AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

104TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 104–679

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997

JULY 16, 1996.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 3816]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers civil works mission	.....	4
General investigations	2	5
Construction, general	4	23
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	6	35
Operation and maintenance, general	7	38
Regulatory program	8	54
Flood control and coastal emergencies	8	55
Oil spill research	.....	56
General expenses	8	56
Administrative provisions	9	.....
General provision	9	57

	Page Number Bill	Report
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	10	59
Bureau of Reclamation:		
General investigations	11	59
Construction program	12	62
Operation and maintenance	13	68
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account	14	69
Central Valley Project restoration fund	14	71
General administrative expenses	15	71
Special funds	15	.....
Administrative provision	16	.....
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction	.....	73
Energy supply, research and development activities	16	76
Uranium supply and enrichment activities	17	86
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	18	87
General science and research activities	18	88
Nuclear waste disposal fund	18	89
Departmental administration	19	90
Office of inspector general	20	93
Atomic energy defense activities:		
Weapons activities	20	94
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	21	96
Fixed asset acquisition account	.....	103
Other defense activities	22	104
Defense nuclear waste disposal	22	109
Power marketing activities:		
Alaska Power Administration	22	110
Bonneville Power Administration	23	110
Southeastern Power Marketing Administration	23	111
Southwestern Power Marketing Administration	23	112
Western Area Power Administration	24	112
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	25	113
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	25	113
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	26	125
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	26	125
Delaware River Basin Commission	.....	126
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	.....	126
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	27	126
Office of Inspector General	29	128
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	30	128
Susquehanna River Basin Commission	.....	129
Tennessee Valley Authority	30	130
V. General Provisions	31	133
House Reporting Requirements	.....	135

Summary of Estimates and Recommendations

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the *Budget of the United States Government, 1997*. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1996, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1997.

	1996 appropriation	1997 estimate	1997 recommendation	1997 recommendation compared with—	
				1996 appropriation	1997 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	3,366,272,000	3,292,850,000	3,449,192,000	+82,920,000	+156,342,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	853,342,000	843,808,000	838,341,000	−15,001,000	−5,467,000
Title III—Department of Energy	15,404,490,000	16,182,494,000	15,279,926,000	−124,564,000	−902,568,000
Title IV—Independent Agencies	311,550,000	329,800,000	281,531,000	−30,019,000	−48,269,000
Subtotal	19,935,654,000	20,648,952,000	19,837,680,000	−97,974,000	−811,272,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	−609,343,000	−428,000,000	−428,000,000	+181,343,000	.....
Grand total of bill	19,326,311,000	20,220,952,000	19,420,990,000	+94,679,000	−799,962,000

INTRODUCTION

With the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 1997, the Committee continues to deliver on its commitment to effect substantial cost savings, structural deficit reduction, and significant governmental reforms. At $19.4 billion in new budget authority, new spending in the bill is more than $1 billion below that of the Energy and Water Development Bill passed by Congress just two years ago. Because the Committee has made the substantial investments necessary to protect, improve and reconfigure our atomic energy defense infrastructure, savings in domestic discretionary programs are particularly pronounced. Total funding for these programs has been reduced by over sixteen percent in just two years. Furthermore, the Committee has achieved these savings without gimmicks, accounting tricks or one-time devices.

Although budget savings in the bill are dramatic, they are realized without inflicting damage on high-priority programs and activities in which Federal investment is most appropriate. Indeed, the Committee has endeavored to: protect its previous investments in water and energy infrastructure; provide sufficient funding to operate and maintain critical facilities and programs within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction; and achieve further savings through accelerated completion of various projects currently in the construction pipeline.

Demands on the Energy and Water Development Bill have been extraordinary this year. The Committee conducted a series of hearings on the 1997 bill, which is recorded in eight separate volumes containing more than 13,000 pages. Moreover, Members of Congress from forty-eight states and Puerto Rico have communicated over 2,300 discrete priorities for the bill. The Committee has done its best to balance these requests against a limited allocation of resources; nevertheless, the Committee acknowledges that the imperative of deficit reduction has resulted in reluctant rejection of many such requests.

Authorization for various projects and agencies funded by this bill is in various stages of the legislative process. The Committee has worked closely with jurisdictional committees to establish the funding levels recommended in the bill. Funding has been provided for certain programs in anticipation and advance of authorization in order to avoid unnecessary disruptions in the provision of government services.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CORPS OF ENGINEERS' CIVIL WORKS MISSION

In the fiscal year 1996 budget request, the Administration proposed radical changes in the Civil Works mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Those proposals were rejected by the Congress as being counterproductive to the well-being of the Nation.

The Committee is pleased that the Administration has abandoned the proposal made last year that would have all but ended the Corps of Engineers' role in protecting our citizens from the devastating impacts of floods. However, the Committee is extremely troubled that the Administration has again proposed that the Federal Government's role in shore protection projects and smaller navigation projects be terminated.

Shore protection projects serve the same function as other flood control projects—they protect lives and property from the impacts of flooding. The only difference is that for shore protection projects, the flood waters come from the oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Great Lakes, rather than from rivers. Through this proposal, the Administration has determined that all Americans are eligible for flood protection assistance except those who live along our coastlines. The Committee notes that the Administration's proposal would permit Federal involvement in those cases where the project does not rely on the placement of sand. The Committee, however, can find no logic in a policy that permits one community to be protected if the appropriate engineering solution is the construction of a seawall, but allows another to go unprotected simply because the appropriate solution is a protective structure constructed of sand.

Therefore, the Committee has included funds in the bill for continued construction of shore protection projects, the periodic nourishment of previously constructed projects, and the continuation of ongoing studies related to shore protection. The Committee expects the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to proceed with those projects, all of which are fully authorized. The Committee further directs the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to continue to process all decision documents, including the transmission of feasibility reports to the Congress for authorization and reports prepared under section 934 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, without regard to whether or not projects comply with the Administration's proposed new policies.

The Committee also remains concerned about the Administration's plans to stop requesting funds for the maintenance of smaller navigation projects beginning in fiscal year 1998. Failure to adequately maintain those projects will cause economic hardship for many communities throughout the nation and result in hazardous navigation conditions that could directly lead to the loss of life and property. The Committee expects the Administration to continue to request adequate funds for maintenance of these projects.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1996	$121,767,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	142,500,000
Recommended, 1997	153,628,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+31,861,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+11,128,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON CNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHEDS).	---	---	300,000	---
	ALASKA				
	ALEUTIAN ISLANDS, AK.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK.....	113,000	---	113,000	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK.....	223,000	---	223,000	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK.....	---	61,000	---	61,000
(FC)	COOK INLET, AK.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	DUTCH HARBOR, AK.....	148,000	---	148,000	---
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK.....	238,000	---	238,000	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK.....	160,000	---	160,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	15,000	---	15,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	257,000	---	257,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, N SCOTTSDALE DRAINAGE AREA,.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ..	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, TORTOLITA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	RIO SALADO WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM, AZ.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	TRES RIOS, AZ.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FDP)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX.....	250,000	---	250,000	---

CALIFORNIA

(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,500,000	---	3,500,000
	BOLINAS LAGOON, CA	---	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJECT, CA	363,000	---	363,000	---
	CITIES OF ARCADIA AND SIERRA MADRE, CA	---	---	300,000	---
	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA	---	---	450,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	495,000	---	495,000
	DRY CREEK (MIDDLETOWN), CA	---	---	300,000	---
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	389,000	---	389,000	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	---	600,000	---	1,000,000
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA	370,000	---	370,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	430,000	---	430,000	---
	LAKE TAHOE WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	---	---	400,000	---
	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA	---	---	200,000	---
	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	---	---	---	450,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA	---	---	250,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	250,000	---	250,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, COLUSA BASIN DRAINAGE SYSTEMS, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, SUISUN MARSH WATERSHED, CA	---	---	400,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE/DIXON, CA	---	---	350,000	---
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS & VICINITY, CA	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS & VICINITY, CA	30,000	---	30,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	700,000	---	1,000,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	377,000	---	377,000	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	---	---	180,000
	NOYO HARBOR BREAKWATER, CA	---	---	---	300,000
(E)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	410,000	---	410,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	810,000	---	810,000
(SP)	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	252,000	---	252,000	---
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	---	194,000	---	194,000
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	270,000	---	270,000	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	386,000	---	386,000	---
	SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, LITTLE HOLLAND TRACT, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA ISLANDS, C	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	128,000	---	128,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	---	---	300,000	---
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	---	---	250,000	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK, CA	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	540,000	---	540,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	---	---	400,000	---
(E)	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	365,000	---	365,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.	350,000	---	350,000	---
	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	---	---	375,000	---
	SANTA MONICA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RELIABILITY, CA	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	579,000	---	579,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SP)	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	252,000	---	300,000	---
	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	430,000	---	430,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	45,000	---	45,000	---
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	---	1,210,000	---	1,210,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	557,000	---	557,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	288,000	---	288,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ & PA	---	156,000	---	156,000
	FLORIDA				
(N)	BIG BEND CHANNEL	---	250,000	---	250,000
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	500,000
	CHICOPIT BAY, FL	---	---	150,000	---
	DADE COUNTY WATER REUSE FACILITY, FL	---	---	425,000	---
	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	---	---	150,000	---
	HILLSBORO COUNTY, FL	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	200,000	---	200,000

(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	39,000	---	39,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	246,000	---	246,000	---
(SP)	LIDO KEY SARASOTA COUNTY, FL.....	26,000	---	26,000	---
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	112,000	---	112,000	---
	ST JOHNS RIVER, FL.....	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA CHANNEL, FL.....	---	---	200,000	---
	GEORGIA				
(E)	ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	FLINT RIVER BASIN STUDY, GA.....	260,000	---	---	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA & SC.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	SAVANNAH/CHATHAM COUNTY REGIONAL FLOOD CONTROL, GA....	---	---	250,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	---	365,000	---	365,000
(N)	MAUI SECOND HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI.....	230,000	---	230,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL.....	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(RDP)	FREEPORT, IL.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL.....	---	---	175,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
	OHIO RIVER, SOUTHEASTERN, IL.....	---	---	200,000	---
	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL.....	---	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	9,883,000	---	10,500,000	---
	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL.....	---	---	150,000	---
	INDIANA				
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN.....	---	475,000	---	475,000
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN.....	---	---	---	100,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN.....	---	---	---	200,000
	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY, IN.....	---	---	---	200,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	TIPPECANOE RIVER, IN	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN (MIDDLE REACHES), IN & IL	105,000	---	200,000	---
	IOWA				
(RCP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	235,000	---	235,000	---
	KANSAS				
(SPE)	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KS	129,000	---	129,000	---
(RCP)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	25,000	---	25,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, KS	145,000	---	145,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	302,000	---	302,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	367,000	---	367,000	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	25,000	---	25,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	79,000	---	79,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	155,000	---	155,000	---
	KENTUCKY				
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	380,000	---	180,000	---
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK, KY	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	149,000	---	149,000	---
	LOWER CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY	315,000	---	315,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	---	150,000	---	150,000
	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK, KY	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	262,000	---	262,000	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	7,719,000	---	7,719,000	---
	PANTHER CREEK, KY	---	---	200,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
	BAYOU BLANC, CROWLEY, LA	---	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	BAYOU TIGRE, ERATH, LA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	BLACK BAYOU DIVERSION, LA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	---	200,000	---	200,000

(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	593,000	---	593,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	278,000	---	278,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SABINE DIVERSION CANAL, LA	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	ST TAMMANY PARISH, LA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	129,000	---	129,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	700,000	---	700,000	---
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	442,000	---	442,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	---	338,000	---	338,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	191,000	---	191,000	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	596,000	---	596,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC	522,000	---	522,000	---
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE - REALLOCATION, MD & WV	---	37,000	---	37,000
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE - REALLOCATION, MD & WV	34,000	---	34,000	---
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	740,000	---	740,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	300,000	---	300,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	---	90,000	---	90,000
	MICHIGAN				
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	---	---	---	250,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	---	190,000	---	190,000
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	56,000	---	56,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
	JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	---	---	200,000
(FC)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	---	2,790,000	---	2,790,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	450,000	---	450,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	285,000	---	285,000	---
(RCP)	FABIUS RIVER LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	318,000	---	318,000	---
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	50,000	---	250,000	---
	KIMMSWICK, MO	---	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	50,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	55,000	---	55,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, NE	420,000	---	420,000	---
	NEVADA				
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	210,000	---	210,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PAIUTE, NV	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH LAS VEGAS, CHANNEL "A", NV	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, RENO, NV	650,000	---	650,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
	BARNEGAT BAY ESTUARY AND WATERSHED, NJ	---	---	200,000	---
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	558,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	160,000	---	160,000	440,000
	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	231,000	---	231,000	---
	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	400,000	---
	NEW JERSEY INTERCOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	---	---	200,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (CLIFFWOOD BEACH), NJ	25,000	---	---	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	590,000	---	725,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	2,781,000	---	2,781,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	45,000	---	45,000	330,000

	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM	---	207,000	---	207,000
(SPE)	RIO CHAMA, ABIQUIU DAM TO ESPANOLA, NM	150,000	---	150,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	75,000	---	75,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	375,000	---	375,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	600,000	---	600,000	---
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	---	742,000	---	742,000
	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	---	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	120,000	---	120,000	---
	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	---	---	300,000	---
	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	209,000	---	209,000	---
	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY & PA	---	---	350,000	---
(SP)	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY	25,000	---	25,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	400,000	---	400,000	---
	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NC	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	---	100,000	---	100,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	361,000	---	361,000	---
	OHIO				
	HOCKING RIVER BASIN, OH	---	---	300,000	---
	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	---	---	500,000	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	179,000	---	179,000	---
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	230,000	---	230,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	400,000	---	400,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	PENNSYLVANIA				
	BEAVER RIVER, PA	---	---	300,000	---
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	73,000	---	73,000	---
	MUSSERS DAM, MIDDLE CREEK, SNYDER COUNTY, PA	---	---	---	450,000
(FDP)	SCHYULKILL RIVER BASIN, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN AREA, PA	175,000	---	175,000	---
	TIOGA RIVER WATERSHED, PA	---	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, STORAGE REALLOCATION, PA & MD	175,000	---	175,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	---	329,000	---	329,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	---	150,000	---	150,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	---	225,000	---	225,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	207,000	---	207,000	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	254,000	---	254,000	---
	YADKIN/PEE DEE RIVERS WATERSHED, SC	---	---	300,000	---
	TENNESSEE				
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLAND SPRINGS, WETLANDS, TN	---	---	---	435,000
	DUCK RIVER, TN	---	---	300,000	---
	MEMPHIS METROPOLITAN AREA, TN & MS	---	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	330,000	---	330,000	---
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	ALPINE, TX	178,000	---	178,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	1,110,000	---	1,110,000
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.-MEXICO BORDER, TX & AZ	320,000	---	520,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	400,000	---	400,000
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	930,000	---	930,000

(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	---	857,000	---	857,000
	GIWW - BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR	---	---	200,000	---
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	---	---	150,000	---
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	860,000	---	860,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	---	1,900,000	---	1,900,000
	LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN, TX	---	---	---	150,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	520,000	---	520,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	140,000	---	140,000	---
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	650,000	---	650,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	1,230,000	---	1,230,000	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	320,000	---	320,000	---
	UPPER JORDAN RIVER RESTORATION, UT	---	---	500,000	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	---	100,000	---	100,000
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	---	344,000	---	344,000
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, POQUOSON, VA	301,000	---	301,000	---
	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, VA	---	---	270,000	---
(RCP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	620,000	---	620,000	---
	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, VA & MD	---	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, SUFFOLK, VA	226,000	---	226,000	---
	NORFOLK VIRGNIA, VICINITY OF WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA	---	---	---	375,000
	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	---	---	250,000	---
(BE)	SANDBRIDGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	283,000	---	283,000
	WASHINGTON				
	BLAIR WATERWAY, PORT OF TACOMA, WA	---	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	320,000	---	320,000	---
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	140,000	---	140,000	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	330,000	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	331,000	---	331,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(E)	CHEAT R B, N BRANCH, LICK RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	366,000	---	366,000
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	1,850,000	---	1,850,000
	MERCER COUNTY, WV	---	---	400,000	---
	MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV	---	---	---	500,000
	MONONGAHELA RIVER (FAIRMONT), WV	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RVR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV	550,000	---	550,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN (PHILIPPI), WV	---	---	250,000	---
(E)	TYGART VALLEY R B, GRASSY RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	350,000	---	350,000	---
	WISCONSIN				
(RCP)	FOX RIVER, WI	187,000	---	187,000	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	650,000	---	650,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	8,540,000	---	4,280,000	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	250,000	---	---	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	10,000,000	---	6,000,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	500,000	---	500,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	300,000	---	300,000	---
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS	575,000	---	---	---
	PRECIPITAITON STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	500,000	---	400,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	300,000	---	300,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	27,000,000	---	21,950,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	150,000	---	---	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	770,000	---	770,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	950,000	---	900,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-16,064,000	---	-16,954,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	103,760,000	38,740,000	109,128,000	44,500,000

Alabama River below Claiborne Lock and Dam, Alabama.—The bill includes $250,000, the same as the budget request, to continue the study of ways to improve the reliability of the authorized 9-foot navigation channel in the Alabama River below Claiborne Lock and Dam. The Committee is aware that studies to date indicate that an additional lock and dam is not a feasible alternative and, therefore, directs that the Corps use the funds provided to investigate other alternatives to improve the reliability of the navigation channel.

Jefferson County, Alabama.—Within available funds, $300,000 is provided for a study to address flooding and related water resources problems in the Cahaba River Basin in Jefferson County, Alabama.

Aleutian Islands, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive evaluation of the Aleutian Islands region in order to determine the extent of a Federal interest in a regional network of small ports and harbors along the Aleutian Islands.

Rio Salado Watershed Ecosystem, Arizona.—The Committee has included $500,000, the same as the budget request, to continue work on the Rio Salado feasibility study in cooperation with the cities of Phoenix and Tempe. The Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers accelerate work on the study to the extent possible in order to allow completion of the study by the beginning of fiscal year 1998.

Tres Rios, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of the flood control aspects of the Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration project being developed by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the cities of Phoenix, Tempe, Mesa, Glendale, and Scottsdale as authorized by section 321 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. Under that authority, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for the planning, design, and construction of flood damage reduction features of the project, including channel clearing within the floodway to protect the constructed wetlands project, and levee construction to protect the surrounding residential properties near the confluence of the Salt and Gila Rivers.

Central Basin Groundwater Project, California.—The Committee has provided $363,000, the same as the budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study for the Central Basin Groundwater project. The study will identify and recommend remediation measures to address contamination within and down gradient of existing Federal facilities at Whittier Narrows Dam.

Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre Water Infrastructure Restoration Study, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue a special study to identify problems and alternative solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, for providing a more dependable water supply for the Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to the water system that might occur during an earthquake.

City of Huntington Beach, California.—The Committee has provided $450,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to identify problems and alternative solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, for providing a more dependable

water supply for the City of Huntington Beach, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to the water system that might occur during an earthquake.

City of Santa Monica, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to identify problems and alternative solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, for providing a more dependable water supply for the City of Santa Monica, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to the water system that might occur during an earthquake.

Crescent City Harbor, California.—The bill includes $495,000, the same as the budget request, for preconstruction engineering and design of the Crescent City Harbor deepening project. The work of the Corps of Engineers at Crescent City is a further example of the importance of a continuing Federal presence in smaller harbors.

Dry Creek (Middletown), California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update its earlier study of the flood control problems along Dry Creek near Middletown, and to perform the necessary environmental review.

Kaweah River, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Kaweah River project, $400,000 above the budget request, in order to maintain an optimum schedule for preconstruction engineering and design for the project to enlarge Terminus Dam in California.

Malibu Coastal Area, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study of the need for shoreline protection measures along the Malibu coastal area.

Napa River, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000, $300,000 above the budget request, to complete the design and environmental review and to finalize the Project Cooperation Agreement for the Napa River flood control project. The Committee believes the additional funds are appropriate to address all concerns that have been raised in the recent reevaluation of the project and to affirm the flood control effort.

Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration and Russian River Ecosystem Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided $377,000 for the Napa River Salt Marsh Restoration study and $386,000 for the Russian River Ecosystem Restoration study, the same as the amounts included in the budget request. The Committee is pleased that the Corps is continuing these efforts, which were initiated by the Congress in fiscal year 1996.

Norco Bluffs, California.—The bill includes $180,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

Northern California Streams, Colusa Basin Drainage Systems, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control problems along the Colusa Basin Drain and its tributaries.

Northern California Streams, Middle Creek, California.—The Committee concurs with Administration's request and has included $410,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue its study of alternatives to restore the natural functions of the Middle Creek/Clear

Lake ecosystem, including the restoration of wetlands at the historic Robinson Lake.

Noyo Harbor Breakwater, California.—The Committee has included $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the General Design Memorandum for the Noyo Harbor Breakwater, California, project. While work on the project was previously suspended when the local sponsor indicated difficulty raising the non-Federal share of project costs, a number of boats have been lost in the past year, with attendant loss of life. This has led to renewed efforts by the Harbor Commission and City of Fort Bragg to identify additional local funding sources. Funds were included in the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate a proposal to utilize prefabricated structures in lieu of a stone breakwater. Given the continued loss of life and property, the Committee believes that the Corps should complete the General Design Memorandum for either the original stone breakwater or prefabricated structures at the same time as local funding sources are identified.

Sacramento River Watershed Management Plan, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive review of the watershed of the Sacramento River and its tributaries.

San Joaquin River Basin, Caliente Creek, California.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete, during fiscal year 1997, the Caliente Creek feasibility study.

San Joaquin River Basin, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California.—The Committee has provided $540,000, the same as the budget request, to continue the reconnaissance study for flood damage protection for the Stockton metropolitan area, and flood control, water supply, and water storage at Farmington Dam.

San Joaquin River Basin, West Stanislaus County, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance investigation for flood control, environmental restoration, and related purposes for Salado Creek in Stanislaus County, California.

Santa Margarita River and Tributaries, California.—The Committee has provided $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study to examine watershed management needs, including flood control, environmental restoration, stormwater retention, water conservation and supply, and recreation along the Santa Margarita River and its tributaries, including Murrieta Creek, in Riverside and San Diego Counties, California.

Ventura and Santa Barbara County Shoreline, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $48,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Ventura and Santa Barbara County Shoreline project.

Dade County Water Reuse Facility, Florida.—The bill includes $425,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance report and initiate the feasibility study for the Dade County Water Reuse project in Florida.

St. Johns River, Florida.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of water quality management within the St. Johns River basin in Florida.

Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study of the need for deepening of the Alafia Channel in Tampa Harbor.

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, project.

Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, project.

Tippecanoe River, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of sedimentation problems and ecosystem restoration opportunities at Lakes Shafer and Freeman on the Tippecanoe River.

Wabash River Basin (Middle Reaches), Indiana and Illinois.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study at Greenfield Bayou in Vigo County, Indiana.

Kentucky Lock, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Kentucky Lock addition project.

Lower Cumberland River, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of the streambank erosion and navigation problems on the Lower Cumberland River associated with the rapid rise and fall of water surface elevations resulting from hydroelectric power generation.

Baltimore Harbor Anchorages and Channels, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $529,000, the same as the budget request, to complete the feasibility study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Baltimore Harbor Anchorages and Channels project. The Committee notes the delay since last year in completing the study and urges the Corps to accelerate its completion in order to initiate PED at the earliest possible date.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Tolchester Channel S-Turn, Maryland.—Within available funds, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete design work associated with correcting the dangerous S-turn in the Tolchester Channel.

Jackson County, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide technical assistance for the project to provide an alternative water supply for Jackson County, Mississippi, as authorized by section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

Fabius River Levee and Drainage District, Missouri.—The Committee is aware of the need to conduct a study to review, update and revise, as appropriate, the flow-frequency curves prepared by the Corps of Engineers for the upper and middle reaches of the Mississippi River, including the lower Missouri and Illinois Rivers. In order to accomplish this work, the Corps of Engineers may utilize funds previously appropriated and appropriated in this Act for the Fabius River Levee and Drainage District project. The work should include an examination of flow records of the river, a review

of existing flow-frequency data, and development of a scope of work for additional efforts if needed.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes $558,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided an additional $440,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet project.

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project.

New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study to address environmental restoration opportunities along the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—The Committee has included a total of $725,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the study of hurricane and storm damage reduction improvements for Raritian Bay and Sandy Hook Bay in New Jersey. Included in that amount is $135,000 for completion of the reconnaissance study and initiation of the feasibility study for the Cliffwood Beach portion of the project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to undertake the work associated with Cliffwood Beach as part of the overall Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay project.

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes an additional $330,000 for the initiation of preconstruction engineering and design for the Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet project.

North Shore of Long Island, New York.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the North Shore of Long Island, New York, project.

South Shore of Staten Island, New York.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the feasibility study for the South Shore of Staten Island, New York, project.

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Cleveland Harbor Federal Navigation Channel Bulkheading study.

Mussers Dam, Snyder County, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $450,000 for completion of preconstruction engineering and design for the Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania, project.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oakland Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $435,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands project in Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

Colonias Along the U.S.-Mexico Border, Texas and Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the Corps of

Engineers to provide water-related environmental infrastructure planning and technical assistance to the Littletown and San Luis Colonias in Arizona.

Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Raymondville Drain feature of the Lower Rio Grande Basin, Texas, project.

Upper Jordan River Restoration, Utah.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of environmental restoration opportunities along the upper Jordan River in Utah.

Powell River Watershed, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake an ecosystem and environmental restoration and flood control study of the Powell River Watershed.

Flooding in Eastern Washington.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with the city and county governments within eastern Washington that were affected by the February 1996 floods to mitigate flood related silting and flood damage. Furthermore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to give full consideration to each city and county's request for recommendations for the prevention and management of future flooding.

Monongahela River, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities at the Palatine Park, Pricketts Fort, Morgantown, and Rail to Trail Corridor sites.

Monongahela River (Fairmont), West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the potential for waterfront development at the CSX site adjacent to the Monongahela River in Fairmont, West Virginia.

Tygart River Basin (Philippi), West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for a reconnaissance study of potential nonstructural projects to reduce flood damages in the vicinity of Philippi in Barbour County, West Virginia.

Coordination Studies with Other Agencies.—The amount provided for Coordination Studies with Other Agencies includes $480,000 for Cooperation with Other Agencies, $2,000,000 for the Planning Assistance to States program, $1,300,000 for Special Investigations, and $500,000 for the Interagency Water Resources Development program.

Section 22 Planning Assistance to the States.—Within the funds provided for the Section 22 Planning Assistance to States program, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to work with the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to develop a floodplain maintenance plan for Murrieta Creek in California, and the San Bernardino County Flood Control District to develop a floodplain management plan for the Mojave River in California.

Research and Development.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the Corps of Engineers Construction Technology Transfer Project.

The Committee is aware of passive cathodic protection systems and their potential for protecting Corps of Engineers projects from

underwater corrosion. The Committee urges the Corps to consider demonstrating this technology on Corps' structures. In addition, the Committee is aware that in response to the devastating Midwest floods of 1993, the Institute of Hydraulic Research at the University of Iowa, in cooperation with private industry, has begun development of the Comprehensive Flood Impact-Response Modeling System (CFIRMS), which would utilize supercomputers to provide models for watershed management nationwide. Given the importance of the project and the academic and private resources already committed to it, the Committee believes the Corps of Engineers should consider participating in the development of CFIRMS.

