105TH CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
105–190

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998

JULY 21, 1997.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 2203]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the *Budget of the United States Government, 1998.* The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1997, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1998.

	1997 appropriation	1998 estimate	1998 recommendation	1998 recommendation compared with—	
				1997 appropriation	1998 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,107,203,000	3,370,470,000	4,029,557,000	−77,646,000	+659,087,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	826,375,000	933,218,000	910,297,000	+83,922,000	−22,921,000
Title III—Department of Energy	15,757,418,000	18,433,515,000	15,282,735,000	−474,683,000	−3,150,780,000
Title IV—Independent Agencies	299,031,000	310,700,000	194,400,000	−104,631,000	−116,300,000
Subtotal	20,990,027,000	23,047,903,000	20,416,989,000	−573,038,000	−2,630,914,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	−1,039,355,000	−414,000,000	−414,000,000	+625,355,000	
Grand total of bill	19,950,672,000	22,633,903,000	20,002,989,000	+52,317,000	−2,630,914,000

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 1998, represents another installment payment on the national obligation to balance the budget. At the same time, the bill advances initiatives to make government more efficient, and it preserves funding for important domestic priorities. As funding in the Energy and Water Bill declines in fiscal year 1998 relative to CBO's baseline, the bill continues to deliver on the promise of deficit reduction.

Significantly, the Energy and Water Bill for fiscal year 1998 attempts to correct the fundamental imbalance in the Administration's allocation of resources among energy and water activities. The budget request for fiscal year 1998 continues to demonstrate the Administration's hostility toward the nation's water infrastructure. This institutional aversion to water projects (previously manifested in proposed Corps of Engineers policies to discontinue the Federal role in local flood control, small harbor maintenance and shore protection efforts) reflects a lack of appreciation for the value of Federal investments in water-related improvements.

Flood control projects, which must pass rigorous cost-benefit analyses, are designed to protect our communities from the devastating consequences of uncontrolled flood waters. Flood control works provide a real measure of protection for homes, businesses, and lives. The terrible floods of last winter and this spring should alert us all to the importance of developing and maintaining effective flood control mechanisms. Failure to do so is clearly more costly in the long run. It has been demonstrated time and again that a relatively modest investment in preventative measures can save: untold amounts in disaster assistance payments; communities from chaotic disruption, catastrophic physical damage, and enormous financial liabilities; and, most importantly, lives.

Our investments in navigation, shore protection and environmental restoration likewise yield outstanding returns. Development, operation and maintenance of our international harbors and inland waterways help the U.S. preserve its leadership in international commerce. Shoreline erosion projects protect communities and maintain a vital recreational and economic resource.

Federal investment in these water-related projects is as appropriate as it is vital to the continued well-being of communities throughout the nation. Yet the Administration continues to neglect these important priorities. Specifically, the Administration: propounds policies inimical to the Federal interest in water infrastructure; underfunds water projects currently in the pipeline; and, in several instances, provides no funding whatsoever for projects well on their way toward completion. With inadequate funding, the construction schedules for water resource projects extend and their costs increase.

Unfortunately, the counterweight to the budget's inattention to water resource needs is the unjustifiably high priority it accords to the Department of Energy, a sprawling bureaucratic enterprise whose present activities bear faint relation to the mission the Department was created to pursue. The Department, characterized by continuing mission creep and management disorder, lacks a clear

focus and invests far too much of its limited resources in a relevance-seeking and turf-protecting effort to perpetuate itself.

In addition to providing for the continued downsizing and streamlining of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation includes a number of management reforms intended to control costs, improve accountability, and increase efficiency. The Department's response to these reforms will help determine whether DOE should continue to exist as a cabinet-level agency.

Notwithstanding the Committee's concerns surrounding management of the Department of Energy, the recommendation does support essential programs of the Department. More than $2 billion is provided for science and basic research programs at the Department of Energy. Environmental cleanup activities at Department of Energy sites are continued with funding levels over $6 billion, while $3.9 billion is provided to maintain the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. All of these activities are continued at a level consistent with fiscal year 1997.

However, the Committee did not provide the total budget request for all programs and activities. The Department of Energy's budget request for fiscal year 1998 includes an unrealistic increase of $2.6 billion over the Department's fiscal year 1997 appropriation. With no consultation with the Congress, the Department proposed full funding of all construction projects and a $1 billion privatization initiative for the environmental cleanup program. Both of these proposals would have benefited from early consultation with the Committee. While it is clear that the Department has several problems managing and successfully completing construction projects, incremental funding is one of the lesser concerns. With respect to the privatization proposal, the Committee spent several months unsuccessfully attempting to get thorough and comprehensive answers on the proposed privatization projects. Funding these two proposals as requested would have jeopardized hundreds of millions of dollars on projects for which costs are still not well defined.

The bill also terminates direct appropriations to the Tennessee Valley Authority. To provide for continuity of program management pending the implementation of the Administration's proposal to remove all appropriated programs from TVA's portfolio, the measure provides for the funding of TVA's nonpower activities with internally generated revenues and savings.

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

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

The Committee considers the full and effective implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act, P.L. 103–62, to be a priority for all agencies of government.

Starting with fiscal year 1999, the Results Act requires each agency to, "prepare an annual performance plan covering each program activity set forth in the budget of such agency." Specifically,

for each program activity the agency is required to establish "performance goals to define the level of performance to be achieved by a program activity" and "performance indicators to be used in assessing the relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes of each program activity."

The Committee takes this requirement of the Results Act very seriously and plans to carefully examine agency performance goals and measures during the appropriations process. As a result, starting with the fiscal year 1999 appropriations cycle, the Committee will consider the progress of jurisdictional agencies in articulating clear, definitive, and results-oriented (outcome) goals and measures as it reviews requests for appropriations.

The Committee suggests that agencies examine their program activities in light of their strategic goals to determine whether any changes or realignments would facilitate a more accurate and informed presentation of budgetary information. Agencies are encouraged to consult with the Committee as they consider such revisions prior to finalizing any requests pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1104. The Committee will consider any requests with a view toward ensuring that budget submissions for fiscal year 1999 and subsequent years display amounts requested against program activity structures for which annual performance goals and measures have been established.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CORPS OF ENGINEERS' CIVIL WORKS MISSION

In testimony before the Committee, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works stated, "The 1998 budget would fund a program that balances a number of high priority interests and objectives. Investments in water resources infrastructure development are balanced with investments in watershed and other environmental restoration. Continued funding to complete ongoing projects and studies is balanced with investment with new high-priority infrastructure and environmental projects. Continued maintenance and rehabilitation of existing projects is balanced with construction of new water resources development projects to serve society's current and future needs."

The Committee recognizes that budgetary realities do necessitate the balancing of competing priorities. However, in many respects, the Committee believes that the budget request represents a lack of commitment by the Administration to the traditional roles and missions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: navigation, flood control, and shore protection.

The amounts requested by the Administration for continuing construction of a number of navigation and flood control projects are woefully inadequate to keep those projects on efficient construction schedules, significantly increasing the total cost of those projects. In addition, for navigation projects, stretched out project completion schedules delay the economic benefits that would be derived from those projects and hurt the nation's competitiveness in the world marketplace. For flood control, delay in the completion of projects increases the risk that our citizens will be devastated by the floods that those projects were designed to prevent. The Committee has, therefore, provided additional funds in order to accelerate completion of a number of projects.

In the area of shore protection, the Committee is extremely disappointed that the Administration has once again failed to request funds to continue several ongoing construction projects and studies or to initiate new studies or projects. As the Committee stated last year, shore protection projects serve the same function as other flood control projects—they protect lives and property from the impacts of flooding. Accordingly, the Committee has included funds in the bill for construction of shore protection projects, the periodic nourishment of previously constructed projects, and for planning, engineering, and design of proposed projects.

The Committee is also very concerned about the reductions proposed by the Administration in the Corps of Engineers' Operation and Maintenance program. The Committee recognizes the need to more efficiently utilize the limited resources available for operation and maintenance of existing projects; however, the Committee is concerned that the budget request will result in reductions in service to the public and that no analysis has been performed of the impacts of those reductions in service. The Committee expects the Corps to use the flexibility that exists within the Operation and Maintenance program to assure that there are no significant adverse impacts on the public as a result of the reduced funding levels proposed for a number of projects.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1997	$153,872,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	150,000,000
Recommended, 1998	157,260,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+3,388,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+7,260,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	200,000	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	400,000	---	400,000	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	54,000	---	54,000	---
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	125,000	---	125,000	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	168,000	---	168,000	---
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	COOK INLET, AK	---	125,000	---	125,000
(N)	DUTCH HARBOR, AK	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	KENAI RIVER NAVIGATION, AK	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	---	37,000	---	37,000
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	118,000	---	118,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY, AK	120,000	---	120,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	---	138,000	---	138,000
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTH SCOTTSDALE, AZ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	325,000	---	325,000	---
(E)	RIO SALADO WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM, AZ	540,000	---	540,000	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	400,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	825,000	---	825,000

	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FC)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	---	200,000	---	200,000
	WHITE RIVER TO NEWPORT, AR	---	---	---	400,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	401,000	---	1,500,000
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	146,000	---	146,000	---
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	240,000	---	240,000	---
	CITIES OF ARCADIA AND SIERRA MADRE, CA	---	---	525,000	---
	CLEAR LAKE BASIN WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	COSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA	204,000	---	204,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	189,000	---	189,000	---
	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	530,000	---	530,000	---
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	MUGU LAGOON, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, COLUSA BASIN, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, FAIRFIELD STREAMS AND CORDELIA MARSH, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PL	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE, DIXON AND VICINITY, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	1,600,000	---	1,600,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	---	250,000	---	250,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	40,000	---	40,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	---	160,000	---	---
	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	378,000	---	378,000	---
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	79,000	---	79,000	---
	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	240,000	---	240,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	750,000	---	750,000	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA ISLANDS,	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SACRAMENTO & SAN JOAQUIN RIVERS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, C	---	---	3,650,000	---
	SACRAMENTO WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	178,000	---	178,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	315,000	---	315,000	---
	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.	380,000	---	380,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SANTA MONICA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RELIABILITY, CA	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL AND EXTENSION, CA	600,000	---	600,000	---
	SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES CNTY WATER CONSERVATION & SUPPLY	---	---	500,000	---
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AQUATIC RESOURCES, CA	---	---	200,000	---
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	320,000	---	810,000	---
	TIJUANA RIVER VALLEY, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	TOULUMNE RIVER, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	750,000	---	750,000
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	475,000	---	475,000	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	370,000	---	370,000	---
	VENTURA - SANTA BARBARA COUNTIES SHORE PROTECTION, CA.	---	---	300,000	---
	COLORADO				
	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	---	---	100,000	---

	CONNECTICUT				
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	---	1,625,000	---	1,625,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	150,000	---	150,000	506,000
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	293,000	---	293,000	450,000
	FLORIDA				
(N)	BIG BEND CHANNEL, FL.....	---	80,000	---	80,000
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	---	154,000
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK (WARES CREEK), FL.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	CHICOPIT BAY, FL.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	DADE COUNTY WATER REUSE, FL.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL.....	---	230,000	---	230,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	---	90,000	---	90,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	301,000	---	301,000	---
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL.....	---	140,000	---	140,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	---	175,000	---	175,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	---	280,000	---	280,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER, FL.....	---	---	270,000	---
	GEORGIA				
	AUGUSTA, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	93,000	---	93,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	FLINT RIVER BASIN STUDY, GA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA & SC.....	---	94,000	---	94,000
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA.....	800,000	---	---	800,000
	SAVANNAH HARBOR TIDEGATE, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAVANNAH/CHATHAM COUNTY REGIONAL FLOOD CONTROL, GA....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	SAVANNAH RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, GA.....	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	333,000	---	333,000	---
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	---	267,000	---	267,000
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	227,000	---	227,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	400,000	---	400,000
	ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL, IL	---	---	175,000	---
	ILLINOIS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, IL	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	250,000	---	400,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	395,000	---	395,000
	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	---	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM FLD PROFILE STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	1,957,000	---	1,957,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	7,700,000	---	7,700,000	---
	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER D&LD, MADISON COUNTY, IL	---	112,000	---	112,000
	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	---	100,000	---
	INDIANA				
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	---	458,000	---	458,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CADY MARSH DITCH, IN	---	---	---	150,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN (MIDDLE REACHES), IN & IL	56,000	---	56,000	---
	IOWA				
(RCP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	339,000	---	339,000	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	135,000	---	135,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	155,000	---	155,000	---

(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	261,000	---	261,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	30,000	---	30,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	38,000	---	38,000	---
	KENTUCKY				
	AUGUSTA, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	DOVER, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	FRANKFORT, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	300,000	---	300,000	---
	GREENUP, KY	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK, KY	---	1,750,000	---	---
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	375,000	---	375,000	---
	LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, KY	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	---	525,000	---	525,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	470,000	---	470,000	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	8,800,000	---	8,800,000	---
	OLIVE HILL, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	RUSSELL, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER - DARLINGTON RESERVOIR, LA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	BAYOU TIGRE, ERATH, LA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	BLACK BAYOU DIVERSION, LA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	---	265,000	---	265,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	620,000	---	620,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	138,000	---	138,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	---	129,000	---	129,000
	RAPIDES AND ST LANDRY PARISHES, LA	---	---	100,000	---
	WALLACE LAKE, LA	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	250,000	---	250,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	690,000	---	690,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD & VA	---	338,000	---	338,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	415,000	---	415,000	---
	HAVRE DE GRACE, MD	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	600,000	---	600,000	---
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	350,000	---	350,000	---
	MICHIGAN				
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	---	---	---	200,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	---	400,000	---	400,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	---	2,640,000	---	100,000
	MISSOURI				
	BALLWIN, MO	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	656,000	---	656,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	365,000	---	365,000	---
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	173,000	---	223,000	---
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO & KS	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	KIMMSWICK, MO	51,000	---	51,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	57,000	---	107,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	120,000	---	120,000	---

	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, NE	300,000	---	300,000	---
	NEVADA				
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,.	---	300,000	---	300,000
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,.	354,000	---	354,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	177,000	---	177,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FDP)	NORTH LAS VEGAS, CHANNEL "A", NV	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, RENO, NV	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	300,000	---	580,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	450,000	---	450,000	---
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	72,000	---	72,000	400,000
	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	54,000	---	54,000	100,000
	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	400,000	---
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ.	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	1,200,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	510,000	---	510,000	---
	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	---	---	---	500,000
	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NJ	---	---	100,000	---
	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, NJ	---	---	100,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(E)	RIO GRANDE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, NM & CO	100,000	---	100,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	378,000	---	878,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	100,000	---
	BOQUET RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY & PA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	---	---	100,000	---
	GREAT CHAZY RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	250,000	---	---	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LINDENHURST, NY	---	---	100,000	---
	MONTAUK POINT, NY	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	1,250,000	---	1,250,000	---
	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGES, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	115,000	---	115,000	---
	SARANAC RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	451,000	---	451,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY.	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	---	330,000	---	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	450,000	---	450,000	---
	LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET, NC	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR - NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	---	100,000	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	128,000	---	128,000	---
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND	---	178,000	---	178,000
	OHIO				
	BELPRE, OH	---	---	250,000	---
(E)	GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OXBOW AREA, OH	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	100,000	---	100,000	---
	OHIO RIVER RIVERFRONT RESTORATION, OH	---	---	100,000	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	724,000	---	724,000	---
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	150,000	---	150,000	---

(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	217,000	---	217,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	420,000	---	420,000	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	100,000	---	100,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	---	520,000	---	1,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
	BEAVER RIVER, PA	---	---	---	375,000
	BLOOMSBURG, PA	---	---	100,000	---
	BRUSH CREEK, PA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	---	90,000	---	90,000
(E)	LOWER WEST BR SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIR RESTORATIO	200,000	---	500,000	---
	LYONS CREEK, PA	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	500,000	---	500,000	---
	SUNBURY, PA	---	---	100,000	---
	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER LEVEES, PA	---	---	500,000	---
(E)	TIOGA RIVER WATERSHED, PA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	UPPER TURTLE CREEK, PA	---	---	100,000	---
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, STORAGE REALLOCATION, PA & MD	125,000	---	125,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	---	665,000	---	665,000
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	700,000	---	700,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	---	267,000	---	267,000
	RHODE ISLAND				
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & SRTM DMG REDU	200,000	---	200,000	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	---	200,000	---	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	300,000	---	300,000	---
	TENNESSEE				
(FC)	EAST RIDGE, HAMILTON CO, TN	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FC)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, TN	---	150,000	---	150,000
	NOLICHUCKY WATERSHED, TN	---	---	100,000	---
	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK WATERSHED, TN	---	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	ALPINE, TX	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	1,830,000	---	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	937,000	---	937,000
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	220,000	---	220,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	940,000	---	940,000
(FC)	FORT WORTH SUMPS, 14 & 15, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN,	---	70,000	---	70,000
(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	---	324,000	---	324,000
(RCP)	GIWW - BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	220,000	---	220,000	---
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	---	105,000	---	105,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	HUNTING BAYOU, TX	---	---	---	500,000
	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	---	---	510,000	---
(N)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	400,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	179,000	---	179,000	---
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	211,000	---	211,000	---
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	370,000	---	370,000
	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
	WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	---	---	150,000	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	350,000	---	350,000	---
(E)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER RESTORATION, UT	150,000	---	150,000	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	---	270,000	---	270,000

	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, DEEP CREEK, VA	100,000	---	100,000	---
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA	---	---	286,000	---
(SPE)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	200,000	---	200,000	---
	JAMES RIVER, VA	---	---	100,000	---
	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	---	---	100,000	---
	LAKE MERRIWEATHER, VA	---	---	300,000	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, VA & MD	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, VA	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	---	---	100,000	---
	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	---	---	200,000	---
	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	---	---	100,000	---
	PULASKI, VA	---	---	100,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY NAVIGATION STUDY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	252,000	---	252,000	---
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	460,000	---	460,000
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	56,000	---	56,000	---
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	386,000	---	386,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(SPE)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	121,000	---	121,000	---
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	672,000	---	672,000
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	830,000	---	---
	MONONGAHELA RIVER, FAIRMONT, WV	---	---	---	350,000
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	553,000	---	553,000	---
(E)	TYGART THREE BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	TYGART VALLEY R B, GRASSY RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	100,000	---	100,000	---
	UPPER MONONGAHELA RIVER, WV	---	---	100,000	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	200,000	---	200,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	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	---	11,690,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	400,000	---	400,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500,000	---
	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	---	27,000,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	130,000	---	130,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	800,000	---	800,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	800,000	---	800,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-26,006,000	---	-28,156,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	113,898,000	36,102,000	121,334,000	35,926,000

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the need for navigation improvements on the Mobile and Tombigbee Rivers below Demopolis, Alabama.

Dog River, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 to accelerate work on the feasibility study of the need for navigation improvements on the Dog River in Alabama.

White River Navigation to Newport, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a general reevaluation study of extending navigation on the White River to Newport, Arkansas.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies of extending commercial navigation on the Red River upstream of Shreveport-Bossier City, Louisiana, into southwest Arkansas using funds previously appropriated for the Red River Waterway, Shreveport to Daingerfield, Texas, project.

Rio Salado, Arizona.—The bill includes $540,000 for the Rio Salado feasibility study, the same as the budget request. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to honor its commitment to the local project sponsor and complete the Rio Salado feasibility study in time for the project to be considered for authorization in the Water Resources Development Act of 1998.

Tres Rios, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue planning, engineering, and environmental analyses for the Tres Rios, Arizona, project.

American River Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,099,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to work with local interests in the development of a comprehensive plan for flood control along the American River.

Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a study of wastewater improvements and ecosystem restoration in the Clear Lake Basin in California under the authority of section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre, California.—The bill includes $525,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide technical assistance, including design, for water infrastructure improvements, particularly those aimed at minimizing damages to water systems that might occur during an earthquake, for the cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre.

Cosumnes and Mokelumne Rivers, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along the Cosumnes and Mokelumne Rivers.

Laguna de Santa Rosa, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of Laguna de Santa Rosa to determine if siltation has impacted its ability to act as flood control basin.

Llagas Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers, using available funds, to complete a reevaluation report and develop any necessary plans and specifications for the Llagas Creek project identified in the authorized Llagas Creek

Watershed Plan of the Department of Agriculture in anticipation of Corps of Engineers construction of the unconstructed elements of the Llagas Creek project.

Malibu Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of environmental restoration and shoreline protection in the Malibu Creek Watershed.

Morro Bay Estuary, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the sedimentation and tidal circulation problems in Morro Bay in California.

Mugu Lagoon, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of the environmental impacts associated with sediment transport, floodflows, and upstream watershed land use practices on Mugu Lagoon in California.

Port of Stockton, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of deepening the Port of Stockton's main ship channel to forty feet.

Redwood City Harbor, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest, costs, benefits, and environmental impacts of deepening Redwood City Harbor.

Sacramento Watershed Management, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to participate in a non-Federal project sponsored by the City of Sacramento to make combined sewer improvements in the City of Sacramento to improve water quality in the Sacramento River Watershed under the authority of section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. Participation by the Corps of Engineers shall include planning, technical, and design assistance as requested by the non-Federal sponsor.

Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, California.—In response to the devastating floods of 1997, the Committee has added funds and directs the Corps of Engineers to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the entire flood control system within the existing study authorizations of the Sacramento River Watershed Management Plan (authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962) and the San Joaquin River and Tributaries authority (authorized by 1964 Resolution of the House Committee on Public Works). These comprehensive investigations will include: (1) preparation of a comprehensive post-flood assessment for the California Central Valley (Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin), (2) development and formulation of comprehensive plans for flood control and environmental restoration purposes, and (3) development of a hydrologic/hydraulic model of the entire system including the operation of the existing reservoirs for evaluation of the current flood control system. Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary shall transmit an interim report describing results of the post-flood assessment and the assessment of the existing flood control system and its deficiencies.

San Diego Harbor, National City Marine Terminal, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study of the potential for development

of a Federal navigation project to deepen the existing Federal navigation channel in San Diego Harbor from the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal to the National City Marine Terminal.

San Francisco Bay, California.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the need to remove underwater rock formations in San Francisco Bay.

San Francisco Bay Bar Channel, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the San Francisco Bay Bar Channel feasibility study, the same as the budget request. The Committee is aware that the local sponsor for the study wishes to limit it to the need for deepening the Southampton Shoal Channel and Extension. The Committee expects the Corps to proceed with the study in compliance with the desires of the local sponsor and has renamed the study to reflect the change in emphasis.

San Pablo Bay Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to address Federal participation and design assistance in the environmental restoration of the San Pablo Bay Watershed.

Santa Margarita River and Tributaries, California.—The bill includes $300,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Santa Margarita River and Tributaries project, the same as the budget request, which will include an examination of the need for flood control measures along Murrieta Creek.

Santa Monica Water Infrastructure Reliability, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for completion of a study to identify problems and alternative solutions for providing a more reliable water supply system during seismic events for the city of Santa Monica.

Southeast Los Angeles County Water Conservation and Supply, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide technical assistance for the design of seismically reliable water system capital improvements for the city of Norwalk, California.

Southern California Aquatic Resources, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate Special Area Management Plans to protect aquatic resources, including wetlands, in Orange and San Diego Counties. The plans should be conducted in coordination with State of California Natural Community Conservation Planning Program, local governments, and the private sector. The plans, when complete, are to be used by the Corps of Engineers and local governments as the basis for the issuance of long-term permits.

Tahoe Basin, California and Nevada.—The Committee has provided $270,000 to complete ongoing studies of watershed restoration opportunities on the California side of the Lake Tahoe Basin and $540,000 to complete similar studies on the Nevada side of the Basin.

Tijuana River Valley, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers, in consultation with the International Water and Boundary Commission, to undertake a reconnaissance study of flood control and other water resources needs in the Tijuana River Valley in California, with particular emphasis on evaluation of the flooding potential in the event of a dam break and the development of emergency flood response plans.

