Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DENT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SALI, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. KIRK.

H. Res. 49: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H. Res. 76: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 353: Mr. REYES and Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 356: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 389: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 415: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 674: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 834: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 881: Mr. SPACE, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. BOYD of Florida, and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Res. 937: Mr. SALI and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Res. 977: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CARSON.

H. Res. 1008: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Res. 1009: Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 1011: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 1022: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 1043: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 1062: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 1063: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 1064: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. FEENEY.

H. Res. 1069: Mr. BOREN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1079: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 1080: Mr. ISSA and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 1086: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 1091: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H. Res. 1093: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H. Res. 1100: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 1104: Mr. STARK, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 1109: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 1110: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H. Res. 1113: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHULER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. KELLER.

H. Res. 1114: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHULER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. KELLER.

H. Res. 1122: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Res. 1124: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HOOLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CARSON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 1130: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SALI, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H. Res. 1131: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H. Res. 1132: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WOLF, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1134: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H. Res. 1140: Mr. SALI, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1144: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SIRES, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1146: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 1149: Ms. LEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HARE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 1153: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 1154: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Today the House of Representatives will consider S. 2739. Section 504 of S. 2739 authorizes funding for the Arthur V. Watkins Dam Enlargement Project. This language is similar to language found in H.R. 839, a bill which authorizes a feasibility study on raising the height of the Arthur V. Watkins Dam at Willard Bay in Box Elder County, Utah. The entity authorized to receive funding under this request is the Department of the Interior at 1849 C. Street, Washington, DC 20240.

The authorized study is cost shared 50/50 between Weber Basin and the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) at the Department of the Interior, a record of BOR's finance plan is not available. However, a copy of Weber Basin's finance plan (for its share of the project) is attached.

This project is justified as the Arthur V. Watkins Dam is a federally owned water storage facility. It is managed by the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, a political subdivision of the State of Utah. Water stored in this facility serves the culinary water needs of Weber, Davis and Box Elder Counties, which encompass some of the most populous areas of northern Utah. The federal government has made a significant financial commitment to the State of Utah to ensure that this arid state has adequate water resources to meet the needs of its residents. This authorization ensures that.

A.V. WATKINS DAM RAISE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Under a feasibility study to be prepared by Reclamation an integrated feasibility report and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance document will be prepared to address the potential raise of A.V. Watkins Dam to accommodate additional storage of 10,000 acre-feet.

The following areas and estimated costs are presented to cover the study:

Item	Description	Estimated cost
1	NEPA: Investigation and report of environmental impacts and appropriate federal actions.	$500,000
2	Cultural Mitigation Plan: Investigation of impacts to cultural findings and corresponding recovery plan.	200,000
3	Water Rights: Review and verification of the preliminary water rights work originally conducted. Will include coordination with the Utah Division of Water Rights.	50,000
4	Investigations/Drilling/Laboratory Testing: A study of existing physical conditions including field testing and verification of existing geology of the entire 14 mile dam.	900,000
5	Hydrology: Review and verification of the available river flows from the Ogden and Weber rivers.	50,000
6	Feasibility Design/Drawings/Report: Culmination of the feasibility study including written conclusions from each of the above investigations.	300,000
Total		2,000,000

Expected duration of report—1½ to 2 years.

The Weber Basin Water Conservancy District (District), in an effort to insure that it is able to meet the ever increasing demand for water throughout its service area, continues to evaluate the need for improvements, including the development of new resources. Part of the challenges facing the District in this effort are: identifying growth patterns and projecting future populations by geographic location; estimating the total water consumption of the projected population both indoors and outdoors; and evaluating existing supplies to determine how to most effectively utilize those supplies, particularly in times of drought. Through these proactive efforts, a need for additional resources has been identified in order for the District to meet future demands along the Wasatch Front.

