Calendar No. 107

105TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 105–44

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1998

JULY 10, 1997.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1004]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1004) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1998

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$23,047,903,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	21,209,623,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Below the budget estimate, 1998	1,838,280,000
Over enacted bill, 1997	219,596,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

TITLE II

TITLE III

TITLE IV

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1998 beginning October 1, 1997, and ending September 30, 1998, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1998 budget estimates for the bill total $23,047,903,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $21,209,623,000. This is $1,838,280,000 below the budget estimates and $219,596,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 602(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals $20,842,000,000 in budget authority and $20,883,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1998. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1998 in budget authority and outlays.

The Committee allocation for nondefense discretionary funding for fiscal year 1998 continues the downward trend experience for the past several years. For fiscal year 1998, the allocation has been reduced about $310,000,000 below the President's budget request for 1998, excluding the late budget amendment which reduced the Corps of Engineers funding by $330,000,000. With the severely limited resources and the heightened expectation created by a new Water Resources Development Act and the expanded wastewater and ground water reuse authorization which passed late last year, the Committee has been faced with an overwhelming number of requests for funding to initiate work on new projects and studies for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

To complicate matters further, severely constrained budget targets within the executive branch have forced both the Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation to significantly lengthen project completion schedules envisioned last year. The effect of this action, while reducing the funding needs for fiscal year 1998, has created a situation in which sizable additional funding is needed on many ongoing projects to keep up with previous construction schedules. To cite one example, the Los Angeles Harbor project in California was included in the budget at $16,100,000, but the Corps has informed the Committee that $60,000,0000 is needed to continue the project

at an optimum rate. This $44,000,000 difference is caused by the lack of budgetary resources for the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. There are several critical lock and dam replacement projects on the Nation's inland waterway system which the Committee has not been able to recommend for construction because their large estimated project cost makes it extremely difficult to accommodate the annual funding requirements in future years. These are just two examples of many items which contribute significantly to the national economy, that the Committee has not been able to fully support in the fiscal year 1998 budget.

The 5-year budget agreement just completed does not place a priority on infrastructure programs such as the water resource development activities of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Yet, the subcommittee continues to receive increasing numbers of requests from Members to fund new projects and programs, or to increase the funding allocation on projects included in the budget. If the trend of lower allocations for the Energy and Water Subcommittee continues, the Committee will be required to further reduce the recommendation for individual projects, despite the interest of Members.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

In accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act, the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission submitted draft strategic plans to the Committee on June 16 and July 1 respectively.

The Committee recommends that the Department consider using the 1996 performance agreement between President Clinton and Secretary O'Leary as the basis for future versions of its strategic plan. Unlike the draft plan, the performance agreement enunciates goals and quantifies criteria for evaluating the Department's performance. It is a document that, if incorporated into policy, planning, and budgeting decisions, can contribute to the Department's management as envisioned by sponsors of the Government Performance and Results Act, and can assist the Congress in evaluating the Department's performance.

The Committee recommends that the Department establish a secretarial officers concurrence process for the strategic plan and, as was done with the performance plan, circulate copies of the concurrence sheet with future drafts of the strategic plan.

The Committee commends the Commission for its efforts regarding a draft strategic plan. The Commission assembled a senior group of staffers from numerous program offices to contribute to the plan, and the broad perspective is evident. Discussions between Committee and Commission staff identified some shortcomings in the plan; some of the strategies are unnecessarily vague, and more qualitative measurements of success need to be included. The Committee recommends the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's budget request to the Commission. Many aspects of the FERC's regulatory responsibilities are comparable to those of the Commission and the FERC deserves credit for quantifying its workload.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $11,749,405,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Stockpile stewardship	$1,925,900,000
Stockpile management	2,108,050,000
Nonproliferation and national security	662,000,000
Other defense programs	975,981,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	5,311,974,000
Defense environmental privatization	343,000,000

ENERGY RESEARCH

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $966,940,000 for energy research programs including:

Solar and renewable energy	$301,422,000
Nuclear fission R&D	244,281,000
Magnetic fusion	240,000,000

NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $664,684,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $2,223,077,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$675,035,000
Nuclear physics	315,925,000
Basic energy sciences and other research	668,240,000
Biological and environmental R&D	376,710,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $887,840,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$160,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	162,141,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	476,500,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	86,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General investigations	$164,065,000
Construction	1,284,266,000
Flood control Mississippi River and tributaries	289,000,000
Operations and maintenance	1,661,205,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities	106,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Water resource management and development	452,211,000
Facility operation, maintenance and rehabilitation	236,168,000

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,611,279,000 for Federal water resource develop-

ment programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Water is our Nation's most precious and valuable resource. It is evident that water supply in the near future will be as important, if not more so, than energy. There is only so much water available. Water cannot be manufactured. Our Nation cannot survive without water, and economic prosperity cannot occur without a plentiful supply.

While many areas of the country suffer from severe shortages of water, others suffer from the other extreme—an excess of water which threatens both rural and urban areas with floods. Because water is a national asset, and because the availability and control of water affect and benefit all States and jurisdictions, the Federal Government has historically assumed much of the responsibility for financing of water resource development.

The existing national water resource infrastructure in America is an impressive system of dams, locks, harbors, canals, irrigation systems, reservoirs, and recreation sites with a central purpose—to serve the public's needs.

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural production, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

Reservoir projects provide hydroelectric power production and downstream flood protection, make available recreational opportunities for thousands of urban residents, enhance fish and wildlife habitat, and provide our communities and industries with abundant and clean water supplies which are essential not only to life itself, but also to help maintain a high standard of living for the American people.

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held four sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1998 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal

year 1998, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote on July 10, 1997, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

By unanimous vote of 28 to 0 the Committee on July 10, 1997, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1997	$153,872,000
Budget estimate, 1998	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	164,065,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	ALABAMA						
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	1,100,000	100,000	400,000		400,000	
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	700,000	200,000	200,000		200,000	
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	1,100,000	100,000	400,000		400,000	
	ALASKA						
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	587,000	233,000	54,000		54,000	
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	550,000	133,000	125,000		125,000	
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	680,000	262,000	168,000		168,000	
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	1,800,000	446,000	450,000		600,000	
(FC)	COOK INLET, AK	3,755,000	205,000		125,000		125,000
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR, AK	100,000				100,000	
(N)	DUTCH HARBOR, AK	920,000	653,000	50,000		50,000	
(FDP)	KENAI RIVER, AK	100,000				100,000	
(N)	KENAI RIVER NAVIGATION, AK	600,000	89,000	150,000		150,000	
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	737,000	362,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	MATANUSKA RIVER. AK	100,000				100,000	
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	777,000	287,000	450,000		490,000	
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	100,000				100,000	
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	13,500,000			37,000		37,000
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	580,000	462,000	118,000		118,000	
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	485,000	261,000	150,000		225,000	
(FDP)	SHIP CREEK, AK	100,000				100,000	
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY, AK	340,000	80,000	120,000		120,000	
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	14,851,000	759,000		138,000		
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	653,000	261,000	200,000		330,000	
	VALDEZ HARBOR, AK	100,000				100,000	

	ARIZONA						
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.—MEXICO BORDER, AZ AND TX	300,000	200,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTH SCOTTSDALE, AZ	1,775,000	1,003,000	400,000		400,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	1,475,000	742,000	400,000		400,000	
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	1,850,000	750,000	325,000		325,000	
(E)	RIO SALADO WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM, AZ	2,045,000	1,505,000	540,000		540,000	
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	1,600,000	130,000	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	18,000,000	100,000		825,000		825,000
	ARKANSAS						
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	740,000	136,000	240,000		240,000	
(FC)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR AND TX		57,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER TO NEWPORT, AR	2,400,000					500,000
	CALIFORNIA						
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	29,160,000	15,109,000		401,000		401,000
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	3,665,000	3,519,000	146,000		146,000	
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	50,500,000			1,000,000		1,000,000
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,100,000	100,000	240,000		750,000	
	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLAND RESTORATION, CA	100,000				100,000	
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	1,250,000	622,000	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	18,400,000	900,000		1,100,000		1,100,000
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS AND SUP(HANSEN AND LOPEZ DAMS), CA	1,270,000	1,066,000	204,000		204,000	
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS AND SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS AND SANTA FE DAM	1,360,000	1,171,000	189,000		189,000	
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	1,447,000	1,297,000	150,000		150,000	
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	1,825,000	712,000	530,000		530,000	
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	1,300,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	1,090,000	680,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, COLUSA BASIN, CA	1,100,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	1,100,000	89,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, FAIRFIELD STREAMS AND CORDELIA MARSH, CA	1,600,000	89,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	1,520,000	720,000	300,000		300,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	1,500,000	609,000	350,000		350,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PL	1,600,000	89,000	400,000		400,000	
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE, DIXON AND VICINITY, CA	1,100,000	89,000	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	20,605,000			50,000		50,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,070,000	1,745,000	325,000		325,000	
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	70,800,000	12,980,000		1,600,000		1,600,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,125,000	450,000	500,000		500,000	
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	1,155,000	775,000	270,000		270,000	
(E)	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	380,000	180,000				200,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	6,800,000	1,770,000		500,000		500,000
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	925,000	700,000	225,000		225,000	
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	6,500,000			250,000		250,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	990,000	950,000	40,000		40,000	
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	16,420,000	750,000		160,000		160,000
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	790,000	412,000	378,000		378,000	
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	1,230,000	1,151,000	79,000		79,000	
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,125,000	450,000	240,000		240,000	
(SPC)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN RIVERS COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY, CA					500,000	
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940,000	4,337,000	750,000		750,000	
(E)	SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA ISLANDS,	1,898,000	718,000	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	865,000	687,000	178,000		178,000	
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	1,100,000	100,000	300,000		400,000	
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	1,100,000	100,000	600,000		600,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FARMINGTON DAM, CA	1,000,000				225,000	
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	1,915,000	1,201,000	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	26,000,000			500,000		500,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	2,070,000	1,890,000	180,000		180,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	2,000,000	816,000	450,000		225,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	1,378,000	893,000	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	1,100,000	89,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,250,000	596,000	315,000		315,000	

(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	2,849,000	2,349,000	380,000		380,000	
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	1,600,000	100,000	300,000		300,000	
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	1,600,000	100,000	320,000		320,000	
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	42,500,000			750,000		750,000
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,815,000	556,000	475,000		475,000	
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	850,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	2,080,000	1,468,000	370,000		370,000	
	CONNECTICUT						
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	700,000		100,000		100,000	
	DELAWARE						
(N)	C&D CANAL—BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEP	69,800,000	1,225,000		1,625,000		1,625,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE AND NJ	3,406,000	3,205,000	150,000		150,000	
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,845,000	2,377,000	293,000		293,000	
	FLORIDA						
(N)	BIG BEND CHANNEL	4,900,000	223,000		80,000		80,000
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	3,270,000	955,000	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK (WARES CREEK), FL	8,900,000	100,000		300,000		300,000
(N)	CHICOPIT BAY, FL	350,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	850,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	1,577,000	245,000		230,000		230,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	4,027,000	126,000		90,000		90,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL				100,000		100,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,308,000	1,007,000	301,000		301,000	
(BE)	LIDO KEY BEACH, FL	100,000				100,000	
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	13,000,000	1,434,000		140,000		290,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	6,250,000			175,000		175,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	425,000	100,000	325,000		325,000	
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	1,100,000	598,000		280,000		280,000
	GEORGIA						
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,527,000	2,434,000	93,000		93,000	
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	26,650,000			1,100,000		1,100,000
(FDP)	FLINT RIVER BASIN STUDY, GA	1,000,000	100,000	300,000		300,000	
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA AND SC	2,580,000	506,000		94,000		94,000
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	1,600,000	600,000	400,000		400,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	2,470,000	739,000	800,000		800,000	
(FDP)	SAVANNAH/CHATHAM COUNTY REGIONAL FLOOD CONTROL, GA	800,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
(SPEC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	600,000				300,000	
	HAWAII						
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	1,243,000	835,000	333,000		333,000	
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	1,250,000		100,000		100,000	
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	6,471,000	902,000		267,000		267,000
(FDP)	LAULAULEI, HI	200,000				200,000	
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	1,016,000	789,000	227,000		227,000	
	ILLINOIS						
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,352,000	1,011,000	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	100,000,000			400,000		400,000
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL AND IN	765,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL	850,000	89,000	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	7,662,000	175,000		395,000		395,000
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM FLD PROFILE STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	10,000,000	350,000	1,957,000		1,957,000	
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	51,690,000	39,329,000	7,700,000		7,700,000	
(FC)	WOOD RIVER D&LD, MADISON COUNTY, IL	2,069,000			112,000		112,000
	INDIANA						
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	7,500,000	492,000		458,000		458,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN (MIDDLE REACHES), IN AND IL	1,142,000	1,086,000	56,000		56,000	
	IOWA						
(RCP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	1,150,000	300,000	339,000		339,000	
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	100,000				100,000	
	KANSAS						
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	850,000	325,000	135,000		135,000	

(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	968,000	372,000	155,000	.....	155,000	.....
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	28,600,000	.....	.....	261,000	.....	261,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	1,967,000	1,937,000	30,000	.....	30,000	.....
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	400,000	160,000	38,000	.....	38,000	.....
	KENTUCKY						
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	830,000	230,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK, KY	197,500,000	9,131,000	.....	1,750,000	.....	1,750,000
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	1,109,000	359,000	375,000	.....	375,000	.....
(FC)	LICKING RIVER WATERSHEAD, KY	500,000	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	5,925,000	83,000	.....	525,000	.....	525,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	850,000	100,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	1,502,000	600,000	470,000	.....	470,000	.....
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	38,400,000	14,925,000	8,800,000	.....	8,800,000	.....
	LOUISIANA						
(E)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	800,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	800,000
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER—DARLINGTON RESERVOIR, LA	880,000	380,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	BAYOU TIGRE, ERATH, LA	1,340,000	185,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(FDP)	BLACK BAYOU DIVERSION, LA	1,500,000	522,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	70,577,000	6,135,000	.....	265,000	.....	265,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	69,400,000	1,165,000	.....	620,000	.....	620,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	4,880,000	2,976,000	850,000	.....	850,000	.....
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	3,044,000	2,378,000	138,000	.....	138,000	.....
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	2,660,000	1,222,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	4,000,000	600,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	2,700,000	2,031,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	2,500,000	244,000	.....	129,000	.....	129,000
(FDP)	WEST SHORE—LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	1,875,000	500,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
	MARYLAND						
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	3,195,000	2,097,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	3,000,000	590,000	690,000	.....	690,000	.....
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND VA	24,000,000	150,000	.....	338,000	.....	338,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	1,791,000	1,326,000	415,000	.....	415,000	.....
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	2,689,000	2,581,000	108,000	.....	108,000	.....
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	2,400,000	760,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	1,100,000	450,000	200,000		200,000	
	MASSACHUSETTS						
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,600,000	400,000	350,000		350,000	
	MINNESOTA						
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	6,190,000	169,000		400,000		400,000
	MISSISSIPPI						
(FC)	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	85,056,000	355,000		2,640,000		2,640,000
	MISSOURI						
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	12,000,000	392,000		656,000		656,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,079,000	548,000	365,000		365,000	
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	563,000	390,000	173,000		173,000	
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO AND KS	1,710,000		100,000		400,000	
(FDP)	KIMMSWICK, MO	223,000	172,000	51,000		51,000	
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	398,000	341,000	57,000		57,000	
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460-471, MO	1,875,000	755,000	300,000		300,000	
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	1,500,000		100,000		100,000	
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	13,986,000	2,041,000		500,000		500,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	585,000	283,000	120,000		120,000	
	NEBRASKA						
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	838,000	692,000	90,000		90,000	
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,526,000	776,000	300,000		300,000	
	NEVADA						
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	1,300,000	600,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	13,000,000			300,000		300,000
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	1,228,000	874,000	354,000		354,000	
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	505,000	328,000	177,000		177,000	

(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	13,000,000	.....	.....	150,000	.....	150,000
(FDP)	NORTH LAS VEGAS, CHANNEL "A", NV	1,100,000	100,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, RENO, NV	1,700,000	630,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	1,800,000	175,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	NEW JERSEY						
(E)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	400,000	.....
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	1,000,000	100,000	450,000	.....	450,000	.....
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	1,717,000	1,645,000	72,000	.....	72,000	.....
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS—CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	1,300,000	1,246,000	54,000	.....	54,000	.....
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	1,050,000	100,000	450,000	.....	450,000	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	5,247,000	2,399,000	1,200,000	.....	1,200,000	.....
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	2,800,000	1,054,000	510,000	.....	510,000	.....
(E)	TOWNSEND INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200,000
	NEW MEXICO						
(E)	RIO GRANDE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NM AND CO	2,270,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
	NEW YORK						
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	1,380,000	305,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL—HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	45,400,000	3,222,000	.....	378,000	.....	878,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	7,000,000	3,205,000	1,400,000	.....	1,400,000	.....
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY AND PA	1,300,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	2,399,000	859,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	3,000,000	1,243,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	2,700,000	178,000	1,250,000	.....	1,250,000	.....
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	890,000	653,000	115,000	.....	115,000	.....
(BE)	ORCHARD BEACH, BRONX, NY	300,000	.....	.....	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,100,000	100,000	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	2,500,000	789,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	1,300,000	100,000	451,000	.....	451,000	.....
(FDP)	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY	1,200,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	31,200,000	2,640,000	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR—NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	154,124,000	1,000,000	.....	330,000	.....	330,000
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,097,000	1,568,000	450,000	.....	450,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR—NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	26,330,000	1,980,000		100,000		100,000
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	4,445,000	2,275,000	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	1,560,000	1,432,000	128,000		128,000	
(FC)	GRAND FORKS / EAST GRAND FORKS, ND AND MN				178,000		2,678,000
	OHIO						
(E)	GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OXBOW AREA, OH	450,000		100,000		100,000	
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	600,000		100,000		100,000	
	OKLAHOMA						
	GRAND NEOSHO RIVER BASIN, OK	1,500,000	1,000,000			500,000	
	OREGON						
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA	4,228,000	2,916,000	724,000		724,000	
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	970,000	420,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	866,000	265,000	217,000		217,000	
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,284,000	1,286,000	420,000		420,000	
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	1,465,000		100,000		100,000	
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	46,000,000	2,413,000		520,000		520,000
	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY, OR	100,000				100,000	
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	3,000,000			90,000		90,000
(E)	LOWER WEST BR SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIR RESTORATIO	1,300,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	1,560,000	560,000	500,000		500,000	
(E)	TIOGA RIVER WATERSHED, PA	1,000,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	300,000				300,000	
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, STORAGE REALLOCATION, PA AND MD	625,000	375,000	125,000		125,000	

	PUERTO RICO						
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,469,000	1,035,000	.....	665,000	.....	665,000
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	21,116,000	150,000	.....	700,000	.....	700,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	8,888,000	150,000	.....	267,000	.....	267,000
	RHODE ISLAND						
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST AND SRTM DMG REDU	700,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
	PROVIDENCE, RI (FOX PT. HURRICANE BARRIER)	350,000	.....	.....	.....	350,000	.....
	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,100,000	100,000	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	1,600,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	95,174,000	225,000	.....	200,000	.....	200,000
(BE)	PAWLEY'S ISLAND, SC	100,00	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	1,828,000	504,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC AND NC	1,615,000	100,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	TENNESSEE						
(FC)	EAST RIDGE, HAMILTON CO, TN	12,500,000	200,000	.....	300,000	.....	300,000
(FC)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, TN	3,100,000	.....	.....	150,000	.....	150,000
	TEXAS						
(FDP)	ALPINE, TX	1,143,000	393,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	271,110,000	4,059,000	.....	1,830,000	.....	1,830,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,740,000	525,000	800,000	.....	800,000	.....
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	125,733,000	1,963,000	.....	937,000	.....	937,000
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	2,040,000	1,015,000	220,000	.....	220,000	.....
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	30,900,000	3,347,000	.....	940,000	.....	940,000
(FC)	FORT WORTH SUMPS, 14 AND 15, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN,	11,050,000	.....	.....	70,000	.....	70,000
(N)	GIWW—ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	19,510,000	1,506,000	.....	324,000	.....	324,000
(RCP)	GIWW—BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	2,420,000	89,000	220,000	.....	220,000	.....
(RDP)	GIWW—HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	3,679,000	1,651,000	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....
(RCP)	GIWW—PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	1,180,000	100,000	170,000	.....	170,000	.....
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	6,470,000	45,000	.....	105,000	.....	105,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	162,240,000	3,704,000	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	17,955,000	2,312,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	870,000	100,000	130,000	.....	130,000	.....
(N)	PACKERY CHANNEL, CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	888,000	709,000	179,000		179,000	
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	773,000	523,000	211,000		211,000	
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	75,818,000	134,000		370,000		370,000
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	141,465,000	4,110,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	8,235,000	5,569,000	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	RINCON CANAL, CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	100,000				100,000	
	UTAH						
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	1,550,000	635,000	350,000		350,000	
(E)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER RESTORATION, UT	1,100,000	89,000	150,000		150,000	
	VIRGIN ISLANDS						
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	3,710,000	89,000		270,000		270,000
	VERMONT						
	SUMERSET AND SEARSBORG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, VT					100,000	
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, DEEP CREEK, VA	1,168,000		100,000		100,000	
(SPE)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	1,451,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, VA AND MD	900,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, VA	1,630,000	500,000	250,000		250,000	
	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, VA (EMBREY DAM REMOVAL)	100,000				100,000	
	WASHINGTON						
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	1,300,000	100,000	600,000		600,000	
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	1,727,000	554,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	900,000	440,000	252,000		252,000	
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	11,250,000			460,000		460,000
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,225,000	2,169,000	56,000		56,000	
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	799,000	356,000	100,000		100,000	

(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	2,099,000	700,000	386,000		386,000	
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	2,435,000	721,000	400,000		400,000	
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	900,000	400,000	100,000		100,000	
	WEST VIRGINIA						
(SPE)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV	1,277,000	792,000	200,000		200,000	
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	11,700,000	11,579,000	121,000		121,000	
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, WV	17,000,000	207,000		672,000		1,000,000
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	230,000,000	9,850,000		830,000		830,000
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	1,915,000	1,086,000	553,000		553,000	
(E)	TYGART THREE BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV	875,000	375,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	TYGART VALLEY R B, GRASSY RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	1,212,000	924,000	100,000		100,000	
(COMP)	WEST VIRGINIA STATEWIDE FLOOD PROTECT PLAN	2,000,000				400,000	
	WYOMING						
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	1,482,000	1,080,000	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			11,690,000		12,810,000	
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES			100,000		100,000	
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA			400,000		400,000	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES			9,000,000		9,000,000	
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES			500,000		500,000	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES			340,000		340,000	
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS			671,000		671,000	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)			400,000		400,000	
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			420,000		420,000	
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			37,000,000		37,000,000	
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS			130,000		130,000	
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)			800,000		800,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	.....	.....	800,000	.....	800,000	.....
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−26,006,000	.....	−24,956,000	.....
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	114,098,000	36,102,000	122,923,000	41,142,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT
(RDP) REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT
(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE
(SPEC) SPECIAL

Coastal studies of navigation improvements, Alaska.—An appropriation of $600,000, an increase of $450,000, has been included for the Corps to initiate feasibility studies at Kotzebue, Akutan, and False Pass in Alaska. The feasibility studies continue the effort to evaluate the navigation needs of Alaska's coastal communities. By combining several harbor and navigation studies into this one study, the Corps is expected to be able to continue significant work substantially below the cost to address each project separately.

Nome Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided an additional $40,000 over the budget request for the Nome Harbor project in Alaska for the Corps to complete the feasibility study improvements at the harbor.

Valdez Harbor, AK.—Funding in the amount of $100,000 has been included for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study of expanding the harbor at Valdez, AK.

White River navigation to Newport, AR.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps to complete a project study plan and initiate a general reevaluation study to confirm economic justification and the environmental acceptability of providing navigation improvements for a segment of the White River in central Arkansas in the vicinity of Newport, AR.

Bolinas Lagoon, CA.—The Committee has provided an additional $510,000 over the budget request for the Bolinas Lagoon, CA, project for the Corps to expedite feasibility phase activities.

Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, comprehensive basin study, California.—An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to undertake comprehensive basin studies for the Sacramento/San Joaquin River basins in California. The study would analyze the flood risk in the watersheds and evaluate environmental sensitive and long-term solutions from a system perspective. Given the size and complexity of the activities associated with this study, the Committee believes that the normal funding for reconnaissance studies should not apply.

San Joaquin River Basin Stockton metro area, CA.—The Committee has provided $225,000 for a feasibility study for flood damage reduction of the Stockton metropolitan area and $225,000 for a feasibility study of Farmington Dam. The Committee understands that the Corps and the local sponsors have agreed that upon completion of the reconnaissance study, two separate feasibility studies will be conducted. The Committee directs that the flood damage reduction feasibility study focus on the flood protection project under construction by the local sponsor and the study be developed as a report for review by the Chief and Secretary as required by section 211(e)(2) of Public Law 104–303. Upon completion of the report and approval by the Secretary, the recommended project is considered eligible for reimbursement and credit as provided in section 211 of Public Law 104–303.

Florida mitigation banking study.—In order to further the goals established in section 307(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, the Committee directs the Corps to use $400,000 of available funds to complete, within 1 year, a study to determine what measures need to be taken to facilitate the establishment of private and public mitigation banks in Florida where significant wetland and aquatic resource impacts are expected.

Naussau County, FL.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $290,000 for the Naussau County, FL, study, an increase of $150,000, for the Corps to conduct a general reevaluation report for the project.

Savannah River basin comprehensive water resources study, Georgia and South Carolina.—An amount of $300,000 is recommended for the Corps to initiate a comprehensive study to address the current and future needs for flood damage prevention and reduction, water supply, and other related water resource needs in the Savannah River basin in Georgia and South Carolina. The study is to be limited to an analysis of water resource issues that fall within the traditional civil works mission of the Corps.