Toulumne River, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of options for increased flood protection along the Toulumne River and its tributaries, including the reoperation of New Don Pedro Dam.

Twentynine Palms, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to identify problems and alternative solutions for providing a more dependable water supply for the Twentynine Palms Water District service area, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to water systems that might occur during an earthquake.

Ventura Harbor Sand Bypass, California.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Ventura Harbor Sand Bypass project, the same as the budget request. Of the funds provided, $100,000 shall be used to complete a new reconnaissance study on the potential for developing a regional plan for maintaining Ventura Harbor and other existing Federal harbors in the Ventura County and Santa Barbara County area. The study shall consider the potential for beneficial uses of dredged material from maintenance dredging operations as well as other benefits including environmental restoration and storm damage reduction opportunities.

Ventura-Santa Barbara Counties Shoreline Protection, California.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the Ventura-Santa Barbara Counties shoreline protection study.

Chatfield, Cherry Creek, and Bear Creek Reservoirs, Colorado.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of the potential for reallocation of storage at Chatfield, Cherry Creek, and Bear Creek Reservoirs from flood control to water supply.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island (Rehoboth Beach/Dewey Beach), Delaware.—The bill includes $450,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Dewey Beach/Rehoboth Beach portion of the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Port Mahon element of the Delaware Bay Coastline project and $256,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Cape May Villas element of the project.

Brevard County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $154,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Brevard County project in Florida.

Dade County Water Reuse Facility, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study for the Dade County Water Reuse project in Florida.

Tampa Harbor, Alafia River, Florida.—The bill includes $270,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study of deepening the Alafia River channel in Tampa Harbor.

Augusta, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flooding problems in the city of Augusta, Georgia.

New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct, in co-

operation with local interests, a study to develop a plan for the final disposition of the New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam.

Savannah Harbor Tidegate, Georgia.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to examine alternatives for final disposition of the Savannah Harbor tidegate.

Savannah River Comprehensive Study, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a comprehensive study of the Savannah River basin authorized in Section 414 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Savannah Harbor Expansion, Georgia.—The Committee is aware that the local sponsor for the Savannah Harbor Expansion project has elected to conduct the feasibility study under the provisions of Section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. The Committee supports this initiative to expedite the project development process. The Committee has provided $800,000 for this project in fiscal year 1998, the same as the budget request. These funds may be used by the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the project upon submission of the feasibility report to the Secretary of the Army.

Illinois and Michigan Canal, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $175,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a feasibility study of improvements at Lock 14 on the Illinois and Michigan Canal.

Mississippi River, Alexander County, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study to determine the potential benefits to navigation and flood control associated with improvements to the Len Small Levee.

Peoria Riverfront Development, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies to address flood control and navigation issues along the Illinois River in Peoria, Illinois.

Waukegan Harbor, Illinois.—The bill includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance phase and initiate the feasibility study of the Waukegan Harbor project.

Wood River, Illinois.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to analyze the need for rehabilitation of the existing Wood River levee system.

Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch project in Indiana.

Grayson Lake, Kentucky.—The bill includes $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of the possibility of using Grayson Lake as a water supply source for the city of Grayson, Kentucky.

Kentucky Flooding, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided funds for the Corps of Engineers to initiate reconnaissance studies to address flooding problems in Augusta, Dover, Frankfort, Greenup, Olive Hill, and Russell, Kentucky.

Licking River Watershed, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate individual reconnaissance studies to investigate structural and non-structural solutions to flooding problems in communities along the Licking

River impacted by flooding in March of 1997, including Falmouth, Butler, and Cynthiana, Kentucky.

Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky.—The bill includes $470,000, the same as the budget request, for the Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, flood control project. In light of the recent floods which resulted in damages to thousands of homes and businesses in the area, the Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to continue with the feasibility phase of this study, which is essential to the safety of metropolitan Louisville.

Rapides and St. Landry Parishes, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems in Rapides and St. Landry Parishes and other areas west of the West Atchafalaya Basin protection levee in central Louisiana.

Wallace Lake, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flooding problems in the Wallace Lake area in Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

Havre de Grace, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of water resources problems in the area of Havre de Grace, Maryland, including shoaling of navigation channels, shoreline erosion flooding, loss of fish and wildlife habitat, and degraded water quality.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a feasibility study of extending the Pascagoula Harbor 42-foot channel into Bayou Casotte.

Walker River Basin, Nevada.—The Committee has provided an additional $280,000 to enable the Corps of Engineers to develop additional information on the hydrologic and hydraulic conditions of the Walker River Basin.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes an additional $400,000 for preconstruction engineering and design for the Absecon Island element of the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet project.

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

Lower Cape May Meadows-Cape May Point, New Jersey.—The bill includes an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Lower Cape May Meadows-Cape May Point project.

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study for the Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet project.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study of the Cliffwood Beach element of the Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay project.

South River, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $510,000 for the South River, Raritan River Basin project, the same as the budget request. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to include the Old Bridge section of Sayreville in the project.

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes $500,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet project.

Upper Passaic River and Tributaries, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the water resources needs, including flood control and environmental restoration, of the Upper Passaic River and its tributaries in Long Hill Township, Morris County, New Jersey.

Upper Rockaway River, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the water resources needs, including flood control and environmental restoration, of the Upper Rockaway River in Morris County, New Jersey.

Arthur Kill Channel, Howland Hook Marine Terminal, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for a 45-foot navigation channel as authorized in Section 301 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Flushing Bay and Creek, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the Flushing Bay and Creek, New York, project.

Montauk Point, New York.—The bill includes $200,000 for the feasibility phase of the Montauk Point, New York, study.

New York Harbor Anchorages, New York.—The bill includes $100,000 for initiation of the feasibility study for the Red Hook Flats Anchorage Area.

South Shore of Staten Island, New York.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility phase of the South Shore of Staten Island study.

Lockwoods Folly Inlet, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of the effects of the construction of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway and the closure of the Eastern Channel on the water quality in the vicinity of Lockwoods Folly River and Inlet.

Belpre, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies of the potential for waterfront development in the vicinity of Belpre, Ohio.

Ohio River Riverfront Restoration, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of land and infrastructure requirements along the Ohio River for port and industrial development, and recreational and environmental restoration opportunities.

Flood Damage Reduction Measures, Portland, Oregon.—Within the funds provided for the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Portland Metropolitan Regional Government, the USGS, and the National Weather Service, to evaluate and recommend potential flood damage reduction measures for the Port-

land area, such as non-structural alternatives, flood warning systems, floodplain evacuation, and emergency response plans.

Sunbury, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of the existing flood control system in Sunbury, Pennsylvania.

Turtle Creek Watershed, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 each for the Corps of Engineers to initiate reconnaissance studies of ecosystem restoration needs in the Lyons Creek, Upper Turtle Creek, and Brush Creek Basins of the Turtle Creek Watershed in Pennsylvania.

Beaver River, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities associated with a comprehensive plan being developed for the main channel of the Beaver River and its tributaries near the Boroughs of New Brighton, Rochester, and Bridgewater in Pennsylvania.

Lower West Branch Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $500,000 to modify the reconnaissance study for the Lower West Branch Susquehanna River Basin, Environmental Restoration, Pennsylvania, to address the wide range of complex water resources problems in the large study area which includes Clinton, Northumberland, Lycoming, Sullivan, Tioga, and Union Counties, Pennsylvania.

Susquehanna River Levees, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study to modify the existing flood control project at Williamsport, Pennsylvania, to provide flood protection measures for expansion of the Williamsport Industrial Park.

Nolichucky Watershed, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of ecosystem restoration and flood control needs in the Nolichucky Watershed in Tennessee.

North Chickamauga Creek Watershed, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration and flood control in the North Chickamauga Watershed, Hamilton County, Tennessee.

Hunting Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for preconstruction engineering and design activities on the Hunting Bayou project in Texas. The funds are to be utilized for reimbursement of the local sponsor and Corps of Engineers oversight activities in accordance with Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Mustang Island, Corpus Christi, Texas.—Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to undertake a study of the feasibility of constructing and maintaining the Packery Channel on the southern portion of Mustang Island as authorized by Section 442 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Sabine and Neches River Channels, Texas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of expanding the existing navigation channels in the Sabine and Neches Rivers.

White Oak Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the White Oak Bayou project. The funds are to be utilized for reimbursement of the local sponsor and Corps of Engineers over-

sight activities in accordance with Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia.—The bill includes $286,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia, project.

Powell River Watershed, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a feasibility study of ecosystem restoration needs in Ely and Puckett Creeks in the Powell River Watershed in Virginia.

John W. Flanagan Dam and Reservoir, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of the potential for reallocation of storage at the John W. Flanagan Dam and Reservoir project to water supply purposes.

Lake Merriweather, Little Calfpasture River, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of the Lake Merriweather, Virginia, project authorized in Section 507 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Prince William County Watershed, Virginia.—The bill includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of water resources problems related to wetlands protection, flooding, erosion, environmental degradation, and water quality in the Prince William County Watershed in Virginia.

Monongahela River, Fairmont, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for preconstruction engineering and design activities for the waterfront development project at the CSX site in Fairmont, West Virginia.

Upper Monongahela River, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of port development opportunities along the upper Monongahela River in Monongahela County, West Virginia.

Flood Plain Management Services.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided, the Corps of Engineers is urged to: use $50,000 to study the effects of future development on flooding in Winchester, Kentucky; use $25,000 to provide technical assistance for levee construction in Monterey, Kentucky; and use $40,000 to provide technical assistance related to dam sites in the Gunpowder Creek Basin in Boone County, Kentucky.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Planning Assistance to States program, the same as the budget request. Within the funds provided the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with the Riverside County, California, Flood Control and Water Conservation District to complete the floodplain maintenance plan for Murrieta Creek. Within the funds provided, the Committee also directs the Corps of Engineers to participate in the development of Special Area Management Plans in coordination and association with the State of California Natural Community Conservation Planning Program in southern California.

Research and Development.—The Committee has provided $27,000,000 for Research and Development activities, the same as the amount provided in fiscal year 1997. Within the funds pro-

vided, $200,000 is for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Construction Technology Transfer project.

The amount provided for Research and Development also includes $2,000,000 for development of strategies for the control of zebra mussels at public facilities, the same as the budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1997	$1,081,942,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	1,062,470,000
Recommended, 1998	1,475,892,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+393,950,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+413,422,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,331,000	500,000	600,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	91,200,000	3,440,000	3,440,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)...	27,400,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	ALASKA			
	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	---	---	4,282,000
	COOK INLET, AK	---	---	3,700,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	10,116,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	13,800,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	---	---	5,000,000
	ARKANSAS			
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR	---	---	300,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)..	29,700,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	632,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK & DAM, AR	242,000,000	10,000,000	25,000,000
	RED R. WTRWY, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, AR, LA, OK, TX	---	---	1,400,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	47,500,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA	---	---	10,100,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	43,800,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,900,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	---	850,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	69,200,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	12,300,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	180,000,000	11,700,000	21,700,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	121,700,000	16,100,000	16,100,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,560,000	300,000	2,000,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,600,000	7,300,000	9,300,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	15,300,000	3,100,000	5,600,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	62,500,000	8,935,000	8,535,000
	PORT OF LONG BEACH, CA	---	---	6,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	25,700,000	8,620,000	8,620,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,100,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	600,000	600,000
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	---	250,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	12,640,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA	61,100,000	5,400,000	5,400,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	52,900,000	52,900,000
	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	---	---	2,000,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	20,300,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	---	500,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,660,000	200,000	2,750,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	16,200,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	6,000,000	3,298,000	3,298,000
	DELAWARE			
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	13,300,000	224,000	224,000
	FLORIDA			
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	---	---	100,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	123,760,000	2,500,000	6,000,000
	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL	---	---	1,640,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,431,000,000	27,400,000	27,400,000
(BE)	DADE COUNTY, FL	163,300,000	8,185,000	9,400,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	111,200,000	278,000	278,000
(FC)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	---	2,261,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	180,700,000	693,000	693,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	30,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	231,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL	---	---	300,000
(BE)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL	43,600,000	206,000	206,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	19,985,000	1,872,000	1,872,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	25,600,000	99,000	99,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	51,066,000	2,889,000	7,889,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	75,900,000	202,000	5,762,000
	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	---	---	480,000
	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	---	---	4,000,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	129,000,000	4,586,000	12,586,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	55,200,000	500,000	500,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	---	300,000
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200,000	900,000	900,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	596,150,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
	TYBEE ISLAND, GA	---	---	2,500,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	13,046,000	275,000	275,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	9,117,000	691,000	691,000
	ILLINOIS			
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF C	108,530,000	575,000	575,000
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	144,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	---	---	500,000
	DES PLAINES RIVER WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, IL	---	---	1,000,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,859,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	EAST ST LOUIS AND VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), I	---	---	300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	25,736,000	4,370,000	4,370,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	22,926,000	4,230,000	4,230,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	18,800,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	741,332,000	1,900,000	2,065,000
	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	---	---	539,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	1,020,000,000	98,440,000	98,440,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,940,000	5,262,000	5,262,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MO, MN	241,399,000	14,000,000	16,700,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	INDIANA			
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	14,600,000	3,000,000	4,400,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	34,550,000	5,300,000	6,300,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	3,000,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	7,000,000
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	3,500,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	114,000,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
	NEW HARMONY, IN	---	---	150,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	---	1,300,000
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,900,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	81,400,000	3,895,000	3,895,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	217,567,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,610,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	41,874,000	8,255,000	8,255,000
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	27,230,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	8,177,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	157,299,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	18,500,000	250,000	250,000
	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, KY	---	---	4,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS & DAMS, KY & IN	268,000,000	1,720,000	8,000,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	11,571,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	---	2,050,000
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	---	3,000,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	7,378,000	1,510,000	1,510,000
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	---	1,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	505,000,000	6,448,000	22,920,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA	---	---	2,379,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,500,000	541,000	541,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	610,000,000	2,018,000	2,018,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	164,000,000	1,793,000	2,593,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	168,000,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (TWELVEMILE BAYOU), LA	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,888,342,000	9,990,000	15,297,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	280,000,000	6,440,000	47,000,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTEC	120,000,000	2,385,000	2,385,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,900,000	4,300,000	5,041,000
	MARYLAND			
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	12,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	265,000,000	1,797,000	1,797,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRON. RESTORATION & PROT. PROG., MD	---	---	1,000,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	542,000	542,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000,000	30,621,000	30,621,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	19,350,000	3,920,000	6,000,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	17,400,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	7,930,000	1,880,000	1,880,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	29,100,000	700,000	700,000
	MICHIGAN			
	FLINT RIVER, MI	---	---	875,000
	MINNESOTA			
	KNIFE RIVER HARBOR, MN	---	---	150,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	12,400,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,220,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	14,900,000	300,000	300,000
	STILLWATER, MN	---	---	1,700,000
	MISSISSIPPI			
	JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	---	3,000,000
	NATCHEZ BLUFF, MS	---	---	4,000,000
	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	---	---	800,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	198,000,000	17,900,000	17,900,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO	33,400,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	17,736,000	2,347,000	2,347,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	278,000,000	3,446,000	3,446,000
(FC)	ST GENEVIEVE, MO	35,387,000	4,145,000	6,145,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	50,200,000	800,000	800,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	6,036,000	500,000	500,000
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	176,200,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	92,700,000	280,000	280,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	375,000,000	3,076,000	3,076,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	20,700,000	7,090,000	7,090,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHNLS, PORT JERSEY CHNL, NJ	---	---	600,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	14,800,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	5,000,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	10,600,000	277,000	1,500,000
	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	---	---	200,000
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	---	3,700,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,115,000,000	15,116,000	15,116,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	7,200,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	64,600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	2,720,000	2,720,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800,000	560,000	560,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	59,500,000	280,000	280,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	3,020,000	2,563,000	2,563,000
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	81,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	BUFFALO RIVER GREENWAY, NY	---	---	250,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	62,400,000	600,000	600,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	326,000,000	285,000	285,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	526,000,000	4,802,000	4,802,000
	HUDSON RIVER, ATHENS, NY	---	---	8,700,000
	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	---	---	1,000,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	324,000,000	429,000	929,000
	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	---	---	2,000,000
	ORCHARD BEACH, NY	---	---	400,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	---	---	5,000,000
	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	---	---	4,000,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	75,972,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(BE)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	169,780,000	2,840,000	2,840,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR CHANNEL WIDENING, NC	18,600,000	3,700,000	---
	WILMINGTON HARBOR NAVIGATION PROJECTS, NC	---	---	2,430,000
(BE)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC	25,200,000	1,070,000	1,070,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
	BUFORD - TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT, ND	---	---	2,000,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	40,840,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,700,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	15,800,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,150,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	33,580,000	500,000	500,000
	OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,300,000	105,000	105,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,414,000	1,890,000	1,890,000
	LOWER GIRARD DAM, OH	---	---	500,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	13,138,000	2,120,000	2,120,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000,000	2,518,000	2,518,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,758,000	15,181,000	15,181,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	9,260,000	3,928,000	3,928,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	74,800,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	36,000,000	95,000	95,000
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	75,000,000	8,400,000	8,400,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	181,000,000	250,000	2,200,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500,000	6,205,000	6,369,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	9,800,000	400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	14,800,000	425,000	5,425,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	695,000,000	2,700,000	12,700,000
	LYCOMING COUNTY, PA	---	---	339,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	61,730,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575,000	500,000	500,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT, PA	---	---	30,000,000
	SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	---	1,000,000
	SUNBURY, PA	---	---	200,000
	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA	---	---	400,000
	WILLIAMSPORT, PA	---	---	225,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	418,825,000	12,712,000	12,712,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	53,318,000	510,000	510,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	11,868,000	11,868,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	34,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	---	---	4,000,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	206,673,000	1,869,000	1,869,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,535,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	TENNESSEE			
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN..	---	---	2,900,000
	EAST RIDGE, TN	---	---	1,500,000
	TENNESSEE RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	---	---	1,500,000
	TEXAS			
	BRAYS BAYOU, TX	---	---	2,000,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	22,293,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	70,024,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	114,500,000	5,290,000	5,290,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	63,557,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	---	---	7,000,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX	58,770,000	940,000	940,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	316,541,000	15,000,000	23,800,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	9,516,000	3,291,000	3,291,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM (BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE), TX..	---	---	900,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	147,800,000	390,000	1,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	209,480,000	9,590,000	13,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	9,800,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	---	9,200,000
	UTAH			
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	9,400,000	700,000	700,000
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	23,100,000	1,526,000	1,526,000
	LYNCHBURG COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	---	---	1,000,000
	NEABSCO CREEK, VA	---	---	800,000
	NORFOLK HARBOR (50-FOOT ANCHORAGE), VA	---	---	1,200,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	1,098,000	1,098,000
	RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	---	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	---	10,000,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	---	---	925,000
	WASHINGTON			
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	1,376,217,000	127,000,000	85,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	87,700,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	---	---	1,500,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,597,597,000	7,927,000	48,017,000
	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	---	1,830,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH	373,000,000	5,356,000	5,356,000
	SOUTHERN WV ENVIRONMEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM, WV	---	---	3,000,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	29,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	---	3,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	221,600,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	WISCONSIN			
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	7,260,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	---	2,600,000	2,600,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	---	2,000,000	8,900,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	---	2,000,000	2,400,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	---	500,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	---	7,500,000	11,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	18,048,000	18,048,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	25,500,000	40,000,000
	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)	---	5,000,000	11,400,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	14,175,000	21,175,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-45,863,000	-45,913,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL		1,062,470,000	1,475,892,000

Rillito River, Arizona.—Subsequent to authorization of the Rillito River and Associated Streams, Arizona, project, severe flooding has caused damages to public infrastructure and private property along Tanque Verde Creek immediately upstream of its confluence with the Rillito River, between Craycroft and Sabino Canyon Roads. The Corps of Engineers is directed, as part of the Rillito River project, to accomplish a limited reevaluation report of Tanque Creek immediately upstream of and including Craycroft Road Bridge to determine the advisability of extending the bank protection and related measures. The analysis will be consistent with that of the Chief of Engineers' report for the Rillito Creek project to include full use of location benefits for economic justification purposes. The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for this work and the construction of pedestrian bridges required for safety purposes.

Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for rehabilitation and reconstruction of Faulkner County Levee #1.

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware that the reliability of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system is threatened by low river stages on the Mississippi River and that dredging alone will not provide a solution to this problem. The solution developed by the Corps of Engineers is the construction of a new lock and dam near the confluence of the White River entrance channel with the Mississippi River. Because of the need to protect the investment that has been made in the McClellan-Kerr system, the Committee has provided $25,000,000, $15,000,000 above the amount requested by the Administration, to expedite construction of this important project.

Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas to Denison Dam, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas, to Denison Dam, Texas, bank stabilization project. Of the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for plans and specifications for a bendway weir demonstration project at the U.S. Highway 271 bridge between Oklahoma and Texas.

American River Watershed (Natomas), California.—The Committee had provided $10,000,000 for partial reimbursement to the local sponsor of the Federal share of the cost of construction of flood control improvements undertaken by the sponsor in the Natomas area of Sacramento. The Committee has also provided $100,000 for initiation of the Ueda Parkway feature of the project.

Marysville/Yuba City Levee Reconstruction, California.—The Committee has provided $9,300,000 for the Marysville/Yuba City Levee Reconstruction project to accelerate levee reconstruction in reaches that failed or were weakened in the floods of January of 1997.

Norco Bluffs, California.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for initiation of construction of the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

Prado Dam, California.—The Committee is aware that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works approved the Prado Dam element of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project as a separable element pursuant to Section 309 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The Committee further understands that the Corps will be modifying the Local Cooperation Agreement con-

sistent with Section 309. The Corps of Engineers is urged to proceed expeditiously on this matter and to continue design of the Prado Dam work in fiscal year 1998 so that it can proceed to construction by fiscal year 1999.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the environmental review and continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Baldwin Phase of the San Francisco Bay to Stockton project.

San Lorenzo River, California.—The Committee has provided $4,200,000 for the San Lorenzo River project, the same as the budget request. The Committee encourages the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the Section 1135 environmental restoration project for the San Lorenzo River concurrently with the flood control project.

San Timoteo Creek, California.—The bill includes $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the San Timoteo Creek feature of the Santa Ana River Mainstem project.

Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the General Reevaluation Report for the Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, project.

Upper Sacramento Area Levee Reconstruction, California.—The Committee has provided $2,750,000 for the Upper Sacramento Area Levee Reconstruction project to accelerate work in 3.7 miles of levee on the right bank of the Sacramento River between the City of Colusa and the Tisdale Bypass. Of the funds provided, $750,000 is intended to be used to reinforce and protect from future damage and potential failure the recently repaired levees within Site B, the so-called Back Levee of Reclamation District 108, and to identify and initiate work on additional sites in the project area requiring reconstruction.

Faulkner's Island, Connecticut.—Within available funds, the bill includes $500,000 for the Faulkner's Island, Connecticut, project. Using these funds, along with funds appropriated for the project in fiscal year 1997 that will be carried over into fiscal year 1998, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to award a continuing contract in fiscal year 1998 for construction of the Faulkner's Island project.

Broward County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to review the General Design Memorandum for renourishment of the Broward County, Florida, project currently being prepared by the local sponsor.

Canaveral Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 for the sand bypass project at Canaveral Harbor.

Canaveral Harbor Deepening, Florida.—The Committee has provided $640,000 for reimbursement to the local sponsor for the Federal share of revetment work completed by the sponsor and $1,000,000 for widening of the entrance channel.

Dade County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $9,400,000 for the Dade County, Florida project, $1,215,000 above the budget request. The funds provided include $4,400,000 for the Surfside feature of the project, $2,000,000 for the Bal Harbour element of

the project, $1,000,000 for modifications to the north jetty at Government Cut, $1,000,000 for the Sunny Isle feature of the project, and $1,000,000 for continuing engineering and design of the project.