To estimate the future demand for water within the District's service area across the Wasatch Front, the District completed the

Supply and Demand Study (January 2008), in which population projections were developed through build-out, and the associated water demand of that population estimated based on historic water use. The demands were then compared to available District supplies, including those developed by the United States Bureau of Reclamation via the Weber Basin Project, those developed or being developed by the District, and outside resources that are controlled by various independent agencies (municipalities, improvement districts, etc.). Based on the results of this study, the District anticipates a need for one or more additional raw water resources within the next 20 years; possibly as early as 2015. Future sources that are being considered include wastewater reuse (for outdoor irrigation use), aquifer storage and recovery, and the importation of water from the Bear River. Even with the full development of all of the new resources listed, it is anticipated that the supply will still be inadequate to meet projected demands without aggressive coinciding conservation efforts. The District has implemented an aggressive water conservation plan with a goal to reduce per capita water consumption by 25 percent by 2025.

Although the need for additional water supplies within the District's service area is becoming increasingly evident, nowhere is it more evident than in the Weber County area. Population projections predict that much of the future growth along the Wasatch Front will occur in the area of western Weber County. As growth has tended to move outward from the Salt Lake City area, from Davis County into Weber County, the District has observed increasing demands on the Weber South and Davis North Treatment Plants (located in southern Weber County and northern Davis County respectively). Those plants are now approaching capacity during times of peak demand. To evaluate the need for additional treatment plant capacity, the District recently retained consulting engineers to examine several strategic locations for construction of a new water treatment plant to meet increasing demands. The resulting Implementation Plan and Schedule (Technical Memorandum 11, Site Evaluation for the New Weber West WTP and Related Facilities, Draft dated 06/11/07) indicates that in order to keep up with the increasing demand resulting from growth in western Weber County, a new centrally located treatment plant will be required. The report further concludes that design of the new raw water conveyance facilities should commence in early 2009, with construction beginning in late 2010. Completion and commissioning of all facilities would then be scheduled for 2012. All of the possible water treatment plant sites considered were assumed to utilize raw water from storage at Arthur V. Watkins Dam/Willard Bay Reservoir.

Based on current projections, the need for additional water supplies along the Wasatch Front is both certain and imminent. With the Bureau of Reclamation already having filed for additional water rights from the Ogden and Weber rivers, raising the Arthur V. Watkins Dam would effectively increase the water that can be stored in Willard Bay by an additional 10,000 to 70,000 acre-feet and would make it available for use within the time projected for additional demand. Arthur V. Watkins Dam/Willard Bay Reservoir is strategically located relative to future demands, and as an existing facility could be increased at a relative lesser cost, and without the significant impacts that are sure to accompany other projects of this magnitude.

OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The amendment to be offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER or a designee to H.R. 5522, the Worker Protection Against Combustible Dust Explosion and Fire Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. WALDEN OF OREGON

Bill Number: S. 2739 (H.R. 495).

Account: Secretary of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

Legal Name of Requesting Entity(ies): The North Unit Irrigation District Act—Requesting Entity: North Unit Irrigation District, Madras, Oregon; The Deschutes River Conservancy Reauthorization Act—Requesting Entity: Deschutes River Conservancy, Bend, Oregon; The Wallowa Lake Dam Rehabilitation Act—Requesting Entity: Associated Ditch Company, Joseph, Oregon; The Little Butte/Bear Creek Subbasins Water Feasibility Act—Requesting Entity: City of Medford, Medford, Oregon.

Address of Requesting Entity(ies): North Unit Irrigation Districts, 2024 NW Beech Streets, Madras, Oregon 97740, (ph) 541–475–3625; Deschutes River Conservancy, 700 NW Hill Street, Bend Oregon 97701, (ph) 541–382–4077; Associated Ditch Company, 1102 Engleside Avenue, Joseph, Oregon 97846, (ph) 541–432–6155; City of Medford, 411 W 8th Street #312, Medford, Oregon 97501, (ph) 541–774–2000.