Kaumalapau Harbor, HI.—The Corps of Engineers may use up to $900,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design activities at Kaumalapau Harbor, HI. Funding is contingent upon the State of Hawaii taking control over the harbor. The Committee is aware that Lanai's petroleum products supplier has indicated its intention to cancel all deliveries to the island due to the unsafe condition of the breakwater.

The Committee recognizes that the standard procedures in determining a benefit/cost ratio may not fully take into consideration the unique requirements of an island State dependent on ocean traffic for the delivery of supplies. The Committee, therefore, expects the Army Corps of Engineers to continue efforts to resolve concerns about the formula for establishing a benefit/cost ratio. Similarly, the Committee urges the Corps to work with residents and businesses on Lanai, the barge operators, the State of Hawaii to determine how best to resolve the safety problems at Kaumalapau Harbor.

Laulaulei, HI.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance level study of flooding problems at Laulaulie, HI, at the naval magazine and the surrounding area.

Upper Mississippi and Illinois navigation study, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee has included $7,700,000, the full budget request, for the Upper Mississippi and Illinois navigation study. Given the importance of the undertaking, the Committee expects the Corps to make additional resources available in fiscal year 1998, if necessary, to maintain the completion schedule for the study. The Committee reaffirms the position taken on this project in the conference report on the Energy and Water Development Act for 1996.

Kentucky lock and dam, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided the full budget request of $1,750,000 for the Kentucky lock and dam to continue preconstruction engineering and design activities. The Committee understands that the preconstruction engineering and design is scheduled to be completed in September 1998. If additional funding is needed during the year to keep work on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to reprogram funds into the project.

The Committee is supportive of the Corps efforts to include the Kentucky lock project in the fiscal year 1999 budget and future year budget schedules. Through 1998, over $10,000,000 will have been spent on preconstruction engineering and design. The Corps

and the administration should make every effort to avoid further delays in commencing the next stage for this project.

Licking River watershed, Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps to initiate individual reconnaissance studies to investigate structural and nonstructural measures to reduce flood damages in communities along the Licking River in Kentucky, including Falmouth, Butler, Cynthiana, and other South and North Fork damage centers. In conducting the studies, the Corps is to evaluate the feasibility of constructing a flood wall around Falmouth, KY.

Grand Isle and vicinity, Lousiana.—The recommendation includes an amount of $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Grand Isle and vicinity, LA, project.

North Branch Potomac River environmental restoration, Maryland and West Virginia.—In carrying out the planning and development of the environmental restoration projects on the North Branch, Potomac River, Maryland and West Virginia, the Secretary is encouraged to investigate projects that demonstrate the feasibility of resource recycling and reuse, including the utilization of coal combustion byproducts (fly ash fluidized combustion ash, flue gas desulfurization byproducts) in the abatement of acid mine drainage.

Ocean City and vicinity, Maryland, (Assateaque Island).—The Committee is aware of concerns about the severe erosion on the north end of Assateaque Island National Seashore which is partially attributable to the Federal navigation project at Ocean City, MD. Last year, the Committee provided $150,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of measures to mitigate associated damages to the shoreline. The Committee expects that once the Corps and the National Park Service resolve remaining issues of allocation of costs and operation and maintenance that the Corps should include funding in their next budget request.

Grand Forks, ND, East Grand Forks, MN.—In an effort to address the flood control needs in the Grand Forks, ND, and East Grand Forks, MN, areas which were devastated by flooding this spring, the Committee has included $2,500,000 for the Corps to conduct planning for a combined flood control project for the area. By combining both projects under one postauthorization report, it is hoped that comprehensive flood control project will be eligible for authorization in the next water resources authorization bill to be considered by Congress.

Kansas City, MO-KS.—The Committee is aware that the Kansas City, MO, and Kansas City, KS, flood control study encompasses two States, two rivers, seven separable units, and five separate sponsors; and, therefore, believes that the study area and issues are too large and complex to be adequately address by the standard reconnaissance study simplified analysis of limited scope as set forth in current Corps policy. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps to use the additional $300,000 provided to scope potential multifeasibility studies, develop associated project study plans and negotiate feasibility cost sharing agreements related to the study.

Devils Lake, ND.—An appropriation of $1,100,000, the full budget request, has been included for the Corps to expedite work on the Devils Lake, ND, feasibility study for lake stabilization. The Committee urges the Corps to work cooperatively with the Bureau of Reclamation, the State of North Dakota, other interested parties, and Canada in this effort. The Committee expects the study, which is the document on which a project authorization will be based, will address all aspects of the project set out in the study evaluation.

Lower Platte River and tributaries, Nebraska.—Appropriations made for the Lower Platte and tributaries study in Nebraska should also be used to conduct studies authorized by section 503(d)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Grand Neosho River basin, OK.—An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Grand Neosho River basin reconnaissance study in Oklahoma.

Tahoe basin, Nevada and California.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for the Tahoe basin study in Nevada and California. The study will examine flood control, water quality, wetland habitat, and other environmental restoration opportunities. The study is critical for restoring the health of Lake Tahoe and the Lake Tahoe basin. If additional funding is needed during the year to keep work on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to reprogram additional funds into the project.

Tillamook Bay and estuary, OR.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study of the Tilamook Bay estuary and watershed in Oregon. The primary focus of the study is dredging to reduce the risk of flooding, but the study will also address ecosystem restoration possibilities and other water resource needs.

Turtle Creek watershed, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 each for the Corps to undertake reconnaissance studies at the following locations: Upper Turtle Creek, Lyons Run, and Brush Creek within the Turtle Creek basin. The purpose of the reconnaissance studies is to identify and prioritize corrective actions concerning acid mine drainage within the watershed near the Borough of Export, PA.

Charleston Harbor, SC (deepening and widening).—The Committee continues to support the Charleston Harbor deepening and widening project in South Carolina and has provided the full budget request of $200,000 for fiscal year 1998, which will allow the Corps to complete all preconstruction engineering and design in fiscal year 1998, including preparation of plans and specifications for the first construction contract, making the project ready for a fiscal year 1999 new construction start. The Committee would be supportive of the Corps efforts to include the Charleston Harbor deepening and widening project in the fiscal year 1999 budget and future year budget schedules. If additional funding is needed during the year to keep work on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to reprogram funds into the project.

Mustang Island, Corpus Christi, TX (Packery Channel).—The Committee understands the need to construct Packery Channel in Nueces County, Texas. This channel will be an important outlet from Corpus Christi Bay and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to

the Gulf of Mexico, providing significant economic and safety benefits for waterborne traffic. The Committee is concerned that the Corps did not request any funding to perform an initial study, as authorized by the Water Resources Act of 1996. The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps to perform this study.

Rincon Canal, TX.—The Rincon Canal system connects the Corpus Christi ship channel to the Rincon industrial park, where a number of businesses are located. The Corps is directed to use $100,000 provide herein to perform necessary studies to determine the acceptability of the project during fiscal year 1998. If the Secretary determines that maintenance dredging is acceptable, he is urged to use available funds to perform necessary dredging this fiscal year.

Somerset and Searsburg Dams, VT.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconaissance study of possible operational or other changes, including the conveyance of Somerset and Searsburg Dams to the Corps, to enhance ecosystem restoration.

Marmet lock and dam, WV.—The Committee continues to support the Marmet lock and dam project in West Virginia and has provided the full budget request of $830,000 for fiscal year 1998 which will allow the Corps to complete all preconstruction engineering and design in fiscal year 1998, making the project ready for a fiscal year 1999 new construction start. Given the size of this and other inland navigation projects and the severely limited resource availability in future years, it will be necessary to carefully schedule the funding needs into out-year budget profiles. The Committee would be supportive of the Corps efforts to include the Marmet project in the fiscal year 1999 budget and future year budget schedules. The Marmet project has already had nearly 10 million dollars' worth of preconstruction engineering and design over a 5-year period, and the Corps and the administration should make every effort to avoid further delays in commencing the next stage for this project. If additional funding is needed during the year to keep work on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to reprogram funds into the project.

Research and development.—An appropriation of $37,000,000 is recommended for research and development activities of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark funding for university research institutions given the limited resources and severe budget constraints.

The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for zebra mussel research. The Committee has been informed of the need to conduct activities in the Great Lakes region and Lake Champlain, VT. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to apply the funds to various regions geographically, and on varying technologies and applications in order to accomplish the highest-priority work.

The Committee recommendation also supports the full budget request for the Corps to continue activities related to the comprehensive flood impact response modeling system [CFIRMS].

Coordination and studies with other agencies.—An appropriation of $12,810,000 is recommended for coordination studies with other agencies for fiscal year 1998. An additional $1,000,000 over the

budget request is provided for planning assistance to States to reduce the backlog of activities waiting funding.

The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to participate as a stakeholder in the interagency ecosystem management task force's Pacific Northwest forest case study with responsibility to restore, sustain, and develop coordinated watershed ecosystem management strategies for species viability on all public lands.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1997	$1,081,942,000
Budget estimate, 1998	1,062,470,000
Committee recommendation	1,284,266,000

An appropriation of $1,284,266,000 is recommended for ongoing construction activities.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS AND PROGRAM EXECUTION

The Committee has been faced with difficult choices in development of the budget for the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1998. Lack of allocation for nondefense discretionary programs has severely limited the Committee's ability to respond to needs of the Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program as contained in the numerous requests of Members. The constrained budget environment will also require changes in the way the Corps manages their programs in order to realize the greatest efficiency and public benefit from the funding available for fiscal year 1998. Therefore, the Committee expects the Corps to manage resources on a nationwide basis.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	ALABAMA				
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,331,000	1,703,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	91,200,000	87,760,000	3,440,000	3,440,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,400,000	473,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	ALASKA				
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	4,000,000	205,000	.....	3,945,000
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	5,000,000	172,000	.....	4,500,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM, AK (SHORELINE EROSION)	3,623,000	2,423,000	.....	1,200,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	10,116,000	2,528,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(N)	ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK	13,200,000	760,000	.....	6,638,000
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	13,800,000	11,500,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	ARKANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR	.....	.....	.....	300,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	10,579,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	632,500,000	601,803,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000,000	25,238,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(E)	RED RIVER ENERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	3,500,000	.....	.....	3,500,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	47,500,000	2,756,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	43,800,000	22,527,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,900,000	32,187,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	69,200,000	44,775,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	12,300,000	3,035,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	180,000,000	29,668,000	11,700,000	20,700,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	121,700,000	13,903,000	16,100,000	26,100,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,560,000	1,280,000	300,000	2,300,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,600,000	10,485,000	7,300,000	9,300,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800,000	16,490,000	1,100,000	6,885,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	15,300,000	4,195,000	3,100,000	5,600,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	62,500,000	53,565,000	8,935,000	8,935,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	25,700,000	13,042,000	8,620,000	8,620,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,100,000	99,593,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	3,693,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	12,640,000	1,571,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	61,100,000	55,700,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	513,462,000	52,900,000	52,900,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	20,300,000	13,680,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,660,000	1,587,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	16,200,000	4,346,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
	COLORADO				
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	6,000,000	2,702,000	3,298,000	3,298,000
	DELAWARE				
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	13,300,000	4,694,000	224,000	224,000
	FLORIDA				
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	123,760,000	31,114,000	2,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,431,000,000	435,207,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
(BE)	DADE COUNTY, FL	163,300,000	55,847,000	8,185,000	8,185,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	111,200,000	19,986,000	278,000	278,000
(FC)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000,000	.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
	FT. PIERCE BEACH, FL	13,000,000	1,492,000	.....	2,300,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	180,700,000	73,819,000	693,000	693,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	30,600,000	2,225,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	231,500,000	31,371,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL	43,600,000	5,518,000	206,000	206,000

(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	19,985,000	6,098,000	1,872,000	1,872,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	25,600,000	4,906,000	99,000	99,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	51,066,000	18,071,000	2,889,000	2,889,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	75,900,000	9,591,000	202,000	202,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	129,000,000	31,147,000	4,586,000	4,586,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	55,200,000	13,213,000	500,000	500,000
	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	62,400,000	4,779,000	.....	5,000,000
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200,000	.....	900,000	900,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	8,748,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	596,150,000	590,195,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	5,145,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
	HAWAII				
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	13,046,000	326,000	275,000	275,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	9,117,000	2,129,000	691,000	691,000
	ILLINOIS				
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL AND MO (DEF C	108,530,000	96,484,000	575,000	575,000
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	144,000,000	9,953,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,859,000	24,336,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	25,736,000	3,608,000	4,370,000	5,370,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	22,926,000	8,770,000	4,230,000	4,230,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	18,800,000	11,005,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	741,332,000	723,363,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	27,100,000	25,000,000	.....	2,100,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL AND KY	1,020,000,000	243,620,000	98,440,000	98,440,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,940,000	678,000	5,262,000	5,262,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MO, MN	241,399,000	144,124,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
	INDIANA				
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	14,600,000	10,050,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	34,550,000	16,108,000	5,300,000	6,300,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	114,000,000	48,012,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
	WABASH RIVER, NEW HARMONY, IN	2,433,000	112,000	.....	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	IOWA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,900,000	3,050,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	81,400,000	32,026,000	3,895,000	3,895,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	217,567,000	95,788,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,610,000	1,527,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	41,874,000	14,283,000	8,255,000	8,255,000
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	27,230,000	3,271,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	8,177,000	2,443,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	KENTUCKY				
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	157,299,000	147,466,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	18,500,000	2,052,000	250,000	250,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAMS, KY AND IN	268,000,000	13,768,000	1,720,000	1,720,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	11,571,000	2,617,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	LOUISIANA				
(FC)	ALOHA—RIGOLETTE, LA	7,378,000	4,035,000	1,510,000	1,510,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA				3,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	505,000,000	348,022,000	6,448,000	16,448,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,500,000	69,793,000	541,000	541,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER—GULF OUTLET, LA	610,000,000	104,930,000	2,018,000	2,018,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	164,000,000	21,665,000	1,793,000	1,793,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	168,000,000	139,612,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,888,342,000	1,671,783,000	9,990,000	16,490,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	280,000,000	18,560,000	6,440,000	6,440,000
(FC)	WEST BANK—EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTEC	120,000,000	3,098,000	2,385,000	2,385,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,900,000	29,134,000	4,300,000	4,300,000

	MARYLAND				
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	12,000,000	1,201,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	265,000,000	29,930,000	1,797,000	1,797,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIR. RESTORATION AND PROJECT, MD, VA	10,000,000	.....	.....	1,000,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	627,000	542,000	542,000
(SPEC)	CUMBERLAND, MD (SEC. 535 WRDA 96)	375,000	.....	.....	375,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000,000	10,784,000	30,621,000	25,621,000
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	19,350,000	2,563,000	3,920,000	5,920,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	17,400,000	2,000,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	7,930,000	3,950,000	1,880,000	1,880,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	29,100,000	28,100,000	700,000	700,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN	8,700,000	2,874,000	.....	1,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	12,400,000	.....	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,220,000	1,832,000	500,000	1,500,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	14,900,000	1,283,000	300,000	300,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	JACKSON COUNTY, MS WATER SUPPLY	10,000,000	.....	.....	3,000,000
(FDP)	NATCHER BLUFF, MS	12,900,000	45,000,000	.....	4,000,000
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF WALKIAK BLUFF, MS	4,000,000	2,000,000	.....	2,000,000
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	198,000,000	92,173,000	17,900,000	17,900,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU—JACKSON, MO	33,400,000	24,908,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	17,738,000	8,905,000	2,347,000	2,347,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	278,000,000	183,901,000	3,446,000	3,446,000
(FC)	ST GENEVIEVE, MO	35,387,000	8,569,000	4,145,000	4,145,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	1,100,000	800,000	800,000
	MONTANA				
	NORTH FORK, FLATHEAD RIVER, MT (SEC. 584 MONITORING STATION)	50,000	.....	.....	50,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000,000	2,089,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	6,036,000	1,850,000	500,000	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	NEVADA				
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	176,200,000	29,028,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	92,700,000	13,699,000	280,000	280,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	375,000,000	29,894,000	3,076,000	3,076,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	20,700,000	10,334,000	7,090,000	7,090,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	14,800,000	500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	10,600,000	2,226,000	277,000	3,000,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,115,000,000	84,304,000	15,116,000	15,116,000
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	7,200,000	1,616,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	64,500,000	11,386,000	600,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	3,720,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	407,000	2,720,000	2,720,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600,000	600,000	300,000	3,000,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800,000	8,675,000	560,000	560,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	59,500,000	3,720,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	3,020,000	457,000	2,563,000	2,563,000
	NEW YORK				
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	81,000,000	12,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	62,400,000	38,465,000	600,000	600,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	326,000,000	30,588,000	285,000	285,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	526,000,000	41,678,000	4,802,000	4,802,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ	324,000,000	197,606,000	429,000	429,000
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	51,300,000	1,050,000	.....	2,000,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(N)	AIWW—REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	75,972,000	54,756,000	7,000,000	7,000,000

(BE)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	169,780,000	21,419,000	2,840,000	2,840,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR CHANNEL WIDENING, NC	224,200,000	4,068,000	3,700,000	2,430,000
(BE)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	25,200,000	3,529,000	1,070,000	1,070,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
	BUFORD TRENTON IRRIGATION DIST., ND	34,000,000	15,992,000	.....	3,000,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	40,840,000	319,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,700,000	1,226,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	15,800,000	13,365,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,150,000	4,797,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	33,580,000	22,632,000	500,000	500,000
	OHIO				
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,300,000	552,000	105,000	105,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,414,000	1,524,000	1,890,000	1,890,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	13,138,000	1,588,000	2,120,000	2,120,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000,000	97,431,000	2,518,000	2,518,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,758,000	35,000,000	15,181,000	15,181,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	9,260,000	5,332,000	3,928,000	3,928,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	74,800,000	62,394,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	36,000,000	2,009,000	95,000	95,000
	OREGON				
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	10,990,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	75,000,000	13,011,000	8,400,000	8,400,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	109,025,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	181,000,000	173,894,000	250,000	2,900,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500,000	2,950,000	6,205,000	6,205,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	9,800,000	2,639,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	14,800,000	2,764,000	425,000	425,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	695,000,000	42,426,000	2,700,000	12,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	61,730,000	15,553,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575,000	2,534,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,000,000	28,745,000	13,000,000	13,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	418,825,000	359,772,000	12,712,000	12,712,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	63,318,000	4,586,000	510,000	510,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	25,199,000	11,868,000	11,868,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	34,400,000	4,092,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	206,673,000	203,935,000	1,869,000	1,869,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,535,000	19,365,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	TEXAS				
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	22,293,000	11,006,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	70,024,000	19,478,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	114,500,000	96,351,000	5,290,000	5,290,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	63,557,000	56,429,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(N)	GIWW—SARGENT BEACH, TX	58,770,000	51,848,000	940,000	940,000
(N)	HOUSTON—GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	316,541,000	18,800,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	9,516,000	6,225,000	3,291,000	3,291,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	147,800,000	147,410,000	390,000	390,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	209,480,000	49,409,000	9,590,000	13,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	9,800,000	729,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	62,512,000	58,544,000	.....	10,000,000
	UTAH				
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	9,400,000	2,076,000	700,000	700,000
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	23,100,000	1,961,000	1,526,000	1,526,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	19,368,000	1,098,000	1,098,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,400,000	5,130,000	4,400,000	4,400,000

(BE)	VIRIGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	8,460,000	7,535,000	.....	925,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	66,810,000	15,992,000	.....	15,000,000
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	1,376,217,000	380,014,000	127,000,000	117,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	224,217,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	87,700,000	1,893,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	12,000,000	15,992,000	.....	1,500,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,597,597,000	607,164,000	7,927,000	55,667,000
(FDP)	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	100,000	.....	.....	100,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV AND OH	373,000,000	340,212,000	5,356,000	5,356,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	29,500,000	1,457,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	221,600,000	201,566,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	WISCONSIN				
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	17,000,000	.....	.....	713,000
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	7,260,000	3,102,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	.....	.....	2,600,000	6,600,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	.....	.....	2,000,000	2,750,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	.....	.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	.....	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	.....	.....	500,000	500,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	.....	.....	7,800,000	7,800,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	.....	.....	18,048,000	18,048,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	.....	.....	.....	10,000,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	.....	.....	32,400,000	34,300,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	.....	.....	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	.....	.....	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	.....	.....	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	.....	.....	5,800,000	6,885,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	.....	.....	21,175,000	24,752,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−45,863,000	−46,153,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	.....	.....	1,077,470,000	1,284,266,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

Dillingham, AK, shoreline erosion.—The Committee has included $1,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Dillingham, AK, shoreline erosion control project. The Committee understands that serious erosion has endangered public facilities and that the project helps eliminate the erosion.

St. Paul Harbor, AK.—An appropriation of $6,638,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to complete planning for the St. Paul Harbor, AK, project and initiate construction in fiscal year 1998. The Committee understands that a large part of the first year funding requirement is mobilization costs associated with this remote Alaska island.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system (Montgomery Point lock and dam), Arkansas.—The bill includes $10,000,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project, as proposed in the budget request, which is $3,000,000 more than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Red River emergency bank protection, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $3,500,000 is included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete construction of the Black Lake revetment feature of the Red River emergency bank protection project in Arkansas.

Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, AR.—Using $300,000 provided herein, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete reconstruction and rehabilitation of Faulkner County Levee No. 1 (Tucker Creek) in accordance with section 110 of Public Law 101–640, and in accordance with Public Law 99–662 cost-sharing requirements.

Los Angeles Harbor, CA.—An appropriation of $26,100,000 is recommended for the Los Angeles Harbor project in California. This is $10,000,000 over the budget for fiscal year 1998. This is a good example for the impact of current and future budget constraints have on providing for the infrastructure needs of the Nation. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers could utilize $60,000,000 to maintain efficient progress on this project which contributes billions of dollars to the national economy through export and import of goods, direct and indirect employment, and associated economic activity generated in the region. Yet, only $16,100,000 has been included in the budget request for fiscal year 1998. The Committee is unable to provide the full amount required for 1998, and budget profiles for the next several years project a continued decline in available resources to support projects such as the Los Angeles Harbor that contribute so much to the national economy.

Marysville/Yuba City, CA.—An amount of $9,300,000 has been included by the Committee to accelerate work on flood control levee work in the Marysville and Yuba City area of California. The Committee understands that a levee break during the January 1997 flood caused loss of life and substantial property damage in the area.

Mid-Valley area levee reconstruction, California.—The Committee has provided an increase of $2,500,000 over the budget request for the Corps to accelerate construction of levee reconstruction work of the Mid-Valley Area Levee Reconstruction project in California in order to have flood protection in place at the earliest possible time.

Sacramento River flood control project, (Glenn-Colusa irrigation district), California.—The Committee has provided $600,000, the same as the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction on the riffle restoration project.

Faulkner Island Lighthouse, CT.—The Committee is aware that the budget request did not include funding to continue the shoreline protection project for the Faulkner Island Lighthouse in Connecticut, but understands the available fiscal year 1997 carryover funds could be used to continue the project in fiscal year 1998. The Corps is directed to use $400,000 of available funds to continue the project in fiscal year 1998.

Canaveral Harbor, FL.—The recommendation includes $3,500,000 for the Corps to proceed with the Canaveral Harbor project in Florida. The Committee understands that contract work had to be terminated and funding reprogrammed from the project following the explosion of an Air Force rocket and subsequent contamination of the project area. Since the problem is now resolved, the Committee has provided the full capability of the Corps to award a new contract and resume work.

Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for the Everglades and south Florida ecosystem restoration project in Florida as requested by the President. The President's budget transmitted to the Congress in February of this year contained $75,000,000 for this project. However, a subsequent budget amendment reduced this amount to the annual incremental amount which could actually be spent in fiscal year 1998 without carrying over large unused balances into future years. The Committee concurs with the amended request and has provided the full $10,000,000 as requested.

Fort Pierce Beach, FL.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,300,000 for the Corps to continue work on the Fort Pierce Beach, FL, project. Activities include completion of a general reevaluation report and renourishment work.

Kissimmee River restoration, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Kissimmee River restoration project in Florida. This is the same amount as included in the budget request.

Panama City beaches, FL.—The Committee is aware that Hurricane Opal devastated the beaches and area around Panama City, FL, in the summer of 1995. The Hurricane left the area without hurricane and flood protection by stripping the coastline of all beach sand which provides storm surge protection. The Committee understands that the State and local officials believe that restoration of hurricane protection is essential. Therefore, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 to continue this important project.

McCook Reservoir, IL.—While the budget request for the McCook Reservoir, IL, project does not include a request for new funding, the Committee understands that programmed carryover funding will finance fiscal year 1998 work activities.

O'Hare Reservoir [CUP], IL.—The Committee understands that the Corps has not requested funding in their fiscal year 1998 budget to complete the O'Hare Reservoir, IL, project, but plans to reprogram available funding to this purpose. Given the importance of

this project, the Committee has recommended an appropriation of $2,100,000 to ensure completion in fiscal year 1998.

Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.—In the report to Congress on the Environmental Management Program, the Corps should include, as complete as possible, a quantification and qualification of project results, since inception, to provide an assessment of the Nation's return on investment for projects completed. This report will help give the Congress a fuller basis to evaluate the success of the program.

Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $3,000,000 to continue the development of the Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge project in Louisiana.

Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 for this project to be used by the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of parallel protection and other priority work in fiscal year 1998.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—An appropriation of $16,490,000 is recommended for the Red River Waterway, LA, project. The additional funding is provided for the Corps to complete the Eagle Bend Capout, and to initiate the Hadden-Fort DeRussy reinforcement; Ben Routh-Dupre reinforcement, and saline reinforcement in pool 1; Powhatan Dikes in pool 3; East Point Dikes in pool 4; and Moss Capout phase 2 in pool 5.