Use of Private Sector for Planning, Engineering, and Design.—The Committee is aware of recent efforts by the Corps of Engineers to increase the use of the private sector in performing planning, engineering and design work for Corps' projects. However, the Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers needs to intensify those efforts. The Committee expects the Corps, in those instances where a district office has not obtained the goal of having the private sector perform at least 50% of planning, engineering and design work for projects in that district, to increase private sector contracting by 10% in fiscal year 1997 and in each subsequent fiscal year until the level of work contracted to the private sector reaches at least 50%. It is not the Committee's intent that the Corps reduce contracting levels in those offices that are already conducting more than 50% of planning, engineering and design work with the private sector. Contracting with the private sector shall continue to be conducted in compliance with the normal qualification based selection process found in 40 U.S.C. 541–544.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1996	$804,573,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	914,000,000
Recommended, 1997	1,035,394,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+230,821,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+121,394,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	6,184,000	1,123,000	1,123,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,123,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	87,300,000	4,281,000	4,281,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,400,000	900,000	---
	ALASKA			
(FC)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION, AK	16,133,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	10,116,000	4,000,000	---
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	11,500,000	204,000	204,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	25,000,000	4,406,000	4,406,000
	ARKANSAS			
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	632,500,000	1,414,000	1,414,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK & DAM, AR	200,000,000	5,886,000	8,000,000
	CALIFORNIA			
	CORTE MADERA, CA	---	---	400,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	44,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	63,300,000	5,000,000	7,500,000
	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	---	---	3,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	204,000,000	14,400,000	16,350,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	100,700,000	850,000	12,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,450,000	50,000	500,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,600,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	85,900,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	25,700,000	100,000	2,500,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	56,025,000	4,306,000	4,306,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	24,350,000	3,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	159,100,000	6,100,000	9,800,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	172,250,000	500,000	650,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	9,030,000	200,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	51,020,000	51,020,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	20,300,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	---	400,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	43,200,000	5,604,000	5,604,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	2,890,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	15,700,000	5,700,000	5,900,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	5,950,000	100,000	100,000
	DELAWARE			
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	12,800,000	214,000	214,000
	FLORIDA			
	CANAVERAL HARBOR SAND BYPASS, FL	---	---	4,000,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,366,000,000	17,237,000	17,237,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	170,400,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	181,000,000	580,000	580,000
	FT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	---	3,500,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	30,600,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	255,600,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL	---	---	1,511,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	18,585,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	26,000,000	109,000	109,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	51,066,000	500,000	5,000,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	34,100,000	1,919,000	6,100,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	129,000,000	5,865,000	8,000,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY, ST AUGUSTINE BEACH, FL	---	---	300,000
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	586,650,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
	TYBEE ISLAND, GA	---	---	4,665,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HAWAII, HI	10,670,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	12,112,000	345,000	---
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HAWAII, HI	6,178,000	2,238,000	2,238,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	8,810,000	517,000	517,000
	ILLINOIS			
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	8,100,000	1,300,000	11,310,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,563,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	EAST ST LOUIS AND VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), I	---	---	300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	23,430,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	21,150,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	18,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	738,932,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	24,600,000	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	1,020,000,000	70,352,000	70,352,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,880,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	222,737,000	15,694,000	17,694,000
	INDIANA			
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	13,600,000	4,000,000	4,190,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	33,866,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	2,200,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	8,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	109,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	---	1,800,000
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,700,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	75,700,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	126,723,000	400,000	650,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,540,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	41,644,000	5,363,000	5,363,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA	14,600,000	2,814,000	2,814,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	28,100,000	50,000	500,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	10,300,000	50,000	500,000
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	157,299,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	18,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS & DAMS, KY & IN	255,000,000	7,501,000	9,000,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	8,471,000	3,089,000	---
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	---	3,500,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	7,333,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	504,000,000	4,025,000	18,525,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	79,100,000	517,000	517,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	599,000,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	161,000,000	752,000	752,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	166,000,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	RED RVR BELOW DENISON DAM LEVEE/BANK STAB, LA, AR & TX	---	---	100,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,886,880,000	4,800,000	6,875,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	25,000,000	10,000,000	18,000,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,800,000	4,206,000	7,206,000
	MARYLAND			
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	206,000	206,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	287,000,000	22,000,000	15,000,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	17,100,000	5,200,000	---
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	7,930,000	2,663,000	2,663,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	27,000,000	3,137,000	3,137,000
	MINNESOTA			
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	29,100,000	1,609,000	1,609,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,220,000	500,000	400,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	14,600,000	680,000	680,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	194,000,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO	33,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	16,267,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	214,000,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	460,000	460,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	5,900,000	1,000,000	---
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	170,000,000	10,260,000	10,260,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	89,400,000	1,965,000	1,965,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	343,000,000	380,000	380,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	23,500,000	8,150,000	8,150,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	9,025,000	250,000	250,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	2,196,000,000	24,118,000	24,118,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	4,200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	63,900,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	35,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE	56,000,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	3,020,000	250,000	250,000
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	61,470,000	1,298,000	1,298,000
	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	---	---	4,471,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	519,400,000	13,900,000	13,900,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	326,200,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &	130,000,000	100,000	100,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	77,100,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
(BE)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	177,680,000	6,533,000	6,533,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	36,100,000	337,000	---
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	8,190,000	450,000	450,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	15,800,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	32,230,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	101,387,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,380,000	220,000	220,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,306,000	592,000	592,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	8,688,000	466,000	---
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	13,650,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	72,000,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	32,800,000	690,000	690,000
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	24,040,000	500,000	500,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA	678,714,000	600,000	600,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	74,400,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	8,352,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	500,000	500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
	GLEN FOERD, PA	---	---	800,000
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	181,000,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	10,900,000	610,000	610,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	15,400,000	358,000	958,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	645,000,000	17,100,000	17,100,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	63,035,000	485,000	485,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	7,050,000	500,000	---
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, PA	---	---	10,000,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	100,000,000	14,063,000	14,063,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	11,700,000	350,000	---
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	416,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	62,400,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	89,050,000	2,540,000	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	7,663,000	7,663,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,535,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	17,150,000	2,200,000	---
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	4,436,000	1,396,000	1,396,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	22,500,000	9,550,000	9,550,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	68,800,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	113,400,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX	58,600,000	18,300,000	18,300,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	7,580,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	317,450,000	3,004,000	3,004,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	36,914,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	147,410,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	203,600,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	10,100,000	300,000	300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	---	10,000,000
	VIRGINIA			
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA	34,500,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	RICHMOND FILTRATION PLANT, VA	---	---	3,500,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,500,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	---	8,000,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	7,461,000	487,000	487,000
	WASHINGTON			
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	1,382,217,000	107,000,000	78,800,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,760,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	86,000,000	3,000,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,559,728,000	6,921,000	33,021,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	18,000,000	6,385,000	6,385,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	17,900,000	4,516,000	4,516,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	373,000,000	12,158,000	12,158,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	225,600,000	30,900,000	30,900,000
	WISCONSIN			
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	---	---	20,000
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	6,620,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	---	2,500,000	---
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	3,000,000	5,800,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	---	4,000,000	---
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT	---	500,000	500,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	7,500,000	9,500,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	18,892,000	18,892,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	24,500,000	29,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	---	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	---	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT	---	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	15,000,000	15,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-46,716,000	-46,716,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL		914,000,000	1,035,394,000

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam project in Arkansas. The Committee notes that the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946, prior to creation of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Therefore, the Committee has deleted language proposed by the Administration that would have authorized the use of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund for construction of the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam. The Committee expects that the Administration will continue to budget for this project without cost-sharing from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 to initiate deepening of Humboldt Harbor and Bay. The funds are included in anticipation of enactment of the authorization for the project, which has been included by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, as reported to the House.

Klamath-Glen Levee Repairs, California.—The Committee commends the Corps of Engineers for its decision to proceed with repairs of Klamath-Glen levee design deficiencies under the same financial terms as the original project construction. The South Pacific Division acted with dispatch to address the concerns of Del Norte County officials about the repair project. The agreement between the Corps and County officials reflects the Committee's understanding that the Corps will continue to be responsible for correcting any design deficiencies in the project. The Committee is hopeful the repairs will proceed promptly, before this year's rainy season.

Lower Sacramento Area Levee Reconstruction, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000, $450,000 above the budget request, to continue construction of the Lower Sacramento Area Levee Reconstruction project.

Mid-Valley Area Levee Reconstruction, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the high priority Mid-Valley Area Levee Reconstruction project, an increase of $2,400,000 over the amount included in the budget request.

Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California.—As requested in the budget, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the riffle restoration project, which is an integral part of the effort to develop a long-term solution to the fish passage problem at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant. It is the Committee's intent that the Corps of Engineers participate in, and, when necessary, provide direct support to, this important state-Federal effort.

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California.—The bill includes $7,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the San Timoteo Creek feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project in California.

Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California.—The bill includes $400,000 for a General Reevaluation Report for shore protection improvements along the Silver Strand Shoreline in Imperial Beach, California.

Faulkner's Island, Connecticut.—Within available funds, the committee provides $2,000,000 for the Faulkner's Island beach erosion control project, Faulkner's Island, Connecticut.

Canaveral Harbor Sand Bypass, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to complete the initial sand bypassing for the Canaveral Harbor, Florida, project.

Ft. Pierce Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $3,300,000 for renourishment of the Ft. Pierce Beach project in Florida. The Committee is aware that a section 934 report recommending the extension of Federal participation in this project to the year 2020 was completed in June of 1995 but has not received final approval because of the Administration's proposal to terminate the Corps of Engineers role in shore protection projects. In light of the Congress' rejection of that proposal, the Committee expects Corps of Engineers and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to complete the processing of that report. In addition, $200,000 has been provided for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a General Reevaluation Report that will examine the feasibility of extending the project.

Lee County, Florida.—The bill includes $1,211,000 for reimbursement of the Federal share of costs for the renourishment of the Captiva Island segment of the Lee County, Florida, project. In addition, the Committee has provided $300,000 to complete the General Reevaluation Report for the Estero and Gasparilla Islands segment of the Lee County, Florida, project.

St. Johns County (St. Augustine Beach), Florida.— The Committee has provided $300,000 for completion of the General Reevaluation Report for the St. Johns County (St. Augustine Beach), Florida, project.

Tybee Island, Georgia.—The bill includes $4,665,000 for the renourishment of the Tybee Island, Georgia, project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee is in agreement with the Corps of Engineers plan to use $6,655,000 in previously appropriated funds to continue the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs project in Illinois.

Burns Waterway Harbor (Major Rehabilitation), Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $190,000 to construct access for the disabled at a jetty construction project currently underway at the harbor.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The bill includes $2,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion project.

Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana.—The bill includes $1,800,000 to continue construction of the Ohio River Flood Protection project in Indiana. The Committee has also included language in the bill directing the Secretary of the Army to utilize the $1,000,000 provided in the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for construction of the Ohio River Flood Protection project for that purpose.

Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa.—The Committee has included language in the bill that directs the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with state, county, and city governments and in consultation with the Des Moines River Greenbelt Advisory Committee, to provide highway and other signs appropriate to di-

rect the public to the bike trail which runs from downtown Des Moines to the Big Creek Recreation area at the Corps of Engineers Saylorville Lake project and the wildlife refuge in Jasper and Marion Counties in Iowa authorized in Public Law 101–302.

Missouri River Levee System, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The bill includes $200,000, the same as the budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design of the Unit L–385 levee. However, the Committee is concerned about impact of the project on other flood control levees in the vicinity and, within the funds provided, directs the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of the increase in Missouri River elevations that will occur as a result of levee construction and the impact of that increase on nearby flood control levees. The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers for a General Reevaluation Report and engineering and design for Unit L–15 of the Missouri River Levee System project.

Salyersville, Kentucky.—The bill includes $3,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the cut-through project for the City of Salyersville, Kentucky.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana.—The bill includes $18,525,000 to continue construction of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity hurricane protection project. Of the amount provided above the budget request, $4,500,000 shall be used for levee raising and landslide runoff control for Jefferson Parish lakefront levees and $10,000,000 shall be used to continue construction of parallel protection along the Orleans and London Avenue outfall canals, including studying the feasibility of using a levee gate where Lakeshore Drive crosses London Avenue Canal at the entrance to the University of New Orleans.

Red River Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,075,000 for the Red River Waterway project to be used for construction of the Eagle Bend Capout.

Red River below Denison Dam Levee and Bank Stabilization, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas.—The Committee has included $100,000 in the bill for the Red River below Denison Dam Levee and Bank Stabilization project to continue the Bowie County Levee, Texas, portion of the project. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to continue to prepare plans and specifications for restoration or replacement of the Bowie County Levee, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, for incorporation into the Federal levee system, to provide the same level of protection as the adjoining Miller County Levee in Arkansas under the terms and conditions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936.

Poplar Island, Maryland.—The Administration has proposed to construct the Poplar Island dredged material disposal facility under the provisions of section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, which authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out projects for the protection, restoration, and creation of aquatic habitats in connection with dredging for construction or maintenance of authorized navigation projects. The authority to carry out projects under section 204, however, is limited to $15,000,000 per year. Therefore, the Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the project in fiscal year 1997.

Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet Beach Erosion Control Project, New Jersey.—It is the intent of the committee that within available funds for construction of the Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet beach erosion project, construction be continued on section I, contract 2 (Monmonth Beach-Long Branch border to Lake Takanasee) and section II, contract 1 (Shark River Inlet to Manasquan) and that construction begin on section 1, contract 3 (Lake Takanasee to Deal Lake) and section II, contract 1 (Asbury Park to Shark River Inlet).

Acequias Irrigation System, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $300,000, the same as the budget request, for the Acequias Irrigation System project in New Mexico. These funds, combined with $1,176,000 in programmed carryover, will provide a total of $1,476,000 for acequia rehabilitation projects in fiscal year 1997. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to work more closely with acequia members in order to accelerate the number of acequia projects undertaken and encourages the Corps to work with acequia members to permit them to perform some of their own repairs.

Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York.—The Committee has provided $4,471,000 to the Corps of Engineers for dredging of Fire Island Inlet and the placement of the material on Gilgo Beach.

New York City Watershed, New York.—The Committee is aware of ongoing efforts at the State and local level to develop a management plan for the 2,000 square mile watershed that supplies drinking water for the City of New York. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to utilize its expertise in dam and reservoir management and water quality monitoring to assist in that effort, which is essential to protect the drinking water supply for the 9 million people who live in the New York metropolitan area.

Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the project to provide flood control for the Plot and Greenridge sections of Scranton, Pennsylvania.

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $10,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program authorized by section 313 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs the Corps to provide assistance to the Chestnut Ridge Area Joint Municipal Authority for the design and construction of public sewer projects. In fiscal year 1995, the Committee directed that funding provided for this program was to be used to design and construct a sewer management system for Broad Top Township and Coaldale Borough. Those funds may also be used for watershed reclamation projects included as part of the Broad Top Township and Coaldale Borough sewer management system. In addition, the Committee directs that funds provided for this program in fiscal year 1996 be used for the following projects: Hyndman Levee Project, Bedford County, Pennsylvania ($1,000,000); Guilford Township Water Line, Franklin County, Pennsylvania ($330,000); and Blair County Airport Industrial Development Sewer and Water Line, Martinsburg, Pennsylvania ($320,000).

Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia.—The bill includes $3,500,000 to complete construction of the Richmond Filtration Plant flood control project in Virginia.

Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—Last year the Committee referred to this program as "a black hole for money." That characterization was based on two concerns. First, the total estimated cost of the program had grown from $345,000,000 in fiscal year 1994 to $583,600,000 in fiscal year 1996. Second, in spite of the enormous sums of money being spent on the program, there appeared to be no consensus among all the parties involved in the effort about what needed to be done to restore the salmon runs. This year, the Corps of Engineers estimates that the total cost of this program will be almost $1,400,000,000 and there still appears to be no consensus about what steps need to be taken to restore the salmon runs. In a response to a question at this year's hearings about the changing cost of the program, the Corps of Engineers North Pacific Division Engineer stated that "the total cost will be relatively firm when final decisions are made on the long-term configuration and operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System to restore anadromous fish runs. At this time, we expect these decisions to be made near the turn of the century." The Committee believes that it would be appropriate to slow down spending for this program until a definite plan for recovery of the fish runs can be developed. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation for the Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation program is $78,800,000, which is the same as the amount appropriated in FY 1996 and $28,200,000 below the budget request. The Administration should be aware that in these times of declining budgets for discretionary programs it is unlikely that this line item will receive a significant increase in the future. The Administration should work to priorize its efforts in salmon recovery within a budget which is justified considering current and future fiscal constraints.

The Committee supports the testing and installation of surface bypass facilities at several of the Corps projects and understands that they may hold great promise for improving fish survival in the system. It is important, however, for the Corps to design, construct and install the surface bypass prototypes at the lowest possible cost. The recently installed surface bypass prototype at Lower Granite Dam cost more than twice as much as a surface bypass facility at a public utility district-owned project on the mid-Columbia River. While the configurations of the Federal and non-Federal projects on the Columbia and Snake rivers are all unique, and comparisons among them are difficult to make, the Committee is concerned that the Corps is over-designing its prototypes, and encourages the Corps to review its procedures in order to lower the cost of future facilities.

The Corps is directed to continue its work on gas abatement measures, including the construction of spillway flip lips at Ice Harbor and John Day dams. The Committee encourages efforts to continue improving monitoring of dissolved gas levels at the projects, and directs the Corps to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the states and the tribes to further improve the current physical gas monitoring and reporting system.

In addition, the Committee supports the construction of Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) tag detectors at the John Day and Bonneville projects. The Committee understands that the Corps' cost estimate for the construction of the John Day PIT tag facility has been revised upward due to recently discovered problems at the construction site. The Committee considers this facility to be a high priority, and directs the Corps to allocate sufficient funds within the overall program to ensure that the facility is completed no later than October 1997.

In accordance with the Administration's request, no funds have been provided for the advanced planning and design for public and private facilities affected by the operation of the John Day project at minimum pool levels.

La Farge Lake, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin.—The Committee has provided $20,000 for the Corps of Engineers to carry out remediation activities in anticipation of deauthorization of the La Farge Lake project and the transfer of project lands out of Federal ownership.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—In addition to the amounts provided in the budget request, the Committee has provided: $18,500,000 to continue construction of the Phase III portion of the Harlan, Kentucky, element of the project, including continued construction of a river diversion, levee and floodwall structures, and nonstructural work; $4,050,000 to continue construction of the levee/floodwall and complete nonstructural work on the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the project; $2,000,000 for channel improvement work and nonstructural work on the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $2,000,000 to continue nonstructural work on the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project; $350,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $300,000 for a draft report/plan for a flood prevention project in Martin, Kentucky, on the Levisa Fork; and $500,000 to continue engineering and design of the Haysi Dam feature of the Levisa Fork Basin, Virginia, element of the project. In addition, the Committee has deleted $1,600,000 requested for detailed project reports.

Continuing Authorities Programs.—The Committee is pleased that the Administration has abandoned the proposal made last year to terminate the various continuing authorities programs. For relatively modest amounts of money these programs have provided significant benefits to many of our citizens, particularly those in smaller communities.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $29,000,000, $4,500,000 above the budget request, for the section 205 program. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $1,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Northport, Alabama, project; $150,000 to initiate construction of the Elba, Alabama, project; $150,000 to initiate construction of the Geneva, Alabama, project; $3,916,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Muscle Shoals, Alabama, project; $252,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Dallas Branch/Pinhook Creek, Alabama, project; $242,000 to initiate and complete construction of the

Clarks Spring Branch, Decatur, Alabama, project; $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Huntsville Spring Branch, Alabama, project; $250,000 to initiate engineering and design of the Arizona Statewide Flood Warning System project; $125,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Tehama-Hamilton City, California, project; $690,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Magpie Creek, California, project; $540,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the San Pedro Creek, Pacifica, California, project; $774,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Mission Zanja Creek, California, project; $20,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase of the Christopher Creek, Florida, project; $20,000 to complete the reconnaissance phase of the Spanish Pond, Florida, project; $65,000 to initiate construction of the Wills Branch (Cedar River), Florida, project; $300,000 to initiate engineering and design of the Cedar Hammock (Wares Creek), Manatee County, Florida, project; $170,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Harmon Canal, Savannah, Georgia, project; $800,000 to complete design and initiate and complete construction of the Hamburg, Iowa, project; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Grand Tower, Degonia and Fountain Bluff, Illinois, project; $223,000 to complete design for the installation of flood gates at McHenry and Algonquin Dams on the Fox River in Illinois; $222,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Prairie du Rocher, Illinois, project; $1,500,000 to initiate construction of the North Libertyville Estates, Illinois, project; $50,000 to initiate studies of flooding problems along Indian Creek, Muddy Creek, and Brushy Creek in Lawrence County, Illinois; $363,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Brevoort Levee, Deshee Ditch Pump Plant, Indiana, project; $122,000 for design and construction of the Wabash River, City Ditch, Brevoort Levee, Indiana, project; $500,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Flatrock River, Rushville, Indiana, project; $200,000 to initiate construction of the Feather Creek, Clinton, Indiana, project; $150,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Little Calumet River Basin, Dyer, Indiana, project; $25,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Bellepoint Floodwall, Frankfort, Kentucky, project; $100,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Beech Fork, Bardstown, Kentucky, project; $40,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Rolling Fork River, Lebanon Junction, Kentucky, project; $100,000 to initiate construction of the Jackson (Cy Bend), Kentucky, project; $100,000 to initiate construction of the Gwynn Falls, Maryland, project; $100,000 to initiate construction of the Black River at Poplar Bluff, Missouri, project; $91,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Main Ditch No. 8, Pemiscot County, Missouri, project; $3,200,000 to initiate construction of the St. Peters Old Town Levee, Missouri, project; $400,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Logan Creek at Pender, Nebraska, project; $135,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersey, project; $130,000 for the feasibility study for the Poplar Brook, Monmouth County, New Jersey, project; $300,000 to complete construction of the Sugar Creek, Bellbrook, Ohio, project; $200,000 to initiate and

complete a feasibility study for flood reduction measures at two sites along Connoquenessing Creek in Franklin, Marion, and North Sewickley Townships in Pennsylvania; $100,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study for the Emily Avenue/Timothy Street, Knoxville, Tennessee, project; and $555,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Cedar River, Renton, Washington, project.

For the Magpie Creek, California, project, the Committee understands that the portion of the project located at McClellan Air Force base is not proceeding on the same schedule as the Corps of Engineers' section 205 project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with this project such that its design shall provide for the future construction of on-base improvements. Any modifications made to the on-base portion of the project during design shall be made in consultation with the local sponsor.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $9,500,000 for the section 14 program, $2,000,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $185,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ditto Landing, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Batesville, Arkansas, project; $110,000 to complete construction of the Whitewater River, Brookville, Indiana, project; $40,000 to initiate and complete planning and design of the Mill Creek, Parke County, Indiana, project; $80,000 for planning, design and construction of the White River, Freedom, Indiana, project; $109,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ohio River, Masterson House, Kentucky, project; $335,000 to complete construction of the French Creek, Wattsburg, Pennsylvania, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete planning and construction of the Cumberland River, Clarksville Fairgrounds, Tennessee, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete planning and construction of the Cumberland River (river miles 193.8 to 197.5), Nashville, Tennessee, project; $300,000 to initiate and complete planning and construction of the Cumberland River, Erin Water Treatment Intake, Tennessee, project; $500,000 for design and construction of the City Interceptor Sewer Line (Tennessee River mile 466.5), Tennessee, project; $500,000 for design and construction of the Tennessee Riverpark, Frye Fishing Center, Tennessee, project; $258,000 to initiate and complete construction of the project at Howard Bridge in Columbia, Tennessee; $395,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Washington-on-the-Brazos, Texas, project; and $232,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ohio River, City of Chester, West Virginia, project.

Small Beach Erosion Control Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $5,800,000 for the section 103 program, $2,800,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $1,850,000 for construction of the City of Carlsbad-Aqua Hedionda Lagoon, California, project; $500,000 to initiate construction of the Shelter Island/Ram Island Causeway, New York, project; $400,000 to initiate construction of the Oakwood Beach, New York, project; and $1,757,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Lummi Shore Road, Lummi Indian Reservation, Washington, project.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the section 107 program, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $100,000 to initiate a study of navigation problems at Hernando Beach Channel in Florida; $305,000 to implement a modification to expand the limits of the Shallow Creek navigation project in Baltimore County, Maryland; $100,000 to initiate a study of navigation problems at Rockhold Creek in Maryland; $100,000 to initiate a study of navigation problems at Huron Harbor, Michigan; $100,000 to study the need for navigation improvements at Mamaroneck Harbor in New York; $980,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate and complete construction of the breakwater extension project at Newport Harbor, Oregon; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Coan River, Virginia, project; and $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Messick Point, Back River, Virginia project.

Clearing and Snagging for Flood Control (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the section 208 program, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Committee has provided $300,000 for initiation and completion of planning and design studies for the Walker River Basin project in Nevada.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the section 1135 program, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $438,000 to prepare a project modification report and initiate engineering and design of the Gunnerson Pond, California, project; $600,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the San Lorenzo River, California, project; $600,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Upper Sacramento River, Murphy Slough, California, project; $3,000,000 to continue construction of the Yolo Basin Wetlands (Davis Site), California, project; $500,000 to complete the project modification report for the Prospect Island, California, project; $500,000 for plans and specifications for a sea turtle nesting habitat project at Long Beach, North Carolina; $253,000 to initiate and complete design and environmental compliance work for the Grande Ronde Headcut Stabilization project in Oregon; and $3,750,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate and complete construction of an environmental restoration project at the Port of Jefferson in the Cypress Valley Watershed in Texas.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriation, 1996	$307,885,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	292,500,000
Recommended, 1997	302,990,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−4,895,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+10,490,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	4,805,000	965,000	965,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS	7,377,000	338,000	338,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	2,092,000	350,000	350,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	2,130,000	130,000	130,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	335,000	335,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	204,750,000	788,000	788,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		2,906,000	2,906,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,570,000,000	50,800,000	50,800,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	8,570,000	841,000	841,000
(FC)	HELENA & VICINITY, AR	7,700,000	150,000	---
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,452,000,000	24,369,000	27,229,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	381,000,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	3,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	172,000,000	5,020,000	5,445,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,650,000,000	18,600,000	18,600,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	59,000,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	93,700,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	167,428,000	11,393,000	11,393,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,320,271,000)	(33,164,000)	(38,464,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	214,115,000	20,000	20,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	100,215,000	6,807,000	6,807,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	206,701,000	12,700,000	18,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	7,304,000	480,000	480,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	203,200,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408,000	3,459,000	3,459,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	244,228,000	904,000	904,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	312,100,000	8,769,000	8,769,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	18,400,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	131,000,000	3,024,000	3,024,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		173,861,000	182,296,000
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	65,101,000	65,101,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	---	475,000	475,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	156,000	156,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	121,000	121,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	5,458,000	5,458,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	9,815,000	9,815,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,631,000	2,631,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	---	50,000	50,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	---	28,000	28,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	150,000	150,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	12,223,000	12,223,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	172,000	172,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	92,000	92,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	1,228,000	1,228,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	---	415,000	415,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	56,000	56,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA	---	261,000	261,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	5,025,000	5,025,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,849,000	2,849,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	239,000	239,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	---	195,000	195,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	122,000	122,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	---	(18,658,000)	(20,758,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	2,838,000	2,838,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	668,000	668,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	2,821,000	2,821,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	751,000	751,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	3,783,000	3,783,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	936,000	936,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	3,946,000	6,046,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	---	485,000	485,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	393,000	393,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	750,000	750,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	---	223,000	223,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	3,545,000	3,545,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	---	129,000	129,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MAPPING	---	1,064,000	1,064,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		133,481,000	135,581,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-17,748,000	-17,793,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		292,500,000	302,990,000

Helena and Vicinity, Arkansas.—Due to the budgetary situation, the Committee has deleted the funds requested for the initiation of construction of the Helena and Vicinity, Arkansas, project.

Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $425,000 for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct a boat ramp near Simmesport in Avoyelles Parish, Louisiana, as part of the Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana, project authorized in Public Law 99-88.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The bill includes $18,000,000 for the Demonstration Erosion Control program, a continuation of joint efforts by the Vicksburg District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo Basin of Mississippi. The funds provided will permit the Corps of Engineers to undertake work in the following watersheds: Batupan Bogue, Otoucalofa Creek, Hotophia Creek, Black Creek, Abiaca Creek, Hurricane-Wolfe Creek, Coldwater River, and Yalobusha River. For the Yalobusha River Basin, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to design and construct grade control structures, clean out channels, develop an environmental impact statement and design future work. The Committee does not concur with the Administration's position that this partially completed project has fully demonstrated its effectiveness. This project, which is only now beginning to generate the technology transfer originally anticipated, should be continued to completion, including the necessary monitoring to facilitate technology transfer. The Committee expects the Administration to continue to request funds for this important program.

St. Johns-New Madrid Floodway Flood Control Project, Missouri.—The Committee urges the Corps to complete its pre-construction activities on the St. Johns-New Madrid Floodway Flood Control Project, particularly the East Prairie element, within six months of the enactment of this bill. The Corps is expected to cooperate with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, its Enterprise Community Program, and other federal agencies.

West Tennessee Tributaries, Tennessee.—The Committee is aware that the West Tennessee Tributaries flood control project authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, has been a matter of considerable concern for many years because of the need to consider and implement measures to preserve and enhance environmental values as part of the project. The Committee is further aware that a steering committee, including membership representing a cross-section of all interested groups, has been tasked by the State of Tennessee to develop a plan which can be supported by all interests. The Committee has been advised that the steering committee has developed a consensus plan on two critical watersheds within the basin to be implemented as a demonstration of a total watershed/ecosystem approach to providing a measure of flood control while preserving and enhancing environmental resources. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers utilize funds provided for the West Tennessee Tributaries project for demonstration projects on the Middle Fork Forked Deer River, Buck Creek, and Stokes Creek Watersheds, and to conduct refor-

mulation studies to develop consensus plans for flood control and environmental preservation using a total watershed/ecosystem approach. The construction of protection works for bridges and other facilities where channel improvement work has been completed should also be continued.

Mississippi River Levees, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,860,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate the important work of bringing Mississippi River levees in Louisiana up to grade.