Description of Request(s): I am the author of H.R. 495, the Oregon Water Resources Management Act of 2007, which is a package of water-related bills contained within S. 2739 which is scheduled to be considered by the full House on April 29, 2008. On July 23, 2007, the House of Representatives passed this package of bills included in H.R. 495 by voice vote. H.R. 495 is identical to the bill passed unanimously by the Resources Committee and the full House in the 109th Congress (H.R. 5079). All of these measures, described in detail below, are related to projects in my district and have been thoroughly vetted through the Committee and are supported by my colleagues from Oregon in the United States Senate, Senators Ron Wyden and Gordon Smith. H.R. 495 does not have a direct and foreseeable effect on the pecuniary interests of me or my spouse.

Deschutes River Conservancy Reauthorization Act—Bill language would amend the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) in the Deschutes River Conservancy (DRC) through Fiscal Year 2015. The DRC was originally authorized by Congress in 1996 to implement water conservation measures in the Deschutes River basin. The DRC was founded by local irrigation districts, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, conservation groups, and other local stakeholders in an effort to focus on practical, incentive-based solutions to the basin's water management challenges. The DRC has leased over 70 cubic feet per second of water in the basin's streams and has restored over 100 miles of stream corridor using livestock management techniques, restored channel floodplain connectivity, and planted over 250,000 native plants and trees in the riparian zone. The DRC has permanently acquired about 9,200 acre-feet of senior water rights in the Deschutes Basin that will remain instream during critical low flow periods, benefiting fish species such as ESA listed bull trout and summer steelhead. The bill has received positive and bipartisan support in the House and Senate, is supported by the DRC, the local community and Reclamation. This bill would authorize $2 million per year over 10 years in federal spending. The use of federal funding for this project is justified because it would address critical water shortage issues in the summer months that have a direct impact on federal Endangered Species Act listed salmon and steelhead.

Wallowa Lake Dam Rehabilitation Act—Bill language authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to provide grants, or to enter into cooperative agreements, with tribal, State, local governmental entities and the Associated Ditch Companies to plan, design, and repair Wallowa Lake Dam. Over the last several years I have visited Wallowa County on a number of occasions to convene meetings with both proponents and opponents of this legislation in order to gain a full understanding of the situation and to discuss the merits of this proposal. These meetings have clearly demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of Wallowa County residents support this bill and its main tenet—the rehabilitation of the Wallowa Lake Dam—has been identified by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers as a high hazard structure. H.R. 495 authorizes $6 million in federal funds for dam rehabilitation; however, spending authority sunsets after 10 years and requires a 50/50 federal/local cost share match. Federal funding for this project is justified to not only protect citizens from the highly hazardous Wallowa Lake Dam, but to assist with the tremendous environmental costs that directly result from the presence of federally listed Endangered Species Act salmon and steelhead in the dam rehabilitation project.

Little Butte/Bear Creek Subbasins Water Feasibility Act—Bill language would authorize the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to conduct a needed water management feasibility study and environmental impact statement for the Water for Irrigation, Streams, and the Economy Project in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between City of Medford and Reclamation in order to address water management issues for irrigation, municipal use and conservation. This bill language passed the Senate by unanimous consent in November 2005 and the bill is nearly identical to legislation I sponsored in the 108th Congress which received a hearing in the Subcommittee on Water and Power, passed by the Committee by unanimous consent, and ultimately passed the House by voice vote in September of 2004. H.R. 495 authorizes $500,000 in federal funds; however, spending authority sunsets after 10 years and requires a 50/50 federal/local cost share match. Federal funds are justified because the federal partnership established via the MOA is for the express purpose of addressing federal Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements. Additionally, Congress needs to provide Reclamation the authority to achieve the goals of the MOA and also provide funds due to costs from addressing previous acts of Congress, including the Clean Water Act and ESA.