The Committee is informed of the discovery of the shipwreck, *Kentucky,* located in the Red River Waterway. Given the significance of this find, the Committee expects the Corps to follow applicable rules and guidelines in the recovery of the *Kentucky,* and to include in future budget requests funding to address this new requirement.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, MD.—The Committee understands the Corps' Baltimore District recently completed a limited reevaluation report with a favorable recommendation for the Brewerton Channel extension and that the report is presently under review by the Corps. Given the fact that the project was authorized in 1958 and is necessary for safety and efficient passage of the larger ships calling on the Port of Baltimore, the Committee hopes the Corps will give serious consideration to including the project in the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

Poplar Island, MD.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,621,000 for the Poplar Island restoration project in Maryland, which is $5,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1998. The reduction is made without prejudice and is based on delays being experienced with real estate acquisition during the current year. The Committee is informed that previously appropriated funds will be carried over into fiscal year 1998, thus reducing the need for new appropriations to the amount recommended. The Committee further understands that phase I work can be fully funded with the amount included for fiscal 1998 and the expected carryover.

North Jefferson City, MO.—The Committee notes that despite its encouragement in last year's report, only minimal progress has been made. The Committee directs that the Corps proceed expeditiously on the project, develop a project timetable, and submit a report to the Committee.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway wildlife mitigation, Alabama and Mississippi.—Of the funds provided for wildlife mitigation on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, the Committee encourages the Corps to consider acquiring additional acreage in Neshoba County, MS, using existing authorization for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway mitigation, to alleviate access problems associated with previously acquired mitigation lands in that area.

Reno, NV, flood warning system.—The Committee understands that the Corps is proceeding with activities related to the need for a flood preparedness and flood warning system for Reno, NV, as directed in the 1997 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. The Corps is directed to use $250,000 of available funds to undertake planning for this work in fiscal year 1998.

Acequias irrigation system, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the acequias irrigation system in New Mexico in order to continue progress on this important project.

Wilmington Harbor channel widening, North Carolina.—The Committee is aware that the Wilmington Harbor project in North Carolina involves three features which, if consolidated and not undertaken separately, would improve the construction management of the total project and produce a lower overall project cost to the Federal Government. In light of the potential efficiencies and savings, the Committee has included language in the bill to consolidate the three features of the project by modifying the project authorization. The Committee has included $2,430,000, $1,270,000 below the budget request, to begin construction of the modified Wilmington Harbor project in fiscal year 1998.

Buford Trenton Irrigation District, ND.—An appropriation of $3,000,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to begin to prioritizing the sites and land acquisition process for the Buford Trenton Irrigation District project in North Dakota.

Houston-Galveston navigation channels, Texas.—The Committee understands the critical importance of widening and deepening the Houston-Galveston navigation channels, including the Port of Houston and the Houston ship channel. The Port of Houston draws cargo from every State, provides over $5,500,000,000 to the Nation's economy, generates nearly 200,000 jobs, and is the largest container port in the Nation. It is the only major port in the United States that remains at a 40-foot depth, and the Committee understands the need to widen and deepen the Houston-Galveston navigation channels to permit safer, more cost-effective movement of cargo. The Committee is informed that the Corps believes it could use $23,900,000 in fiscal year 1998, although only $15,000,000 has been requested. If additional funds are needed in fiscal year 1998, the Committee urges the Corps to reprogram additional resources to the project.

Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee has had to recommend a $10,000,000 reduction below the budget request. The amount recommended is $21,000,000 more than the appropriation for the current fiscal year.

The amount recommended supports continued improvements to juvenile fish bypass activities including extended length screens, electronic smolt monitoring, and other items. Funding is also in-

cluded to complete the John Day passive integrated transponder [PIT] tag detector facility and to evaluate the impacts of reservoir drawdowns.

The Committee believes that the regional consensus is important in carrying out the Columbia Fish Mitigation Program and that the region is better able to determine priorities for fish passage facilities and other modifications to scheduled activities. Therefore, the Committee expects adjustments required by the reduction in funding be made in a cooperative way in the region by the system configuration team [SCT].

The Committee approved the Corps February 25, 1997, reprogramming request related to a study of the biological, social, and economic impacts of a drawdown of John Day, consistent with the terms and conditions specified in its June 6, 1997, letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. The Bonneville Power Administration shall be responsible for preparing the analysis of direct and indirect power costs for this purpose. The Corps is directed to provide a final scoping document for the Committee's approval no later than 90 days from the date of enactment of this act. Based upon and acceptable review of the final scoping document, the Committee will permit the Corps to continue forward with the study within available funds. The Committee specifies that no funds shall be made available to drawdown John Day or make any physical modifications related to such an activity.

Port Seattle, East Waterway, WA.—The Committee encourages the Corps to work with the non-Federal interest to carry out any work associated with the project which is later recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary, and which is determined to be compatible with the project. The Secretary is further encouraged to credit, as appropriate, such non-Federal interest with the cost of such work in accordance with law and established cost sharing procedures. In analyzing the costs and benefits of such project, the Secretary may consider the costs and benefits produced by any work which is carried out by non-Federal interests and which the Secretary determines is compatible with such project.

John Day lock and dam, WA—Kennewick skeletal remains.—The Committee is aware of a recent discovery of prehistoric skeletal remains and believes that it is in the public interest that information providing greater insight into America prehistory should be collected, preserved, and disseminated for the benefit of the country as a whole. The Corps should work cooperatively with all affected interest groups in determining the treatment and disposition of the Kennewick man skeleton, a set of ancient human remains found near Kennewick, WA, on the Columbia River is accomplished in the interest of all Americans. The Committee expects the Corps to keep such objectives in mind and act as an impartial party in resolving questions concerning the study and disposition of the remains.

Houston-Galveston navigation channels, TX.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 to initiate construction of the Houston-Galveston navigation channels project in Texas. The recommendation is the full amount requested in the amended budget request for fiscal year 1998. The Committee does not concur with the fully funded policy proposed by the administration and directs the Corps

of Engineers to enter into a project cooperation agreement for the entire authorized project.

Little Dell Lake, UT.—The Committee has included an appropriation of $1,000,000 to complete construction of recreation facilities at the Little Dell Lake, UT, project, and reimbursement to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City consistent with the May 23, 1997, project cooperation agreement.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—The Committee has provided a total of $55,667,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project.

In addition to amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes $18,000,000 to continue the Harlan, KY, element of the project; $4,690,000 for the Williamsburg, KY, element of the project; $5,800,000 for the Pike County (Tug Fork) element; and $7,200,000 for continuation of flood proofing on the Middlesboro, KY, element of the project. In addition, the Corps is directed to continue construction of the Pike County, KY, element using funds previously appropriated.

The Committee recommendation also includes $3,000,000 for the Upper Mingo County, WV, element; $6,300,000 for the Lower Mingo (Kermit), WV, element; $1,200,000 for the Wayne County, WV, element; $400,000 for the Tug Fork basin flood warning system; $1,000,000 for the Hatfield Bottom, WV, nonstructural element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, (sec. 202) project; and $150,000 to complete the Lower Mingo, WV, detail project report.

Lower Mud River, Milton, WV.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a review of a National Resource Conservation Service [NRCS] watershed plan and environmental impact statement to determine what changes, if any, are required before construction begins.

Aquatic plant control program.—The Committee has included $6,600,000, a $4,000,000 increase over the budget request, to continue the aquatic plant control program. In light of severe budget constraints and the fact that this is a nationwide program, the Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark the small amount of funding available for fiscal year 1997. The appropriations are to undertake the highest priority activities.

Small flood control projects, (sec. 205).—The Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects is $34,300,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $75,000 to initiate and complete feasibly studies for the Resurrection River, AK, project; $300,000 for design of the Fort Fairfield, ME, flood control project; $275,000 for a cost shared feasibility study at Lake Carl Blackwell, OK; $280,000 for the Snoqualmie River, WA, small flood control project; $250,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete feasibility studies on the March Run (Sullivan County), PA, project; and $100,000 for a reevaluation of the economics and alternatives for flood protection on the Winooski River at Colchester, VT.

Small navigation projects, (sec. 107).—An appropriation of $6,885,000 is recommended for small navigation projects, section 107, projects.

The Committee recommendation includes $175,000 to initiate plans and specification on the Whittier Harbor, AK, project; $75,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Tatitlik Harbor, AK, project; $35,000 to complete the feasibility report the Tamgas Harbor, AK, project; $100,000 each for the Corps to undertake limited reevaluation reports for the Haines Harbor and Kitchikan Harbor, AK, projects; $500,000 for initiation and completion of plans and specifications for the Unalaska Harbor, AK, project; and $100,000 to initiate studies on the Des Arc, AR, project.

Emergency streambank and shoreline protection, (sec. 14).—The Committee recommendation for section 14, emergency streambank and shoreline protection projects is $7,800,000. The recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to undertake erosion studies at Homer Harbor, AK.

The Committee is aware that Tioga County, PA, communities have been devastated regularly by flooding and that there is a need for streambank protection and stabilization as well as stream restoration. The Committee directs the Corps to consider Tioga County for such a project.

Beach erosion control, (sec. 103).—An appropriation of $3,000,000 is recommended for beach erosion control, section 103 projects for fiscal year 1997.

Projects modifications for improvement of the environment, (sec. 1135).—The Committee has provided a total of $24,752,000 for section 1135, projects modifications for improvements of the environment. The recommendation includes $125,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Talkneetna, AK, project; $2,000,000 to continue the Amazon Creek wetlands restoration project in Oregon; $1,052,000 for feasibility studies, plans and specification, and construction of the Bear Creek, King County, WA, project; and $400,000 for feasibility studies for the Lake Washington Ship Canal, WA, Smolt Passage restoration project.

Aquatic ecosystem restoration, (sec. 206).—An appropriation of $2,750,000 is recommended for the newly authorized aquatic ecosystem restoration program. Included in the Committee recommendation is $75,000 for the Badger Slough, AK; $100,000 for the Ship Creek, AK; $75,000 for the Snake River, AK, projects for the Corps to initiate and complete feasibility studies; and $500,000 for the Drakes Creek, Old Hickory Lake, TN, project.

Environmental infrastructure assistance.—Several provisions of the Water Resources Development Acts of 1990, 1992, and 1996 authorized pilot programs to demonstrate the need for Federal planning, design, and construction assistance for water related environmental infrastructure and environmental resources development projects. Many of these pilot programs, such as those authorized in sections 217 through 222, 303, 304, 307, 313, 324, 331 and 340 of the 1992 act, and sections 504 and 531 of the 1996 act, recognize that there are serious water and wastewater problems facing rural and small municipal localities which these small communities simply cannot afford to fix. The high cost per capita of these projects not only reflect the relatively small population served, but also the difficult construction conditions in mountainous and cold areas.

Through these programs, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has contacted many of these communities, offered to provide assistance, and subsequently has undertaken several projects. Under the authority of section 313 of the 1992 act, for example, the Corps this year will complete construction of the Mill Run water treatment project, and start construction of the Broad Top/Coaldale wastewater management project, both in south central Pennsylvania. Design work will begin on one flood control and two water line projects. In fiscal year 1998, construction of the Chestnut Ridge wastewater management project will begin. The Chestnut Ridge Joint Municipal Authority, Broad Top Township, and Coaldale Borough are actively pursuing additional funding. Having been planned as much as 20 years ago, these projects are now proceeding and, once completed, will provide higher standard of living for the communities they serve.

Therefore, in an effort to bring about efficiencies and focus the effort of the Corps of Engineers, the Committee has recommended a general provision which would consolidate the numerous environmental infrastructure programs and has included $10,000,000 to undertake these types of projects. In carrying out this program, the Secretary of the Army is directed to give priority to projects located in rural areas and small municipalities.

Shoreline protection policy.—The Committee continues to be troubled by the administration's policy regarding the Federal role in shore protection projects and smaller navigation projects. While these proposals would only directly affect the coastal States, including the Great Lakes States, the impacts of terminating the Federal Government's role in protecting our shorelines and maintaining small boat harbors would be felt throughout the Nation. The Committee also strongly rejects these proposals.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1997	[1] $330,374,000
Budget estimate, 1998	266,000,000
Committee recommendation	289,000,000

[1] Includes a $20,000,000 emergency supplemental appropriation.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Benefit cost ratio	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS						
	SURVEYS:						
	GENERAL STUDIES:						
(FDP)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS	.....	2,175,000	100,000	100,000	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	.....	4,805,000	2,980,000	912,000	1,070,000	3,070,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN AND KY	.....	1,982,000	1,574,000	219,000	335,000	335,000
	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	.....	4,000,000	.....	.....	.....	500,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	.....	1,329,000	782,000	282,000	465,000	465,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	.....	.....	.....	.....	345,000	345,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,015,000	5,515,000
	CONSTRUCTION						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	39.30	3,620,000,000	2,449,373,000	48,030,000	44,490,000	44,490,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	2.30	8,500,000	2,324,000	195,000	812,000	812,000
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	1.90	7,700,000	2,167,000	142,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	39.30	1,457,000,000	800,931,000	25,715,000	24,238,000	25,238,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	1.30	381,000,000	352,884,000	9,305,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	5.50	3,300,000	1,587,000	845,000	1,105,000	1,105,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	39.30	185,000,000	53,187,000	5,148,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	39.30	1,750,000,000	801,131,000	17,586,000	19,100,000	22,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	1.70	63,300,000	7,863,000	756,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	7.10	97,300,000	52,367,000	11,157,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2.10	170,969,000	97,992,000	10,772,000	7,006,000	7,006,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS	.....	(1,391,574,000)	(649,157,000)	(42,039,000)	(25,470,000)	(25,470,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	1.40	228,482,000	59,101,000	19,000	20,000	520,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	2.20	102,684,000	83,893,000	9,272,000	3,862,000	3,862,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	.....	221,424,000	211,424,000	17,150,000	10,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	.....	7,410,000	6,182,000	322,000	363,000	363,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Benefit cost ratio	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	1.30	212,800,000	34,518,000	24,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	.....	32,408,000	23,740,000	3,270,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	1.30	247,366,000	107,245,000	2,402,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	1.40	339,000,000	123,054,000	9,580,000	9,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	ST. JOHNS BAYOU—NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	.....	54,700,000	4,150,000	95,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS	6.20	17,930,000	10,948,000	1,105,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	77	140,000,000	50,447,000	2,859,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	.....	.....	.....	.....	150,221,000	161,721,000
	MAINTENANCE						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	56,112,000	61,112,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS CO, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	280,000	280,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	472,000	472,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER—NORTH BANK, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	840,000	840,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER—SOUTH BANK, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	124,000	124,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,252,000	7,252,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR AND MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,130,000	8,130,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,807,000	2,807,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	.....	.....	.....	.....	49,000	49,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	.....	.....	.....	.....	27,000	27,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	670,000	670,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,700,000	12,700,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR—DEVIL SWAMP, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	92,000	92,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	390,000	390,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER—SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	.....	.....	.....	.....	378,000	378,000

(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA					377,000	377,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA					4,390,000	4,390,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA					2,891,000	2,891,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS					361,000	361,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS					203,000	203,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS					237,000	237,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS					(21,902,000)	(21,902,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS					3,514,000	3,514,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS					237,000	2,237,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS					3,556,000	3,556,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS					816,000	816,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS					4,662,000	4,662,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS					1,151,000	1,151,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS					4,766,000	4,766,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS					1,343,000	1,343,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS					498,000	498,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS					524,000	524,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS					835,000	835,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO					220,000	220,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO					7,468,000	7,468,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN					124,000	124,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN					1,345,000	1,345,000
(FC)	MAPPING					1,027,000	1,027,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE					− 18,754,000	− 18,754,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE					112,764,000	121,764,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES					266,000,000	289,000,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee is concerned by the severe reduction, nearly $45,000,000, in the budget request for fiscal year 1998 for the Mississippi River and Tributaries project. The Committee feels this is unacceptable when only a few short years ago the Mississippi River was experiencing devastating flooding. The Mississippi River has the third largest drainage basin in the world, exceeded in size only by the Amazon and Congo River watersheds. It drains a total of 1,245,000 square miles, covering 41 percent of the contiguous United States including all or part of 31 States and two Canadian Provinces. Water from as far east as New York and as far west as Wyoming contribute to floods in the lower Mississippi River Valley, flowing through the basin roughly resembling a funnel which has its spout at the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, the project provides for navigation which is central to the Nation's economy.

Therefore, flood control and protection and maintaining navigation along the Mississippi River and its tributaries is not an option, it is mandatory. The floods of 1993 demonstrated the projects' importance by averting $8,100,000,000 in flood damages. Over the years, the MR&T project has saved an estimated $150,000,000,000 in flood damages based on a Federal investment of $8,121,000,000. Another outcome of the recent floods is the need to raise and strengthen numerous section of levees. The nearly $45,000,000 reduction below the appropriation for 1997 severely impacts this effort and increases the likelihood of higher flood damage disaster payments as the result of major flooding. The Committee hopes that future budgets will reflect the unique nature of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project and the area its protects.

Southeast Arkansas, AR.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Corps to complete the feasibility phase of the Southeast Arkansas, AR, study looking into the need to protect groundwater and to better utilize surface water resources in the Boeuf Tensas basin in Arkansas.

Yazoo basin Backwater project, MR&T.—The Committee is aware that the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 clarified the definition of "physical construction", thus emphasizing the Federal responsibility on the Yazoo Backwater project. The Committee understands that due to emergencies caused by flooding, delays will be experienced in the completion of planning documents for the tributaries project and the backwater project in the Yazoo basin. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps to resume the original schedule of work on these two flood protection measures in order to accelerate the process for identifying the best alternative for reducing floods.

Yazoo basin, demonstration erosion control, MR&T.—The Committee remains concerned by the significant decrease in funding for the demonstration erosion control project. The Committee has provided $15,000,000, $5,000,000 above the budget request, and expects the Corps to expedite work on East Goose Creek in Oxford, MS.

Horn Lake Creek, MS.—The Committee encourages the Corps to continue to work with the city of Horn Lake, MS, in addressing flooding problems along Horn Lake Creek.

Grand Prairie/Bayou Metro, AR.—The Committee directs the Corps to continue design activities on the Grand Prairie portion of

the Grand Prairie/Bayou Metro, AR, project and to initiate a revaluation of the Bayou Metro portion and expects the local cost share of that reevaluation to be recovered during project construction.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1997	[1] $1,866,015,000
Budget estimate, 1998	1,618,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,661,203,000