Sardis Lake, Mississippi.—The Committee is aware that the City of Sardis, Mississippi, has worked closely with the Corps of Engineers to develop a viable and responsible plan for developing the valuable resources of Sardis Lake in Mississippi. The Committee has provided additional funds so that the Corps of Engineers may perform the dredging that is necessary for the development plan to proceed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1996	$1,703,697,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	1,663,000,000
Recommended, 1997	1,701,180,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−2,517,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+38,180,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
	ACF-ACT COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY	---	250,000
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,839,000	5,839,000
(N)	BAYOU CODEN, AL	5,000	5,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	5,000	5,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,693,000	21,343,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	550,000	550,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,054,000	3,054,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	35,000	35,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	6,647,000	6,647,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,918,000	17,918,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	899,000	899,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	392,000	392,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	4,491,000	4,491,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	90,000	90,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	19,192,000	22,892,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	5,972,000	5,972,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	BETHEL HARBOR, AK	325,000	325,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,726,000	1,726,000
(N)	CRESCENT BAY HARBOR, SITKA, AK	70,000	70,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	551,000	551,000
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR, AK	396,000	396,000
(N)	DRY PASS, AK	345,000	345,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	233,000	233,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	24,000	24,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	181,000	181,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	260,000	260,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	565,000	565,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,069,000	1,069,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	72,000	72,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,136,000	1,136,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	70,000	70,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	112,000	112,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,961,000	3,961,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,595,000	4,595,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,088,000	1,088,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,416,000	4,416,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,793,000	5,793,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,088,000	4,088,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,051,000	1,051,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,034,000	1,034,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	995,000	995,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,264,000	4,464,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR	455,000	455,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	209,000	209,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	24,155,000	24,155,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,743,000	1,743,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,614,000	3,614,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,295,000	1,295,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,505,000	3,505,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	426,000	426,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,763,000	5,763,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,986,000	3,986,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	5,000	5,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,257,000	2,257,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	113,000	113,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,576,000	1,576,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,376,000	1,376,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,432,000	2,432,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,177,000	3,177,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	192,000	192,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,446,000	1,446,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,155,000	3,155,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,224,000	1,224,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,125,000	1,125,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	100,000	3,800,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,729,000	4,229,000
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (SEPULVEDA DAM), CA	---	3,200,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER, CA	---	300,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	291,000	291,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	222,000	222,000
	MORO BAY HARBOR, CA	---	300,000
(N)	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	1,130,000	1,130,000
(N)	NAPA RIVER, CA	2,056,000	2,056,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,651,000	1,651,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	910,000	910,000
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40,000	590,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	736,000	736,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,625,000	2,625,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	680,000	750,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,721,000	2,721,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	399,000	399,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,415,000	1,415,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	3,025,000	3,025,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,099,000	2,099,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	897,000	897,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	105,000	105,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	175,000	175,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER - MISSION BAY, CA	35,000	35,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,030,000	2,030,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	100,000	100,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,290,000	2,290,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,365,000	2,365,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,960,000	1,660,000
(N)	SAN LEANDRO MARINA (JACK D MALTESTER CHANNEL), CA	1,450,000	1,450,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,410,000	1,410,000
(N)	SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	2,515,000	2,515,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,739,000	2,739,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,265,000	1,265,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	739,000	739,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,610,000	1,610,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	745,000	745,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,569,000	2,249,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,300,000	3,900,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	48,000	48,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	423,000	423,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	793,000	793,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,084,000	1,084,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	63,000	63,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,415,000	1,415,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	330,000	330,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	632,000	632,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	396,000	396,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	419,000	419,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	469,000	469,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	868,000	868,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	3,000	3,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	470,000	470,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	415,000	415,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,210,000	1,210,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	402,000	402,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	477,000	477,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	426,000	426,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	100,000	100,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,602,000	11,602,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	42,000	42,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	265,000	265,000
(N)	WATERWAY INDIAN RIVER INLET TO REHOBOTH BAY, DE	315,000	315,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	4,810,000	4,810,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	7,000	7,000
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	829,000	829,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	62,000	62,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	30,000	30,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	34,000	34,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	1,436,000	1,436,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	150,000	150,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,545,000	3,545,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,513,000	9,513,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	35,000	35,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	886,000	886,000
(N)	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	136,000	136,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,848,000	1,848,000
	FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	---	375,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	696,000	696,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	50,000	50,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	209,000	209,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,538,000	3,538,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,965,000	6,000,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,040,000	5,040,000
(N)	JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	40,000	40,000
(N)	LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	80,000	80,000
(N)	LONG BOAT PASS, FL	40,000	40,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	343,000	343,000
(N)	NEW PASS, SARASOTA, FL	30,000	30,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,276,000	4,276,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	155,000	155,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,233,000	2,233,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	35,000	35,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	120,000	120,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	113,000	113,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	55,000	55,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	500,000	500,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,980,000	3,980,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	68,000	68,000
(N)	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	13,000	13,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,068,000	4,068,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	41,000	41,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,514,000	4,514,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,109,000	4,109,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,710,000	1,710,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,883,000	3,400,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,649,000	6,649,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,324,000	4,324,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	9,441,000	9,081,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	40,000	40,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,378,000	9,978,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,357,000	6,117,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	14,714,000	16,000,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	277,000	1,277,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,911,000	4,911,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	150,000	150,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	200,000	200,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	275,000	275,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,535,000	4,535,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	7,939,000	7,939,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	114,000	114,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,151,000	1,151,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	272,000	272,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	45,000	45,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	1,258,000	1,258,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,497,000	4,497,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	3,528,000	4,678,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	507,000	507,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	257,000	257,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	881,000	881,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN	23,726,000	23,726,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	712,000	712,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,556,000	1,556,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	498,000	760,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,763,000	5,763,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	13,081,000	13,081,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	79,423,000	79,423,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	150,000	150,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	105,000	105,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,568,000	3,568,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	191,000	191,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,167,000	1,167,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	815,000	815,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,193,000	1,193,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	5,000	5,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	661,000	661,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	739,000	739,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	733,000	733,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	458,000	750,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	117,000	117,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	62,000	62,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	993,000	993,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	749,000	749,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	605,000	605,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	26,000	26,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	799,000	799,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	110,000	110,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,726,000	2,726,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	874,000	874,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	64,000	64,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	6,210,000	6,210,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IA	61,000	61,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,884,000	1,884,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,518,000	3,518,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,635,000	3,635,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,473,000	1,473,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,032,000	1,032,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	489,000	489,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	723,000	723,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	737,000	737,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	807,000	807,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	78,000	78,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	4,054,000	4,054,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,395,000	1,395,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,580,000	1,580,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,759,000	1,759,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	798,000	798,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,798,000	1,798,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,720,000	1,720,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	56,000	56,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	357,000	357,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,031,000	2,031,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,715,000	1,715,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	8,429,000	8,429,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,968,000	1,968,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,080,000	1,080,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,232,000	1,232,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,397,000	1,397,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	964,000	964,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,330,000	1,330,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	420,000	420,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,944,000	1,944,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,249,000	1,249,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,835,000	1,835,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,791,000	1,791,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	153,000	153,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,148,000	1,148,000
	KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, 5-14, KY	---	3,600,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,235,000	1,235,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	23,000	23,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	692,000	692,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	83,000	83,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,725,000	1,725,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	52,146,000	52,146,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	6,533,000	6,533,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,041,000	1,041,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,790,000	1,790,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,015,000	1,015,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,996,000	5,996,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,067,000	1,067,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	8,281,000	8,281,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	497,000	497,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	520,000	520,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	119,000	119,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	138,000	138,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	4,535,000	4,535,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,947,000	1,947,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	16,603,000	16,603,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	2,321,000	2,321,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	418,000	418,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	321,000	321,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	38,000	38,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA	46,155,000	46,155,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	12,828,000	12,828,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,190,000	2,190,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	144,000	144,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	9,853,000	10,853,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,890,000	1,890,000
(N)	TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	150,000	150,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	165,000	165,000
(N)	WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	115,000	115,000
(N)	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	225,000	225,000
	MAINE		
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,131,000	1,131,000
(N)	SCARBOROUGH RIVER, ME	1,167,000	1,167,000
(N)	YORK HARBOR, ME	714,000	714,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	10,711,000	10,711,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	420,000	420,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	550,000	550,000
(N)	CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	478,000	478,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	108,000	108,000
(N)	FISHING BAY, MD	695,000	695,000
	FISHING CREEK, MD	---	400,000
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	65,000	65,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	32,000	32,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,600,000	1,740,000
(N)	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	117,000	117,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	582,000	582,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	119,000	119,000
(N)	TILGHMAN ISLAND HARBOR, MD	50,000	50,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	744,000	744,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	70,000	70,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(N)	ANDREWS RIVER, MA	165,000	165,000
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	324,000	324,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	451,000	451,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	348,000	348,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,191,000	8,191,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	378,000	378,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	168,000	168,000
(N)	CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	101,000	101,000
(N)	DUXBURY HARBOR, MA	1,882,000	1,882,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	294,000	294,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	262,000	262,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	339,000	339,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	HYANNIS HARBOR, MA	358,000	358,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	112,000	112,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	371,000	371,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	338,000	338,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	595,000	595,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	971,000	971,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MA	16,000	16,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	376,000	376,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	521,000	521,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	387,000	387,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	254,000	254,000
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	293,000	293,000
(N)	AU SABLE HARBOR, MI	22,000	22,000
(N)	BLACK RIVER (PORT HURON), MI	23,000	23,000
(N)	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	124,000	124,000
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	125,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	125,000	125,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	80,000	80,000
(N)	CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	105,000	105,000
(N)	CLINTON RIVER, MI	113,000	113,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,466,000	3,466,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	38,000	38,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,278,000	1,278,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	112,000	112,000
(N)	HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	368,000	368,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	614,000	614,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	23,000	23,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
	KAWKAWLIN RIVER, MI	---	160,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	302,000	302,000
(N)	LAC LA BELLE, MI	82,000	82,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	306,000	306,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	225,000	225,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	94,000	94,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	166,000	166,000
(N)	MACKINAW CITY HARBOR MI	22,000	22,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	323,000	323,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	484,000	484,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	717,000	717,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	126,000	126,000
(N)	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	25,000	25,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	496,000	496,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,719,000	1,719,000
(N)	PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI	163,000	163,000
(N)	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	298,000	298,000
(N)	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	163,000	163,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	255,000	255,000
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	82,000	82,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	169,000	169,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	502,000	502,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,729,000	1,729,000
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	1,926,000	1,926,000
(N)	SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	538,000	538,000
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	35,000	35,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	767,000	767,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	671,000	996,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	16,557,000	16,557,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,301,000	2,301,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,688,000	1,688,000
(N)	WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	22,000	22,000
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	179,000	179,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,665,000	2,665,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	22,000	22,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	9,000	9,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	835,000	835,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	145,000	145,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	2,909,000	2,909,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	59,000	59,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	87,000	87,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,397,000	2,397,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	231,000	231,000
(N)	TWO HARBORS, MN	157,000	157,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	800,000	800,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	3,000	3,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	200,000	200,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,999,000	2,999,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	78,000	78,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,693,000	1,693,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,001,000	3,001,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	1,983,000	1,983,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5,000	5,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	348,000	348,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	315,000	315,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,197,000	5,197,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,025,000	2,375,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,418,000	8,418,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	203,000	203,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	878,000	878,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	747,000	747,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	14,299,000	14,299,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	265,000	265,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,845,000	1,845,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,046,000	1,046,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	101,000	101,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,391,000	3,391,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,501,000	5,501,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	16,000	16,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,684,000	3,684,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	16,000	16,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	8,127,000	8,127,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	47,000	47,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	14,000	14,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,193,000	6,193,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,382,000	1,382,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO	1,000,000	1,000,000
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	736,000	736,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	928,000	928,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	442,000	442,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	483,000	483,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	164,000	164,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	415,000	415,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	468,000	468,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	731,000	731,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,887,000	1,887,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	489,000	489,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	355,000	355,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	532,000	532,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,275,000	1,275,000
(N)	CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	430,000	430,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	500,000	500,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20,000	20,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	15,195,000	15,195,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,445,000	1,445,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	293,000	293,000
(N)	KEYPORT HARBOR, NJ	50,000	50,000
(N)	MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	MATAWAN CREEK, NJ	50,000	50,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,079,000	2,079,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	1,190,000	1,190,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	354,000	354,000
(N)	SHARK RIVER, NJ	420,000	420,000
(N)	SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	375,000	375,000
	TUCKERTON CREEK, NJ	---	600,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,340,000	1,340,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,987,000	1,987,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,105,000	1,105,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	356,000	356,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	109,000	109,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	425,000	425,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	966,000	966,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	66,000	66,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	455,000	455,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	525,000	525,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	259,000	259,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	465,000	465,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,906,000	3,906,000
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY	365,000	365,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,476,000	1,476,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	263,000	263,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	90,000	90,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	466,000	466,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	625,000	625,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	120,000	120,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	900,000	900,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	380,000	380,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	925,000	925,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,215,000	2,215,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	540,000	540,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,300,000	1,300,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	1,005,000	1,005,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	85,000	85,000
	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	---	1,700,000
	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	---	1,000,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	100,000	100,000
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY	80,000	80,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,361,000	2,361,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	1,750,000	1,750,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,273,000	4,273,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	730,000	730,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	5,798,000	5,798,000
	NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY CHANNEL SURVEYS, NY & NJ	---	750,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	285,000	285,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	109,000	109,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	918,000	918,000
(N)	RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	740,000	740,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	900,000	900,000
(N)	STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15,000	15,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	527,000	527,000
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	510,000	510,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC BEACH CHANNELS, NC	20,000	20,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,328,000	5,328,000
(N)	AVON HARBOR, NC	20,000	20,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,128,000	1,128,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	20,000	20,000
(N)	BELHAVEN HARBOR, NC	90,000	90,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	655,000	655,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	686,000	686,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	852,000	852,000
(N)	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	20,000	20,000
(N)	DRUM INLET, NC	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,043,000	1,043,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	857,000	857,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,171,000	6,331,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	890,000	890,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	2,748,000	2,748,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,595,000	1,595,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	840,000	840,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	20,000	20,000
(N)	STUMPY POINT BAY, NC	20,000	20,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,904,000	1,904,000
(N)	WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	20,000	20,000
(N)	WATERWAY CONNECTING SWANQUARTER BAY AND DEEP BAY, NC	20,000	20,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,757,000	5,757,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	229,000	229,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	8,445,000	8,545,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	150,000	150,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	104,000	104,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	933,000	933,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	418,000	418,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	261,000	261,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	33,000	33,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	693,000	693,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	718,000	718,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,429,000	1,429,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,142,000	1,142,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	808,000	808,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	17,938,000	17,938,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	628,000	628,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	671,000	671,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	503,000	503,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	866,000	866,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	1,030,000	1,030,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	335,000	335,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	445,000	445,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	887,000	887,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	899,000	899,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,793,000	5,793,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	312,000	312,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,664,000	1,664,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	15,000	15,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	26,000	26,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,013,000	1,013,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	283,000	283,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,340,000	3,340,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	367,000	367,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	558,000	558,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	802,000	802,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	295,000	295,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	812,000	812,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,691,000	1,691,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,848,000	1,848,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	916,000	916,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,522,000	3,522,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,269,000	3,269,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	802,000	802,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	330,000	330,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	764,000	764,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,619,000	1,619,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	424,000	424,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	84,000	84,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,781,000	1,781,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,545,000	3,545,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,326,000	1,326,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	247,000	247,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	10,000	1,510,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,182,000	1,182,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,546,000	3,546,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	932,000	932,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	474,000	474,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	922,000	922,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,554,000	3,554,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,521,000	1,521,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,902,000	2,902,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	856,000	856,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	699,000	699,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	273,000	273,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR	17,109,000	17,109,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	530,000	530,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,739,000	14,139,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	8,021,000	8,021,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	344,000	344,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,433,000	4,433,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	559,000	559,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	756,000	756,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,466,000	1,466,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	3,000	3,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,217,000	2,217,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	597,000	597,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	551,000	551,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	964,000	964,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,549,000	2,549,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	764,000	764,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	184,000	184,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	14,558,000	14,558,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	4,138,000	4,138,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	4,021,000	4,021,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	11,242,000	11,242,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	396,000	396,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	154,000	154,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	1,153,000	1,153,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	102,000	102,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	753,000	753,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	17,000	17,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	56,000	56,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	13,000	13,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,228,000	1,228,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	1,201,000	1,201,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	60,000	60,000
	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OR	---	1,345,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	603,000	603,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,192,000	2,192,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	7,586,000	7,586,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	635,000	635,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	219,000	219,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	830,000	830,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,194,000	2,194,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	2,252,000	2,252,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,076,000	2,076,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,301,000	1,301,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	754,000	754,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,071,000	1,071,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	25,000	25,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	744,000	744,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	818,000	818,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	587,000	587,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	181,000	181,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	222,000	222,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,399,000	1,399,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,138,000	1,138,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,317,000	1,317,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	16,940,000	16,940,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	1,228,000	1,228,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	586,000	586,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	12,000	12,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,690,000	4,190,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	60,000	60,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	350,000	350,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,418,000	2,418,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	345,000	345,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,577,000	2,577,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,231,000	1,231,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	297,000	297,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	919,000	919,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,297,000	1,297,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,154,000	2,154,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	444,000	444,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,589,000	2,589,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,609,000	4,609,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,287,000	3,287,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	392,000	392,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,088,000	3,088,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	27,000	27,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	40,000	40,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, SC	42,000	42,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	81,000	81,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	23,000	23,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	395,000	395,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	488,000	488,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,457,000	6,457,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	201,000	201,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	186,000	186,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,041,000	8,041,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	430,000	430,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,911,000	9,911,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	311,000	311,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	4,938,000	4,938,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,559,000	5,559,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,694,000	4,694,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,908,000	3,908,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	130,000	130,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,039,000	4,039,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,833,000	6,833,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	7,000	7,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,612,000	13,612,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	650,000	650,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	627,000	627,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,162,000	1,162,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,344,000	1,344,000
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,325,000	2,325,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,572,000	1,572,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,328,000	3,328,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,413,000	3,413,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,001,000	2,001,000
(N)	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	600,000	600,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	160,000	160,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	951,000	2,601,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,360,000	4,360,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,275,000	5,275,000
(N)	DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	510,000	510,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS, TX	12,000	12,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,182,000	2,182,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	3,140,000	3,140,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,693,000	3,693,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	620,000	620,000
(N)	GIWW - CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	300,000	300,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,416,000	1,416,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,968,000	1,968,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	19,138,000	19,138,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,004,000	1,004,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,323,000	4,323,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	590,000	590,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	774,000	774,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	235,000	235,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,180,000	2,180,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,589,000	2,589,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,490,000	1,490,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,165,000	1,165,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,380,000	1,380,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,539,000	1,539,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	792,000	792,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	796,000	796,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,543,000	1,543,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	60,000	60,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	711,000	711,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	10,050,000	10,050,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	3,462,000	3,462,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	77,000	77,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,385,000	2,385,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,567,000	1,567,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,250,000	1,250,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,571,000	1,571,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	35,000	35,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	1,901,000	1,901,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	449,000	449,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,326,000	3,326,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,295,000	2,295,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	41,000	41,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	159,000	159,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	854,000	854,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	133,000	133,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	46,000	46,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	555,000	555,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	668,000	668,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	592,000	592,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	392,000	392,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	5,000	5,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,290,000	2,290,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, VA	1,000	1,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	50,000	50,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	125,000	125,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	144,000	144,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	887,000	887,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,481,000	1,481,000
(N)	HAMPTON CREEK, VA	210,000	210,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	700,000	700,000
(N)	HORN HARBOR, VA	125,000	125,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	84,000	84,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	2,567,000	4,000,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	6,652,000	6,652,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,498,000	1,498,000
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	712,000	712,000
(N)	NEABSCO CREEK, VA	137,000	137,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	232,000	232,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	337,000	337,000
(N)	PARKER CREEK, VA	113,000	113,000
(N)	PARROTTS CREEK, VA	234,000	234,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,203,000	2,203,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	41,000	41,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	711,000	711,000
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	608,000	608,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	152,000	152,000
(N)	TYLERS BEACH, VA	170,000	170,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,246,000	1,246,000
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,830,000	12,830,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	44,000	44,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	38,000	38,000
(N)	EDIZ HOOK, WA	746,000	746,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	853,000	853,000
(N)	FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	52,000	52,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	7,479,000	7,479,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,198,000	1,198,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,689,000	7,689,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	116,000	116,000
(N)	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	34,000	34,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,833,000	6,833,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,187,000	5,187,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,541,000	7,541,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,876,000	5,876,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA	737,000	737,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA	414,000	414,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,860,000	1,860,000
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	9,000	9,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	282,000	282,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,100,000	1,100,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	769,000	769,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	421,000	421,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	265,000	265,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	185,000	185,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	87,000	87,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	365,000	365,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	66,000	66,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	10,820,000	10,820,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	1,002,000	1,002,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,069,000	1,069,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,647,000	1,647,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,427,000	1,427,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,520,000	1,520,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	3,000	3,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	73,000	73,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,759,000	8,759,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,504,000	1,504,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	940,000	940,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,512,000	1,512,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,481,000	1,481,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	780,000	780,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	276,000	276,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	585,000	585,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	2,602,000	2,602,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,018,000	1,018,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,793,000	3,793,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	46,000	46,000
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	465,000	465,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	329,000	329,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	120,000	120,000
(N)	LA POINTE HARBOR, WI	22,000	22,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	187,000	187,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,673,000	2,673,000
(N)	OCONTO HARBOR, WI	58,000	58,000
(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	40,000	40,000
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR, WI	109,000	109,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	78,000	78,000
(N)	SAXON HARBOR, WI	188,000	188,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	560,000	560,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	299,000	299,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	424,000	424,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	29,000	29,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,041,000	1,041,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	36,000	36,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,000,000	1,250,000
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000,000	1,000,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	480,000	480,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	1,000,000	500,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	700,000	700,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAINSTEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	500,000	500,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,900,000	1,500,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	5,500,000	5,000,000
	OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,650,000	2,175,000
	PEER REVIEW PROGRAM	200,000	---
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	500,000	250,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	250,000
	REPAIR EVALUATION MAINTENANCE RESEARCH (REMR II)	2,000,000	1,000,000
	RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH	500,000	---
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-32,216,000	-32,966,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,663,000,000	1,701,180,000

Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for paving of roads at the Greers Ferry Lake project in Arkansas.

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated in this Act to conduct the measures required by the May 16, 1996, Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the operation of Isabella Reservoir, Kern County, California. The Committee further expects the Corps of Engineers to identify the least costly actions available, including, whenever possible, the utilization of partnerships with other Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations, so that the Corps can continue to operate and maintain Isabella Dam and Reservoir for flood control and water conservation purposes as provided in the October 23, 1964 contract among the United States of America and various public agencies.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, Compton Creek, California.—The Committee has been advised that the Corps of Engineers has entered into an agreement with the City of Compton and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to begin a one-time clean-up of the Compton Creek channel feature of the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project. In support of this agreement and in light of the potential hazards that exist because of the project's current condition, the Committee directs the Corps to use $500,000 to continue the necessary channel maintenance and other related flood control improvements.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, Sepulveda Dam, California.—The Committee has provided $3,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the development of recreation facilities at Sepulveda Dam in California.

Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, California.—The Committee has provided $3,800,000 for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project. With the funds provided, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging, conduct channel condition surveys, and conduct a study of the need to rehabilitate the breakwater. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to work with the Environmental Protection Agency to complete all actions necessary for the designation of the LA–3 site as a permanent dredged material disposal site.

Los Angeles River, California.—The Committee is aware of the need for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging to remove the material that has accumulated at the mouth of the Los Angeles River. The Committee is also aware that a suitable disposal site for that material has yet to be identified. Therefore, the Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the ongoing study of dredged material disposal alternatives for material that has accumulated at the mouth of the Los Angeles River.

Napa River, California.—The bill includes $2,056,000 for maintenance dredging of the Napa River, California, project as requested by the Corps of Engineers.

Newport Bay Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $550,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue repairs to the damaged east and west jetties at Newport Bay Harbor in California.

Noyo River and Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $736,000 for maintenance dredging of the Noyo River and Harbor project, the same as the budget request. The Committee is aware of recent loss of life and property at the project and supports designation of the project as a Harbor of Refuge. Such losses are an example of why the Committee views the Administration's proposal to discontinue dredging at smaller harbors as ill-advised. The Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should investigate whether controlling sedimentation before it reaches the navigation channel is a cost-effective means of maintaining the project. The Committee further directs the Corps to evaluate whether the design of the original inner jetty is contributing to the dangerous situation at the mouth of the Noyo River.

San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, California.—The Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should continue its maintenance dredging of Mare Island Strait at sufficient depths to permit commercial traffic to continue to use Mare Island facilities once they have been converted from military use.

Terminus Dam, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $680,000 to accelerate completion of the ongoing seismic analysis at Terminus Dam.

Ventura Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $3,900,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging and repair the breakwater and jetties at Ventura Harbor in California.

Fort Myers Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the local sponsor of the Fort Myers Beach, Florida, project for maintenance dredging it performed to open the authorized channel to navigation.

Savannah and Brunswick Harbors, Georgia.—The Committee is very concerned that the Corps of Engineers has not been adequately maintaining the Savannah and Brunswick Harbor projects in Georgia. In order to keep these important projects open to navigation, the Committee has provided $16,000,000 for Savannah Harbor and $3,400,000 for Brunswick Harbor.

Savannah River Below Augusta, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake repairs to the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam.

Chicago Harbor, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue repairs to the Chicago Lock.

Indiana Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $292,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the design memorandum and initiate and complete plans and specifications for a confined dredged material disposal facility for the Indiana Harbor, Indiana, project.

Kentucky River Locks and Dams 5–14, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $3,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete repairs to Locks and Dams 5–14 on the Kentucky River in preparation for transfer of the facilities to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Red River Waterway, Louisiana.—The bill includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake remedial measures to enhance the environmental value of, and provide access to

the oxbow lakes created by construction of the Red River Waterway project.

Fishing Creek, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of the Fishing Creek project in Maryland.

Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland and West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $140,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete work on the revised master plan for Jennings Randolph Lake.

Kawkawlin River, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $160,000 for maintenance of the Kawkawlin River, Michigan, flood control project.

St. Joseph Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided an additional $325,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of the inner harbor at the St. Joseph Harbor, Michigan, project.

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $125,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake detailed design, including the preparation of plans and specifications, for repairs to the breakwaters at Cedar River Harbor in Michigan.

Clearwater Lake, Missouri.—The bill includes an additional $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake engineering and design activities related to the relocation of facilities impacted by flooding.

Little Sodus Bay Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $1,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair the deteriorated breakwater at Little Sodus Bay Harbor in New York.

Semi-Annual Surveys of Critical Channels in New York and New Jersey Harbors.—The Committee has provided an additional $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct semi-annual hydrographic surveys of the Sandy Hook, Raritan Bay, Arthur Kill, Passaic River, Hackensack River, Newark Bay and Kill Van Kull navigation channels in the ports of New York and New Jersey. These funds should be utilized to supplement the funds provided to conduct normal channel surveys until such time as normal maintenance dredging can be conducted in these critical navigation channels.

New York—New Jersey Dredged Material Management Study.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has been unable to adequately maintain to authorized depths the Federal navigation channels in the Ports of New York and New Jersey due to the lack of acceptable dredged material disposal sites. The Committee also understands that efforts are being made in the region by Federal, state, and port agencies to identify short and long term disposal strategies and to site the necessary facilities. Those efforts are to be encouraged. In the interim, the Secretary of the Army is directed to use all available resources, and to work with the States of New Jersey and New York, to maintain the authorized depths of the Federal navigation channels in New York-New Jersey Harbor and to employ any economically feasible sediment management options that become available for dredged material disposal.

The Committee is aware that the budget request includes $2,500,000 for the Dredged Material Management Plan for New York-New Jersey Harbor. As work on the plan progresses, the

Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed with implementation of any individual option to advance solutions to the dredged material disposal problem in advance of completion of the overall management plan. An example would be implementation of solutions such as long-term capacity confined disposal facilities to serve Federal and non-Federal dredging activity. In addition to the regional discussions above, the Corps of Engineers' December 1989 report, "Managing Dredged Material: Evaluation of Disposal Alternatives in the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Region," and the 12-year study on which it is based should serve to indicate feasible solutions.

Manteo (Shallowbag Bay), North Carolina.—The Committee has provided an additional $160,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the monitoring of the terminal groin constructed at Oregon Inlet.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake mosquito control activities in the vicinity of Williston, North Dakota.

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.—The Committee recommends that the Corps of Engineers negotiate with the City of Cleveland a more flexible payment schedule for completion of the new confined disposal facility adjacent to Burke Airport. This will alleviate the burden on the City of a $3,500,000 payment due in early fall.

Oklahoma Reservoirs.—The Committee is aware that several Corps of Engineers projects in the State of Oklahoma were constructed over producing or abandoned oil and natural gas fields and that, over time, a number of unplugged or poorly plugged wells have purged saltwater, oil, or gas into the lakes. The Committee understands that the Oklahoma Corporation Commission has recently received grants from the Department of Energy that can be used to locate and map existing oil and gas wells that may be purging into Corps of Engineers reservoirs. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to cooperate fully with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in that undertaking.

Pensacola Reservoir—Lake of the Cherokees, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of the need to acquire additional real estate interests in the upstream areas adjacent to and surrounding Grand Lake that are adversely impacted by the operation of the project.

Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancover, Washington, and Portland, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a ship simulation study of the need to make modifications to the Bookfield/Pillar Rock stretch of the Columbia River channel in the interest of navigation safety and $2,000,000 to undertake corrective measures.

Willamette River Basin, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $1,345,000 for a program to mark hatchery reared salmon in order to permit a selective fishery to be developed. This will allow wild fish to be released, while at the same time permitting a recreational fishery to continue.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to implement facility upgrades

identified in the 1992 Master Plan update for Raystown Lake in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania.

Tennessee River, Tennessee.—From within funds available for maintenance of the Tennessee River project, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for improvements to landing facilities as recommended in the Corps of Engineers Nashville District's Guntersville Landing report dated June 1996.