North Unit Irrigation District Act—Bill language amends a repayment contract between the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the North Unit Irrigation District (District) to meet State water conservation law and allow the District to improve its overall water management and efficiency. The bill increases the maximum irrigated land within the District available to receive Deschutes Project water from 50,000 acres to 59,000 acres, and reclassifies that land. The legislation allows the repayment terms to shift from a variable to a fixed term, and would allow for accelerated repayment of capital costs. Finally, the legislation allows Reclamation to negotiate future contract terms without Congressional authorization, only after receiving written notice from the District and getting the consent of the Commissioner of Reclamation. The legislative authority granted in H.R. 495 to change the Reclamation contract would not require additional taxpayer funding above the existing

programmatic appropriations for the agency. Conservation efforts to provide additional instream water and other conservation projects cannot be implemented solely by the District without a change in their current Reclamation authorities; Congress provided the current authorities and only Congress can modify those authorities.

OFFERED BY MR. GARY G. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Bill Number: H.R. 1195.

Bill Section: Sec. 102.

Account: U.S. Department of Transportation.

Legal Entities To Receive Funding: Nevada Department of Transportation, 1263 South Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89712, who shall cooperate with the California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission, 400 Stewart Street, Las Vegas, NV 89101; U.S. Department of Transportation; 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE., Washington, DC 20590.

Description of Request: In the SAFETEA–LU Act, two Magnetic Levitation Transportation Projects (MAGLEV) received federal authorization for a total of $90,000,000; however, mistakenly, contract authority was not assigned to these important projects. To ensure these MAGLEV projects have the funding necessary to succeed, I requested language to amend Section 1307 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1217) to add contract authority to the projects at the funding levels authorized in SAFETEA–LU. The term ''MAGLEV'' means transportation systems employing magnetic levitation that would be capable of safe use by the public at a speed in excess of 240 miles per hour. According to SAFETEA–LU, this funding can be used for preconstruction planning activities and to supplement the cost of the fixed guideway infrastructure of these MAGLEV projects, including land, piers, guideways, propulsion equipment and other components attached to guideways, power distribution facilities substations, control and communications facilities, access roads, and storage, repair, and maintenance facilities. The federal cost share of these projects will be 80 percent.

MAGLEV is an advanced train technology that can offer competitive trip-time savings compared to alternative forms of travel over long distances. Federal funding is needed to deploy this technology further and thereby reduce congestion along heavily travelled corridors in the United States. In addition to the request for contract authority, I also requested that the project description contained in Sec. 102(d)(1) be amended to ensure the entire high-speed ground transportation corridor project, which starts in Las Vegas, Nevada, and extends to Anaheim, California, is authorized to receive federal assistance and that the project be coordinated with the California-Nevada Super Speed Train Commission.

OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON OF NEW MEXICO

Bill Number: S. 2739 (Companion H.R. 1904).

Account: Interior, Bureau of Land Management, USGS, Management of Lands and Resources.

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: State of New Mexico.

Address of Requesting Entity: 1220 South St. Francis Drive, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505.

Description of Request: Provide a total earmark of $12,000,000 apportioned in equal amounts of $3,000,000 in Fiscal years FY08 through 2011 to assist the State of New Mexico in water planning. This includes: technical assistance and grants for the development of comprehensive State water plans, activities to conduct a mapping of water resources throughout the State, and to conduct a comprehensive study of groundwater resources (including potable, brackish, and saline) throughout the State. This assistance may include acquisition of hydrologic data, expansion of water monitoring networks, modeling of resources, coordination with Federal water management planning, integration of State planning forums and groups in the planning efforts, and technical reviews of data, models, planning scenarios and water plans developed by the State. Expansion of water resources throughout the State is critical to the continued development of the economy within the State.

The funding and levels of effort will be allocated approximately as follows: $5,000,000 to develop hydrologic models covering the Rio Grande and Rios Pueblo de Taos and Hondo, Rios Nambe, Pojaque and Teseque, Rio Chama, and Lower Rio Grande tributaries; $1,500,000 for surveys for the San Juan River and tributaries; $1,000,000 for surveys for the Southwest New Mexico basins, and $4,500,000 for statewide digital mapping.