[1] Includes $165,000,000 in emergency supplemental appropriations.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL	4,903,000	4,903,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	5,000	5,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,252,000	18,252,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	500,000	500,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,677,000	3,677,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	30,000	30,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,835,000	5,835,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,936,000	20,936,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL		300,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300,000	300,000
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,858,000	3,858,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	20,000	20,000
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	16,058,000	18,713,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	6,044,000	6,044,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,400,000	1,400,000
BETHEL HARBOR, AK	20,000	20,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,766,000	2,566,000
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	459,000	459,000
HOMER HARBOR, AK	245,000	245,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	27,000	27,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	200,000	200,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	260,000	260,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	565,000	565,000
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	400,000	400,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,055,000	1,055,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	107,000	107,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	2,293,000	2,293,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	22,000	22,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	199,000	199,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,918,000	3,918,000
BLAKELY MT DAM—LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,632,000	4,632,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,105,000	1,105,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,810,000	4,810,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,679,000	5,679,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,959,000	3,959,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,012,000	2,341,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,015,000	1,015,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	946,000	946,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,241,000	4,241,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	283,000	283,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	210,000	210,000
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	21,604,000	21,604,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,647,000	1,647,000
NARROWS DAM—LAKE GREESON, AR	3,568,000	3,568,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,284,000	1,284,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,183,000	3,183,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	311,000	311,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	5,179,000	5,179,000
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,789,000	3,789,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	5,000	5,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,265,000	2,265,000
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	120,000	120,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,587,000	1,587,000
BUCHANAN DAM—H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,372,000	1,372,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,000,000	3,000,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,718,000	2,718,000
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,140,000	1,140,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,451,000	3,451,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	281,000	281,000
HIDDEN DAM—HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,371,000	1,371,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,775,000	3,775,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,326,000	1,326,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,413,000	1,413,000
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,288,000	4,288,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	252,000	252,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	307,000	307,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,110,000	2,110,000
NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	938,000	938,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	3,146,000	4,350,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	2,090,000	2,090,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,968,000	1,968,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,615,000	1,615,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,667,000	2,667,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,778,000	1,778,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	884,000	884,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	133,000	133,000
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	175,000	175,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY—DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,787,000	1,787,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,309,000	2,309,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,267,000	2,267,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,494,000	1,494,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,680,000	1,680,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,762,000	2,762,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,492,000	1,492,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	968,000	968,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,573,000	1,573,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	952,000	952,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	2,073,000	2,073,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,236,000	2,236,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	361,000	361,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	715,000	715,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	945,000	945,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	110,000	110,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,595,000	1,595,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	368,000	368,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	627,000	627,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	400,000	400,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	558,000	558,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	199,000	199,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	843,000	843,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	35,000	35,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	360,000	360,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	401,000	401,000
PATCHOGUE RIVER, CT	466,000	466,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,241,000	1,241,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	351,000	351,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	489,000	489,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	395,000	395,000
DELAWARE		
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL—ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,794,000	11,794,000
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	165,000	165,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50,000	50,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,360,000	2,360,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	6,000	6,000
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	840,000	840,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	32,000	32,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC AND VA	30,000	30,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	6,460,000	6,460,000
CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	520,000	520,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,500,000	9,500,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	.....	2,750,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,536,000	1,536,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	717,000	717,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	50,000	50,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	47,000	47,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,909,000	2,909,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	5,961,000	5,961,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	5,399,000	5,399,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	408,000	408,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,503,000	3,503,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,079,000	1,079,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	700,000	700,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	50,000	50,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	3,500,000	3,500,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	5,000	5,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	410,000	410,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,032,000	3,032,000
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
STEINHATCHEE RIVER, FL	5,000	5,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,607,000	6,607,000
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,628,000	4,628,000
APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,741,000	7,041,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,783,000	1,783,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,030,000	3,030,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,179,000	6,179,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,500,000	4,500,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	9,547,000	9,547,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	40,000	40,000
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	8,982,000	8,982,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	7,520,000	7,520,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,053,000	13,053,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	207,000	207,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	4,631,000	4,631,000
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	84,000	84,000
HALEIWA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	334,000	334,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	188,000	188,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	415,000	415,000
WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	334,000	334,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,775,000	4,775,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	7,866,000	7,866,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	89,000	89,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,087,000	1,087,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	193,000	193,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	64,000	64,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	717,000	717,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,908,000	3,908,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	4,545,000	4,545,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	343,000	343,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	294,000	294,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	1,310,000	1,310,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL AND IN	22,738,000	22,738,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	657,000	657,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,433,000	1,923,000
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	796,000	796,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,820,000	4,820,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	10,535,000	10,535,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	81,363,000	81,363,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	110,000	110,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,451,000	3,451,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	129,000	129,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	643,000	643,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INDIANA		
BEVERLY SHORES, IN	.....	1,700,000
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	754,000	754,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	902,000	902,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	709,000	709,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	715,000	715,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	1,242,000	1,242,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	732,000	732,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	133,000	133,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	56,000	56,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	975,000	975,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	778,000	778,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	739,000	739,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	30,000	30,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	832,000	832,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	120,000	120,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,731,000	2,731,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	183,000	183,000
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	152,000	152,000
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	6,496,000	6,496,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,746,000	1,746,000
RED ROCK DAM—LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,291,000	3,291,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,191,000	4,191,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,482,000	1,482,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,003,000	1,003,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	488,000	488,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	699,000	699,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	772,000	772,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	790,000	790,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	250,000	250,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,019,000	1,019,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,219,000	1,219,000
MARION LAKE, KS	1,630,000	1,630,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,580,000	1,580,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,537,000	1,537,000
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	799,000	799,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,673,000	1,673,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,533,000	1,533,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	178,000	178,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	364,000	364,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,858,000	1,858,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,349,000	1,349,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	8,127,000	8,127,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,918,000	1,918,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,120,000	1,120,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,309,000	1,309,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,374,000	1,374,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	908,000	908,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,167,000	1,167,000
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	334,000	334,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,602,000	1,602,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,014,000	1,014,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,915,000	1,915,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,759,000	1,759,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	137,000	137,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	4,843,000	4,843,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,233,000	1,233,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	22,000	22,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	654,000	654,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52,000	52,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,795,000	1,795,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	53,126,000	53,126,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	5,889,000	5,889,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	878,000	878,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	5,000	5,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,669,000	1,669,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,086,000	1,086,000
WOLF CREEK DAM—LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	4,290,000	4,290,000
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,111,000	1,111,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	10,436,000	10,436,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	505,000	505,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	466,000	466,000
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5,000	5,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	172,000	172,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	78,000	78,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	6,480,000	6,680,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,452,000	2,452,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA AND TX	15,015,000	15,015,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	826,000	826,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	414,000	414,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	371,000	371,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	56,000	56,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,143,000	1,143,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER—BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA	41,000,000	41,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER—GULF OUTLET, LA	10,998,000	10,998,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	144,000	144,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	7,714,000	7,714,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,960,000	1,960,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	152,000	152,000
WATERWAY—EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	765,000	765,000
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	335,000	335,000
MAINE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	15,000	15,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	722,000	722,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	12,025,000	12,025,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	425,000	425,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	560,000	560,000
CHESTER RIVER, MD	65,000	65,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	111,000	111,000
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	677,000	677,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	28,000	28,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,528,000	1,528,000
LOWER THOROFARE, DEAL ISLAND, MD	63,000	63,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	47,000	47,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	306,000	306,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	79,000	79,000
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	2,600,000	2,600,000
UPPER THOROFARE, MD	53,000	53,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	829,000	829,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	340,000	340,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	385,000	385,000
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	16,500,000	16,500,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	359,000	359,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,855,000	8,855,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	156,000	156,000
COHASSET HARBOR, MA	.....	1,500,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	138,000	138,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	327,000	327,000
GREEN HARBOR, MA	296,000	296,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	348,000	348,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	78,000	78,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	527,000	527,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	459,000	459,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	242,000	242,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,117,000	1,117,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MA	16,000	16,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	391,000	391,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	415,000	415,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	488,000	488,000
MICHIGAN		
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	.....	2,377,000
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	324,000	324,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	805,000	805,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	475,000	475,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,839,000	2,839,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	210,000	210,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,129,000	1,129,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	359,000	359,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	392,000	392,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	976,000	976,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	607,000	607,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	276,000	276,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	257,000	257,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	337,000	337,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	316,000	316,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	157,000	157,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	407,000	407,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,579,000	1,579,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	21,000	21,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	211,000	211,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	134,000	134,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,291,000	1,291,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,014,000	1,014,000
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	587,000	587,000
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	17,744,000	17,744,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,353,000	2,353,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,585,000	1,585,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	184,000	184,000
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	3,749,000	3,749,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	103,000	103,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	549,000	549,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	150,000	150,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	930,000	930,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	70,000	70,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	175,000	175,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,677,000	2,677,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	239,000	239,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	464,000	464,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	158,000	158,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	120,000	120,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,121,000	2,121,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	79,000	79,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,500,000	1,500,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,620,000	2,620,000
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	391,000	391,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5,000	5,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	406,000	406,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	176,000	176,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,677,000	5,527,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,991,000	2,341,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,006,000	8,006,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	399,000	399,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	867,000	867,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	889,000	889,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	14,839,000	14,839,000
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	21,000	21,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,668,000	1,668,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,063,000	1,063,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	275,000	275,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,988,000	2,988,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,576,000	4,576,000
UNION LAKE, MO	5,000	5,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,664,000	3,664,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	23,000	23,000
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	6,517,000	6,517,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	53,000	53,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	69,000	69,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	5,469,000	5,469,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,395,000	1,395,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	164,000	164,000
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	1,800,000	1,800,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	250,000	250,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	.....	100,000
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	690,000	690,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	854,000	854,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	116,000	116,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	480,000	480,000
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	145,000	145,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	404,000	404,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	456,000	456,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	813,000	813,000
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	973,000	973,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	10,000	10,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	478,000	478,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	161,000	161,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	616,000	616,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	.....	1,500,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375,000	375,000
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20,000	20,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	15,098,000	15,098,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,480,000	1,480,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	443,000	443,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,040,000	2,040,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	670,000	670,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,021,000	1,021,000
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	250,000	250,000
TUCKERTON CREEK, NJ	.....	650,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,295,000	1,295,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,922,000	1,922,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,081,000	1,081,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	299,000	299,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	66,000	66,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	457,000	457,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	891,000	891,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	64,000	64,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	323,000	323,000
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	435,000	435,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	218,000	218,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	4,350,000	4,350,000
BRONX RIVER, NY	600,000	600,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,550,000	1,550,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	220,000	220,000
CATSKILL CREEK, NY	20,000	20,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	545,000	545,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,000,000	2,000,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	483,000	483,000
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	650,000	650,000
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	155,000	155,000
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	540,000	540,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	3,275,000	3,275,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	549,000	549,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	100,000	100,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,385,000	1,385,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	800,000	800,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	4,800,000	4,800,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	730,000	730,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	7,764,000	7,764,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,504,000	1,504,000
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	1,245,000	1,245,000
SAUGERTIES HARBOR, NY	20,000	20,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	526,000	526,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	651,000	651,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	627,000	627,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,438,000	5,438,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	973,000	973,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	590,000	590,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	648,000	648,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,340,000	1,340,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	867,000	867,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	375,000	375,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	5,074,000	5,074,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	2,200,000	2,200,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	2,672,000	2,672,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	650,000	650,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	180,000	180,000
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	100,000	100,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100,000	100,000
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,468,000	1,468,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,834,000	5,834,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
SD AND NE, BTID (SEC. 33)	.....	750,000
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND	194,000	194,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,143,000	9,193,000
HOMME LAKE, ND	188,000	188,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	60,000	60,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,149,000	1,149,000
MISSOURI RIVER BETION FT. PECK, MT AND GAVINS FT. DAM	.....	750,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	395,000	395,000
SOURIS RIVER, ND	188,000	188,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	30,000	30,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	616,000	616,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,175,000	1,175,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,368,000	2,368,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,153,000	1,153,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	726,000	726,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,560,000	6,560,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	1,358,000	1,358,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	678,000	678,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	814,000	814,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	501,000	501,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	400,000	400,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	1,035,000	1,035,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	220,000	220,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,325,000	1,325,000
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	882,000	882,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	965,000	965,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,060,000	6,060,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	311,000	311,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	569,000	569,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	74,000	74,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,015,000	1,015,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	206,000	206,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,575,000	3,575,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	245,000	245,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	546,000	546,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	846,000	846,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	277,000	277,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	836,000	836,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,671,000	1,671,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,756,000	1,756,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	906,000	906,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,959,000	3,959,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,354,000	3,354,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	817,000	817,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	323,000	323,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	813,000	813,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,510,000	1,510,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	462,000	462,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	168,000	168,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,735,000	1,735,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,453,000	3,453,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,329,000	1,329,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	265,000	265,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR—LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	20,000	20,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,088,000	1,088,000
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,795,000	3,795,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,037,000	1,037,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	558,000	558,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	949,000	949,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,423,000	3,423,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,486,000	1,486,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,288,000	3,288,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	824,000	824,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	787,000	787,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	276,000	276,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	16,576,000	16,576,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	284,000	500,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	11,332,000	11,332,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	7,904,000	7,904,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	346,000	346,000
COOS BAY, OR	4,892,000	4,892,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	377,000	377,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	708,000	708,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,157,000	1,157,000
DEPOE BAY, OR	33,000	33,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,200,000	2,200,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	512,000	512,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	618,000	618,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	955,000	955,000
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,545,000	2,545,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	748,000	748,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	179,000	179,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	12,886,000	12,886,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	3,991,000	3,991,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	4,030,000	4,030,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	12,333,000	12,333,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	484,000	484,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	135,000	135,000
ROGUE RIVER, OR	746,000	1,353,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	115,000	115,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	965,000	965,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5,000	5,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7,000	7,000
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	13,000	13,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,321,000	1,321,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	606,000	606,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	61,000	61,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	564,000	564,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,607,000	1,607,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,700,000	6,700,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	622,000	622,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	200,000	200,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,046,000	1,046,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,986,000	1,986,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	3,127,000	3,127,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,679,000	1,679,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,452,000	1,452,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	677,000	677,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	799,000	799,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	635,000	635,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	728,000	728,000
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	715,000	715,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	287,000	287,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	205,000	205,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,109,000	1,109,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,400,000	1,400,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,182,000	1,182,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	826,000	826,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	13,864,000	13,864,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	15,000	15,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	438,000	438,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13,000	13,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	2,520,000	2,520,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	53,000	53,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,290,000	1,290,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,916,000	1,916,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	334,000	334,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	82,000	82,000
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,775,000	1,775,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,293,000	1,293,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	324,000	324,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	821,000	821,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	518,000	518,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	1,663,000	1,663,000
RHODE ISLAND		
BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	342,000	342,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	5,000	5,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	677,000	677,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,850,000	2,850,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,815,000	4,715,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,372,000	3,562,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	246,000	246,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,165,000	3,665,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	27,000	27,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	981,000	981,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	20,000	20,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	400,000	400,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	.....	360,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM—LAKE SHARPE, SD	5,759,000	5,759,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	325,000	325,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	200,000	200,000
FT RANDALL DAM—LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,863,000	7,863,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	14,000	14,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
JAMES RIVER, JAMESTWON AND PIPESTEM RESERV., SD	.....	100,000
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	1,499,000	1,499,000
OAHE DAM—LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	8,854,000	9,154,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	67,000	67,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,373,000	5,373,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,832,000	4,832,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,097,000	4,097,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,622,000	3,622,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	133,000	133,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,348,000	3,348,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,404,000	6,404,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	4,000	4,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	10,266,000	10,266,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	310,000	310,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	602,000	602,000
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,185,000	1,185,000
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	845,000	845,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,301,000	1,301,000
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,170,000	1,170,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,650,000	2,650,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,660,000	1,660,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,050,000	1,050,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,457,000	3,457,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,052,000	2,052,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	155,000	155,000
COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	978,000	978,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,885,000	1,885,000
DENISON DAM—LAKE TEXOMA, TX	4,681,000	4,681,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14,000	14,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM—LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,113,000	2,113,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,350,000	4,350,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,010,000	3,010,000
GIWW—CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,940,000	1,940,000
GIWW—CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,517,000	1,517,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,804,000	1,804,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	17,072,000	17,072,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,133,000	1,133,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,617,000	7,617,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	296,000	296,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	817,000	817,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	235,000	235,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,476,000	2,476,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,467,000	2,467,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,460,000	3,460,000
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,900,000	1,900,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,373,000	1,373,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,650,000	1,650,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,287,000	1,287,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	856,000	856,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,197,000	2,197,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	85,000	85,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	768,000	768,000
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,020,000	8,020,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,038,000	4,038,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	49,000	49,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,367,000	2,367,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,514,000	1,514,000
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	770,000	770,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM—B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,469,000	1,469,000
WACO LAKE, TX	2,031,000	2,031,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	488,000	488,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,628,000	3,628,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,446,000	2,446,000
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	58,000	58,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	452,000	452,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	606,000	606,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN (MASTER PLAN), VT		200,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	40,000	40,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	556,000	556,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	672,000	672,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	570,000	570,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	602,000	602,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	439,000	439,000
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	25,000	25,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	1,971,000	1,971,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	485,000	485,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	1,094,000	1,094,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,544,000	1,544,000
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	707,000	707,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	69,000	69,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,635,000	3,635,000
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	7,906,000	7,906,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,192,000	1,192,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	280,000	280,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,310,000	5,310,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	301,000	301,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,075,000	2,075,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	711,000	711,000
RUDEE INLET, VA		535,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	177,000	177,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,082,000	1,082,000
WASHINGTON		
ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	240,000	240,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,547,000	12,547,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR	10,000	10,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6,000	6,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,202,000	1,202,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	7,226,000	7,226,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,271,000	1,271,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	8,090,000	8,090,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	173,000	173,000
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	352,000	352,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,558,000	6,558,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,672,000	5,672,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,684,000	7,684,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,461,000	5,461,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	762,000	762,000
MT ST HELENS, WA	415,000	415,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,953,000	1,953,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	294,000	294,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,050,000	1,050,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	492,000	492,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	787,000	787,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	186,000	186,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	61,000	61,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	375,000	375,000
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	72,000	72,000
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	10,744,000	10,744,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	615,000	3,615,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,018,000	1,018,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,253,000	1,828,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,167,000	1,167,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,563,000	1,563,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	370,000	370,000
ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	93,000	93,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,743,000	8,743,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,418,000	1,418,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	970,000	970,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,612,000	1,612,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,611,000	1,611,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,243,000	1,243,000
WISCONSIN		
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	910,000	910,000
FOX RIVER, WI	1,926,000	1,926,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,048,000	1,048,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,613,000	3,613,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	15,000	15,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	188,000	188,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	93,000	93,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	407,000	407,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,779,000	1,779,000
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	175,000	175,000
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	222,000	222,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	96,000	96,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	511,000	511,000
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	324,000	324,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	475,000	475,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	199,000	199,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	553,000	553,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	315,000	315,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	4,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000,000	2,000,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	735,000	735,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,000,000	6,000,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,700,000	1,700,000
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	2,930,000	2,930,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	600,000	600,000
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,900,000	1,900,000
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	5,500,000	5,500,000
NATIONAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SUPPORT (NRTS)	900,000	900,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	415,000	415,000
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	675,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	500,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINT AND REHAB RESEARCH (REMR II)	3,000,000	3,000,000
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	850,000	850,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000,000	4,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−29,368,000	−27,253,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,618,000,000	1,661,203,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:
(N) NAVIGATION
(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

The Committee continues to believe that it is essential to provide adequate resources and attention to operation and maintenance requirements in order to protect the large Federal investment. Yet current and projected budgetary constraints require the Committee to limit the amount of work that can be accomplished in the fiscal year. In order to cope with the current situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities.

Maintenance backlogs continue to grow with much of the backlog being essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Nation's ports, harbors, and waterways open and able to efficiently handle important national and international trade activities. Yet the Committee is aware that out-year budget planning guidance for the Corps of Engineers projects that the current appropriations for their critical operation and maintenance activities will continue to decline for the foreseeable future. If additional resources are not made available, the Committee will be forced to cut back on services, and begin to terminate and close many projects and activities.

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. As more and more projects enter the inventory and budgetary constraints continue, it is clear that the Corps will need to find innovated ways to accomplish required O&M work nationwide. Adjustment in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be made in conjunction with efforts to opti-

mize the use of the limited resources in order to maximize the public benefit.

Lower Chena River dredging, Alaska.—The Committee has included $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to dredge a navigational channel within the lower reaches of the Chena River to reestablish safe water depths.

Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, IA.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work cooperatively with the city of Dubuque, IA, to deposit dredge material at appropriate points near the Dubuque Riverboat Museum.

Kaskaskia River navigation, Illinois.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $490,000 for the Corps to examine the feasibility of operating remotely the low volume Kaskaskia Lock and Dam from a high volume lock and dam located elsewhere within the St. Louis District.

Calcasieu River and Pass, LA.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reevaluate the feasibility of dredging a 40-foot channel in the Cameron Loop to the Port of Cameron, LA.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Tolchester Channel S-turn, Maryland.—In fiscal years 1996–97, the Committee directed the Corps to complete ongoing studies and design work associated with correcting the dangerous S-turn in the Tolchester Channel. This serious safety issue has been brought to the attention on numerous occasions over the years. The Committee understands the Corps' Baltimore District recently completed report with a favorable recommendation and that the report is currently under review by Corps headquarters, and that dredging work could begin in fiscal year 1999 once approved. Given the safety considerations, the Committee urges the Corps to request funds in its fiscal year 1999 budget request to Congress.

Cedar River Harbor, MI.—An appropriation of $2,377,000 is recommended for the Corps to advertise, award and construct repairs to the east breakwater at Cedar River Harbor in Michigan.

Clearwater Lake, MO.—The Committee has included an additional $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake engineering and design activities related to the relocation of facilities impacted by flooding at Clearwater Lake in Missouri.

Cheesequake Creek, NJ.—Funding in the amount of $1,500,000 is recommended for the Corps to undertake repairs to the south jetty at Cheesequake Creek in New Jersey.

Tuckerton Creek, NJ.—The recommendation includes $650,000 for the Corps to complete the maintenance dredging cycle for the Tuckerton Creek in New Jersey.

Upper Rio Grande water operation model, New Mexico.—The Committee has provide $1,000,000 for scheduling reservoir operations for the Corps to continue joint activities with other Federal agencies related to the need for an Upper Rio Grande water operations model to help water managers in flood control operations, water accounting, and evaluation of water operations alternatives.

Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir, MO.—The Committee has provided an additional $850,000 for the Corps to accomplish necessary infrastructure repairs at the Clarence Cannon Dam and Reservoir in Missouri. Of this amount $300,000 to repair cavitation

damage necessary to ensure continued operation and reliability of service to the power customer and $550,000 is to repair deteriorated project roads, as appropriate, to ensure public safety.

Missouri River between Fort Peck, MT, and Gavins Point Dam, ND.—An appropriation of $750,000 is recommended to allow the Corps to undertake weir construction for bank stabilization in the vicinity of Buford Trenton in North Dakota.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee recommendation for the Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea project in North Dakota includes $50,000 for the Corps to continue mosquito control activities.

Rogue River, OR.—The Committee has provided an additional $607,000 for the Rogue River project in Oregon. The recommendation includes an additional $407,000 for maintenance dredging and $200,000 for the Corps to conduct a study to update the advisability of relocating the existing entrance in order to reduce annual maintenance dredging costs.

Charleston Harbor, SC.—The Committee has included an additional $900,000 for the Corps to accomplish ditching, clearing, site preparation, and diking of the southern and middle cells of the Clouter Creek disposal area which are owned by the Army Corps for purposes of disposal of dredge material from areas previously occupied by the Charleston Navy Base.

Oahe Dam-Lake Oahe, SD.—The Committee has included an additional $325,000 for the Oahe Dam-Lake Oahe, SD, project to address sediment buildup problems downstream in the vicinity of Pierre and Fort Pierre, SD. The Committee understands that sediment buildup at the base of Oahe Dam combined with winter ice conditions creates a situation which results in either severe flooding in the Pierre and Fort Pierre area or reduced power generation. The additional funding is to be used by the Corps to assess the causes, problems, and solutions to the problem. The Committee directs the Corps to coordinate the study effort with the Western Power Administration.

Ball Mountain Dam, VT.—The Committee directs the Corps to use available funds to take additional steps, described in its Ball Mountain Dam report, if sediment control steps already taken prove to be inadequate.

Burlington Harbor, VT.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to inspect the breakwater at Burlington Harbor, VT, and make needed repairs. The Corps should work with local interest to evaluate the configuration of the breakwater, the condition of the shoreline, and to address other navigation related concerns.

Connecticut River basin (master plan), VT.—The Committee has provided an appropriation of $200,000 for the Corps to continue a comprehensive update of the master plans for the five Corps of Engineer flood control reservoirs in the Connecticut River basin in Vermont.

Willapa River and Harbor, WA.—An additional $3,000,000 is provided for the Corps to undertake structural and beach nourishment measures to protect the highway from wave erosion, and to halt further migration of the North Channel.

Tricities land conveyance, Washington.—The Committee is informed that the Corps and local interests are negotiating an agree-

ment associated with land transfer work in the tricities of Washington. All parties are to be commended for working diligently to solve the costs allocation issues. The Committee understands that the six local government entities are working on an agreement to pay the Corps for the reasonable costs of administrative support, as authorized by law, currently estimated at $120,000. The Committee also recognizes the parties are continuing to resolve responsibility for potential NEPA documentation and CERCLA costs in association with the land Conveyance. Since this is to be a joint agreement between the parties, the Committee expects all costs associated with this effort to be held to a minimum so that the cost allocation agreement is adhered to.

Bluestone Lake and Dam, WV.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,828,000 for the Bluestone Lake and Dam in West Virginia, including $575,000 for the Corps to initiate engineering and design and model study of proposed modifications to the dam to allow for drift and debris removal and for completion of a dam safety report.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests: Coosa-Alabama River navigation system, Alabama; Anclote River, FL; Brunswick Harbor, GA; and Little River and Murrells Inlets, SC.

Direct funding of O&M requirements, hydropower generation facilities.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Energy have been discussing an agreement under which the Bonneville Power Administration [BPA] would provide direct funding for the annual operations and maintenance costs associated with Corps hydropower generation facilities in the Pacific Northwest. This approach would replace the existing procedure under which the Corps requests annual appropriations to cover those costs with BPA providing reimbursement to the Treasury. The Committee believes that such an agreement for O&M costs would provide greater assurance to the Corps of an appropriate level of funding for maintenance of power facilities, thereby reducing the frequency of costly overhauls and increasing the reliability of BPA's power supply to Federal Columbia River Power System electric ratepayers.

Last year, the energy and water development appropriations conference agreement supported implementation of such a direct funding agreement for all hydropower O&M costs between the Bureau of Reclamation and the BPA by assuming such an agreement would be implemented at the beginning of fiscal year 1997 and removing all associated discretionary funding effective with that date. The Committee recently heard testimony from the Regional Director of the Pacific Northwest region of the Bureau of Reclamation stating that: (1) the now implemented Reclamation/BPA O&M agreement has created a more businesslike arrangement, fostered better joint planning, reduced costs, and improved the lines of communications between BPA and Reclamation, and (2) while Reclamation had concerns similar to those of the Corps, regarding the alignment of multipurpose projects priorities, prior to completion of the agreement, those concerns have been found to be misplaced.

Given this experience, the Committee strongly urges the Corps to consider the potential benefits and savings by entering into a direct funding agreement similar to that of the Bureau of Reclamation for operations and maintenance activities with the Bonneville Power Administration and to take steps to move to finalize an agreement in this regard.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1997	$101,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	112,000,000
Committee recommendation	106,000,000

An appropriation of $106,000,000 is recommended for regulatory programs of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee has recommended an increase of $5,000,000 over the current year funding level to offset the inflation impacts in this program. This program, which has been held at the 1995 level of appropriation, is labor intensive and has had to absorb inflationary increases for several years.

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.

In discharging its responsibilities under 33 U.S.C. Section 1344 for a permit for completion of the terminal 5 berth enhancement project in the West Waterway of the Duwamish River in Seattle, the Corps shall recognize that both the tribe and the applicant hold legally protected interests with respect to the permit. The applicant has a legally protected right to construct and operate facilities for maritime commerce, the applicant has continuously exercised this right at the location of the proposed project for many decades. The tribes have a legally protected right to harvest fish in their usual and accustomed areas. The rights of both parties were recognized in the creation of the applicable treaties. The Corps shall not interpret either party's rights in a manner that unreasonably interferes with any party's protected interests. The Corps shall seek to maximize maritime usage for this facility provided that treaty harvesters' physical access to the site, as measured by their functional ability to harvest fish at that location or at newly created or enhanced fishing sites of the same or greater quality in the vicinity of the West Waterway, is not materially diminished.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1997	[1] $425,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	14,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

[1] Includes $415,000,000 in emergency supplemental appropriations.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies. This is $4,000,000 below the budget request.

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.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1997	$149,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	148,000,000
Committee recommendation	148,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $148,000,000 which is the same as the budget request.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1997	$43,627,000
Budget estimate, 1998	41,153,000
Committee recommendation	41,153,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1998 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act is $41,153,000, the same as the budget request.

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.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 1997	[1] $685,937,000
Budget estimate, 1998	651,552,000
Committee recommendation	688,379,000

[1] Includes $7,355,000 in emergency supplemental appropriations.

An appropriation of $688,379,000 is recommended by the Committee for water and related resources activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The budget request for fiscal year 1998 restructures the accounts of the Bureau of Reclamation to better reflect the activities and evolving role of the Bureau as a water management agency. By depicting more clearly how the Bureau of Reclamation uses its budgetary resources, this account also will facilitate compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA].

A new account, "Water and related resources," incorporates activities previously funded under general investigations, construction program, and operation and maintenance. The budget request for fiscal year 1998 totals $651,552,000, which is $27,030,000 below the comparable appropriation for 1997.

The amounts recommended by the Committee are shown on the following table along with the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
ARIZONA						
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	4,268,481,350	3,291,727,350	61,242,000	.....	55,920,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	458,959,000	403,900,936	3,078,000	6,500,000	3,078,000	6,500,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	183,158,000	90,408,165	4,200,000	.....	4,200,000	.....
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	8,317,000	.....	8,317,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	15,606,000	1,150,000	.....	1,200,000	.....	1,200,000
SOUTHERN ARIZONA REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	150,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	47,363,000	7,000,000	6,693,000	.....	6,693,000	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	6,025,000	1,800,090	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY	1,000,000	374,999	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
WEST SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	1,400,000	200,000	75,000	.....	475,000	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	1,670,000	11,868,000	1,670,000	11,868,000
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	25,489,000	11,489,039	565,000	8,881,000	565,000	8,881,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,645,604,143	521,924,282	2,219,000	16,204,000	2,219,000	18,204,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT	.....	.....	4,362,000	.....	4,362,000	.....
DELTA DIVISION	392,403,000	187,622,389	13,368,000	4,682,000	13,368,000	4,682,000
EAST SIDE DIVISION	100,000	100,000	199,000	3,190,000	199,000	3,190,000
FRIANT DIVISION	75,000	75,000	3,426,000	5,406,000	3,426,000	5,406,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	534,039,000	280,346,005	16,632,000	2,504,000	19,632,000	2,504,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	538,955,000	366,513,607	7,685,000	1,186,000	7,685,000	1,186,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	352,451,000	306,661,315	1,345,000	.....	1,345,000	.....
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	194,278,000	47,740,226	6,955,000	.....	6,955,000	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	297,793,000	262,116,544	6,619,000	4,929,000	6,619,000	4,929,000
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	322,908,000	314,118,294	5,643,000	4,220,000	5,643,000	4,220,000

WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	.....	.....	445,000	4,981,000	445,000	4,981,000
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	1,541,408,000	568,833,122	2,839,000	9,833,000	2,839,000	9,833,000
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	500,000	275,000	75,000	.....	75,000	.....
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	69,970,000	38,585,000	10,000,000	.....	10,000,000	.....
LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	300,000	100,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
MAMMOTH LAKES WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	350,000	.....	80,000	.....	80,000	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	.....	431,000	45,000	431,000	45,000
PORT HUENEME BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMO., CA	4,000,000	1,000,000	.....	.....	2,000,000	.....
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	10,000,000	500,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	172,590,000	14,907,000	13,000,000	.....	13,000,000	.....
SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	3,790,000	3,415,000	375,000	.....	375,000	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	38,090,000	22,203,000	5,235,000	.....	5,235,000	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	120,236,000	6,523,677	3,000,000	.....	3,000,000	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	.....	.....	1,624,000	208,000	1,624,000	208,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	750,000	275,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
SO. CALIF. COMPREHENSIVE WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	3,291,999	2,522,999	769,000	.....	769,000	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECT. 5 AND 8	503,765,700	71,591,478	6,000,000	.....	6,000,000	.....
BOSTWICK PARK PROJECT	.....	.....	40,000	36,000	40,000	36,000
COLLBRAN PROJECT	.....	.....	72,000	716,000	72,000	716,000
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	.....	.....	115,000	6,539,000	115,000	6,539,000
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	.....	.....	18,000	134,000	18,000	134,000
DOLORES PROJECT	567,962,780	557,394,780	10,592,000	433,000	10,592,000	433,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	.....	.....	46,000	3,864,000	46,000	3,864,000
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	160,905,000	155,822,911	4,456,000	635,000	4,456,000	635,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	.....	770,000	798,000	770,000	798,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	444,000	.....	444,000
MESA COUNTY WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	325,000	.....	90,000	.....	90,000	.....
PARADOX UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	2,782,000	.....	2,782,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS	.....	.....	70,000	3,052,000	70,000	3,052,000
UPPER COLORADO AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	103,000	57,000	103,000	57,000
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	2,577,000	2,421,000	2,577,000	2,421,000
COLUMBIA-SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	87,536,121	36,042,121	13,062,000	.....	13,062,000	.....
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT STUDY	1,898,870	998,870	300,000	.....	300,000	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	3,728,000	1,742,000	3,728,000	1,742,000
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	232,485	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	922,496	422,496	175,000	.....	175,000	.....
KANSAS						
CHENEY RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY STUDY	1,000,000	100,000	131,000	.....	131,000	.....
CHEYENNE BOTTOMS WILDLIFE AREA STUDY	1,400,000	.....	101,000	.....	101,000	.....
EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	3,200,000	1,500,000	.....	.....	500,000	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	.....	.....	122,000	68,000	122,000	68,000
MONTANA						
COLD CLIMATE WASTEWATER TREATMENT	875,000	35,000	37,000	.....	37,000	.....
FT. PECK RESERVATION, MR&I WATER SYSTEM	450,000	210,000	.....	.....	240,000	.....
FT. PECK RURAL COUNTY WATER SYSTEM	5,700,000	.....	.....	.....	300,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	408,000	.....	408,000
JEFFERSON RIVER BASIN RETURN FLOW STUDY	400,000	80,000	86,000	.....	86,000	.....
MILK RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	53,000	706,000	53,000	706,000
MONTANA RIVER SYSTEMS STUDY	1,275,000	100,000	180,000	.....	180,000	.....
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION	344,638	204,936	65,000	.....	65,000	.....
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	828,593	778,593	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY	319,830	195,361	75,000	.....	75,000	.....
NEBRASKA						
NEBRASKA RAINWATER BASIN ASSESSMENT	450,000	.....	133,000	.....	133,000	.....
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT	275,261	175,261	88,000	.....	88,000	.....
NEVADA						
NEWLANDS PROJECT	9,409,708	9,409,708	3,750,000	.....	3,750,000	500,000
LAS VEGAS SHALLOW AQUIFER DESALINATION DEMO	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,750,000	.....

