCHE/COTTON CO SOLID WASTE I	71	$84,000	$6,646,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0S01	CHEROKEE/KENWOOD & CHERRY TREE LAGOONS	72	$186,000	$6,832,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK62824-0B01	CHICKASAW/PONT RWD#7-FRANCIS RD IMP	73	$128,000	$6,960,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK56737-0B01	CREEK/OKMULGEE RWD# 20 (MORRIS)	74	$43,000	$7,003,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK54999-0A01	CREEK/BURDEN WATER LINE EXTENSION	75	$48,000	$7,051,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK45999-0B01	CHOCTAW/McCURTAIN CO W&S	76	$164,000	$7,215,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0B02	CHEROKEE/THOMPSON CORNER II	77	$212,000	$7,427,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0G01	SAC & FOX/NULLAKE WATER EXTENSION	78	$46,000	$7,473,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK62999-0A01	CHICKASAW/PONTOTOC RWD# 4 EXT. KER	79	$32,000	$7,505,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0L01	OSAGE/OSAGE CO.SOLID WASTE-HIGH HAZARD	80	$57,000	$7,562,900	75
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0D01	CHEROKEE/ROSS RD WL EXT.	81	$150,000	$7,712,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0C01	CHEROKEE/HOOT OWL RWD WL EXT	82	$91,000	$7,803,900	
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0A01	CHEROKEE/BALLOU/EAR BOB RD WL EXT.	83	$161,000	$7,964,900	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK46616-0S01	CREEK/HANNA LAGOON (HUD)	84	$0	$7,964,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0W09	CHEROKEE/DOUBLE SPRING CR	85	$46,000	$8,010,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0K02	CHEROKEE/PHASE II-TENKILLER WATER CO	86	$200,000	$8,210,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0K01	CHEROKEE/PHASE I-TENKILLER WATER CO	87	$200,000	$8,410,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63839-0C01	SAC & FOX/GROVERS WATER EXTENSION	88	$105,000	$8,515,900
OKLAHOMA	OK54708-0S01	CREEK/CLEARVIEW COMMUNITY SEWER	89	$50,000	$8,565,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0C01	POTAWATOMI/MAUD WL EXTENSION	90	$101,000	$8,666,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0E01	SAC & FOX/MOKOHOKA WATER EXTENSION	91	$224,000	$8,890,900
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0L02	IOWA INDIVIDUAL SOLID WASTE	92	$20,000	$8,910,900
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0G01	IOWA/TOM LINCOLN WATER EXTENSION	93	$48,000	$8,958,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0C02	CHEROKEE/RWD NO 2 WTP IMP	94	$47,000	$9,005,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0F01	CHEROKEE/ELDON HILL WL EXTN	95	$123,000	$9,128,900
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0N01	CHEROKEE/HONEY HILL	96	$71,000	$9,199,900
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0J01	CHEROKEE/LYONS SWITCH SO. EXT	97	$106,000	$9,305,900
KANSAS	KS07999-0B01	KS KICKAPOO TANKS & FILTER REHAB	98	$15,000	$9,320,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0L04	SAC & FOX INDIVIDUAL SOLID WASTE	99	$8,000	$9,328,900
OKLAHOMA	OK52999-0C01	OTOE/OTOE WATER SYSTEM-SOUTH EXT.	100	$64,000	$9,392,900
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0A05	CHEROKEE/TWIN BRIDGES II	101	$90,000	$9,482,900
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0A04	CHEROKEE/TWIN BRIDGES I	102	$122,000	$9,604,900
OKLAHOMA	OK32999-0C01	SEMINOLE/HUGHES RWD#5 EXT.-JUSTICE	103	$310,000	$9,914,900
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0F01	CHEROKEE/DELAWARE RWD#6 WL EXT.	104	$98,000	$10,012,900
OKLAHOMA	OK18269-0W01	CHEROKEE/COLLINS WL EXTN	105	$23,000	$10,035,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0A01	CHEROKEE/NO FIRE HOLLOW	106	$78,000	$10,113,900
KANSAS	KS43999-0L01	KS POTAWATOMI SOLID WASTE	107	$220,000	$10,333,900
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0E01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD#15 PRUE RD. PROJECT	108	$65,000	$10,398,900
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0F01	SAC & FOX/ROSIE LAKE WATER EXTENSION	109	$85,000	$10,483,900
OKLAHOMA	OK18999-0A01	CHEROKEE/BLUEJACKET	110	$87,000	$10,570,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0D01	CHEROKEE/SPARROW HAWK WL EXTN.	111	$33,000	$10,603,900
KANSAS	KS07999-0S02	KS KICKAPOO MAIN COMMUNITY LAGOON	112	$0	$10,603,900

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0L01	A SHAWNEE/POTTAWATOMIE CO. SOLID WASTE	113	$16,000	$10,619,900
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0W03	CHEROKEE/CHRISTIE WL EXTN	114	$47,500	$10,667,400
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0H01	CHEROKEE/ROCK FENCE RD EXT	115	$92,000	$10,759,400
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0D01	CHEROKEE/PROCTOR-CHEWEY EXTENSION	116	$379,000	$11,138,400
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0D01	POTAWATOMI/PINK WL EXTENSION	117	$73,000	$11,211,400
OKLAHOMA	OK58762-0W01	CHEROKEE/DILLINGHAM WL EXTN.	118	$26,000	$11,237,400
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0B01	CHEROKEE/GRITS HILL WL EXTN	119	$182,000	$11,419,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0W05	CHEROKEE/GRAND POINT WL EXTN.	120	$20,000	$11,439,400
KANSAS	KS07999-0D01	KS KICKAPOO DISTR. SYSTEM UPGRADE	121	$19,000	$11,458,400
KANSAS	KS07999-0A01	KS KICKAPOO WTR STORAGE FACILITY	122	$94,000	$11,552,400
OKLAHOMA	OK74999-0L02	CHEROKEE/OLD DEWEY RD. DUMP	123	$2,000	$11,554,400
OKLAHOMA	OK74999-0L01	CHEROKEE/WASHINGTON CO SOLID WASTE	124	$50,000	$11,604,400
OKLAHOMA	OK74959-0L01	CHEROKEE/COPAN DUMP	125	$2,000	$11,606,400
OKLAHOMA	OK73999-0L02	CREEK/WAGONER CO. SOLID WASTE	126	$45,000	$11,651,400
OKLAHOMA	OK73999-0L01	CHEROKEE/WAGONER CO SOLID WASTE	127	$50,000	$11,701,400
OKLAHOMA	OK72999-0L02	CHEROKEE/N TULSA CO SOLID WASTE	128	$20,000	$11,721,400
OKLAHOMA	OK72999-0L01	CREEK/SO. TULSA CO. SOLID WASTE	129	$25,000	$11,746,400
OKLAHOMA	OK69999-0L01	CHICKASAW/STEPHENS CO. SOLID WASTE	130	$25,000	$11,771,400
OKLAHOMA	OK68999-0L01	CHEROKEE/SEQUOYAH CO SOLID WASTE	131	$75,000	$11,846,400
OKLAHOMA	OK67999-0L01	SEMINOLE/SEMINOLE CO. SOLID WASTE	132	$50,000	$11,896,400
OKLAHOMA	OK66999-0L01	CHEROKEE/ROGERS CO SOLID WASTE	133	$50,000	$11,946,400
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0L03	POTAWATOMI/SILAS/VIEUX DUMP	134	$10,000	$11,956,400
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0L02	POTAWATOMI/POT. CO. SOLID WASTE	135	$50,000	$12,006,400
OKLAHOMA	OK62999-0L01	CHICKASAW/PONTOTOC CO. SOLID WASTE	136	$50,000	$12,056,400
OKLAHOMA	OK58999-0L01	CHEROKEE/OTTAWA CO. SOLID WASTE	137	$20,000	$12,076,400
OKLAHOMA	OK56999-0L01	CREEK/OKMULGEE CO. SOLID WASTE	138	$60,000	$12,136,400
OKLAHOMA	OK53999-0L01	CHEROKEE/NOWATA CO SOLID WASTE	139	$50,000	$12,186,400
OKLAHOMA	OK52999-0L01	OTOE/NOBLE CO. SOLID WASTE	140	$6,000	$12,192,400
OKLAHOMA	OK52691-0A01	PONCA/MARLAND WATER IMPROVEMENTS	141	$15,000	$12,207,400

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0L02	CREEK/MUSKOGEE CO. SOLID WASTE	142	$75,000	$12,282,400
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0L01	CHEROKEE/MUSKOGEE CO SOLID WASTE	143	$50,000	$12,332,400
OKLAHOMA	OK50999-0L01	CHICKASAW/MURRAY CO SOLID WASTE	144	$25,000	$12,357,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L05	CHEROKEE/THREE FINGERS BAY DUMP	145	$2,000	$12,359,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L04	CHEROKEE/DEVIL'S HOLLOW DUMP	146	$2,000	$12,361,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L03	CHEROKEE/CHEROKEE HEIGHTS DUMP	147	$2,000	$12,363,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L02	CHEROKEE/RIDGE RD DUMP	148	$10,000	$12,373,400
OKLAHOMA	OK49999-0L01	CHEROKEE/MAYES CO SOLID WASTE	149	$75,000	$12,448,400
OKLAHOMA	OK48999-0L01	CHICKASAW/MARSHALL CO SOLID WASTE	150	$25,000	$12,473,400
OKLAHOMA	OK46999-0L01	CHEROKEE/MCINTOSH CO SOLID WASTE	151	$20,000	$12,493,400
OKLAHOMA	OK46612-0A01	CREEK/MCINTOSH CO. RWD #8 EXT.	152	$30,000	$12,523,400
OKLAHOMA	OK44999-0L01	CHICKASAW/MCCLAIN CO. SOLID WASTE	153	$25,000	$12,548,400
OKLAHOMA	OK43999-0L01	CHICKASAW/LOVE CO. SOLID WASTE	154	$15,000	$12,563,400
OKLAHOMA	OK36999-0L02	PONCA/KAY CO. SOLID WASTE-LOW/MOD HAZ	155	$19,000	$12,582,400
OKLAHOMA	OK35999-0L01	CHICKASAW/JOHNSTON CO SOLID WASTE	156	$25,000	$12,607,400
OKLAHOMA	OK32999-0L02	SEMINOLE/HUGHES CO SOLID WASTE	157	$15,000	$12,622,400
OKLAHOMA	OK26999-0L01	CHICKASAW/GRADY CO SOLID WASTE	158	$25,000	$12,647,400
OKLAHOMA	OK25999-0L01	CHICKASAW/GARVIN CO SOLID WASTE	159	$25,000	$12,672,400
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0L03	CHEROKEE/BETTY MOUSE DUMP	160	$1,500	$12,673,900
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0L02	CHEROKEE/DELAWARE CO. SOLID WASTE	161	$75,000	$12,748,900
OKLAHOMA	OK21306-0L02	CHEROKEE/KENWOOD EAST # 2 DUMP	162	$5,500	$12,754,400
OKLAHOMA	OK21306-0L01	CHEROKEE/KENWOOD EAST # 1 DUMP	163	$2,000	$12,756,400
OKLAHOMA	OK19999-0L01	CREEK/CREEK CO. SOLID WASTE	164	$10,000	$12,766,400
OKLAHOMA	OK18999-0L01	CHEROKEE/CRAIG CO. SOLID WASTE	165	$50,000	$12,816,400
OKLAHOMA	OK15999-0L01	CHICKASAW/COAL CO. SOLID WASTE	166	$15,000	$12,831,400
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0L02	CHEROKEE/CHEROKEE CO SOLID WASTE	167	$75,000	$12,906,400
OKLAHOMA	OK10999-0L01	CHICKASAW/CARTER CO. SOLID WASTE	168	$50,000	$12,956,400
OKLAHOMA	OK07999-0L02	CHICKASAW/BRYAN CO. SOLID WASTE	169	$15,000	$12,971,400
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0L04	CHEROKEE/GOLDMINE HOLLOW#1	170	$1,500	$12,972,900
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0L03	CHEROKEE/LAND UNIT #44 DUMP	171	$2,000	$12,974,900