Lee County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preparation of a General Reevaluation Report for the Estero and Gasparilla elements of the Lee County, Florida, project.

Palm Beach County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $5,762,000 for the Palm Beach County, Florida, project, which includes $2,462,000 for the Boca Raton element of the project and $3,300,000 for the Ocean Ridge element of the project.

Sarasota County, Florida.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the City of Venice, Florida, from available funds for the non-Federal share of the construction of an artificial reef, stormwater outfalls, and such other activities as the Corps deems appropriate.

St. Johns County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the General Reevaluation Report and initiate plans and specifications for the St. Johns County, St. Augustine Beach, Florida, project.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to design and construct an environmental dispersal barrier in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal to prevent the spread of exotic species between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River ecosystems.

Des Plaines Wetlands Demonstration Project, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to participate in the Des Plaines Wetlands Demonstration project, which was reauthorized in Section 363 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the General Reevaluation Report for the East St. Louis and Vicinity, Interior Flood Control, project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers plans to use $4,922,000 in carryover funds in fiscal year 1998 to continue engineering and design of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs project.

Melvin Price Lock and Dam, Illinois.—The amount provided for the Melvin Price Lock and Dam project includes $500,000 for the design and construction of exhibits at the visitor center which is currently under construction.

North Branch of the Chicago River, Illinois.—The bill includes $39,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the Village of Deerfield for its costs associated with the completion of a feasibility study for the project and $500,000 for remaining work on reservoirs 15, 27, and 29A.

O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois.—The Committee supports the Corps of Engineers' plan to reprogram the funds necessary for completion of the O'Hare Reservoir project.

Burns Waterway Harbor Major Rehabilitation, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,400,000 to complete con-

struction of the Burns Waterway Harbor major rehabilitation project.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for completion of the initial nourishment phase of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion project.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the continuation of construction of the Indianapolis Central Waterfront project.

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana.—The bill includes $3,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete construction of the Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, project.

Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue rehabilitation of six flood protection projects along the Ohio River in southern Indiana.

Salyersville, Kentucky.—The bill includes $2,050,000 to complete construction of the Salyersville, Kentucky, project.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake environmental infrastructure projects in southern and eastern Kentucky as authorized by Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Hurricane Protection, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project to be used for landside drainage on lakefront levees in Jefferson Parish, fronting protection at pumping stations in Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, and the continuation of construction of parallel protection along the London and Orleans Avenue canals.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $15,297,000 for continued construction of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project. The additional funds are available for the acquisition of mitigation lands, the construction of recreation features at Locks and Dams 3, 4, and 5, and the construction of dikes and capouts along the waterway.

Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana.—Section 108 of the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act and Section 533 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorized and directed the Secretary of the Army to proceed with engineering, design, and construction of projects to provide for flood control and improvements to rainfall drainage systems in Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes in Louisiana. Construction of the project is being delayed, and at this time only a small portion of the project is being implemented. The Committee considers this to be most inefficient and believes it will result in higher costs to the Federal government. Continued delays in implementing this project will result in continued disastrous loss of life and property such as that experienced as a result of the rainfall flooding in southeast Louisiana in May of 1995. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army is directed to proceed immediately with design and construction of the Southeast Louisiana project and, consistent with authorized appropriation ceilings, is directed to award continuing contracts beginning in fiscal year 1998. The Committee has provided

$47,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the project.

Red River Below Denison Dam Levee and Bank Stabilization, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for reinforcement of the Twelvemile Bayou Revetment to eliminate the bank erosion threat to the integrity of the Federal levee system.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate work on the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program authorized in Section 510 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Flint River, Michigan.—The bill includes $875,000 for the Corps of Engineers to replace the inflatable dam on the Flint River in Michigan as authorized by section 329 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Knife River Harbor, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin detailed design and plans and specifications for the Knife River Harbor, Minnesota, project.

Jackson County, Mississippi.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for the Jackson County alternative water supply system authorized in Section 504 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The funds are to be used for construction of a new water treatment plant and related transmission pipelines.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of phase 2 of the Pascagoula Harbor project.

New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey Channel, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $600,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Port Jersey Channel project.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey.—The bill includes $3,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete engineering and design and initiate construction of the Lower Basin and Stony Brook portions of the Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin project. Within the funds provided, $100,000 shall be used to reevaluate alternative plans for the Upper Basin portion of the project.

Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $15,116,000 for the Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project, the same as the budget request. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to consider a proposal to remove the dilapidated pier in Long Branch, New Jersey, as part of the ongoing project to address safety concerns related to construction of the project with the pier in place. In addition, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to consider a proposal to extend the Ocean Grove, New Jersey, fishing pier as part of the project in order to mitigate impacts on the pier by construction of the project.

Hudson River, Athens, New York.—The bill includes $8,700,000 for design and construction of a navigation channel on the Hudson River near Athens, New York.

Hudson River Habitat Restoration, New York.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to expedite

completion of the Hudson River Habitat Restoration feasibility study and initiate work authorized in Section 551 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channel, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the initiation of the Phase II dredging of the Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channels navigation project to 45 feet.

Wilmington Harbor Navigation Projects, North Carolina.—The budget request includes funds for three separate navigation improvement projects for Wilmington Harbor in North Carolina: the Wilmington Harbor Channel Widening project; the Cape Fear-Northeast (Cape Fear) River project; and the Wilmington Harbor-Northeast Cape Fear River project. The Committee is aware that the consolidation of these three projects into a single construction effort would produce significant savings from the resulting construction efficiencies. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction of the three projects as a single project requiring one Project Cooperation Agreement. The Committee has provided $2,430,000 for the initiation of the combined project in fiscal year 1998.

Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin the process of acquiring flowage easements from willing sellers as authorized by Section 336 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate activities associated with the rehabilitation of the Lower Girard Lake Dam as authorized by Section 507 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Johnstown, Pennsylvania (Major Rehabilitation).—The Committee has provided an additional $164,000 for design and construction of the Conemaugh River Urban Greenway Trail.

Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes an additional $3,000,000 for planning, engineering, and design of the Green Ridge section, and an additional $2,000,000 for planning, engineering, and design of the Plot section of the Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania, project. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to budget in subsequent fiscal years for construction of the Green Ridge and Plot sections as part of the Lackawanna River, Scranton, Pennsylvania project.

Lackawanna River, Olyphant, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake activities leading to construction of flood control measures at Dickson City, Pennsylvania as part of the Lackawanna River, Olyphant, project. The Committee directs that the Secretary of the Army provide Dickson City, Pennsylvania, with the same levels of protection as provided to Olyphant, Pennsylvania.

Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $339,000 for the Corps of Engineers to design and implement an early flood warning system for Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake work

at the East Central Incinerator site under the authority of Section 566 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $30,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Infrastructure Program. Of the funds provided, $3,000,000 is for Hollidaysburg Borough stormwater and wastewater improvements; $200,000 is for the Northern Blair County Regional Sewer Authority; $300,000 is for Taylor Township, Blair County, Pennsylvania; $1,000,000 is for Greenfield Township sewer improvements; $5,500,000 is for Chestnut Ridge Municipal Authority wastewater improvements; $10,000,000 is for work in the Ohio River watershed of south central Pennsylvania; and $10,000,000 is for design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike, and Monroe Counties in Pennsylvania.

Sunbury, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake engineering and design for modifications to the pump stations at the Sunbury, Pennsylvania, local flood protection project.

Susquehanna River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate activities associated with the environmental restoration of the Susquehanna River as authorized by Section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

Williamsport, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $225,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake necessary repairs to the flume and conduit at Hagerman's Run for the flood control project at Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $2,900,000 for the Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs wetlands preservation project authorized in Section 573 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The funds are to be used for preserving and enhancing the wetland area, and planning and design, but not construction, of an environmental education center.

Hamilton County, Tennessee.—The bill includes $1,500,000 for design and construction of the Hamilton County, Tennessee, bank stabilization project authorized by Section 574 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

East Ridge, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the initiation of construction of the East Ridge flood control project authorized by Section 572 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Brays Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for construction of the Brays Bayou, Texas, project by local interests in accordance with the provisions of Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Red River Below Denison Dam (Bowie County Levee), Texas.—The Committee has provided $900,000 for design and construction for restoration of the Bowie County Levee to the same level of protection as the adjoining Miller County Levee in Arkansas.

Neabsco Creek, Prince William County, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for design and construction of a flood control project on upper Neabsco Creek as authorized by Section 576 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has previously expressed concern about the level of spending for Pacific Northwest salmon recovery efforts and the lack of clear evidence of benefits resulting from that spending. Moreover, the budget request appears to reflect the pursuit of multiple restoration strategies, some of which may not be adopted. Accordingly, the Committee has recommended $85,000,000 for the Columbia River Fish Mitigation program, $42,000,000 below the budget request.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big and Sandy River and Upper Cumberland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—In addition to the amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes: $16,000,000 to continue construction of the Harlan, Kentucky element of the project; $4,690,000 to continue construction of the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the project; $7,200,000 to continue construction of the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $5,800,000 to continue construction of the Pike County, Kentucky element of the project; $5,500,000 to continue the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $500,000 to initiate a Detailed Project Report for the Buchanan County element of the project; and $400,000 for a flood warning system for the Levisa Fork Basin element of the project.

Marmet Locks and Dam, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,830,000 for the Marmet Locks and Dam project for the Corps of Engineers to complete engineering and design and initiate real estate acquisition.

Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure Program, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure program. Of the funds provided, at least $750,000 shall be allocated to the Krouts Creek Storm Drainage project.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control project authorized in Section 581 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. Of the funds provided, $1,000,000 is for the development of a management plan and the initiation of individual project reports for non-structural opportunities for reducing flooding in the lower Allegheny River Basin of western Pennsylvania, including the communities of Meyersdale, Connellsville, Benson-Hooversville, Clymer, and New Bethlehem; $100,000 is for flood control on Pentz Run, Dubois, Pennsylvania; $125,000 is for flood control on Bloody Run, Everett, Pennsylvania; $50,000 is for Newton Hamilton Borough, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania; $75,000 is for flood control on Six Mile Run, Bedford County, Pennsylvania; $150,000 is for flood control on Muddy Run, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania; $500,000 is for flood control in Logan Township/Altoona, Pennsylvania; and $1,000,000 is for preconstruction engineering and design for flood control measures, including, but not limited to (and only if ultimately necessary) flood warning systems and emergency evacu-

ation plans, in the communities of Philippi and Belington, West Virginia.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $11,000,000 for the Section 14 program, $3,500,000 more than the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $500,000 for a streambank protection project at Ditto Landing in Huntsville, Alabama; $390,000 for a streambank erosion project along the Ohio River in Tell City, Indiana; $500,000 for streambank restoration at Sugar Creek, Troy, Bradford County, Pennsylvania; $100,000 to remove a large island gravel bar in the Susquehanna River at the outlet of the Hepburn Street Pump Station, Williamsport, Pennsylvania; $100,000 for dredging the Lackawanna River and for stream bank restoration at Carbondale, Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania; $100,000 for stream bank restoration and placement of rip rap to control erosion and protect residential properties at Lycoming Creek, Trout Run, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania; $106,000 for stream bank stabilization by replacement of 500 feet of rip rap at Dingman Township, Pike County, Pennsylvania; $118,000 for stream bank stabilization and debris and gravel removal at Hop Bottom Borough, Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania; $10,000 to rebuild a creek bank at La Porte, Sullivan County, Pennsylvania; $50,000 for stream bank restoration and gravel bar removal at Satterlee Creek, Athens Township, Bradford County, Pennsylvania; $25,000 for a streambank erosion protection project along Elk Creek in Hills Grove, Sullivan County, Pennsylvania; $300,000 for dredging Loyal Sock Creek through Dushore and a ponding area on the Loyal Sock at the junction of Route 87 and Route 487 at Dushore, Sullivan County, Pennsylvania; $500,000 for a streambank erosion project at Scotts Hill Park, Scotts Hill, Tennessee; $500,000 for streambank erosion control measures at Mousetail Landing State Park, Perry County, Tennessee; $770,000 for a streambank erosion protection project on the Cumberland River (river miles 193.8 to 197.5) in Nashville, Tennessee; $325,000 for a streambank erosion control project at the Loudoun County, Tennessee, municipal facilities; $300,000 for streambank erosion control measures along Beaver Creek in Bristol, Tennessee; and $800,000 for a streambank erosion control project in Moundsville, West Virginia.

The bill also includes $1,000,000 for the project for bank stabilization, St. Joseph River, South Bend, Indiana, including recreation and pedestrian access features as authorized by Section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $40,000,000 for the Section 205 program, $14,500,000 above the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $3,900,000 for the Muscle Shoals, Alabama, project; $2,000,000 to reimburse the local sponsor for the Lake Elsinore, California, project; $875,000 for completion of engineering and design and initiation of construction of the San Pedro Creek, California, project; $774,000 for the Mission Zanja Creek, California, project; $1,440,000 for construction of the Magpie Creek, California, project; $1,000,000 for the Northern California Streams, Winters and Vicinity, California, project; $50,000 for appraisal investigations of Blockhouse Creek, Fishing Creek, Little Six Mile

Creek, Nine Mile Creek, and Trout River in Jacksonville, Florida; $1,200,000 for construction of the Cedar River (Wills Branch), Florida, project; $1,178,000 for the installation of floodgates on the McHenry and Algonquin Dams on the Fox River in Illinois; $350,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Deer Creek in Cook County, Illinois; $250,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Stony Creek, Illinois; $200,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Tinley Creek in Illinois; $1,125,000 for construction of the North Libertyville Estates, Illinois, project; $100,000 for construction of the Flatrock River project in Rushville, Indiana; $55,000 for plans and specifications for the Pipe Creek project in Alexandria, Indiana; $100,000 for completion of the feasibility study and initiation of plans and specifications for the White River project in Anderson, Indiana; $50,000 each for studies of flooding problems in Lawrenceburg, Burgin, Georgetown, and Millersburg, Kentucky; $75,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems in Silver Grove, Kentucky; $165,000 for construction of the Bardstown, Kentucky, Water Treatment Plant floodwall; $100,000 for completion of plans and specifications for the Lebanon Junction, Kentucky, floodwall project; $640,000 for construction of the Cy Bend, Jackson, Kentucky, project; $660,000 for studies of flooding problems in Jefferson and St. Tammany Parishes in Louisiana, including the W–11/W–12 Basins, Bayou Tete L'Ours, Unnamed Bayou; Little Bayou Castine, and Galvez Street; $100,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems on Mud Creek, Hendersonville, North Carolina; $3,741,000 for construction of the Pender (Logan Creek), Nebraska, flood control project; $150,000 for a study of flooding problems in Ponca, Nebraska; $250,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersrey, project; $120,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Poplar Brook, New Jersey, project; $250,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Cazenovia Creek in New York; $100,000 for a study of the Buffalo Creek, New York, project; $400,000 for construction of a concrete retaining wall, replacement of sluice pipes, removal of sedimentation, and installation of retaining walls at a bridge on Towanda Creek, Canton, Bradford County, Pennsylvania; $2,100,000 for construction of a flood protection dike, storm water pump station, discharge pipe, rip rap and storm drain at Montoursville, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania; $5,000,000 for construction of a flood protection dike on Loyal Sock Creek to accommodate a new airport access road at the Williamsport-Lycoming County Airport, Pennsylvania; $300,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems in Eastlake, Ohio; $275,000 for a feasibility study of the Lake Carl Blackwell flood control project in Oklahoma; $800,000 for construction of the Emily/Timothy Residential Area, Knoxville, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for a study of flooding problems along Richland Creek in Morgantown, Tennessee; $100,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along the Doe River in Carter County, Tennessee; $300,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Walnut and Browder Creeks in Springtown, Texas; $300,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Lick Creek and the Clinch River in Russell and Dickenson Counties in Virginia; and $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Snoqualmie River flood control project.

Clearing and Snagging for Flood Control (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Section 208 program, $1,500,000 more than the budget request. From within the funds provided, the bill includes: $500,000 for a project to remove sediment from Blackwood Creek in California; $500,000 for a project to remove sediment from Ward Creek in California; and $50,000 to clear debris from Saw Mill Creek in the Borough of Milford, Pensylvania.

Small Beach Erosion Control Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Section 103 program, the same as the budget request. From within the funds provided, the bill includes: $100,000 for a study of beach erosion control measures at the former U.S. Coast Guard seaplane base in Miami, Florida; and $800,000 to complete the Shelter Island/Ram Island Causeway project in New York.

The Committee recognizes the serious erosion problems being experienced on the east end of Dauphin Island, Alabama. To counter this threat to property and habitat, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers, acting in coordination with non-Federal interests, to initiate a beach restoration project on the east end of Dauphin Island, Alabama, utilizing alternative sand recapture technologies.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $11,400,000 for the Section 107 program, $6,400,000 more than the budget request. From within the funds provided, the bill includes: $250,000 for planning associated with the project to deepen the West Turning Basin at Canaveral Harbor in Florida; $150,000 for a feasibility study for construction of a harbor of refuge at Duluth (McQuade Road) Harbor, Minnesota; $1,500,000 for construction of a harbor of refuge at Taconite Harbor, Minnesota; $3,500,000 for construction of a harbor of refuge at Two Harbors, Minnesota; $50,000 for completion of the feasibility study for the Morehead City Harbor, North Carolina, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study for the Buffalo Inner Harbor, New York, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study for the Union Ship Canal, New York, project; and $31,000 for a feasibility study of expanding the turning basin at the Port of Morrow, Oregon, project.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $21,175,000 for the section 1135 program, $7,000,000 more than the budget request. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $2,770,000 for construction of the Ajo Detention Basin project in Arizona; $2,100,000 for completion of plans and specifications and the initiation of land acquisition for the Gunnerson Pond, California, project; $500,000 for completion of plans and specifications and initiation of construction for the Pine Flat Dam Turbine Bypass, California, project; $150,000 for a project modification plan for the Wildcat-San Pablo Creeks, California, project; $1,350,000 for design and construction of the Middle Creek, California, project; $200,000 for construction of manatee protection features at Canaveral Locks in Florida; $3,133,000 for construction of the Lower Amazon Creek Restoration and Protection project in Oregon; $1,000,000 for the Mecklenburg County Streambank Stabilization and Restoration project in North Carolina; $1,000,000 for an environmental restoration project at Lake Wallenpuapack, Wayne County, Pennsylvania; $1,052,000 for

completion of plans and specifications and initiation of construction of the Bear Creek Fish and Wildlife Restoration project in Washington; $450,000 to initiate work on the Green/Duwamish Ecosystem Restoration project in Washington; $400,000 for the feasibility phase of the Hiram Chittendam Locks fish passage project in Washington; and $120,000 to initiate and complete the Sammamish River weir restoration project in Washington.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorized a new program under which the Corps of Engineers could carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects if the Secretary of the Army determines that such projects will improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost-effective. The Committee has provided $8,900,000, $6,900,000 above the budget request for this program. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $500,000 for design and construction of an aquatic ecosystem restoration project on the Huntsville Spring Branch in Huntsville, Alabama; $1,000,000 for the project to remove sediments from upper Newport Bay in California; $1,000,000 for the cleanup of the abandoned Penn Mine site in California; $600,000 for the Upper Truckee River restoration program in California; $750,000 for the Santa Rosa Vernal Pools, California, demonstration project; $250,000 for the Fairfield Streams and Suisun Marsh Watershed project; $200,000 for the Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration project in California; $250,000 for the environmental restoration of Rose Bay in Florida; $500,000 for the environmental restoration of Indian River Lagoon in Florida; $500,000 for design and construction of an ecosystem restoration project along the Lower Cumberland River in Kentucky; $500,000 for work associated with development of a plan to eliminate combined sewer overflows in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania; $500,000 for the Upper Jordan River Restoration project in Utah; and $500,000 for the Decker Lake Restoration in Utah.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 for the Corps of Engineer to initiate a study for a possible aquatic restoration project at Hamilton Army Airfield in Marin County, California.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 1997	$330,374,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	266,000,000
Recommended, 1998	285,450,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−44,924,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+19,450,000

NOTE.—The fiscal year 1997 appropriation includes $20,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 105–18.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	2,175,000	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	4,805,000	1,070,000	1,070,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	1,982,000	335,000	335,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	1,329,000	465,000	465,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	345,000	345,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		3,015,000	3,015,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,620,000,000	44,490,000	44,490,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	8,500,000	812,000	812,000
(FC)	HELENA & VICINITY, AR	7,700,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,457,000,000	24,238,000	34,738,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	381,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	3,300,000	1,105,000	1,105,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	185,000,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,750,000,000	19,100,000	19,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	63,300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	97,300,000	11,500,000	13,500,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	170,969,000	7,006,000	7,006,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,391,574,000)	(25,470,000)	(25,470,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	228,482,000	20,000	20,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	102,684,000	3,862,000	3,862,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	221,424,000	10,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	7,410,000	363,000	363,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	212,800,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	247,366,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	339,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(FC)	ST. JOHNS BAYOU - NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	54,700,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	17,930,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	140,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		150,221,000	167,721,000
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	56,112,000	56,162,000
(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 & TN	---	7,252,000	7,252,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	8,130,000	8,130,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & 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	10,700,000
(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	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	6,666,000
(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	114,714,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		266,000,000	285,450,000

Channel Improvement.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the use of dikes in maintaining the navigation channel on the Mississippi River and supports their continued use. The Committee is also aware that on rare occasions dikes can inhibit access to the main channel from private and public boat ramps located in the vicinity of dikes as a result of deposition that occurs and results in the formation of sand bars. The Committee has been advised that such a situation now exists for a boat ramp that is located on the left descending bank of the Mississippi River at river mile 798.5 between Forked Deer dikes 3 and 4. Accordingly, the Committee has provided $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform necessary dredging from the boat ramp to the main channel of the Mississippi River.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $13,500,000 for the Mississippi Delta Region project, $2,000,000 above the budget request. The additional funds will permit the Corps of Engineers to initiate work on the Southern Pacific Railroad Bridge relocation. If this work is not started in fiscal year 1998, the schedule for completion of the project will slip by two years.

Mississippi River Levees.—The Committee has provided $34,738,000 for the Mississippi River Levees element of the Mississippi River and Tributaries project, $10,500,000 more than the budget request. Of the funds provided, up to $9,000,000 shall be used to accelerate completion of work to bring mainline levees up to grade, including work to advance construction of the levees at Mayersville, Mississippi, and Lake Providence, Louisiana, and work to complete levee slide repairs north of Lake Providence, Louisiana. In addition, $1,500,000 shall be used to advance construction of the Commerce to Birds Point levee in Missouri.

Sardis Lake, Yazoo Basin, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,900,000 for the Sardis Lake project to permit the Corps of Engineers to complete the dredging of Shady Cove Marina.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000, $5,000,000 more than the budget request, for the Demonstration Erosion Control Program, a continuation of a joint effort by the Vicksburg District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo Basin of Mississippi. The funds provided will permit the Corps of Engineers to undertake construction work in the following watersheds: Abiaca Creek, Batupan Bogue, Black Creek, Coldwater Creek, Cane-Mussacana Creek, Hurricane-Wolfe Creek, Hickahala-Senatobia Creek, Hotophia Creek, Long Creek, Pelucia Creek, Otoucalofa Creek, and the Yalobusha River. Design of future work, acquisition of real estate, and monitoring of results will be accomplished for all watersheds in order to facilitate work in fiscal year 1998 and for future work as required for completion of the program. The Committee expects the Administration to continue to request funds for this important project.

Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware of the severe groundwater depletion problem in eastern Arkansas, particularly in the Grand Prairie and Bayou Meto areas. This problem has caused and will continue to cause ir-

reparable damage to the alluvial aquifer. The Committee believes the Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Arkansas, project reauthorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 would provide the much-needed solution to this problem. Therefore, from within available funds, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to continue design on the Grand Prairie portion of the project and initiate a reevaluation on the Bayou Meto Basin portion.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1997	$1,866,015,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	1,618,000,000
Recommended, 1998	1,726,955,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−139,060,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+108,955,000

NOTE.—The fiscal year 1997 appropriation includes $19,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 104–208 and $150,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 105–18.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	4,903,000	5,903,000
	BAYOU CODEN, AL	---	5,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	5,000	705,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,252,000	19,200,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	500,000	752,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,677,000	3,677,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	30,000	30,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,835,000	6,335,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,936,000	17,936,000
	PERIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	---	300,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300,000	300,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,858,000	4,389,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	20,000	20,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	16,058,000	20,000,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,044,000	8,724,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,400,000	1,400,000
(N)	BETHEL HARBOR, AK	20,000	20,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,766,000	1,766,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	459,000	459,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	245,000	245,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	27,000	27,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	200,000	200,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	260,000	260,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	565,000	565,000
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	400,000	400,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,055,000	1,055,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	107,000	107,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	2,293,000	2,293,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	22,000	22,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	199,000	199,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,918,000	3,918,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,632,000	4,632,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,105,000	1,105,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,810,000	4,810,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,679,000	5,679,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,959,000	3,959,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,012,000	1,012,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,015,000	1,015,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	946,000	946,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,241,000	4,241,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR	283,000	283,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	210,000	210,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	21,604,000	21,604,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,647,000	1,647,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,568,000	3,568,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,284,000	1,284,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,183,000	3,183,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	311,000	311,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,179,000	5,179,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,789,000	3,789,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	5,000	5,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,265,000	2,265,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	120,000	120,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,587,000	1,587,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,372,000	1,372,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,718,000	2,718,000
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,140,000	1,140,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,451,000	3,451,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	281,000	281,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,371,000	1,371,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,775,000	3,775,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,326,000	1,326,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,413,000	1,413,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	4,288,000	5,288,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	252,000	252,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	307,000	307,000
	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	---	3,200,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	2,110,000	2,110,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	938,000	938,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	3,146,000	3,146,000
	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	---	900,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	2,090,000	2,090,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	1,968,000	1,968,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,615,000	1,615,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	2,667,000	2,667,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,778,000	1,778,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	884,000	884,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	133,000	133,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	175,000	175,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	1,787,000	1,787,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,309,000	2,309,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,267,000	2,267,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,494,000	1,494,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,680,000	1,680,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,762,000	2,762,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,492,000	1,492,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	968,000	968,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,573,000	1,573,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	952,000	952,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	2,073,000	2,073,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,236,000	2,236,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	361,000	361,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	715,000	715,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	945,000	945,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	110,000	110,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,595,000	1,595,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	368,000	368,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	627,000	627,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	400,000	400,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	558,000	558,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	199,000	199,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	843,000	843,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	35,000	35,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	360,000	360,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	401,000	401,000
(N)	PATCHOGUE RIVER, CT	466,000	466,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,241,000	1,241,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	351,000	351,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	489,000	489,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	395,000	395,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,794,000	11,794,000
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	165,000	165,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50,000	50,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,360,000	2,360,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	6,000	6,000
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	840,000	840,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	32,000	32,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	30,000	30,000
	ANCLOTE RIVER, FL	---	1,500,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	6,460,000	6,460,000
(N)	CARRABELLE HARBOR, FL	520,000	520,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,500,000	9,500,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,536,000	1,536,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	717,000	717,000
	HORSESHOE COVE, FL	---	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	50,000	50,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	47,000	47,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	2,909,000	2,909,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	5,961,000	8,600,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	5,399,000	5,399,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	408,000	408,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,503,000	3,503,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,079,000	1,079,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	700,000	700,000
(N)	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	50,000	50,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	5,000	5,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	410,000	410,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,032,000	3,032,000
(N)	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
(N)	STEINHATCHEE RIVER, FL	5,000	5,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,607,000	6,607,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,628,000	4,628,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,741,000	5,741,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,783,000	1,783,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,030,000	3,030,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,179,000	6,179,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,500,000	4,500,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	9,547,000	9,547,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	40,000	40,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	8,982,000	8,982,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	7,520,000	7,520,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,053,000	14,500,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	207,000	207,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,631,000	4,631,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	84,000	84,000
(N)	HALEIWA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	334,000	334,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	188,000	188,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	415,000	415,000
(N)	WAIANAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HI	334,000	334,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,775,000	4,775,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	7,866,000	7,866,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	89,000	89,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,087,000	1,087,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	193,000	193,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	64,000	64,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	717,000	717,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,908,000	3,908,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	4,545,000	4,545,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	343,000	343,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	294,000	294,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	1,310,000	1,310,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN	22,738,000	22,738,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	657,000	657,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,433,000	1,433,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	796,000	796,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,820,000	4,820,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	10,535,000	10,535,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	81,363,000	81,363,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	110,000	110,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,451,000	3,451,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	129,000	129,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	643,000	643,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	754,000	754,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	902,000	902,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	709,000	709,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	715,000	715,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	1,242,000	1,242,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	732,000	732,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	133,000	133,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	56,000	56,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	975,000	975,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	778,000	778,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	739,000	739,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	30,000	30,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	832,000	832,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	120,000	120,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,731,000	2,731,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	183,000	183,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA.	152,000	152,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,496,000	6,496,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,746,000	1,746,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,291,000	3,291,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,191,000	4,191,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,482,000	1,482,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,003,000	1,003,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	488,000	488,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	699,000	699,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	772,000	772,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	790,000	790,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	250,000	250,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,019,000	1,019,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,219,000	1,219,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,630,000	1,630,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,580,000	1,580,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,537,000	1,537,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	799,000	799,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,673,000	1,673,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,533,000	1,533,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	178,000	178,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	364,000	364,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,858,000	1,858,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,349,000	1,349,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	8,127,000	8,127,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,120,000	1,120,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,309,000	1,309,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,374,000	1,374,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	908,000	908,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,167,000	1,167,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	334,000	334,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,602,000	1,602,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,014,000	1,014,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,915,000	1,915,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,759,000	1,759,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	137,000	137,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	4,843,000	4,843,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,233,000	1,233,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	22,000	22,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	654,000	654,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52,000	52,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,795,000	1,795,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	53,126,000	53,126,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV.	5,889,000	5,889,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	878,000	878,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,669,000	1,669,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,086,000	1,086,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	4,290,000	4,440,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,111,000	1,111,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	10,436,000	10,436,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	505,000	505,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	466,000	466,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5,000	5,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	172,000	172,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	78,000	78,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	6,480,000	6,480,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,452,000	2,452,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	15,015,000	15,015,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	826,000	826,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	414,000	414,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	371,000	371,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	56,000	56,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,143,000	1,143,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	41,000,000	48,100,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	10,998,000	14,498,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	---	2,400,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	144,000	144,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	7,714,000	10,192,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,960,000	1,960,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	152,000	152,000
(N)	WATERWAY - EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	765,000	765,000
(N)	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	335,000	335,000
	MAINE		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	15,000	15,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	722,000	722,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	12,025,000	12,025,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	425,000	425,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	560,000	560,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD	65,000	65,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	111,000	111,000
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	677,000	677,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	28,000	28,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,528,000	1,528,000
(N)	LOWER THOROFARE, DEAL ISLAND, MD	63,000	63,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	47,000	47,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	306,000	306,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	79,000	79,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	UPPER THOROFARE, MD	53,000	53,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	829,000	829,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	340,000	340,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	385,000	385,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	16,500,000	16,500,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	359,000	359,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,855,000	8,855,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	156,000	156,000
	COHASSET HARBOR, MA	---	1,342,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	138,000	138,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	327,000	327,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	296,000	296,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	348,000	348,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	78,000	78,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	527,000	527,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	459,000	459,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	242,000	242,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	1,117,000	1,117,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MA	16,000	16,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	391,000	391,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	415,000	415,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	488,000	488,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	324,000	324,000
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	2,377,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	805,000	805,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	475,000	475,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,839,000	2,839,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	210,000	210,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,129,000	1,129,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	359,000	359,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	392,000	392,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	976,000	976,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	607,000	607,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	276,000	276,000
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
(N)	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	257,000	257,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	337,000	337,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	316,000	316,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	157,000	157,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	407,000	407,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,579,000	1,579,000
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	21,000	21,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	211,000	211,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	134,000	134,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,291,000	1,291,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,014,000	1,014,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	587,000	587,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	17,744,000	17,744,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,353,000	2,353,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,585,000	1,585,000
	MINNESOTA		
	ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT, DULUTH, MN	---	500,000
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	184,000	184,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,749,000	3,749,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	103,000	103,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	549,000	549,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	150,000	150,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	930,000	930,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	70,000	70,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	175,000	175,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,677,000	2,677,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	239,000	239,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	464,000	464,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	158,000	158,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	120,000	120,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,121,000	2,121,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	79,000	79,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,620,000	2,620,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	391,000	391,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5,000	5,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	406,000	406,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	176,000	176,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,677,000	4,677,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	1,991,000	2,341,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,006,000	8,006,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	399,000	399,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	867,000	867,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	889,000	889,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	14,839,000	14,839,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	21,000	21,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,668,000	1,668,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,063,000	1,063,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	275,000	275,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	2,988,000	2,988,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	4,576,000	4,576,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	5,000	5,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,664,000	3,664,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	23,000	23,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	6,517,000	6,517,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	53,000	53,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	69,000	69,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	5,469,000	5,469,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,395,000	1,395,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	164,000	164,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	1,800,000	1,800,000
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	250,000	250,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	690,000	690,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	854,000	854,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	116,000	116,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	480,000	480,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	145,000	145,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	404,000	404,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	456,000	456,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	813,000	813,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	973,000	973,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	10,000	10,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	478,000	478,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	161,000	161,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	616,000	616,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	375,000	375,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20,000	20,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	15,098,000	15,098,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,480,000	1,480,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	443,000	443,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,040,000	2,040,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	670,000	5,710,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	1,021,000	1,021,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	250,000	250,000
	TUCKERTON CREEK, NJ	---	650,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,295,000	1,295,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,922,000	1,922,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,081,000	1,081,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	299,000	299,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	66,000	66,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	457,000	457,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	891,000	891,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	64,000	64,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	323,000	323,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	435,000	435,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	218,000	218,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	4,350,000	4,350,000
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY	600,000	600,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,550,000	1,550,000
	BUFFALO HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	---	125,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	220,000	220,000
(N)	CATSKILL CREEK, NY	20,000	20,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	545,000	545,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	483,000	483,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	650,000	650,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY & CREEK, NY	155,000	155,000
(N)	GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	540,000	540,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	3,275,000	3,275,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	549,000	549,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	100,000	100,000
	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	---	6,200,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,385,000	1,385,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	800,000	38,760,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,800,000	4,800,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	730,000	730,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	7,764,000	7,764,000
	OWASCO OUTLET, NY	---	250,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,504,000	1,504,000
(N)	RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	1,245,000	1,245,000
	SAG HARBOR, NY	---	90,000
(N)	SAUGERTIES HARBOR, NY	20,000	20,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	526,000	526,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	651,000	651,000
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	627,000	627,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,438,000	5,438,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	973,000	973,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	590,000	590,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	648,000	648,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,340,000	1,340,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	867,000	867,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	375,000	375,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	5,074,000	5,074,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	2,672,000	2,672,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	650,000	650,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	180,000	180,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	100,000	100,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100,000	100,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,468,000	1,468,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,834,000	5,834,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	194,000	194,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,143,000	9,243,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	188,000	188,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	60,000	60,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,149,000	1,149,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	395,000	395,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	188,000	188,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	30,000	30,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	616,000	616,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,175,000	1,175,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	2,368,000	2,368,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,153,000	1,153,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	726,000	726,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,560,000	6,560,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	1,358,000	1,358,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	678,000	678,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	814,000	814,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	501,000	501,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	400,000	400,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	220,000	220,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	1,325,000	1,325,000
	MAHONING RIVER, OH	---	1,000,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	882,000	882,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	965,000	965,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,060,000	6,060,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	311,000	311,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	569,000	569,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	74,000	74,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,015,000	1,015,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	206,000	206,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,575,000	3,575,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	245,000	245,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	546,000	546,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	846,000	846,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	277,000	277,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	836,000	836,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,671,000	1,671,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,756,000	1,756,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	906,000	906,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,959,000	3,959,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,354,000	3,354,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	817,000	817,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	323,000	323,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	813,000	813,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,510,000	1,510,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	462,000	462,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	168,000	168,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,735,000	1,735,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,453,000	3,453,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,329,000	1,329,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	265,000	265,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	20,000	20,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,088,000	1,088,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,795,000	3,795,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,037,000	1,037,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	558,000	558,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	949,000	949,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,423,000	3,423,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,486,000	1,486,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,288,000	3,288,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	824,000	824,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	787,000	787,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	276,000	276,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	16,576,000	16,691,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	284,000	284,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,332,000	11,332,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,904,000	7,904,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	346,000	346,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,892,000	4,892,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	377,000	377,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	708,000	708,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,157,000	1,157,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	33,000	33,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	512,000	512,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	618,000	618,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	955,000	955,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,545,000	2,545,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	748,000	748,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	179,000	179,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,886,000	12,886,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	3,991,000	3,991,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	4,030,000	4,030,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,333,000	12,333,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	484,000	484,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	135,000	135,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	746,000	746,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	115,000	115,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	965,000	965,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	5,000	5,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7,000	7,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	13,000	13,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,321,000	1,321,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	606,000	606,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	61,000	61,000
	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OR	---	647,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	564,000	564,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,607,000	1,607,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	622,000	622,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	200,000	225,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,046,000	1,046,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	1,986,000	1,986,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	3,127,000	3,127,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,679,000	1,679,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,452,000	1,452,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	677,000	804,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	799,000	799,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	635,000	635,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	728,000	728,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	715,000	715,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	287,000	287,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	205,000	205,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,109,000	1,109,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,182,000	1,182,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	826,000	826,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	13,864,000	13,864,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	15,000	15,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	438,000	438,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13,000	13,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	2,520,000	4,690,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	53,000	53,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,290,000	1,290,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	1,916,000	1,916,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	334,000	334,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	82,000	82,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,775,000	2,155,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	324,000	324,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	821,000	821,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	518,000	518,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,663,000	1,663,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(N)	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	342,000	342,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	5,000	5,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	677,000	677,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,850,000	2,850,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,815,000	4,715,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,372,000	3,372,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	246,000	246,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,165,000	3,165,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	27,000	27,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	981,000	981,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	20,000	20,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	400,000	400,000
	TOWN CREEK, SC	---	300,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	5,759,000	5,759,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	325,000	325,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	200,000	200,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,863,000	7,863,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	14,000	14,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	1,499,000	1,499,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,854,000	8,854,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	67,000	67,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,373,000	5,373,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,832,000	4,832,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,097,000	4,097,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,622,000	3,622,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	133,000	133,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,348,000	3,348,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,404,000	6,404,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	4,000	4,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	10,266,000	10,266,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	310,000	310,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	602,000	602,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,185,000	1,185,000
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	845,000	845,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,301,000	1,301,000
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,170,000	1,170,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,650,000	2,650,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,660,000	1,660,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,457,000	3,457,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,052,000	2,052,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	155,000	155,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	978,000	978,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,885,000	1,885,000
	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (RINCON CANAL), TX	---	675,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	4,681,000	4,681,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14,000	14,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,113,000	2,113,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,350,000	4,350,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,010,000	3,010,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,940,000	1,940,000
(N)	GIWW - CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,517,000	1,517,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,804,000	1,804,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	17,072,000	17,072,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,133,000	1,133,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,617,000	7,617,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	296,000	296,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	817,000	817,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	235,000	235,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,476,000	2,476,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,467,000	2,467,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,460,000	3,460,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,900,000	1,900,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,373,000	1,373,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,650,000	1,650,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	856,000	856,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	2,197,000	2,197,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	85,000	85,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	768,000	768,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	8,020,000	8,020,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,038,000	4,038,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	49,000	49,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,367,000	2,367,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,514,000	1,514,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	770,000	770,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,469,000	1,469,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,031,000	2,031,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	488,000	488,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,628,000	3,628,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,446,000	2,446,000
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	58,000	58,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	452,000	452,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	606,000	606,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	40,000	40,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	556,000	556,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	672,000	672,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	570,000	570,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	602,000	602,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	439,000	439,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	25,000	25,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	1,971,000	1,971,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	485,000	485,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	1,094,000	1,094,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,544,000	1,544,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	707,000	707,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	69,000	69,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,635,000	5,000,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	7,906,000	7,906,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,192,000	1,192,000
	NEABSCO CREEK, VA	---	1,000,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	280,000	280,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,310,000	5,310,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	301,000	301,000
	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	---	174,000
	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC, VA	---	176,000
	RUDEE INLET, VA	---	535,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,075,000	2,075,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	711,000	711,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	177,000	177,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,082,000	1,082,000
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA	240,000	240,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,547,000	12,547,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	10,000	10,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6,000	6,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,202,000	1,202,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	7,226,000	13,226,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,271,000	1,271,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	8,090,000	8,090,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	173,000	173,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	352,000	352,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,558,000	6,558,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,672,000	5,672,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,684,000	7,684,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,461,000	5,461,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	762,000	762,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA	415,000	415,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,953,000	1,953,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	294,000	294,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	492,000	492,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	787,000	787,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	186,000	186,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	61,000	61,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	375,000	375,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	72,000	72,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	10,744,000	10,744,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	615,000	715,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,018,000	1,018,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,253,000	1,728,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,167,000	1,167,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,563,000	1,563,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	370,000	370,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	93,000	93,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,743,000	8,743,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,418,000	1,418,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	970,000	970,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,612,000	1,612,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,611,000	1,611,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,243,000	1,243,000
	WISCONSIN		
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	910,000	910,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	1,926,000	1,926,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,048,000	1,048,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,613,000	3,613,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	15,000	15,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	188,000	188,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	93,000	93,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	407,000	407,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,779,000	1,779,000
(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	175,000	175,000
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR, WI	222,000	222,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	96,000	96,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	511,000	511,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	324,000	324,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	475,000	475,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	199,000	199,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	553,000	553,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	315,000	315,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	2,500,000
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000,000	1,500,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	735,000	500,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	6,000,000	2,000,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	1,700,000	1,500,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	2,930,000	2,500,000
	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	---	500,000
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	600,000	600,000
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	1,900,000	1,500,000
	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	700,000
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	415,000	415,000
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	1,000,000
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	500,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	500,000
	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINT & REHAB RESEARCH (REMR II)	3,000,000	2,000,000
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	850,000	650,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-29,368,000	-30,543,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,618,000,000	1,726,955,000

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use funds provided in this act to conduct the measures required by the April 18, 1997, Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with respect to the long-term operation of Isabella Reservoir in Kern County, California. The Committee further expects the Corps of Engineers to identify the least costly actions available, including, whenever possible, the utilization of partnerships with other Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations, so that the Corps can continue to operate and maintain Isabella Dam and Reservoir for flood control and water conservation purposes as provided in the October 23, 1964, contract among the United States of America and various public agencies.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Los Angeles County Drainage Area project for the completion of recreation facilities at Howard Hansen Dam.

Morro Bay Harbor, California.—The bill includes $3,200,000 for maintenance dredging of Morro Bay Harbor in California.

Anclote River, Florida.—The bill includes $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to address the backlog of maintenance dredging in the Anclote River in Florida.

Fort Myers Beach, Florida.—The Committee has included language in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the local sponsor of the Fort Myers Beach, Florida, project for maintenance dredging performed by the local sponsor to open the authorized channel to navigation using $375,000 appropriated in the fiscal year 1997 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for that purpose.

Wolf Creek Dam—Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study for a bridge to replace the current route of U.S. 127 at Wolf Creek Dam. In addition, the Committee is concerned about the amount of solid waste entering Lake Cumberland, Kentucky. Within the amounts available, the Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, project, with which the Secretary of the Army is directed to implement measures upstream of Lake Cumberland to intercept and dispose of solid waste.

Mississippi River Outlets at Venice, Louisiana.—The bill includes $2,400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform dredging of Baptiste Collette and make repairs to the Baptiste jetty.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,478,000 for the Red River Waterway project to maintain 24 hour per day lock operations and to perform additional revetment repairs to maintain the integrity of the navigation channel.

Cohasset Harbor, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $1,342,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of Cohasset Harbor in Massachusetts.

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $2,377,000 for repair of the east breakwater at Cedar River Harbor in Michigan.

Alternative Technology Project, Duluth, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the project to develop and imple-

ment alternative methods for decontamination and disposal of contaminated dredged material at the Port of Duluth, Minnesota, authorized in Section 541 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Little Falls, Mississippi River, Minnesota.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of a project for clearing, snagging, and sediment removal on the Mississippi River at Little Falls, Minnesota, and, if the project is found to be feasible, to complete it under the authority of Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act of 1945 in accordance with Section 106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Clearwater Lake, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake engineering and design activities related to the relocation of facilities impacted by floodings.

Tuckerton Creek, New Jersey.—The bill includes $650,000 for maintenance dredging of Tuckerton Creek in New Jersey.

Buffalo Harbor Environmental Dredging, New York.—The bill includes $125,000 for the Corps of Engineers to investigate the dredging of contaminated sediments located outside of and adjacent to the Federal navigation channels in Buffalo Harbor and in the Buffalo River.

Mamaroneck Harbor, New York.—The bill includes $6,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging main and tributary channels and anchorage areas of Mamaroneck Harbor project, including justified advance maintenance dredging to −10 feet MLW.

Owasco Outlet, Owasco Seawall, New York.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for study, design, and the preparation of plans and specifications for rehabilitation of the seawall at the outlet of Owasco Lake.

Ports of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to address the critical backlog of maintenance dredging in authorized navigation channels in the Ports of New York and New Jersey.

Sag Harbor, New York—The Committee has provided $90,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of the need for repair of the breakwaters at Sag Harbor, New York.

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

Bonneville Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee has provided $115,000 for the Corps of Engineers to determine if the Old Dalles Levee, constructed as a feature of the Bonneville Lock and Dam project, is still required for project purposes, and, if it is not, to initiate actions to transfer it to the City of The Dalles for expansion of its wastewater treatment facility.

Mahoning River, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate activities associated with the dredging of contaminated sediments from the Mahoning River in Ohio under the authority of Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990, as amended.

Willamette River Basin, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $647,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the program to mark hatchery reared salmon in order to permit a selective fishery to be developed. This will allow wild salmon to be released, while at the same time permitting the recreational fishery to continue.

Allegheny River, Pennsylvania.—Within available funds, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to extend the navigation channel on the Allegheny River to provide passenger boat access to the Kittanning, Pennsylvania, Riverfront Park.

Aylesworth Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $25,000 for operation and maintenance of recreational facilities at Aylesworth Lake in Pennsylvania.

Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $127,000 for the Corps of Engineers to make improvements to recreation facilities at Curwensville Lake in Pennsylvania.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,170,000 for the Raystown Lake project for the Corps of Engineers to implement recommendations of the 1992 update of the project Master Plan.

Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $380,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair and reopen the Lambs Creek Recreation area.

Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.—The bill includes an additional $900,000 for the Charleston Harbor project to be used for dewatering and diking of the Clouter Creek dredged material disposal site.

Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Rincon Canal System, Texas.—The Committee has provided $675,000 for maintenance dredging of the Rincon Canal in Texas as authorized by Section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Neabsco Creek, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of the Neabsco Creek navigation project.

Potomac River, Virginia.—The bill includes $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the planning process and initiate maintenance dredging for the Potomac River at Alexandria and Potomac River below Washington, D.C., navigation projects.

Grays Harbor, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $6,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to extend the south jetty at the Grays Harbor project to provide a permanent solution to the ongoing erosion problem.