The non-Federal share of all work shall be 50% and may be provided with in-kind resource acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5534: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

[Omitted from the Record of Apr. 25, 2008]

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 7, April 23, 2008, by Mr. FOSSELLA on the bill (H.R. 5440), was signed by the following Members: Vito Fossella, John A. Boehner, John R. ''Randy'' Kuhl, Jr., Greg Walden, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Peter Sessions, Gus M. Bilirakis, Joseph R. Pitts, David Davis, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Jo Bonner, Joe Wilson, Tim Walberg, Dennis R. Rehberg, Robert E. Latta, Kevin McCarthy, Peter T. King, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., Candice S. Miller, John Kline, Ron Lewis, Heather Wilson, J. Gresham Barrett, Adrian Smith, Frank A. LoBiondo, Paul C. Broun, Dan Burton, Ander Crenshaw, Michael N. Castle, Michele Bachmann, Mike Ferguson, Jim Jordan, Joe Knollenberg, Bill Sali, Jim Gerlach, Zach Wamp, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Rob Bishop, Charles W. Dent, Mark Steven Kirk, Louie Gohmert, Tom Price, Doc Hastings, Michael C. Burgess, Jeff Miller, Trent Franks, J. Randy Forbes, Tom Latham, Mac Thornberry, Terry Everett, Daniel E. Lungren, Harold Rogers, Kevin Brady, Phil Gingrey, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Henry E. Brown, Jr., David Dreier, Jerry Lewis, Rick Renzi, Peter J. Roskam, Doug Lamborn, Ted Poe, Michael T. McCaul, Dana Rohrabacher, Jeff Fortenberry, Todd Tiahrt, Gary G. Miller, K. Michael Conaway, Ric Keller, Vern Buchanan, Dave Weldon, Geoff Davis, David G. Reichert, Darrell E. Issa, Dave Camp, John R. Carter, Kay Granger, Judy Biggert, Randy Neugebauer, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Thelma D. Drake, Tom Cole, Todd Russell Platts, W. Todd Akin, John M. McHugh, John L. Mica, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Elton Gallegly, Ken Calvert, Jon C. Porter, Thomas M. Reynolds, Howard Coble, Sam Johnson, Phil English, Jo Ann Emerson, Jean Schmidt, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon. Steve Buyer, Edward R. Royce, Barbara Cubin, Roy Blunt, Robert J. Wittman, John T. Doolittle, Vernon J. Ehlers, Steve Chabot, Mary Bono Mack, Virginia Foxx, Michael K. Simpson, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Thomas G. Tancredo, James T. Walsh, Dean Heller, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Bob Inglis, Adam H. Putnam, Jim Ramstad, Christopher Shays, John Abney Culberson, Nathan Deal, Paul Ryan, Frank R. Wolf, Patrick J. Tiberi, Patrick T. McHenry, Wally Herger, Deborah Pryce, Michael R. Turner, Lee Terry, Frank D. Lucas, Devin Nunes, Kenny Marchant, Jim McCrery, John Linder, George Radanovich, Eric Cantor, Joe Barton, John B. Shadegg, John Shimkus, Scott Garrett, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Bob Goodlatte, Lamar Smith, Brian P. Bilbray, Bill Shuster, Spencer Bachus, Don Young, Steve King, Cliff Stearns, Mary Fallin, John Boozman, Steven C. LaTourette, C.W. Bill Young, Jeb Hensarling, Ed Whitfield, Tom Davis, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Jack Kingston, Donald A. Manzullo, Chris Cannon, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Mike Pence, Mike Rogers, Duncan Hunter, Christopher H. Smith, John Sullivan, Peter Hoekstra, Mark E. Souder, Jerry Moran, Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering, Jim Saxton, David L. Hobson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Ralph M. Hall, and Sam Graves.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

[Omitted from the Record of Apr. 25, 2008]

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 6 by Mr. BOUSTANY on House Resolution 1025: Michael K. Simpson.