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0L02	CHEROKEE/ADAIR CO SOLID WASTE	172	$75,000	$13,049,900
OKLAHOMA	OK01054-0S01	CHEROKEE/WATTS SWR SYSTEM UPGRADE	173	$50,000	$13,099,900
OKLAHOMA	OK01054-0A01	CHEROKEE/WATTS WTR SYSTEM UPGRADE	174	$29,000	$13,128,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63838-0B02	POTAWATOMI/ST LOUIS WL EXTENSION	175	$113,000	$13,241,900
OKLAHOMA	OK57754-0S02	OSAGE/PAWHUSKA SEWER MAIN EXT.	176	$13,000	$13,254,900
OKLAHOMA	OK49657-0A01	CHEROKEE/ROSE WL EXTENSION	177	$291,000	$13,545,900
OKLAHOMA	OK45586-0W01	CHOCTAW/BETHEL WATER LINE EXTENSION	178	$221,000	$13,766,900
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0H01	IOWA/CIMMARRON WATER EXTENSION	179	$153,000	$13,919,900
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0W04	CHEROKEE/BURNT CABIN RWD EXT.-PIGEON RD	180	$49,000	$13,968,900
OKLAHOMA	OK59999-0L02	PAWNEE/ PAWNEE CO SOLID WASTE	181	$21,000	$13,989,900
OKLAHOMA	OK58999-0A01	QUAPAW/OTTAWA CO RWD # 3 WL EXT	182	$62,000	$14,051,900
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0L02	OSAGE/OSAGE CO SOL.WASTE-LOWMODHAZAR	183	$9,000	$14,060,900
OKLAHOMA	OK56999-0A01	CREEK/OKMULGEE CO RWD#5 EXTN	184	$47,000	$14,107,900
OKLAHOMA	OK46999-0L02	CREEK/MCINTOSH CO SOLID WASTE	185	$185,000	$14,292,900
OKLAHOMA	OK41546-0L03	SAC & FOX TRIBAL TRUST SOLID WASTE	186	$5,000	$14,297,900
OKLAHOMA	OK34999-0L01	CHICKASAW JEFFERSON CO SOLID WASTE	187	$15,000	$14,312,900
OKLAHOMA	OK32999-0L03	CREEK/HUGHES CO. SOLID WASTE	188	$95,000	$14,407,900
OKLAHOMA	OK63999-0L05	SAC & FOX/SOLID WASTE-POTT CO	189	$55,500	$14,463,400
OKLAHOMA	OK62999-0S01	CHICKASAW-BYNG SEWER	190	$250,000	$14,713,400
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0M01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD# 18 NE EXT.	191	$42,000	$14,755,400
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0C01	CHEROKEE/HONEY CREEK AREA	192	$145,000	$14,900,400
OKLAHOMA	OK21307-0A01	CHEROKEE/LEACH SCHOOL AREA	193	$273,000	$15,173,400
OKLAHOMA	OK21302-0A01	CHEROKEE/EUCHA WATERLINE EXTENSION	194	$107,000	$15,280,400
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0E01	CHEROKEE/INDIAN RD WL EXTN.	195	$47,000	$15,327,400
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0G01	CHEROKEE/MALLOY HOLLOW EXT	196	$106,000	$15,433,400
OKLAHOMA	OK74999-0A01	CHEROKEE/OCHELATA WATER	197	$10,000	$15,443,400
OKLAHOMA	OK64999-0L01	CHOCTAW/PUSHMATAHA CO. SOLID WASTE	198	$2,900	$15,446,300
OKLAHOMA	OK59999-0B01	PAWNEE/PAWNEE RWD # 4 EXTENSION	199	$9,000	$15,455,300

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK59999-0A01	PAWNEE/PAWNEE RWD #3 EXTENSION	200	$7,500	$15,462,800
OKLAHOMA	OK54999-0L01	CREEK/OKFUSKEE CO SOLID WASTE	201	$100,000	$15,562,800
OKLAHOMA	OK52999-0B01	OTOE/NOBLE CO RWD # 2 EXT	202	$50,000	$15,612,800
OKLAHOMA	OK01999-0F01	CHEROKEE/CANDY MINK REPLACEMENT WL	203	$105,000	$15,717,800
KANSAS	KS22038-0O01	KS IOWA TRIBE O&M	204	$70,000	$15,787,800
OKLAHOMA	OK63839-0A01	SAC & FOX/CARTER & ET AL. WATER EXT.	205	$99,000	$15,886,800
OKLAHOMA	OK60787-0L03	SAC & FOX/PAYNE COUNTY SOLID WASTE	206	$28,500	$15,915,300
OKLAHOMA	OK60787-0A01	SAC & FOX/EUCHEE CREEK WATER EXT.	207	$349,000	$16,264,300
OKLAHOMA	OK57754-0A01	OSAGE/PAWHUSKA INDIAN VILLAGE	208	$15,000	$16,279,300
OKLAHOMA	OK39999-0L01	CHOCTAW/LATIMER CO SOLID WASTE	209	$6,000	$16,285,300
OKLAHOMA	OK07999-0L01	CHOCTAW/BRYAN CO SOLID WASTE	210	$2,000	$16,287,300
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0D01	CHEROKEE/SPADE EXTENSION	211	$98,000	$16,385,300
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0B01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD#15-QUAIL HOLLOW EXT.	212	$20,000	$16,405,300
OKLAHOMA	OK57758-0A01	OSAGE/TOWN OF WYNONA WTR TREATMENT	213	$20,000	$16,425,300
OKLAHOMA	OK63839-0L01	KICKAPOO/WHITEWATER SOLID WASTE	214	$4,900	$16,430,200
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0C01	OSAGE/OSAGE CO RWD# 15 TREATMENT PLANT	215	$500,000	$16,930,200
OKLAHOMA	OK56737-0A01	CREEK NATION COMMUNITY BLDGS	216	$0	$16,930,200
OKLAHOMA	OK52694-0A01	OTOE/RED ROCK WATER SUPPLY	217	$125,000	$17,055,200
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0E01	SAC & FOX/BARKER PLACE WTR EXTENSION	218	$78,000	$17,133,200
OKLAHOMA	OK16999-0001	KIOWA/LAWTON INTER-TRIBAL O&M ORGAN	219	$150,000	$17,283,200
OKLAHOMA	OK52999-0D01	OTOE/NOBLE CO RWD #2/SOUTH LOOP	220	$79,000	$17,362,200
OKLAHOMA	OK52691-0B01	PONCA/TOWN OF MARLAND-WTR DISTRIB IMP	221	$4,000	$17,366,200
OKLAHOMA	OK41999-0D01	SAC & FOX/TOAD HILL WATER EXTENSION	222	$308,000	$17,674,200
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0F01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD #15-AVANT EXTENSION	223	$50,000	$17,724,200
OKLAHOMA	OK11999-0C01	CHEROKEE/RWD NO 2 EXTENSION	224	$114,000	$17,838,200
OKLAHOMA	OK19279-0S01	CREEK/KELLYVILLE COMM. BLDG LAGOON	225	$5,000	$17,843,200
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0P01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD&SWDD# 3-NORTH LOOP	226	$13,000	$17,856,200

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OKLAHOMA	OK62824-0A01	CHICKASAW/PONT RWD#7 FRANCIS WLX	227	$92,000	$17,948,200
OKLAHOMA	OK56999-0S01	CREEK/COALTON COMMUNITY SEWER	228	$20,000	$17,968,200
OKLAHOMA	OK64999-0W01	CHOCTAW/PUSHMATAHA RWD#3-BRIAR BR.	229	$118,000	$18,086,200
OKLAHOMA	OK21999-0A01	CHEROKEE/PINEY CHURCH AREA	230	$78,000	$18,164,200
OKLAHOMA	OK59781-0A01	PAWNEE/TOWN OF RALSTON EXTENSION	231	$90,000	$18,254,200
OKLAHOMA	OK06999-0001	C&A TRIBAL O&M	232	$150,000	$18,404,200
KANSAS	KS07999-0C01	KS KICKAPOO WATER SUPPLY RESERVOIR	233	$216,000	$18,620,200
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0H01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD&SWDD# 3-SW EXT.	234	$38,000	$18,658,200
OKLAHOMA	OK51999-0S01	CREEK/SUMMIT LAGOON (HUD)	235	$0	$18,658,200
OKLAHOMA	OK60999-0L02	SAC & FOX/PENNOCK SOLID WASTE	236	$3,800	$18,662,000
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0K01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD #18-NELAGONEY EXT.	237	$18,000	$18,680,000
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0G01	OSAGE/TULSA EXTENSION	238	$18,000	$18,698,000
OKLAHOMA	OK56999-1S01	CREEK/SALEM LAGOON (HUD)	239	$0	$18,698,000
OKLAHOMA	OK32999-0L01	CHOCTAW/HUGHES CO. SOLID WASTE	240	$4,000	$18,702,000
OKLAHOMA	OK19285-0A01	CREEK/CREEK CO. RWD #3 EXT	241	$27,000	$18,729,000
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0N01	OSAGE/STRIKE AXE, STANDPIPE	242	$35,000	$18,764,000
OKLAHOMA	OK19279-0A01	CREEK/CREEK CO. RWD #1 EXTENSION	243	$34,000	$18,798,000
KANSAS	KS43999-0S02	KS POTAWATOMI IND LAGOON REPLACE	244	$4,000	$18,802,000
OKLAHOMA	OK36482-0A01	TONKAWA/FORT OAKLAND WATER SYSTEM IMP.	245	$300,000	$19,102,000
OKLAHOMA	OK09999-0A01	C&A/CONCHO WATER & SEWER IMPROV.	246	$743,000	$19,845,000
OKLAHOMA	OK57999-0I01	OSAGE/OSAGE RWD&SWDD#3-BURBANK EXT	247	$52,800	$19,897,800
OKLAHOMA	OK46999-0001	CREEK/MISTY VALLEY LAGOON (HUD)	248	$0	$19,897,800
OKLAHOMA	OK46613-0001	CREEK/LAHREN LAGOON (HUD)	249	$0	$19,897,800