WALKER RIVER BASIN					300,000	
WASHOE PROJECT			866,000	461,000	866,000	461,000
NEW MEXICO						
ALBUQUERQUE WASTEWATER RECYCLING					5,000,000	
BRANTLEY PROJECT			1,200,000		1,200,000	
CARLSBAD PROJECT			1,059,000	437,000	1,059,000	437,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,402,992	293,992	1,830,000	8,932,000	1,830,000	9,432,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE WATER CONVEYANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN	180,000	100,000	80,000		80,000	
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT				129,000		129,000
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE	750,000	350,000			400,000	
RIO GRANDE PROJECT			537,000	2,475,000	537,000	2,475,000
RIO GRANDE RIPARIAN TREE SPECIES CONSUMPTIVE USE	175,000		75,000		75,000	
SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT			70,000	153,000	70,000	153,000
SAN JUAN GALLUP-NAVAJO PIPELINE					450,000	
SANTE FE WATER REUSE	500,000				500,000	
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	31,754,000	17,008,870		1,000,000		1,000,000
NORTH DAKOTA						
FREEZE/THAW DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	360,000		360,000		360,000	
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P–SMBP	1,508,875,139	594,481,936	17,025,000	6,350,000	24,525,000	6,350,000
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT			39,000	55,000	39,000	55,000
LUGERT-ALTUS WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS	850,000		100,000		100,000	
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT			162,000	383,000	162,000	383,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT			79,000	44,000	79,000	44,000
NORMAN PROJECT			104,000	12,000	104,000	12,000
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	375,000	200,000	135,000		135,000	
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT			143,000	172,000	143,000	172,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT			70,000	85,000	70,000	85,000
OREGON						
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG. SYSTEM CONSERVATION FEASIBILITY	767,056	442,056	225,000		225,000	
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT			116,000	400,000	116,000	400,000
DESCHUTES PROJECT			89,000	146,000	89,000	146,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	995,807	895,807	50,000		50,000	
KLAMATH PROJECT	62,925,000	56,499,301	2,405,000	370,000	2,405,000	370,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY	908,209	833,209	75,000	.....	75,000	.....
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING STUDY	1,886,495	836,495	175,000	.....	175,000	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	.....	.....	87,000	682,000	87,000	682,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS STUDY	734,416	284,416	175,000	.....	175,000	.....
TUALATIN PROJECT	.....	.....	13,000	111,000	13,000	111,000
UMATILLA PROJECT	57,760,804	50,060,804	7,849,000	1,505,000	7,849,000	1,505,000
SOUTH DAKOTA						
BELLE FOURCHE, P–SMBP	62,787,000	60,267,000	.....	2,520,000	.....	2,520,000
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER STUDY	750,000	517,660	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	122,814,000	27,914,303	10,000,000	.....	13,000,000	.....
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	1,218,512	859,512	208,000	.....	208,000	.....
MNI WICONI PROJECT	278,976,000	80,432,868	20,976,000	3,349,000	27,976,000	3,349,000
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY	225,000	.....	75,000	.....	75,000	.....
TEXAS						
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	25,000	55,000	25,000	55,000
COLORADO RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	2,000	7,000	2,000	7,000
NORTHEAST EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	4,500,000	3,500,000	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	127,000	195,000	127,000	195,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	.....	.....	169,000	314,000	169,000	314,000
RINCON BAYOU—NUECES MARSH RESTORATION STUDY	853,970	703,360	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
RIO GRANDE PROJECT DRAINS WATER QUALITY STUDY	300,000	.....	95,000	.....	95,000	.....
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMNT	596,844	346,844	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	.....	.....	100,000	20,479,000	100,000	20,479,000
UTAH						
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY	452,788	237,778	130,000	.....	130,000	.....
CARBON/EMERY COUNTIES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	500,000	50,000	130,000	.....	130,000	.....

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE/JENSEN	1,323,786,000	1,317,358,066	3,921,000	44,000	3,921,000	44,000
OGDEN RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT STUDY	450,000	50,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	235,000	217,000	235,000	217,000
TOOELE WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND REUSE	.....	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	19,639,000	15,779,723	373,000	1,538,000	373,000	1,538,000
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	.....	.....	4,239,000	6,099,000	4,239,000	6,099,000
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING	1,114,142	164,142	175,000	.....	175,000	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT	164,674,178	6,660,505	8,980,000	8,839,000	8,980,000	8,839,000
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT	.....	.....	107,000	2,547,000	107,000	2,547,000
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	.....	.....	93,000	1,137,000	93,000	1,137,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT	.....	.....	80,000	1,152,000	80,000	1,152,000
VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, T. II BASINWIDE	75,000,000	5,145,187	7,600,000	.....	7,600,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECT. 8, REC, FISH AND WILDLIFE	70,465,000	47,312,099	2,284,000	.....	2,284,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	61,000,000	39,574,985	310,000	.....	310,000	.....
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	.....	.....	3,553,000	.....	3,553,000	.....
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	.....	.....	5,250,000	.....	3,000,000	.....
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	101,107,000	31,939,263	14,257,000	.....	14,257,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	.....	.....	1,990,000	.....	1,990,000	.....
ENVIRONMENTAL/INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	.....	.....	1,665,000	.....	1,665,000	.....
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	.....	.....	.....	2,142,000	.....	2,142,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	.....	.....	1,730,000	.....	1,730,000	.....
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS	.....	.....	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	.....	.....	7,602,000	.....	7,602,000	.....
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	90,000	.....	90,000	.....
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	.....	.....	105,000	766,000	105,000	766,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	.....	.....	1,500,000	.....	1,500,000	.....
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS	.....	.....	8,459,000	.....	8,000,000	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	.....	.....	662,000	.....	662,000	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	.....	.....	107,000	215,000	107,000	215,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS	.....	.....	3,648,000	16,376,000	3,648,000	16,376,000
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	.....	.....	622,000	1,050,000	622,000	1,050,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM			394,000	66,000	394,000	66,000
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION			4,996,000		4,996,000	
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE 28			4,288,000		4,288,000	
RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			4,922,000		4,500,000	
SAFETY OF DAMS:						
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM				1,200,000		1,200,000
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION AND MODIFICATION				42,433,000		42,433,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:						
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	143,418,905	51,084,633	3,850,000		3,850,000	
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEV PROGRAM	19,222,270	7,222,270	2,000,000		5,000,000	
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	25,530,039	24,583,039	199,000		199,000	
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL	1,260,000		400,000		400,000	
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,763,962	563,962	400,000		400,000	
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	5,012,259	2,012,259	1,000,000		1,000,000	
SITE SECURITY				5,000,000		5,000,000
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION			239,000		239,000	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES			1,700,000		1,700,000	
WATER MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM			9,801,000		9,301,000	
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT			6,309,000		6,759,000	
ADJUSTMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 ITEMS NOT REQUESTED IN FISCAL YEAR 1998						
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS				−30,953,000		−27,463,000
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES			421,874,000	229,678,000	452,211,000	236,168,000

Central Arizona project, Arizona.—The Committee has recommended a reduction of $5,322,000 for the Central Arizona project. The recommendation includes a reduction of $3,872,000 for excess noncontract costs and $1,450,000 in nonproject fish and wildlife management and development costs. The Committee directs the Bureau to carefully analyze future requirements to ensure that noncontract costs more accurately reflect Reclamation's construction activities which are nearly complete.

West Salt River Valley, AZ.—Funding in the amount of $475,000 has been provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue studies of alternatives for water resource management of the different water sources, infrastructure development, and economic and environmental issues in the west Phoenix metropolitan area.

Hungry Horse Dam, MT.—The Committee is concerned with the impacts of operations at Hungry Horse Dam on recreation, and the resident fish populations. In accordance with the Northwest Power Planning Council's amendments, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, should consider the Council's plan and to the maximum extent possible operate in accordance with the plan.

Animas-La Plata project, Colorado and New Mexico.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000, the same amount requested in the budget request. The Committee is aware that last year the Governor of Colorado and the Secretary of the Interior initiated a process to examine alternatives to the authorized Animas-La Plata project. The process calls for a proposal from parties to the settlement and one from opponents. Funding is provided to support this process and other aspects of the project as may be possible.

Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico.—An additional $500,000 is recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation to install drains in the Pena Blanca area to eliminate seepage problems caused by Cochiti Lake.

San Juan River Gallup, Navajo water supply project, New Mexico.—The Committee has included $450,000 for the San Juan Gallup-Navajo pipeline project, including $150,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue activities related to ongoing activities and $300,000 for the Bureau to undertake a study of the feasibility of using the Mount Taylor mine as a possible source of water supply for the city of Gallup.

Santa Fe water reclamation and reuse, New Mexico.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate preconstruction feasibility, studies and activities for the Santa Fe water reclamation and reuse project in New Mexico.

Upper Rio Grande water operation model study, New Mexico.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $400,000 of available funds to continue the upper Rio Grande water operation model study in New Mexico which investigates ways to be responsive to current drought conditions and other current water resource management issues.

Newlands project, Nevada.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to mitigate the impact of increased fish and wildlife activities associated with the newlands project. The Bureau is directed to make an assessment of the need for additional oper-

ation and maintenance funding related to increased operations of the Marble Bluff fish facility.

Garrison diversion project, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation for the Garrison diversion project is $30,875,000, an increase of $7,500,000 over the budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue development of municipal, rural, and industrial water programs for the Oaks test area, and for Indian water systems. The Committee has also included language in the bill to increase the authorized level of appropriations for the municipal, rural, and industrial water systems for the Fort Berthold, Stand Rock, and Spirit Lake Nation (formerly Fort Totten) in order to allow activities to continue.

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.—The recommendation for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation includes $1,500,000, the same as the budget request, for fish and wildlife management and development.

The Committee is generally pleased with the way activities have been carried out in the cooperative program between the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the Bureau of Reclamation. It is still the Committee's expectation that, while not required by law, the Foundation will make every effort to secure a 2- or 3-to-1 non-Federal contribution on projects and activities undertaken through these appropriations. Further, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to submit to the Committee as soon as practical after the end of the fiscal year a status report on how the funding for the previous year has been allocated by project, the level and source of funding both Federal and non-Federal, a completion schedule for each project, and an analysis of the unobligated and unexpended balances related to these appropriations.

Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Equus beds recharge project in Kansas. The Committee understands that the project is being cost shared on a 50–50 basis.

Applied science and technology development.—Additional funding of $1,000,000 has been included for the Bureau to conduct and complete the in situ technology research field test to achieve conclusive demonstration of the technology, including the efficient control and manipulation of transport solutions, a cost-shared field demonstration. These funds are to be cost shared by the private sector participant as provided for in the contract. An additional $300,000 is also provided for oversight Bureau oversight and related technology transfer activities to other ground water programs administered by the Bureau to assure that the Federal investment in this technology is maximized.

Desalination Research and Development Program.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,000,000 for the Desalination Research and Development Program. The recommended increase over the budgeted amount is in response to new authorizing legislation expanding the Bureau's desalination responsibilities. The Bureau is directed to make an effort to extend the benefits under this program to small rural communities. The Committee recommendation also includes additional funds for research and de-

velopment activities to develop lower cost and implementable desalting solutions, and funds for cost-shared work to develop the most efficient pump for reverse osmosis desalination.

Wetlands development.—The Committee recommends a $1,000,000 reduction in the increase request in the budget for 1998. Within the $6,659,000 recommended, the Committee has included $1,450,000 under fish and wildlife management and development for the Bureau to undertake Central Arizona project fish and wildlife activities.

Operation and maintenance program costs.—The Committee has been made aware of and is concerned about reports of exceptionally large increases in operation and maintenance costs attributable to a number of Bureau of Reclamation projects including incidents where, is some cases, overhead costs are responsible for more than one-half of the costs growth for the year. On the other hand, the Committee is informed that the inspector general of the Department of the Interior accomplishes annual audits and none has show any indication that reclamation costs are excessive or questionable in any way. Yet, the Committee still finds the criticism disturbing, if in fact, it is true. Therefore, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to conduct a survey of program operation and maintenance costs associated with each of its projects and provide a report to the Committee on the amount of operation and maintenance costs attributable to each project; the percentage change on an annual basis for each project; the amount of overhead cost associated with the O&M costs for each project; the charge to beneficiaries for municipal industrial, irrigation, power, fish and wildlife, recreation, and other reclamation purposes; the percentage of O&M attributable to overhead for each project; and a brief explanation of why any overhead rate exceeds 20 percent of the total O&M cost attributable to each project. The information shall cover fiscal years 1995–97 and be provided to Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Finally, the Committee strongly encourages the Bureau to create new opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the review and development of operation and maintenance budgets for their respective projects. The Committee believes that those responsible for the repayment of O&M charges should have an opportunity for meaningful consultation and coordination with the Bureau during the formulation of the annual budget submission.

Title XVI—Reclamation Wastewater and Ground Water Program.—The Committee is concerned with the increasing size, potential Federal liability, and commitments being made by local interests with the expectation of Federal participation in the Title—XVI Reclamation Wastewater and Ground Water Program. It should be pointed out that Federal participation in projects started in previous years have not kept pace with the expected level of support anticipated by local interests, and the reauthorization legislation, which became law last year, has placed an even greater expectation and burden on already strained budget resources of the Committee. Further, in reviewing specific project schedules, the Committee understands that more and more local sponsors are proceeding on their own in advance of a commitment by the Federal

Government to participate in the project. Local sponsor who take this action do so at their own risk.

It is also clear that budget constraints in the future will continue to hold down the ability of the Committee to commit to additional new projects, particularly projects that carry large amounts of Federal cost sharing. Therefore, the Committee supports efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to develop and apply criteria to prioritize the numerous projects awaiting funding as a result of the new authorizing legislation. The process and criteria should be consistent with the authorizing legislation.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1997	$12,715,000
Budget estimate, 1998	10,425,000
Committee recommendation	10,425,000

The Committee concurs with the House in recommending an appropriation of $10,425,000, the same as the budget request, for the small reclamation program of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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—LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
ARIZONA						
TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION—SCHUK TOAK DISTRICT	5,353,000	5,353,000				
CALIFORNIA						
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER	14,604,000	4,564,000	2,100,000		2,100,000	
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION	8,980,000	3,650,000	1,718,000		1,718,000	
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 3	13,650,411	13,650,411				
SALINAS VALLEY	9,391,000	3,500,000	1,300,000		1,300,000	
SAN SEVAINE PROJECT	28,100,000		976,000		976,000	
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	5,797,000	2,700,000	651,000		651,000	
OREGON						
MILLTOWN HILL, DOUGLAS COUNTY	17,468,000	2,750,000	3,255,000		3,255,000	
VARIOUS						
LOAN ADMINISTRATION			425,000		425,000	
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM			10,425,000		10,425,000	

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriations, 1997	.....
Budget request, 1998	$143,300,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Program, commonly referred to as CALFED, is a joint program between the State of California, and several Federal agencies with the objective of developing a comprehensive, long-term solution to the complex and interrelated water and other resource problems in the bay-delta region. The California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement Act, which authorized this program, became law in November 1996 and authorizes $143,300,000 per year in additional Federal funding for bay-delta ecosystem restoration activities in 1998, 1999, and 2000. It is estimated that the total cost of this effort could be $2,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000. The program will focus on ways to improve the health of the ecosystem and improving management of the water resources in the region.

The Committee commends the diverse interest groups for their efforts and interest in solving the challenging issues related to restoring the bay-delta ecosystem. But the Committee is concerned that the program is not ready or capable of efficiently and effectively utilizing $143,300,000 in the first year of existence. Recent efforts associated with the central Utah project demonstrates that 4 to 5 years is needed for a program of this nature to mature and grow thereby reducing the chances of waste and ensuring that only the best projects and activities receive funding.

Further, critical planning and environment reviews, namely the programmatic EIR/EIS which will set out the preferred alternative restoration program, are currently not complete and it will be late in calendar year 1998 before it is finalized and in place. The mechanism to review project proposals is unclear and time will be needed to strengthen this process and sort through the thousands of proposals for which funding will be requested. While CALFED is an important undertaking, it must be kept in mind that this initiative must compete with other high priority programs during a time of reduced budget allocations and constraints. Therefore, it is essential that the Committee have a high level of confidence that the funding made available will be used fully and efficiently.

Based on the information available to the Committee, and in light of the many requests made for fiscal year 1998, the Committee can recommend only $50,000,000 for the CALFED initiative. This action is taken without prejudice and in the spirit of ensuring the long-term success of the program. As the restoration program matures, the review process is finalized and strengthened, and the required environmental documentation is completed, the Committee will review the program for additional funding needs. During fiscal year 1998, the Committee expects a rigorous, competitive review process will be established—a process which ensures that Federal funds are allocated to only those projects that will provide the greatest benefit to the bay-delta ecosystem. The Committee also expects that performance measures, indicators of ecosystem health and associated monitoring protocols, be established as part of the review process. Further, the Committee directs that, to the

greatest extent possible, Federal funds be spent primarily for on the ground activities and not for administrative, overhead, or support activities. It is thus the Committee's expectation that the participating Federal agencies will obtain these administrative and other costs from the individual agency appropriations account. Similarly, the restoration coordination program's administrative costs should be held to a minimum.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 1997	$38,096,000
Budget estimate, 1998	39,130,000
Committee recommendation	25,130,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,130,000. The Committee understands that $14,000,000 of carryover appropriations from prior years is available for use in 1998 and, therefore, has reduced the funding request accordingly.

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.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1997	$46,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	47,658,000
Committee recommendation	47,558,000

The Committee recommendation for policy and administration expenses is $47,558,000.

This program provides for the executive direction and management of all reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, Denver, CO, 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 concerned about the administrative overhead costs in the Sacramento regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation and has recommended a $100,000 reduction in those costs. The Committee is aware of criticism of the regional office that it has been unresponsive to concerns regarding its management practices and neglect of regional issues.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's defense and nondefense functions, the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee has reorganized the Department of Energy's nondefense accounts to create the following structure:

Energy research:
- Solar and renewable energy;
- Nuclear energy;
- Environment, safety, and health;
- Magnetic fusion energy; and
- Energy support activities.

Uranium supply and enrichment.

Nondefense environmental management.

Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

Nuclear waste fund.

Science:
- High energy physics;
- Nuclear physics;
- Biological and environmental research;
- Basic energy sciences; and
- Other energy research.

Departmental administration.

Inspector general.

Community relations.—The Department of Energy's success in forging support among communities in which DOE facilities are located has been mixed. The Committee recommends that particular effort be made to improve community relations by encouraging DOE and contractor employees to interact with and become a part of their communities.

Community relations have been particularly difficult in those situations in which the Department's facilities have been isolated by secrecy and set apart by social and economic factors. The Committee commends the Department for its initial efforts to recognize and address these difficult issues and, in particular, for the establishment of the Hispanic outreach initiative.

The Department, its employees, and the employees of its contractors have unique capabilities that could be of great benefit to their communities. The Committee has reestablished the university and science education program to formalize a portion of the Department's efforts in this regard and will continue to review other specific proposals that could assist in this regard.

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12902

The Committee is aware of interest over many years in feasible cost-effective applications for solar energy within the Federal Gov-

ernment. The goal has been addressed in legislation and in Executive Order No. 12902, dated March 8, 1994. The Committee intends that the Federal Government utilize solar technology wherever economically feasible.

Consistent with these goals and objectives, the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] is directed to coordinate a Government-wide effort to find feasible, cost-effective applications for solar energy within the Federal Government and in the application of Federal programs. The OMB shall assess progress made under Executive Order No. 12902 and report to Congress no later than 120 days after enactment of this provision. The report shall compile existing data, identify viable, cost-effective use of solar technology, and specify further actions necessary to assure progress in Federal Government use of solar technology.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1997	.....
Budget estimate, 1998	$1,084,178,000
Committee recommendation	966,940,000

The Committee has consolidated the Department of Energy's programs related to energy production and consumption within a new account: energy research. Those programs are: solar and renewable energy; nuclear energy; nondefense environment safety, and health; magnetic fusion, and; related energy support activities.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 1997	$266,344,000
Budget estimate, 1998	344,700,000
Committee recommendation	301,422,000

The Committee urges the Department to develop an agencywide program to pool resources and work with States to develop and implement their renewable energy portfolios in preparation for utility deregulation. This should include funding for organizations like the National Renewable Energy Laboratory to provide assistance with advanced resource assessment and mapping techniques.

Solar energy.—The Committee has provided $189,111,000, an increase of $14,774,000 over the current level, for solar energy programs. The Committee recommendation includes: $2,500,000 for solar building technology research to be allocated among quality assurance, technology deployment, and technology development as it is in the current year; the Committee has provided $69,521,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the current year for photovoltaic energy systems to provide, in part, for the President's million solar roofs initiative, within that amount, $2,000,000 shall be made available to support the ongoing research in photovoltaics conducted by the Southeast and Southwest regional photovoltaic experiment stations, and; $14,350,000 for solar thermal energy systems to be allocated in accordance with the request except that funds are not provided to deploy additional dish/engine systems since two were deployed in fiscal year 1997 and funds are not provided for systems and markets/industrial assistance.

Biofuels.—The Committee recommendation includes $60,000,000 for biofuels energy systems, an increase of $5,025,000 over the current level. The Committee recommends that the funds provided be

allocated in the following manner: within the "Biopower energy systems" account: $1,500,000 for thermochemical conversion, $23,000,000 for system development, and $3,000,000 for biomass for cogeneration; within biofuels energy systems: $27,000,000 for ethanol production, including the requested amount for the biomass ethanol plant in Jennings, LA, $3,500,000 for feedstock development, and $2,000,000 for the regional biomass energy program.

In fiscal year 1997, the Department completed funding for biomass gasifiers in Vermont and Hawaii. The Committee is aware of proposals to upgrade those facilities to demonstrate the application of more advanced energy conversion technologies. The Committee is supportive of those proposals and recommends that the Department enter into cost-shared partnerships to demonstrate those advanced technologies if the non-Federal partners are willing to provide 50/50 cost sharing for the additional costs.

The Committee is also aware of proposals to use switchgrass that is beneficial to control soil erosion as a fuel for electric generation, is supportive and recommends that the Department enter into cost sharing partnerships to demonstrate the technologies if the non-Federal partners provide the required cost sharing.

Wind.—The Committee recommends $34,640,000 for wind energy systems, an increase of $5,654,000 over fiscal year 1997, and recommends the following amounts within turbine research: $2,000,000 for near-term research and testing, an increase of $2,000,000 over fiscal year 1997; $5,000,000 for the next-generation turbine project, an increase of $5,000,000 over the fiscal year 1997 level; and no funds have been provided for the small wind turbine project which has received no new funds in the last 2 years. The Committee recommends $8,300,000, the same as the fiscal year 1997 level, for cooperative research and testing. From the funds provided, $2,000,000 is to complete installation of wind turbines at Kotzebue, AK.

International solar energy.—The Committee recommends $2,000,000, an increase of $1,250,000 over the fiscal year 1997 level for the U.S. initiative on joint implementation.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends $30,000,000, a slight increase over the level provided in fiscal year 1997, of which $300,000 is provided to continue operation of the ocean thermal energy conversion system at Keahole Point, Kona, HI, in order to: obtain operation data regarding components, performance, and output; provide potential commercial partners with a functioning demonstration of the technology; and continue to demonstrate U.S. leadership in the development of ocean thermal energy conversion technology.

The Committee has provided $300,000, the same as the budget request, for the Geo-Heat Center at the Oregon Institute of Technology.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee recommends $19,000,000, a $4,000,000 increase above the level of the request.

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy has invested heavily in hydrogen research and development with inadequate attention to the validation and deployment of new technologies. Therefore, the Committee recommends that an operational test and evaluation program be established and adminis-

tered at the Nevada test site wherein production, storage, distribution, and utilization can be integrated at a single site. This initiative will facilitate quantitative understanding of technology capabilities in a comprehensive functional system.