Cooper Lake and Channels, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to accomplish necessary environmental compliance and studies associated with a land designation change at the Cooper Lake and Channels project and an additional $1,500,000 for infrastructure improvements to support proposed project enhancements.

Mississippi River Mainstem Model Development.—The Committee is aware of the Corps of Engineers' involvement in mapping and geographic information system (GIS) activities for the Mississippi River Mainstem Model Development project. Within available funds, the Corps is encouraged to work toward completion of surveying, large-scale mapping and GIS activities in support of the hydraulics and hydrology model.

Laser Induced Distance and Ranging (LIDAR).—The Committee supports the use of the LIDAR system for topographic mapping and expects the Corps of Engineers New Orleans District to utilize funds to participate in the proof of concept of this technology for further commercial uses as part of the Atchafalaya Hydrographic Survey Book project.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1996	$101,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	112,000,000
Recommended, 1997	101,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	
Budget Estimate, 1997	−11,000,000

This appropriation provides for salaries and related costs to administer laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States in accordance with the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the Clean Water Act of 1977, and the Marine Protection Act of 1972.

For fiscal year 1997, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $101,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers' Regulatory Program, which is the same as the fiscal year 1996 level and $11,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee notes that the fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Regulatory Program is over 50% greater than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1991. In light of the budgetary situation, the Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers must seek ways to streamline the permitting process, which will not only have the benefit of reducing the costs associated with administering this program, but will also reduce the regulatory burden on our citizens.

Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pools Task Force, California.—The goal of the Vernal Pools Task Force is to develop a general permit application that will specifically identify a finite area of high grade vernal pools suitable for protection. Using the data gathered in Phase

I and Phase II, the application will also specifically identify areas with low quality or no vernal pools that qualify for automatic inclusion under the general permit. The Committee is disappointed that the Corps of Engineers has thus far utilized only about $100,000 of the $250,000 appropriated for the task force in fiscal year 1996. The Committee directs that such amounts as are necessary for the Vernal Pools Task Force in fiscal year 1997 be taken from funds otherwise available for the Regulatory Program.

Lakes Earl and Talawa, California.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use up to $300,000 of the funds provided for the Regulatory Program to conduct a study of the effects of different breach elevations on the natural resources of Lakes Earl and Talawa.

Evaluation of Gravel Operations, Lower Eel and Mad Rivers, California.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $250,000 of the funds provided for the Regulatory Program to study long-term sedimentation and conduct biological monitoring of the impacts of gravel operations on the aquatic ecosystem in the Lower Eel and Mad Rivers, including potential mitigation measures.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1996	$145,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	15,000,000
Recommended, 1997	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−135,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−5,000,000

Note: The fiscal year 1996 appropriation includes $135,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 104–134.

This activity provides for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and repair of flood control and Federal hurricane or shore protection works. It also provides for emergency supplies of clean drinking water where the source has been contaminated and, in drought distressed areas, provision of adequate supplies of water for human and livestock consumption.

Pierce County, Washington.—The Committee is aware that as a result of flooding which occurred in November of 1995 and February of 1996, non-Federal levees along the Puyallup and Carbon Rivers in Pierce County, Washington, suffered severe damages. The Committee is further aware that these levees could be eligible for Federal assistance under the provisions of Public Law 84–99 were it not for requirements of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians Settlement Act of 1989, which prevented the County from complying with the Corps of Engineers national vegetation management standards. The Committee believes that the residents of Pierce County should not be penalized for having to comply with the terms of that agreement, and has, therefore, included language in the bill which directs the Secretary of the Army to rehabilitate the damaged levees along the Puyallup and Carbon Rivers. The Committee further directs the Corps of Engineers to immediately begin working with the County and the Tribe to develop an acceptable levee vegetation management program for levees affected by the Puyallup Tribal settlement in Pierce County, Washington.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1996	$850,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	850,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−850,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−850,000

Section 7001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Oil Pollution Research to develop a plan for, and coordinate the implementation of, an oil pollution research, development, and demonstration program.

Title VII of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 also authorizes use of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to perform oil pollution research.

Due to the severe budgetary situation, the Committee has deleted the funds requested by the Administration for the Corps of Engineers participation in the activities of the Interagency Coordinating Committee of Oil Pollution Research established by section 7001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996	$151,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	153,000,000
Recommended, 1997	145,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−6,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−8,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

Last year, the Committee expressed its concern about the amount of money required to provide executive direction and management to the Corps of Engineers district offices. The Committee also expressed its belief that, faced with the prospect of declining budgets, the Nation could no longer afford the current Corps of Engineers division office structure. It is now clear that the Committee's concerns were well founded and the Committee has included language in the bill requested by the Administration that permits funds to be used to reduce the number of division offices. Due to the budgetary constraints faced by the Committee, the recommendation for General Expenses of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1997 is $145,000,000, a decrease of $6,500,000 below the fiscal year 1996 level and $8,000,000 below the budget request.

San Francisco Bay—Sacramento—San Joaquin Delta, California.—In the Bay-Delta Accord signed on December 15, 1994, several Federal agencies, the State of California, environmental organizations, and water users agreed to develop a plan to protect the Bay-Delta estuary's environmental resources and restore reliable water supplies to California's farms and cities. Though not a signatory to the Accord, the Corps of Engineers has authority over programs that are necessary to its successful implementation. The Committee urges the Corps to work with Bay-Delta agencies and to provide them with technical, planning and administrative assistance in fulfilling their obligations under the Bay-Delta Accord.

GENERAL PROVISION

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Hopper Dredging.—Public Law 95–269 requires that the Secretary of the Army carry out dredging by contract if the Secretary determines that industry has the capability to do the work and that it can be done at reasonable prices and in a timely manner. Under this authority, the Corps tested the industry's capability in the 1980s through a program of competitive bidding that indicated industry could do a great deal of the dredging work far more efficiently than the Federal government. The Committee notes that recent efforts to test industry's capability by advertising for contract 7,500,000 cubic yards of dredging volume previously accomplished by government vessels has been successful. The Committee, therefore, has decided to expand that effort by including a provision in the bill that directs the Secretary of the Army to advertise for competitive bid 10,000,000 cubic yards of hopper dredge volume accomplished with government dredges in fiscal year 1992.

Hopper Dredge McFarland.—The Committee has included language prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to study, design, or undertake improvements to the Federal vessel, *McFarland.* The limitation of the use of funds includes funds appropriated to carry out Federal dredging projects which are then deposited into the Corps Revolving Fund and used to pay for the operation, maintenance or improvement of Federal equipment, such as Corps' dredges. In prohibiting improvements to the vessel, the Committee does not intend to prevent or interfere with repairs to the vessel needed to keep the vessel in its current operating condition.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1996	$44,139,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	43,627,000
Recommended, 1997	43,627,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−512,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	

The Central Utah Project Completion Act (Titles II–VI of Public Law 102–575) provides for the completion of the Central Utah Project by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Act also authorizes the appropriation of funds for fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation; establishes an account in the Treasury for the deposit of these funds and of other contributions for mitigation and conservation activities; and establishes a Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to administer funds in that account. The Act further assigns responsibilities for carrying out the Act to the Secretary of the Interior and prohibits delegation of those responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $43,627,000, the same as the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1996	$12,684,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	15,095,000
Recommended, 1997	14,548,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+1,864,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−547,000

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
ARIZONA			
HOPI WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	900,000	80,000	---
NAVAJO WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	900,000	100,000	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	150,000	---
WEST SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER RESOURCES MGMT STUDY	---	---	200,000
CALIFORNIA			
DEL NORTE CNTY/CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ST	---	---	500,000
DELTA MODEL DEVELOPMENT GROUP	490,000	90,000	---
FORT BRAGG WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	---	---	500,000
FRIANT UPPER BASIN OPTIMIZATION AND REUSE STUDY	100,000	75,000	---
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	500,000	175,000	175,000
LOWER OWENS RIVER STUDY	300,000	100,000	---
MYSTIC LAKE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION	550,000	100,000	---
NEW MELONES TEMPERTURE CONTROL EVALUATION	90,000	90,000	---
NEW MELONES WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	---	---	150,000
SACRAMENTO COUNTY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	---	---	300,000
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	---	---	400,000
SAN FRANCISCO AREA RECLAMATION STUDY	3,790,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	750,000	250,000	250,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY	3,097,000	750,000	750,000
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	125,000	125,000
COLORADO			
DOLORES RIVER BASIN RUNOFF MODEL	225,000	75,000	---
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER NEEDS ASSESSMENT	200,000	100,000	---
IDAHO			
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	1,900,000	250,000	250,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY	1,552,000	300,000	300,000
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	504,000	150,000	150,000
KANSAS			
CHENEY RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY INVESTIGATION	900,000	100,000	---
MONTANA			
COLD CLIMATE WASTEWATER TREATMENT	875,000	35,000	---
FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION	---	---	210,000
JEFFERSON RIVER BASIN RETURN FLOW STUDY	400,000	80,000	---
MONTANA RIVER SYSTEMS STUDY	1,275,000	150,000	---
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	729,000	150,000	150,000
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY	320,000	100,000	100,000
NEBRASKA			
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT	300,000	100,000	100,000
NEVADA			
CARSON RIVER BASIN	---	---	200,000
WALKER RIVER BASIN	---	---	250,000
NEW MEXICO			
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE WATER CONVEYANCE PLAN	200,000	100,000	---
RIO GRANDE/LOW FLOW CONVEYANCE CHANNEL STUDY	480,000	200,000	200,000
OKLAHOMA			
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	375,000	125,000	125,000
OREGON			
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION SYSTEM CONSERVATION FEASIBIL	900,000	250,000	250,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	996,000	150,000	150,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	878,000	200,000	200,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY	944,000	150,000	150,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING	887,000	100,000	100,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS	800,000	200,000	200,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III	275,000	100,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	725,000	75,000	75,000
TEXAS			
EDWARDS AQUIFER REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES AND MANAGEMEN	896,000	190,000	190,000
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARCH WETLANDS RESTORATION/ENHANCE	875,000	100,000	100,000
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMENT	600,000	200,000	200,000
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE	---	---	200,000
UTAH			
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEK OPTIMIZATION STUDY	475,000	200,000	200,000
CARBON/EMERY COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	500,000	100,000	---
OGDEN RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATI	450,000	50,000	---
WASHINGTON			
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING	500,000	125,000	125,000
VARIOUS			
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	58,914,000	360,000	360,000
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	---	1,745,000	1,250,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	---	1,985,000	1,476,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS	---	705,000	389,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED PROJECTS	---	145,000	108,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES IN ND/SD WATER RESOURCES M	1,250,000	250,000	250,000
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM	350,000	140,000	140,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	---	1,925,000	1,500,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION	1,164,000	50,000	50,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		15,095,000	14,548,000

West Salt River Valley Water Resources Management Study, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin work on a study to develop a regional solution to eliminate groundwater mining and increase reliance on renewable water supplies in the West Salt River Valley.

Del Norte County and Crescent City Wastewater Reclamation Study, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the appraisal study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Del Norte County and Crescent City Wastewater Reclamation project. The Committee believes that in view of the depressed economy of the region, the Bureau should make every effort to minimize any requirement for a local contribution. At a minimum, in-kind services performed by the local sponsor should be considered part of the local share.

Fort Bragg Reclamation Study, California.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the appraisal study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Fort Bragg Reclamation project. The Committee believes that in view of the depressed economy of the region, the Bureau should make every effort to minimize any requirement for a local contribution. At a minimum, in-kind services performed by the local sponsor should be considered part of the local share.

Sacramento County Water Reclamation and Reuse Study, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a water reclamation and reuse study for Sacramento County, California.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Salton Sea, California, research project.

Southern California Comprehensive Water Study, California.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its participation to develop a long-range water supply and reclaimed water management program for the southern California coastal and inland valley area. Due to the addition of the Orange County Regional Water Reclamation study as part of this existing study, up to $97,000 shall be provided for the Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project.

Carson River Basin, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a groundwater study in the Fallon area of Churchill County, Nevada.

Walker River Basin, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue a study, being conducted in cooperation with the University of Nevada, of the potential for water banking within the Walker River Basin of Nevada. Specifically, the study is seeking to assess the extent to which voluntary water transfers involving private water rights holders and the Walker River Indian Reservation might be employed to assist in the development of a water bank, and in the conservation and stabilization of water quality for fish habitat and recreation in the Walker River Basin.

Rio Grande Conveyance Canal/Pipeline, Texas.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its participation in the modeling of a lined conveyance system to deliver water from Elephant Butte Dam to El Paso.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1996–	$420,046,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	392,524,000
Recommended, 1997	398,069,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−21,977,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+5,545,000

Note: The fiscal year 1996 appropriation includes $9,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 104–134.

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			
ARIZONA			
CRBSCP, TITLE I DIVISION	459,038,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
IN SITU COPPER MINING RESEARCH PROJECT	---	---	440,000
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	35,795,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
CALIFORNIA			
BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY	---	---	1,000,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:			
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	161,961,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,394,762,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA DIVISION	394,940,000	8,850,000	9,600,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	543,459,000	14,200,000	14,850,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	550,765,000	7,200,000	9,116,000
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	220,561,000	4,737,000	4,737,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,509,164,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
SHASTA DIVISION	343,310,000	500,000	500,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	326,407,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION / REUSE PROGRAM	69,970,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	172,590,000	9,340,000	9,340,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	38,090,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	109,959,000	2,760,000	2,760,000
IDAHO			
MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	180,000	180,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,483,255,000	21,600,000	21,600,000
OREGON			
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	57,362,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	62,076,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER SYSTEM	119,417,000	2,500,000	11,500,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	250,341,000	28,350,000	28,350,000
TEXAS			
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	---	2,000,000
WASHINGTON			
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, IRRIGATION FACILITIES	1,768,993,000	2,590,000	2,590,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	150,327,000	4,475,000	4,475,000
VARIOUS			
COLUMBIA / SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	108,504,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
CRBSCP, TITLE II DIVISION	331,878,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	---	4,350,000	---
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	89,744,000	14,511,000	14,511,000
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	64,769,000	6,759,000	6,759,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	---	2,500,000	---
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION		53,620,000	46,770,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:			
BOISE PROJECT, ID	35,196,000	200,000	200,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	198,703,000	700,000	700,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM, AZ, CA,	183,158,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
CRSP, DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, CO	121,631,000	300,000	300,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR, CA	62,925,000	2,245,000	2,245,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, NM, TX	3,500,000	100,000	100,000
LEADVILLE / ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT, CO	21,195,000	650,000	650,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	45,459,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, CA, NV	73,143,000	6,550,000	6,550,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:			
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, NE	361,179,000	900,000	900,000
OAHE UNIT, SD	490,000,000	85,000	85,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT-TITLE 28, VARI	31,425,000	3,515,000	2,155,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NM, TX	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION, CO	95,249,000	400,000	400,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, AZ	6,025,000	500,000	500,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH, NM	30,550,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	51,483,840	3,938,000	4,138,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	47,351,000	370,000	370,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION		27,253,000	26,093,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAM:			
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OCHOCO DAM, OR	14,605,000	900,000	900,000
CVP, FOLSOM DAM (MORMON ISLAND), CA	29,930,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM, VARIOUS	16,151,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	483,335,000	25,050,000	25,050,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	57,699,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ	35,167,000	3,097,000	3,097,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ	22,773,000	403,000	403,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TX	60,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION PROJECT, COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	48,203,000	221,000	221,000
SCOFIELD PROJECT, SCOFIELD DAM, UT	2,500,000	500,000	500,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, BUMPING LAKE DAM, WA	5,086,000	640,000	640,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFEY OF DAMS PROGRAM		59,261,000	59,261,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:			
SHOSHONE PROJECT, WY	7,500,000	1,459,000	1,459,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	19,639,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT		3,159,000	3,159,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:			
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	25,081,000	540,000	540,000
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (PHAS	1,200,000	400,000	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,002,000	400,000	300,000
WATERSHED RIVER SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY	17,176,000	2,000,000	1,300,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	134,962,000	3,800,000	2,800,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		8,140,000	5,940,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		319,515,000	325,060,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
COLORADO			
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PARTICIIPATING PROJECT	437,744,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
DOLORES PARTICIPATING PROJECT	549,262,000	6,115,000	6,115,000
UTAH			
CENTRAL UTAH PARTICIPATING PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,231,301,000	7,495,000	7,495,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	80,694,000	2,440,000	2,440,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		25,550,000	25,550,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT			
ARIZONA			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	4,190,701,000	71,728,000	71,728,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS	138,487,000	4,918,000	4,918,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		76,646,000	76,646,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS			
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-29,187,000	-29,187,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM		392,524,000	398,069,000

Central Arizona Project, Tucson Reliability Project, Arizona.—The Committee has included language in the bill that directs the Bureau of Reclamation, utilizing funds appropriated for the Tucson Aqueduct System Reliability Investigation, to complete, by the end of fiscal year 1997, the environmental impact statement being conducted on the proposed surface reservoir. The Bureau of Reclamation is further directed to work with the City of Tucson on any outstanding issues related to the preferred alternative.

Brackish Water Reclamation Demonstration Facility, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 in support of the Port Hueneme Water Agency's brackish water reclamation demonstration project.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000, $750,000 above the budget request, for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake an environmental analysis and perform pre-design and design engineering for screening of the Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—

Refuge Water Supply.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000, the same as the budget request, for design, engineering, and construction of facilities to convey water supplies to Federal wildlife refuges, as required by section 3406(d) of Public Law 102–575. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to make the selection of an alternative for supplying water to the Sacramento National Wildlife Refuge complex a high priority and to take such steps as are necessary to ensure that the project is not delayed, particularly in light of the continuing delays in the completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the entire Central Valley Project.

Spring Run and Coho Salmon Programs.—The Committee has provided funds to be deposited with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to be used in support of activities to enhance and protect the Spring Run Salmon ($225,000) and the Coho Salmon ($225,000).

Salmon Stamp Program.—The Committee, pursuant to section 3407(e) of Public Law 102–575, has provided $200,000 for the Salmon Stamp Program, which is directed and overseen by representatives of commercial salmon fishermen, charter boat operators, and the California Department of Fish and Game for programs and activities that will increase the production of young salmon in Central Valley Project impacted streams or fishery habitat.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (Hamilton City Pumping Plant).—The Committee has provided $4,300,000 for continuing work on a new fish screen and fish recovery facilities associated with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant, the same as the budget request. Costs incurred for work undertaken to construct and evaluate the interim fish protection improvements shall be included as a part of the Federal-state cost share, pursuant to section 3406(b)(20) of Public Law 102–575, of the long-term program to mitigate

the fishery impacts associated with the district's operations. The Committee notes that the aforementioned section authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to "participate" in the "on-going" project to address the fish passage problems at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant. To ensure that the intent of the authorizing statute is observed and to ensure that the project is carried out at the least cost, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to provide private entities with a fair and reasonable opportunity to design and construct the project with oversight responsibility by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District.

Alternative Fish Protection Facilities.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,100,000 for the installation and evaluation of electric fish guidance systems at Reclamation District 108's Wilkins Slough pumping plant and an additional $215,000 for the installation and evaluation of an alternative fish guidance system at Reclamation District 1004. Such funds are provided as a continuation of the Bureau of Reclamation's unscreened diversion technology demonstration program.

Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program. The Committee strongly supports this program's objectives.

Colusa Basin Drainage District.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for continued work on the Colusa Basin Drainage District's integrated resource management project, $100,000 more than the budget request.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Restoration Program, California.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Trinity River Restoration Program, the same as the budget request. The amount provided includes $750,000 requested by the Hoopa Valley Tribe and endorsed by the Administration for support of the co-management agreement between the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation.

San Francisco Bay—Sacramento—San Joaquin Delta, California.—As a signatory to the Bay-Delta Accord of December 15, 1994, the Bureau of Reclamation joined other Federal agencies and the State of California in committing financial resources to the restoration and protection of the Bay-Delta estuary. The Bureau of Reclamation's budget estimates for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 did not, however, identify the funds that will be devoted to implementation of the Bay-Delta Accord. The success of this historic initiative depends upon the fulfillment of the Federal commitment. The Committee expects that the fiscal year 1998 budget estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation will identify in detail the funds and programs dedicated to implementation of the Accord.

Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado and New Mexico.—It is the desire of the Committee that the Secretary of the Interior comply with the directive issued by Congress last year and proceed without delay to construct those features on the Animas-La Plata project (Stage A) which were approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. In the event that the funding provided to the Bureau of Reclamation is inad-

equate for the tasks to be accomplished this year, the Committee expects the Bureau to reprogram available funds for construction of the project.

When it passed the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, Congress endorsed the project as the vehicle for settlement of the water rights of the two Colorado Ute Indian Tribes. Congress intended that by the year 2000, the project would provide the Tribes with substantial quantities of water for their use. The need for environmental compliance does not mean that the terms of that agreement may be rewritten. As a result of the section 7 process, the final configuration of the project remains uncertain. The Bureau of Reclamation has done a superb job in describing the various stages through which the project may progress, the impacts and required mitigation for each stage, and the utility associated with each stage. In addition, the State of Colorado has always supported this project and has committed $42,600,000 (plus interest) to the project. For purposes of initiating construction of Stage A, the existing repayment obligations of the parties contracting for water, along with the commitments of the States of Colorado and New Mexico, provide adequate assurances that the United States will be repaid in connection with construction of those facilities.

The Committee is aware that the San Juan River and its tributaries do not consistently meet New Mexico's newly adopted water quality standards for selenium and that there is concern over the potential effect of the operation of Animas-La Plata facilities in Colorado on this existing problem. The Secretary of the Interior should take reasonable steps to assist Colorado and New Mexico in improving the quality of surface flows by addressing the problems caused by non-point sources.

The Committee is also aware that the Endangered Species Act has the potential to limit water development in the San Juan Basin, including completion of the Animas-La Plata and Navajo Indian Irrigation projects. The Committee remains confident that the San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program will achieve its stated objectives of (1) recovering the endangered fish and (2) permitting water development to proceed. Although the precise level of development that will ultimately be allowed cannot be determined at this time, the immediate construction of Stage A is required if the United States is to meet the terms of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988. The present documentation is fully informative of these issues and construction of the first stage of the project may proceed without adversely affecting any of the other water users on the San Juan system.

Northwest Wastewater Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to continue the Northwest Wastewater Reuse Project being undertaken in cooperation with the El Paso, Texas, Water Utilities Public Service Board.

Wetlands Development.—The Committee has provided $4,138,000 for the Wetlands Development program, $200,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $630,000 to continue the Caddo Lake Scholars and other wetland development components of the Caddo

Lake Wetlands project through continuing cooperation with the National Biological Service.—

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1996–	$–273,076,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	292,876,000
Recommended, 1997—	286,232,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996—	+13,156,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	−6,644,000

In 1997, a total of 38 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects will be operated and maintained for power, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits with funds made available under this appropriation.

Provision is also made for administration of 14 associated programs. These programs seek to maximize benefits from existing projects. Project benefits and operations will be enhanced through water conservation measures, examination of existing structures, environmental considerations, improvement of recreation opportunities, and water quality improvement.

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $286,232,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's Operation and Maintenance program, which is $13,156,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1996, and $6,644,000 below the budget request. The Committee expects the Bureau of Reclamation to use the flexibility available to it in managing the operation and maintenance program to ensure that the most critical maintenance needs are met. The Committee again encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to derive a significant share of the reduction below the budget request from the Associated O&M Programs in order to retain as much money as possible for operation and maintenance of projects.

Central Valley Project, California.—The Committee has provided $66,703,000, $1,045,000 above the budget request, for operation and maintenance of the Central Valley Project. Of the total, $5,000,000 is provided for operation and maintenance of the Trinity River Division, which is $1,045,000 above the budget request and $454,000 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1996. The Commissioner of Reclamation testified that the fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Trinity River Division was substantially below last year's amount in part because the Trinity River Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act has not been extended. Since that testimony, on May 15, 1996, the President signed the extension to that Act. Of the amount provided, $400,000 is for the Yurok and Karuk Tribes, to assist in their new responsibilities as members of the Trinity River Task Force, and in view of the additional work now authorized in the Klamath River downstream from its confluence with the Trinity. In addition, $30,000 is included for the fish hatchery on Horse Linto Creek. The remaining amounts above the budget request are for activities to be undertaken in cooperation with the Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Of the funds provided, such sums as may be necessary shall be made available to facilitate the planned transfer of certain operation and maintenance responsibilities from the Bureau of Reclamation to the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority, the Friant Canal

Authority, the San Luis-Delta Mendota Water Authority and the Madera Irrigation District and provide for the continuation of funding, if necessary, of conveyance operation and maintenance under existing cooperative agreements.

Parker Dam, California.—The Committee is concerned about the Bureau's transfer of 77 acres to the Bureau of Land Management at Parker Dam, California and its potential impact on residents currently occupying Parker Dam Village. The Committee strongly urges the Bureau to continue working with the residents of Parker Dam Village to ensure that the housing and educational needs are appropriately addressed.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1996–	$–11,668,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	12,715,000
Recommended, 1997—	12,715,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996—	+1,047,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l), loans and/or grants can be made to non-Federal organizations for construction or rehabilitation and betterment of small water resource projects.

As required by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, this account records the subsidy costs associated with the direct loans, as well as administrative expenses of this program.—

The budget request and the approved Committee allowance are shown on the following table:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
ARIZONA			
TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION - SCHUK TOAK DISTRICT.....	5,353,000	1,810,000	1,810,000
CALIFORNIA			
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	13,813,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT, SANTA ANA WATERSHED.	8,200,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 3.....	13,650,000	1,030,000	1,030,000
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY FOR CROP IRR	8,973,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT, ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WAT	5,268,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
OREGON			
MILLTOWN HILL PROJECT, DOUGLAS COUNTY.....	16,899,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	---	425,000	425,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....		12,715,000	12,715,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 1996–	$43,579,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	38,000,000
Recommended, 1997—	38,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996—	−5,579,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title 34 of Public Law 102–575. This Fund was established to provide funding from project beneficiaries for habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities in the Central Valley Project area of California. Revenues are derived from payments by project beneficiaries and from donations. Payments from project beneficiaries include several required by the Act (Friant Division surcharges, higher charges on water transferred to non-CVP users, and tiered water prices) and, to the extent required in appropriations Acts, additional annual mitigation and restoration payments.

San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative, California.—The Committee notes that the budget request does not include any funds for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative. Consistent with the budget request, the Committee directs that no funds shall be available for this study in fiscal year 1997.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996—	$48,150,000–
Budget Estimate, 1997—	48,971,000
Recommended, 1997—	45,150,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996—	−3,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997—	−3,821,000

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, D.C., and the Denver, Colorado, and five regional offices. The Denver office and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations.

The Committee is pleased with the progress the Bureau of Reclamation has made in reducing administrative costs. However, faced with the prospects of a declining program and the severe budgetary situation, the Committee believes that the Bureau of Reclamation needs to further reduce administrative expenses.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities; Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities; the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund; General Science and Research Activities; the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund; Departmental Administration; the Office of Inspector General: Atomic Energy Defense Activities; Power Marketing Administrations; and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

INTRODUCTION

Funding recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 1997 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 1997 budget request, reflecting the continuing realities of reducing the deficit and balancing the budget. These funding levels are not a one time occurrence with the prospect of increasing appropriations in fiscal year 1998; rather, they reflect the new baseline for Department of Energy funding. Absorbing these reductions will require considerable effort on the part of the Department to prioritize activities and seek the most cost-effective means for accomplishing program goals. The Department must focus on specific core program missions and reduce the number of activities currently being performed which may be nice to do, but are not possible in a severely constrained funding environment.

While the Committee acknowledges that these program reductions will be difficult, there continue to be numerous areas where operational improvements need to be made. Examples of areas where the Committee expects to see reductions include the number of Federal employees at headquarters who micromanage field and laboratory activities instead of setting policy and allowing implementation of these policies at the field level; the number of individual sites and offices throughout the country where Department of Energy employees are stationed; the number of support service contractors paid to do work which should be performed by Federal employees at headquarters and in field offices; and the number of Departmental internal regulations and pronouncements requiring facilities and laboratories to implement compliance actions far exceeding those of comparable commercial facilities.

FINANCIAL INTEGRITY

The Committee has become increasingly concerned about the fundamental financial integrity of the Department of Energy. A series of disconcerting incidents pertaining to the use of appropriated funds over the past year has raised serious questions about the capability of the Department to identify and prevent misuse and

abuse of taxpayer funds. Funds have been reprogrammed from their original purpose to fund programs specifically denied by the Congress in fiscal year 1996. The Department created a furlough relief fund to augment appropriations for salary accounts which were specifically reduced by Congress. Some employees were furloughed for two days by the Department due to a shortage of funds and later paid in full for the two days they did not work. Contractor work forces have been downsized at great expense to the taxpayer through the use of generous separation packages, only to have the employees subsequently rehired or replaced with employees with the same skills. A recent draft Department Inspector General report noted that the Department deliberately ignored a statutory funding limitation on the use of representational expenses and spent more than appropriated for receptions. The same report provided a litany of poor financial practices making it impossible to calculate the actual cost of foreign trips or even the number of participants.

