



## NATIONAL URBAN AGRICULTURE COUNCIL

ROGER WATERS  
PRESIDENT

February 20, 2001

PETER CARLSON  
VICE PRESIDENT / OPERATIONS

JIM BREZACK  
VICE-PRESIDENT /PLANNING

### WITHERING IN THE DESERT:

#### THE NEED TO INCREASE THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'S BUDGET

Western water interests have been concerned for several years about the downward trend of the Water and Related Resources Budget of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. The Bureau's Budget has decreased more than 36% in ten years going from \$899,378,000 in FY91 to \$573,612,000 in FY2000. During the five year period covered by the tables attached to this report it was reduced by \$106 million.

In order to address the backlog in the Bureau of Reclamation that is discussed later in this report, we suggest a \$1 billion a year budget be provided for the Water and Related Resources account in their budget so that important needs in the West are adequately addressed.

During that time frame of FY91-FY2000, Congress has passed new project and program authorizing legislation for the Bureau such as the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 and projects in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY2001. Free standing authorization bills in the 106th Congress totaled \$2 billion, giving the Bureau of Reclamation a \$5 billion backlog of authorizations to be incorporated into their Budget. This backlog includes the Title 16 Water Reclamation and Reuse Program and the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Program.

In 1997 the Bureau published its five year Strategic Plan pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act (GRPA) of 1993. Western water organizations participated in discussions and development of the plan and on the subsequent Annual Plans for the Bureau. The Strategic Plan had three primary objectives coupled with eighteen strategies and five-year goals for each of the strategies. Their mission, in its simplest terms, is broken down as follows:

- A. Manage, develop, and protect associated water related resources;
- B. Protect the Environment in the West;
- C. Improve business practices and increase employee productivity.

We do not believe the Bureau should unilaterally redefine its mission. First, its original mission isn't finished. Second, defining the mission of a Federal agency is the prerogative of Congress, not the agency itself.

## NATIONAL URBAN AGRICULTURE COUNCIL

In June of 1998 Congress was presented with a report from the Western Water Policy Review Advisory Commission: "Water in the West: Challenge for the Next Century". Western water interests concerns with the decline of the Bureau's Budget are matched by their concern of how to address the growth-related issues in the West. As the report notes:

"For the past 15 years, the West has been experiencing the most dramatic demographic changes for any region or period in the country's history. Should present trends continue, by 2020 population in the West may increase by more than 30 percent."

With that growth is a little recognized fact: The Bureau of Reclamation is about to celebrate its 100th birthday. The Bureau of Reclamation is responsible for the largest portion of water storage in Federal reservoirs in the West - an ever increasing aging infrastructure. Reclamation has sole responsibility for the operation of reservoirs with a total capacity of more than 119 MAF and shares responsibility for the operation of reservoirs with an additional 16 MAF. There are about 133 water projects in the western United States constructed by Reclamation. As a result, the Bureau of Reclamation's operation and maintenance budget, just like that of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is increasing at a substantial rate. Just as the backlog of projects needs to be accommodated, there is a need to recognize the operations and maintenance budget with future Budget increases.

Attached is a table for FY's 1996-2000 budgets for each of the major agencies in the Department of the Interior. All of these agencies are funded by the Interior Appropriations Bill. The Bureau of Reclamation is funded by the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, which also funds the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Energy. However, when viewed by the Administration and the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation is included in the Department's framework for decisions on increases or reductions to the overall Department's Budget even though it is funded by a different appropriations account.

There is great concern among Western water interests about the downward trend of the Bureau's Budget. There is a general consensus that a minimum of \$1 billion a year is needed to address ongoing programs and the growing backlog of the Bureau. This is necessary for the West to address its growth related issues. Given the information presented in the attached tables, every agency except the Bureau of Reclamation and the Minerals Management Service received a Budget increase, ranging from \$30 million to \$500 million during these five fiscal years. The Bureau of Reclamation has suffered a \$106 million decrease. We feel a change needs to occur, especially since there was a combined increase of \$1.3 billion for these agencies during the FY96-2000 time frame. This time frame incidentally coincides with the 5-year Balanced Budget Agreement where a vast majority of other agencies programs were being reduced. In addition, Congress has provided money through Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA)-type programs in the FY2001 budget that, just for the Interior related budget non-Reclamation program, amounted to \$678 million. This funding is only expected to increase in the future once the actual authorizing legislation passes Congress.