The Committee directs the Department to support the Russian-American Fuel Cell Consortium [RAFCO] demonstration of United States fuel cell power. The Committee has included $4,000,000 for this initiative.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000, the same amount as provided in fiscal year 1997, for the renewable Indian energy resources program to encourage the vertical integration of energy production on Indian reservations.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation for electric energy systems and storage is $44,500,000, an increase of $12,750,000 over the amount provided in fiscal year 1997. The increase is due to a $12,750,000 increase in funding for high temperature superconducting research and development; one of the Department's most promising research programs. The Committee has provided $8,000,000 to complete the electric and magnetic fields research and development program. The Committee has not provided funding for the climate challenge program which received no funding in fiscal year 1997.

Remote power.—The Committee is concerned by the uncertain future renewable energy technologies face in a deregulated electricity market. However, there is one area of applications for which the Committee contends renewable energy technologies are close to being a viable alternative to traditional energy sources.

In much of the developing world, and portions of the United States, the costs of electricity transmission and distribution systems are prohibitive. As a result, large amounts of electricity are generated using comparatively expensive and polluting diesel generators. In may cases, renewable energy technologies are cost competitive. They are not utilized, however, for two related reasons; reliability and acceptance.

For technologies that will be unable to compete in a deregulated, utility-based electricity market, the Committee directs the Department to focus near-term research on the development of reliable systems for remote applications in occasionally hostile climates.

For example, the Department should consider programs to deploy solar, wind, fuel cell, and biomass technologies in remote areas of the United States. The objective of the demonstrations should be to displace diesel generation. Therefore, the Department should develop and demonstrate cost competitive, modular technologies as reliable, easy to operate, and maintain as diesel generators. The Committee has included $5,000,000 for this initiative.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable energy program direction is $13,811,000, a $2,083,000 increase from the amount provided in fiscal year 1997. The amount recommended provides for a 15-percent reduction in the amount requested for salaries.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1997	$219,890,000
Budget estimate, 1998	311,877,000
Committee recommendation	244,281,000

The Committee recommendation for nuclear energy research and development is $66,642,000, a reduction of $45,261,000 from the request.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The Committee recommends $45,000,000 for advanced radioisotope power systems, an increase of $6,738,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 1997.

Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation.—An amount of $2,000,000 was requested for materials irradiation to support the magnetic fusion energy program. The Committee has provided no funds within the "Nuclear energy" account for this activity but has included a significant increase above the amount requested in the magnetic fusion energy program. Of that increase, $2,000,000 is available for advanced test reactor fusion irradiation.

Nuclear energy security.—The Committee has not provided funds for the Department's proposed nuclear energy security program. The Committee supports the use of nuclear energy to produce electricity. However, it is the view of the Committee that utility companies' decisions regarding the continued use of nuclear energy will be based on cost, public perception, and technical considerations in that order. It is the Committee's view that the Department's proposed program to address technical issues will have insufficient impact to justify the expense and that any technical issues that need to be resolved by utilities can well be resolved at their own expense.

Uranium programs.—Due to budget constraints, the Committee has provided $71,400,000 instead of the requested $85,535,000 for uranium programs.

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation for isotope support is $17,504,000, an increase of $4,800,000 from the fiscal year 1997 level. The $4,200,000 reduction from the request is due to the Committee's recommendation that $6,704,000, the same as the amount provide in fiscal year 1997, be provided for isotope production and distribution, instead of the $10,904,000 requested.

Termination costs.—The Committee has provided $72,035,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 for termination costs. The reduction results from the Committee's recommendation to provide only $3,000,000 of the requested $5,500,000 to terminate the advanced light water reactor program and to not provide the requested $1,500,000 for management studies and evaluations.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 1997	$84,003,000
Budget estimate, 1998	108,916,000
Committee recommendation	87,779,000

The Committee recommendation includes $87,779,000 for environment safety, and health.

The reduction results from the Committee's recommendation to shift $18,731,000 requested for health studies to the "Atomic en-

ergy defense, environment safety and health" account as the Committee has done in previous years and to reduce the remaining amount of the request by $2,406,000.

Line management support.—The Committee has provided $16,244,000 for line management support, the same amount as provided in fiscal year 1997 when a $4,500,000 adjustment is made to reflect the shift of the certification, packaging, and transportation of nuclear materials program from this account to the nondefense "Environmental management" account in fiscal year 1998.

External regulation.—The Committee notes with interest the joint efforts by the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to evaluate the costs and benefits of an independent regulatory entity overseeing certain DOE nuclear activities or facilities. In particular, the Committee understands that the NRC and the DOE are developing a small pilot program to test regulatory concepts for DOE nuclear activities or facilities and understands that this work will be performed under a reimbursable arrangement from the DOE to the NRC. The Committee recommends that the pilot program have the following objectives: to obtain sufficient information about a set of DOE nuclear activities or facilities to determine the value added if NRC had regulatory oversight of the activities or facilities; to evaluate alternative regulatory approaches to NRC regulation of DOE nuclear activities or facilities; to determine the status of a set of DOE facilities with respect to meeting existing NRC requirements, and to identify any significant safety issues; to identify potential issues associated with a transition to NRC oversight of DOE nuclear facilities; and to assess the costs (to NRC and DOE) associated with NRC regulation of DOE nuclear facilities. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for this purpose.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for environment, safety, and health program direction is $45,835,000. The $350,000 reduction from the request is to be taken from the proposed travel budget resulting in a travel budget of $2,000,000, a $500,000 increase over the fiscal year 1997 level.

MAGNETIC FUSION ENERGY

Appropriations, 1997	$232,337,000
Budget estimate, 1998	225,000,000
Committee recommendation	240,000,000

This Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act provided $244,144,000, a reduction of $128,419,000 or 34 percent from the amount requested, for the magnetic fusion energy program. In the conference report accompanying the act, the conferees instructed the Department to prepare, with the participation of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee, a strategic plan to implement the necessarily restructured program. The conferees directed that the plan should assume a constant level of funding in the base program for the next several years; as appropriate, it should be integrated with the plans of the international magnetic fusion program; and it should address the institutional makeup of a domestic program consistent with the funding assumptions.

Last year, the Committee was impressed that, with the assistance of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee, the Department

was able to develop a balanced program consistent with the directions of the Committee. However, because of budget pressures, the Committee was able to recommend only $240,000,000. That amount was further reduced in conference with the House so that the final level provided for fiscal year 1997 was $232,337,000.

For fiscal year 1998, the Committee recommends $240,000,000 for the magnetic fusion energy program. This amount will fulfill the Committee's commitment to provide level funding in light of the magnetic fusion community's successful effort to restructure the program. This amount includes $2,000,000 transferred to the "Magnetic fusion energy" account from the "Nuclear energy" account for advanced test reactor fusion irradiation.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1997	$110,300,000
Budget estimate, 1998	112,220,000
Committee recommendation	111,993,000

Energy support activities include the technical information management program, program direction, construction, and field office management. The Committee recommends $111,993,000, a reduction of $227,000 from the request.

Technical information management.—The Committee recommends $2,200,000 for technical information management, $227,000 below the request and the same amount as provided in fiscal year 1997.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 1997	$591,711,000
Budget estimate, 1998	684,684,000
Committee recommendation	664,684,000

In previous years, nondefense environmental restoration and waste management and nuclear materials and facilities stabilization were included in the "Energy supply, research, and development" account.

FUSRAP.—The reduction from the request is due to budget constraints, and the Committee recommends that it be taken from the Formerly Utilized Site Remediation Action Program [FUSRAP]. The Committee strongly supports FUSRAP and last year urged the Department to increase the request for FUSRAP. The Committee appreciates the Department's responsiveness in this regard; the budget request increases from $75,085,000 to $182,079,000, a 142-percent increase. Unfortunately, budget constraints prevent the Committee from providing the full amount of the increase. The Committee recommendation includes $162,079,000 for the program, a 116-percent increase over fiscal year 1997.

From within available funds, the Committee recommendation is to continue the support of the University Research Program in Robotics at $3,500,000.

The Committee supports the multi-institution, multistate consortium known as the Integrated Petroleum Environmental Consortium [IPEC], and is especially encouraged with its level of research expertise and development of technology to address biological waste

treatment and bioremediation. The Committee encourages the Department to fully support the initiative of this multi-institution consortium.

These funds also support continued standby condition for the fast flux test facility to be evaluated as a possible backup option for tritium production.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 1997	$200,200,000
Budget estimate, 1998	248,788,000
Committee recommendation	230,000,000

The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund was established in accordance with title XI of Public Law 102–486, the National Energy Policy Act of 1992. The funds provided for the environmental cleanup of the Department's uranium enrichment plants, two of which are currently leased to the USEC, and the cleanup of uranium mill tailings and thorium piles resulting from production and sales to the Federal Government for the Manhattan project and other national security purposes.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $18,788,000 from the budget request of $248,788,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

Appropriations, 1997	$182,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	190,000,000
Committee recommendation	160,000,000

The Committee has provided $350,000,000 for the civilian nuclear waste program; $160,000,000 derived from the nuclear waste fund and $190,000,000 derived from the "Atomic energy defense" account. These funds should be used to proceed in accordance with the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Draft Program plan issued by the Department in May 1996. No later than September 30, 1998, the Secretary shall provide to the President and to the Congress a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain site. The viability assessment shall include: the preliminary design for the critical elements for the repository and waste package; a total system performance assessment, based upon the design concept and the scientific data and analysis available on June 30, 1998, describing the probable behavior of the Yucca Mountain geologic setting relative to the overall system performance standards; a plan and cost estimate for the remaining work required to complete a license application; and an estimate of the costs to construct and operate the repository in accordance with the design.

The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the State of Nevada and $6,175,000 for affected local governments in accordance with statutory restrictions contained in the act.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 1997	$2,239,517,000
Budget estimate, 1998	2,260,377,000
Committee recommendation	2,223,077,000

The Committee has consolidated the Department's science programs, previously in energy supply research and development and general science and research, into a single "Science" account. Those programs are: high energy physics, nuclear physics, biological and environmental research, basic energy sciences, and other energy research.

The Committee is concerned that the level of funding requested by the Department for science is inadequate to make full use of research facilities in which the Federal Government has made significant capitol investments. The Committee urges the Department, in preparing its fiscal year 1999 budget request, to more fully support the capabilities of new facilities, including support for laboratory completion and operating costs and for university researchers conducting experiments at these facilities.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1997	$670,075,000
Budget estimate, 1998	675,035,000
Committee recommendation	675,035,000

The Committee has provided the full amount of the request for high energy physics and strongly endorses U.S. participation in the large hadron collider.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1997	$315,925,000
Budget estimate, 1998	315,925,000
Committee recommendation	315,925,000

The Committee has provided the full amount of the request for nuclear physics.

The Committee understands that by providing an additional $3,000,000 in operating funds for the Thomas Jefferson National Laboratory such that its budget is $70,400,000 instead of the requested $67,400,000, the laboratory could operate for an additional 8 weeks in fiscal year 1998. The Committee encourages the Department to review its budget for nuclear physics and provide the additional funds if possible.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1997	$389,075,000
Budget estimate, 1998	376,710,000
Committee recommendation	376,710,000

The Committee has provided the full amount of the request for biological and environmental research, including $9,700,000 for the National Institute for Global Environmental Change.

The Committee has provided $3,930,266, an increase of $730,266 over the current year, to continue the nuclear medicine research program in biological imaging at the University of California Los Angeles. Also, at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, $300,000 is recommended to establish a biological and environmental research genetic biodiversity laboratory and $150,000 to study indoor air quality.

The Committee notes that the Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia, PA, is establishing a new women's cancer center as

a focal point of care for its own patients and those of community hospitals by introducing new technologies and promoting and facilitating biomedical research. The Committee further notes that the Einstein Center is located in an area with nearly twice the national proportion of households with incomes under $15,000 per year and that cancer is a particular problem for the poor, who often neglect their health for financial reasons. The Committee directs the Department to consider a proposal from the Einstein Center for a research and health care delivery project to determine whether it meets the objective of using the Department's unique scientific and technical capabilities to solve major problems in medicine and biology.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1997	$649,348,000
Budget estimate, 1998	668,240,000
Committee recommendation	668,240,000

The Committee has included the amount of the budget request for basic energy sciences.

EPSCoR.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to continue the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] Program. Also, the Midwest superconductivity consortium is continued at the current level.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1997	$205,094,000
Budget estimate, 1998	229,267,000
Committee recommendation	212,167,000

Other energy research programs such as energy research analysis, laboratory technology transfer, advisory and oversight, multiprogram energy laboratory support, and program direction are funded in this section.

University and science education.—The Department of Energy through its national laboratories and sites has unique physical and intellectual resources available to support the Nation's efforts to prepare the next generation of scientists and engineers by improving teaching and learning in science, technology, engineering, and math at all levels. The Committee regrets the elimination last year of the university and science education program and has provided $10,000,000 to reinstate it. The Department is directed to focus its educational efforts on two areas in fiscal year 1998: expanding undergraduate and faculty research opportunities through programs such as the successful University Lab Cooperative Program; and reinstating programs to support minority institutional development, in particular, the Minority Technical Education Program.

Next-generation internet.—The Committee has not provided the $25,000,000 requested for the Department's participation in the next-generation internet. The Committee concurs with the Department's finding that increased internet capabilities would facilitate broader use of and benefit from the Department's scientific user facilities. However, given the rapid rate of commercial internet technology development, the Committee concludes it is unnecessary for the Department to fund the development of enabling technologies to meet its internet requirements.

Computational and technology research.—The Committee recommendation for other energy research programs includes $760,000 for computing equipment at the Institute for Computational Chemistry and Molecular Modeling at the University of Georgia.

Program direction.—The Committee has provided $28,500,000 for program direction, the same as the amount provided in fiscal year 1997 and $2,100,000 less than the request.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 1997	$215,021,000
Budget estimate, 1998	232,604,000
Committee recommendation	220,847,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Revenues, 1997	$125,388,000
Budget estimate, 1998	131,330,000
Committee recommendation	131,330,000

For fiscal year 1997, the Congress reduced funding for departmental administration by 9 percent and is generally pleased with the Department's implementation of the reduction. However, during the reduction, the Department maintained the number of full-time equivalents [FTE's] in the Office of General Counsel and increased the number of FTE's in the Office of the Secretary. In order to return the number of FTE's in the Office of the Secretary to the 1996 level, the Committee has provided $2,500,000, $500,000 more than was provided in fiscal year 1997 but $350,000 less than the request, for the Office of the Secretary. Within general management—personnel compensation and benefits, the Committee has provided $13,950,000 for salary and benefits for the Office of General Counsel and expects the Secretary to reduce the number of FTE's in the Office to 150 instead of increase it to 170 as requested. In accordance with a budget amendment submitted by the Department, of the amount provided for other expenses within Departmental Administration, $1,623,000 is available for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary in order to pay the salaries and expenses of employees otherwise on detail to the Office of the Secretary.

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1997	$23,853,000
Budget estimate, 1998	29,499,000
Committee recommendation	27,500,000

The Committee has provided $27,500,000, $1,999,000 less than the request, for the Office of the Inspector General. The Committee is aware that, by utilizing unobligated balances, the Office of the Inspector General has maintained total program costs of $28,000,000 and $28,600,000 for the previous 2 years. Due to budget constraints, the Office will have to reduce its total program costs in fiscal year 1998.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The atomic energy defense activities programs of the Department of Energy are divided into four separate appropriation accounts: weapons activities; defense environmental restoration and waste management; other defense programs; and defense nuclear waste disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1997	$3,911,198,000
Budget estimate, 1998	[1] 3,576,255,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 4,302,450,000

[1] Excludes funding requested for asset acquisitions.
[2] Reflects incremental funding for asset acquisition projects.

Weapons activities support the Nation's national security mission of nuclear deterrence by preserving nuclear weapons technology and competence in the laboratories and maintaining the reliability and safety of the weapons in the enduring nuclear stockpile. The United States continues to retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter future hostile countries from seeking a nuclear advantage. In the past, confidence in the nuclear weapons stockpile was assured through a combination of underground nuclear and laboratory testing. 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 mission of defense programs is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, utilizing a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. 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 certify weapon 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.

The Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program is a single, highly integrated technical program for maintaining the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile in an era without underground nuclear testing and without new nuclear weapons development and production. Traditionally, the activities of the three weapons laboratories and the Nevada test site have been regarded

separately from those of the weapons production plants. However, although there remain separate budget items within defense programs, all stockpile stewardship and management activities have achieved a new, closer linkage to each other.

There are three primary goals of the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program: (1) provide high confidence in the safety, security, and reliability of the U.S. stockpile to ensure the continuing effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear deterrent while simultaneously supporting U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policy; (2) provide a small, affordable, and effective production complex to provide component and weapon replacements when needed, including limited lifetime components and tritium; and (3) provide the ability to reconstitute U.S. nuclear testing and weapon production capacities, consistent with Presidential directives and the "Nuclear Posture Review," should national security so demand in the future.

The policy framework which guides the Department of Energy's stockpile stewardship and management activities is the "Nuclear Posture Review" which is approved by the President. The requirements for DOE stated in terms of infrastructure to support U.S. nuclear forces are: (1) maintain nuclear weapons capability (without underground nuclear testing); (2) demonstrate the capability to design, fabricate, and certify weapon types in the enduring stockpile; (3) maintain the capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads; and (4) ensure tritium availability. In addition, the President has also requested a new annual certification process to certify that the stockpile is safe and reliable in the absence of underground nuclear testing, and to produce a statement about the future confidence in the safety and reliability of the stockpile.

The Committee has serious concerns that projected budget profiles for the Department of Energy may be insufficient to sustain important stockpile stewardship and management initiatives, such as the national ignition facility; a new tritium source; critical diagnostic tools; and a production infrastructure supporting a START II stockpile with the capability of returning to START I levels, while at the same time allowing the Nation's nuclear weapons laboratories to certify the safety and reliability of the weapons in the stockpile. The Committee believes that the issue of sufficient resources to ensure the certification of the weapons stockpile safety and reliability is of such importance it requires the immediate attention of the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the National Security Council, and the President. The capability of the national laboratories to provide the certification required by the President must not be allowed to erode in future years.

The Committee's recommendation for weapons activities is $4,302,450,000, an increase of $391,252,000 over the enacted funding level for fiscal year 1997. While this is a sizable increase over last year, it is still well short of the amount that those require to certify the safety and reliability of the stockpile feel is adequate to fulfill their responsibility. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

An appropriation of $1,925,900,000 is recommended for the stockpile stewardship activities of the Department of Energy.

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in weapons 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.

The Committee continues to view laboratory directed research and development [LDRD] as an integral, essential component of the Department's ability to respond to changing needs and requirements, and maintaining the preeminence of the national laboratories in the areas of science and engineering. The Committee directs DOE to continue current guidelines for managing laboratory directed research and development.

Core stockpile stewardship.—The Core Stockpile Stewardship Program provides the physical, technical, and intellectual infrastructure necessary to support a reliable, safe, and secure nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee has recommended a total of $1,333,290,000 for core stockpile stewardship base operating programs. This is $175,000,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the funding level proposed for fiscal year 1998 and future budget planning projections of the Department of Energy may not be sufficient to address the critical needs of an aging stockpile. The Committee believes that preservation of core intellectual, scientific, and technical competencies and the continued ability of the weapons complex to respond to changing world situations is critically important. Further, the Committee is not convinced that engineering and surveillance approaches of yesterday will be adequate to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of underground testing.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $50,000,000 for the Core Research and Advanced Technology Program. This program provides the science and technology infrastructure needed to support DOE's defense mission. Emphasis is placed on those research and technology development activities necessary to maintain and improve the understanding of the underpinning science of complex nuclear weapons systems and subsystems and to advance the enabling technologies used in weapon assessment, engineering, certification, surveillance, and disposal. This program sustains the DOE defense core competencies and core technologies which provide the principal opportunities for assistance in advanced manufacturing.

The Committee is aware of the significant scientific advancements made over the past year on the Z-accelerator at Sandia National Laboratory. Major increases in energy and temperature production enhance prospects that pulsed power may contribute in a significant way to both weapons and energy applications. Much has been accomplished, but more remains to be done to enhance the maturity of the technology. Therefore, DOE is urged to develop a scientific and technical contract, including milestones and deliverables, in order to guide and assess the future progress of the pulsed power program.

The Committee increase places emphasis on critical core activities such as advanced hydrodynamic radiography, advanced manufacturing components and technologies, electronics, photonics, and

microelectronic. The Department is to continue to emphasize and advance activities related to an advanced hydrodynamic test facility. Additional funding is also provided for chemistry and material science technology.

Up to $30,000,000 is provided to develop an in-house, contingent source of radiation hardened microelectronics. It is not the Committee's preference that the Department supply its own radiation hardened microelectronics. To the contrary, the Committee would prefer that the private sector be positioned to supply radiation hardened microelectronics; an essential component for a variety of Department of Energy applications. However, in recent years, 13 of 15 radiation hardened microelectronics suppliers have left the business, and the remaining 2 face an uncertain future. Given the importance of these components, the Committee directs the Department to develop a capability, should it be necessary, to rapidly transfer production capability to private sector vendors to produce radiation hardened microelectronics.

An increase of $25,000,000 is included for the accelerated strategic computing initiative [ASCI]. The ASCI program will provide the computing software, computer platforms, and an operating environment to allow the national laboratories to make critical decisions about the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapon stockpile without underground nuclear testing. Additional funding is recommended to support code development and simulation, for additional physics modeling, and other essential activities.

An additional $10,000,000 is recommended to enhance nonnuclear component assessment and experimental activities.

Consistent with Senate authorizing committee action, no funding is included for the Greenville Road project.

Landmine remediation.—The problem of abandoned antipersonnel landmines has reached crisis proportions with more than 30,000 people killed or seriously injured by these abandoned weapons each year. The national laboratories of the Department of Energy have developed a cooperative effort to accelerate their technical contributions to this important endeavor. New technologies have been developed which have the potential of detection, localization, and discrimination of both metallic and nonmetallic antipersonnel landmines. A test and evaluation facility at the Nevada test site provides a unique environment to field test and evaluate performance of the technologies. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to use such funds as are available within the stockpile stewardship for operation of this testing facility and for further technology development for detecting, locating, and removing the threat of abandoned landmines.

Testing capabilities and readiness.—An appropriation of $187,002,000 is recommended for testing capabilities and readiness activities. The Committee is concerned that insufficient resources and emphasis is being given to the Testing Capability and Readiness Program. Current Presidential direction is to maintain a readiness capability to conduct an underground nuclear test at the Nevada test site. Therefore, infrastructure and other measures are to be maintained to support this requirement. Presidential direction also indicates that resources should be included that are necessary to conduct experimental activities planned by the nuclear weapons

design laboratories and appropriate to the national nuclear testing policy. It should be pointed out that DOE's budget document made it clear that the decrease proposed in the budget for fiscal year 1998 may impact test readiness activities.

The additional funds recommended will protect the Nation's ability to return to underground testing, if required; execute the planned subcritical experiments for fiscal year 1998; and adequately plan for future experiments, and conduct the required number of hydrodynamic experiments.

Infrastructure and capital equipment.—The three weapons laboratories and the Nevada test site will continue to form the foundation upon which the science-based stewardship program is built and from which many capabilities to support other critical work will originate. However, the institutional infrastructure of the laboratories cannot be ignored if their longer-term vitality is to be maintained. Therefore, the Committee has included an additional $50,000,000 to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance and for facility refurbishment; and $10,000,000 to address the capital equipment needs at the laboratories and Nevada test site.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $98,810,000 is recommended for construction projects under core stockpile stewardship activities for fiscal year 1998. The Committee action does not concur with the budget proposal to fully fund DOE's stockpile stewardship construction projects in a consolidated "Defense asset acquisition" account. The incremental funding amount has been included by the Committee.

Inertial confinement fusion [ICF].—An appropriation of $227,000,000 is recommended for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program. The ICF Program continues to be a major contributor to the science and technology base supporting the nuclear deterrent through improved understanding of the underlying physics of nuclear weapons and computational modeling that will provide the future basis for ensuring safety, reliability, and performance on nuclear components.

Recognizing the increased value of the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program to Stockpile Stewardship and Management, the Committee has recommended an increase of $10,000,000 to better exploit the capabilities of the Omega and Nova lasers as well as other assets for the stockpile stewardship program.

Project 96–D–111, national ignition facility [NIF].—The NIF is a key facility in maintaining nuclear weapons science expertise required for the stockpile stewardship program, and to supporting weapons effects testing. An appropriation of $197,800,000, the full amount needed in fiscal year 1998, is recommended for the NIF project. Funding is provided to complete the project design and initiate construction.

Technology transfer and education.—The technology transfer and education program directly supports core competencies through the development of technologies and intellectual capabilities to meet current and future defense mission needs.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $69,000,000 for these activities for fiscal year 1998 to support ongoing cooperative research and development agreements, including AMTEX; and education activities.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,108,050,000 for stockpile management activities. This is $164,219,000 over the current year appropriation.

The stockpile management mission is to provide for maintenance, evaluation, dismantlement, transportation, and disposal of nuclear weapons in accordance with quality, quantity, and schedule requirements approved by the President in the nuclear weapons stockpile plan. The program addresses issues of near-term and long-range support for the enduring stockpile, and for ensuring an adequate supply of tritium. Along with routine stockpile surveillance, this includes corrective maintenance and system replacement, as well as weapon dismantlement. The goal is to support the national security of the United States by maintaining a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent.

The Committee understands that recent risk reduction analysis has indicated the need for additional funding in fiscal year 1998 to support near-term workload activities in support of the W–87 program and to provide capability in preparation of expected future stockpile life extension activities. Therefore, an increase of $25,000,000 is recommended in the Stockpile Life Extension Program for fiscal year 1998.