These are the most recent incidents which have come to the Committee's attention. There is great concern that this is only the tip of the iceberg. While the Committee is unable to determine what is happening inside the Department to cause these financial lapses, it is clear that financial management principles are taking a back seat to the dictates of the Department's leadership. Whether deliberate or not, it reflects a fundamental weakness in the Department's management, and has brought into question the credibility of the entire Department.

REPROGRAMMINGS

The Committee requires the Department to keep the Committee promptly and fully informed when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. To assist the Department in this effort, the following guidance is provided for programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Definition.—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification as presented to and approved by Congress. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

Criteria for Reprogramming.—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding for an activity. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, pro-

posals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—For several years the Department has had the latitude to meet changing program requirements by reprogramming funds of less than $1,000,000 without prior approval of the Committee on Appropriations. However, during the past year the Department has inappropriately used this authority to reprogram funds to new initiatives which were purposely not funded by Congress and to augment Secretarial travel with funds originally appropriated for other programs. It is unlikely that either of these reprogrammings would have been approved by the Committee.

In light of this, the Committee is providing no internal reprogramming flexibility to the Department in fiscal year 1997 unless specifically provided in the report. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committee in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committee on Appropriations.

USE OF RECEIPTS FROM LEASING OR SELLING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY OR ASSETS

The Committee is aware that, in downsizing the former defense production complex, the Department has excess property and materials, and is seeking to lease or sell government property, facilities, and assets which have been obtained over the years. The Committee expects the full value of receipts from either the lease or sale of government property or other government assets to be returned to the United States Treasury unless specific authority is contained in the Appropriations Act permitting the Department to retain these receipts to offset funding requirements.

CONTRACTOR EMPLOYMENT LEVELS

The Committee has tried unsuccessfully over the past several months to obtain accurate, credible, and consistent numbers of contractor employees at each Departmental site. It is difficult to understand why neither Headquarters nor the field organizations have been able to provide this information on a timely basis. Thus, the Committee directs the Department to provide a report to Congress by November 1, 1996, identifying contractor employment levels for September 30, 1996, and estimated for September 30, 1997, which includes the following data elements: Federal full-time equivalent employees, support service contractors (average man-years), and management and operating and/or integrating management contractor manpower for direct, direct support, and general support categories showing both average man-years and estimated end-of-year head count. This report should include summary information as well as detailed backup for each Department location.

CONFERENCES AND NEWSLETTERS

The Committee notes that the Department sanctioned in excess of 400 key conferences during fiscal year 1995 at a cost presumed to be many millions of dollars to the Government. In this spartan budget environment, the Committee questions both the wisdom of,

as well as the value added, from so many events. The Department is strongly encouraged to substantially reduce the number of key conferences sponsored, and strictly control the attendance of both Federal and contractor employees at such conferences.

Additionally, the Committee is concerned with the proliferation of monthly newsletters and similar documents being generated within the Department at Headquarters and in the field offices, and by contractors, stakeholder groups, State regulators, and other Federal agencies participating in cleanup activities—all funded by the Department. The Committee directs the Department to make an assessment of these publications with an objective of consolidating and/or eliminating publications to the extent practicable to reduce costs and duplication, and report to the Committee by November 30, 1996, on the number of its publications and progress made to reduce costs.

FIXED ASSET ACQUISITION ACCOUNT

The President's budget request includes funding for a Department of Energy fixed asset acquisition account to provide future year funding for some construction projects and establish an account for privatizing some environmental management activities. The Committee has not provided funding for construction projects beyond fiscal year 1997, but has provided funding for the environmental management program privatization initiative which is discussed in a later section of this report.

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

The effort to improve the quality of the Department's budget justifications resulted in mixed success. The Department is expected to continue to work with the Committee to ensure that pertinent information is not eliminated from the budget justifications in the name of streamlining. Much information must still be obtained through additional program briefings and questions for the record. This additional work could be reduced by devoting more attention to the quality of information provided in the initial budget submission.

The Committee staff will be working with the Department's budget office and individual program offices to continue to improve the quality of the budget justifications for the next fiscal year, and to develop a process for electronic transmission of the Department's fiscal year 1998 budget justifications.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1996	$2,727,407,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	3,020,497,000
Recommended, 1997	2,648,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−79,407,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−372,497,000

The appropriation recommended for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities provides funding for the Department of Energy's research and related programs including: solar and renewable energy; nuclear energy; non-defense environment, safety and health; biological and environmental research; fusion energy sciences; basic energy sciences; other energy-related research; and non-defense-related environmental restoration and waste management.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 is $2,648,000,000, $372,497,000 less than the budget request and $79,407,000 less than fiscal year 1996. The recommendation reflects a continuation of last year's effort to reverse the unsustainable increases of prior years. The recommendation is consistent with the Committee's view that the Department must participate in the government-wide downsizing effort, shift its emphasis from commercial technology development to basic research, reverse its efforts to expand into new areas and focus on its core commitments.

The Committee expected that last year's funding level would result in downsizing and elimination of low priority programs. The Committee is concerned that the Department failed to eliminate low priority programs and even identified funds to continue programs specifically eliminated by the Congress last year. The Committee continues to be concerned about the abnormally high level of uncosted balances in programs under this appropriation. These balances represent an unreasonable accumulation of funds appropriated in prior fiscal years.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Five years ago, in fiscal year 1991, the appropriation for solar and renewable energy programs was $196,437,000. Just four years later, in fiscal year 1995, $388,108,000 was appropriated, representing a 98% increase. Last year, the Congress passed and the President approved $275,213,000 for solar and renewable energy, a 29% reduction from fiscal year 1995. Last year's reduction was consistent with the effort to reverse the unsustainable increases of prior years and to direct scarce resources to basic research rather than technology development. This year, the Committee continues this direction with a 16% reduction from the fiscal year 1996 level. Although this funding level is a 40% reduction from fiscal year 1995, the recommendation represents a 18% increase above the level of funding five years ago.

EXCESSIVE CARRYOVER BALANCES

Most funds appropriated by the Congress are available for a limited time—from one to five years in most cases. When funds are not used, the appropriation is cancelled. Because the funds appropriated under this account are available until expended, there is no imperative to expend funds in a timely manner. Consequently, appropriated funds have been accumulating from year to year. In its April 1996 report, "Energy Management: DOE Needs to Improve its Analysis of Carryover Balances," the General Accounting Office (GAO) repeated its concerns about the extraordinarily high uncosted balances in certain DOE programs. (Similar concerns

were included in GAO's March 1992 report: "Energy Management: Systematic Analysis of DOE's Uncosted Obligations Is Needed.") The most recent report points out that while some DOE programs have improved management of carryover balances, ". . . other programs, such as Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and Energy Research, have not used significant amounts of their carryover balances and have experienced growing balances."

The Committee notes that several DOE offices have worked successfully to better manage these balances, identifying the causes and reducing the carryover. Unfortunately, the Office of Energy Efficiency has not made an effort to better manage its funds. While other DOE offices have set goals to reduce carryover balances, the Office of Energy Efficiency has not. The Committee notes that earlier this year, when the GAO attempted to identify projected year-end uncosted balances for fiscal year 1996, offices in the DOE provided their estimates of anticipated year-end uncosted balances, except for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, which either would not or could not provide its estimates.

At the end of fiscal year 1995, the carryover balance under solar and renewable energy programs was $269,230,000, representing 98% of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1996. On March 31, 1996, halfway through the fiscal year, the carryover balances under solar and renewable energy programs included $509,000 in unallocated funds, $117,018,000 in unobligated funds and $266,192,000 in uncosted funds, representing a total unspent balance of $383,719,000. This balance includes appropriated funds that have yet to be made available to the offices that obligate the funds, appropriated funds for which contracts or grants have not yet been awarded, and funds which have been obligated with costs that have yet to be incurred. This balance, on the books halfway through the current fiscal year, reflects 139% of the appropriation provided last year.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE PROGRAMS

Solar Building Technology Research.—The Committee recommendation is $2,000,000, the same amount provided last year.

Photovoltaic.—The Committee recommendation is $55,800,000, a decrease of $9,200,000 from last year.

The Committee notes that the Solar Industry Journal lists 99 solar manufacturing companies and 316 companies that provide solar-related services. The Federal role in providing research and technology development assistance has helped to create a significant industry. The Committee disagrees with the Administration's proposal to increase spending by 34% for this industry.

The Committee is aware of a proposal to produce hydrogen from solid waste and sunlight by use of a Photovoltaic Array and intends to examine this issue in greater detail in the future.

Solar Thermal Energy Systems.—The Committee recommendation is $21,500,000, a decrease of $3,500,000 from last year.

Biofuels.—The Committee recommendation is $53,500,000, a decrease of $1,800,000 from last year.

The Committee recommendation represents a funding level of 97% of the amount provided last year. The Committee directs that the Department provide 50% of the funds of this program to the

biochemical and thermochemical conversion programs as part of the biofuels transportation program. Within the amount provided for biochemical conversion, the Department is directed to provide $3,000,000 for the cost-shared biomass ethanol production plant in Gridley, California and $1,000,000 for testing forest residue feedstocks at the Department's biomass ethanol user facility.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation is $6,000,000, a decrease of $26,500,000 from last year.

Renewable Energy Production Incentive.—The Committee recommendation is $2,000,000, $988,000 less than last year.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory.—The Committee recommendation is $3,300,000, an increase of $1,300,000 over last year. The recommendation includes $2,800,000, the same as the budget request, for Phase II of the three phase renovation and expansion construction project. The remaining amount is available for other infrastructure and equipment upgrades.

Solar and renewable energy deployment.—The Committee recommendation is $0, $8,509,000 less than the budget request. The Department created this new program title, combining the solar technology transfer and international solar energy programs. Both of these programs were eliminated last year by the Committee. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee again recommends elimination of these activities.

The Committee directs that the Department refrain from entering into new agreements under this program. Any carryover funds available on October 1, 1996 under this program shall be used to honor existing contracts to the extent possible or provide for related termination costs.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $29,000,000, a decrease of $892,000 from last year.

The Committee continues to support this program which provides significant benefits including a growing source of power within the United States, a significant market overseas for U.S. companies and more than $20 million in royalty payments to the U.S. Treasury for geothermal power produced on federal lands.

The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Geysers geothermal project. The $2,000,000 represents the final Federal contribution for this program. The Committee has provided the budget request for the cost-shared geothermal heat pump deployment program.

No funds are included for the hydropower activities included in the geothermal program in the budget request.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee recommendation is $15,000,000, an increase of $500,000 from last year.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommendation is $1,000,000, a decrease of $500,000 from last year. This funding completes the Federal share of the Haida Alaska Native Village Corporation's Reynolds Creek hydroelectric project.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation is $29,000,000, a decrease of $1,309,000 from last year.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the electric and magnetic fields research program, $19,000,000 for high temperature superconducting R&D, and $2,000,000 for energy stor-

age systems. The Committee supports the Department's reduction to the EMF Biological Mechanisms Research program and its effort to realize savings by coordinating this work with that being done by the EMF Research and Public Information Dissemination program.

The Committee also recognizes and supports the ongoing research and development of high temperature superconducting cable (HTS). The recommendation includes $850,000 for this initiative, the same as the amount included in the budget request.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $13,102,000. The Committee directs that $1,440,000 of this amount be used to pay one-time separation related costs to reduce the Federal headquarters workforce as discussed below. The remaining amount represents a 20% reduction from last year and is a significant departure from the 24% increase planned by the Administration.

Last year, funding for solar and renewables was $112,805,000 less than fiscal year 1995—a 29% reduction. The Committee expected the Department to adjust both the Federal and support contractor workforce commensurate with the 29% reduction. The Committee notes that the headquarters workforce was reduced only 4%—from 148 in fiscal year 1995 to 142 in fiscal year 1996. The Committee further notes that the Department planned to increase the headquarters staff funding from the comparable appropriated level in fiscal year 1996 of $14,317,000 to $17,742,000 in fiscal year 1997—a 24% increase. The Committee notes that this headquarters staff increase is inappropriate given current budget constraints and the lower level of funding for solar and renewable programs. The Committee believes the headquarters staff should direct scarce resources directly to programs and cites the planned staff-related increase as another example of the unrealistic funding increases being proposed by this Administration.

The Committee directs that the Department significantly reduce the Federal employment levels in these programs which are being funded at a level 43% below the level in fiscal year 1995. The Committee directs that the headquarters workforce be reduced from the 148 FTE level in fiscal year 1995 to a level of 84 FTEs in fiscal year 1997—representing a corresponding 43% reduction.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation is $182,934,000, a reduction of $48,039,000 from last year.

Light water reactor.—The recommendation is $17,000,000, a $23,000,000 reduction from last year and from the Administration's request. The recommendation provides the Federal share of the first-of-a-kind engineering partnership with industry. The Committee notes that this is the final year of funding for this program.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The recommendation includes $38,810,000 for the advanced radioisotope power systems program, a $1,190,000 (or 3%) reduction from the Administration's request.

Nuclear technology research and development.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the nuclear technology research and development program to continue study of treating

spent fuel using electrometallurgical technology. The Committee has provided an additional $15,000,000 as part of the defense environmental restoration and waste management program for a total funding level of $20,000,000.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The Committee recommendation is $4,000,000, a $500,000 increase over fiscal year 1996. The Committee notes that on March 31, 1996, halfway through the current fiscal year, the unspent balances in this program were $4,517,000—129% of the amount appropriated last year.

The Committee supports this program, particularly the peer-reviewed Nuclear Engineering Education Research (NEER) program.

Termination costs.—The Committee recommendation is $79,100,000, the same amount as the budget request.

Isotope Support.—The Committee recommendation is $12,704,000, the same amount as the budget request.

The Committee continues to be concerned about the level of administrative oversight supporting the Isotopes Support program. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation for isotope program direction is $1,000,000, a reduction of $580,000 from the budget request.

Program direction.—The Committee's recommendation for program direction is adjusted in accordance with the downsizing of the nuclear energy program.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $100,500,000, a decrease of $11,706,000 from the budget request of $112,206,000.

The program direction account is reduced from the request of $39,046,000 to $37,300,000, a reduction of $1,746,000. The Committee expects to see progress by the Department in reducing the Federal full time equivalents included in this account.

The core environment, safety and health program is reduced from the request of $73,160,000 to $63,200,000, a reduction of $9,960,000 from the budget request. The request appears to include provisions for contractor employment levels which rival the Federal workforce included in the program direction account. Clearly, the level of contractor utilization proposed is excessive, most notably in the Technical Assistance and Management and Administration areas. The level recommended is intended to result in a timely and substantial downsizing of contractor support, specifically in the two aforementioned areas.

Funding for the Radiation Effects Research Foundation is included at the budget request level of $15,000,000, $5,000,000 below the fiscal year 1996 level. The Committee recognizes and applauds the recent five-year agreement negotiated between the Office of Environment, Safety and Health and the Japanese Ministry of Health and Welfare. The new agreement benefits both parties by lowering the financial burden attributed to the exchange rate differences, while maintaining a mutual commitment to the goals of the program. The Committee anticipates further negotiations including the important contribution of the National Academy of Sciences. The Committee expects the negotiations to include the goal of concluding U.S. participation in these activities after fulfillment of the scientific objectives of the program.

Finally, the Committee does not approve of the planned use of resources to educate and develop a future Department workforce; accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to re-evaluate this part of the program.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation of $1,449,395,000 for Energy Research Programs reflects a net decrease of $69,152,000 from the cumulative fiscal year 1996 appropriated amount of $1,518,547,000. This lower funding level is mostly attributable to the $40,411,000 reduction to the biological and environmental research program as provided in the budget request, a $12,133,000 reduction related to reduced requirements of multi-program laboratories and a $26,400,000 reduction in funding for certain activities under Other Energy Research which represents program activities not requested or included in other accounts.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $379,075,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee reiterates its strong and continued support for the identification and application of effective and cost-efficient technologies to hasten the Department's environmental cleanup activities. To that end, full final year funding of $35,113,000 for the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory is included.

Within available funds, $9,000,000 is provided for continuing the research contribution of the National Institute for Global Environmental Change program. This is the same amount included in the Administration's request.

The Committee encourages the Secretary of Energy to review the proposal by the Northern California Neutron Capture Therapy Study Group to establish a collaborative Boron Neutron Capture Therapy (BNCT) program using the nuclear radiation capabilities at the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center. The program will help establish the efficacy of BNCT for the treatment of inoperable brain tumors and could expand to other difficult to treat malignancies. This program could complement the Department's existing BNCT program.

The Committee wishes to reinforce its position that the Department be proactive in seeking out and using the expertise and knowledge base of the Energy Research programs and the national laboratories to address the multitude of complex challenges facing the environmental cleanup programs.

FUSION PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for the fusion energy sciences program is $225,000,000. Last year, the Committee provided $244,144,000 which included one-time termination costs.

As requested by Congress, the Department of Energy and an expert review panel have proposed a restructured fusion energy sciences program. This new program supports—at a significantly reduced funding level—advancement of key fusion research areas and exploration of alternatives. The budget request is based upon

an extensive review of the fusion program conducted by the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee (FEAC) and is described in the report entitled, "A Restructured Fusion Energy Sciences Program." The Committee endorses the restructured program policy goals recommended by FEAC. However, due to the reduced funding in fiscal year 1997, implementation of the restructured program will proceed on a somewhat slower schedule. The Committee provides $17,000,000 for fusion plasma theory and $3,000,000 for basic plasma science.

Three research facilities comprise the major experimental elements of the nation's fusion science and technology infrastructure—the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR) at Princeton, the Alcator C–Mod at MIT, and the DIII–D at General Atomics. Because these facilities make up an important component of the domestic fusion energy sciences program, the Committee provides funding for these facilities in fiscal year 1997 at $52,000,000 for TFTR, $44,000,000 for DIII–D, and $12,000,000 for Alcator C–Mod. The Committee notes that in keeping with FEAC's recommendation, this will be the final year of operation for TFTR.

In addition to the facilities listed above, a new small-scale national initiative, the National Spherical Tokamak Experiment (NSTX), has been proposed to investigate innovative approaches to plasma confinement. Exploration of promising alternative concepts has been recommended by FEAC. The Committee provides $5,000,000 to begin construction of the NSTX facility in fiscal year 1997.

The Committee's recommendation includes $7,600,000 which the Department requested for fusion-related support under the Computational and Technology Research program, and $8,400,000 which the Department requested for fusion-related program direction. The Committee is providing the full $225,000,000 directly to the Office of Fusion Energy Sciences to maintain comparability to the amount provided last year and to provide maximum flexibility to the Office. The Committee notes that the Federal headquarters workforce for the Office of Fusion Energy Sciences is excessive. The Committee directs that the Office reduce its Federal workforce by 25 percent by the end of fiscal year 1997.

The scientific challenges posed by the international ITER project are consistent with the policy goals of the domestic fusion energy sciences program. Therefore, the Committee provides $55,000,000 for U.S. participation in the ITER design activities in fiscal year 1997.

It is vital that the U.S. fusion energy sciences program make maximum effective use of its considerable human resources and facility infrastructure, while leveraging off the international programs. The Committee is committed to seeing that these objectives are implemented.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for Basic Energy Sciences is $642,960,000, a net decrease of $10,715,000 from the budget request of $653,675,000. This represents a modest 1.6% reduction from the budget request.

The Committee remains committed to robust basic energy research programs which are characterized by cutting-edge basic research, availability of world-class facilities to the scientific and research community, and direction to meet current and future energy-related challenges.

The recommendation includes $7,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR), the same amount provided in the budget request. The recommendation also includes $3,700,000 for the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium.

For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 1997, funding may be reallocated by the Department among all operating accounts in basic energy sciences.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for the Computational and Technology Research program is $148,500,000, a reduction of $9,643,000 from the budget request of $158,143,000. Most of this reduction is the result of the Committee's redirection of funds included for fusion-related activities. The budget request included $7,600,000 under the computational and technology research program for fusion-related activities. The Committee has provided this funding as part of the fusion program, as it was last year. The recommendation represents a funding level of 98.6% of the budget request, adjusted to remove fusion-related activities.

The Committee supports the budget request of $2,000,000 for the Energy Research Analysis program.

The Committee recommendation for the energy research program direction account is $30,600,000, a decrease of $11,554,000 from the budget request. Most of this decrease is the result of the Committee's recommendation to redirect $8,400,000 from the request amount for program direction to the fusion energy sciences program. The Committee directs that $2,500,000 be used to reduce Federal salaries and benefits relating to reducing the Federal workforce. The balance of the reduction is to be targeted against the remaining activities in the account.

The Committee recommendation for Multiprogram Energy Laboratory Support is $21,260,000, a decrease of $7,625,000 from the budget request of $28,885,000. The Committee supports the budget request for construction projects which will maintain the viability of the multiprogram energy laboratories general purpose facilities and infrastructure. The recommendation does not include $7,625,000 for operations support. Any required operations support should be provided by the benefiting laboratory programs. The Committee does not agree with the proposed omnibus line item project which effectively relegates all existing line item construction projects to a sub-project level. It is the desire of the Committee to retain the integrity of prior year existing construction projects as stand-alone projects.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation for Energy Support Activities is $120,000,000, a decrease of $54,223,000 from the budget request of $174,223,000. The recommended level of $120,000,000 is an increase of $88,000,000 above the fiscal year 1996 level and is prin-

cipally caused by the movement of certain Federal employees from the Departmental Administration account into this account. These employees are located at four of the Department's field offices.

Because of severe budget constraints and the demands of higher priority programs, the Committee recommendation excludes any funding for the University and Science Education programs. The Committee believes many of these educational activities are relevant to the Department's line programs. To the extent such activities benefit and are a byproduct of the line programs, those programs should, within available funding, be the educational sponsor.

The Committee recommendation for the Technical Information Management program is $12,000,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for Field Offices and Management is $108,000,000, a decrease of $13,723,000 from the budget request of $121,723,000. The Committee does not agree with the proposed move of the Headquarters field management organization from the Departmental Administration account to this account. Insofar as this organization is a servicing organization to the field elements in much the same respect as other organizations in the Departmental Administration account, the Federal staff and associated salaries and related support costs are to remain in the Departmental Administration account. The adjustment to move this organization back to Departmental Administration is reflected in the Committee recommendation and represents $12,802,000 of the $13,723,000 decrease. The recommended level essentially provides the request level for the remaining four Department field locations.

The Committee has not included funding for the proposed new Management Information Systems Investment program.

The Committee indicated in the FY 1996 House Report (104–149) a need for the Department to integrate in-house energy management activities with the applicable operating programs and to eliminate the In-House Energy Management program as a standalone program. Notwithstanding this direction, the Department has defied the Committee and continued the program by using other available Department resources. Again, the Committee recognizes the contributions made by this program over many years in successfully incorporating energy efficiency measures and disciplines into line programs and facilities. However, the Committee position relative to incorporating this program into other applicable programs has not changed. Accordingly, the Committee provides no funds for In-House Energy Management and directs the Department to eliminate the In-House Energy program as a separate program.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(NON-DEFENSE)

The Committee recommendation is $622,146,000, a decrease of $29,268,000 from the budget request of $651,414,000. This level, however, is higher than the fiscal year 1996 level of $621,541,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $6,250,000 to continue the Wayne, New Jersey project which is a part of the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

The Committee does not support the establishment of site operations as a new, stand-alone program element; accordingly, the Department is directed to fund such activities as part of the nuclear materials and facilities stabilization program element.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee directs the Department to apply unobligated and available uncosted balances to program termination expenses. To the extent these balances are insufficient to fully fund termination costs, the Department may reduce other programs funded by this account to cover any such shortfalls.

The Administration's request includes an unspecified general reduction of $48,177,000. The Committee recommendation includes an adjustment of $48,177,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee opposes using a general reduction to programs and directs the Department to use prior year balances to fund programs to the levels recommended. The reduction of $48,177,000 is to be allocated on the basis of prior year unobligated and/or uncosted balances remaining in each program on September 30, 1996.

A general reduction of $10 million is applied proportionately to all amounts under Energy Supply, Research and Development other than solar and renewable energy.

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1996	$29,294,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	27,800,000
Recommended, 1997	11,772,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−17,522,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−16,028,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1996	$−34,903,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−42,200,000
Recommended, 1997	−42,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−7,297,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	.....

The Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities program funds the Department's efforts in overseeing the government's continuing interest in the operation of the gaseous diffusion plants managed by the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC); developing means for using or disposing of depleted uranium; monitoring Russian uranium processing facilities to ensure that low enriched uranium being purchased by USEC is derived from Russian highly enriched uranium removed from dismantled nuclear weapons; transferring enrichment-related technologies to the private sector; and leading the Department's uranium revitalization efforts.

The budget request for fiscal year 1997 includes $87,266,000 for operation, maintenance, and construction activities, and is offset by the receipt of $42,200,000 in revenues and the use of $17,266,000 from unobligated balances carried over from prior years' funding, resulting in a net budget request of $27,800,000.

Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee recommends a reduction of $16,028,000 from the budget request of $87,266,000. This includes reductions of $2,000,000 for program direction expenses; $4,000,000 in program management services; $8,000,000 in transparency measures; $1,000,000 in technology transfer; and $1,028,000 in all other expenses.

Transparency Measures.—The Department has proposed to increase spending for transparency measures from $6,950,000 in fiscal year 1996 to $13,890,000 in fiscal year 1997. This program funds activities associated with monitoring the United States and Russian agreement to dispose of excess Russian weapons grade highly enriched uranium. The Committee does not support this increased funding level, and has provided $5,890,000 to support only site specific activities.

Program Direction.—Last year the Committee directed a fifteen percent reduction in program direction expenses in this account. The Department unexpectedly found an additional $903,000 of prior year funds to supplement the program direction expenses by 20 percent. Any redirection of prior year funds to this program direction account in fiscal year 1997 will require submission of a reprogramming request to the Committee.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 1996	$278,807,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	240,200,000
Recommended, 1997	200,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−78,607,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−40,000,000

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Fund supports D&D, remedial actions, waste management, and surveillance and maintenance associated with preexisting conditions at sites leased and operated by the newly created USEC, as well as Department of Energy facilities at these and other uranium enrichment sites. The sites covered by this D&D Fund include the operating uranium enrichment facilities at Portsmouth, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, and the inactive K–25 site in Tennessee, formerly called the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Environmental restoration efforts at these three sites are supported from the D&D Fund established by a tax on domestic utilities and by Congressional appropriations. In fiscal year 1997, the Department of Energy will transfer $376,648,000 into this Fund.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends $200,200,000, a reduction of $40,000,000 from the budget request of $240,200,000. The Committee understands that this will severely limit funding for activities related to immediate cleanup of the gaseous diffusion plants. However, most of these facilities do not currently present an imminent public health or safety risk.

The Committee was also unable to provide full funding of $42,000,000 to implement the reimbursement program authorized under Title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act for active uranium and thorium processing sites which sold uranium and tho-

rium to the United States Government. This program is to assist site owners by compensating them on a per ton basis for the restoration and disposal costs of those mill tailings resulting from sale of materials to the government. Due to severe budget constraints, funding of $34,000,000 has been provided for reimbursement in fiscal year 1997.

The Administration proposed legislation to collect fees from foreign utilities similar to the decontamination and decommissioning fund assessment that is being collected from domestic utilities. This proposed language has not been included by the Committee.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1996	$981,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	1,009,150,000
Recommended, 1997	996,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+15,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−13,150,000

The General Science and Research Activities account consists of the high energy physics and nuclear physics programs. High energy physics research seeks to understand the nature of matter and energy at the most fundamental level, as well as the basic forces which govern all processes in nature. The goal of nuclear physics research is to understand the structure and properties of atomic nuclei and the fundamental forces between the constituents that form the nucleus. Nuclear processes determine essential physical characteristics of our universe and the composition of the matter that forms it. Knowledge acquired in this basic research is an essential part of the intellectual foundation of other scientific disciplines. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base.

While high energy physics and nuclear physics research programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society. The Committee's funding recommendation for General Science and Research Activities reflects the continued role of the Federal government in fundamental scientific research where research is not market-driven and is difficult or impossible for the private sector to conduct.

The Committee recommendation includes a new program entitled "Research and Technology" which consolidates the funding and program activities formerly contained in "Physics Research" and "High Energy Technology." This will provide greater flexibility in executing the high energy physics program and allocating resources among facilities and activities.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee was unable to fund the full budget request. The recommendation for General Science and Research Activities is $996,000,000, a reduction of $13,150,000 from the budget request of $1,009,150,000, but an increase of $15,000,000 over fiscal year 1996. The Committee encourages the Department to: continue to pursue management improvements, such as reducing the requirements of internal regulations

and the number of audits and oversight reviews; lessen administrative requirements at facilities and laboratories; and direct more of the funding to support direct program tasks.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation, 1996	$151,600,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	200,028,000
Recommended, 1997	182,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+30,400,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−18,028,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 established a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities. These laws also established the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste. The Committee recommends $182,000,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 1997, subject to authorization. Combined with the appropriation of $200,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $382,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 1997. This amount is in addition to the $85,000,000 provided in Public Law 104–46 for interim storage activities, subject to authorization.

The Committee is encouraged by recent progress in characterization activities at the Yucca Mountain site. The Committee observes with pride that congressional direction to, "refocus the repository program on completing the core scientific activities at Yucca Mountain," has resulted in substantial cost efficiences and programmatic improvements. It bears noting that major reductions in program funding levels have been associated with acceleration of tunnel boring and scientific activities.