Willapa River and Harbor, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study to find a permanent solution to erosion problems at the Willapa River and Harbor project.

Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided an additional $475,000 for the Bluestone Lake project in West Virginia to be used for engineering and design of the preferred alternative for drift and debris removal, and to initiate cleanup downstream of the dam.

Great Lakes Sediment Transport Models.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop sediment transport models for river systems depositing sediment into Fed-

eral navigation projects in the Great Lakes as authorized by Section 516(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1997	$101,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	112,000,000
Recommended, 1998	112,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+11,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

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

For fiscal year 1998, the Committee recommends $112,000,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee has recommended the full amount of the budget request with the expectation that the Corps of Engineers will move rapidly to put in place an administrative appeals process for the Regulatory Program.

The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to transfer regulatory responsibility for Lake, Porter, and LaPorte Counties in Indiana from the Detroit District to the Chicago District.

Agricultural Drainage Wells, Iowa.—The Committee is aware of the ongoing environmental problems associated with agricultural drainage wells in Iowa. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to cooperate with the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in facilitating the closing of these wells in a timely manner. Furthermore, the Committee recognizes the environmental benefits associated with the closure of agricultural drainage wells and expects these benefits to be taken into account fully for purposes of determining wetlands mitigation when and if the wells are closed and alternative drainage systems are devised.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1997	$425,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	14,000,000
Recommended, 1998	14,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−411,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

NOTE.—The fiscal year 1997 appropriation includes $415,000,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 105–18.

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.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1997	.....
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....
Recommended, 1998	$110,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	110,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	110,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes statutory language transferring the funding and responsibility for administering the Department of Energy's Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) to the Corps of Engineers. The Department of Defense has a similar environmental restoration program for cleanup of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The Corps of Engineers manages and executes these cleanup projects at formerly owned or leased defense sites which were contaminated during previous use. The Committee believes that there are significant cost and schedule efficiencies to be gained by having the Corps manage FUSRAP as well.

The FUSRAP program was funded at $75,085,000 in fiscal year 1997. The Committee recommendation includes $110,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 to accelerate cleanup of the existing sites. The current estimate for completion is 2016. The Department of Energy's fiscal year 1998 budget request stated that funding of $182,079,000 along with appropriate outyear funding would permit completion of all existing FUSRAP sites by 2002, a significant acceleration from the current completion date of 2016. However, the budget did not include a detailed plan on how this schedule is to be accomplished, and was dependent on reaching agreement with local communities on work to be performed. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to review the baseline cost, scope and schedule for each of the cleanup sites, and determine what actions can be taken to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup activities. The Corps should determine if the 2002 completion date is reasonable and report to the Committee on what steps must be taken to meet this date.

In those instances in which a contract or agreement has been reached between the Federal government and a contractor or subcontractor, the terms of that agreement should still be honored. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is expected to immediately pursue cost recovery from the responsible parties at FUSRAP sites either through a negotiated settlement or a court action.

The Committee has provided an additional $35,000,000 for FUSRAP activities in fiscal year 1998, for a total of $110,000,000, but does not agree to provide additional funds for any site where a final cleanup agreement is not in effect. Statutory language has been included providing that additional funds are available only for those sites which have a validated baseline for the work to be performed, including a technical plan, schedule, and life-cycle cost estimate for the selected cleanup remedy, and that this baseline has been agreed to by the Federal government, the local community, and the appropriate state and Federal regulators.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1997	$149,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	148,000,000
Recommended, 1998	148,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	

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

The Committee recommendation for General Expenses is $148,000,000, the same as the budget request.

It has come to the Committee's attention that the Corps of Engineers is in the process of restructuring its headquarters' Resource Management organization, including the assumption of functions, including oversight of programmatic goals, mission execution, and customer coordination, that have previously been accomplished by program managers within the Civil Works Directorate of the headquarters. The Committee believes that there is a significant difference between Civil Works program management and the legal resource distribution and performance measurement activities that are a part of Resource Management in the Corps of Engineers. The Committee has enjoyed an excellent relationship with the Corps of Engineers program managers, who provide the Committee with the accurate and responsive program, project, and policy information that the Committee needs to make spending and policy decisions and perform oversight of the Corps of Engineers' Civil Works program. The Committee would not like to see this relationship endangered by a restructuring that would detract from the program managers' ability to achieve program results and may overemphasize "financial management" at the expense of "program management."

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1997	$43,627,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	41,153,000
Recommended, 1998	41,153,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−2,474,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1997	685,937,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	651,552,000
Recommended, 1998	651,931,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−34,006,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+379,000

NOTE.—The amount shown as the fiscal year 1997 appropriation includes funds appropriated in fiscal year 1997 under General Investigations, Construction Program, and Operation and Maintenance; and also includes $7,355,000 in emergency appropriations for Operation and Maintenance enacted in Public Law 105–18.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATES FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES				
ARIZONA				
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	61,242,000	---	54,242,000	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	3,078,000	6,500,000	3,078,000	6,500,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM	4,200,000	---	4,200,000	---
IN SITU COPPER MINING RESEARCH PROJECT	---	---	1,700,000	---
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECT	---	8,317,000	---	8,317,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
SOUTHERN ARIZONA REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	200,000	---	200,000	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	6,693,000	---	6,693,000	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	---	---	250,000	---
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY	200,000	---	200,000	---
WEST SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	75,000	---	200,000	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	1,670,000	11,868,000	1,670,000	13,368,000
CALIFORNIA				
BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY	---	---	2,000,000	---
CACHUMA PROJECT	565,000	8,881,000	565,000	8,881,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,219,000	16,204,000	10,819,000	16,204,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT	4,362,000	---	4,362,000	---
DELTA DIVISION	13,368,000	4,682,000	15,618,000	4,682,000
EAST SIDE DIVISION	199,000	3,190,000	199,000	3,190,000
FRIANT DIVISION	3,426,000	5,406,000	3,426,000	5,406,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	16,632,000	2,504,000	19,632,000	2,504,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	7,685,000	1,186,000	8,685,000	1,186,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	1,345,000	---	1,345,000	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	6,955,000	---	6,955,000	---
SHASTA DIVISION	6,619,000	4,929,000	6,619,000	4,929,000
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	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 JUIS UNIT	2,839,000	9,833,000	2,839,000	12,833,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND RESERVE	---	---	-14,000,000	---
DEL NORTE & CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION STUDY	---	---	550,000	---
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	75,000	---	75,000	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY	100,000	---	100,000	---
MAMMOTH LAKES WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	80,000	---	80,000	---
NEW MELONES WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	---	---	100,000	---
ORLAND PROJECT	431,000	45,000	431,000	45,000
SACRAMENTO COUNTY WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	---	---	500,000	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	400,000	---	400,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	13,000,000	---	13,000,000	---
SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	375,000	---	375,000	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	5,235,000	---	5,235,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,624,000	208,000	1,624,000	208,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	350,000	---	350,000	---
SO. CALIF. COMPREHENSIVE WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	769,000	---	769,000	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECT. 5 & 8	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	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	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	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	13,062,000	---	13,062,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATES FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT STUDY	300,000	---	300,000	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,728,000	1,742,000	3,728,000	1,742,000
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	300,000	---	300,000	---
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	175,000	---	175,000	---
KANSAS				
CHENEY RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY STUDY	131,000	---	131,000	---
CHEYENNE BOTTOMS WILDLIFE AREA STUDY	101,000	---	101,000	---
EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	---	---	667,000	---
HUTCHINSON - NICKERSON SALTWATER INTRUSION STUDY	---	---	150,000	---
WICHITA PROJECT	122,000	68,000	122,000	68,000
MONTANA				
COLD CLIMATE WASTEWATER TREATMENT	37,000	---	37,000	---
FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION	---	---	240,000	---
FORT PECK RURAL WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM	---	---	293,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	408,000	---	408,000
JEFFERSON RIVER BASIN RETURN FLOW STUDY	86,000	---	86,000	---
MILK RIVER PROJECT	53,000	706,000	53,000	706,000
MONTANA RIVER SYSTEMS STUDY	180,000	---	180,000	---
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION	65,000	---	65,000	---
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	50,000	---	50,000	---
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY	75,000	---	75,000	---
NEBRASKA				
NEBRASKA RAINWATER BASIN ASSESSMENT	133,000	---	133,000	---
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT	88,000	---	88,000	---
NEVADA				
NEWLANDS PROJECT	3,750,000	---	3,750,000	---
WALKER RIVER BASIN	---	---	300,000	---
WASHOE PROJECT	866,000	461,000	866,000	461,000

NEW MEXICO				
BRANTLEY PROJECT	1,200,000	---	1,200,000	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	1,059,000	437,000	1,059,000	437,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,830,000	8,932,000	1,830,000	8,932,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE WATER CONVEYANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN	80,000	---	80,000	---
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	129,000	---	129,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	537,000	2,475,000	537,000	2,475,000
RIO GRANDE RIPARIAN TREE SPECIES CONSUMPTIVE USE	75,000	---	75,000	---
SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT	70,000	153,000	70,000	153,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
NORTH DAKOTA				
FREEZE/THAW DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	360,000	---	360,000	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	17,025,000	6,350,000	17,025,000	6,350,000
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	39,000	55,000	39,000	55,000
LUGERT-ALTUS WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OPTIONS	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	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	225,000	---	225,000	---
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	116,000	400,000	116,000	400,000
DESCHUTES BASIN WORKING GROUP	---	---	500,000	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	89,000	146,000	89,000	146,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	50,000	---	50,000	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	2,405,000	370,000	2,405,000	370,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY	75,000	---	75,000	---
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING STUDY	175,000	---	175,000	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	87,000	682,000	87,000	682,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS STUDY	175,000	---	175,000	---
TUALATIN PROJECT	13,000	111,000	13,000	111,000
UMATILLA PROJECT	7,849,000	1,505,000	7,849,000	1,505,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATES FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
SOUTH DAKOTA				
BELLE FOURCHE, P-SMBP	---	2,520,000	---	2,520,000
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER STUDY	100,000	---	100,000	---
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	10,000,000	---	12,000,000	---
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	208,000	---	208,000	---
MNI WICONI PROJECT	20,976,000	3,349,000	29,325,000	3,349,000
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY	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
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	127,000	195,000	127,000	195,000
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	---	1,000,000	---
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	169,000	314,000	169,000	314,000
RINCON BAYOU - NUECES MARSH RESTORATION STUDY	150,000	---	150,000	---
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE	---	---	400,000	---
RIO GRANDE PROJECT DRAINS WATER QUALITY STUDY	95,000	---	95,000	---
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMNT	150,000	---	150,000	---
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	100,000	20,479,000	100,000	20,479,000
UTAH				
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY	130,000	---	130,000	---
CARBON/EMERY COUNTIES WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	130,000	---	130,000	---
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE/JENSEN	3,921,000	44,000	3,921,000	44,000
OGDEN RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT STUDY	125,000	---	125,000	---
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	235,000	217,000	235,000	217,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	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	175,000	---	175,000	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	8,980,000	8,839,000	10,980,000	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	7,600,000	---	7,600,000	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECT. 8, REC, FISH & WILDLIFE.	2,284,000	---	2,284,000	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	310,000	---	310,000	---
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	3,553,000	---	3,109,000	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	5,250,000	---	3,000,000	---
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	14,257,000	---	14,257,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,990,000	---	1,990,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL/INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	1,665,000	---	1,338,000	---
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 & WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS	8,459,000	---	8,459,000	---
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
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	394,000	66,000	394,000	66,000
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,996,000	---	4,619,000	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE 28	4,288,000	---	2,039,000	---
RECREATION AND FISH & WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.	4,922,000	---	3,261,000	---
SAFETY OF DAMS:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION & MODIFICATION	---	42,433,000	---	42,433,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	3,850,000	---	3,000,000	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEV PROGRAM	2,000,000	---	1,300,000	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATES FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MGMT & DEVELOPMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	199,000	---	199,000	---
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL	400,000	---	---	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	400,000	---	300,000	---
WATERSHED / RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	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	---	1,500,000	---
WATER MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM	9,801,000	---	9,235,000	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	6,309,000	---	3,638,000	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-30,953,000	---	-31,253,000
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	421,874,000	229,678,000	418,053,000	233,878,000

New Programmatic Budget Structure.—For fiscal year 1998, the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed a new budget structure which it believes more accurately reflects the work it currently undertakes. The previous budget structure defined the three phases of development of water resources projects: study; construction; and operation and maintenance. The Bureau of Reclamation believes that its original mission of water resources development is now complete and that its core mission is now water resources management. Therefore, it has proposed that funds previously appropriated under the General Investigations, Construction Program, and Operation and Maintenance appropriation accounts be combined in a single account titled "Water and Related Resources". All work under the Water and Related Resources account is allocated to one of five programmatic activities: Water and Energy Management and Development; Land Management and Development; Fish and Wildlife Management and Development; Facility Operation; and Facility Maintenance and Rehabilitation. A description of the work which is performed under each programmatic activity is contained in the Bureau of Reclamation budget justification documents, which are published in Part 3 of the Committee's hearing record for fiscal year 1998.

The Committee has agreed to adopt this new budget structure for fiscal year 1998 because in many ways it does a better job of displaying the type of work being performed by the Bureau of Reclamation. In doing so, however, the Committee is not indicating its agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation's assertion that it can create a new mission for itself. The roles and missions of Federal agencies are established through the legislative process and cannot and should not be arbitrarily changed by those agencies. The Committee believes that it is up to the Congress to decide if the Bureau of Reclamation's original mission is complete and, if it is, whether Reclamation should have a new mission.

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $54,242,000 for the Central Arizona Project, $7,000,000 less than the budget request.

Yuma Area Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate work to reduce the threat of flooding to Federal, tribal, and local facilities in Yuma, Arizona, that exists as a result of the deposition of large amounts of sediment that occurred in the lower Colorado River during flooding in 1993.

In Situ Copper Mining Research Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $1,400,000 to conduct the In Situ Copper Mining Research Project to achieve conclusive demonstration of the technology, including the efficient control and manipulation of transport solutions. These funds will be cost shared by the private sector participant as provided for in the contract. In addition, $300,000 is provided for Bureau of Reclamation oversight of the project and technology transfer activities to other groundwater programs administered by the Bureau to assure that the Federal investment in this technology is maximized.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,250,000 for the Bureau of Rec-

lamation to complete design and initiate construction of the fish screen at the Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—

Permanent Pumping Facility, Placer County Water Agency.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake design and construction of a permanent pumping facility for the Placer County Water Agency.

Mountain Quarries Railroad Bridge.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for repairs to the Mountain Quarries Railroad Bridge, which is commonly known as the "No Hands Bridge."

Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency Reimbursement.—The Committee has provided $3,900,000 for the Federal share of costs associated with the variable flood control operation of Folsom Dam as authorized in Section 101(a)(1)(D) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Central Valley Project, San Felipe Division, California.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to continue to work with the Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency (PVWMA) on implementation of its Basin Management Plan, dated November 1993. The Committee further directs the Bureau of Reclamation, consistent with the provisions of Public Law 102–575, to identify and assist PVWMA obtain additional sources of water through water transfers and/or other opportunities and to identify and address impediments to obtaining such supplies including, but not limited to, cost.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—

Anadromous Fish Screen Program.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, $3,000,000 more than the budget request. Within funds available to the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, including funds appropriated in fiscal year 1997, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to fund the following fish screen projects at the levels indicated below or provide such other amounts as may be necessary to keep construction of each of these high priority fish screen projects on an optimum schedule: Reclamation District 108, $5,000,000; Reclamation District 1004, $2,625,000; and Princeton-Glenn-Codora and Provident Irrigation Districts, $2,500,000.

The Committee supports streamlining the process for making funding decisions under the Anadromous Fish Screen Program, and, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Interior to assign full and sole responsibility for the allocation of funding under the program to the Bureau of Reclamation. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's role in the program should be limited to providing technical asistance and advice to help the Bureau of Reclamation evaluate the relative merits of various screening options at individual diversion sites.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—

Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to continue the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.

Colusa Basin Drainage District.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for continued work on the Colusa Basin Drainage District's integrated resource management program.

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for continuing work on a new fish screen and fish recovery facility associated with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant, the same as provided in the budget request. Elsewhere in the bill, under the Corps of Engineers, Construction, the Committee has provided $600,000 for the construction of a gradient facility, which is an essential and integral part of the fish screen facility authorized pursuant to the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. The fish screen facility and gradient facility are both necessary to meet fish protection goals at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant. Despite the different funding sources, the Committee directs both agencies to consider both activities as two elements of the same project, and to take every step possible to ensure that the two elements are fully coordinated in every respect.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division, California.—Within the funds provided for the Trinity River Division, $1,500,000 is for continued support of the Co-Management Agreement between the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Central Valley Project, West San Joaquin Division, San Luis Unit, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for operation and maintenance of San Luis Unit joint-use facilities.

Brackish Water Reclamation Demonstration Facility, California.—The Committee has provided $1,700,000 for completion of the Port Hueneme Water Agency's brackish water reclamation demonstration project. In addition, the Committee has provided $300,000 for a study of the use of brine from the facility to maintain an existing salt marsh.

Del Norte County and Crescent City Wastewater Reclamation Study, California.—The Committee has provided $550,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Del Norte County and Crescent City Wastewater Reclamation study. The Committee believes that in view of the depressed economy of the area, the Bureau should make every effort to minimize any requirement for a local contribution. At a minimum, in-kind services performed by the local sponsor should be considered part of the local share.

Sacramento County Reclamation Reuse Study, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue the study of utilizing reclaimed water in Sacramento County.

Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado.—The Committee wishes to state its continued support for the Animas-La Plata project in Colorado and New Mexico, which is necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988. Controversy has delayed the construction of the project by the Bureau of Reclamation despite the commitments made in the Settlement Act and a subsequent directive by the Congress that those portions of the project which were approved under the Endangered Species Act should be constructed without delay. In the last year, the Governor of Colorado and the Secretary of the Interior have convened the project supporters and opponents in a process intended to seek resolution of the controversy. The Colorado

process calls for a proposal from parties to the settlement as well as one from those who oppose the project as presently contemplated. Proposals are due by July 31, 1997, and meetings will reconvene shortly thereafter. The Committee directs that funds previously appropriated for the project and still available are to be used for the project and advancement of a proposal from the process which meets the original intent of the Settlement to provide a new supply of water to meet the present and future needs of the Ute Tribes and the surrounding region. In the event such a proposal is advanced, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to utilize to the fullest extent the existing environmental compliance documents.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The Committee has provided $667,000 for operation and monitoring of the Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project. The Committee directs that the Bureau of Reclamation not reprogram funds from the Equus Beds project in fiscal year 1998.

Fort Peck Indian Reservation Water System Investigation, Montana.—The Committee has provided $240,000 to continue pre-authorization activities for a municipal and industrial water supply system for the Fort Peck Indian Reservation.

Fort Peck Rural Water Supply System, Montana.—The bill includes $293,000 for preconstruction activities, such as NEPA compliance, associated with the Fort Peck Rural Water Supply System project.

Walker River Basin, Nevada.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to work with local interests to identify the most effective water conservation practices applicable to the Walker River Basin, and to quantify the contribution that conservation can make to solving the water resources problems in Walker Lake and the basin as a whole.

Northwest Wastewater Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for completion of the Northwest Wastewater Reuse project in Texas.

Rio Grande Conveyance Canal/Pipeline, Texas.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for NEPA compliance and design activities associated with the Rio Grande Conveyance/Pipeline project.

Yakima Project, Washington.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement project.

Operation and Maintenance Costs, Deficits, and Budget Development/Priorities.—The Committee is concerned about reports of exceptionally large increases in operation and maintenance (O&M) costs at a number of Bureau of Reclamation projects and reports that Bureau of Reclamation overhead is responsible, in some cases, for more than half of such cost increases. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a survey of O&M costs associated with each of its projects and report back to the Committee on: the O&M costs for each of its projects; the percent change, on an annual basis, in O&M costs for each project; the amount and percentage of O&M costs attributable to overhead for each project; the charges to beneficiaries for municipal and industrial, irrigation, power, fish and wildlife, recreation, and other purposes; and a brief

explanation of the justification for any overhead rate in excess of 20 percent of total O&M costs for any project. The above information should be provided for fiscal years 1993–1997. The cost of this survey shall be a non-reimbursable expense that is the sole responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation. The results of the survey shall be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, the House Committee on Resources, and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The Committee is also concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation has adopted water rate-setting policies that diminish the repayment of O&M deficits. The net result of these changes is that revenues collected from municipal and industrial water contractors as well as some agricultural water contractors are applied first to repay lower interest rate obligations rather than higher interest rate O&M deficit balances. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to review and, where necessary, modify these policies to ensure that current O&M water rate revenues are applied against O&M expenses with any deficiency resulting in an O&M deficit to the water contractor. Any O&M revenues in excess of O&M expenses, along with any additional water rate revenues derived from a water contractor, shall be applied first, to the greatest degree practicable, to repay the highest rate obligation of the water contractor.

The Committee strongly encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to create new opportunities for water and power contractors to participate in the review and development of O&M budget priorities for their respective Bureau of Reclamation projects. Many water and power contractors have expressed concerns to the Committee that there is insufficient consultation between the water and power users and the Bureau of Reclamation on O&M funding priorities. The Committee believes this is inappropriate given that the water and power users are required to repay, in full, the costs of their proportionate share of O&M activities undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation and approved by Congress. Significant consultation by the Bureau of Reclamation with the affected water and power contractors, in advance of the budget submission, is both reasonable and desirable.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1997	$12,715,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	10,425,000
Recommended, 1998	10,425,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−2,290,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	

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

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
CALIFORNIA			
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER	14,604,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION	8,980,000	1,718,000	1,718,000
SALINAS VALLEY	9,391,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
SAN SEVAINE PROJECT	28,100,000	976,000	976,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	5,797,000	651,000	651,000
OREGON			
MILLTOWN HILL, DOUGLAS COUNTY	17,468,000	3,255,000	3,255,000
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	---	425,000	425,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM		10,425,000	10,425,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 1997	$38,096,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	39,130,000
Recommended, 1998	39,130,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+1,034,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

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.

The General Accounting Office has advised the Committee that the Bureau of Reclamation has established a Water Acquisition Reserve, currently totaling $14,000,000, within the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund to be used for the purchase of water during periods of drought. The Committee is extremely concerned that it was not notified of the creation of this reserve fund, particularly since funds were never specifically appropriated for that purpose. In light of the current budgetary situation, the Committee has determined that those funds should be utilized now for activities authorized under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. Accordingly, the Committee directs that funds currently in the Water Acquisition Reserve be utilized for Central Valley Project habitat restoration, improvement and acquisition, and other fish and wildlife restoration activities identified in the budget request for fiscal year 1998. The Committee has made a corresponding reduction in the amount appropriated in the Water and Related Resources Account for the Central Valley Project.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriation, 1997	.....
Budget Estimate, 1998	143,300,000
Recommended, 1998	120,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+120,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−23,300,000

The California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account funds the Federal share of ecosystem restoration activities being developed for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in the fall of 1996. That Act authorizes the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. The funds appropriated in this account would be transferred to participating Federal agencies based on a program recommended by the CALFED group and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the participating agencies.

Because of the timing of enactment of the authorization for this program, the Committee was surprised that the fiscal year 1998 budget request included the full amount authorized, $143,300,000. Upon receipt of Bureau of Reclamation's budget justifications, the Committee was shocked to see that the justification for the proposed expenditure of $143,300,000 consisted of a single page which included no details explaining: how the money would be utilized; which Federal agencies would be receiving funds; and how much each would receive. The Committee still does not know the answer to those questions.

Notwithstanding the lack of detailed information on how funds appropriated under this program will be expended, because of the importance of this effort, the Committee has provided $120,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

The Committee directs the Department of the Interior to report to the Committee on a quarterly basis on how the funds appropriated for this program are being utilized. The report should include a description of each project to be undertaken, its cost, and the agency to which funds were provided to carry out the project.