Joint development of manufacturing technologies with the labs is an integral part of the effort needed to help determine when aging concerns justify refurbishment or remanufacturing. The production plants need new and more efficient means to manufacture components in a fashion consistent with the existing nuclear test data base, and advanced manufacturing technologies to save costs by reducing the number and complexity of the integral manufacturing process steps as well as to monitor product quality. An additional $10,000,000 is provided to support these efforts.

An additional $10,000,000 is recommended for activities related to DOE's environmental surety program. The additional funding is to focus on waste minimization activities within the complex to ensure the weapons complex of the future reduces waste streams in meeting defense requirements.

An additional $15,000,000 is recommended to sustain the modernization of the weapons complex begun last year, and for more efficient and effective manufacturing and infrastructure needs of the weapon production plants. It is critical that the evaluation, surveillance, maintenance, repair, and dismantlement capabilities in the production complex be maintained; along with improving the manufacturing technologies needed to support the stockpile. In addition, these funds are intended to address aging processing equipment, information system upgrades, and funding deficits for ongoing production activities. The Committee expects that the additional funding will be allocated equitably across the production plants and with recognition that the weapons laboratories must be involved in this effort.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 in operating funds for the Department to continue upgrades to the existing tritium recycling facility begun in fiscal year 1997.

The Department is directed to explore ways to utilize the device assembly facility at Nevada in training and other activities associated with nonproliferation and terrorist programs consistent with other weapons activities and requirements.

Tritium source.—An appropriation of $184,485,000 is recommended for activities related to providing a new tritium source. This amount is $34,485,000 over the current year and the same as the budget request. Tritium is a key element used in nuclear weapons which must be replaced periodically in order for the weapon to operate as designed. Currently, there is no capability to produce tritium and, therefore, it is essential that activities related to providing a new source of tritium proceed as quickly as possible and requirements dictate. The Committee continues to support the dual-track program being developed by the Department.

Infrastructure and capital equipment.—The four production plants will continue to perform the production mission into the future. However, the institutional infrastructure of the plants cannot be ignored if their longer-term vitality is to be maintained. Therefore, the Committee has included an additional $40,000,000 to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance and for facility refurbishment and to address critical capital equipment needs.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $171,585,000 is recommended for line item construction projects under core stockpile management for fiscal year 1998. The Committee action does not concur with the budget proposal to fully fund DOE's stockpile management construction projects in a consolidated "Defense asset acquisition" account. The incremental funding amount for fiscal year 1998 has been included by the Committee.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of $268,500,000 is recommended for program direction activities. This is a reduction of $35,000,000 below the budget request and reflects the recommendations of the Institute for Defense Analysis on how best to streamline the management structure of DOE's Office of Defense Programs. The Committee recommendation includes $9,250,000 for the community assistance program at Los Alamos, which is the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1997	$5,459,304,000
Budget estimate, 1998	[1] 5,052,499,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 5,311,974,000

[1] Excludes funding requested for asset acquisition.
[2] Reflects incremental funding for asset acquisition.

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety 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.

The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. Environmental management activities of the Department of Energy are budgeted under three appropriation accounts: defense environmental restoration and waste management; energy supply, research, and development; and the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

This "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" account includes waste management functions, environmental restoration activities, science and technology activities, nuclear materials and facilities stabilization functions, and a variety of other crosscutting and program support activities, such as policy and management, analysis, and education and risk management.

The recommended funding for defense environmental restoration and waste management, excluding the privatization initiative is $5,311,974,000.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is beginning to turn the corner in the cleanup effort. Leadership within the Department has put in place initiatives which have produced greater efficiencies, reduced costs growth on many projects, and resulted in moving the program from the study phase to the cleanup of facilities. Yet, the Committee feels that additional funding is warranted and that it is critical to future program success to have a stable and predictable stream of funding. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 1998 is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

As stated last year, budget constraints will continue to check future increases and additional efficiencies will be required. However, even with these constraints, tremendous progress continues to be made both in tangible, on-the-ground results and in the business practices within the program. The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough businesslike approaches to program execution, including reductions in headquarters staffing. The Department should continue the critical review of the need and requirement for each individual support service contract, duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements, and employees performing functions which duplicate other headquarters functions.

The Committee is concerned about the high cost of disposing of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from Department of Energy sites. The Committee directs the Department to conduct competitive procurements among non-Federal entities for the disposal of its low-level waste and/or mixed low-level waste. The Committee recommends that those procurements allow for the evaluation of alternative regulatory structures allowed under the Atomic Energy Act.

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relative small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The

Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintaining buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible. Therefore, in prioritizing spending for environmental management work, the Secretary should continue to give special attention to those specific facilities which offer the opportunity to accelerate closure thereby reducing significantly out-year costs.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

An appropriation of $1,762,073,000 is recommended for environmental restoration programs, an increase of $17,500,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 1998. The Environmental Restoration Program conducts cleanup activities to stabilize radioactive waste, carries out remediation efforts, and performs decommissioning and decontamination work at contaminated DOE sites. Other activities include performing assessments and characterizations to determine potential radioactive and hazardous waste releases and to reduce and remove the potential risks to the environment, human health, and safety resulting from past defense-related Department activities.

The Committee has provided an additional $17,500,000 for the Department to undertake accelerate efforts to reduce growing landlord costs as discussed earlier in this report, to meet current commitments, and to address high priority removal and remedial actions at various sites including the Savannah River site, Rocky Flats, and the Fernald site. The Committee directs that increased funding be applied to those specific activities and sites where remediation can occurs.

CLOSURE PROJECTS

The Committee is concerned with the way the Department allocated and managed the funding provided for closure projects in fiscal year 1997. Instead of allocating additional funding to specific projects with a high likelihood of accelerating the reduction of landlord and mortgage cost, the funding was essentially provided to the sites on a proportional basis thereby reducing the effectiveness and potential savings of the closure initiative.

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near term results in significantly reduced out-year costs is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term. Since this is not a new initiative or concept to the Department, the Committee expects that clear selection guidelines based on maximizing the return on investment from specific, individual projects be put in place at the earliest possible time in order that the recommended funding can be effectively utilized. The Committee has included $65,000,000 for DOE to carry out this program. Sites such as Savannah River, Hanford, Rocky Flats, and Oak Ridge would

each have the opportunity to propose specific projects to be accomplished under this program.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,571,644,000 for the Waste Management Program, including $1,490,876,000 in operating expenses. The Waste Management Program seeks to protect the public and workers by seeking to minimize, treat, store, and dispose of radioactive, hazardous, mixed, and sanitary waste generated by past and ongoing operations at DOE facilities.

The Committee continues to be concerned with the approach taken by DOE in development of the fiscal year 1998 budget request for waste management activities, specifically the reductions required in ongoing program activities such as reducing large mortgages, safety and compliance monitoring, cleanup of surface contamination, and tank monitoring upgrades and maintenance at Hanford tank farms, in order to undertake DOE's new environmental management privatization initiative.

The Committee recommendation provides significant additional resources to continue critical ongoing activities in an effort to mitigate the impact of proposed budget reductions for fiscal year 1998. Stable and predictable funding levels for ongoing cleanup work are essential in order to sustain the excellent progress being made.

The Committee has recommended additional appropriations for the "Waste management" account in order to bring the operation funding back up closer to the current year level. The recommendation includes additional funding to support increased operations at the defense waste processing facility [DWPF], high level waste research and development work, tank farm characterization and retrieval, and the consolidated incineration facility consistent with the authorized level in the Senate.

Funding has been provided under environment, safety and health in other defense programs to complete the Hanford thyroid study.

Construction projects.—An amount of $80,768,000 is provided for waste management construction activities for fiscal year 1998. This reflects the incremental funding level for construction projects which were requesting in the "Defense asset acquisition" account proposed in the fiscal year 1998 budget request. The Committee recommendation does not concur with a separate acquisition account.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION

The Committee recommendation for nuclear material and facility stabilization is $1,266,021,000. The Nuclear Material and Facility Stabilization Program reflects the change in the Department's mission from production of nuclear weapons to the cleanup of the former production complex. The activities of this program reduce the level of potential risk to people and the environment and drive down the cost of maintaining surplus facilities. Nuclear material and facility stabilization activities that reduce risk include stabilizing nuclear materials and deactivating surplus production facilities. As stabilization and deactivation work is completed, the cost

of implementing other environmental management activities should decrease.

The recommendation includes an increase of $63,000,000 in operating expenses for nuclear material and facility stabilization activities. The Committee recommendation supports continuation of the National Spent Fuel Program, and nuclear materials stabilization and site operations at Savannah River F and H Canyons consistent with the authorization.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development activities is $232,881,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 below the budget request.

The mission of the Office of Technology Development is to develop new technologies or improve existing technologies that reduce risks and the cost of cleanup at the Department's facilities and contaminated areas. The Committee again states its belief that advanced technology development is key to a successful restoration and waste management program, and to significantly reducing costs.

However, the Committee has serious concern with the Department's efforts to develop appropriate and effective technologies to facilitate the cleanup of the legacy of past nuclear weapon production activities. A recent analysis by the Congressional Research Service [CRS] indicated that about $2,000,000,000 has been provided to the DOE Environmental Management Program for technology development. CRS found that with this funding DOE had "funded 1,370 different technology projects and that 50 of those have been deployed or used for actual cleanup work. Another 12 technologies have been selected for deployment. DOE statistics list about 100 additional technologies that may be deployed." The analysis further indicated that the nearly $2,000,000,000 investment had resulted in approximately $309,000,000 in life-cycle cost savings. With this level of return on investment, it is clear to the Committee that changes need to be made in the management, execution, and oversight of the Technology Development Program.

In light of this situation, the Committee has recommended a $25,000,000 reduction for fiscal year 1998. The funding level recommended supports technology development and the technology deployment initiative at lower levels. The Department is to provide a report to the Committee, at the earliest possible time after enactment, which lays out the actions and steps needed to improve the results to this program.

The Committee is informed of the on-site asbestos conversion/recycling unit at Hanford and the successful outcome of the unit's demonstration. The Committee understands that the Hanford technology shows promise as a safe alternative to landfill disposal of asbestos containing material. Therefore, the Committee urges the Secretary to take steps to upgrade the unit to operate at full capacity and potential, if appropriate. In taking this action, the Committee expects the Department to review asbestos disposal needs across DOE and to ensure this technology is allowed to compete with other options to meet disposal needs with the goal of reducing the overall costs as much as possible.

The Committee is aware of the work carried out under the Department's Environmental Management Program in cooperation with university-based researchers who have developed advanced monitoring equipment, including instruments for use in verifying the content of plutonium in waste forms and systems to extend the useful life of melters used to convert DOE waste to glass. The Committee supports these efforts and directs the Department to continue its support for efforts that will lead to cost effective, nonbiased, flexible testing of environmental technologies.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides an appropriation of $18,104,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request, for policy and management activities. The Committee continues to have concern about the overlap and duplication of responsibilities between the Policy Office and other environmental management organizations.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

A total of $50,000,000 is included for the Environmental Science Program. This is the same as the budget request. The goal of this program is to strengthen the Department's environmental management basic science activities through a competitive process between DOE's national laboratories, academic, and industrial organizations. This program was initiated by Congress in fiscal year 1996 in response to the Galvin Commission report.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

An appropriation of $343,000,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee action is taken without prejudice, but in recognition that the new privatization concept has yet to be proven effective.

Based upon the Committee's analysis, the amount recommended is sufficient to meet the Department's privatization requirements.

While recommending sizable reductions in the Department's privatization initiative, the Committee believes that such an approach may have application in some cases, particularly projects that are more traditional in scope and complexity, and ones that are not heavily dependent upon scientific and technological advances for success.

Yet serious questions and issues remain to be addressed if DOE's privatization program, as currently structured, is to be successful. Management, regulatory, and budget issues, to name a few, must be overcome. The Department and those in the Environmental Management Program are to be commended for the hard work and effort to find a solution the cleaning up the waste left from decades of cold war weapons production. The environmental restoration and management is one of the biggest challenges facing this county. The Committee expects the Department to continue to work cooperatively with the legislative branch in an effort to move the program forward, and to provide periodic updates on those steps and actions takes to address the major issues and strengthen the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program.

The Committee notes that the tank waste remediation system [TWRS] privatization project is a critical element of the cleanup program at the Hanford site. Adequately treating and disposing of the high-level nuclear waste in Hanford's 177 underground storage tanks is an essential cleanup priority. While reductions in the fiscal year 1998 request for the TWRS project have been recommended, the Committee supports the privatization of cleanup activities. The Committee feels that the funding proposed should be sufficient for TWRS to proceed in fiscal year 1998.

The Committee also recognizes the importance of treating or removing waste in silo three at Fernald, OH. The Committee recommends that a portion of the funds provided should be used to treat or remove that waste.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $373,251,000, which is $15,000,000 below the budget request. The amount recommended is consistent with that provided by the authorizing committee in the Senate. Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES

The Committee has included a $20,000,000 reduction from prior year balances from the "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" account for fiscal year 1998.

FIXED ASSET ACQUISITION

The budget proposed a new account to consolidate several capital construction project and requested funding to cover the full cost of those projects. The Committee dose not concur with this approach. The recommendation put forth by the Committee provides the incremental portion for each project.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1997	$1,605,733,000
Budget estimate, 1998	[1] 1,605,981,000
Committee recommendation	[2] 1,637,981,000

[1] Excludes funding requested for asset acquisition.
[2] Reflects incremental funding for asset acquisition

An appropriation of $1,637,981,000 is recommended by the Committee for other defense activities.

This account includes the following programs: verification and control technology, nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, security evaluations, the Office of Nuclear Safety, Worker, and Community Transition Assistance, fissile materials control and disposition, emergency management, international nuclear safety and security activities, and naval reactors. Descriptions of each account are provided below.

Verification and control technology/arms control.—The Verification and Control Technology Program includes activities related to nonproliferation and verification research and development, arms control, and intelligence. The Department is engaged in an active nuclear nonproliferation program through research and development activities performed at the national laboratories, by providing technical and analytical support to treaty development and implementation, and by providing intelligence support to these efforts.

The Committee recommendation totals $478,200,000. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology research and development, and arms control totals $444,600,000. The funding level recommended by the Committee provides significant increases over the current year level for DOE to continue important activities related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons; and initiatives to reduce the danger of nuclear smuggling and the associated nuclear terrorism threat.

The recommendation provides an additional $137,008,000 over the current level, which is the same as the budget request, for material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities. The Committee continues to consider these activities important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

Intelligence.—The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers 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 totals $33,600,000, the same as the budget request.

Emergency management.—The Committee has provided $27,700,000 for emergency management activities. The Office of Emergency Management serves as the single point of contact and control for all DOE emergency and threat assessment-related activities, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting the departmental operations and activities or requiring departmental assistance. The amount recommended by the Committee supports increased emphasis to plan and conduct realistic exercises to prepare Federal, State, and local organizations to work effectively in response to domestic terrorism and the use of existing national assets such as the Nevada test site to train Federal, State, and local first responders as part of domestic emergency response program.

Nuclear safeguards and security.—This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft, sabotage, espionage, and terrorist activities. As departmental sites and facili-

ties are decommissioned, safeguards and security costs are expected to decrease Department-wide. The Committee concurs with the budget request of $47,200,000.

Security investigations.—This program includes those activities necessary for granting appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must in the performance of their work have access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position. An appropriation of $20,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety, and Health is the departmental resource that provides oversight in the areas of environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security performance. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $74,000,000, a $20,000,000 increase over the budget request.

The Committee recommendation continues funding to support commitments under State health agreements, and studies conducted under a memorandum with the Department of Health and Human Services under defense activities as in past years. The recommendation also supports the program to monitor former DOE workers with significant occupational exposures. Included in the amount recommended is $2,000,000 for the Hanford thyroid study. The Committee understands that the study will be completed in fiscal year 1998 with the funds recommended.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

In accordance with section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993 and as a result of a change in the work force at defense nuclear facilities, defense employees of the Department may be provided various options to minimize impacts of these work force structure changes. These options include retraining, early retirement incentives, preference in hiring, outplacement assistance, and relocation assistance. In addition, this program funds contractor employment reduction requirements for severance and separation payments. The Committee recommendation is $62,000,000, the same as the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

The Committee recognizes the efforts of the city of Paducah and the surrounding western Kentucky communities to establish a community reuse organization [CRO]. This organization is charged with developing a regional economic plan to minimize possible work force reductions at the Department of Energy's gaseous diffusion plant in Paducah. The Committee directs the Department of Energy to support the establishment of the CRO and participate in the development of a strategic plan for the diversification of the regional economy.

FISSILE MATERIALS CONTROL AND DISPOSITION

The Fissile Materials Control and 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 $95,796,000, which is $9,000,000 over the comparable level for the current level.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

An appropriation of $81,000,000 is recommended by the Committee for international nuclear safety and nuclear security programs of DOE. This is the same as the budget request.

Nuclear energy (defense) supports development of technologies to address issues associated with long-term operation of nuclear powerplants, and to reduce the national security and environmental threats posed by the operation of unsafe and aging nuclear facilities around the world. Particular attention is given to improving the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear powerplants, threats posed by reprocessing of spent fuel in Russia and the former Soviet Union states, and spent fuel management activities that minimize the risks of proliferation of weapons-usable nuclear material.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $660,500,000.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 to continue inactivation and dismantlement of shutdown prototype naval reactor plants at DOE naval nuclear propulsion sites.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 1997	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	190,000,000
Committee recommendation	190,000,000

The Committee recommends $190,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

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 1994, the balance owed by the Federal Government to the nuclear waste fund was $1,071,000,000 (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.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to 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 appropriations, and related receipts 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

Appropriations, 1997	$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	23,500,000

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

Public Law 104–58 authorizes the sale of the APA assets. The Snettisham project will be sold to the State of Alaska and Eklutna project to the three current power customers: Municipal Light & Power, Chugach Electric Association, Inc., and Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. The Department and the APA expect to complete sale of the Eklutna project by November 28, 1997, and of the Snettisham project by December 31, 1997.

The Department has requested, and the Committee has provided, $1,000,000 to meet obligations that may be incurred prior to the sales. Any unobligated balances resulting from that appropriation will be returned to the Treasury of the United States upon the sale of the APA.

The Committee is aware that oil is leaking from one of the APA's submerged cables used to transmit power from the Snettisham hydroelectric facility to Juneau. Unfortunately, because the APA staff has been reduced from 31 to 8 over the previous year in anticipation of the APA's sale, the staff no longer has the engineering or procurement expertise to conduct the major technical procurement necessary to replace the cable.

In order to address this problem, in addition to the $1,000,000 requested, the Committee has provided an additional $2,500,000; the estimated cost of replacing a single cable. It is the Committee's hope that, prior to final disposition of this act, an agreement could be reached between the APA and the State of Alaska by which the

APA would make a contribution to the State to cover the cost of replacing a single cable or, at the discretion of the State, the funds could be used to partially fund the replacement of all four cables.

The Committee has allocated $20,000,000 for the Swan Lake-Lake Tyee Intertie project to promote the economic self-sufficiency of the community of Wrangell, Peterburg, and Ketchikan, AK, which are recovering from the economic disaster attributed to lost timber sales income.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

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 29 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 interregionally 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 21,500 megawatts.

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, regionwide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

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 on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 1998, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $253,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capitol equipment programs.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1998, Bonneville will pay the Treasury $805,000,000, of which $205,000,000 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 1998.

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.

Cost control.—The Committee commends BPA for its actions in the last 3 years to reduce spending by approximately $600,000,000 annually and to reduce staffing by 1,000 positions. The Committee believes there is an opportunity to further reduce costs. The Committee understands that BPA and the Northwest Governor's Regional Review Transition Board are reviewing BPA's budget in order to recommend ways for BPA to further control discretionary programs costs. The Committee supports the efforts of BPA to aggressively review costs to assure that limited ratepayer dollars are prudently spent. In order to keep pace with a competitive wholesale power market, discretionary program expenditures that require ratepayers to assume financial risk must be carefully reviewed by BPA to determine where additional reductions can be made to minimize the potential for stranded cost and to at least achieve BPA's goal of 2 cents in 2000. Concurrent with this review, BPA staffing levels should continue to be reviewed and adjusted to match changing program needs. The Committee directs that BPA and the transition board provide a report to the Committee by March 1, 1998, identifying specific recommendations for cost reductions in all discretionary spending for which BPA is responsible.

Fish and wildlife agreement.—Last fall, four cabinet level Secretaries (Energy, Commerce, Interior, and the Army) signed a memorandum of agreement which committed Bonneville to a fixed budget for its fish and wildlife expenditures for fiscal years 1996 through 2001 that will provide $252,000,000 per year in program funding, plus $90,000,000 to $280,000,000 per year for hydrosystem operating expenditures on fish and wildlife projects, reimbursement to other Federal agencies and the Federal Treasury, the cost of purchase replacement power, and forgone hydrosystem revenues. In fiscal year 1998, the direct expenditure portion of the budget is expected to be $127,000,000. The Administrator shall use the funding available under the direct program portion of the fish and wildlife budget during fiscal year 1998 first to fund those measures, including reasonable and prudent alternatives, that are identified as mandatory Bonneville responsibilities for that fiscal year pursuant to the biological opinions on salmon and sturgeon issued in 1995 under the Endangered Species Act. The remainder of the funding available under the direct program portion shall be used in a manner consistent with the Northwest Power Planning Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program and section 4(h)(10)(D) of the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act.

Independent scientific review panel.—The Committee understands that the Northwest Power Planning Council's Independent Scientific Advisory Review Panel, created by the Fiscal Year 1997 Energy and Water Development Act, has carefully reviewed proposals for funding from BPA's annual fish and wildlife program. The Committee urges the ISRP to continue its aggressive, independent review of projects proposed for funding to ensure that Northwest ratepayer dollars are spent wisely and to maximum benefit of regional fish and wildlife populations.

Hatchery review report.—Due to budgetary constraints it is critical that federally funded programs, such as the hatchery programs for the Columbia River basin, spend limited Federal dollars wisely and in a cost-effective manner that maximizes the benefits to the

fish resource. The Committee directs the Northwest Power Planning Council with assistance from its independent Scientific Advisory Board to conduct a thorough review of all federally funded hatchery programs operating in the Columbia River basin, including an assessment of the hatchery operation goals and principles of State, tribal, and Federal hatcheries, and produce a formal recommendation for a coordinated policy for the future operation of federally funded hatcheries in the basin and how to obtain such a coordinated policy. National Marine Fisheries and the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho and Indian tribes in the basin should assist the Council in its review by providing information necessary to conduct a thorough review of federally funded hatchery programs. An independent, comprehensive review that examines all federally funded hatcheries and their roles in fishery restoration is long overdue, and the Committee directs the Northwest Power Planning Council, to provide a final report to the Committee on the subject by October 1998. The Committee directs BPA to provide the necessary funding based on the Council's scope of work for the hatchery review.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1997	$16,359,000
Budget estimate, 1998	14,222,000
Committee recommendation	12,222,000

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 transmission 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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1997	$25,210,000
Budget estimate, 1998	26,500,000
Committee recommendation	26,500,000

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.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1997	$182,230,000
Budget estimate, 1998	194,334,000
Committee recommendation	180,334,000

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 which operate 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 distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

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 Basin 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 for fiscal year 1998 is $180,334,000, a decrease of $14,000,000 from the budget request of $194,334,000.

The amount to be deposited in the "Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation" account is $5,592,000, the same amount as the request.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994–95. 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.

The Committee recommendation is $1,065,000, the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1997	$156,290,000
Budget estimate, 1998	167,577,000
Committee recommendation	162,141,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1997	$146,290,000
Budget estimate, 1998	167,577,000
Committee recommendation	162,141,000

The Committee recommendation provides $162,141,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Committee recommends that the FERC give high priority to the renewal of hydroelectric licenses for which there are competing applications. In particular, the Committee urges the FERC to decide these cases as their licenses expire.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY RESEARCH			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY:			
Solar energy:			
Solar building technology research	2,307	4,000	2,500
Photovoltaic energy systems	59,921	77,000	69,921
Solar thermal energy systems	22,187	19,800	14,350
Biomass and Biofuels:			
Power systems	27,488	36,500	27,500
Transportation	27,487	40,040	32,500
Wind energy systems	28,986	42,858	34,640
Renewable energy production incentive program	2,000	4,000	2,000
International solar energy program	661	7,000	2,000
Solar technology transfer	.....	1,360	.....
National renewable energy laboratory	500	2,800	1,500
Construction: 96–E–100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	2,800	2,200	2,200
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	3,300	5,000	3,700
Subtotal, Solar Energy	174,337	237,558	189,111
Total, Solar Energy	174,337	237,558	189,111
Geothermal:			
Geothermal technology development	29,982	30,000	30,000
Hydrogen research	14,987	15,000	19,000
Hydropower development	984	1,000	1,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	4,000	.....	4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Electric energy systems and storage:			
Electric and magnetic fields R&D	8,000	8,000	8,000
High temperature superconducting R&D	19,750	32,500	32,500
Energy storage systems	4,000	4,000	4,000
Climate challenge	.....	1,000	.....
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	31,750	45,500	44,500
Program direction	11,728	15,642	13,811
Prior year projects	−1,424	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	266,344	344,700	301,422
NUCLEAR ENERGY:			
Nuclear energy R&D:			
Light water reactor	37,992	.....	.....
Advanced radioisotope power system	38,262	47,000	45,000
Nuclear technology R&D	20,000	.....	.....
Oak Ridge landlord	11,484	9,500	9,500
Test reactor area landlord	2,000	3,217	3,217
Construction: 95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,000	4,425	4,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	3,000	7,642	7,642
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	777	2,000	.....
University reactor fuel assistance and support	4,000	6,000	4,500
Nuclear energy security	.....	39,761	.....