Despite progress on Yucca Mountain characterization, the Committee remains frustrated that the nation's nuclear waste policy remains adrift. The Committee is especially dismayed that the Administration refuses to propose or endorse legislation to permit the Federal government to discharge its responsibility to accept spent fuel from commercial producers of nuclear energy by 1998. Although the Secretary has asked Congress to "untie" her hands to permit the pursuit of interim storage options, the Administration refuses to countenance any legislation to do exactly that. The Administration's lack of leadership on this issue seems calculated to yield short-term political gain; any such gain may be achieved at the expense of long-term domestic security. This policy of avoidance is irresponsible. The Committee urges the Administration to work with Congress on the development of a viable long-term policy for the storage and disposal of nuclear waste.

The Committee is no longer willing to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the nuclear waste disposal program without enactment of legislative reforms, provisions for the interim storage of nuclear waste, and a clear articulation of long-term national policy. Accordingly, the funds provided by this appropriation will be avail-

able only upon the enactment of specific authorization for their expenditure.

Pending authorization of appropriations, the Committee is supportive of the Department's recent revision of the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Program Plan, to the extent that it: supports efficient and aggressive pursuit of an early decision on the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada as a geologic repository; achieves significant cost savings; and recommends process improvements to expedite assessment of the site's viability and repository licensing. Qualified endorsement of the revision in no way suggests waning enthusiasm for aggressive and immediate pursuit of interim storage options.

The Committee is cognizant of the Department's strategy for market-based procurement of spent fuel transportation services and is anxious to discover the extent of industrial interest in this proposal.

No funds are provided for the State of Nevada or affected units of local government. The balance of the reduction from the budget request is to be applied to program direction, cooperative agreements, and other budget elements not directly associated with the performance of characterization and interim storage activities.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1996	$366,697,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	244,863,000
Recommended, 1997	195,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−171,697,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−49,863,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1996	$−122,306,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−125,388,000
Recommended, 1997	−125,388,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−3,082,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	.....

The funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy. The account funds a wide array of activities not directly associated with program execution.

Field Office Transfers.—In the Department's budget request for fiscal year 1997, four field offices and the Headquarters office of field management have been transferred to the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation account. The Committee agrees that the transfer of funding for the field offices more accurately portrays their multiprogram functions. However, the Committee does not agree that the transfer of the Headquarters office of field management is warranted. This is inherently a central Departmental activity and should remain in the Departmental Administration account.

Working Capital Fund.—The Department has established a charge back program similar in nature to a formal working capital fund which charges benefiting programs and organizations with certain administrative and housekeeping activities traditionally funded in a central account. The Committee supports its implementation starting in fiscal year 1997, but has certain expectations as part of this new funding proposal. Departmental representation on the Board establishing the policies should be broad based and include smaller organizations; the pricing policies used must be sound and defensible and not include added factors for administrative costs; the advanced payments at any time may be no more than that minimally required to adequately cover outstanding commitments and other reasonable activities; a defined process must be established to dispose of excess advance payments (accumulated credits); the fund must be audited at least annually by the Office of Inspector General; and the salaries and related costs of departmental administration employees who administer fund activities shall not be amortized and charged to the fund. Additionally, it is the Committee's expectation that the fund manager will ensure that the fund will neither be managed in a manner to produce a profit nor allow the program customers to use the fund as a vehicle for maintaining unencumbered funds. Finally, the Committee expects the working capital fund to be included as part of the Department's fiscal year 1998 budget request, and presented in a manner which clearly identifies the elements of cost and associated detail.

Office of the Secretary.—The fiscal year 1997 budget request identified 24 employees in the Office of the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and the Under Secretary. However, information provided to the Committee identifies an additional 27 employees working in these offices, but included on the rolls and paid for by other program organizations in the Department. The Committee considers this to be very misleading and expects the fiscal year 1998 budget request to accurately reflect *all* employees working in the Office of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Under Secretary, and that these personnel be funded from the Secretary's budget account.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation for administrative activities is $195,000,000, a decrease of $49,863,000 from the budget request of $244,863,000. Program activities in many areas of the Department are being reduced which should result in decreasing needs for administrative and support activities. The Committee expects the Department to begin immediately to restructure its administrative work force to achieve the necessary cost savings.

Directed reduction.—The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $5,000,000 which is to be allocated specifically to those organizations, including the Office of the Secretary, which directed the preparation of information transmitted to Congress on June 5, 1996, purporting to show the impact of the Subcommittee's proposed fiscal year 1997 602(b) allocation on the Department of Energy programs. As stated in the letter under the heading, Analytical Assumptions, "* * * the Department has estimated the impact

of the recent House allocations and anticipated Congressional action on these programs." After calculating this assumed impact, "the reduction was spread in the same manner and pattern in which the House took reductions from the Department's FY96 request for these programs." Based on these assumptions, estimates, and anticipated Congressional actions, the Department proceeded to outline the funding impact of these reductions for each state and calculate the job losses.

It is almost inconceivable that the Department of Energy has the time and people available to participate in an exercise with no value. If the Department has ample resources to conduct such a make-work exercise, then clearly it has too much funding and too many people.

Staffing levels.—Last year Congress reduced funding for the Departmental Administration account and expected the Department to review its current organization structure to determine what functions could be significantly reduced, consolidated, or eliminated. The Department chose to deal with the Congressional direction by furloughing employees for several days and then seeking to establish a furlough relief fund to reimburse employees with private donations for those days that they did not work. Ultimately, the Department found additional funding within the account and proceeded to pay the employees for the time they were furloughed and did not work, an action which is also questionable. The Committee seriously questions the Department's management judgment in this matter, and has chosen to be more prescriptive in the fiscal year 1997 funding recommendations.

The Committee continues to believe that Headquarters staffing for administrative functions is excessive. The Department's own Strategic Alignment Initiative anticipates many of these reductions, but proposes to phase them in over a five year period. The Committee is sympathetic to the desire to make these reductions with minimal impact, but cannot support a five year effort to reduce personnel to the appropriate levels. Thus, the Committee's funding recommendation accelerates this schedule by reducing salaries and expenses requested for fiscal year 1997. Reductions are not to be prorated across each organization. The Committee expects the Department to assess objectively the workload and value added by many of these organizations and the redundancy which exists within program organizations which have created their own support staffs, thereby duplicating many of the central staff functions. Manpower ceilings recommended by the Committee, and included in the accompanying bill, are the following:

Organization:	*Ceiling*
Board of Contract Appeals	6
Chief Financial Office	192
Congressional, Public, and Intergovernmental Affairs	35
Economic Impact and Diversity	30
Field Management	20
General Counsel	153
Human Resources and Administration	550
Office of the Secretary	23
Policy	20
Total	1,029

Use of Prior Year Deobligations and Construction Project Reserves.—Throughout the fiscal year, funds often become available as projects are completed and contracts closed out. These funds become available for reuse and are retained by the Controller as either prior year deobligations or transferred to construction project reserve accounts. During fiscal year 1997 these funds are not available for reallocation within the Department unless approved by Congress as part of a reprogramming or specifically identified in the budget request.

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $26,336,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recognizes that funds received from reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

Revenues.—The revenue estimate for fiscal year 1997 is $125,388,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $3,082,000 from the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1996.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1996	$25,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	29,605,000
Recommended, 1997	24,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−5,605,000

The Office of Inspector General performs agency-wide audit, inspection, and investigative functions to identify and correct management and administrative deficiencies which create conditions for existing or potential instances of fraud, waste and mismanagement. The audit function provides financial and performance audits of programs and operations. The inspections function provides independent inspections and analyses of the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy of programs and operations. The investigative function provides for the detection and investigation of improper and illegal activities involving programs, personnel, and operations.

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation is $24,000,000, a reduction of $5,605,000 from the budget request of $29,605,000. The Committee recommendation includes the elimination of the Office of Contractor Employee Protection, an office which duplicates services available in other areas, and whose workload is too small to justify maintaining a separate organization. Funding is provided only for termination of this office.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include Weapons Activities; Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Fixed Asset Acquisition; Other Defense Programs; and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1996	$3,460,314,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	3,710,002,000
Recommended, 1997	3,684,378,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+224,064,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−25,624,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. This must be done within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, using a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. Since October 1992, the United States has maintained a moratorium on underground nuclear testing and has explored other means to assure confidence in the safety, reliability and performance of nuclear weapons. The future weapons complex will rely on scientific understanding and expert judgment, rather than on underground nuclear testing and the development of new weapons to predict, identify, and correct problems affecting the safety and reliability of the stockpile. Enhanced experimental capabilities and new tools in computation, surveillance, and advanced manufacturing will become necessary to recertify weapons safety, performance, and reliability without underground nuclear testing. Weapons will be maintained, modified, or retired and dismantled as needed to meet arms control objectives or remediate potential safety and reliability issues. As new tools are developed and validated, they will be incorporated into a smaller, more flexible and agile weapons complex infrastructure for the future.

GENERAL

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—The Committee supports the recommendation of the House National Security Committee to limit the funding for laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) activities to two percent of the funding received by the laboratory, a reduction from the current level of six percent. While the Committee supports the use of some funding for innovative projects at the discretion of the laboratory director, current funding levels for LDRD activities at the three national weapons laboratories exceed $170,000,000. Continuing budget constraints dictate that savings be made in as many areas as possible.

Outyear Funding.—The Committee is concerned that the Department continues to pursue a program which will require a substantial increase in resources in future years. The Administration's budget request acknowledges an anticipated $623,000,000 shortfall in funding for this account in fiscal year 1998. The proposal is

footnoted to indicate that offsets will come from potential savings within the Department of Energy, possible additional user fees, and potential adjustments in future funding for discretionary programs in other agencies. The Administration seems content to propose funding levels and several new initiatives in fiscal year 1997 which will be difficult to support in future years with continually constrained resources.

The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $3,684,378,000, an increase of $224,064,000 over the fiscal year 1996 appropriation, and a decrease of $25,624,000 from the budget request of $3,710,002,000. Differences in funding levels between fiscal years 1996 and 1997 reflect the transfer of salaries and other expenses for Federal employees at field offices from the major program accounts to a separate program direction account. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in stockpile safety and reliability without underground nuclear testing through a technically challenging science-based stockpile stewardship program utilizing upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities. Funding of $1,601,767,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request of $1,576,767,000, has been recommended for fiscal year 1997. The additional funding is provided to support various stockpile stewardship activities at the nuclear weapons laboratories.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends the budget request of $366,460,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, and has included $21,150,770 for the University of Rochester's OMEGA laser, and $9,000,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory's Nike laser facility. The Committee has consistently supported these facilities and expects both to contribute to the research and technology development efforts in the inertial confinement fusion program.

National Ignition Facility.—Funding of $191,000,000, the same as the budget request, has been provided for the National Ignition Facility. The Committee supports a strong stockpile stewardship program in the absence of underground nuclear testing, but is still concerned that it will be difficult to assure funds are available in the future to support this project as well as other critical needs in the weapons program.

Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test Facility.—The Committee understands that the stop work injunction issued by the Federal District Court in Albuquerque has been lifted and that construction of the facility will continue in fiscal year 1997. No funding for this project was requested in fiscal year 1997 as prior year funds will be available for needed activities.

Technology Transfer and Education.—The Committee recommendation provides $59,400,000, the same as the budget request, for technology transfer and education programs. Technology transfer and education activities should be funded only to the extent that they directly support weapons program activities.

Marshall Islands.—Funding of $6,800,000, the same as the budget request, for the Marshall Islands program has been provided in

the Environment, Safety and Health program account in fiscal year 1997. This funding has been included in the weapons activities account in prior years. Responsibility for managing and funding the Marshall Islands program is under the purview of the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The stockpile management program supports the enduring stockpile, including maintenance, system refurbishment, and weapons dismantlement, and seeks to ensure an adequate supply of tritium. The Committee recommendation for stockpile management is $1,823,831,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request of $1,798,831,000. The additional funding is provided for activities necessary to sustain a reliable, quality production capability to support the nuclear weapons stockpile as it ages.

Tritium.—Funding of $100,000,000 as requested in the budget is provided to assure the availability of adequate supplies of tritium to meet future nuclear weapons stockpile requirements. The Department is pursuing a dual-track strategy which explores the use of a commercial light-water reactor or purchase of irradiation services from such a reactor, and the design and testing of components of an accelerator system for production of tritium.

National Resource Center for Plutonium.—The Committee continues to support the National Resource Center for Plutonium in Amarillo, Texas. A total of $10,000,000 has been provided for the Center. Included in the stockpile management program is $5,000,000, and an additional $5,000,000 has been included in the fissile materials disposition program.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The budget request for program direction funding for fiscal year 1997 reflects the restructuring of the budget to include all salaries and expenses for Federal employees in a single program account. The budget request includes personnel expenses, capital equipment, and contractual services for 1,997 Federal employees in Defense Programs' offices at Headquarters and in the field.

The Committee recommendation of $258,780,000 for program direction is a reduction of $75,624,000 from the budget request of $334,404,000. This reflects a fifteen percent reduction in funding for personnel costs and travel expenses for Federal employees at Headquarters and in the field, and a fifty percent reduction in the use of advisory and assistance services. Funding of $161,237,000 requested for personnel costs is reduced by $24,186,000; funding of $15,837,000 requested for travel is reduced by $2,376,000; and funding of $98,130,000 requested for advisory and assistance services is reduced by $49,062,000.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1996	$5,557,532,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	5,409,310,000
Recommended, 1997	5,409,310,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−148,222,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	

The Environmental Management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action. Environmental management activities are budgeted under the following accounts: Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Fixed Asset Acquisitions; Energy Supply, Research and Development; and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account includes waste management functions, environmental restoration activities, technology development efforts, nuclear materials and facility stabilization activities, basic science activities, privatization efforts, and a variety of crosscutting and program management initiatives. In comparing fiscal year 1996 funding to the fiscal year 1997 request, in several instances the Department has restructured and consolidated program accounts. For example, salaries and expenses for Federal employees have been moved from individual program accounts and consolidated in a separate program direction account.

The recommended funding for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $5,409,310,000, the same as the budget request, but the Committee has recommended reallocating resources from program management activities to direct cleanup activities. Funding reductions are consistent with the recommendations of the House National Security Committee.

GENERAL

The Committee encourages the Department to continue to prioritize Environmental Management spending on activities which directly support site closures. Mortgage reduction and project acceleration must be emphasized. The Department's seemingly directionless policy at many of the former nuclear materials production sites must be focused on those activities and facilities which can be brought to closure within a defined time frame. Current Department of Energy estimates indicate closure of many sites may not occur for 70 years and may cost $350,000,000,000. By not accelerating cleanup activities now, we risk the possibility that future budgets will be too constricted to support ongoing cleanup efforts, jeopardizing the safe shutdown of former defense facilities. The Committee particularly applauds the efforts of those cleanup sites such as Fernald and Rocky Flats which have developed their own accelerated cleanup programs with project schedules, milestones, and cost estimates against which progress can be measured.

Report Requirement.—The Committee strongly supports the current initiative by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management to establish a ten year plan to clean up the most serious risks and reduce mortgages at each site. The Committee directs the Department to submit this ten year plan to Congress as part of the fiscal year 1998 budget submission. Those efforts to accelerate cleanup activities and reduce mortgages which may result in large cost savings over the life of the cleanup should be maximized. The

Committee expects this ten year plan to support completion of most environmental activities and closure of many sites.

Project Closure Fund.—The Committee directs the Department to include in its fiscal year 1998 budget request to Congress an account designated as a "Project Closure Fund." The purpose of a closure project is, within a fixed period of time, to clean up and decommission a former defense nuclear facility or portion thereof and to make the facility safe by stabilizing, consolidating, or removing special nuclear materials from the facility. Sites and site contractors would be expected to clearly demonstrate and validate that candidate projects and/or facilities meet or exceed established criteria in order to be considered.

Closure projects should, at a minimum, meet the following criteria; (1) define a clear, delineated scope of work for completion by a date certain; (2) demonstrate that the site has in place a regulatory agreement for the implementation of environmental remediation requirements that would allow successful completion of the closure project; (3) demonstrate the support, to the maximum extent possible, of State and local officials and the public; (4) show that the Department of Energy and the contractor have agreed upon a formula that puts the contractor's fee at risk in the event the closure project is not completed successfully in a timely manner, provided there is funding allocated for the closure project consistent with the initial project plan; and (5) demonstrate that the closure project can be completed in ten years or less from the date of its establishment. Additionally, the use of new and innovative cleanup technologies which hold broad-based potential for application to other locations and facilities should be encouraged.

Initial funding for this account should be equal to ten percent of the total defense environmental restoration and waste management program. This funding is not to be designated for specific sites, but would be made available on a competitive basis to those sites which meet the established criteria. If there are not sufficient proposals to meet these criteria, the funding would remain in the account to be used the following year.

Employment Levels.—The Committee understands that one of the most difficult tasks the Department faces is reducing contractor employment levels at cleanup sites. This is disruptive for the program, the site, and the community. However, the Department must also understand that unnecessarily maintaining high employment levels undercuts the credibility of the Department as it seeks to convince the Committee that the program is being managed in the most cost-effective manner. It has been acknowledged by some sites that employment reductions are necessary regardless of the funding levels because the current workforce level is not necessary to move into the next phase of the cleanup program. This should be viewed as a measure of progress in the cleanup program. The Department should be actively supporting this effort, not seeking to impede field office and contractor actions which can free up funding to accelerate necessary cleanup projects and reduce life cycle costs and schedules.

Privatization.—The Committee continues to stress the need to improve efficiency and reduce costs in the environmental program, and urges the Department to use every means possible to broaden

its use of existing companies with cleanup technologies and to maximize competition in its procurement processes. This should be done by outsourcing work traditionally performed by the Department's management and operating contractors, awarding fixed price or highly incentivized contracts, and expanding the use of privatization initiatives to purchase environmental management services.

The Department is considering a number of privatization initiatives which, if successful, can be a cost-effective method to secure waste treatment, remediation, and decontamination and decommissioning services from the private sector. This should enable the environmental management program to do more cleanup with less funding and shorten the time required to do each cleanup. It is important that the Department begin to bring competency, innovation, and new or improved technology by private vendors to bear on solving environmental management problems.

Temporary Reprogramming Authority.—Consistent with the recommendation of the House National Security Committee, the Committee has agreed to provide greater flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at former defense sites which are undergoing remedial cleanup activities. In fiscal year 1997, each site manager may transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs and construction projects to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This temporary reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days after the reprogramming of funds occurs.

Economic development.—The Committee wants to reiterate the position outlined in last year's conference report that none of the environmental management funds may be used for economic development activities. The Committee appropriates funding for the "Worker and Community Transition Program" which is the only program authorized in the Department to provide economic development funding for communities, and this is the proper forum for evaluating the merits of the many proposals which the Department receives for economic development funding.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The environmental restoration program assesses, remediates, and decontaminates and dismantles contaminated Department of Energy facilities and sites which are inactive or surplus to current program needs. The Committee recommendation is $1,812,194,000, an increase of $50,000,000 over the budget request of $1,762,194,000.

Program management costs.—The environmental restoration budget identifies funding in each field office for activities performed by outside contractor employees, such as preparation of the Department's budget, development of activity data sheets, program assessment activities, community and stakeholder relations, public outreach, and strategic planning. Program management costs for

some sites appear to exceed 25% of the total cleanup activity. This is unacceptable. The budget identifies approximately 2,500 Federal employees in the field offices who are to oversee and administer environmental management program activities. The additional need for contractor support to perform these activities is not apparent. Excess program management costs reduce funding which should be directed toward cleanup. The Committee directs the Department to significantly reduce or eliminate program management activities performed by contractors in the environmental restoration program, fully utilize Federal employees in performing these tasks, and reallocate those funds to direct cleanup activities.

Accelerated Cleanup.—The Committee continues to support proposals to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup at sites such as Fernald and Rocky Flats, and expects the Department to make every effort to increase funding to advance these projects. The Committee recommendation includes an additional $50,000,000 to be used to accelerate cleanup at sites which have established cleanup schedules with firm dates for completion and which can be shown to be accelerated with additional funding. Last year the Committee provided additional funding for acceleration activities, but much of the money was spread among numerous small projects at many sites—amounts too small to have a noticeable impact on total site budgets and schedules. In fiscal year 1997 funding should be allocated in sufficient sums to demonstrate that total project costs can be reduced and overall cleanup schedules accelerated at a specific site or sites.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The waste management program treats, stores, and disposes of radioactive and hazardous wastes generated across the Department of Energy complex. The Committee recommendation is $1,536,653,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITY STABILIZATION

The nuclear materials and facility stabilization program was established to manage the activities related to surplus weapons complex facilities; to ensure that nuclear materials remaining in the facilities are placed in a form suitable for longer-term storage; and to deactivate the facilities. The Department has indicated that this program should be completed in the 2005–2010 time frame.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 funding is $1,269,290,000, an increase of $365,469,000 over the budget request of $903,821,000. This increase consists of two separate elements. The first is the transfer of $329,469,000 from the proposed site operations account to nuclear materials and facility stabilization as discussed below. The second is the addition of $36,000,000 to increase funding to reduce life cycle costs by accelerating existing activities, and reducing current mortgages for maintaining facilities which will ultimately be closed.

Surveillance and maintenance costs for surplus activities are expensive and labor intensive. The Department should review the possibility of reducing costs without compromising safety by redefining the minimum safety requirements commensurate with each

surplus facility, and by developing a validated, requirement-based estimate of surveillance and maintenance costs.

SITE OPERATIONS

The Department proposes to create a new budget category for site operations in fiscal year 1997. This proposal seems to conflict with the Department's continued complaints that there are too many budget categories which limit their management and funding flexibility. Thus, the Committee has not agreed to establish a new program which would further limit the Department's ability to manage funding at each site.

Fiscal year 1997 funding of $329,469,000 was requested for site operations. The Committee recommends transferring this funding to the nuclear materials and facility stabilization program. Funding for two new construction projects has not been included in the recommendation. The Committee remains concerned with the Department's proposal to initiate new construction projects at Departmental sites and facilities where ongoing missions are currently being evaluated, and where the possibility exists that the projects can be executed using new procurement mechanisms such as privatization which could ultimately reduce the cost of each project.

Additionally, funds transferred for site operations should be reduced by $4,700,000 for program integration activities and $8,000,000 for transportation activities. This funding should be allocated to other high priority cleanup and decommissioning activities in the nuclear materials and facility stabilization program.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development is $303,771,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee continues to hear that new, innovative, and cost-saving technologies available in the private sector are not being adopted by the Department and its contractors. The technology development office should be the driving force to ensure that new and innovative processes are evaluated and brought to bear on cleanup problems across the complex.

The Committee recommends that the Department implement a pilot program whereby innovative technological approaches are considered for demonstration and application in order to achieve cost savings to the waste remediation and cleanup program. Performance-based criteria shall be utilized in the selection of such a technological approach. The Committee expects the Department to report in its Fiscal Year 1998 budget justification on the program's progress.

University Robotics Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the university robotics program.

Electrometallurgical Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for the electrometallurgical treatment of DOE spent fuel. Funding of $5,000,000 for this program has been provided in the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation account; thus, a total of $20,000,000 is provided for this activity.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for this program is $23,155,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request of $48,155,000. The recommendation also reallocates funding in this account to provide the fiscal year 1996 appropriated level of $8,788,000 for stakeholder affairs, $1,250,000 for training and education to implement the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation 93-3, and $13,117,000 for contractual services for planning, information management, budgeting, and engineering and cost management. The Committee is concerned that the training and education funding is being directed toward programs which have only a marginal benefit to cleanup activities, and has provided no funds in this account for funding specific colleges and universities, nor for providing contractual services for education activities.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for the environmental science program is $62,136,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. Within this funding, $50,000,000 has been provided for the basic science program. It is too early to measure the success of this initiative established by Congress last year, but the response of the university and laboratory community to the request for proposals is encouraging. The Committee continues to believe that the Office of Energy Research can most appropriately oversee the basic research aspects of environmental management, and expects the Department to support this management arrangement. A continuing and interactive relationship between the basic research programs of the Department and the technology development program must be established. The Committee expects the Office of Energy Research and the Office of Environmental Management to work closely in using these resources to pursue long-term solutions to cleanup problems which cannot be met with today's cleanup technologies.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The Committee supports the Department's efforts to seek new and innovative solutions to long-term cleanup problems such as the high-level waste tanks at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, and has provided the budget request of $185,000,000. However, the Committee is concerned that the proposal to retrieve and vitrify 99% of the tank farm waste will ultimately cost almost $40 billion. While the Committee supports the initial pilot plant project, this is not a commitment for the full $40 billion project. The Committee is well aware of the millions of dollars already spent at Hanford in previous years when the Department and the State of Washington insisted on rushing to start construction of the Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant (HWVP) without thorough investigation of alternatives. Meeting an unrealistic milestone for the HWVP became the most important consideration and resulted in millions of wasted dollars and a canceled project. The Committee expects the Department: to move cautiously in executing this current program; pursue and take advantage of new technology developments which may occur; ensure that the tank waste disposal system is compatible with other cleanup decisions which have not yet

been made for the site; and guarantee that final decisions are also in the best interest of the taxpayer.

The Committee is also aware that the Department will soon select a new lead contractor for the Hanford facility. New contract provisions should result in cost savings at this site. The Committee strongly encourages the Department, to the maximum extent possible, to allocate those savings that result from the new management contract to the privatization program. This approach should help to diminish to some degree the negative budgetary impact that results from the creation of the privatization fund in fiscal year 1997 and should eliminate any negative impact on current cleanup activities at the Hanford facility. Creation of a privatization fund is not intended to interfere with or impede ongoing critical stabilization, maintenance, and cleanup operations at this site.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $375,511,000, a reduction of $71,000,000 from the budget request of $446,511,000, for the program direction accounts in Headquarters and the field offices. This reduces the number of Headquarters Federal employees, reduces travel expenses at Headquarters and the field, and reduces advisory and assistance services by at least fifty percent from the budget request at Headquarters and in the field. The Committee understands and expects that this recommendation will result in fewer employees at Headquarters. Any attempt to mitigate the impact of this reduction by the use of unexpected prior year balances, furloughs, establishment of an employee relief fund, or use of other discretionary funds will require prior notification of Congress.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $150,400,000 of prior year balances as requested by the Department, and the use of $8,000,000 from the Savannah River pension fund. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report by November 15, 1996, showing how the $150,400,000 of prior year balances have been allocated by program and site.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

FIXED ASSET ACQUISITION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1996	.....
Budget Estimate, 1997	$182,000,000
Recommended, 1997	134,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+134,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−47,500,000

As part of a separate fixed asset acquisition account outside the regular Department of Energy budget request, the President's budget request proposed an additional $182,000,000 for privatization activities for high priority waste treatment projects at several sites. Using this contracting approach, private contractors will be responsible for the design, permitting, financing, construction, and operation of facilities needed to treat waste. The contractor will be paid by the Federal government upon successful delivery of treated

waste meeting predetermined specifications. The Committee was unable to provide full funding for this activity, but has provided $134,500,000 to support these privatization initiatives.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1996	$1,388,212,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	1,547,700,000
Recommended, 1997	1,459,533,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+71,321,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−88,167,000

This account provides funding for Nonproliferation and National Security Programs which include Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development, Arms Control, Intelligence, Emergency Management, Nuclear Safeguards and Security, Security Investigations, and Program Direction; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Worker and Community Transition; Fissile Materials Disposition; Nuclear Energy (Defense); and Naval Reactors. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United States response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities. The Committee recommendation is $194,919,000, the same as the budget request.

ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION

The arms control and nonproliferation program supports the Nation's arms control and nonproliferation policies by securing nuclear materials and expertise in Russia and the Newly Independent States; limiting weapons-usable fissile materials; establishing transparent and irreversible nuclear reductions; and controlling nuclear exports. The Committee recommendation is $169,544,000, a reduction of $11,700,000 from the budget request of $181,244,000. This recommendation includes $7,900,000, the amended budget request, for the North Korean program to can spent fuel from the research reactor, and a reduction of the $14,600,000 budget request for the Industrial Partnering Program. The recommendation includes the budget request of $90,000,000 for the materials protection, control and accounting program to secure and safeguard nuclear materials in Russia and the Newly Independent States.

INTELLIGENCE

The intelligence program provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging

proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the Former Soviet Union. The Committee recommendation is $35,185,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request of $29,185,000. Consistent with the recommendations of the House National Security Committee, an additional $5,000,000 has been provided to expand counterintelligence activities at the nuclear weapons laboratories and other high-risk facilities, and $1,000,000 is provided for expanded analysis of the Russian and Chinese nuclear weapons programs.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The emergency management program encompasses all Departmental emergency management and threat assessment related activities, with the exception of the nuclear response activities funded in the Weapons Activities account, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting Departmental operations and activities or requiring Departmental assistance. The Committee recommendation for funding is $16,794,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The nuclear safeguards and security program provides policy, programmatic direction, and training for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. The Committee recommendation for nuclear safeguards and security is $47,208,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee remains concerned that the Department is continuing to spend in excess of $800,000,000 annually for safeguards and security costs throughout the complex. Greater efforts must be made to reduce these costs. The Committee directs the Department to conduct an independent assessment of its current threat policy and the application of this policy to the various Departmental facilities and locations to determine whether substantially reduced security requirements are viable at some locations with attendant cost reductions. This independent assessment is to be conducted by individuals not employed by the Department or its contractors, or by a company or organization which does not receive funding from a contractual arrangement from either the Department or its contractors.