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: PH						
ARIZONA	AZ03033-0301	SUPAI VILLAGE SEWER IMPROVEMENTS	1	$320,000	$320,000	
CALIFORNIA	CA26417-0201	BENTON WELL #1 & PUMPHOUSE REHAB	2	$38,000	$358,000	10
	AZ11215-0201	GRIC, D4/D5 WTR SYS CONSOL	3	$507,000	$865,000	
NEVADA	NV01999-0902	FALLON TRANSFER STATION	4	$200,000	$1,065,000	
CALIFORNIA	CA36038-0401	CHEMEHUEVI WELL IMPROV	5	$50,000	$1,115,000	
CALIFORNIA	CA14369-0101	LONE PINE-WTR MAIN REPLCMNT	6	$150,000	$1,265,000	20
ARIZONA	AZ11211-0301	AK-CHIN WWTF	7	$920,000	$2,185,000	
ARIZONA	AZ08153-0501	HUAL APAI SEWER COLLEC IMPROV	8	$35,000	$2,220,000	
UTAH	UT24999-0106	U&O RANDLETT WATER MAINS	9	$58,000	$2,278,000	
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0601	CRIT FAILED SEPTIC SYSTEMS	10	$112,000	$2,390,000	
ARIZONA	AZ13266-0101	CAMP VERDE, MID VERDE WTR	11	$45,000	$2,435,000	
ARIZONA	AZ08155-0902	KAIBAB TRANSFER STATION	12	$100,000	$2,535,000	
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0906	CRIT OLD PARKER TOWN DUMP	13	$50,000	$2,585,000	
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0903	CRIT MAIN DUMP CLOSURE	14	$350,000	$2,935,000	45
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0702	WHITERIVER RSS, CONST WETLANDS	15	$700,000	$3,635,000	60
ARIZONA	AZ04999-0104	SAN CARLOS RES WIDE PLUMB-PH4	16	$580,000	$4,215,000	
ARIZONA	AZ04059-0101	SAN CARLOS PLUMBING REHAB	17	$288,000	$4,503,000	75
ARIZONA	AZ04059-0903	SAN CARLOS OPEN DUMP CLOSURE	18	$800,000	$5,303,000	
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0301	HOPI WATER HAULING	19	$75,000	$5,378,000	
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0601	SALT RIVER BEELINE HWY WTRMAIN EXT	20	$35,000	$5,413,000	
ARIZONA	AZ03033-0401	SUPAI VILLAGE SWR COLL. IMPR.	21	$25,000	$5,438,000	
ARIZONA	AZ13268-0101	YAVAPAI-PRESCOTT WTR SYS PRV/FL	22	$50,000	$5,488,000	
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0402	HOPI (HPL) SCATTERED W/S PH2	23	$2,520,000	$8,008,000	
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0401	HOPI (HPL) SCATTERED W/S PH1	24	$2,100,000	$10,108,000	
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0103	HOPI RES WIDE PLUMBING, PH III	25	$3,367,000	$13,475,000	
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0102	HOPI RES WIDE PLUMBING, PH II	26	$650,000	$14,125,000	
NEVADA	NV12627-0905	DUCKWATER SW TRANSFER STATION	27	$100,000	$14,225,000	
NEVADA	NV07999-0903	FT MCDERMITT DUMP CLOSURE/TS	28	$366,000	$14,591,000	
CALIFORNIA	CA14871-0101	DEATH VALLEY REV OSMOSIS SYS	29	$65,000	$14,656,000	
ARIZONA	AZ11211-0201	AK-CHIN VILLAGE SEWER	30	$311,000	$14,967,000	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ15999-1201	CRIT POSTON LIFT STATION REPL	31	$499,000	$15,466,000
	AZ11240-0202	GRIC D3/D4 WATER TANK	32	$395,000	$15,861,000
	AZ11215-0401	GRIC,CASA BLNC WTR MAIN IMPROV/TNK	33	$816,000	$16,677,000
ARIZONA	AZ09964-0401	CIBECUE COMM WELL	34	$150,000	$16,827,000
NEVADA	NV10612-0101	YERINGTON-CMBELL RN INDV WELLS	35	$78,000	$16,905,000
NEVADA	NV04560-0302	DUCKVALLEY-OWYHEE SWR SYS REPAIR	36	$175,000	$17,080,000
NEVADA	NV02538-0903	MOAPA SOLID WASTE SITE CLEANUP	37	$156,000	$17,236,000
ARIZONA	AZ13266-0201	CAMP VERDE, MID VERDE TANK & WELL	38	$280,000	$17,516,000
	AZ11240-0203	GRIC D3/D4 WTR SYS INTERCON	39	$839,000	$18,355,000
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0302	SHUNGOPAVI WATER/SEWER PH2	40	$500,000	$18,855,000
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0301	SHUNGOPAVI WATER/SEWER PH1	41	$460,000	$19,315,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0201	LOWER MOENKOPI WATER/SEWER	42	$698,000	$20,013,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0501	FORT YUMA WATER STORAGE TANK	43	$823,000	$20,836,000
ARIZONA	AZ04067-0101	UPPER PERIDOT WATER WELL	44	$97,000	$20,933,000
ARIZONA	AZ04065-0101	SAN CARLOS SEVEN MILE WATER WELL	45	$97,000	$21,030,000
ARIZONA	AZ04059-0301	SAN CARLOS REGIONAL SEWER SYS	46	$527,000	$21,557,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0501	UPPER MOENCOPI W/S MAIN RPLCM.	47	$242,000	$21,799,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0201	SALT RIVER WATER MAIN EXTENSION	48	$400,000	$22,199,000
ARIZONA	AZ04044-0401	CEDAR CREEK COMM WELL	49	$150,000	$22,349,000
UTAH	UT24999-0201	U&O RANDLETT SEWER LAGOON	50	$300,000	$22,649,000
NEVADA	NV10612-0201	YERINGTON-CMBELL RANCH SWR SYS	51	$480,000	$23,129,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0301	CRIT SEPTIC TANK PUMPER	52	$90,000	$23,219,000
	AZ11999-0301	GRIC, CASA BLCA WTR IMPROV II	53	$1,366,000	$24,585,000
ARIZONA	AZ04062-0301	LOWER PERIDOT WATER MAIN IMPROV	54	$136,000	$24,721,000
CALIFORNIA	CA14368-0101	FT INDEPENDENCE TANK REHAB & CL	55	$80,000	$24,801,000
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0103	SHUNGOPAVI PLUMBING	56	$243,000	$25,044,000
ARIZONA	AZ04059-0902	SAN CARLOS WASTE COLLECTION TRUCK	57	$150,000	$25,194,000
ARIZONA	AZ04044-0302	CEDAR CREEK WTR STORAGE TANKS	58	$150,000	$25,344,000
NEVADA	NV02538-0301	MOAPA WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT	59	$190,000	$25,534,000
CALIFORNIA	CA14367-0601	BISHOP WATER METERS	60	$347,000	$25,881,000
ARIZONA	AZ09974-0301	LOWER MISHONGNOVI WATER TANK	61	$140,000	$26,021,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ07132-1001	SALT RIVER COMM SWR MAIN EXT	62	$1,800,000	$27,821,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0903	SALT RIVER DUMP CLOSURE	63	$25,000	$27,846,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0401	SALT RIVER (LEHI) WTR MAIN EXT	64	$400,000	$28,246,000
ARIZONA	AZ07128-0101	GILA RIVER D-7 WATER SOURCE	65	$541,000	$28,787,000
NEVADA	NV16999-0101	PYRAMID LK RES AS-BUILTS/O&M	66	$31,000	$28,818,000
CALIFORNIA	CA14367-0401	BISHOP SEWER MAIN EXTENSION	67	$33,000	$28,851,000
	AZ11213-0401	BLACKWATER TANK RENOVATION	68	$175,000	$29,026,000
	AZ11213-0301	STOTONIC WTR IMPROV PH I	69	$377,000	$29,403,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0A01	MOENKOPI NEW WELL & MAIN EXT	70	$490,000	$29,893,000
UTAH	UT24999-0904	L&O GUSHER LANDFILL CLOSURE	71	$460,000	$30,293,000
NEVADA	NV04560-0902	ELY SHOSHONE DUMP CLOSURE	72	$200,000	$30,493,000
CALIFORNIA	CA14366-0201	BIG PINE WATER SOURCE PH 2	73	$143,000	$30,636,000
ARIZONA	AZ09974-0101	UPPER MISHONGNOVI WTR/SWR/O&M	74	$566,000	$31,202,000
ARIZONA	AZ04062-0201	L&U PERIDOT WATER MAIN INTERCON	75	$51,000	$31,253,000
ARIZONA	AZ04059-0401	SAN CARLOS 7MILE PUMPHOUSE REHAB	76	$60,000	$31,313,000
ARIZONA	AZ04048-0301	SAN CARLOS GW PUMPHOUSE RENOV	77	$60,000	$31,373,000
ARIZONA	AZ04048-0201	SAN CARLOS GW STORAGE TNK REHAB	78	$87,000	$31,460,000
UTAH	UT24999-0107	U&O FT DUCHESNE WATER UPGRADES	79	$300,000	$31,760,000
NEVADA	NV04564-0902	SOUTH FORK TRANSFER STATION	80	$80,000	$31,840,000
NEVADA	NV04560-0401	DUCK VALLEY O & M	81	$120,000	$31,960,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0601	FORT YUMA WATER SOURCE	82	$447,000	$32,407,000
ARIZONA	AZ08153-0101	HUALAPAI INDIVIDUAL WELLS	83	$34,000	$32,441,000
CALIFORNIA	CA14367-0701	BISHOP SWR MN HYDRO-JET CLNR	84	$252,000	$32,693,000
ARIZONA	AZ09967-0201	HON DAH HOMESITES WTR STRAG TNK	85	$240,000	$32,933,000
ARIZONA	AZ08039-0301	FORT MOJAVE WATER SYS. UPGRADES	86	$130,000	$33,063,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0801	U MOENKOPI PLMB/SEWER EXTENSION	87	$87,000	$33,150,000
UTAH	UT24999-0A01	U&O WHITEROCKS SEWER IMPROVEMENTS	88	$115,000	$33,265,000
NEVADA	NV11623-0401	WALKER RIVER SEPTIC TANK PUMPER	89	$95,000	$33,360,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0101	CRIT-POSTON WTR SYS IMPROV	90	$268,000	$33,628,000
	AZ11213-0302	STOTONIC WTR IMPROV PH II	91	$1,471,000	$35,099,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0102	SHUNGOPAVI WATER TANK	92	$120,000	$35,219,000
ARIZONA	AZ09961-0201	BACAVI SEWER MAIN EXTENSION	93	$235,000	$35,454,000
NEVADA	NV02538-0101	MOAPA SEWER MANHOLE REPAIR	94	$8,000	$35,462,000
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0101	SHUNGOPAVI WATER SOURCE	95	$400,000	$35,862,000
ARIZONA	AZ09961-0102	BACAVI LAGOON RELOCATION	96	$500,000	$36,362,000
ARIZONA	AZ08039-0401	FORT MOJAVE AZ VILLAGE	97	$120,000	$36,482,000
NEVADA	NV02538-0201	MOAPA SWR, LIFT STA & FRC MAIN	98	$390,000	$36,872,000
ARIZONA	AZ09983-0201	SHUNGOPAVI - SEWERMAINS & TRMT	99	$185,000	$37,057,000
ARIZONA	AZ09981-0201	WEST SIPAULOVI, COM WIND SEWER	100	$375,000	$37,432,000
ARIZONA	AZ09977-0201	ORAIBI UNTY COMM & TRTN-DIV SEW	101	$475,000	$37,907,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0301	SALT RIVER (N OF CANAL) TANK, VFD	102	$295,000	$38,202,000
ARIZONA	AZ01999-0401	FT. APACHE DRY VALLEY COMM W&S	103	$3,560,000	$41,762,000
NEVADA	NV12627-0101	DUCKWATER DUMP CLOSURE	104	$100,000	$41,862,000
ARIZONA	AZ04999-0301	SAN CARLOS DRIPPING SPRINGS CWS	105	$366,000	$42,228,000
UTAH	UT24999-0501	U&O HILLTOP SEWER LAGOON	106	$135,000	$42,363,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-1001	CRIT WATER SYS CONTROLS	107	$46,000	$42,409,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0501	CRIT ADD STORAGE TANK	108	$1,806,000	$44,215,000
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0902	COCOPAH (SW COLLECTION & O&M)	109	$198,000	$44,413,000
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0603	FT APACHE MINER FLAT WTR STOR TANK	110	$760,000	$45,173,000
ARIZONA	AZ01999-0301	WHITERIVER ABANDONED LAGOONS	111	$200,000	$45,373,000
UTAH	UT24999-0104	U&O WATER TANK FENCING	112	$25,000	$45,398,000
UTAH	UT14999-0201	KANOSH WATER TREATMENT	113	$79,000	$45,477,000
	AZ11213-0102	GRIC D4 LAGOON RELOC	114	$1,574,000	$47,051,000
ARIZONA	AZ09977-0101	ORAIBI WATER & SEWER	115	$1,080,000	$48,131,000
ARIZONA	AZ05073-0201	BYLAS WATER SERVICE LINES	116	$222,000	$48,353,000
ARIZONA	AZ04999-0101	SAN CARLOS RES WIDE WTR METERS	117	$230,000	$48,583,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0301	UPPER MOENKOPI TANK REHAB	118	$40,000	$48,623,000
CALIFORNIA	CA26417-0101	BENTON WATER TANK	119	$82,000	$48,705,000
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0401	FORT APACHE N FORK SWR EXT	120	$500,000	$49,205,000
ARIZONA	AZ09961-0301	BACAVI WATERMAIN REPLACEMENT	121	$200,000	$49,405,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
CALIFORNIA	CA36038-0201	CHEMEHUEVI LAGN LIFT STA REHAB	122	$3,000,000	$52,405,000
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0801	U EAST FORK COMM SWR MAIN EXT	123	$760,000	$53,165,000
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0501	WHITERIVER SEWER MAIN REPLCMNT	124	$480,000	$53,645,000
ARIZONA	AZ09980-0101	SPIDER MOUND COMM	125	$750,000	$54,395,000
UTAH	UT23031-0101	SKULL VALLEY WTR IMPROV	126	$24,000	$54,419,000
UTAH	UT14999-0102	KANOSH COMMUNITY WATER TANK	127	$60,000	$54,479,000
NEVADA	NV16999-0301	PYRAMID LK-SUTCLIFFE MN REMOVAL	128	$177,000	$54,656,000
NEVADA	NV12632-0903	YOMBA SW TRANSFER/DUMP CLOSURE	129	$225,000	$54,881,000
NEVADA	NV02538-0302	MOAPA WATER TANK REPAINT	130	$47,000	$54,928,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0503	FT YUMA HOMESTEAD DUMP CLO	131	$84,000	$55,012,000
	AZ11999-0201	GRIC,(OLBERG) D2/D3 LOOP WTR MAIN	132	$903,000	$55,915,000
	AZ11213-0101	BLACKWATER SEWER & LAGOON EXP.	133	$1,122,000	$57,037,000
ARIZONA	AZ08153-0401	HUALAPAI TRANSMISSION MAIN	134	$1,150,000	$58,187,000
	AZ11240-0301	SACATON SEWER MAIN REPLACEMENT	135	$235,000	$58,422,000
ARIZONA	AZ09976-0101	KYKOTSMOVI WELL CONTROL BLDG	136	$20,000	$58,442,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0801	SALT RIVER EVGRN BOOSTER STATION	137	$76,000	$58,518,000
ARIZONA	AZ03126-0701	MOENKOPI SEWER LAGOON	138	$500,000	$59,018,000
NEVADA	NV12632-0101	YOMBA WTR SYS IMPROV	139	$175,000	$59,193,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0701	CRIT WATER WELL	140	$2,360,000	$61,553,000
UTAH	UT25999-0102	U&O HILLTOP WATER UPGRADES	141	$40,000	$61,593,000
UTAH	UT24999-0801	U&O RESERVATION WIDE O&M	142	$300,000	$61,893,000
NEVADA	NV07999-0201	FT MCDERMITT WATERMAIN REPLACEMENT	143	$350,000	$62,243,000
	AZ11215-0101	GRIC D-5 DRAINFIELD REPLACEMNT	144	$389,000	$62,632,000
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0905	HOPI DUMP CLOSURE - HPL	145	$1,300,000	$63,932,000
ARIZONA	AZ09999-0904	HOPI DUMP CLOSURE-TUBA CITY	146	$2,000,000	$65,932,000
ARIZONA	AZ07128-0301	GRIC D-7 WTR MAIN IMPROV.	147	$771,000	$66,703,000
UTAH	UT24999-0108	U&O OURAY WATER UPGRADES	148	$115,000	$66,818,000
ARIZONA	AZ04064-0101	PERIDOT SIDING SEWER MAIN EXT	149	$940,000	$67,758,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0102	FT YUMA VGS SWR SYS EXT PH2	150	$3,575,000	$71,333,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0905	CRIT SCAT DUMP CL PH 2	151	$2,776,000	$74,109,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ09990-0301	LWR EAST FORK COMM SWR MAIN EXT	152	$975,000	$75,584,000
ARIZONA	AZ04963-0201	CARRIZO COMMUNITY SEWER SYSTEM	153	$570,000	$75,654,000
ARIZONA	AZ03033-0902	SUPAI VILLAGE LANDFILL	154	$450,000	$76,104,000
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0601	COCOPAH NORTH COMM SWR SYS	155	$1,142,000	$77,246,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0401	CRIT RIVERBEND SEWER EXTENSION	156	$913,000	$78,159,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0201	CRIT HEADSTART AREA SWR SYS UPG	157	$315,000	$78,474,000
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0501	COCOPAH NORTH WTR DIS SYS	158	$232,000	$78,706,000
ARIZONA	AZ09974-0401	LOWER MISHONGNOVI SEWER	159	$400,000	$79,106,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0501	SALT RIVER (LEHI) WELL,TANK,BSTER PUMP	160	$466,000	$79,572,000
ARIZONA	AZ07128-0201	GILA RIVER D-7 SEWER EXTENSION	161	$1,186,000	$80,758,000
ARIZONA	AZ03033-0903	SUPAI VILLAGE DUMP CLOSURE	162	$500,000	$81,258,000
ARIZONA	AZ09964-0301	CIBECUE WATER SYSTEM UPGRADE	163	$1,424,000	$82,682,000
ARIZONA	AZ07132-0701	SALT RIVER N SYS WTRMAIN LOOP	164	$129,000	$82,811,000
ARIZONA	AZ03033-0201	SUPAI VILLAGE WATER SYS IMPROV	165	$642,000	$83,453,000
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0103	COCOPAH NORTH WTR STORAGE TNK	166	$1,215,000	$84,668,000
ARIZONA	AZ07127-0101	GILA RIVER D-6 BACKUP WTR SUPLY	167	$142,000	$84,810,000
ARIZONA	AZ04999-0904	SAN CARLOS REG LANDFILL	168	$1,124,000	$85,934,000
ARIZONA	AZ08153-0601	HUALAPAI VALENTINE LAGOON RELOC	169	$200,000	$86,134,000
UTAH	UT12628-0201	GOSHUTE O&M	170	$55,000	$86,189,000
NEVADA	NV11623-0101	WALKER RIVER WTR MAIN EXT	171	$273,000	$86,462,000
CALIFORNIA	CA36038-0301	CHEMEHUEVI WTR SYS IMPROV	172	$580,000	$87,042,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-1101	CRIT MO CHEM SWR EXT	173	$586,000	$87,628,000
	AZ11240-0401	SACATON FLATS SEWER IMPROV.	174	$1,724,000	$89,352,000
ARIZONA	AZ09971-0101	KEAMS CANYON WTR SYS UPGRADES	175	$75,000	$89,427,000
ARIZONA	AZ04044-0301	CEDAR CREEK WATER SYS UPGRADES	176	$400,000	$89,827,000
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0101	COCOPAH NORTH WELL	177	$372,000	$90,199,000
ARIZONA	AZ15999-0801	CRIT WTR DIST LOOPS	178	$5,182,000	$95,381,000
UTAH	UT24999-0101	U&O ARCADIA WATER UPGRADES	179	$132,000	$95,513,000
ARIZONA	AZ08153-0701	HUALAPAI B&D WTR MAIN EXT	180	$36,000	$95,549,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0301	FT YUMA WTR MAIN REPL PH I	181	$2,107,000	$97,656,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ14999-0102	COCOPAH NORTH WTR TRMNT	182	$656,000	$98,312,000
ARIZONA	AZ13263-0101	CAMP VERDE, CLARKDALE WELL,PH,TANK	183	$375,000	$98,687,000
CALIFORNIA	CA13999-0302	FT YUMA WTRMAIN RPLCMT- PHASE 2	184	$3,592,000	$102,279,000
	AZ11215-0301	GRIC, CASA BLNCA LAGOON RELOCATE	185	$469,000	$102,748,000
ARIZONA	AZ13262-0101	CAMP VERDE TANK/VFD	186	$350,000	$103,098,000