Total, Nuclear energy R&D	115,515	111,903	66,642
Termination costs	76,889	76,035	72,035
Construction:			
97–E–200 Modifications to reactors, sodium system drain and closure, Argonne National Lab—West, ID	1,200	.....	.....
97–E–201 Modifications to reactors, hot fuel examination facility equipment upgrades, ANL–W	1,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	2,200	.....	.....
Total, Termination costs	79,089	76,035	72,035
Uranium programs	.....	79,135	65,000
Construction:			
98–U–200 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	.....	400	400
96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	.....	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, Construction	.....	6,400	6,400
Total, Uranium programs	.....	85,535	71,400
Isotope support	12,704	21,704	17,504
Program direction	13,502	16,700	16,700
Prior year projects	−920	.....	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	219,890	311,877	244,281
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH:			
Environment, safety and health	46,703	62,731	41,944
Program direction	37,300	46,185	45,835
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	84,003	108,916	87,779
MAGNETIC FUSION:			
Fusion energy	232,436	225,000	240,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Prior year projects	−99		
TOTAL, MAGNETIC FUSION	232,337	225,000	240,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES:			
Technical information management program	2,200	2,427	2,200
Program direction	8,700	8,560	8,560
Construction	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	11,900	11,987	11,760
Field offices and management	98,400	100,233	100,233
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	110,300	112,220	111,993
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	912,874	1,102,713	985,475
Renewable energy research program			
Use of prior year balances	−48,177	−18,535	−18,535
General reduction for contractor training			
Prior year projects	−197		
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	864,500	1,084,178	966,940
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			
Uranium program activities	52,466		
Program direction	4,000		
Construction: 96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plant	4,000		

Subtotal, Construction	4,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	60,466	.....	.....
Revenues—Sales	−42,200	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	−17,266	.....	.....
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	1,000	.....	.....
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Environmental restoration	328,000	457,625	437,625
Waste management	177,862	153,004	153,004
Construction:			
97–E–600 ANL waste handling facility, CH	360	.....	.....
94–E–602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL	1,106	1,900	1,900
93–E–900 Long-term storage of TMI–2 fuel, INEL	.....	397	397
91–E–600 Rehabilitation of waste management building 306, ANL	2,066	.....	.....
88–R–830 Liquid low-level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	2,692	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	6,224	2,297	2,297
Total, Waste management	184,086	155,301	155,301
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	73,054	71,758	71,758
Construction: 93–E–900 Long-term storage of TMI–2 fuel, INEL	6,571	.....	.....
Total, Nuclear materials and fac stabilization	79,625	71,758	71,758
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	591,711	684,684	664,684
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	200,200	248,788	230,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	182,000	190,000	160,000
SCIENCE			
High energy physics:			
Research and technology	210,000	205,240	205,240
Facility operations	360,075	418,945	418,945
Construction:			
98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab		5,500	5,500
98–G–305 C–Zero area experimental hall, Fermilab		5,000	5,000
97–G–303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC	3,000	9,400	9,400
94–G–304 B–Factory, SLAC	45,000		
92–G–302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	52,000	30,950	30,950
Subtotal, Construction	100,000	50,850	50,850
Subtotal, Facility operations	460,075	469,795	469,795
Total, High energy physics	670,075	675,035	675,035
Nuclear physics	250,925	256,525	256,525
Construction: 91–G–300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	65,000	59,400	59,400
Total, Nuclear physics	315,925	315,925	315,925
Biological and environmental research:			
Biological and environmental research R&D	352,962	376,710	376,710
Construction:			
94–E–339 Human genome lab, LBL	1,000		

91–EM–100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	35,113	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	36,113	.....	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research	389,075	376,710	376,710
Basic energy sciences:			
Materials sciences	332,051	392,475	392,475
Chemical sciences	171,601	199,933	199,933
Engineering and geosciences	41,225	41,371	41,371
Energy biosciences	28,161	27,461	27,461
Capital equipment	45,695	.....	.....
Construction:			
GPE–400 General plant projects	9,275	.....	.....
97–E–305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	2,500	.....	.....
95–E–305 Accelerator improvement projects	9,840	.....	.....
96–E–300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	9,000	7,000	7,000
Subtotal, Construction	30,615	7,000	7,000
Total, Basic energy sciences	649,348	668,240	668,240
Other energy research:			
Computational and technology research	153,500	175,907	150,907
Energy research analyses	1,834	1,500	1,500
University and Science Education	.....	.....	10,000
Program direction	28,500	30,600	28,500
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities:			
Construction:			
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations [1]	.....	7,259	7,259
95–E–301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	2,500	3,442	3,442
95–E–303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	1,500	.....	.....
95–E–310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	2,960	.....	.....
94–E–363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	.....	4,000	4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	6,960	14,701	14,701
Construction:			
96–E–333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	7,424	5,273	5,273
95–E–307 Fire safety imp. III (ANL)	1,000	718	718
95–E–308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	1,032	568	568
95–E–309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)	4,620	.....	.....
93–E–320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)	224	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	14,300	6,559	6,559
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. suppor	21,260	21,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research	205,094	229,267	212,167
Science program direction	10,000	10,200	10,000
Use of prior year SSC balances	.....	−15,000	−35,000
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,239,517	2,260,377	2,223,077
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations:			
Office of the Secretary—salaries and expenses	2,000	2,850	2,500
General management—personnel compensation and benefits	100,695	104,530	101,695
Severance, termination and related cost	6,000	.....	.....
General management—other expenses	74,900	77,356	73,000
Program support:			
Minority economic impact	1,500	2,320	2,000
Policy analysis and system studies	500	2,096	500
Consumer affairs	40	40	40

Public affairs	50	50	50
Environmental policy studies	2,500	2,500	2,500
Scientific and technical training	500	800	500
Information management	.....	8,000	6,000
Subtotal, Program support	5,090	15,806	11,590
Total, Administrative operations	188,685	200,542	188,785
Cost of work for others	26,336	32,062	32,062
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	.....	.....	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	215,021	232,604	220,847
Miscellaneous revenues	−125,388	−131,330	−131,330
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	89,633	101,274	89,517
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	24,750	29,499	27,500
Use of prior year balances	−897	.....	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	23,853	29,499	27,500
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES:			
Stockpile stewardship:			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,132,570	1,158,290	1,333,290
Construction:			
97–D–102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	.....	46,300	46,300
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations [1]	19,250	51,106	19,810
96–D–103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory [1]	15,100	19,800	13,400
96–D–104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL [1]	14,100	29,820	.....
96–D–105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL [1]	17,100	26,000	19,300

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
94–D–102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	7,787	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	73,337	173,026	98,810
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,205,907	1,331,316	1,432,100
Inertial fusion	234,560	217,000	227,000
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, TBD [1]	131,900	876,400	197,800
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	366,460	1,093,400	424,800
Technology transfer/education:			
Technology transfer	59,400	60,000	60,000
Education	10,000	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	69,400	69,000	69,000
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,641,767	2,493,716	1,925,900
Stockpile management	1,834,470	1,828,465	1,936,465
Construction:			
98–D–123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SR [1]	.....	14,343	11,000
98–D–124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN [1]	.....	7,311	6,450
98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SR [1]	.....	39,453	9,650
98–D–126 Acceleration prod. of tritium, VL [1]	.....	168,590	67,865
97–D–121 Consolidated pit packaging system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	870	.....	.....
97–D–122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM [1]	4,000	41,292	9,200
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS [1]	1,400	16,600	.....
97–D–124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	600	1,900	1,900
96–D–122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant [1]	100	10,600	6,900

96–D–123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y–12 plant	7,000	2,700	2,700
96–D–125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD	3,825	.....	.....
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL [1]	15,000	106,360	15,700
95–D–122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y–12 plant	10,900	12,600	12,600
94–D–124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y–12 plant	4,900	1,400	1,400
94–D–125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	5,200	2,000	2,000
94–D–127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	2,200	.....	.....
94–D–128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant [1]	.....	3,000	.....
93–D–122 Life safety upgrades, Y–12 plant	7,200	2,100	2,100
93–D–123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	14,487	.....	.....
92–D–126 replace emergency notification system, VL	.....	3,200	3,200
88–D–122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	21,940	19,520	18,920
88–D–123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	9,739	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	109,361	452,969	171,585
Total, Stockpile management	1,943,831	2,281,434	2,108,050
Program direction	325,600	303,500	268,500
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....
General reduction for contractor training	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,911,198	5,078,650	4,302,450
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Environmental restoration	1,385,546	1,356,573	1,367,073
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	376,648	388,000	388,000
Total, Environmental restoration	1,762,194	1,744,573	1,755,073
Closure projects	15,000	15,000	65,000
Waste management	1,490,320	1,455,576	1,490,876
Construction:			
98–D–401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC [1]	.....	12,000	1,000
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA [1]	7,584	41,530	13,961

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
96–D–408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations [1]	11,246	12,709	8,200
95–D–402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	752	176	176
95–D–405 Industrial landfill V and construction/demolition landfill VII, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	200	3,800	3,800
95–D–407 219–S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	.....	2,500	2,500
94–D–404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	6,345	1,219	1,219
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA [1]	12,600	182,800	15,100
93–D–182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	8,100	.....	.....
93–D–187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC [1]	20,000	171,969	17,520
92–D–172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant	.....	5,000	5,000
89–D–174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,500	1,042	1,042
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA [1]	10,000	23,573	11,250
Subtotal, Construction	88,327	458,318	80,768
Total, Waste management	1,578,647	1,913,894	1,571,644
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	1,173,718	1,118,114	1,181,114
Construction:			
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA [1]	.....	13,636	8,136
98–D–700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID [1]	.....	10,800	500
97–D–450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,900	18,000	18,000
97–D–451 B–Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	1,500	2,000	2,000
97–D–470 Environment monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, SC [1]	2,500	27,780	5,600
97–D–473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC [1]	2,000	15,200	4,200
96–D–406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	60,672	16,744	16,744
96–D–461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	6,790	2,927	2,927
96–D–464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID [1]	10,440	38,500	14,985
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC [1]	8,541	34,959	8,500

95–E–600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, WA	7,900	.....	.....
95–D–155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC	4,137	2,713	2,713
95–D–456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID [1]	4,645	1,087	602
94–D–401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	547	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	117,572	184,346	84,907
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization	1,291,290	1,302,460	1,266,021
Technology development	303,771	257,881	232,881
Policy and management	23,155	23,104	18,104
Environmental science program	62,136	50,000	50,000
Hanford tank waste vitrification project	170,000	.....	.....
Program direction	411,511	388,251	373,251
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,617,704	5,695,163	5,331,974
Savannah river pension refund	−8,000	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	−150,400	.....	−20,000
General reduction for contractor training	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,459,304	5,695,163	5,311,974
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	160,000	1,006,000	343,000
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs:			
Nonproliferation and national security:			
Verification and control technology:			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	211,919	210,000	210,000
Arms control	216,244	234,600	234,600
Intelligence	34,185	33,600	33,600
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	462,348	478,200	478,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Emergency management	16,794	27,700	27,700
Nuclear safeguards and security	47,208	47,200	47,200
Security investigations	20,000	20,000	20,000
Program direction—NN	88,122	94,900	88,900
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	634,472	668,000	662,000
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	68,094	54,000	74,000
Program direction—EH	10,706	.....	.....
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	78,800	54,000	74,000
Worker and community transition	57,659	65,800	57,659
Program direction—WT	4,341	4,700	4,341
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	62,000	70,500	62,000
Fissile materials disposition	83,163	99,451	91,451
Program direction—MD	3,633	4,345	4,345
Construction: 97–D–140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	17,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Fissile materials control/disposition	103,796	103,796	95,796
Nuclear energy (Defense):			
Nuclear technology research and development: Electrometallurgical program	.....	25,000	25,000
International nuclear safety: Soviet designed reactors	45,000	50,000	50,000
Nuclear security: Spent fuel management	.....	4,000	4,000
Chornobyl shutdown initiative	.....	2,000	2,000
Russian plutonium reactor core conversion	3,500	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	48,500	81,000	81,000
Office of hearings and appeals	.....	2,685	2,685

Total, Other national security programs	927,568	979,981	977,481
Independent assessment of DOE projects	.....	.....	.....
Naval reactors:			
Naval reactors development	641,130	605,920	625,920
Construction:			
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations	8,200	.....	.....
98–D–200 Site laboratory facility upgrade, various locations [1]	.....	1,200	5,700
97–D–201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID [1]	400	4,600	4,600
95–D–200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations [1]	4,800	1,100	1,100
95–D–201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	500	.....	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID [1]	8,000	14,900	3,100
Subtotal, Construction	21,900	21,800	14,500
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	663,030	627,720	640,420
Program direction	18,902	20,080	20,080
Total, Naval reactors	681,932	647,800	660,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,609,500	1,627,781	1,637,981
Use of prior year balances	−3,767	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,605,733	1,627,781	1,637,981
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	200,000	190,000	190,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,336,235	13,597,594	11,785,405
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,000	1,000	3,500

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Capital assets acquisition	.....	.....	20,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	3,989	4,313	4,313
Purchase power and wheeling	23,456	11,909	9,909
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	27,445	16,222	14,222
Use of prior year balances	−11,086	−2,000	−2,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	16,359	14,222	12,222
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses	2,793	2,382	2,382
Purchase power and wheeling	1,095	57	57
Program direction	17,862	17,309	17,309
Construction	6,054	6,752	6,752
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	27,804	26,500	26,500
Use of prior year balances	−2,594	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,210	26,500	26,500
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Construction and rehabilitation	29,764	24,243	24,243
System operation and maintenance	33,453	39,246	39,246
Purchase power and wheeling	74,235	54,886	44,886

Program direction	105,807	106,157	102,157
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,432	5,432	5,432
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	248,691	229,964	215,964
Use of prior year balances	−66,461	−35,630	−35,630
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(3,774)	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	182,230	194,334	180,334
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	970	1,065	1,065
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	228,769	237,121	243,621
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	156,290	167,577	162,141
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	−10,000	.....	.....
FERC revenues	−146,290	−167,577	−162,141
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	.....	.....	.....

[1] This request for this account was $2,999,497. The lower totals shown for the request and prior years reflect Committee recommendation to combine certain functions of the Office of Energy Research with General Science and Research in a new account, General Science and Other Research Activities, and to create a separate account for Non-Defense Environmental Management.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1997	$160,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	165,000,000
Committee recommendation	160,000,000

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 cochairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $160,000,000, which is the same as the current fiscal year. An appropriation of $99,500,000 is recommended for ARC highways.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1997	$16,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	17,500,000
Committee recommendation	17,500,000

An appropriation of $17,500,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1998. This is the same as the budget request.

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.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1997	$471,800,000
Budget estimate, 1998	476,500,000
Committee recommendation	476,500,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1997	$457,300,000
Budget estimate, 1998	457,500,000
Committee recommendation	457,500,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1997	$14,500,000
Budget estimate, 1998	19,000,000
Committee recommendation	19,000,000

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 licenses and annual fees.

The Committee encourages the NRC to continue to give special attention to replacing unnecessary prescriptive requirements and guidance with performance-based requirements and guidance. The Committee believes that a performance-based regulatory approach can substantially improve the regulatory process and result in a more effective and efficient use of both the NRC and licensee resources.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1997	$5,000,000
Budget estimate	4,800,000
Committee recommendation	4,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1997	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	4,800,000
Committee recommendation	4,800,000

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 $4,800,000 for fiscal year 1997.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 1997	$2,531,000
Budget estimate, 1998	3,200,000
Committee recommendation	3,200,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,200,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed 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.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1997	$106,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	106,000,000
Committee recommendation	86,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $86,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is $20,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1998.

The budget for fiscal year 1998 for the Tennessee Valley Authority contemplated the development of a plan that would eliminate Federal funding for the agency's appropriated programs by fiscal year 1999. It was felt that such action would allow TVA to focus more on generating low-cost, dependable electricity. TVA's efforts to develop such a plan have not produced consensus on a way to achieve a significant shift away from appropriations. In addition, the Committee is aware of several legislative proposals which fundamentally change the mission or future of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1998 continues the phase down of TVA while allowing the region and Congress time to consider the future of TVA's activities and responsibilities. The amount recommended by the Committee includes $78,000,000 for general stewardship of the water and land resources of the Tennessee River basin, including $7,900,000 for the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area and $5,000,000 to continue environmental cleanup work at the Environmental Research Center.

The Committee urges the TVA to work with local sponsors in Union County, MS, in its efforts to establish a new water supply lake, and to work cooperatively to resolve the need to relocate TVA power lines that may lie within the project area and assist in the preparation of the environmental impact statement on the project where appropriate.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 502. *Albuquerque metropolitan area water reclamation and reuse, New Mexico.*—The Committee has included language in the bill to clarify that the project is eligible for construction under title XVI of Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Act, Public Law 104–266, as amended.

Section 503. *Chandler pumping plant, Arizona.*—Language is included which amends the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Treaty Settlement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–434) to increase the appropriation ceiling to $13,000,000, at 1997 prices, plus or minus such amounts that may result from ordinary fluctuations of applicable cost indexes. The increase is needed as the result of unforeseen design changes, including the need to provide protection to the existing discharge pipe from pressure surges. The modifications are expected to result in up to 420 ft^3/s, additional flow in an 11 mile stretch of the Yakima River that is critical to the movement of anadromous fish.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 7 of rule XVI requires that Committee reports on general appropriations bills identify each Committee amendment to the House bill "which proposes an item of appropriation which is not made to carry out the provisions of an existing law, a treaty stipulation, or an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998, is currently being considered by the Senate.

Also, contained in title III, Department of Energy, in connection with the appropriation under the heading "Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund," the recommended item of appropriation is brought to the attention of the Senate.

In title IV, independent agencies, the recommended appropriation for the Appalachian Regional Commission is $160,000,000.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7(C), RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee en bloc ordered reported S. 1005, an original DOD appropriations bill and

S. 1004, an original Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, 1998, subject to amendment and subject to their budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mr. Faircloth	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Bumpers	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Boxer	

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 12, RULE XXVI, OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

In compliance with this rule, changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill are shown as follows: existing law to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is printed in italic; and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZATION AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1992 (PUBLIC LAW 102–575)

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1701. IRRIGATION ON STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATION.

(a) * * *

(b) Section 10 of Public Law 89–108, as amended by section 8 of Public Law 99–294, is further amended by adding subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) The portion of the **[**$61,000,000**]** *$62,300,000* authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features shall be indexed as necessary to allow for ordinary fluctuations of construction costs incurred after October 1, 1986, as indicated by engineering costs indices applicable for the type of construction involved. All other authorized cost ceilings shall remain unchanged."

* * * * * * *

YAVAPAI-PRESCOTT INDIAN TRIBE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT (PUBLIC LAW 103–434)

SEC. 1208. CHANDLER PUMPING PLANT AND POWERPLANT-OPERATIONS AT PROSSER DIVERSION DAM.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

(2) **[**$4,000,000 for construction**]** *$13,000,000, at 1997 prices, for construction plus or minus such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations of applicable cost indexes*; and

* * * * * * *

RECLAMATION RECYCLING AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT OF 1996 (PUBLIC LAW 104–266)

"SEC. 1621. ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE [STUDY] *PROJECT*.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, is authorized to participate in the *planning, design, and construction of the* Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Study to reclaim and reuse industrial and municipal wastewater and reclaim and use naturally impaired ground water *and nonpotable surface water* in the Albuquerque metropolitan area.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93–344, AS AMENDED

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1998: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Defense discretionary	11,803	11,803	11,997	[1] 11,995
Nondefense discretionary	9,039	8,993	8,886	8,865
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1998	.....	.....	.....	[2] 13,533
1999	.....	.....	.....	6,065
2000	.....	.....	.....	909
2001	.....	.....	.....	117
2002 and future year	.....	.....	.....	172
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1998 in bill	NA	163	NA	15

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Item	1997 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1997 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	$153,872,000	$150,000,000	$164,065,000	+$10,193,000	+$14,065,000
Construction, general	1,081,942,000	1,062,470,000	1,284,266,000	+202,324,000	+221,796,000
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)			(−1,000,000)	
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	310,374,000	266,000,000	289,000,000	−21,374,000	+23,000,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–18)	20,000,000			−20,000,000	
Operation and maintenance, general	1,697,015,000	1,618,000,000	1,661,203,000	−35,812,000	+43,203,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 104–208)	19,000,000			−19,000,000	
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–18)	150,000,000			−150,000,000	
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	106,000,000	+5,000,000	−6,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	14,000,000	10,000,000		−4,000,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–18)	415,000,000			−415,000,000	
General expenses	149,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	−1,000,000	
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,107,203,000	3,370,470,000	3,662,534,000	−444,669,000	+292,064,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	25,827,000	23,743,000	23,743,000	−2,084,000	
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,700,000	11,610,000	11,610,000	−90,000	
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

Item	1997 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1997 appropriation	Budget estimate
Program oversight and administration	1,100,000	800,000	800,000	−300,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	43,627,000	41,153,000	41,153,000	−2,474,000	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	16,650,000	.....	.....	−16,650,000	.....
Construction program	394,056,000	.....	.....	−394,056,000	.....
Operation and maintenance	267,876,000	.....	.....	−267,876,000	.....
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–18)	7,355,000	.....	.....	−7,355,000	.....
Water and related resources	.....	651,552,000	688,379,000	+688,379,000	+36,827,000
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	143,300,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	−93,300,000
Loan program	12,715,000	10,425,000	10,425,000	−2,290,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(37,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(31,000,000)	(−6,000,000)	.....
Policy and administration	46,000,000	47,658,000	47,558,000	+1,558,000	−100,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(−3,774,000)	.....	(−5,592,000)	(−1,818,000)	(−5,592,000)
Central Valley project restoration fund	38,096,000	39,130,000	33,130,000	−4,966,000	−6,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	782,748,000	892,065,000	829,492,000	+46,744,000	−62,573,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	826,375,000	933,218,000	870,645,000	+44,270,000	−62,573,000
(By transfer)	(−3,774,000)	.....	(−5,592,000)	(−1,818,000)	(−5,592,000)
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Research	2,699,728,000	2,999,497,000	953,915,000	−1,745,813,000	−2,045,582,000
Energy assets acquisition	.....	43,582,000	13,025,000	+13,025,000	−30,557,000
Non-defense environmental management	.....	.....	664,684,000	+664,684,000	+664,684,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	43,200,000	.....	.....	−43,200,000	.....

Gross revenues	−42,200,000			+42,200,000	
Net appropriation	1,000,000			−1,000,000	
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	200,200,000	248,788,000	230,000,000	+29,800,000	−18,788,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	182,000,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	−22,000,000	−30,000,000
Science	996,000,000	875,910,000	2,084,567,000	+1,088,567,000	+1,208,657,000
Science assets acquisition		110,250,000	138,510,000	+138,510,000	+28,260,000
Departmental Administration	215,021,000	232,604,000	220,847,000	+5,826,000	−11,757,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−125,388,000	−131,330,000	−131,330,000	−5,942,000	
Net appropriation	89,633,000	101,274,000	89,517,000	−116,000	−11,757,000
Office of the Inspector General	23,853,000	29,499,000	27,500,000	+3,647,000	−1,999,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:					
Defense function	(5,619,304,000)	(6,058,499,000)	(6,058,499,000)	(+439,195,000)	
Non-defense function	(791,911,000)	(933,472,000)	(684,684,000)	(−107,227,000)	(−248,788,000)
Total	(6,411,215,000)	(6,991,971,000)	(6,743,183,000)	(+331,968,000)	(−248,788,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons Activities	3,911,198,000	3,576,255,000	4,302,450,000	+391,252,000	+726,195,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	5,459,304,000	5,052,499,000	5,311,974,000	−147,330,000	+259,475,000
Defense environmental management privatization	160,000,000	1,006,000,000	343,000,000	+183,000,000	−663,000,000
Other Defense Activities	1,605,733,000	1,605,981,000	1,637,981,000	+32,248,000	+32,000,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	200,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	−10,000,000	
Defense asset acquisition		2,166,859,000			−2,166,859,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,336,235,000	13,597,594,000	11,785,405,000	+449,170,000	−1,812,189,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	4,000,000	1,000,000	3,500,000	−500,000	+2,500,000
Capital assets acquisition			20,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	16,359,000	14,222,000	12,222,000	−4,137,000	−2,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,210,000	26,500,000	26,500,000	+1,290,000	
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	182,230,000	194,334,000	180,334,000	−1,896,000	−14,000,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(3,774,000)		(5,592,000)	(+1,818,000)	(+5,592,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—Continued

Item	1997 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1997 appropriation	Budget estimate
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	970,000	1,065,000	1,065,000	+95,000	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	228,769,000	237,121,000	243,621,000	+14,852,000	+6,500,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	146,290,000	167,577,000	162,141,000	+15,851,000	−5,436,000
Revenues applied	−146,290,000	−167,577,000	−162,141,000	−15,851,000	+5,436,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,757,418,000	18,433,515,000	16,390,744,000	+633,326,000	−2,042,771,000
(By transfer)	(3,774,000)	.....	(5,592,000)	(+1,818,000)	(+5,592,000)
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	160,000,000	165,000,000	160,000,000	.....	−5,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	16,000,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	+1,500,000	.....
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	471,800,000	476,500,000	476,500,000	+4,700,000	.....
Revenues	−457,300,000	−457,500,000	−457,500,000	−200,000	.....
Subtotal	14,500,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	+4,500,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	5,000,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	−200,000	.....
Revenues	−5,000,000	−4,800,000	−4,800,000	+200,000	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	14,500,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	+4,500,000	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,531,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	+669,000	.....

Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	106,000,000	106,000,000	86,000,000	−20,000,000	−20,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	299,031,000	310,700,000	285,700,000	−13,331,000	−25,000,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	20,990,027,000	23,047,903,000	21,209,623,000	+219,596,000	−1,838,280,000
Appropriations	(20,378,672,000)	(23,047,903,000)	(21,209,623,000)	(+830,951,000)	(−1,838,280,000)
Emergency appropriations	(611,355,000)	.....	.....	(−611,355,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	(−1,000,000)	.....

○