The Committee is aware of the December 1995 Inspector General report titled, "Audit of the Department of Energy's Site Safeguards and Security Plans." This report noted that the Office of Safeguards and Security presently issues policy guidance relative to the preparation of the Site Safeguards and Security Plans in which neither the affected Headquarters program offices nor the field sites have input or concur. Further, such guidance can and does at times result in unilaterally establishing expensive new security requirements for which no cost-benefit analyses are performed. The Committee recommends that the Department separate the responsibility for establishing Departmental security policy from the program office charged with the responsibility to implement the policy and ascertain compliance with the policy. The Committee believes this

separation of responsibilities will provide an appropriate check and balance which may foster new and innovative approaches to continuing security concerns and simultaneously lead to substantial cost-savings.

Declassification.—The Department has made several announcements concerning its new openness initiative to declassify information. However, in response to a Committee question, the Department stated that in fiscal year 1994 the Department classified 1,592,470 pages and declassified 213,800 pages. In fiscal year 1995 the Department classified 1,438,140 pages and declassified 337,210 pages. These statistics do not appear to support the Department's request for additional resources to continue declassification efforts. The Committee is concerned that funding is being provided for declassification of older documents, while the Department continues to classify current documents three times faster than they can be declassified. As part of the budget submission for fiscal year 1998, the Department should include an analysis of declassification efforts indicating anticipated results of the declassification initiative and proposals to limit the creation of new classified documents.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The security investigations program funds background investigations for Department of Energy and contractor personnel who, in the performance of their official duties, require access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material. This program continues to maintain large uncosted balances each year. As a result, the Committee recommendation is $20,000,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request of $22,000,000.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

At the direction of Congress, all expenses associated with Federal employees in fiscal year 1997 have been consolidated into a single program direction account for each organization. The fiscal year 1997 request for funding nonproliferation and national security Federal employees is $95,622,000, an increase of $12,813,000 over the fiscal year 1996 level of $82,809,000. The Committee recommendation is $80,622,000, a reduction of $15,000,000 from the budget request. This reduction is to be used to reduce the number of Federal employees at Headquarters and to reduce reliance on advisory and assistance services which were proposed to increase from $28,246,000 in fiscal year 1996 to $33,414,000 in fiscal year 1997.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Environment, Safety and Health activities included in this account provide oversight processes to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department's environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security programs; fund epidemiologic studies to examine possible linkages between conditions at DOE sites and adverse health effects among workers and offsite populations; and oversee epidemiologic studies on the health of population groups in the Marshall Islands who have been exposed to ionizing radiation. The Committee recommendation is $63,800,000, the same as the budget request.

Included in this recommendation is the budget request of $6,800,000 for Marshall Islands support.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

In accordance with Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993, the worker and community transition program seeks to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities of contractor work force restructuring at defense sites, and assist community planning for defense conversion. The Committee recommendation is $57,000,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $67,000,000.

The Committee is concerned with reports that the Department is providing very generous separation and severance benefits to contractor employees who are separated, and that these generous packages are being offered to contractor employees hired after 1991. Further, the Committee is concerned that at some sites, the contractors subsequently either rehire some of the separated workers or hire new employees with the skills of the separated workers because the field office and contractor failed to properly manage the downsizing. The Committee will be reviewing the Department's workforce restructuring process including the costs of employee buyout proposals to ensure that they do not exceed acceptable standards, and that they are also fair to the taxpayers who fund the payments.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The fissile materials disposition program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense needs. The Committee recommendation is $93,796,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee encourages the Department of Energy to demonstrate to the world its commitment to the disposition of excess weapons plutonium by rapidly implementing the applicable Record of Decision. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to utilize commercially available and demonstrated technology and experience to deploy the options selected in the safest, most expedient, and cost-effective manner possible.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

The budget request for nuclear energy activities includes funding for the international nuclear safety program and the nuclear security/Russian production reactor shutdown program. Descriptions of these programs follow.

International Nuclear Safety.—The international nuclear safety program is designed to reduce the national security and environmental threats posed by the operation of unsafe and aging nuclear facilities around the world. This program has three basic elements: improve the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in Russia and the Newly Independent States; secure shutdown of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in Ukraine; and maintain core com-

petencies in nuclear safety through the establishment of international safety centers in the United States and elsewhere, and through cooperative research and development with other countries and international organizations.

The budget request for this program in fiscal year 1997 is $66,200,000, an increase of $35,800,000 over the fiscal year 1996 appropriation of $30,000,000 to the Department of Energy. The Committee has provided no funding for this program in fiscal year 1997. However, it should be noted that this program has a large funding balance available. Through May 31, 1996, the Department had spent less than $20,000,000 on this program, and had $80,000,000 available for expenditure.

The Committee is also concerned that the Soviet-designed reactor program, which was originally envisioned to provide short-term assistance to make reactors safer and ultimately shut them down, is being expanded into a life extension program for Soviet-designed reactors. In light of no program plan, unclear mission needs, and huge funds available, no funding is provided. The Committee also questions the need for establishment of an International Nuclear Safety Center in the United States. It appears that the Department's interpretation of its role in this program has expanded beyond original intent to provide immediate short-term assistance to countries with Soviet-designed reactors.

NUCLEAR SECURITY

The Nuclear Security program seeks to reduce the threats posed by continued operation of reactors in Russia and the Newly Independent States that produce weapons materials, and to promote management practices that minimize the risks of proliferation of weapons-usable nuclear materials. The budget request for this activity in fiscal year 1997 is $6,000,000. The Committee has provided the budget request of $2,500,000 for preparatory work for converting the fuel in three Russian production reactors so that they do not produce weapons-grade plutonium while producing heat and electricity. This will allow Russia the time needed to identify a replacement source for the heat and electricity produced by the reactors while still achieving nonproliferation objectives. No funding is provided for international nuclear safety activities, breeder reactor safety issues, or spent fuel management.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of Naval nuclear propulsion—from technology development through reactor operations to, ultimately, reactor plant disposal. This program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores, and these efforts are critical to the continued success of over 120 reactors in operating submarines and surface ships, and to the New Attack Submarine class currently under development.

The Committee recommendation is $681,932,000, an increase of $18,000,000 over the budget request of $663,932,000. Additional funding of $18,000,000 has been provided to continue test reactor inactivation efforts and preclude inefficiencies due to delaying environmental cleanup activities. Scheduled to be completed in fiscal

year 2002, funding for these environmental remediation activities peaks in fiscal year 1997.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $3,767,000 in prior year balances remaining in the canceled new production reactor program. The budget request did not propose the use of any prior year balances.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1996	$248,400,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	200,000,000
Recommended, 1997	200,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−48,400,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 1995, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was $1,098,000,000 (including principal and interest). The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal government's contribution to the Nuclear Waste Fund. Through fiscal year 1995, a total of $380,500,000 has been paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund for atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommends the fiscal year 1997 budget request of $200,000,000.

POWER MARKETING ACTIVITIES

Management of the Federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of Interior to the Department of Energy as directed in the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). The functions include power marketing activities authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

All power marketing administrations except Bonneville are funded annually with appropriated funds. Revenues collected from power sales and transmission services are deposited in the Treasury. Bonneville operations are self-financed under authority of Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, which authorizes Bonneville to use its revenues to finance operating costs, maintenance and capital construction, and sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1996	$4,260,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	4,000,000
Recommended, 1997	4,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−260,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	.....

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and marketing of power for Alaska's two Federal hydroelectric projects. The operating projects are the 30 MW Eklutna Project near Anchorage and the 78 MW Snettisham Project near Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems, and necessary maintenance facilities.

The Committee recommendation is $4,000,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee supports the transfer of assets authorized by the Alaska Power Administration Asset Sale and Termination Act (Public Law 104–58). If the transfer is completed before the end of fiscal year 1997, any unobligated appropriations must be returned to the Treasury.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000 square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power inter-regionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of 14,800 circuit-miles of transmission line and 400 substations with an installed capacity of 22,212 MW. Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, region-wide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

Eastern Canadian Intertie.—The Department requested language providing approval by Congress for initiation of construction of the Eastern Canadian Intertie (Grand Coulee Dam to the Canadian Border 'Oliver') facility. This facility will provide transmission facilities that are required for returning the Canadian entitlement power to Canada under the 1964 Columbia River Treaty. The Committee recommendation does not include this language. The Committee has deferred action on this issue to allow additional time for consultations about the line with interested parties.

Energy Services Business Line.—The Committee believes that the proposed request for FY 97 to create a new Energy and Environmental Services business line at Bonneville are premature in light of the uncompleted regional review initiated by Congress and the

Northwest Governors last year. Moreover, the Committee is concerned that these new business ventures by Bonneville may compete with existing private companies, both large and small. And finally, the Committee is concerned that any new business venture that is not specifically authorized by Congress should be fully scrutinized by the appropriate Committees to assure that any new obligations by Bonneville do not become contingent liabilities of the U.S. Treasury. The Committee denies the request for borrowing authority, appropriations, and reallocation of funds for these purposes pending the outcome of the regional review and approval by the appropriate Committees of the Congress. Bonneville should however continue to provide historic services to its existing customers. The Committee believes that if Bonneville has staff who are not being fully utilized, Bonneville should pursue reducing FTEs before expanding into new business ventures.

Borrowing Authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation for these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 1997, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $267,000,000 in new borrowing authority, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs. Funds have been reduced to ensure Bonneville does not initiate new programs prior to regional and Congressional reviews.

Budget revisions and notification.—The Committee expects Bonneville to adhere to the borrowing authority estimates recommended by the Congress and promptly inform the Committee of any exceptional circumstances which would necessitate the need for Bonneville to obligate borrowing authority in excess of such amounts.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1997, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $851,000,000, of which $263,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Limitation On Direct Loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1997.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1996	$19,843,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	20,900,000
Recommended, 1997	18,859,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−984,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−2,041,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 10 southeastern states. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through "wheeling" arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with trans-

mission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommendation of $18,859,000 is a decrease of $984,000 from last year. The Committee notes that at the end of fiscal year 1995, Southeastern had a balance of $17,230,000 in unobligated and uncosted funds. The Committee is concerned about the level of carryover balances and will continue to make adjustments to appropriations that reflect the availability of these funds.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1996	$29,778,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	26,900,000
Recommended, 1997	25,210,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−4,568,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−1,690,000

The Southwestern Power Administration is the marketing agent for the power generated at Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-state area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 is $25,210,000, a decrease of $4,568,000 from last year. The Committee notes that at the end of fiscal year 1995, Southwestern had a balance of $12,708,000 in unobligated and uncosted funds. The Committee is concerned about the level of carryover balances and will continue to make adjustments to appropriations that reflect the availability of these funds.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1996	$257,652,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	217,891,000
Recommended, 1997	211,582,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−46,070,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−6,309,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. Western operates hydropower generating plants in 15 central and western states encompassing a 1.3 million square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of 16,727 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 257 substations.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased

power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins Power Marketing Fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River Storage Facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

The Committee recommendation for Western is $211,582,000, a decrease of $6,309,000 from the budget request. The Committee notes that at the end of fiscal year 1995, Western had a balance of $136,835,000 in unobligated and uncosted funds. The Committee is concerned about the level of carryover balances and will continue to make adjustments to appropriations that reflect the availability of these funds.

Colorado River Dam Fund.—The Committee recommends bill language as requested by the Administration to implement the provisions of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 1996	$1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	970,000
Recommended, 1997	970,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−30,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad Operation and Maintenance Fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995. This legislation also directed that the Fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas. Prior to fiscal year 1996, funds for Falcon and Amistad were included in the appropriations of the Department of State.

The Committee recommendation is $970,000, the same level as the budget request. The Committee notes that on March 31, 1996, halfway through the current fiscal year, the unspent balances in this program were $830,000—83% of the amount appropriated last year.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996	$131,290,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	159,397,000
Recommended, 1997	141,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−18,107,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1996	−131,290,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−159,397,000
Recommended, 1997	−141,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	+18,107,000

The Committee recommendation is $141,290,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the amount provided last year. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

On March 31, 1996, halfway through the fiscal year, the Commission had a balance of $692,000 in unallocated funds, $72,973,000 in unobligated funds and $40,864,000 in uncosted funds, representing a total unspent balance of $114,529,000. This balance includes appropriated funds that have yet to be made available to the offices that obligate the funds, appropriated funds for which contracts or grants have not yet been awarded and funds which have been obligated with costs that have yet to be incurred. This balance, on the books halfway through the current fiscal year, represents 87% of the appropriation provided last year. Consistent with the direction given in last year's conference report, the Committee encourages the Commission to apply carryover balances to meet fiscal year 1997 funding needs.

The Committee supports the additional funding requested for implementing Orders 888 and 889, the regulatory changes that open the wholesale electricity market to competition, and establish a "same-time" information system to ensure that transmission owners and their affiliates do not enjoy an advantage over their competitors. The Committee recommends that the increase in funding for these activities be offset by decreases in funding for hydropower and natural gas and oil pipelines activities.

As stated in the conference report last year, the Congress directed a specific reduction to the FTE level in the natural gas and oil program. The Committee notes that the FTE level in June, 1995, when the House report recommended a 10% reduction for FTEs, was 616. Last year's conference report recommended a 20% reduction from fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1997. The Committee notes that the Commission appears to be on track to reach this goal (493 FTEs) by the end of fiscal year 1997.

General Provision

The Committee has recommended a provision which creates a priority placement and job retraining program for employees who have been, or are about to be, separated from government service as a result of a reduction in force. The Department of Energy shall provide such employees priority placement for other Energy vacanies as they occur, and may provide job placement and counseling services.

Committee Recommendation

The Committee's detailed funding recommendations for programs in Title III are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Solar energy			
Solar building technology research	2,000	5,000	2,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	65,000	86,994	55,800
Solar thermal energy systems	25,000	23,750	21,500
Biofuels energy systems	55,300	80,890	53,500
Wind energy systems	32,500	49,650	6,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	---	3,489	2,000
International solar energy program	4,000	---	---
Solar technology transfer	4,300	---	---
National renewable energy laboratory	500	2,200	500
Construction			
96-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	1,500	2,800	2,800
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	2,000	5,000	3,300
Resource assessment	2,000	---	---
Solar and renewable energy deployment	---	8,509	---
Subtotal, Solar Energy	192,100	263,282	144,100
Use of prior year balances	-4,888	---	---
Total, Solar Energy	187,212	263,282	144,100
Geothermal			
Geothermal technology development	30,447	35,600	29,000
Use of prior year balances	-555	---	---
Total, Geothermal	29,892	35,600	29,000
Hydrogen research	14,500	11,012	15,000
Hydropower			
Small scale hydropower development	1,500	---	1,000
Electric energy systems and storage			
Electric energy systems			
Electric field effects research	9,924	---	---
System and materials research	19,000	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-615	---	---
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	28,309	---	---
Energy storage systems			
Battery storage	2,000	---	---
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	2,000	---	---
Electric and magnetic fields R&D	---	8,000	8,000
High temperature superconducting R&D	---	23,050	19,000
Energy storage systems	---	4,000	2,000
Climate challenge	---	1,000	---
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	30,309	36,050	29,000
Program direction	11,800	17,301	13,102
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	275,213	363,245	231,202
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D			
Light water reactor	40,000	40,000	17,000
Advanced radioisotope power system	48,512	40,000	38,810
Nuclear technology R&D	---	30,000	5,000
Program direction	8,000	---	---
Policy and management	5,000	---	---
Oak Ridge landlord	14,400	16,000	11,520
Test reactor area landlord	2,000	3,000	2,000
Construction			
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,900	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	3,900	4,000	3,000
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	2,303	800	800
University reactor fuel assistance and support	3,500	6,950	4,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	125,615	137,750	80,130
Termination costs	79,000	76,900	76,900
Construction			
97-E-200 Modifications to reactors, sodium system drain and closure, Argonne National Lab - West, ID	---	1,200	1,200
97-E-201 Modifications to reactors, hot fuel examination facility equipment upgrades, ANL-W	---	1,000	1,000
95-E-207 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor - II sodium processing facility Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	1,700	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	1,700	2,200	2,200
Total, Termination costs	80,700	79,100	79,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Isotope support	24,658	12,704	12,704
Program direction	---	18,500	11,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	230,973	248,054	182,934
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	114,933	73,160	63,200
Nuclear safety policy	13,500	---	---
Program direction	---	39,046	37,300
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	128,433	112,206	100,500
ENERGY RESEARCH			
Biological and environmental research			
Biological and environmental research R&D	349,891	342,962	342,962
Construction			
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL	2,600	---	---
94-E-338 Structural biology center, ANL	4,295	---	---
94-E-339 Human genome lab, LBL	5,700	1,000	1,000
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	50,000	35,113	35,113
Subtotal, Construction	62,595	36,113	36,113
Subtotal, Biological & environ. research R&D	412,486	379,075	379,075
BER program direction	7,000	---	---
Total, Biological and environmental research	419,486	379,075	379,075
Fusion energy	244,144	255,600	225,000
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	367,400	334,560	328,500
Chemical sciences	198,400	173,370	170,000
Applied mathematical sciences	116,500	---	---
Engineering and geosciences	41,700	41,250	40,500
Advanced energy projects	12,300	---	---
Energy biosciences	30,200	28,185	27,650
Program direction	9,500	---	---
Capital equipment	---	45,695	45,695
Construction			
GPE-400 General plant projects	---	9,275	9,275
97-E-305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	---	2,500	2,500
96-E-305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	10,475	---	---
95-E-305 Accelerator improvement projects	---	9,840	9,840
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL	3,186	---	---
96-E-300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	2,000	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Construction	15,661	30,615	30,615
Total, Basic energy sciences	791,661	653,675	642,960
Other energy research			
Computational and technology research	---	158,143	148,500
Energy research analyses	3,463	2,000	2,000
Laboratory technology transfer	18,000	---	---
Advisory and oversight	6,200	---	---
Policy and management	2,200	---	---
Program direction	---	42,154	30,600
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities	---	7,625	---
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	---	21,260	---
95-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	2,500	---	2,500
95-E-302 Applied science center, phase I (BNL)	3,270	---	---
95-E-303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	1,500	---	1,500
95-E-310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	2,740	---	2,960
94-E-351 Fuel storage and transfer facility upgrade (BNL)	440	---	---
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	2,038	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	12,488	21,260	6,960
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	12,488	28,885	6,960

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Environment, safety and health	6,656	---	---
Construction			
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	4,400	---	7,424
95-E-307 Fire Safety imp. III (ANL)	1,000	---	1,000
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	1,540	---	1,032
95-E-309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)	2,480	---	4,620
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)	2,411	---	224
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade phase I (LBL)	1,130	---	---
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL)	1,288	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	14,249	---	14,300
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	20,905	---	14,300
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	33,393	28,885	21,260
Total, Other energy research	63,256	231,182	202,360
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	1,518,547	1,519,532	1,449,395
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
University and science education programs			
Laboratory cooperative science centers	13,000	13,900	---
University programs	7,000	6,000	---
Total, University and science education programs	20,000	19,900	---
Technical information management program	11,000	2,300	2,300
Program direction	---	8,700	8,700
Construction	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	12,000	12,000	12,000
Field offices and management	---	121,723	108,000
Information systems investment	---	14,900	---
In-house energy management	---	3,941	---
Construction			
IHE - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt	---	1,759	---
Total, In-house energy management	---	5,700	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	32,000	174,223	120,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT. (NON-DEFENSE)			
Environmental restoration	366,400	358,239	351,357
Waste management	171,896	192,799	177,994
Construction			
97-E-600 ANL waste handling facility, CH	---	360	360
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL	300	1,106	1,106
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	4,048	---	---
92-E-601 Melton Valley liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	339	---	---
91-E-600 Rehabilitation of waste management building 306, ANL	787	2,066	2,066
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling facility, LBL	671	---	---
88-R-830 Liquid low-level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	4,000	2,692	2,692
Subtotal, Construction	10,145	6,224	6,224
Total, Waste management	182,041	199,023	184,218
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	73,100	84,782	80,000
Construction			
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	---	6,571	6,571
Total, Nuclear materials and fac stabilization	73,100	91,353	86,571
Site operations	---	2,799	---
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	621,541	651,414	622,146
Subtotal, Energy supply, research and development	2,806,707	3,068,674	2,706,177

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Use of prior year balances	-79,300	---	-48,177
General reduction, ESR&D	---	-48,177	-10,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,727,407	3,020,497	2,648,000
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			
Uranium program activities	83,500	77,594	63,566
Program direction	---	5,672	3,672
Construction			
96-U-201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plant	3,000	4,000	4,000
93-U-200 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	3,400	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	6,400	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	89,900	87,266	71,238
Revenues - Sales	-34,903	-42,200	-42,200
Use of prior year balances	-25,703	-17,266	-17,266
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	29,294	27,800	11,772
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	278,807	240,200	200,200
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	---	---	208,970
Physics research	141,000	141,290	---
Facility operations	353,077	362,955	362,955
Construction			
97-G-303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC	---	3,000	3,000
94-G-304 B-Factory, SLAC	52,000	45,000	45,000
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	52,000	52,000	52,000
Subtotal, Construction	104,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	457,077	462,955	462,955
High energy technology	68,923	74,880	---
Total, High energy physics	667,000	679,125	671,925
Nuclear physics	236,925	253,425	248,425
Construction			
96-G-302 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	2,575	---	---
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	65,000	65,000	65,000
Subtotal, Construction	67,575	65,000	65,000
Total, Nuclear physics	304,500	318,425	313,425
General science program direction	9,500	11,600	10,650
Subtotal, General science	981,000	1,009,150	996,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	981,000	1,009,150	996,000
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	2,500	2,850	2,000
General management - personnel compensation and benefits	185,000	119,647	94,174
General management - other expenses	157,000	83,604	74,900
Program support			
Minority economic impact	2,900	2,900	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies	2,900	3,493	500
Consumer affairs	40	40	40
Public affairs	50	65	50
Environmental policy studies	4,000	4,928	---
Scientific and technical training	1,000	1,000	500
Subtotal, Program support	10,890	12,426	2,590
General reduction	---	---	-5,000
Total, Administrative operations	355,390	218,527	168,664
Cost of work for others	22,826	26,336	26,336
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	378,216	244,863	195,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments	-11,519	---	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	366,697	244,863	195,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-122,306	-125,388	-125,388
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	244,391	119,475	69,612
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	26,915	30,502	24,897
Use of prior year balances	-1,915	-897	-897
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	25,000	29,605	24,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,078,403	1,062,670	1,087,670
Construction			
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	2,520	19,250	19,250
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	8,400	15,100	15,100
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	1,800	14,100	14,100
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	6,600	17,100	17,100
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	9,940	15,000	15,000
94-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	12,200	7,787	7,787
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, NV	15,650	---	---
90-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, Development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	6,200	---	---
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	17,995	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	81,305	88,337	88,337
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,159,708	1,150,907	1,175,907
Inertial fusion	203,267	234,560	234,560
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	37,400	131,900	131,900
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	240,667	366,460	366,460
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	150,000	49,400	49,400
Education	10,000	10,000	10,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	160,000	59,400	59,400
Marshall Island/Dose reconstruction	6,800	---	---
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,567,175	1,576,767	1,601,767
Stockpile management	1,911,458	1,704,470	1,729,470
Construction			
Production base			
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	8,660	21,940	21,940
96-D-126 Tritium loading line modifications, Savannah River Site, SC	12,200	---	---
Subtotal, Production base	20,860	21,940	21,940
Environmental, safety and health			
97-D-121 Consolidated pit packaging system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	---	870	870
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	4,000	4,000
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	---	1,400	1,400
97-D-124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	600	600
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	600	100	100
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAX and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant	3,100	7,000	7,000
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant	6,300	10,900	10,900

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	8,700	4,900	4,900
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	5,500	5,200	5,200
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	2,000	2,200	2,200
94-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	4,000	---	---
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	7,200	7,200	7,200
Subtotal, Environmental, safety and health	37,400	44,370	44,370
Safeguards and security			
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	13,400	9,739	9,739
Nuclear weapons incident response			
96-D-125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD	900	3,825	3,825
Reconfiguration			
93-D-123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	41,065	14,487	14,487
Subtotal, Construction	113,625	94,361	94,361
Total, Stockpile management	2,025,083	1,798,831	1,823,831
Program direction	115,000	334,404	258,780
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,707,258	3,710,002	3,684,378
Use of prior year balances	-209,744	---	---
Streamline DOE contractors (undistributed)	-37,200	---	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,460,314	3,710,002	3,684,378
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Corrective activities			
Construction			
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	3,406	---	---
Environmental restoration	1,635,973	1,385,546	1,435,546
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	---	376,648	376,648
Total, Environmental restoration	1,635,973	1,762,194	1,812,194
Waste management	2,295,994	1,448,326	1,448,326
Construction			
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	---	7,584	7,584
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	42,000	---	---
96-D-407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	2,900	---	---
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	5,615	11,246	11,246
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	4,314	752	752
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,600	200	200
95-D-406 Road 5-01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	1,023	---	---
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000	---	---
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	4,445	---	---
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	282	---	---
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	11,000	6,345	6,345
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	12,000	12,600	12,600
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex Richland, WA	6,606	---	---
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,900	---	---
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line replacement, Richland, WA	5,000	---	---
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	19,795	8,100	8,100
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	19,700	20,000	20,000
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	1,105	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	1,100	---	---
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	2,000	---	---
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID	1,428	---	---
90-D-178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID	2,606	---	---
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	800	---	---
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,500	11,500	11,500
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,885	10,000	10,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	1,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	174,604	88,327	88,327
Total, Waste management	2,470,598	1,536,653	1,536,653
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	1,447,108	818,664	1,156,218
Construction			
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	7,900	7,900
97-D-451 B-Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	---	1,500	1,500
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	---	60,672	60,672
96-D-457 Thermal treatment system, Richland, WA	1,000	---	---
96-D-458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	885	---	---
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,539	---	6,790
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,952	10,440	10,440
96-D-468 Residue elimination project, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Co	33,100	---	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	1,500	---	8,541
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, WA	---	---	7,900
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,900	---	4,137
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River, SC	6,000	---	---
95-D-454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA	3,500	---	---
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	8,382	4,645	4,645
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	5,000	---	---
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,074	---	547
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000	---	---
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, INEL, ID	3,601	---	---
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,940	---	---
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,130	---	---
92-D-123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	9,560	---	---
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	7,000	---	---
92-D-181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID	6,883	---	---
91-D-127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	2,800	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	114,746	85,157	113,072
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization	1,561,854	903,821	1,269,290
Compliance and program coordination	31,251	---	---
Construction			
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	15,000	---	---
Total, Compliance and program coordination	46,251	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Site operations	---	297,054	---
Construction			
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	6,790	---
97-D-470 Environment monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	---	2,500	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	8,541	---
97-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	---	2,000	---
95-E-600 Hazardous materials management and emergency response training center, Richland, WA	---	7,900	---
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC	---	4,137	---
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	---	547	---
Total, Site operations	---	329,469	---
Technology development	440,510	303,771	303,771
Transportation management	13,158	---	---
Analysis, education and risk management	90,022	---	---
Policy and management	---	48,155	23,155
Environmental science program	---	52,136	62,136
Environmental management privatization	---	185,000	185,000
Program direction	---	446,511	375,511
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,261,772	5,567,710	5,567,710
Savannah river pension refund	-37,000	-8,000	-8,000
Use of prior year balances	-667,240	-150,400	-150,400
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,557,532	5,409,310	5,409,310
FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621)			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management Privatization initiative, various locations	---	182,000	134,500
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	246,142	194,919	194,919
Arms control	160,954	181,244	169,544
Intelligence	42,336	29,185	35,185
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	449,442	405,348	399,648
Emergency management	23,321	16,794	16,794
Nuclear safeguards and security	83,395	47,208	47,208
Security investigations	20,000	22,000	20,000
Program direction - NN	---	95,622	80,622
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	576,158	586,972	564,272
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	---	53,094	53,094
Security evaluations	14,707	---	---
Nuclear safety	17,679	---	---
Program direction - EH	---	10,706	10,706
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	32,386	63,800	63,800
Worker and community transition	82,500	62,659	52,659
Program direction - WT	---	4,341	4,341
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	82,500	67,000	57,000
Fissile materials disposition	70,000	73,163	73,163
Program direction - MD	---	3,633	3,633
Construction			
97-D-140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	---	17,000	17,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials control/disposition	70,000	93,796	93,796
Nuclear energy (Defense)			
International nuclear safety	---	66,200	---
Nuclear security	---	6,000	2,500
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	---	72,200	2,500
Total, Other national security programs	761,044	883,768	781,368
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development	652,568	623,130	641,130
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,600	8,200	8,200
97-D-201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID	---	400	400
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	11,300	4,800	4,800

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,800	500	500
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	3,900	---	---
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,000	8,000	8,000
Subtotal, Construction	29,600	21,900	21,900
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	682,168	645,030	663,030
Program direction	---	18,902	18,902
Total, Naval reactors	682,168	663,932	681,932
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,443,212	1,547,700	1,463,300
Use of prior year balances	-70,000	---	-3,767
FY 1996 supplemental appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	15,000	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,388,212	1,547,700	1,459,533
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	248,400	200,000	200,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	10,654,458	11,049,012	10,887,721
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,260	4,000	4,000
FY 1996 Supplemental (by transfer) (P.L. 104-134)	(5,500)	---	---
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	3,472	3,989	3,989
Purchase power and wheeling	26,430	23,456	23,456
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,902	27,445	27,445
Use of prior year balances	-10,059	-6,545	-8,586
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	19,843	20,900	18,859
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	20,897	2,793	2,793
Purchase power and wheeling	1,464	1,095	1,095
Program direction	---	17,862	17,862
Construction	7,931	6,054	6,054
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,292	27,804	27,804
Use of prior year balances	-514	-904	-2,594
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,778	26,900	25,210
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	51,125	29,764	29,764
System operation and maintenance	125,255	33,453	33,453
Purchase power and wheeling	93,709	74,235	74,235
Program direction	---	105,807	105,807
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,283	5,432	5,432
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	275,372	248,691	248,691
Use of prior year balances	-17,720	-30,800	-37,109
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(4,556)	(3,774)	(3,774)
FY 1996 Supplemental (transfer out) (P.L. 104-134)	(-5,500)	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	257,652	217,891	211,582
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	1,000	970	970
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	312,533	270,661	260,621
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	146,290	159,397	151,290
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	-15,000	---	-10,000
FERC revenues	-131,290	-159,397	-141,290
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---

ENERGY
PERSPECTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1996 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621)			
Energy Supply, Research and Development			
Basic sciences			
96-E-300, Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	---	13,000	---
General Science and Research Activities			
High energy physics			
94-G-304, B-factory, SLAC	---	35,100	---
92-G-302, Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	---	36,750	---
Nuclear physics			
91-G-300, Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	---	131,216	---
Subtotal, General Science and Research Activities	---	203,066	---
TOTAL, FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621)	---	216,066	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	151,600	200,028	182,000

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1996	$170,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	170,000,000
Recommended, 1997	155,331,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−14,669,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−14,669,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian states and a Federal Co-Chairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommends $155,331,000 for fiscal year 1997. Of the total amount appropriated, $3,331,000 is provided for salaries and expenses, $57,000,000 is provided for area development, and $95,000,000 is provided for highway development. The recommendation represents level funding for area development and an increase over the budget request for construction of the Appalachian Development Highway System; at the same time, the recommendation continues orderly downsizing of the Federal commission.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996	$17,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	17,000,000
Recommended, 1997	12,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−5,000,000

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board, composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy.