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost	
Area: PO						
IDAHO	ID05024-0501	PLUMMER SEWER TREATMENT UPGRADE	1	$175,000	$175,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0402	LUMMI-HAXTON WAY LS REHAB PH.2	2	$67,000	$242,000	
WASHINGTON	WA31542-0101	SAUK SUIATTLE CORROSION CONTROL	3	$0	$242,000	10
WASHINGTON	WA05344-0301	MAKAH LANDFILL CLOSURE	4	$250,000	$492,000	20
WASHINGTON	WA31736-0701	TULALIP FAILED DRAINFIELDS	5	$440,000	$932,000	
IDAHO	ID05024-0701	WORLEY WATER UPGRADE	6	$213,000	$1,145,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37220-0201	NOOKSACK-S-CEDARS CORROSION CONTROL	7	$0	$1,145,000	
WASHINGTON	WA18480-0201	Pt. Gamble Upper Water System	8	$17,000	$1,162,000	
WASHINGTON	WA14412-0401	CHEHALIS CORROSION CONTROL	9	$0	$1,162,000	
IDAHO	ID35999-0101	NEZ PERCE DUMP CLOSURE/TRANSFER STATION	10	$130,000	$1,292,000	45
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0601	LUMMI-GOOSEBERRY POINT STP	11	$895,000	$2,187,000	60
OREGON	OR13397-0101	BURNS PIAUTE - PUMPHOUSE REPLACEMENT	12	$212,000	$2,399,000	
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0401	YAKAMA PARKER WATER SYSTEM	13	$32,000	$2,431,000	
WASHINGTON	WA20998-0101	YAKAMA-CLOUDVILLE COMMUNAL SEWER	14	$80,000	$2,511,000	75
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0102	YAKAMA-ILLEGAL DUMP SITES	15	$515,000	$3,026,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37220-0301	NOOKSACK RUTSATZ RD CORROSION CONTROL	16	$0	$3,026,000	
WASHINGTON	WA05344-0302	MAKAH TRANSFER STATION	17	$200,000	$3,226,000	
WASHINGTON	WA05342-0401	QUILEUTE SEWER TREATMENT, PH I	18	$400,000	$3,626,000	
IDAHO	ID35182-0201	CULDESAC WATER/SEWER UPGRADE	19	$15,000	$3,641,000	
IDAHO	ID05021-0301	Coeur d'Alene - Desmet Corrosion Control	20	$0	$3,641,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0501	LUMMI-WATER STOR. CAP. IMP.	21	$1,710,000	$5,351,000	
WASHINGTON	WA18480-0101	Ravencrest Sewer System Improvements	22	$109,000	$5,460,000	
WASHINGTON	WA14416-0201	Taholah AC Main Replacement	23	$100,000	$5,560,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0801	LUMMI-LUMMI SHORE RD.LS REHAB.	24	$550,000	$6,110,000	
WASHINGTON	WA37225-0101	UPPER SKAGIT - PUMP HOUSE RENOVATION	25	$0	$6,110,000	
WASHINGTON	WA17451-0101	MUCKLESHOOT COM. BACK UP WELL	26	$317,000	$6,427,000	
WASHINGTON	WA14412-0201	CHEHALIS COM WATER NITRATE STUDY	27	$0	$6,427,000	