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop performance measures (e.g. indicators of ecosystem health and associated monitoring protocols) as part of this program to determine whether restoration goals are in fact being achieved over time. It is also the Committee's intent that the acquisition of lands or interests in lands as part of this program will be done on a willing-seller, willing-buyer basis.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1997	$46,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	47,658,000
Recommended, 1998	47,658,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+1,658,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities,

as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, D.C., and Denver, Colorado, and in the 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.

For fiscal year 1998, the Committee has recommended $47,658,000, the same as the budget request.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Science, the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, Weapons Activities, Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

A large portion of the reduction from the President's budget request is the Committee's rejection of the Administration's requests to provide full up-front funding for all construction projects and a major increase for privatization initiatives in the environmental cleanup programs. It would have been useful for the Administration to discuss these issues with the Committee before submitting a budget increase of almost $2.7 billion in fiscal year 1998 for the Department of Energy.

The Committee recommendation for several appropriation accounts includes reductions for the use of prior year balances, contractor training, or other funding adjustments. The Department is to report to the Committee by December 15, 1997, on the specific application of these reductions by program, project, or activity.

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

The Department of Energy is the largest civilian contracting agency in the Federal government. In fiscal year 1996, the Department obligated $16.4 billion, or about 83 percent of its total obligations, to contracts. The Department uses Management and Operat-

ing (M&O) contracts with nonprofit, educational, or for-profit organizations to operate, maintain, or support its major research, environmental cleanup, and nuclear weapons facilities. The contracting authorities relied upon by the Department for these M&O contracts date back some 50 years to World War II, reflecting circumstances which are not applicable today. The Department's authorities were inherited from its predecessor agencies, beginning with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. This Act and succeeding legislation provides broad authority to adopt contracting practices and regulations which exempt the Department from many of the requirements governing other Federal agencies' contracting activities. Consequently, non-competition became the norm and policy for the Department's M&O contracts. Additionally, the Department's oversight of its contracts was based on blind faith under a policy of "least interference."

In 1994, the Department issued a report on its unique contracting system and identified numerous weaknesses, many of which arise from the common problem of the Department not having adequate control of its contractors. The Secretary of Energy conceded that contractors were not being held accountable, and consequently, the Department could not ensure that taxpayers' dollars were being prudently expended. The report recommended some 48 reforms, including the policy to open its M&O contracts to competition.

Despite this policy, the General Accounting Office (GAO) analysis of the Department's contract reform initiative notes that the Department continues to award most of its contracts noncompetitively. Of 24 contracting decisions made from July 1994 to the end of August 1996, the Department decided to extend 16 contracts on a noncompetitive basis and to competitively award the other eight. In a June 27, 1997 Federal Register notice, the Department affirmed a commitment to full and open competition in the award of its M&O contracts and adopted performance-based management. Exceptions to the use of competitive procedures are to be made pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulations and must be approved by the Secretary.

The Committee recognizes the good intentions of the Department, but is concerned that exceptions to the rule will continue. To prevent this, the Committee has included statutory language prohibiting the use of funds in this bill to award an M&O contract unless the contract is awarded using competitive procedures. The language would permit an exception only for the research and development portion of the work performed at any DOE facility. All remaining activities at the facility such as environmental restoration are to be separated from the research activities and competitively awarded.

The Department of Energy has its own unique procurement regulations to address agency needs. However, the Committee is concerned that the Department has made very liberal use of the procurement flexibility, and would benefit from a critical review of any contract provisions which contain deviations from the Federal Acquisition Regulation. Thus, the Committee has also included language that prohibits the use of funds for a contract that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary of

Energy grants a waiver, on a case-by-case basis, to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

The Department's track record for managing construction projects is not as successful as it could be. The General Accounting Office (GAO) believes that the high rate of cost overruns, schedule slippages, and terminations on major systems acquisitions can be traced to four key factors: constantly changing missions; incremental funding of projects; a flawed system of incentives that has often rewarded contractors despite poor performance; and difficulty in hiring, training, and retaining people with the requisite skills to provide effective oversight and management of contractor operations. The Committee also believes there is a lack of internal, independent oversight of projects at the Department. Projects are proposed by contractors and strongly defended by Federal employees who take on the role of program and project advocate rather than impartial overseer. There does not appear to be a strong independent assessment of projects within the internal Departmental system.

Thus, the Committee has directed the Corps of Engineers to review all Departmental construction projects funded in fiscal year 1998. The Committee has further directed that no funds be obligated for any new fiscal year 1998 construction projects until the cost, schedule, scope, and supporting data for each construction project has been validated by an independent assessment of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee will work with the Department and the Corps to prioritize the order in which the projects should be reviewed.

EXCESSIVE TRAINING COSTS

The Committee has been reviewing the Department of Energy's training costs for Federal employees and contractors, including the cost of the Federal and contractor in-house training organizations, the cost associated with contracting for training, and the value of the time for Federal and contractor personnel being trained. The results were no less than astonishing. As outlined in a recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO), training costs at the Department of Energy for Federal and contractor personnel were $554 million in fiscal year 1995, $476 million in fiscal year 1996, and estimated at $438 million in fiscal year 1997. With these funds, the Department offers a wide range of training ranging from technical courses on nuclear physics and chemistry to personal development and non-technical courses on back care, defensive driving, coping with adolescents, and intercultural views on animals.

GAO noted that the Department's training structure is very decentralized; headquarters offices, field offices, and contractors all have their own training programs with dedicated staff, and the extent to which employees meet DOE-wide training requirements varies from office to office. These Departmental training require-

ments state, in part, that each employee must complete an individual development plan. In fiscal year 1996, the percentage of staff completing these plans varied from 25–30 percent in some offices to 70–90 percent in others. Finally, the average number of training days per year per employee and cost per employee is twice that of private industry.

While the Committee understands that some training is clearly warranted to maintain skills, it is hard to fathom why Federal employees at one DOE field office needed an average of 23 days of training per employee in fiscal year 1996. Additionally, contractor employees at two DOE field offices averaged 15 days of training in fiscal year 1996. The Committee is concerned that there is no central oversight of training requirements, and there is no discipline in the system to prevent training abuses. Thus, the Committee has included funding reductions in several accounts to be applied to all non-safety related contractor training costs in the Department's programs. Reductions for Federal employee training costs have been applied individually to each of the program direction accounts.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee continues to be concerned about excessive use of support service contractors and other non-Federal employees throughout the Department of Energy, and the involvement of these contractor employees in the development of Federal policies and programs. A recent report prepared for the Department by the Institute for Defense Analyses on "The Organization and Management of the Nuclear Weapons Program" also addressed the use of support service contractors. The report, which reviewed the Department's Defense Programs' organization and management structure, notes that Federal employees have augmented themselves by hiring large numbers of support service contractors to assist them. A consequence of this is the risk of Federal employees losing their technical expertise and spending most of their time managing contracts, rather than sharpening their own skills.

Despite continuing Congressional interest in reducing the funds spent on augmenting Federal staff at the Department of Energy, funding for such contracts appears to remain excessive or even increase in certain program areas. Congressional direction to include all support service contracts in the program direction account for each organization has been ignored by the Department in several instances. Additionally, there has been limited effort by the Department to accurately present funding for support service contracts in the budget submission, and to control the use of support service contracts by the program organizations.

The Committee is also aware of other instances where the Department is supplementing its Federal staff with contractor employees. The first category includes management and operating (M&O) contractor employees from the Department's laboratories and facilities who are on detail to Headquarters program organizations. An audit by the Department's Inspector General last year found almost 400 laboratory employees assigned to the Washington, D.C. area for periods of six months or longer, and providing a wide range of services directly to program offices. The Inspector

General concluded that laboratory contract employees were involved in programmatic and policy arenas in which real or perceived conflicts may exist between their official duties and the tasks they assume when serving the Departmental program offices, and that the Department may be augmenting its Federal workforce in a way that is neither cost-effective nor consistent with its staffing objectives.

An additional concern is individual employees or support service contractors in the Washington, D.C. area, who are hired by the Department's M&O contractors and field offices to provide direct administrative and technical support for Headquarters program organizations. These employees are not showing up as support service contractors in the budget request because they are not funded through Headquarters accounts, and apparently are not reflected in the Department's own tracking of support service contractor usage.

The Committee will not fund contractor employees to perform activities which are normally considered the responsibility of Federal employees. The Committee is aware that the Department is hiring contractors to write speeches for Departmental employees, attend and report on Congressional hearings, clip articles of interest to the program areas, track legislation, and prepare Congressional briefing materials. These are examples of activities which the Committee thought Federal employees were being paid to perform. Since the Committee cannot rely on the integrity of the Department to control these types of contracts, the Committee is eliminating funding associated with support service contracts throughout many of the program areas.

In addition, the Committee directs the Department to eliminate the use of all support service contractors or subcontractors hired by M&O contractors to support Headquarters program or field office Federal employees. This is a flagrant violation of the Committee's direction to identify all support service contractor funding in the budget request, and it is a violation of Departmental and Federal policies which state that it is inappropriate for program offices to use M&O contractors to obtain direct contract support for their programs. When direct contract support is necessary, program offices are required to use the Department's—not the M&O contractor's—procurement procedures and personnel.

The Committee directs the Department to provide a report at the end of fiscal year 1997 on the use of all support service contractors (those funded directly by Headquarters, and those funded by M&O contractors and assigned to Headquarters) and M&O contractor employees detailed to Headquarters. This report is to include the use of support service contractors and M&O employees at Headquarters and at each field, area, or site office. The report is to include for each support service contract: the name of the contractor; the program organization (at the lowest organization level possible) hiring the contractor; a descriptive and detailed list of the tasks performed; the number of contractor employees working on the contract; and the annual cost of the contract. The report is to identify all M&O contractor employees who are detailed to Headquarters program organizations, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization and job title the employee is assigned in Headquarters, a description of the tasks the em-

ployee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, and the program account funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department. The report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 1996 through September 31, 1997, and estimates for fiscal year 1998, and is due to the Committee on December 1, 1997.

EXTERNAL REGULATION OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FACILITIES

The Committee is aware of the joint efforts by the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to evaluate the costs and benefits of transitioning from DOE self regulation to external regulation by an independent regulatory entity overseeing the nuclear health, safety, and security of DOE nuclear activities and facilities. The Committee strongly supports this effort, and understands that initially three to five pilot projects will be identified for NRC regulation. The Department and NRC should keep the Committee fully informed of these efforts.

In anticipation of future NRC regulation of DOE nuclear facilities, the Department is directed to ensure that, starting in fiscal year 1998, all new nuclear facilities are constructed in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing requirements.

ASSET ACQUISITION ACCOUNTS

The President's budget request proposed three new construction accounts for the Department of Energy, and recommended full funding for all construction projects. The Administration subsequently amended the budget request to eliminate full funding for construction projects in the Energy and Science Asset Acquisition Accounts, but retained the full funding for the Defense Asset Acquisition Account. The Committee has not included these new accounts, and has recommended funding construction projects in the current appropriation account structure. The Committee has not provided funding for construction projects beyond fiscal year 1998.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriation, 1997	$2,699,728,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	2,999,497,000
Recommended, 1998	880,730,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−1,818,998,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−2,118,767,000

The fiscal year 1997 appropriation for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities provided funding for the Department of Energy's research and related programs including: solar and renewable energy; nuclear energy; environment, safety and health; biological and environmental research; fusion energy sciences; basic energy sciences; other energy-related research; and non-defense-related environmental restoration and waste management. This

year's recommendation separates the functions of this account between three new accounts: Energy Supply; Science; and Non-Defense Environmental Management.

Energy Supply includes the following programs: solar and renewable; nuclear energy; fusion; environment, safety and health; and energy support activities. The Committee provides funding for non-defense-related environmental restoration and waste management in the new account: "Non-Defense Environmental Management." The recommendation establishes another new account, "Science", which combines funding for three programs formerly funded in the Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities account—basic energy sciences, biological and environmental research, and other energy research activities—with all of the activities formerly funded in the General Science and Research Activities account.

The Committee recommendation for Energy Supply is $880,730,000, $118,126,000 less than the comparable amount in the budget request and $44,101,000 less than the comparable amount provided in the current fiscal year. This year's recommendation reflects a continuation of last year's effort to reverse the unsustainable increases of prior years. The recommendation is consistent with the Committee's view that the Department must continue to participate in the government-wide downsizing effort, shift its emphasis from commercial technology development to basic research, reverse its efforts to expand into new areas and focus on its core commitments.

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

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable energy programs administered by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy is $285,000,000, an increase of $18,656,000 over the fiscal year 1997 level. This programmatic increase, unusual among DOE programs, reflects the continued commitment of Congress to the development of clean and renewable sources of energy. The increase is especially notable, given the high level of uncosted balances remaining in various solar and renewable programs. Notwithstanding its commitment to renewable energy development, the Committee remains concerned about the Department's administration of the programs and will exercise vigorous oversight of their execution in fiscal year 1998.

Two separate offices within the Department of Energy pursue renewable energy research activities: the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Energy Research. The recommendation also includes $44,304,000 for Office of Energy Research programs which directly support renewable energy programs. Taken together, the total amount provided to the Depart-

ment for solar and renewable energy programs in fiscal year 1998 is $329,304,000. The table at the end of this title integrates the funding recommendation for both offices. The Department is directed to submit a comprehensive research and development request for fiscal year 1999 which represents a new partnership between the two offices. If there is a role for government in development and improvement of renewable energy sources, it should be soundly based on cutting edge research and should be managed sensibly between the offices of jurisdiction.

Following are specific recommendations for programs:

Solar building technology research.—The recommendation is $3,000,000, an increase $693,000 over the current fiscal year.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The total recommendation is $66,774,000, including $2,274,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The amount provided comparable to the current fiscal year is $64,500,000, an increase of $4,579,000 over the current fiscal year.

The Committee also notes that the Department has once again provided funds for the construction of a photovoltaic manufacturing plant in Moscow, Russia. The Department provided this funding despite the Committee's specific direction to the contrary. The Committee repeats its direction that the Department discontinue and refrain from spending proposals that provide funding for building factories in other countries.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The recommendation is $17,800,000, a decrease of $4,387,000 from the current fiscal year.

Biomass/biofuels energy systems.—The total recommendation is $98,835,000, including $38,635,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The amount provided comparable to the current fiscal year is $60,200,000, which represents an increase of $5,225,000. The recommendation provides $30,100,000 for the power systems program and $30,100,000 for the transportation program. The recommendation includes $750,000 to complete the Gridley rice straw project and $4,000,000 to complete the biomass ethanol plant in Jennings, Louisiana. The recommendation also includes $2,500,000 for the Plant Biotechnology Consortium. Funding for these three projects is to be made available from equal allocations from the power and transportation programs.

Wind energy systems.—The total recommendation is $32,715,000, including $295,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The amount provided comparable to the current fiscal year is $32,420,000, which represents an increase of $3,434,000, over the current fiscal year.

The Department is directed to eliminate funding for incremental product improvement partnerships with manufacturers. The Committee is aware of a proposal to identify a private entity to test and certify wind and other solar technologies and encourages the Department to complete its recommendation for a testing and certification program for domestic manufacturers. The Committee notes that carryover balances in the wind program actually increased during fiscal year 1996, resulting in an unspent balance in excess

of $45,749,000. After the current fiscal year appropriation of $29,000,000, the resulting funds available to be spent in fiscal year 1997 totaled $74,749,000 or 258% of the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

Renewable energy production incentive.—The recommendation includes $3,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the current fiscal year.

International solar energy.—The recommendation includes $750,000 for the international solar energy program.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL).—In the current fiscal year, the Committee provided the full amount of the budget request for the second phase of improvements at the Field Test Laboratory Building. The Committee was informed that this project would result in more efficient use of space and a reduction of leased space. In the Department's responses to hearing questions submitted for the record, the Committee was informed that the budget request includes an increase for leased space this year. The Committee notes that the Department has plans to arrange to have a private sector partner build a new building on government property. The Department is directed to provide an outyear forecast for leased space needs. The description should itemize needs related to each appropriations bill and include space identified as being made available for "non-DOE customers."

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $30,000,000, approximately the same amount as provided last year and the same amount as the budget request. The recommendation includes $6,500,000 for the geothermal heat pump deployment program. The Committee is concerned about the Department's continued reductions to the heat pump deployment effort and directs that no "general reduction" or other adjustment be made to reduce the $6,500,000 provided in fiscal year 1998.

Hydrogen research.—The total recommendation is $17,100,000, including $3,100,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The amount provided comparable to the current fiscal year is $14,000,000, which represents a reduction of $987,000 from the current fiscal year. The Committee urges the Department to emphasize research-related activities for this program and to avoid commitments to multi-million dollar demonstration projects.

Hydropower.—No funds are included for hydropower. The Committee notes that Federal spending for programs to mitigate the impact of dams on various species of fish are spread throughout the government and total hundreds of millions of dollars. If the Department can perform a useful service, it is encouraged to enter into an agreement with any of several Federal agencies that are already spending considerable resources to address these issues.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation is $44,500,000, the same amount as the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the electric and magnetic fields research program, $32,500,000 for high temperature superconducting research and development, and $4,000,000 for energy storage systems. The Committee strongly supports the goals of the superconductivity program. Superconducting transmission lines, motors and storage devices have the poten-

tial to greatly enhance the economic viability of renewable energy sources in the near term.

The recommendation does not include funding for the climate challenge program.

Federal buildings initiative.—Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy to provide financial and technical assistance to Federal agencies that are deploying renewable energy technologies. The Committee encourages the Department to identify, facilitate and document the economic benefit of using these technologies in areas where renewable technologies are currently cost-effective in the marketplace. Specifically, the Department is directed to examine and assist in wind development on San Clemente Island, California; solar domestic hot water collectors in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and a proposal to produce electricity using geothermal gradient technologies at the naval support facility in Diego Garcia. Since electricity prices in these areas represent the highest rates paid by the government, it is worthwhile to actively develop renewable energy technologies that result in direct economic benefits to taxpayers.

The Committee notes that the Department is the lead Federal agency in developing and deploying solar technologies as directed by Executive Order 12902. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Congress on the progress of implementing this Order. The report should quantify the cost-effectiveness of solar technologies and identify actions taken and planned by agencies in order to meet the requirements of the Order.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $12,130,000. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy continues to lead the Department in the ratio of salaries and expenses to program dollars. In addition to the program direction funds, the Office has supplemented its workforce with support service contractors as discussed below, and has further supplemented its staff with laboratory employees who travel back to Washington, D.C. as detailed in a July 1996 Inspector General's report. The recommendation for program direction includes all funding for support service contractors.

Support service contractors.—In the conference report accompanying the bill providing appropriations for the Department in fiscal year 1996, Congress directed that the Department include all funds for support service contractors with salary, travel and other overhead in a separate account—program direction. Most offices within the Department are in compliance with this direction which has been incorporated within internal budget submission instructions. Unfortunately, some offices are including only a portion of support service contractors in program direction and are continuing to fund support service contractors directly from programs. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy has chosen to defy Congressional and Departmental direction by not including support service contractors in the program direction line in fiscal years 1997, nor in the fiscal year 1998 budget request. Further, the Office is requesting an increase for these services. The Committee is disappointed that the Office has failed to follow even its own internal budget rules and rejects the Office's proposal to use wind, geo-

thermal, superconductivity and photovoltaic program funding for support service contractors. The Committee notes that the fiscal year 1997 appropriation for program direction would require a 33% increase to fund the level of support contractors which the Office is funding directly from solar and renewable program funds.

Excessive carryover balances.—Most funds appropriated by the Congress are available for a limited time—from one to five years in most cases. When funds are not used, the appropriation is cancelled. Because the funds appropriated under this account were available until expended, there was no imperative to expend funds in a timely manner. Consequently, appropriated funds have been accumulating from year to year. In its April 1996 report, "Energy Management: DOE Needs to Improve its Analysis of Carryover Balances," the General Accounting Office (GAO) repeated its concerns about the extraordinarily high uncosted balances in certain DOE programs. (Similar concerns were included in GAO's March 1992 report: "Energy Management: Systematic Analysis of DOE's Uncosted Obligations Is Needed.") The most recent report points out that while some DOE programs have improved management of carryover balances, "* * * other programs, such as Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and Energy Research, have not used significant amounts of their carryover balances and have experienced growing balances."

At the end of fiscal year 1996, the carryover balance under solar and renewable energy programs was $280,783,000 representing 105% of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1997. On March 31, 1996, halfway through the fiscal year, the carryover balances under solar and renewable energy programs included $419,000 in unallocated funds, $103,764,000 in unobligated funds and $253,188,000 in uncosted funds, representing a total unspent balance of $357,371,000. This balance includes appropriated funds that have yet to be made available to the offices that obligate the funds, appropriated funds for which contracts or grants have not yet been awarded, and funds which have been obligated with costs that have yet to be incurred. This balance, on the books halfway through the current fiscal year, reflects 134% of the appropriation provided last year.

Last year, the Committee specifically directed that the Department distribute the $48,177,000 reduction to energy supply, research and development activities among programs based on each program's proportionate share of carryover balances. The Committee was dismayed to learn that the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy instead chose to distribute its share without consideration of carryover balances. The recommendation includes a $15,000,000 adjustment to be allocated to solar and renewable programs, the same as the adjustment in the budget request. The Department is directed to distribute this adjustment considering carryover balances for each solar and renewable program.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The recommendation is $228,595,000, an increase of $8,705,000 over the current fiscal year. The Committee accepts the Administration's recommendation to include the uranium program in the Energy Supply account. Adjusting to reflect this change, the com-

parable level of funding represents a $51,626,000 reduction. This change reflects elimination of the advanced light water reactor program and the recommendation to fund $12,000,000 of the nuclear technology research and development program as part of the defense-related activities of the Department.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The recommendation includes $38,800,000, the same amount as the current fiscal year.

Nuclear technology research and development.—The recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the nuclear technology research and development program to continue study of treating spent fuel using electrometallurgical technology. This funding is included with demonstration of the electrometallurgical treatment provided as part of termination costs. An additional $12,000,000 is provided as part of the defense-related activities of the Department for a total of $20,000,000, the same amount provided in the current fiscal year.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The recommendation is $7,000,000, a $3,000,000 increase over fiscal year 1997. The Committee supports a sound nuclear sciences portfolio, particularly the peer-reviewed Nuclear Engineering Education Research (NEER) program. The Department is directed to include appropriate laboratories, industry groups and universities in this program. None of the funds are to be provided for industry and no less than $5,000,000 is to be made available to universities participating in this program.

Termination costs.—The recommendation is $77,535,000, a $1,554,000 decrease from the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes $33,000,000 for electrometallurgical-related activities including $8,000,000 for activities funded in the current fiscal year for the nuclear technology research and development program and $25,000,000 to demonstrate electrometallurgical technology at the Fuel Conditioning Facility. The recommendation does not include $5,500,000 requested for the advanced light water reactor program.

Uranium programs.—The recommendation is $60,331,000, which reflects consolidation of program direction activities among nuclear energy programs. The full amount of the increase over the current fiscal year is to be made available for safeguard and security costs related to highly enriched uranium equipment shutdown and inventory disposition.

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation is $11,314,000, the same amount as provided in the current fiscal year, with an adjustment made reflecting consolidation of program direction activities among nuclear energy programs.

Nuclear energy security program.—The recommendation does not include funds for the Administration's proposal for this new spending program.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation is $7,290,000, the same amount as requested for fiscal year 1998 requirements. The recommendation does not include $3,535,000 identified as available from prior year balances.