## NATIONAL URBAN AGRICULTURE COUNCIL

There is also a growing recognition that in the 107th Congress, there is a strong likelihood of an additional \$3 to \$7 billion dollars of authorizations being proposed for the State of California. These include new authorizations for CAL-FED, a comprehensive water management program for the Santa Ana Watershed, the Salton Sea, and a water reuse/recycling program for various parts of California. There are also growing program needs in the Pacific Northwest with respect to addressing salmon related issues.

A careful note needs to be made about the \$3 billion backlog for the Bureau that existed prior to the action in the 106th Congress. A small portion of that backlog may be reduced as a result of the legislation that passed in the 106th Congress. For example, the old cost-ceiling for the Animas LaPlata (ALP) is in the \$3 billion backlog. The legislation that passed the 106th Congress for ALP reduced the cost of the project substantially. There are further examples of features of projects in that backlog that will likely never get built, but Congress has taken no action to suggest that they should be modified or deleted.

In addition, a report last year by the firm of Will & Carlson, Inc. - “The Greening of the Bureau of Reclamation: From Bird Seed to Pistachio Farms to Life on the Edge” reviewed the Bureau of Reclamation’s budget from FY91-99 regarding loans, grants and cooperative agreements for less than \$2 million. That report indicated during that period, approximately \$750 million had been provided for a variety of activities. The vast majority of these activities were legitimately related to specific project or program authorizations of the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as activities directly related to other Federal requirements and activities, such as the Endangered Species Act and Indian Water Rights Settlements. Without making a value judgment call, there was funding provided for maybe as much as 20% of this total that might be questionable. Regardless, the information is now available so that Congress, if they so choose, can decide on whether such activities should continue in the future. It is important to recognize the dollar amount that is necessary for the environmental challenge for water development to occur to meet the future water needs in the West.

In conclusion, with the growth related issues in the West, the backlog of projects, the downturn in the Bureau’s Budget, the overall increase in almost all of the other Interior Agencies, and with the country now in a budget surplus period, it is time to increase the Bureau’s Budget to a level that meets this challenge. It is time to turn the corner on the funding for the Bureau and put it on a course so the West is not left withering in the desert.

Prepared By: Peter Carlson  
Vice President for Strategic Planning  
The National Urban Agriculture Council

For additional information about NUAC, please see our Internet web site at <http://www.nuac.org>.

# NATIONAL URBAN AGRICULTURE COUNCIL

## 106<sup>th</sup> Congress

### **Bureau of Reclamation Bills/Provisions That Became Law**

#### Reclamation-Wide

Reclamation Reform Act Refunds, Public Law 106-377  
Dam Safety amendments, Public Law 106-377  
Hawaii Reclamation and Reuse Study, Public Law 106-566

#### Great Plains Region

Perkins County Rural Water Supply Project, Public Law 106-136  
Rocky Boys Indian Water Rights Settlement, Public Law 106-163  
Lewis and Clark Rural Water Supply, Public Law 106-246  
Middle Loup Title Transfer, Public Law 106-366  
Northern Colorado Title Transfer, Public Law 106-376  
Glendo Contract Extension, Public Law 106-377  
Canyon Ferry Technical Corrections, Public Law 106-377  
Loveland Warren Act amendment, Public Law 106-377  
Fort Peck Rural Water Supply, Public Law 106-382  
Park County land conveyance, Public Law 106-494  
Palmetto Bend Title Transfer, Public Law 106-512  
City of Dickinson, North Dakota Bascule Gates Settlement Act, Public Law 106-566  
Dakota Water Resources Act, Public Law 106-554  
Lower Rio Grande, Public Law 106-576