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
OREGON	OR30294-0701	UMATILLA - ALEXANDER LANE WATER EXT.	28	$15,000	$6,442,000
IDAHO	ID11060-0101	KOOTENAI WATER SERVICE LINE	29	$4,000	$6,446,000
WASHINGTON	WA31736-0801	TULALIP - JOHN SAM LAKE NITRATE STUDY	30	$75,000	$6,521,000
WASHINGTON	WA29684-0201	SWINOMISH, PM NORTHWEST DUMP	31	$0	$6,521,000
WASHINGTON	WA29684-0102	SWINOMISH-DAN TRACT DUMP CLOSURE	32	$300,000	$6,821,000
WASHINGTON	WA17451-0201	MUCKLESHOOT, STAR WELL RENOVATION	33	$30,000	$6,851,000
OREGON	OR30294-0601	UMATILLA INTERTIE W/PENDLETON WATER SYS	34	$350,000	$7,201,000
OREGON	OR13397-0201	BURNS PIAUTE - LOWER SEWER MAIN CLEAN/VI	35	$40,000	$7,241,000
WASHINGTON	WA23563-0401	SKOKOMISH SOLID WASTE	36	$85,000	$7,326,000
WASHINGTON	WA05344-0104	MAKAH SOOES RVR WTR SYS PH.4	37	$450,000	$7,776,000
IDAHO	ID06040-0106	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT III, PHASE 6	38	$720,000	$8,496,000
WASHINGTON	WA24602-0201	OMAK SOLID WASTE TRANSFER STATION	39	$87,500	$8,583,500
WASHINGTON	WA20904-0101	YAKAMA SAND FILTER CLEANING STATIONS	40	$7,500	$8,591,000
WASHINGTON	WA16431-0101	HOH RIB REPLACEMENT	41	$350,000	$8,941,000
IDAHO	ID25117-0501	KAMIAH IMPROVEMENTS	42	$2,000	$8,943,000
IDAHO	ID06040-0501	FT HALL COMMUNITY SEPTIC TANK PUMPING	43	$80,000	$9,023,000
WASHINGTON	WA25621-0101	SHOALWATER BAY WATER SYSTEM	44	$130,000	$9,153,000
WASHINGTON	WA16431-0201	HOH STORAGE TANK	45	$28,000	$9,181,000
OREGON	OR16265-0201	WARM SPRINGS TRANSFER STATION	46	$325,000	$9,506,000
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0301	YAKAMA - REMOTE SYSTEM MONITORING	47	$15,000	$9,521,000
WASHINGTON	WA39858-0504	YAKAMA-TANK REPAINTING	48	$225,000	$9,746,000
WASHINGTON	WA33770-0101	MCCOY LK WATER SYSTEM	49	$200,000	$9,946,000
WASHINGTON	WA24599-0601	NESPELEM TOWN WATERMAIN EXT.	50	$84,000	$10,030,000
WASHINGTON	WA17451-0401	MUCKLESHOOT OPEN DUMP CLEANUP	51	$85,000	$10,115,000
WASHINGTON	WA14412-0301	CHEHALIS WATER SYS IMPVTS	52	$0	$10,115,000
WASHINGTON	WA26999-0401	CASELINE COMM. SEWER	53	$45,400	$10,160,400
WASHINGTON	WA26999-0202	KALISPEL COMM. SEWER II	54	$156,000	$10,316,400
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0701	YAKAMA - AGENCY TANK REPLACEMENT	55	$125,000	$10,441,400

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0701	KELLER WATER SYSTEM IMPROV	56	$15,800	$10,457,200
WASHINGTON	WA26999-0301	KALISPEL TRANSFER STATION	57	$80,000	$10,537,200
OREGON	OR30294-0301	UMATILLA COM WATER WELL	58	$225,000	$10,762,200
IDAHO	ID25117-0101	RIVERSIDE WATER UPGRADE	59	$10,000	$10,772,200
IDAHO	ID06041-0101	FT HALL TOWNSITE WATER SYS RENOVATIONS	60	$900,000	$11,672,200
IDAHO	ID05024-0301	COEUR D' ALENE SUB-AGENCY CORROSION CONT	61	$0	$11,672,200
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0701	LUMMI-SUCIA DR WATER MAIN EXT	62	$140,000	$11,812,200
WASHINGTON	WA37220-0101	NOOKSACK - TANK REPAIR	63	$0	$11,812,200
WASHINGTON	WA39858-0802	YAKAMA WHITE SWAN CONTROLS/BACK UP POWER	64	$53,000	$11,865,200
WASHINGTON	WA17451-0301	MUCKLESHOOT - ABANDON EXISTING WELLS	65	$9,500	$11,874,700
OREGON	OR18357-0201	SPRAGUE RIVER SEWER SYSTEM	66	$220,000	$12,094,700
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0601	YAKAMA-AGENCY WATER METER	67	$12,500	$12,107,200
WASHINGTON	WA24599-0301	TOWN OF NESPELEM WATER I	68	$250,000	$12,357,200
WASHINGTON	WA20492-0101	YAKAMA-BILLYSVILLE W&S SYSTEM	69	$125,000	$12,482,200
OREGON	OR16265-0302	WARM SPRINGS WEST HILLS TENINO TANK	70	$200,000	$12,682,200
OREGON	OR16265-0301	WARM SPRINGS WEST HILLS MAIN REPLACEMENT	71	$200,000	$12,882,200
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0303	COLVILLE-DUMP CLOSURE (II)	72	$500,000	$13,382,200
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0302	COLVILLE-DUMP CLOSURE (I)	73	$150,000	$13,532,200
WASHINGTON	WA14416-0101	TAHOLAH & QUEETS MSW PLAN	74	$60,000	$13,592,200
WASHINGTON	WA05344-0201	Neah Bay AC Main Replacement	75	$600,000	$14,192,200
OREGON	OR30294-0401	UMATILLA KIRKPATRICK ROAD Wtr EXT	76	$75,000	$14,267,200
IDAHO	ID35182-0401	LAPWAI SEWAGE TREATMENT.	77	$1,132,500	$15,399,700
IDAHO	ID35182-0301	NORTH LAPWAI WATER STORAGE	78	$13,500	$15,413,200
WASHINGTON	WA10384-0402	TWIN LAKES COMMUNITY SEWER I, PHASE 2	79	$232,500	$15,645,700
WASHINGTON	WA05342-0501	QUILEUTE SOLID WASTE	80	$130,000	$15,775,700
IDAHO	ID06041-0501	FORT HALL SOLID WASTE (II)	81	$450,000	$16,225,700
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0801	YAKAMA - AGENCY SEWER MAIN JET/VIDEO	82	$50,000	$16,275,700
WASHINGTON	WA39858-0701	YAKAMA WHITE SWAN WATER METER	83	$50,000	$16,325,700