Program direction.—The Committee's recommendation for program direction is adjusted in accordance with the downsizing of the nuclear energy program. The amount provided herein for program direction includes funding for all nuclear energy employees, includ-

ing those proposed to be funded separately in the isotope support and uranium programs.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $74,500,000 a decrease of $9,503,000 from the current fiscal year. This year's recommendation continues the downsizing in Federal staff, support service contractors and training expenses for this program.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The recommendation establishes a new account: "Science", which combines funding for three programs formerly funded as part of energy research programs in the Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities account—basic energy sciences; biological and environmental research; and other energy research activities—with all of the activities formerly funded in the General Science and Research Activities account. The fusion energy sciences program remains in the Energy Supply account.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for the fusion energy sciences program is $225,000,000. This appropriation will allow the DOE to fulfill its fiscal year 1998 planned program to implement the recommendations of the January 1996 report of the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Committee (FESAC). The Committee notes that, with the closure of the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR), the program will have approximately $40,000,000 more than the current fiscal year for new efforts to better understand the challenges of economically producing electricity with a fusion machine. The Committee encourages the Department to continue to place an emphasis on university programs and exploration of alternative concepts.

The Committee notes the significant progress made by the community in restructuring the fusion energy sciences program since the beginning of fiscal year 1996. Under the guidance of the FESAC, the program has been able to organize and utilize people and resources to maximize progress in plasma and fusion science despite constrained budgets. This appropriation will permit enhanced operation and/or upgrades of the three major collaborative facilities: C-Mod, DIII–D and NSTX, enhancements to university programs in alternate concepts and plasma science, and the strengthening of theory and computation. The Committee is encouraged that the Department has responded to Congressional direction by reducing salaries and expenses by $1,420,000. The Department is encouraged to continue to reduce overhead costs.

International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER).—The Committee has provided $55,400,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the final contribution for engineering and design activities (EDA). The Congress has been very clear that no obligation exists for future participation in ITER beyond the fiscal year 1998 EDA contribution. The Committee is concerned about the recent announcement that plans to build the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) have been suspended. The Japanese

government has reportedly announced that it would not begin construction before 2003. There are considerable questions about ITER: Where will it be built? Is the current design too ambitious? What environmental concerns need to be addressed? What level of confidence can be reached regarding the willingness and ability of our partners to make timely and sufficient contributions to the project? Indeed, there are enough serious questions to justify reducing the fiscal year 1998 contribution. However, the Committee wishes to make a good faith effort to the partnership.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation for Energy Support Activities is $96,000,000, a $14,300,000 reduction from the current fiscal year. The recommendation continues ongoing downsizing of the Federal staff at field offices.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation includes three funding adjustments. The $44,304,000 adjustment represents the funding provided for renewable energy research programs managed by the Office of Energy Research funded in the Science account. The $18,535,000 adjustment represents the amount the Administration recommended as a reduction based on prior year balances available to reduce the amount requested. The Committee opposes using a general reduction to programs and directs the Department to use prior year balances to fund programs to the levels recommended. The recommendation also includes a $9,830,000 reduction which represents the Committee's determination to discontinue excessive training programs throughout the Department. As previously mentioned in this report, the reduction does not apply to safety training and should be targeted to contractor training and other non-essential training programs.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Details of the Committee's recommendations are included in the table at the end of this title. The budget request amounts and amounts provided in prior fiscal years are shown to be comparable to the new account structure.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1997	$591,711,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	684,684,000
Recommended, 1998	497,619,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−94,092,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−187,065,000

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program which was funded in the Energy Supply, Research and Development appropriation account in fiscal year 1997 has been established as a separate appropriation in fiscal year 1998. The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past efforts resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination which requires remediation,

stabilization, or some other type of action. This program includes environmental restoration activities, waste management functions, and nuclear material and facilities stabilization activities. The Committee recommendation is $497,619,000, a reduction of $187,065,000 from the budget request of $684,684,000. The recommendation includes the budget request for all programs except the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program which is described below.

Transfer of the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.—The budget request for fiscal year 1998 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program was $182,079,000, but the Committee was unable to provide this level of funding due to severe funding constraints. The Committee recommendation includes $110,000,000 for fiscal year 1998 to accelerate cleanup of the existing facilities, an increase from the fiscal year 1997 funding level of $75,085,000.

The Department continues to acknowledge that the costs for performing cleanup work at Department of Energy sites are significantly higher than the costs of cleanup work performed by private sector companies. The reasons for this anomaly are difficult to ascertain because the Department uses private sector companies to perform all of its cleanup work. Clearly, the problem must be in the contract management and contract administration function performed by the Department of Energy and the management and operating contractors who actually subcontract for most of the cleanup work. The Committee believes it must break this pattern, and thus, has recommended transferring the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The Department of Defense has a similar environmental restoration program for cleanup of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS). The Corps of Engineers manages and executes these cleanup projects at formerly owned or leased defense sites which were contaminated during previous use by the Department of Defense. The Committee believes that there are significant cost and schedule efficiencies to be gained by having the Corps of Engineers manage the Department of Energy's FUSRAP program as well.

Budget Request.—The budget request is not sufficiently detailed to provide an accurate assessment of program management costs, technical assistance contracts, and support service contracts which are funded in this account. The Committee directs the Department to provide a detailed description of these costs at each site in the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

Funding Adjustments.—The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $4,440,000 to be applied to program management costs, support service contractors and consultants, and non-safety related contractor training costs throughout the non-defense cleanup sites.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 1997	$200,200,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	248,788,000
Recommended, 1998	220,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+20,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−28,588,000

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Fund supports D&D, remedial actions, waste management, and surveillance and maintenance associated with preexisting conditions at sites leased and operated by the newly created USEC, as well as Department of Energy facilities at these and other uranium enrichment sites. Sites covered by this D&D Fund include the operating uranium enrichment facilities at Portsmouth, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, and the inactive K–25 site in Tennessee, formerly called the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Environmental restoration efforts at these three sites are supported from the D&D Fund established by a tax on domestic utilities and by Congressional appropriations. In fiscal year 1998, the Department of Energy will transfer $388,000,000 into this Fund.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends $220,200,000, a reduction of $28,588,000 from the budget request of $248,788,000. The Committee understands that this will limit funding for activities related to immediate cleanup of the gaseous diffusion plants. The Committee encourages the Department to review all costs included in the UED&D program and seek to minimize those of lesser priority. As noted previously, an independent assessment of environmental management project performance found that the Department's projects are approximately 25 percent more costly than comparable private sector work. The Committee believes that there are many efficiencies to be made in all areas of the environmental management program.

Funding reductions are to be made to non-safety related contractor training costs and the use of contractors to manage program activities. For example, the budget request for fiscal year 1998 includes nearly $20,000,000 for additional program planning, management, and integration activities, financial and budget activities, and contract administration—activities which should be performed by Federal employees.

The Committee was also unable to provide full funding of $40,456,000 to implement the reimbursement program authorized under Title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act for active uranium and thorium processing sites which sold uranium and thorium to the United States Government. This program is to assist site owners by compensating them on a per ton basis for the restoration and disposal costs of those mill tailings resulting from sale of materials to the government. Due to severe budget constraints, funding of $37,000,000 has been provided for reimbursement in fiscal year 1998, an increase of $3,000,000 over last year.

The Committee is aware that the Department is seeking funding for a major new initiative to D&D three gaseous diffusion process buildings in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Department has negotiated a contract in which the contractor will D&D the buildings, and use

the value obtained from salvaged materials (estimated at $74,860,000) to offset the cost of the D&D effort. If successful, this will reduce the Federal government's total cost to $272,126,000. While the Committee supports the Department's efforts to find innovative approaches to cleanup, the Committee is equally concerned that the Department does not have an overall cleanup plan developed for the three gaseous diffusion sites in Tennessee, Ohio, and Kentucky, and that choices are being made for short term gains which could lead to increased cleanup costs in the future. It appears that lower risk buildings with the potential for community reuse are being funded first at the expense of higher risk buildings which are not being maintained. Forgoing surveillance and maintenance of higher risk buildings today only means that cleanup costs will be more difficult and more expensive in the future.

Report Requirements.—The Department is directed to prepare a report outlining its strategy for maintaining and cleaning up the three gaseous diffusion plant sites within the funding levels for the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992. This report should address the current status of each building, rank the safety risk to the public, the worker, and the environment, and include a realistic schedule and cost for cleanup of each building as well as the current cost of surveillance and maintenance.

Additionally, the report should provide: a full description of the Department's reindustrialization efforts at Oak Ridge, including the cost of cleaning up the facilities for reuse versus the cleanup cost if the facilities were not to be reused; the cost of site-wide support services and any other benefits provided by the government for the leased facilities; the amount of reimbursement received by the Federal government from the leased facilities; a detailed description of the contracts signed with community reuse organizations, including the amount of money the community reuse organization will receive from each of the leases; and a description of any potential liabilities which the Federal government may face for permitting private companies and private sector workers access to leased facilities which may not be totally free of contamination. This report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by February 1, 1998.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 1997	$2,239,517,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	2,260,377,000
Recommended, 1998	2,207,632,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−31,885,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−52,745,000

This is a new account which combines the high energy and nuclear physics activities funded last year in the General Science and Research Activities account with three activities funded last year in the Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities account: biological and environmental research; basic energy sciences; and other energy research. The Committee has taken this action to make a clear distinction between funding provided for research and

development related to energy supply, and to consolidate the more basic research activities of the Office of Energy Research.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Office of Energy Research informs the Committee that grants to colleges and universities represent nearly one dollar of every four dollars provided for basic research programs. This level of funding is consistent with the Committee's direction that the Department fully support higher education. Last year, the Committee eliminated the university and science education program and directed that the Department fully support university programs by providing funds from programs. The Committee recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request for college and university programs. The Committee urges the Department to continue to place a high priority on graduate and post-graduate students. The Committee continues to believe that the Department should place the highest priority on university programs. The use of program funds benefits the missions of the Department and directly connects our nation's future scientists to cutting edge research.

The Committee supports the goals of the Department's Hispanic Outreach Initiative. The Committee recognizes the value of investing in long-term educational and outreach programs. The Department is encouraged to fully consider the location of Hispanic populations and the proximity of Department facilities as it continues efforts to develop a geographically balanced program.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

High energy physics research seeks to understand the nature of matter and energy at the most fundamental level, as well as the basic forces which govern all processes in nature. The recommendation continues the Committee's support for these fundamental pursuits.

The recommendation is $680,035,000, $9,960,000 more than the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The recommendation represents a sizeable increase in program funding considering that construction funding has been completed for the B-Factory at the Stanford Linear Accelerator and significantly reduced for the main injector at Fermilab, representing $66,050,000 in reduced funding requirements from the current fiscal year. The recommended increases include $20,000,000 for the U.S. contribution to the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), $34,925,000 for facility operations (adjusted to exclude LHC funding), $12,000,000 for research and technology (adjusted to exclude LHC funding), and $6,400,000 for the master substation upgrade at the Stanford Linear Accelerator.

LARGE HADRON COLLIDER

The recommendation includes $35,000,000, the amount requested for fiscal year 1998. The recommendation does not include the advance appropriation totaling $394,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2004. The Committee recognizes the importance of this new machine to the physics community. The nation's scientists who have played a vital role in the recent cutting edge discoveries at

Fermilab and other U.S. facilities, including the discovery of what may be the top quark certainly should have an opportunity to participate in the cutting edge science that will be possible upon completion of the world's most powerful accelerator. The Committee is encouraged by the spirit of cooperation that has characterized the relationship between the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) and the United States, and in particular recognizes the recent adjustments made to address concerns about funding, management and reciprocity. The Committee will carefully monitor this relationship to protect the investment made by the American people and with the hope that this unprecedented investment across borders will be a model for future sensible cost-sharing international partnerships.

No funds appropriated in this bill for high energy physics may be used for the Large Hadron Collider project unless the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation, has transmitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a report containing:

(1) assurances that the project will provide for equal access for United States participants and a significant management role for the United States;

(2) a list of the sources of non-United States funds used for the project;

(3) an enumeration of the total costs of the project and potential sources of contingency funding if the project runs over budget;

(4) a statement that the Member States of CERN—

(A) have agreed that future large accelerators and other scientific facilities are expected to be constructed, operated, and supported multinationally and may be located in any participating nation, including the United States;

(B) have agreed that the United States contribution to the construction of the Large Hadron Collider project represents an important step forward in international scientific collaboration; and

(C) will follow the United States' example in high energy physics accelerator construction with interregional contributions to future important scientific construction projects of mutual interest to the United States and the member states of CERN; and

(5) an assessment of the impact of the obligation of United States funds for the project on high energy and nuclear physics projects in the United States.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The goal of nuclear physics research is to improve understanding of the structure and properties of atomic nuclei and the fundamental forces between the constituents that form the nucleus. Nuclear processes determine essential physical characteristics of our universe and the composition of matter that forms it. The recommendation continues the Committee's support for these fundamental pursuits. The recommendation is $320,925,000, a

$5,000,000 increase over the amount provided in the current fiscal year and a $5,000,000 increase over the amount requested by the Administration (adjusted to reflect reduction for construction of the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider at Brookhaven National Laboratory).

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $381,710,000, a $7,365,000 reduction from the current fiscal year. However, adjusting to reflect completion of the Environmental Molecular Science Laboratory (EMSL), the operating budget provided reflects a $28,748,000 increase over the current fiscal year.

The Committee supports the increase proposed for the Human Genome Project, with the exception of the increase requested to evaluate ethical, legal, and social implications. The Department is urged to concentrate on sequencing and related activities. The Committee recognizes the ongoing valuable work being done in the fight against Parkinson's. The recommendation includes funding to increase the Department's research of cell structures, diagnostic techniques and efforts related to drug development.

Within available funds, $8,200,000 is provided for continuing the research contribution of the National Institute for Global Environmental Change program. This is the same amount included in the Administration's request.

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

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $668,240,000, an increase of $18,892,000 over the current fiscal year.

The Committee remains committed to robust basic energy research programs which are characterized by cutting-edge basic research, availability of world-class facilities to the scientific and research community, and direction to meet current and future energy-related challenges. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 1998, funding may be reallocated by the Department among all operating accounts in basic energy sciences.

The recommendation includes $7,000,000, the same amount as the budget request, for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).

NATIONAL SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE (NSNS)

The recommendation includes $23,000,000 for a new neutron source, a $15,000,000 increase over the current fiscal year. There is widespread agreement that a new neutron source and related instrumentation would provide scientists with the tools needed to advance understanding of materials composition and cell structures. The Committee directs that the Department provide an outyear funding profile identifying outyear funding requirements needed to

complete this project. The Committee notes that outyear projections suggest that the NSNS would require close to $300 million a year in the peak years. The profile should indicate what programs will be reduced to provide the funding in the outyears.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for the Computational and Technology Research program is $147,831,000, a reduction of $28,076,000 from the budget request. The recommendation represents a $14,724,000 increase over the request after subtracting out the Administration's $35,000,000 proposal to start a new spending program (described below) and the $7,800,000 reduction to reflect the recommendation to transfer fusion-related computer activities to the amount provided for fusion.

The Committee recommendation does not include funds for the Next Generation Internet program. The Committee was unable to justify starting a new spending program. The justification provided for this program did not explain the need for a multi-million dollar government program at a time when hundreds of private companies are investing billions of dollars on hardware and software innovations. The Committee was informed that funds would be used to upgrade hardware at laboratories and universities and that the Department would study ways to improve the capabilities of the internet. The Committee notes that these activities have been funded in this account and that it is unnecessary to create a new program to continue these efforts. The Committee also notes that the Department has already signed an agreement to transfer a third of the amount requested to the National Science Foundation. It appears that this new spending program is a work in progress.

The Committee recommendation for Multiprogram Energy Laboratory Support is $21,260,000, the same amount provided in the current fiscal year. The recommendation is consistent with last year's decision not to provide an omnibus line-item for construction projects. The Committee recommendation reflects full support for construction items proposed in the budget request for fiscal year 1998 requirements. The recommendation does not include the $19,007,000 requested for full funding of outyear construction requirements.

The recommendation for program direction is $37,600,000, a $3,200,000 reduction from the amount requested for the Office of Energy Research ($30,600,000 requested in the Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities account and $10,200,000 requested in the General Science and Research Activities account). The reduction is consistent with the effort to downsize the Federal workforce.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation includes three funding adjustments. The $35,000,000 adjustment represents previously appropriated funds the Department has identified as surplus. The funds were provided as part of the closeout costs related to cancellation of the Superconducting Supercollider. The $13,800,000 adjustment represents an estimate of the availability of prior year balances available to reduce the amount appropriated. This year's reduction is

$7,403,000 less than the $21,203,000 reduction recommended in the current fiscal year for Office of Energy Research programs. The recommendation also includes a $2,669,000 reduction which represents the Committee's determination to discontinue excessive training programs throughout the Department. As previously mentioned in this report, the reduction does not apply to safety training and should be targeted to contractor training and other non-essential training programs.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation, 1997	$182,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	190,000,000
Recommended, 1998	160,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−22,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−30,000,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 established a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities. These laws also established the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste.

The Committee recommends $160,000,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 1998. Combined with the appropriation to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $350,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 1998. This amount is in addition to the $85,000,000 provided in Public Law 104–46 for interim storage activities, subject to authorization. Should site-specific interim storage activities be authorized by fiscal year 1998, the total program budget will be $415,000,000; this represents a $33,000,000 increase over fiscal year 1997.

Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee has reduced the budget request by $30,000,000. The recommendation includes a reduction of $14,000,000 from the budget request of $87,000,000 for the science program, bringing that program to the fiscal year 1997 level of $73,000,000. The Committee directs that the remaining reduction of $16,000,000 be applied to personnel costs, training, and travel expenses for Federal employees, support service contractors, non-safety related training for contractor employees, cooperative agreements, and other programs that are not directly associated with the performance of characterization and interim storage activities.

Consistent with authorizing legislation pending in the House Committee on Commerce, no funds are provided for multipurpose canister development or certification. Also, no funds are provided for the State of Nevada or affected units of local government.

The Administration refuses to advance or endorse proposals, legislative or otherwise, that would permit it to discharge its obligation to remove spent fuel from commercial reactor sites in fiscal year 1998. The Committee's frustration at this policy of non-engagement continues unabated. Rather than propose solutions to the problem of interim nuclear waste storage, the Department seems content to leave the matter to the courts, inviting judicial activism

and continued delays. The Committee is anxious for the Administration to reverse its course and demonstrate some measure of leadership and responsibility in connection with this important issue. Unfortunately, the Committee is not possessed of optimism equal to its anxiousness.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1997	$215,021,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	232,604,000
Recommended, 1998	214,723,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−298,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−17,881,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1997	−$125,388,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−131,330,000
Recommended, 1998	−131,330,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−5,942,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

The funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy. The account funds a wide array of activities not directly associated with program execution. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation for administrative activities is $214,723,000, a decrease of $17,881,000 from the budget request of $232,604,000. The Committee expects the Department to continue to restructure its administrative work force to achieve the necessary cost savings.

Staffing levels.—The Committee continues to believe that Headquarters staffing for many administrative functions is excessive, and thus, has not provided additional funding in fiscal year 1998 as requested. The fiscal year 1998 budget request assumes increased employment levels for the office of the general counsel; this additional funding has not been provided. The Committee also continues to question the need for a large central policy staff of 121 employees when each Assistant Secretary has a separate policy office.

The Committee directs the Department to reduce staffing to the level which can be appropriately supported within the available funds provided for fiscal year 1998. Necessary reductions are not to be prorated across each organization. The Committee expects the Department to assess objectively the workload and value added by many of these support and administrative organizations and the redundancy existing within program organizations which have created their own support staffs, thereby duplicating many of the central staff functions. Actions to maintain current staffing levels by furloughing employees, withholding performance awards, or any other actions to avoid staffing reductions are not acceptable.

Office of the Secretary.—The Committee's recommendation of $2,500,000 includes an increase of $500,000 over the fiscal year 1997 funding level. The Department submitted an amended budget request of $4,473,000 for this account, but the amendment was re-

ceived too late for the Committee to address. The Committee expects the Department to include full funding of all staff supporting the Office of the Secretary in the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

Performance awards.—In fiscal year 1997, Congress reduced funding and limited the number of employees in the Departmental Administration account. The Department reduced the number of employees but still had a funding problem. Rather than continue to reduce the number of employees consistent with fiscal year 1997 funding levels, the Department chose a variety of techniques to reduce costs in the account. Unfortunately, those management decisions to reduce costs rather than employment levels led to unfair treatment of those employees who remained. For example, non-Senior Executive Service (SES) employees have been denied their fiscal year 1996 performance awards because they were to have been paid in a lump sum out of fiscal year 1997 funds. SES employees have received their fiscal year 1996 performance awards because they were accrued as they were earned during each pay period in fiscal year 1996. This treatment is inherently unfair. It was never the intention of the Committee to treat the remaining employees as second-class citizens, and the Committee is dismayed that the Department has chosen this approach. To prevent this from happening again, the Committee has earmarked $950,000 to be allocated for non-SES performance awards, and expects the Department to accrue the costs as they are earned during the pay period in the same manner as SES performance awards.

Information management.—The budget request includes $8,000,000 for a new Corporate Management Information System. The Committee recommendation of $4,000,000 includes funding to update and replace a number of independent, antiquated computer systems with compatible, user-friendly business systems that will provide real-time management and financial data on a DOE complex-wide basis. Funding has been provided for the Corporate Financial and Business Information System and the Corporate Human Resources Information System. The investment in these systems has the potential to generate substantial savings over the next five years.

Working Capital Fund.—The Department is using a charge back program similar in nature to a working capital fund which charges benefiting programs and organizations with certain administrative and housekeeping activities traditionally funded in a central departmental account. The Committee continues to support this, but wants to reiterate its expectations that: no salaries or other expenses of Federal employees may be charged to the fund, nor will the Committee agree to this proposal as part of the fiscal year 1999 budget request; Departmental representation on the Board establishing the policies should be broad based and include smaller organizations; the pricing policies used must be sound and defensible and not include added factors for administrative costs; the advanced payments at any time may be no more than the amount minimally required to adequately cover outstanding commitments and other reasonable activities; and a defined process must be established to dispose of excess advance payments (accumulated credits). Additionally, it is the Committee's expectation that the fund manager will ensure that the fund will neither be managed in a

manner to produce a profit nor allow the program customers to use the fund as a vehicle for maintaining unencumbered funds.

The Committee is aware that the Department must conduct audits prior to the award of contracts and at the conclusion of these contracts to comply with Federal Acquisition Regulations. For the most part, these audits are conducted by the Defense Contract Audit Administration. The Committee does not agree that these audit costs should be included in the working capital fund. Audit costs are the direct cost of doing business, and as such, should be charged directly to the program budget which funds the contract, not an administrative account like the working capital fund. Thus, audit costs should not be included in the working capital fund in fiscal year 1998.

The working capital fund is to be audited each year by the Department's Inspector General to ensure the integrity of the accounts. The Inspector General will perform the first audit of the account based on fiscal year 1997 activities. Upon completion by the Inspector General of the initial audit of the fund, the Committee expects to be apprised of any recommendations to improve the charge back system.

Capital Equipment and General Plant Projects.—The Committee eliminated capital equipment and general plant projects as separate budget accounts two years ago to provide more flexibility to the Department to maintain facility and laboratory infrastructure. An enhancement to this flexibility would permit the equitable distribution of costs associated with general purpose capital requirements to all site programs by allowing these costs to be distributed in a manner consistent with other general institutional expenses. The Committee encourages the Department to implement this accounting procedure.

Use of Prior Year Deobligations and Construction Project Reserves.—Throughout the fiscal year, funds often become available as projects are completed and contracts closed out throughout all of the Department's appropriation accounts. These funds become available for reuse and are retained by the Controller as either prior year deobligations or transferred to construction project reserve accounts. During fiscal year 1998 these funds are not available for reallocation within the Department unless approved by Congress as part of a reprogramming or specifically identified in the budget request.