#### Upper Colorado Region

Central Utah Project Completion Act, Public Law 106-140  
Carlsbad Title Transfer, Public Law 106-220  
Jicarilla Apache Feasibility Study, Public Law 106-243  
Weber Basin Warren Act Amendment, Public Law 106-368  
Upper Colorado Fish Recovery, Public Law 106-392  
Colorado River salinity, Public Law 106-459  
Mancos (Warren Act Amendment), Public Law 106-549  
Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments, Public Law 106-554

#### Lower Colorado Region

Griffith Title Transfer, Public Law 106-249  
Ak-Chin Indian Water Rights Settlement, Public Law 106-285  
Hoover Dam Miscellaneous Sales, Public Law 106-461  
Yuma Port Authority Transfer Act, Public Law 106-566

## NATIONAL URBAN AGRICULTURE COUNCIL

Wellton Mohawk Title Transfer, Public Law 106-221

### Pacific Northwest Region

Deschutes, Public Law 106-270

Minidoka Authorization Ceiling Increase, Public Law 106-371

Chandler study, Public Law 106-372

Nampa and Meridian Title Transfer, Public Law 106-466

Cascade Reservoir Land Exchange, Public Law 106-493

Bend Feed Canal, Public Law 106-496

Salmon Creek Studies, Public Law 106-499

Fish Screen, Public Law 106-502

### Mid-Pacific Region

Sly Park Title Transfer, Public Law 106-377

Solano Project Warren Act amendement, Public Law 106-467

Sugar Pine Title Transfer, Public Law 106-566

Clear Creek Title Transfer, California, Public Law 106-566

Colusa Basin, California, signed 12/23/00, signed 12/23/00, Public Law 106-566

City of Roseville, CA, signed 12/23/00, Public Law 106-554

Truckee Water Reuse Project, Public Law 106-554

Sacramento River study, Public Law 106-554

Klamath studies, Public Law 106-498

**BY AGENCY FOR FISCAL YEAR 96-2000**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>PRES. REQUEST</b>	<b>FINAL</b>	<b>PERCENT OF OVERALL INTERIOR BUDGET</b>
<b>BLM</b>	1996	1,156,682,000	1,050,491,000	17%
	1997	1,095,809,000	1,090,675,000	17%
	1998	1,121,539,000	1,135,917,000	17%
	1999	1,233,659,000	1,190,695,000	17%
	2000	1,268,700,000	1,236,150,000	16%
<b>MMS</b>	1996	201,240,000	189,434,000	3%
	1997	189,434,000	163,395,000	2%
	1998	164,040,000	143,639,000	2%
	1999	128,520,000	124,020,000	1%
	2000	116,200,000	116,800,000	1%
<b>OSM</b>	1996	292,773,000	269,857,000	4%
	1997	274,157,000	271,757,000	4%
	1998	271,057,000	273,061,000	4%
	1999	276,956,000	278,769,000	4%
	2000	305,824,000	292,374,000	3%
<b>USGS</b>	1996	586,369	730,503,000	12%
	1997	746,380	738,913,000	11%
	1998	745,388	759,160,000	11%
	1999	806,883	797,896,000	11%
	2000	838,485	823,833,000	11%
<b>NPS</b>	1996	1,490,122,000	1,319,337,000	21%
	1997	1,612,337,000	1,414,258,000	22%
	1998	1,598,900,000	1,646,926,000	24%
	1999	1,753,102,000	1,748,224,000	25%
	2000	2,058,943,000	1,810,363,000	24%
<b>BIA</b>	1996	1,897,941,000	1,546,412,000	25%
	1997	1,776,490,000	1,605,674,000	25%
	1998	1,731,779,000	1,701,991,000	25%
	1999	1,844,136,000	1,746,428,000	25%
	2000	1,902,054,000	1,872,592,000	25%
<b>USFWS</b>	1996	702,817,000	603,864,000	10%
	1997	659,073,000	652,605,000	10%
	1998	687,923,000	745,387,000	11%
	1999	818,228,000	802,192,000	11%
	2000	950,001,000	878,121,000	11%
<b>TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>	1996	6,855,935,000	5,998,205,000	
	1997	6,598,587,000	6,177,297,000	
	1998	6,568,851,000	6,647,276,000	
	1999	7,122,163,000	6,954,276,000	
	2000	7,768,930,000	7,350,520,000	