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
WASHINGTON	WA33999-0301	SPOKANE SOLID WASTE	84	$250,000	$16,575,700
WASHINGTON	WA23563-0101	SKOKOMISH SEWER SYSTEM	85	$3,575,000	$20,150,700
IDAHO	ID06040-0109	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT III, PHASE 9	86	$200,000	$20,350,700
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0401	COLVILLE-SEPTIC TANK PUMPER	87	$200,000	$20,550,700
WASHINGTON	WA24602-0101	OMAK WATER DISTRIBUTION	88	$0	$20,550,700
WASHINGTON	WA24599-0202	NESPELEM AGENCY WATER IMPROV I	89	$100,000	$20,650,700
OREGON	OR30294-0101	UMATILLA - CELILO FALLS W & S IMPVT	90	$496,000	$21,146,700
IDAHO	ID35182-0601	FIELD 19 WATER SYSTEM UPGRADE	91	$0	$21,146,700
IDAHO	ID25117-0301	WINCHESTER WASTEWATER UPGRADE	92	$30,000	$21,176,700
IDAHO	ID25117-0201	STITES WASTEWATER UPGRADE	93	$10,060	$21,186,760
WASHINGTON	WA37801-0103	LUMMI-LUMMI SHORE 'AM LOOP	94	$225,000	$21,411,700
WASHINGTON	WA25621-0501	SHOALWATER BAY COMM RECYCLE CTR	95	$30,000	$21,441,700
WASHINGTON	WA23560-0301	KAMILCHE STORAGE TANK	96	$100,000	$21,541,700
WASHINGTON	WA10384-0403	TWIN LAKES COMMUNITY SEWER I, PHASE 3	97	$240,000	$21,781,700
IDAHO	ID25117-0401	KAMIAH COMMUNITY SEWER (I)	98	$14,660	$21,796,360
WASHINGTON	WA24599-0801	TOWN OF NESPELEM SEWER I	99	$437,000	$22,233,360
WASHINGTON	WA10384-0401	TWIN LAKES COMMUNITY SEWER I, PHASE I	100	$285,000	$22,518,360
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0301	COLVILLE S/W TRNSFER STATION	101	$335,000	$22,853,360
WASHINGTON	WA10384-0501	TWIN LAKES HUD WATER SYSTEM	102	$0	$22,853,360
OREGON	OR30294-0402	Umatillla Kirkpatrick Road Sewer Ext.	103	$150,000	$23,003,360
WASHINGTON	WA18477-0101	SUQUAMISH/GEORGE WATER SYS IMP*	104	$210,000	$23,213,360
OREGON	OR27364-0101	GRAND RONDE SEWER SYS IMPRVMNT	105	$236,000	$23,449,360
IDAHO	ID05021-0201	TENSED SEWER TREATMENT UPGRADE	106	$120,000	$23,569,360
WASHINGTON	WA31736-0602	TULALIP E SIDE WTRMAIN UPGRADE	107	$575,000	$24,144,360
IDAHO	ID06041-0604	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT II, PHASE 4	108	$1,732,000	$25,876,360
IDAHO	ID06041-0603	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT II, PHASE 3	109	$1,476,000	$27,352,360
IDAHO	ID06040-0107	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT III, PHASE 7	110	$594,000	$27,946,360
WASHINGTON	WA10384-0601	METEOR HUD WATER SYSTEM	111	$0	$27,946,360
WASHINGTON	WA05342-0402	QUILEUTE SEWER TREATMENT, PH II	112	$635,000	$28,581,360
IDAHO	ID35182-0101	SWEETWATER WATER/SEWER	113	$250,000	$28,831,360

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Comm. Project Cost
WASHINGTON	WA26999-0101	KALISPEL COMMUNITY WATER	114	$115,000	$28,946,360
OREGON	OR16264-0101	WARM SPRINGS WTP EXPANSION	115	$2,000,000	$30,946,360
IDAHO	ID06041-0606	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT II, PHASE 6	116	$2,521,000	$33,467,360
IDAHO	ID06041-0605	FORT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT II, PHASE 5	117	$1,277,000	$34,744,360
IDAHO	ID06041-0602	FORT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT II, PHASE 2	118	$2,228,000	$36,972,360
IDAHO	ID06040-0108	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT III, PHASE 8	119	$407,000	$37,379,360
IDAHO	ID05024-0101	COEUR D'ALENE SUB-AGENCY LAGOON	120	$60,000	$37,439,360
WASHINGTON	WA26999-0203	KALISPEL COMM SEWER III	121	$511,300	$37,950,660
WASHINGTON	WA25621-0401	SHOALWATER BAY COMM SEWER SYS	122	$620,000	$38,570,660
WASHINGTON	WA11112-0102	CHEHALIS SEWAGE COLLECTION SYST	123	$0	$38,570,660
WASHINGTON	WA05343-0101	LOWER ELWHA SEWER SYSTEM	124	$1,840,000	$40,410,660
WASHINGTON	WA05343-0201	Lower Elwha Water System Improvements	125	$75,000	$40,485,660
WASHINGTON	WA39999-0501	YAKAMA AGENCY WASTEWATER DISPOSAL	126	$250,000	$40,735,660
WASHINGTON	WA16433-0501	QUEETS SEWER SYS IMPROVEMENTS	127	$375,000	$41,110,660
IDAHO	ID11060-0301	KOOTENAI-THREE MILE SEWER	128	$70,000	$41,180,660
IDAHO	ID05024-0202	WALEY COMMUNAL LAGOON UPGRADE	129	$167,000	$41,347,660
IDAHO	ID11060-0201	KOOTENAI-THREE MILE WATER	130	$18,000	$41,365,660
WASHINGTON	WA05343-0401	LOWER ELWHA WATER LINE EXTEN *	131	$80,000	$41,445,660
WASHINGTON	WA05342-0502	LAPUSH DUMP CLOSURE	132	$20,000	$41,465,660
IDAHO	ID06040-0401	Ft. Hall Open Dumps Closure	133	$1,700,000	$43,165,660
IDAHO	ID05021-0101	TIRE DUMP AND CAR CRUSHING SITE	134	$27,000	$43,192,660
WASHINGTON	WA10385-0801	KELLER WATER STORAGE IMPROV	135	$291,000	$43,483,660
IDAHO	ID06040-0601	Sheepskin Road Com Sewer Ext.	136	$350,000	$43,833,660
IDAHO	ID06040-0110	FT HALL AGENCY WTR EXT. III, PHASE 10	137	$343,000	$44,176,660
IDAHO	ID06040-0701	Ft. Hall Reservation Landfill	138	$2,500,000	$46,676,660
WASHINGTON	WA33755-0601	DISAUTEL WATER RESERVOIR	139	$83,750	$46,760,410

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
Area: TU					
ARIZONA	AZ10047-0102	YOEM PUEBLO SEWER	1	$28,650	$28,650
ARIZONA	AZ10901-0001	UPPER COVD WELLS SOLID WASTE	2	$7,210	$35,860
ARIZONA	AZ10029-0002	LOWER COVD WELLS SOLID WASTE-2	3	$90,640	$126,500
ARIZONA	AZ10029-0001	LOWER COVD WELLS SOLID WASTE -1	4	$13,390	$139,890
ARIZONA	AZ07001-0101	KAKA SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	5	$26,800	$166,690
ARIZONA	AZ10049-0004	NEW FIELDS WATER	6	$145,000	$311,690
ARIZONA	AZ11221-0101	FLORENCE SOLID WASTE	7	$31,827	$343,517
ARIZONA	AZ11090-0101	WHITE HORSE PASS SOLID WASTE	8	$12,772	$356,289
ARIZONA	AZ11089-0101	KOHATK SOLID WASTE	9	$24,411	$380,700
ARIZONA	AZ11088-0101	JACKRABBIT SOLID WASTE	10	$11,639	$392,339
ARIZONA	AZ11085-0003	CHUI CHU SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	11	$56,238	$448,577
ARIZONA	AZ11085-0002	CHUI CHU SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	12	$15,965	$464,542
ARIZONA	AZ11085-0001	CHUI CHU SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	13	$25,440	$489,982
ARIZONA	AZ10902-0101	SANTA ROSA SUBDIV SOLID WASTE	14	$28,634	$518,616
ARIZONA	AZ10080-0101	VENTANA SOLID WASTE	15	$10,600	$529,216
ARIZONA	AZ10079-0101	VAYA CHIN SOLID WASTE	16	$10,600	$539,816
ARIZONA	AZ10078-0101	VAMORI SOLID WASTE	17	$22,400	$562,216
ARIZONA	AZ10076-0101	TOPAWA SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	18	$37,000	$599,216
ARIZONA	AZ10070-0101	SIL NAKYA SOLID WASTE	19	$25,500	$624,716
ARIZONA	AZ10061-0101	SAN MIGUEL SOLID WASTE	20	$37,000	$661,716
ARIZONA	AZ10060-0101	SANTA ROSA RANCH SOLID WASTE	21	$12,400	$674,116
ARIZONA	AZ10056-0101	QUEENS WELL SOLID WASTE	22	$6,400	$680,516
ARIZONA	AZ10053-0101	PAN TAK SOLID WASTE	23	$13,800	$694,316
ARIZONA	AZ10052-0202	GARCIA STRIP SOLID WASTE	24	$11,800	$706,116
ARIZONA	AZ10052-0201	BOBCAT SOLID WASTE	25	$9,600	$715,716
ARIZONA	AZ10039-0101	IRON STAND SOLID WASTE	26	$9,600	$725,316
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0006	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 4	27	$20,600	$745,916
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0005	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 6	28	$15,800	$761,716
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0004	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 5	29	$78,500	$840,216
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0003	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	30	$9,600	$849,816