Consistent with agency reductions that the Committee has made throughout this bill in personnel salaries and expenses, the Committee recommendation is $12,000,000, a decrease of $5,000,000 from the budget request of $17,000,000. In downsizing, the Committee recommends that the Board focus primary oversight efforts on those defense nuclear facilities which are operational, and those

facilities in standby or shutdown which represent the highest radiological risk to workers, the public, and the environment. Low risk environmental restoration projects are overseen by State and Federal regulators, and should not demand the attention of the Board.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996	$343,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	342,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−343,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−342,000

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, provided final year funding for the Delaware River Basin Commission. Pursuant to and consistent with that Act, no funds are provided for the Commission in fiscal year 1997.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1996	$428,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	534,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−428,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−534,000

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, provided final year funding for the Delaware River Basin Commission. Pursuant to and consistent with that Act, no funds are provided for the Commission in fiscal year 1997.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation, 1996	$511,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	508,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−511,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−508,000

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, provided final year funding for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. Pursuant to and consistent with that Act, no funds are provided for the Commission in fiscal year 1997.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1996	$468,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	475,300,000
Recommended, 1997	471,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+3,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−3,500,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1996	−$457,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−457,800,000
Recommended, 1997	−457,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	.....
Budget Estimate, 1997	+500,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1996	$11,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	17,500,000
Recommended, 1997	14,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	+3,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−3,000,000

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $471,800,000 for fiscal year 1997, $3,500,000 more than last year and $3,500,000 less than the budget request.

The recommendation includes $457,300,000 for salaries and expenses, the same as the amount provided last year, and $500,000 (or 0.1%) less than the budget request. This funding is fully recovered by fees and collections.

The Committee includes $11,000,000 for activities related to the implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and in support of the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. This funding is to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and the funds are provided subject to authorization of Nuclear Waste Fund expenditures for Department of Energy program activities. The recommendation is the same as last year's level and is $3,000,000 less than the budget request.

The recommendation also includes $3,500,000, the same amount as the budget request, for activities related to commercial vitrification at the Hanford site. This funding is to be derived from general funds, not to be offset by fees and collections. No funding was provided for these activities last year.

The Committee supports the continued downsizing of staff as proposed under the Standard Reactor Design cost center. However, the Committee opposes the proposed staff level increases under Reactor Regulation. This proposed increase appears to be inappropriate to the level of activity, considering: the maturation of the industry; the lack of nuclear power plants under construction; and a lower level of research and rulemaking services. The Committee urges the Commission to participate in the government-wide streamlining and downsizing effort and make additional reductions to its workforce.

The Committee remains concerned about the high level of unobligated and uncosted balances. The Committee notes that the estimate of unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 1995 was $52 million, $11 million higher than the Commission's March 1995 estimate and $27 million higher than the goal for fiscal year 1995. The

Committee will continue to monitor the level of carryover balances and will make adjustments to reflect the availability of these funds.

The Committee notes that last year's funding reduction has resulted in direct relief for power reactors, high and low enriched fuel facilities, and for professionals in the nuclear industry. The direction provided by Congress last year has resulted in a direct benefit to those who pay fees to the Commission. The following tables display the fee reductions made possible by last year's actions to reduce spending at the Commission.

	Fiscal year—		Reduction
	1995	1996	
Class of licensees:			
Power reactors	$3,826,400	$3,506,200	−$320,200
High enriched fuel facilities	2,931,625	2,805,852	−125,773
Low enriched fuel facilities	1,488,781	1,462,665	−26,116
Typical materials licensees:			
Broad scope medical	23,200	21,700	−1,500
Radiographers	13,900	13,000	−900
Well loggers	8,100	7,500	−600
Gauge users	1,700	1,600	−100

Office Of Inspector General

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1996	$5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	5,000,000
Recommended, 1997	5,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	
Budget Estimate, 1997	

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1996	−5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−5,000,000
Recommended, 1997	−5,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	
Budget Estimate, 1997	

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Pursuant to law, budget authority appropriated to the Inspector General must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000, equal to the Administration's request and the amount provided last year. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2214, this appropriation must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board

Appropriation, 1996	$2,531,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	3,214,000
Recommended, 1997	2,531,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	
Budget Estimate, 1997	−683,000

The Committee recommendation provides continued funding for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directs the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

The Committee recommends level funding of $2,531,000. This is the same amount provided in fiscal year 1996.

The Committee is disappointed that it must remind the Board that its statutory function is to, "evaluate the *technical* and *scientific* validity of [nuclear waste disposal] activities" of the Department of Energy (emphasis added). The Board's recent recommendations regarding the importance and timing of interim storage vis-a-vis permanent disposal of nuclear waste hardly amount to scientific and technical evaluations. Rather, these pronouncements involve the exact policy questions pending before Congress. Congress established the Board to ensure the most rigorous external scientific oversight of nuclear waste program operations. The Board's tangential policy excursions only serve to diminish its credibility as a scientific and technological resource. The Committee assures the Board that Congress does not suffer from a shortage of policy advice regarding Yucca Mountain and nuclear waste disposal.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1996	$318,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	322,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−318,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−322,000

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, provided final year funding for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Pursuant to and consistent with that Act, no funds are provided for the Commission in fiscal year 1997.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1996	$250,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	380,000
Recommended, 1997	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−250,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−380,000

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, provided final year funding for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Pursuant to and consistent with that Act, no funds are provided for the Commission in fiscal year 1997.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1996	$109,169,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	120,000,000
Recommended, 1997	97,169,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1996	−12,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1997	−22,831,000

The Committee recommends $97,169,000 for the appropriated programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The appropriation is distributed among TVA programs as follows:

Program:	
Economic Development	$16,000,000
Land Between the Lakes	5,000,000
Stewardship Activities	76,169,000
Environmental Research Center	0

Economic Development.—In testimony before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development this year, TVA conceded that Economic Development is not an essential appropriated activity of the Authority. Further, TVA reported that it intends to phase out appropriations for the program over the next three years. The budget request of $16 million, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1996, does not reflect that intent. The Committee, which recommends the budget request, expects TVA to accelerate the program's phase-out after fiscal year 1997.

Land Between the Lakes.—The Committee recommends $5,000,000 for Land Between the Lakes (LBL).

In fiscal year 1996, Congress appropriated $5,000,000 for LBL and provided authority to transfer an additional $1,000,000 from Stewardship funds in case of a severe lack of funds or an "emergency" and/or "crisis" situation. TVA is exercising this special transfer authority and applying $6,000,000 to LBL in fiscal year 1996, while committing $1,565,000 of its fiscal year 1996 funds to capital improvement projects that were neither included in TVA's budget request nor approved by Congress. Furthermore, TVA has committed $1,317,000 in fiscal year 1995 funds for capital improvements at LBL. This was revealed in neither the fiscal year 1995 nor the fiscal year 1996 budget justifications submitted to the Committee.

Instead of moving toward greater financial self-sufficiency for LBL, TVA has avoided steps to downsize, despite the fact that its workforce is disproportionate to that of similarly situated parks and wildlife areas. Specific examples illustrate the point:

	Acres per FTE
Park:	
Grand Canyon National Park	3,734
Glacier Bay National Park and Reserve	113,213
Yellowstone National Park	4,400
Badlands National Park	5,165
Mojave National Park	72,500
Olympic National Park	4,960
Land Between the Lakes	**1,553**

The recent public debate over alternative concepts for LBL's future has demonstrated the paramount importance that area residents place on maintaining the park in its natural conditions. It is tautological that an army of employees is not necessary for the maintenance of the park in its wild and natural state. Therefore,

TVA is expected to focus on downsizing LBL and becoming more financially self-sufficient.

In light of its poor management and budget practices with respect to LBL, TVA can expect continued close scrutiny of its future operations and budget requirements.

Stewardship and Land and Water.—The Committee recommends $76,169,000 for Stewardship and Land and Water activities. This represents an increase of $6,000,000 over the fiscal year 1996 level.

Due to severe budgetary constraints and unsupportable outyear funding requirements, no funds have been included for activities associated with the replacement or reconstruction of Chickamauga Lock. The Committee does approve TVA's request of $2,000,000 for repairs to the existing Chickamauga Lock.

The Committee understands that certain TVA communities are concerned that the frequency of reservoir drawdowns for dam safety inspections may have an unnecessarily negative impact on local economies. The Committee urges TVA to review its dam safety procedures to determine whether the cycle of safety inspections could be extended without appreciable impacts on safety.

Environmental Research Center.—In testimony before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, TVA acknowledged that operation of the Environmental Research Center (ERC) is not an essential appropriated activity of the TVA. The Committee agrees and, like last year, recommends termination of Federal participation in the ERC.

Reprogrammings.—In an effort to improve TVA's budgetary accountability, the Committee requires that the Authority comply with the following reprogramming guidelines.

Any proposed reprogramming of appropriated funds from or to any program, project or activity of TVA that would result in: a significant change in the scope of any program, project, or activity as described in the TVA budget justification submitted to Congress; the creation of any new program, project or activity; or an increase or decrease of more than $500,000 or 10% of the total amount appropriated for any program, project or activity (whichever is less) requires that the chairmen of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development be informed of the proposed action and be allowed at least thirty days in which to respond.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 501.—The Committee has included language stating the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.–

Section 502.—The Committee has included language repealing section 508(f) of Public Law 104–46, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996. In fiscal year 1996, Congress provided the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration the authority to offer employees voluntary separation incentives not to exceed $25,000 as deemed necessary to reduce employment levels. The fiscal year 1997 budget request assumes that Bonneville employment levels will stay at the fiscal year 1996 level of 3,272 employees; thus, the Committee has included language repealing the permanent buyout authority.

Section 503.—The Committee has included language repealing 42 U.S.C. 7262 which provides authority to the Secretary of Energy to accept gifts, bequests, and devises of money. This change to the Department of Energy Organization Act, Public Law 95–91, is deemed necessary to prevent the Secretary of Energy from using this account to augment appropriations for programs, projects, and activities for which funds were specifically limited in an annual appropriations Act.

Section 504.—The Committee has included language repealing a provision included in Public Law 101–514, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, which provided that in operation of the Shasta Dam, Central Valley Project, California, any increase in power purchase costs incurred by the Western Area Power Administration after January 1, 1986, resulting from bypass releases for temperature control purposes to preserve anadromous fisheries in the Sacramento River shall be nonreimbursable. Completion of the Shasta Temperature Control Device is scheduled for later this year, making this provision unnecessary in fiscal year 1997.

Section 505.—The Committee has included language in the bill which provides that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by the Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters. The language also provides that the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage

Program shall be classified as reimbursable or nonreimbursable by the Secretary of the Interior as described in the Bureau of Reclamation report entitled, "Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995" and that any future obligation of funds for drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries pursuant to Reclamation law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee estimates that enactment of this bill would have negligible or no overall inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 602 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	602(b) Allocation		This Bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	19,421	19,652	19,421	19,585
Mandatory				

The bill provides no new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following information was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

	Millions
Budget authority	19,421
Outlays:	
1997	12,752
1998	5,673
1999	821
2000	67
2001 and beyond	43

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 93–344, the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying

bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

	Millions
Budget authority	163
Fiscal year 1997 outlays resulting therefrom	7

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 1(b), rule X, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill:

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program:

> * * * of which $23,410,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 602d), and $71,728,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended: *Provided,* That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from the fund: *Provided further,* That transfers to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation under this heading * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Special Funds:

> * * * Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified * * *

Under Title III, Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration:

> * * * of which $203,687,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided,* That of the amount herein appropriated, $5,432,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration $3,774,000 to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

> * * * *Provided further,* That from this appropriation, transfer of sums may be made to other agencies

> of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: * * *

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Inspector General:

> * * * and in addition, an amount not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: *Provided,* That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further,* That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: * * *

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3, rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which may directly or indirectly change or be perceived to change the application of existing law.

Title I—Language is included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction.

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Language is also included under Construction, General directing the Secretary of the Army to use funds appropriated in Public Law 104–46 for construction of the Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana, project.

Under Construction, General, language is included that directs the Secretary of the Army to provide highway and other appropriate signs to direct the public to the bike trail which runs from Des Moines, Iowa, to the Big Creek Recreation Area at Saylorville Lake and the wildlife refuge in Jasper and Marion Counties authorized in Public Law 101–302.

Under Construction, General, language is included directing the Secretary of the Army to begin implementation of the Passaic River Preservation of Natural Storage Areas, New Jersey, project using funds appropriated in Public Law 103–126.

For Operation and Maintenance, General, Corps of Engineers, the following language is included:

> * * * including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; * * *

Also under Operation and Maintenance, Corps of Engineers, language is included providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities.

The bill includes language under Operation and Maintenance, General, Corps of Engineers, permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Under Operation and Maintenance, General, language is included that directs the Secretary of the Army to design and construct a landing at Guntersville, Alabama.

Language is included in the bill under the Regulatory Program of the Corps of Engineers regarding the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States.

Under Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies, language is included that directs the Secretary of the Army to use funds appropriated in the Act and funds appropriated in Public Law 104–134 to rehabilitate non-Federal levees in Pierce County, Washington.

Under General Expenses, language is included relating to the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support Activity, the Engineering Strategic Studies Center, and the Water Resources Support Center.

Also under General Expenses, Corps of Engineers, language is included prohibiting the use of other Title I funds for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Division Offices.

Under General Expenses, the bill includes language permitting the use of funds to implement a plan to reduce the number of division offices.

Under Administrative Provisions, Corps of Engineers, language is included providing that funds are available for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Under General Provision, Corps of Engineers—Civil, the bill includes language that directs the Secretary of the Army to advertise for competitive bid at least 10,000,000 cubic yards of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992, and that permits the Secretary to utilize the Corps of Engineers' dredge fleet under certain conditions. Language is also included that provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act may be used for improvements of the dredge *McFarland.*

Title II—Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations and Construction Program providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, General Investigations and Construction Program providing that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure.

Under General Investigations, language is included providing that $500,000 shall be available to complete the appraisal study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Del Norte County and Crescent City, California, Wastewater Reclamation Project and $500,000 shall be available to complete the appraisal study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Fort Bragg, California, Water Supply Project.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program providing that such sums as necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program which permits funds transfers within the overall appro-

priation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Funds.

Language is also included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program, providing that the costs of safety of dams work at Coolidge Dam, Arizona, are in addition to the amount authorized for safety of dams work in 43 U.S.C. 506.

Language is included which directs the Bureau of Reclamation, using funds appropriated for the Tucson Aqueduct System Reliability Investigation, to complete, by the end of fiscal year 1997, the environmental impact statement being conducted on the proposed surface reservoir and which directs the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the City of Tucson on any outstanding issues related to the preferred alternative.

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance making funds available until expended.

For Operation and Maintenance, language is included providing that funds may be derived from the reclamation fund and the special fee account established pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1987.

Clarifying language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance relating to the costs of the examination of existing structures program.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, Operation and Maintenance, funds collected and used pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 395 from water users are made available until expended.

For the Loan Program, language is included regarding the source of appropriated funds.

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses referring to the five Bureau of Reclamation regions.

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses making the funds appropriated available until expended. Language is also included relating to the source of funds for General Administrative Expenses and prohibiting the use of other appropriations for general administrative functions.

Language is included under Special Funds identifying the special funds authorized by law from which funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation as authorized.

Under Administrative Provisions, Bureau of Reclamation, language is included providing for purchase of motor vehicles.

Under the Department of the Interior, Central Utah Project Completion Account, language is included in the bill providing that funds are available for carrying out the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior under the Central Utah Project Completion Act.

Title III—Language is included under the Energy Supply, Research and Development account to restrict the use of $1,440,000l of funds provided for program direction to providing for termination expenses related to the reduction of FTEs in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

Language is included under Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities to permit the use of revenues received by the Department for residual uranium enrichment activities to reduce the appropriations as revenues are received. This language was included in last year's appropriations Act.

Language is included under the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund making $34,000,000 of the amounts derived from the fund available for thorium and uranium company reimbursements.

Language is included under Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund making appropriations from the Nuclear Waste Fund subject to authorization.

Language is included under Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund providing that none of the funds appropriated under that heading shall be distributed to the State of Nevada or affected units of local government for financial assistance.

Language is included under the Departmental Administration account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and consistent with the authorization in Public Law 95–238, to permit the Department of Energy to utilize revenues to offset appropriations. The appropriations language for this account reflects the total estimated program funding to be reduced as revenues are received. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under the Departmental Administration account to permit the Department of Energy to cover increases in the cost of work for others provided that increases are offset by increased revenues, and waives 31 U.S.C. 1511 and 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under the Departmental Administration account limiting the number of employees who may be funded in this account.

Language is included under the Bonneville Power Administration account precluding any new direct loan obligations.

Language is included under the Southwestern Power Administration to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements from the Department of Defense, various Oklahoma companies, and other non-Federal entities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration providing $5,432,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1992.

Language is included under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, to provide for official entertainment expenses and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received.

Language is included under the General Provision, Department of Energy, creating a priority placement and job retraining program for employees who have been, or are about to be, separated from government service as a result of a reduction in force.

Title IV—Language is provided under the Appalachian Regional Development program waiving section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

Language is included under Nuclear Regulatory Commission making appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the Nuclear Waste Fund subject to authorization of Nuclear Waste Fund expenditures for Department of Energy program activities.

Language is also included allowing transfer of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities and waiving 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts. Language is included to exclude the costs of NRC prelicensing activities related to the clean up of the Hanford site from license fee revenues. Language is also included to permit the NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302.

Language is included under the Office of Inspector General to permit transfer of funds to other agencies for performance of work, and to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations.

Language is included under Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board making appropriations to the Board from the Nuclear Waste Fund subject to authorization of Nuclear Waste Fund expenditures for Department of Energy program activities.

Title V—Language is included repealing section 508(f) of Public Law 104–46, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996. Section 508(f) provided the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration the authority to offer employees voluntary separation incentives not to exceed $25,000 as deemed necessary to reduce employee levels.

Language is included repealing 42 U.S.C. 7262 which provides authority to the Secretary of Energy to accept gifts, bequests, and devises of money.

Language is included repealing a provision included in Public Law 101–514, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, which provides that in operation of the Shasta Dam, Central Valley Project, California, any increase in power purchase costs incurred by the Western Area Power Administration after January 1, 1986, resulting from bypass releases for temperature control purposes to preserve anadromous fisheries in the Sacramento River shall be reimbursable.

Language is included which provides that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by the Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project until certain conditions are met and which provides that the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified as reimbursable or nonreimbursable by the Secretary of the Interior as described in the Bureau of Reclamation report entitled, "Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995."

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Construction, General

Department of Energy:

- Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities
- Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities
- General Science and Research Activities
- Departmental Administration

Office of Inspector General
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund
Weapons Activities
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
Other Defense Activities
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal
Power Marketing Administrations
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Appalachian Regional Commission
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspector General

The Committee notes that the annual authorizing legislation for many of these programs is in various stages of the legislative process. It is anticipated these authorizations will be enacted into law later this year.

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3 (RAMSEYER)

In compliance with clause 3 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets):

The accompanying bill would repeal section 508(f) of Public Law 104–46, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996.

[(f) PERSONNEL FLEXIBILITY.—The Administrator may offer employees voluntary separation incentives as deemed necessary which shall not exceed $25,000. Recipients who accept employment with the United States within five years after separation shall repay the entire amount to the Bonneville Power Administration.**]**

The accompanying bill would repeal 42 U.S.C. 7262.

[§ 7262. Gifts, bequests, and devises

The Secretary is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, bequests, and devises of property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Department. Gifts, bequests, and devises of money and proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts, bequests, or devises shall be deposited in the Treasury and shall be disbursed upon the order of the Secretary. Property accepted pursuant to this section, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift, bequest, or devise. For the purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property accepted under this section shall be considered as a gift, bequest, or devise to the United States.**]**

The accompanying bill would amend Public Law 101–514, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991.

[: *Provided,* That in the operation of Shasta Dam, Central Valley Project, California, any increase in power purchase costs incurred by the Western Area Power Administration

after January 1, 1986, resulting from bypass releases for temperature control purposes to preserve anadromous fisheries in the Sacramento River shall be nonreimbursable.]

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1997

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1996 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1997 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1996 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1997 (6)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	121,767,000	142,500,000	153,628,000	+31,861,000	+11,128,000
Construction, general	804,573,000	914,000,000	1,035,394,000	+230,821,000	+121,394,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	307,885,000	292,500,000	302,990,000	-4,895,000	+10,490,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,703,697,000	1,663,000,000	1,701,180,000	-2,517,000	+38,180,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	30,000,000	.....	.....	-30,000,000	.....
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	.....	-11,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	.....	-5,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	135,000,000	.....	.....	-135,000,000	.....
General expenses	151,500,000	153,000,000	145,000,000	-6,500,000	-8,000,000
Oil spill research	850,000	850,000	.....	-850,000	-850,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,366,272,000	3,292,850,000	3,449,192,000	+82,920,000	+156,342,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	18,905,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	+6,922,000	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	18,503,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	-6,803,000	.....

Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,485,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-485,000	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,246,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	-146,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	44,139,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	-512,000	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	12,684,000	15,095,000	14,548,000	+1,864,000	-547,000
Construction program	411,046,000	392,524,000	398,069,000	-12,977,000	+5,545,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134)	9,000,000	.....	.....	-9,000,000	.....
Operation and maintenance	273,076,000	292,876,000	286,232,000	+13,156,000	-6,644,000
Loan program	11,668,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	+1,047,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	.....	.....
General administrative expenses	48,150,000	48,971,000	45,150,000	-3,000,000	-3,821,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	43,579,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	-5,579,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	809,203,000	800,181,000	794,714,000	-14,489,000	-5,467,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	853,342,000	843,808,000	838,341,000	-15,001,000	-5,467,000
(By transfer)	(-4,556,000)	(-3,774,000)	(-3,774,000)	(+782,000)	.....
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	2,727,407,000	3,020,497,000	2,648,000,000	-79,407,000	-372,497,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	64,197,000	70,000,000	53,972,000	-10,225,000	-16,028,000
Gross revenues	-34,903,000	-42,200,000	-42,200,000	-7,297,000	.....
Net appropriation	29,294,000	27,800,000	11,772,000	-17,522,000	-16,028,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1997—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1996 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates, 1997	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with appropriated, 1996	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1997
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	278,807,000	240,200,000	200,200,000	-78,607,000	-40,000,000
General Science and Research Activities	981,000,000	1,009,150,000	996,000,000	+15,000,000	-13,150,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	151,600,000	200,028,000	182,000,000	+30,400,000	-18,028,000
Departmental Administration	366,697,000	244,863,000	195,000,000	-171,697,000	-49,863,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-122,306,000	-125,388,000	-125,388,000	-3,082,000	.....
Net appropriation	244,391,000	119,475,000	69,612,000	-174,779,000	-49,863,000
Office of the Inspector General	25,000,000	29,605,000	24,000,000	-1,000,000	-5,605,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:					
Defense function	(5,557,532,000)	(5,591,310,000)	(5,543,810,000)	(-13,722,000)	(-47,500,000)
Non-defense function	(900,348,000)	(891,614,000)	(822,346,000)	(-78,002,000)	(-69,268,000)
Total	(6,457,880,000)	(6,482,924,000)	(6,366,156,000)	(-91,724,000)	(-116,768,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons Activities	3,460,314,000	3,710,002,000	3,684,378,000	+224,064,000	-25,624,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	5,557,532,000	5,409,310,000	5,409,310,000	-148,222,000	.....
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)	.....	182,000,000	134,500,000	+134,500,000	-47,500,000
Other Defense Activities	1,388,212,000	1,547,700,000	1,459,533,000	+71,321,000	-88,167,000

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	248,400,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-48,400,000	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,654,458,000	11,049,012,000	10,887,721,000	+233,263,000	-161,291,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	4,260,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-260,000	.....
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	.....	.....	(-5,500,000)	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	19,843,000	20,900,000	18,859,000	-984,000	-2,041,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,778,000	26,900,000	25,210,000	-4,568,000	-1,690,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	257,652,000	217,891,000	211,582,000	-46,070,000	-6,309,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(4,556,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-782,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,000,000	970,000	970,000	-30,000	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	312,533,000	270,661,000	260,621,000	-51,912,000	-10,040,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	131,290,000	159,397,000	141,290,000	+10,000,000	-18,107,000
Revenues applied	-131,290,000	-159,397,000	-141,290,000	-10,000,000	+18,107,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)	.....	216,066,000	.....	.....	-216,066,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,404,490,000	16,182,494,000	15,279,926,000	-124,564,000	-902,568,000
(By transfer)	(10,056,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(-6,282,000)	.....
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	170,000,000	155,331,000	-14,669,000	-14,669,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,000,000	12,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1997—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1996 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates, 1997	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with appropriated, 1996	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1997
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	343,000	342,000	.....	-343,000	-342,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	428,000	534,000	.....	-428,000	-534,000
Total	771,000	876,000	.....	-771,000	-876,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	511,000	508,000	.....	-511,000	-508,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	468,300,000	475,300,000	471,800,000	+3,500,000	-3,500,000
Revenues	-457,300,000	-457,800,000	-457,300,000	.....	+500,000
Subtotal	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	-3,000,000
Office of Inspector General	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....
Revenues	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	-3,000,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,531,000	3,214,000	2,531,000	.....	-683,000

Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	318,000	322,000	.....	-318,000	-322,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	250,000	380,000	.....	-250,000	-380,000
Total	568,000	702,000	.....	-568,000	-702,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	109,169,000	120,000,000	97,169,000	-12,000,000	-22,831,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	311,550,000	329,800,000	281,531,000	-30,019,000	-48,269,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	-609,343,000	-428,000,000	-428,000,000	+181,343,000	.....
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	19,326,311,000	20,220,952,000	19,420,990,000	+94,679,000	-799,962,000
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	.....	.....	(-5,500,000)	.....

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE NANCY PELOSI

This Committee Report includes a statement under the category entitled "Central Valley Project Restoration Fund," noting that the Administration's budget request did not include funds for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative and concurring with that request. The Initiative is the line item that has been used for Restoration Fund expenditures on the CVPIA's San Joaquin River Comprehensive Plan.

It is correct that the Administration's budget request included no Restoration Fund money for this study, a regrettable decision by the Secretary of the Interior that suggests that the Secretary has no intention of complying with a statutory requirement. The Administration is under a statutory deadline to complete the Comprehensive Plan this fall and nothing in this or previous appropriations bills has relieved them of that obligation.

The Comprehensive Plan is a common sense study of options that cannot by itself lead to any water reallocation or other action that could pose a threat to anyone. It simply is intended to provide the Secretary with basic research and a series of options that explore the potential for restoring the devastated San Joaquin River. The study is as essential now as ever and I urge the Secretary to employ his numerous other authorities to complete this important Plan as expeditiously as possible, even if this ill-advised cutoff of Restoration Fund monies remains in the bill.

NANCY PELOSI