**BY AGENCY FOR FISCAL YEAR 96-2000**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>PRES. REQUEST</b>	<b>FINAL</b>	<b>PERCENT OF OVERALL INTERIOR BUDGET</b>
<b>BUREAU OF RECLAMATION WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES** - TITLE 16 AND CALFED</b>	1996	678,302,000	679,503,000	11%
	1997	700,495,000	647,784,000	10%
	1998	666,372,000	649,127,000	9%
	1999	665,924,000	604,742,000	8%
	2000	652,838,000	573,612,000	7%
<b>U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS DISCRETIONARY &amp; MANDATORY</b>	1996	3,623,403,000	3,395,272,000	
	1997	3,436,850,000	3,777,374,000	
	1998	3,830,336,000	4,351,315,000	
	1999	3,373,041,000	4,375,027,000	
	2000	3,217,871,000	4,292,517,000	
<b>** These figures do include recissions and supplemental appropriations.</b>				

**BY FISCAL YEAR FOR ALL AGENCIES**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>FISCAL YEAR</b>	<b>PRES. REQUEST</b>	<b>FINAL</b>	<b>PERCENT OF OVERALL</b>
BLM	1996	1,156,682,000	1,050,491,000	17%
MMS	1996	201,240,000	189,434,000	3%
OSM	1996	292,773,000	269,857,000	4%
USGS	1996	586,369,000	730,503,000	12%
NPS	1996	1,490,122,000	1,319,337,000	21%
BIA	1996	1,897,941,000	1,546,412,000	25%
USFWS	1996	702,817,000	603,864,000	10%
BUREC	1996	678,302,000	679,503,000	11%
USCOE	1996	3,623,403,000	3,395,272,000	
BLM	1997	1,095,809,000	1,090,675,000	17%
MMS	1997	189,434,000	163,395,000	2%
OSM	1997	274,157,000	271,757,000	4%
USGS	1997	746,380,000	738,913,000	11%
NPS	1997	1,612,337,000	1,414,258,000	22%
BIA	1997	1,776,490,000	1,605,674,000	25%
USFWS	1997	659,073,000	652,605,000	10%
BUREC	1997	700,495,000	647,784,000	10%
USCOE	1997	3,436,850,000	3,777,374,000	
BLM	1998	1,121,539,000	1,135,917,000	17%
MMS	1998	164,040,000	143,639,000	2%
OSM	1998	271,057,000	273,061,000	4%
USGS	1998	745,388,000	759,160,000	11%
NPS	1998	1,598,900,000	1,646,926,000	24%
BIA	1998	1,731,779,000	1,701,991,000	25%
USFWS	1998	687,923,000	745,387,000	11%
BUREC	1998	666,372,000	649,127,000	9%
USCOE	1998	3,830,336,000	4,351,315,000	
BLM	1999	1,233,659,000	1,190,695,000	17%
MMS	1999	128,520,000	124,020,000	1%
OSM	1999	276,956,000	278,769,000	4%
USGS	1999	806,883,000	797,896,000	11%
NPS	1999	1,753,102,000	1,748,224,000	25%
BIA	1999	1,844,136,000	1,746,428,000	25%
USFWS	1999	818,228,000	802,192,000	11%
BUREC	1999	665,924,000	604,742,000	8%
USCOE	1999	3,373,041,000	4,375,027,000	
BLM	2000	1,268,700,000	1,236,150,000	16%
MMS	2000	116,200,000	116,800,000	1%
OSM	2000	305,824,000	292,374,000	3%
USGS	2000	838,485,000	823,833,000	11%
NPS	2000	2,058,943,000	1,810,363,000	24%
BIA	2000	1,902,054,000	1,872,592,000	25%
USFWS	2000	950,001,000	878,121,000	11%
BUREC	2000	652,838,000	573,612,000	7%
USCOE	2000	3,217,871,000	4,292,517,000	