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0002	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	31	$18,000	$867,816
ARIZONA	AZ10038-0001	HICKIWAN SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	32	$61,500	$929,316
ARIZONA	AZ10037-0101	GU VO SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	33	$255,400	$1,184,716
ARIZONA	AZ10035-0101	GUNSIGHT SOLID WASTE	34	$27,600	$1,212,316
ARIZONA	AZ10031-0102	CROWHANG SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	35	$9,600	$1,221,916
ARIZONA	AZ10031-0101	CROWHANG SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	36	$26,600	$1,248,516
ARIZONA	AZ10030-0101	COWLIC SOLID WASTE	37	$24,400	$1,272,916
ARIZONA	AZ10022-0101	CHOULIC SOLID WASTE	38	$11,800	$1,284,716
ARIZONA	AZ10019-0102	FRESNAL VILLAGE SOLID WASTE #2	39	$35,000	$1,319,716
ARIZONA	AZ10019-0101	FRESNAL VILLAGE SOLID WASTE #1	40	$26,600	$1,346,316
ARIZONA	AZ10018-0101	CHARCO 27 SOLID WASTE	41	$13,800	$1,360,116
ARIZONA	AZ10015-0103	BIG FIELDS SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	42	$25,500	$1,385,616
ARIZONA	AZ10015-0102	BIG FIELDS SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	43	$12,800	$1,398,416
ARIZONA	AZ10015-0101	BIG FIELDS SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	44	$20,200	$1,418,616
ARIZONA	AZ10011-0103	ANAGEM SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	45	$23,380	$1,441,996
ARIZONA	AZ10009-0103	ARTESIA SOLID WASTE	46	$17,000	$1,458,996
ARIZONA	AZ10009-0101	LITTLE TUCSON SOLID WASTE SITE1	47	$31,800	$1,490,796
ARIZONA	AZ10005-0101	PALO VERDE STAND SOLID WASTE	48	$18,025	$1,508,821
ARIZONA	AZ07001-0103	KAKA SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	49	$5,150	$1,513,971
ARIZONA	AZ07001-0102	KAKA SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	50	$10,300	$1,524,271
ARIZONA	AZ11090-0001	WHITEHORSE PASS WATER & SEWER	51	$137,000	$1,661,271
ARIZONA	AZ11089-0001	KOHATK WATER & SEWER	52	$434,000	$2,095,271
ARIZONA	AZ11088-0001	JACKRABBIT WATER & SEWER	53	$222,440	$2,317,711
ARIZONA	AZ11087-0001	NORTH KOMELIK WATER & SEWER	54	$495,000	$2,812,711
ARIZONA	AZ10997-0002	P.Y (BARIO LIBRE & OLD P.)W & S	55	$124,826	$2,937,537
ARIZONA	AZ10997-0001	P.Y (BARIO LIBRE & OLD P.)W & S	56	$172,834	$3,110,371
ARIZONA	AZ10080-0001	VENTANA WATER & SEWER	57	$464,000	$3,574,371
ARIZONA	AZ10078-0002	VAMORI SEWER	58	$187,000	$3,761,371
ARIZONA	AZ10076-0002	TOPAWA WATER & SEWER	59	$668,000	$4,429,371
ARIZONA	AZ10067-0203	SELLS WATER AND SEWER	60	$352,000	$4,781,371
ARIZONA	AZ10065-0001	SAN XAVIER (WEST) WATER & SWR	61	$611,000	$5,392,371

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ10049-0005	NEW FIELDS WATER	62	$251,000	$5,643,371
ARIZONA	AZ10047-0001	YOEM PUEBLO WATER & SEWER	63	$93,100	$5,736,471
ARIZONA	AZ10037-0001	GU VO WATER & SEWER	64	$485,000	$6,221,471
ARIZONA	AZ10035-0001	GUNSIGHT WATER & SEWER	65	$415,000	$6,636,471
ARIZONA	AZ10031-0001	CROWHANG WATER & SEWER	66	$348,000	$6,984,471
ARIZONA	AZ10026-0002	COLD FIELD WATER & SEWER	67	$177,000	$7,161,471
ARIZONA	AZ10021-0001	FRESNAL CANYON WATER	68	$158,000	$7,319,471
ARIZONA	AZ10018-0001	CHARCO 27 WATER & SEWER	69	$362,000	$7,681,471
ARIZONA	AZ10007-0001	AK CHIN WATER & SEWER	70	$484,000	$8,165,471
ARIZONA	AZ10005-0001	SAN LUIS/PALO VERDE STD W & S	71	$422,000	$8,587,471
ARIZONA	AZ07151-0201	HIGH TOWN SOLID WASTE	72	$8,000	$8,595,471
ARIZONA	AZ07151-0001	HIGH TOWN WATER & SEWER	73	$28,428	$8,623,899
ARIZONA	AZ07150-0101	PENJAMO WATER & SEWER	74	$14,214	$8,638,113
ARIZONA	AZ07137-0001	SAN LUCY WATER	75	$1,474,000	$10,112,113
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0202	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	76	$111,240	$10,223,353
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0201	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	77	$111,240	$10,334,593
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0109	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	78	$92,700	$10,427,293
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0108	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	79	$92,700	$10,519,993
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0107	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	80	$92,700	$10,612,693
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0106	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	81	$92,700	$10,705,393
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0105	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	82	$92,700	$10,798,093
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0104	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	83	$92,700	$10,890,793
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0103	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	84	$92,700	$10,983,493
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0102	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	85	$92,700	$11,076,193
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0101	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	86	$92,700	$11,168,893
ARIZONA	AZ11086-0001	COCKLEBURR WATER & SEWER	87	$841,315	$12,010,208
ARIZONA	AZ10081-0102	PASCUA YAQUI PUEBLO WTR & SWR	88	$108,768	$12,118,976
ARIZONA	AZ10081-0101	PASCUA YAQUI PUEBLO WTR & SWR	89	$119,789	$12,238,765
ARIZONA	AZ10067-0102	SELLS SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	90	$8,300	$12,247,065
ARIZONA	AZ10062-0002	SAN PEDRO WATER & SEWER	91	$18,000	$12,265,065
ARIZONA	AZ10060-0001	SANTA ROSA RANCH WATER & SEWER	92	$55,000	$12,320,065

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ10034-0102	SANTA ROSA VILL SOLID WASTE - 2	93	$36,050	$12,356,115
ARIZONA	AZ07137-0002	SAN LUCY WATER STORAGE	94	$671,000	$13,027,115
ARIZONA	AZ11087-0103	N KOMELIC SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	95	$7,416	$13,034,531
ARIZONA	AZ11087-0102	N. KOMELIC SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	96	$63,654	$13,098,185
ARIZONA	AZ11087-0101	N. KOMELIC SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	97	$23,380	$13,121,565
ARIZONA	AZ11086-0101	COCKLEBURR SOLID WASTE	98	$27,604	$13,149,169
ARIZONA	AZ10997-0201	BARIO LIBRE & OLD PASCUA SW	99	$42,230	$13,191,399
ARIZONA	AZ10076-0102	TOPAWA SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	100	$8,600	$13,199,999
ARIZONA	AZ10069-0101	SIKUL HIMATK SOLID WASTE	101	$12,772	$13,212,771
ARIZONA	AZ10067-0101	SAN XAVIER SOLID WASTE (E & W)	102	$508,000	$13,720,771
ARIZONA	AZ10063-0102	SAN SIMON SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	103	$6,400	$13,727,171
ARIZONA	AZ10063-0101	SAN SIMON SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	104	$24,400	$13,751,571
ARIZONA	AZ10062-0101	SAN PEDRO SOLID WASTE	105	$23,400	$13,774,971
ARIZONA	AZ10055-0101	PIA OIK SOLID WASTE	106	$14,800	$13,789,771
ARIZONA	AZ10052-0101	SCATTERED HOME RENOVATIONS	107	$130,500	$13,920,271
ARIZONA	AZ10050-0101	NOLIC SOLID WASTE	108	$8,500	$13,928,771
ARIZONA	AZ10049-0101	NEW FIELDS SOLID WASTE	109	$9,600	$13,938,371
ARIZONA	AZ10047-0201	YOEM PUEBLO SOLID WASTE	110	$18,566	$13,956,937
ARIZONA	AZ10046-0101	RINCON SOLID WASTE	111	$12,000	$13,968,937
ARIZONA	AZ10042-0101	SANTA CRUZ SOLID WASTE	112	$18,000	$13,986,937
ARIZONA	AZ10041-0101	SOUTH KOMELIC SOLID WASTE	113	$21,300	$14,008,237
ARIZONA	AZ10037-0102	GU VO SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	114	$8,450	$14,016,687
ARIZONA	AZ10034-0101	SANTA ROSA VILL SOLID WASTE - 1	115	$13,390	$14,030,077
ARIZONA	AZ10027-0101	COMOBABI SOLID WASTE	116	$9,600	$14,039,677
ARIZONA	AZ10026-0101	COLD FIELD SOLID WASTE	117	$14,500	$14,054,177
ARIZONA	AZ10025-0101	COBABI SOLID WASTE	118	$18,025	$14,072,202
ARIZONA	AZ10021-0101	FRESNAL CANYON SOLID WASTE	119	$22,300	$14,094,502
ARIZONA	AZ10014-0104	PISINIMO SOLID WASTE - SITE 4	120	$6,400	$14,100,902
ARIZONA	AZ10014-0103	PISINIMO SOLID WASTE - SITE 3	121	$4,120	$14,105,022
ARIZONA	AZ10014-0102	PISINIMO SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	122	$4,100	$14,109,122
ARIZONA	AZ10014-0101	PISINIMO SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	123	$44,600	$14,153,722

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ10011-0102	ANEGAM SOLID WASTE - SITE 2	124	$45,630	$14,199,352
ARIZONA	AZ10011-0101	ANEGAM SOLID WASTE - SITE 1	125	$7,416	$14,206,768
ARIZONA	AZ10011-0002	ANEGAM WATER & SEWER	126	$571,650	$14,778,418
ARIZONA	AZ10009-0102	LITTLE TUCSON SOLID WASTE SITE2	127	$23,400	$14,801,818
ARIZONA	AZ10008-0101	MENEGERS DAM SOLID WASTE	128	$21,200	$14,823,018
ARIZONA	AZ10007-0101	AK-CHIN SOLID WASTE	129	$15,965	$14,838,983
ARIZONA	AZ10005-0102	SAN LUIS SOLID WASTE (GU ACHI)	130	$10,610	$14,849,593
ARIZONA	AZ07150-0201	PENJAMO SOLID WASTE	131	$6,180	$14,855,773
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0501	GUADALUPE SOLID WASTE	132	$85,490	$14,941,263
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0402	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	133	$152,440	$15,093,703
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0401	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	134	$152,440	$15,246,143
ARIZONA	AZ11088-0002	JACKRABBIT WATER	135	$95,000	$15,341,143
ARIZONA	AZ10062-0001	SAN PEDRO WATER	136	$49,000	$15,390,143
ARIZONA	AZ10076-0001	TOPAWA WATER	137	$190,000	$15,580,143
ARIZONA	AZ10061-0001	SAN MIGUEL WATER	138	$38,200	$15,618,343
ARIZONA	AZ10060-0002	SANTA ROSA RANCH WATER	139	$98,000	$15,716,343
ARIZONA	AZ10025-0001	COBABI WATER & SEWER	140	$13,400	$15,729,743
ARIZONA	AZ10009-0003	LITTLE TUCSON/ARTESIA WATER	141	$158,000	$15,887,743
ARIZONA	AZ10021-0002	FRESNAL CANYON WATER & SEWER	142	$196,000	$16,083,743
ARIZONA	AZ10014-0005	PISINIMO WATER	143	$93,000	$16,176,743
ARIZONA	AZ10081-0001	PASCUA YAQUI PUEBLO WATER	144	$373,272	$16,550,015
ARIZONA	AZ10042-0001	SANTA CRUZ WATER	145	$43,000	$16,593,015
ARIZONA	AZ10024-0001	DIRT BURN WATER	146	$83,000	$16,676,015
ARIZONA	AZ10999-0601	TOUA WATER SYSTEM CHLORINATION	147	$354,000	$17,030,015
ARIZONA	AZ10047-0101	YOEM PUEBLO WATER & SEWER	148	$146,404	$17,176,419
ARIZONA	AZ10999-0301	T.O. TRIBAL WELL MAINTENANCE	149	$212,000	$17,388,419
ARIZONA	AZ10999-0501	TOHONO O'ODHAM UTILITY AUTHORIT	150	$674,000	$18,062,419
ARIZONA	AZ10999-0201	TOUA O&M	151	$160,000	$18,222,419
ARIZONA	AZ10997-0102	P.Y.(B.L. & O.P.) W & S Service	152	$204,275	$18,426,694
ARIZONA	AZ10997-0101	P Y (B L. & O.P.) W & S Service	153	$245,140	$18,671,834
ARIZONA	AZ07151-0101	HIGH TOWN WATER & SEWER	154	$60,770	$18,732,604

State	Project Number	Project Name	Area Priority	Project Cost	Cumm. Project Cost
ARIZONA	AZ07150-0001	PENJAMO WATER & SEWER	155	$112,270	$18,844,874
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0304	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	156	$189,520	$19,034,394
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0303	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	157	$189,520	$19,223,914
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0302	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	158	$189,520	$19,413,434
ARIZONA	AZ07040-0301	GUADALUPE WATER & SEWER	159	$189,520	$19,602,954
ARIZONA	AZ10053-0002	PAN TAK WATER & SEWER*	160	$291,000	$19,893,954
ARIZONA	AZ10998-0002	MOUNTAIN VILLAGE WATER & SEWER*	161	$291,000	$20,184,954
ARIZONA	AZ10998-0001	MOUNTAIN VILLAGE WATER*	162	$252,000	$20,436,954
ARIZONA	AZ10081-0202	PASCUA YAQUI PUEBLO WTR & SWR	163	$246,170	$20,683,124
ARIZONA	AZ10081-0201	PASCUA YAQUI PUEBLO WTR & SWR	164	$246,170	$20,929,294
ARIZONA	AZ10053-0001	PAN TAK WATER*	165	$590,000	$21,519,294
ARIZONA	AZ10052-0001	SCATTERED(OS,TCLTE,SG,BWR)*	166	$1,445,600	$22,964,894
ARIZONA	AZ10040-0001	ITAK WATER & SEWER(ROCKY POINT*	167	$456,000	$23,420,894
ARIZONA	AZ11901-0001	SAN LUCY FARMS*	168	$374,000	$23,794,894
ARIZONA	AZ10073-0001	STOA PITK WATER & SEWER*	169	$454,700	$24,249,594
ARIZONA	AZ10039-0001	IRON STAND*	170	$330,000	$24,579,594
ARIZONA	AZ10021-0003	FRESNAL CANYON WATER*	171	$1,803,000	$26,382,594
ARIZONA	AZ10024-0002	DIRT BURN WATER & SEWER*	172	$243,000	$26,625,594
ARIZONA	AZ10063-0002	SAN SIMON WATER*	173	$484,000	$27,109,594
ARIZONA	AZ11090-0002	WHITEHORSE PASS WATER*	174	$253,000	$27,362,594
ARIZONA	AZ10082-0001	SAN LUIS(SELLS DISTRICT) WATER*	175	$97,000	$27,459,594
ARIZONA	AZ10054-0001	STAN SHUATAK WATER & SEWER*	176	$415,000	$27,874,594
ARIZONA	AZ10037-0003	GU VO WASTEWATER*	177	$1,470,000	$29,344,594
ARIZONA	AZ10999-0401	O&M TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE*	178	$263,000	$29,607,594

WITNESSES

	Page
Burzyk, C. M	3
Christie, Joe	133
Clement, Kathy	3
Devaney, E. E	315
Fenn, Denny	3
Gilbert, D. A	133
Gover, Kevin	133
Groat, C. G	3
Hanson, Royce	133
Hirsch, Robert	3
Leahy, Pat	3
Manuel, H. A	133
McLean, Robert	3
Neves, C. E	133
Quasula, T. R	133
Thompson, T. M	133
Trezise, J. D	3
Witmer, Dick	3

INDEX

U.S. Geological Survey

	Page
Advanced National Seismic System	26
Avian Vacuolar Myelinopathy Study	32, 33
Basic Research	49
Biography of Charles G. Grant	13
Biology in USGS	25
Chesapeake Bay Watershed	40
Clean Water Programs	15
Coastal and Marine Geology Program	42
Cooperation Between USGS and States	41
Cooperative Research Units	34
Coordination With Federal Partners	19, 20
Credible Science	19
Early U.S. Mapping	3
Earthquake Program	27
Endangered and At Risk Species	47
Everglades Science Before Investment	17
Everglades Scientific Research	14
Federal Strategies for Invasive Species	35
Fire Detection Efforts	46, 47
Future Biological Directions	43
GAP Program	28
Geographic Information Systems	31
Great Lakes	37–39, 44, 45
Mapping	39, 44, 45
Restoration	37
Science Funding	37, 38
Ground-Water Research Funding	21–23
Ground-Water Study	16
Harbor Seals at Hood Canal	36
Information Access	49
Information to Local and State Governments	47
Interagency Coordination	32
International	14, 15
Concern for Endangered Species	15
Information Sharing	14
Scientific Cooperation	14
Introductions	4
Invasive Species	27, 28, 34, 35
Funding	35
In Washington State	27
Interagency Group	35

Page

Invasive Species—Continued
Lead Federal Agency 28
Lands Legacy Initiative 21
Livable Communities Initiative 20
Long Distance Learning 46
Maintenance Backlog 42, 43
Mapping and Digitizing Schedule 42
Nation's Water Supply 16
Ohio Pilot Project 46
Opening Remarks 4–7
USGS Mission 4
Listening Sessions 4
Outstanding Scientists 5
Infrastructure Investments 5
Budget Highlights 5–7
Partnerships With Colleges 48
Proposed Budget's Funding Level 18
Questions Submitted for the Record 51–80
From Congressman Kingston 78–80
From Congressman Kolbe 75
From Congressman Nethercutt 76, 77
From the Subcommittee 51–74
Real-Time Hazards Funding 27
Real-Time Hazards Initiative 29
Salmon Research 28
Saltwater Intrusion 33
Scientific Integrity 24
Sea Lamprey Control 36
Side-Scan Sonar Mapping 40
Southeast Research on Amphibians 32
Southeastern Water Supplies 29–31
Stream Restoration Partnerships 24
Streamgage Monitoring 15
Streamgage Replacement 16
Testimony 8–12
America's Natural Heritage 12
Budget Highlights 10–12
Livable Communities 10
Safer Communities 10
Sustainable Resources for the Future 11
U.S. Geological Survey's Age 3
U.S. Water Quality 17
Uncontrollable Cost Offsets 41
USGS 21, 34, 41, 43, 48
And FWS Relationship 43
Botanists 43
Presence in Ohio 34
Public Communication 48
Reorganization 41
Visit Worthwhile 21
Visitors to USGS Facilities 48
Visits to USGS Web Sites 49
Volunteer Program 48
Wellsboro Research and Development Laboratory 25, 26
Zebra Mussels in the Great Lakes 36, 37

Page

Minerals Management Service

Geological Interpretive Tools 85
Management of Funds 89
Offsetting Collection of Fees 83
Oil Valuation Rulemaking 88
Royalty Reengineering Initiative 87

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Appalachian Clean Streams 109
Emergency Reclamation Program 106
Environmental Protection 115
Federal Reclamation Program 108
Internet Service 127
Minimum Level Programs 112
Mountaintop Mining 122
Small Operators Assistance Program 102
United Mineworkers Health Fund 104

Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians

Accountability of Expenditures 160
Additional Questions Submitted for the Record:
- From the Committee 220
- From Mr. Dicks 266
- From Mr. Skeen 269

BIA Trust Increases 171
Budget Cycle 192
Budget Increases 158
Budget Priorities 175
Bureau Commitment 158
Conclusion 218
Contract Oversight 193
Detention Facilities 198
Education 177
Employee Development 159
Forestry 196
Fractionated Shares 171
Indian Country Tour 218
Information Security 162
Land Ownership Records 171
Law Enforcement:
- Progress 189
- Request 194

National Academy of Public Administration Report:
- Relocation 146
- Field Resources 147
- Status of Implementation 154
- NAPA's Impact 155
- Office Relocation 162
- NAPA Support 189

Office of the Special Trustee 164
Opening Remarks 133
Opening Statements on FY 2001 Budget Requests:
- Mr. Gover 175

Page

Opening Statements on FY 2001 Budget Requests—Continued
Mr. Thompson 165
Opening Statements on NAPA Report:
Mr. Gover 145
Mr. Hanson 133
Recognition of Tribes 199
Replacement School Priority list 197
School Construction 190
School Construction Costs 192
School Operations 193
Self Determination 159
Settlement 174
Single Audits 159
Statements Submitted for the Record:
Mr. Gover 148, 179
Mr. Thompson 167
Mr. Hanson 136
Student Count 194
Student Performance 188
Sunset of Trustee's Office 171
System Management 163
Timber-Fish-Wildlife Programs 196
Tribal Colleges 194
Trust Reform:
Accomplishments 165
Budget 173
Timeframe 166
Trust Management Improvement 189
Trust Responsibilities 161
Tuition Assistance 218

Office of Insular Affairs

American Samoa 284
Brown Tree Snake Program 304
Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands 291
Compact of Free Association 294
General 275
Grant Management System 299
Guam 286
Hawaiian Natives 280
Virgin Islands 281

Office of the Inspector General

Audits 315
Full-Time Employment 320
Investigations 316
MMS Embezzlement 321
Statement of Inspector General Devaney 315
Summary of Audit Recommendations 351
Top Ten Management Problems 318, 323, 327
Uncontrollable Increases 320

Indian Health Service

Construction:
Fort Defiance, AZ Hospital 389

Page

Construction—Continued
Hospital and Clinic 391
Joint Ventures 396
Priority List 388
Staff Quarters Construction 390
Contract Health Services 381
Equipment 366, 385
Equity 366
Facilities Maintenance 365, 383
Fixed Costs 362
Health Professional Shortages 369
Hospitals and Clinics 364
Increases, Distribution of 378
Indian Health Care Improvement Fund 367
New Tribes Funding 382
Other Health Service Programs 364
Indian Health Professions 365
Tribal Management Grant 365
Urban Health 364
Pharmacist Interns 368
Podiatry Program Plan 376
Sanitation Deficiency System—Priority List 399
Sanitation/Water and Sewer Facilities 365, 386
Self-Determination Contracts and Self-Governance Compacts 380
Services 363
Shoalwater Bay Infant Mortality 381
Staffing of New Facilities—Parker River, AZ Clinic 379

○

ISBN 0-16-060631-4