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $32,062,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recognizes that funds received from reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

Revenues.—The revenue estimate for fiscal year 1998 is $131,330,000, the same as the budget request and an increase of $5,942,000 over the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1997.

Funding adjustments.—The Committee recommendation includes the use of $1,924,000 from available prior year balances.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1997	$23,853,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	29,499,000
Recommended, 1998	27,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	3,647,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−1,999,000

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1998 is $27,500,000, a reduction of $1,999,000 from the budget request of $29,499,000. The funding increase over fiscal year 1997 is necessary because unobligated balances were available to offset funding requirements in prior fiscal years.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

In prior years, the funds in these appropriation accounts were available until expended. Consistent with the provisions included by the House National Security Committee in the Fiscal Year 1998 National Defense Authorization bill, these accounts will be one-year appropriations accounts in fiscal year 1998.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1997	$3,911,198,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	3,576,255,000
Recommended, 1998	3,943,442,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+32,244,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+367,187,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. This must be done within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, using a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. Since October 1992, the United States has maintained a moratorium on underground nuclear testing and has explored other means to assure confidence in the safety, reliability and performance of nuclear weapons. The future weapons complex will rely on scientific understanding and expert judgment, rather than on underground nuclear testing and the development of new weapons to predict, identify, and correct prob-

lems affecting the safety and reliability of the stockpile. Enhanced experimental capabilities and new tools in computation, surveillance, and advanced manufacturing will become necessary to recertify weapons safety, performance, and reliability without underground nuclear testing. Weapons will be maintained, modified, or retired and dismantled as needed to meet arms control objectives or remediate potential safety and reliability issues. As new tools are developed and validated, they will be incorporated into a smaller, more flexible and agile weapons complex infrastructure for the future.

The Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget request for Weapons Activities totaled $5,078,650,000 which included $3,576,255,000 for operating expenses in the Weapons Activities appropriation account and $1,502,395,000 for full funding of weapons activities construction projects in a separate Defense Asset Acquisition appropriation account. The Committee recommendation has consolidated both of those accounts.

The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $3,943,442,000, an increase of $32,244,000 over the fiscal year 1997 appropriation, and an increase of $367,187,000 over the budget request of $3,576,255,000. The significant difference between the Committee's recommendation and the budget request for fiscal year 1998 reflects the Administration's proposal to include full funding for construction projects in a separate appropriation account. The Committee did not accept this proposal, and has provided incremental funding for construction projects in this account. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

Outyear funding.—The Committee is concerned that the Department continues to pursue a program which will require a substantial increase in resources in future years. Several major initiatives, such as construction of a new tritium source and facilities for disposal of excess plutonium, are not included in the Administration's outyear funding levels. The Administration seems content to propose funding levels and new initiatives in fiscal year 1998 which will be difficult to support in future years with constrained resources.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in stockpile safety and reliability without underground nuclear testing through a technically challenging science-based stockpile stewardship program utilizing upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities. Funding of $1,733,400,000, an increase of $91,633,000 over fiscal year 1997, has been recommended for fiscal year 1998. This provides the budget request for core stockpile stewardship activities, and the incremental funding needed for each construction project.

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative.—The Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) will provide the software, computer platforms, and operating environments to accelerate the development of simulation capabilities to ensure confidence in a safe and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile without underground

nuclear testing. The Committee recommendation supports the budget request of $204,800,000, an increase of $53,185,000 over the fiscal year 1997 funding level of $151,615,000. The Committee strongly supports the Department's efforts to engage universities in this program. To the extent that university groups participating in the Academic Strategic Alliances Program component of ASCI require additional computational support, the Department should make use of a university-based supercomputer facility compatible with the ASCI systems installed at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $414,800,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $48,340,000 over fiscal year 1997. The recommendation includes the budget request for operating expenses, and the incremental funding request of $197,800,000 for the National Ignition Facility. The Committee also recommends $26,100,000 for the University of Rochester's OMEGA laser, an increase of $2,500,000 over the budget request.

Technology Transfer and Education.—The Committee recommendation provides $61,500,000, for technology transfer and education programs, a decrease of $7,500,000 from the budget request. The recommendation does not include the budget request of $7,500,000 for the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. This activity is funded in other sectors of the Department and is not an appropriate use of national security funding. The Committee recommends $10,000,000 for the American Textiles (AMTEX) partnership project, an increase of $4,500,000 above the budget request.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The stockpile management program supports the enduring stockpile, including maintenance, system refurbishment, and weapons dismantlement, and seeks to ensure an adequate supply of tritium. The Committee recommendation for stockpile management is $2,024,150,000, an increase of $80,319,000 over fiscal year 1997. The recommendation includes $85,000,000 more than the budget request for operating expenses for activities necessary to sustain a reliable, quality production capability to support the nuclear weapons stockpile as it ages. Incremental funding for construction projects is provided except as noted below.

Nuclear weapons production complex.—Additional funding of $85,000,000 over the budget request has been provided to maintain adequate production capability throughout the Department's nuclear weapons production complex. The additional funding includes $35,000,000 in support of the W87 program and to provide capability at the Y–12 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in preparation for expected stockpile life extension activities; $15,000,000 for enhanced surveillance activities; and $35,000,000 for manufacturing and infrastructure initiatives.

Safeguards funding for cleanup sites.—Funding of $44,000,000 for safeguards and security activities at the Rocky Flats environmental cleanup site in Colorado, and $1,200,000 for the Fernald environmental cleanup site in Ohio, was requested in the stockpile management program in fiscal year 1998. The Committee has moved that funding and programmatic responsibility to the De-

fense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account to reflect the full funding for closure of these cleanup sites in one account.

Tritium.—The Committee's recommendation fully funds the operating budget request of $184,485,000, an increase of $34,485,000 over fiscal year 1997, for continued research and development of the Department's dual-track strategy for a new source of tritium. This strategy will pursue the use of a commercial light-water reactor or purchase of irradiation services from such a reactor, and the design and testing of components of an accelerator system for production of tritium. In addition, the budget request of $67,865,000 has been provided for design-only activities for Project 98–D–126, the Accelerator Production of Tritium.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation does not include fiscal year 1998 funding for Project 95–D–102, the chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Department recently stopped this project to review ongoing activities which appear to be beyond the authorized scope of the project and to examine current cost overruns. The Committee is concerned that this project may be suffering the same deficiencies found by the Department's Inspector General (IG) in a report issued in January 1997 on the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility (NMSF) project at Los Alamos. The deficiencies in that facility were so serious that it was rendered unusable for its intended purpose. The IG found that "* * * the primary cause for NMFS problems was due to inadequate design criteria, poor coordination among participants, and a need for better project and construction management". The Committee will not provide more funds to a project which could be suffering from the same deficiencies until the Department has provided an independent assessment of the status of the design, cost, and schedule for the CMR project.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Energy initiated a review of the organization of the field activities and management of the national security functions of the Department of Energy. The Department recently submitted the report entitled, "The Organization and Management of the Nuclear Weapons Program," prepared by the Institute for Defense Analyses. The general findings indicate that "* * * practices for managing environment, safety and health concerns are based on a counterproductive hybrid of centralized and decentralized management practices that have evolved over the past decade * * * the process is ad hoc, and almost defies description". Other major findings are that there are too many people (including support service contractors) chasing too little work; there are concerns over the expertise and training of people; there is confusion over the difference between line and staff; there are two headquarters for stockpile management; there is weak integration of programs and functions within Defense Programs and across the Department of Energy; there is an absence of a formal, disciplined DOE-wide resource allocation process; and there are wide variations among field activities in relationships and processes.

In addition to this analysis, Congress had requested a plan to reorganize the field activities and management, but the Department failed to provide an implementation plan based on the recommendations of the report. The Committee understands the reluctance of the Department to quickly implement the recommendations of the study, but believes it is imperative that such actions be taken. The Committee's recommendation for program direction funding for field offices and headquarters reflects the anticipated reorganization.

The Committee recommendation of $208,500,000 for program direction is a reduction of $95,000,000 from the budget request of $303,500,000. This reflects a $25,000,000, or 15 percent, reduction in funding for personnel costs and travel expenses for Federal employees, and a reduction of $70,000,000 in support service contractors, advisory and assistance services, and training.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $20,000,000 to be applied to non-safety related contractor training costs throughout the nuclear weapons complex. The recommendation also includes the use of $2,608,000 in available prior year balances.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1997	$5,459,304,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	5,052,499,000
Recommended, 1998	5,263,270,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−196,034,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	210,771,000

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

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account includes environmental restoration, closure projects, waste management, nuclear materials and facilities stabilization, technology development, the environmental science program, and a variety of crosscutting and program management activities.

The Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget request for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management totaled $5,695,163,000 which included $5,052,499,000 for operating expenses in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account and $642,664,000 for full funding of construction projects in a separate Defense Asset Acquisition appropriation account. The Committee recommendation has consolidated both of those accounts. In addition to this program funding, the Administration requested $1,006,000,000 for the Defense Envi-

ronmental Privatization appropriation account. The Committee's concerns about the Department's privatization proposal are addressed later in this report.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $5,263,270,000, a reduction of $431,893,000 from the budget request of $5,695,163,000. The significant difference between the Committee's recommendation and the budget request for fiscal year 1998 reflects the Administration's proposal to include full funding for construction projects in a separate appropriation account. The Committee did not accept this proposal and has provided incremental funding for construction projects in this account. This recommendation reduced the budget request by $476,989,000. The other significant difference was the addition of $45,200,000 of safeguards costs from the Weapons Activities account to the closure project account. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

A project performance study performed by Independent Project Analysis, Inc. in 1996 found that while improvements had been made to the Department of Energy's Environmental Management (EM) project system over the past two years, the EM project system remains more costly and slower than systems performed by industry. The analysis notes that many opportunities remain to reduce the costs of projects. Right now, DOE environmental restoration projects are approximately 25 percent more expensive than those of the private sector and DOE waste management projects are approximately 35 to 40 percent more expensive than those of the private sector for comparable work. Clearly, there are many opportunities for improvement. The Committee urges the Department to adopt more industry practices, reduce the numerous layers of oversight, apply the rule of common sense, and remember that the objective of these programs is to complete tasks, not justify continued employment for Federal and contractor employees.

Ten Year Plan.—The Committee is extremely discouraged by the Department's failure to issue a supportable Ten Year Plan for completing cleanup of the Environmental Management sites. The Committee views the repeated delays by the Department to provide a Ten Year Plan as symptomatic of broad, cultural problems that require aggressive, institutional changes. The discussion draft entitled "Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006" does not come close to the Committee's expectations. It is at best a high level document that can be used to initiate discussions with stakeholders. The Committee is extremely disappointed that the document itself admits that the top level document cannot be supported by the details, that it is not based on budget quality data, and that after a year of planning, the Department is only at the initial planning stages.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to produce and deliver to Congress a Ten Year Plan along with its Fiscal Year 1999 Budget. The Ten Year Plan must provide at a minimum for each site, projects that contain a defined scope of work and end state, interim milestones, and validated costs and schedules, including identifying what scope will be completed through fiscal

year 2006 and after fiscal year 2006. The Committee expects the Department to provide budget quality data for each project. The Ten Year Plan should address the full life-cycle costs and schedules. The Committee urges the Department to consider risk and mortgage reduction in the prioritization and sequencing of clean-up projects.

The Committee is concerned that the Department is trying to force a scope of work to fit into an unrealistic acceleration plan using efficiency goals or management challenges that are virtually impossible to meet, especially in the out-years. While the Committee applauds the Department's efforts to be more efficient and believes that there are additional savings to be gained by doing the most important work first and by lowering the cost of doing business, relying on basically yet-to-be defined goals of the magnitude presented in discussion document challenges the overall credibility of the plan. Accordingly, the Committee strongly urges the Department to create a Ten Year Plan that completes as much as the cleanup mission as possible by 2006, with aggressive but defensible efficiency goals, using data based on the true state of the individual Environmental Management sites. The Committee discourages the Department from writing a plan and then trying to force-fit data as appears to be the case with the "Focus on 2006" draft.

The Committee also urges the Department to consider more realistic land use planning assumptions than have been used previously. Consideration should be given to existing compliance agreements; however, there should be flexibility in the process to allow for changes where an improved outcome can be demonstrated.

Low-Level Waste Disposal.—The Committee strongly encourages the Department to pursue an open competition for waste disposal services for various categories of low-level radioactive and mixed low-level radioactive waste. This proposal should also allow for an evaluation of an alternative regulatory structure under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. The Department should report back to the Committee by November 30, 1997, on the status of this competitive proposal.

Reprogramming Authority.—Last year Congress provided greater flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at former defense sites which are undergoing remedial cleanup activities. In fiscal year 1998, each site manager may continue to transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs and construction projects to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days after the transfer of funds occurs.

Economic development.—The Committee wants to reiterate the prohibition against using environmental management funds for economic development activities. The Committee appropriates funding for the "Worker and Community Transition Program" which is the only program authorized in the Department to provide eco-

nomic development funding for communities, and this is the proper forum for evaluating the merits of the many proposals which the Department receives for economic development funding.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

The environmental restoration program assesses, remediates, and decontaminates and dismantles contaminated Department of Energy facilities and sites which are inactive or surplus to current program needs. The Committee recommendation moves $743,600,000 of funding for the Rocky Flats Closure Project and the Fernald Environmental Management Project from this account to a separate closure project account. The Committee recommendation of $1,000,973,000 provides full funding of the budget request for the remaining programs in the environmental restoration account.

The budget justifications do not provide the necessary information to evaluate the progress being made in the environmental restoration program to clean up the facilities and sites. The Department is directed to work with the Committee to establish an adequate level of budget detail that will show the estimated cost of each of these cleanup projects, the projected schedule for completion, the scope of the project, and the types of expenses being incurred. With the information currently provided, assessing progress on an annual basis is not possible.

CLOSURE PROJECTS

Last year the Committee expressed significant interest in accelerating closure of environmental management sites and urged the Department to provide adequate funds to support this effort at sites which could be cleaned up within ten years with a notable reduction in mortgage costs due to the accelerated schedule. However, the fiscal year 1998 budget request did not implement this direction. The Committee considers this a very important issue, and the funding recommendation reflects implementation of this proposal.

Rocky Flats Closure Project.—Current cost projections indicate that completing cleanup at the Rocky Flats Closure Project by 2006 would cost approximately $6.5 billion, while a completion date of 2010 will cost $7.5 billion. With a relatively small increase in funding over the budget request in fiscal year 1998, total project costs of $1 billion can be saved. This seems to the Committee to be a worthy investment. The Department's budget included $598,850,000 for Rocky Flats in various program accounts including $44,000,000 funded in the Weapons Activities account for safeguards activities. The Committee's recommendation consolidates all of this funding and provides an additional $33,250,000 for a total of $632,100,000 for cleanup activities.

Fernald Environmental Management Project.—Current cost projections indicate that closing the Fernald site by 2006 would cost approximately $2.5 billion while closing it by 2011 increases costs to approximately $2.8 billion. The Committee recommendation of $258,700,000 provides the budget request from the environmental restoration program, $1,200,000 for safeguards from the Weapons Activities appropriation, $25,200,000 for the Waste Pits Remedial

Action project, and $6,900,000 for the Silo 3 Residue Waste Treatment project.

Report Requirement.—As part of the fiscal year 1999 budget submittal, the Department is directed to provide adequate detail showing the cost, scope, schedule, and technical assumptions which support project closures by 2006. The Committee will work with the Department to ensure that the budget justifications provide adequate detail to permit Congress to track closure progress on an annual basis.

Other Closure Projects.—The Committee recommendation also includes the budget request of $15,000,000 to accelerate cleanup.

Closure Project Management.—The Committee is concerned that the current management and organization structure in the Environmental Management program at the Department does not lend itself to the successful management of dynamic projects with established completion dates and fixed price costs. Federal management of such projects requires skills quite different from the level of effort activities often performed at DOE sites. The Committee directs the Department to establish a small, separate, and highly skilled team of Federal employees to manage these closure projects. These individuals must be highly motivated, creative, results-oriented, and accountable for the success of each closure project. The Department is directed to provide the Committee within 60 days of enactment of this bill with a detailed plan outlining a proposed project management structure which reduces the numerous layers of Federal bureaucracy through which closure projects must report.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The waste management program treats, stores, and disposes of radioactive and hazardous wastes generated across the Department of Energy complex. The Committee recommendation is $1,455,576,000, the same as the budget request. The independent assessment of environmental management projects conducted last year indicated that the Federal government's waste management costs exceeded those of the private sector by 35 to 40 percent. The Committee expects the Department to explore every available avenue to reduce operational costs. Any savings that can be achieved within the available funding should be used to ensure that programs and facilities such as the Defense Waste Processing Facility at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico, and the Hanford waste tank farm operations in Richland, Washington, are fully funded to meet critical program needs. The Committee urges the Department to review the funding needs associated with each of these critical facilities to ensure they are adequately funded and can be fully utilized in fiscal year 1998. The Committee will expect the Department to submit a reprogramming during the year if it becomes apparent that full operation of any of these facilities is funding limited.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION

The nuclear materials and facilities stabilization program was established to manage the activities related to surplus weapons complex facilities; to ensure that nuclear materials remaining in the facilities are placed in a form suitable for longer-term storage;

and to deactivate the facilities. The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1998 funding is $1,244,021,000, a reduction of $58,439,000 from the budget request. This difference reflects an increase of $41,000,000 for operating expenses, and a decrease of $99,439,000 for full funding of construction projects.

The funding recommendation includes an additional $41,000,000 for operation of the facilities at the Savannah River Site to accelerate processing of "at risk" spent nuclear fuel currently stored at the site. The Committee has provided the additional funding for the Savannah River Site with the expectation that this will permit the Department to accelerate cleanup of the Site. The funding has not been provided merely to permit the Site to maintain the existing workforce without showing significant progress. The Department is directed to submit to the Committee by October 31, 1997, a report indicating: the specific activities which were to be performed under the original budget request; how the additional funds will be allocated by activity; and the specific activities which will undertaken in fiscal year 1998 with the additional funding to accelerate cleanup of the Site. The Committee expects each of these activities to be quantified, and the Committee will expect a quarterly status report on the progress which is being made on each of these activities throughout the fiscal year.

An additional $10,000,000 is also included for the Department's national spent fuel program which is managed by the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. The Committee has also provided $8,500,000 for the hazardous waste operations and emergency response training program, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request of $7,500,000.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development is $182,881,000, a reduction of $75,000,000 from the budget request of $257,881,000. The Department proposed a new program, the Technology Development Initiative, to find ways to encourage the use of new and innovative technologies which are available but untried. The Committee has no objection to the concept, but sees no reason to set up a new program to do this. Instead, the Committee directs the Department to allocate $10,000,000 in each of the budgets for environmental restoration, waste management, and nuclear materials and facilities stabilization to be used to accelerate the use of new technologies and leverage funding already available for these activities. Evaluating and using new technology should be an integral part of the management of each of these program areas.

The additional reduction of $25,000,000 is to be applied to the domestic and international technology systems applications programs. Accountability for program activities in these accounts has been lacking; funds are reallocated and used for activities which never appear in the budget request; and direct application to anything in the technology development arena appears to be marginal.

Funding to support the private industry programs and continue ongoing activities is provided at the budget request of $40,066,000.

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

Program taxes.—The Committee is aware that in prior years the technology development program has been "taxed" to fund activities which were not included in the budget request. The Committee directs the Department to submit a reprogramming request to Congress for any additional program requirements not included in the budget request which arise during the fiscal year.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Due to funding constraints, the Committee recommendation for policy and management is $20,000,000, a reduction of $3,104,000 from the budget request of $23,104,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for the environmental science program is $55,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request of $50,000,000. Within this funding, $50,000,000 has been provided for the basic science program, and $5,000,000 for the risk policy program.

The Committee is concerned that some of the grants provided under the environmental science program are not directly related to real and identifiable cleanup problems throughout the Department of Energy complex. Thus, the Department is to provide to the Committee a list of each grant that has been funded, a description of what cleanup problem is being addressed, and how the grantee is to interact with the appropriate Departmental site to address the specific problem. The purpose of this program is provide future-oriented solutions to existing problems, not just to support basic research in environmental areas. The Committee wants to ensure that this link is established and maintained throughout the award and execution phase of the grants.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The Department requested $1,006,000,000 for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program. The Committee has recommended no funding for this program in fiscal year 1998. Not only was this request a major component of the Department's unrealistic budget increase over fiscal year 1997, but there are serious programmatic concerns about how the "privatization" program, which was initiated in fiscal year 1997, has been managed.

In the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the Department proposed a new initiative called "privatization" which would seek to procure services from the private sector through fixed price contracts with no payment due from the Federal government until services and/or products are provided. This concept required the private sector to finance the design and construction of the project with no payments made until the facility is operational. However, this is not "privatization" in the true sense of the word, because the Department already uses private sector contractors to perform all of its cleanup activities.

Based on the budget request for privatization activities in fiscal year 1997, Congress provided $170,000,000 for the Hanford waste vitrification project in Richland, Washington, and $160,000,000 for three other initiatives. The information provided in support of

these projects was not as thorough as is normally expected for a construction project, but there was much interest in pursuing an innovative process which sought to reduce costs and improve contract efficiencies through the use of fixed price contracts and the discipline of private sector financing.

In fiscal year 1998 the Department requested an additional $1,006,000,000 for eleven new privatization initiatives. Since submittal of the budget request, the Committee has been seeking consistent and timely answers on the "privatization" program for both fiscal year 1997 projects and fiscal year 1998 projects. Accurate and consistent information on the projects has been difficult, if not impossible, to acquire from the Department. Answers on financial data and requirements vary from individual to individual, and from meeting to meeting. Questions have arisen pertaining to the accuracy of the cost estimates, the accuracy of the cost savings, the changing scope of the projects, and the very need for some of the projects.

Based on this experience, the Committee is recommending funding no new "privatization" projects in fiscal year 1998. The four projects which were started in fiscal year 1997 will continue. Once the Committee sees that these projects are successfully executed, it will then be prepared to consider further funding for this type of activity. The Committee wants to reiterate that it in no way objects to proposals for creative financing, fixed price contracts, or more involvement by the private sector in cleanup activities. The Department's failure to obtain funding in fiscal year 1998 is a result of the sloppy work done in developing the project proposals, inadequate and inconsistent answers to questions, and skepticism that the Department is capable of managing technically complex, fixed price contracts. The Committee expects proposals for any future projects, whether funded totally by the Federal government or through the private sector, to have been thoroughly evaluated to ensure the accuracy of the cost estimates, the scope, the schedule, and the projected cost savings.

HANFORD TANK WASTE VITRIFICATION PROJECT

The Committee recommends $70,000,000 to continue the Hanford tank waste vitrification project at the Hanford site near Richland, Washington. This will provide a total of $240,000,000 when added to the $170,000,000 which was provided for this project in fiscal year 1997. None of these prior year funds have been obligated, and they will be carried over into the new fiscal year. The Department had requested $427,000,000 in the defense environmental management privatization account for this project, but the Committee does not believe that this large increase in funding is necessary in fiscal year 1998. The Department is currently funding two design efforts for this project. Designs will be submitted to the Department in January 1998, with a selection to be made by the Department in May 1998. The Committee directs that the Department notify the Committee 30 days prior to execution of the contract. To indicate a commitment to this project and provide assurance for the contractors who will be seeking private sector financing for this project, the Committee is providing funding in advance of knowing the specific project details. Once a decision is made, the Depart-

ment is to provide detailed information on the decision to the Committees on Appropriations prior to signing the contract.

The Committee has an additional concern about the Hanford waste vitrification project. The success of the project also rests on the ability of the Department to provide high-level liquid waste from the Hanford waste tank farm to meet the waste specifications of the vitrification plant. There is a concern that the Department is focusing so specifically on the contract for the vitrification plant that the integration of the entire waste tank system may be overlooked. The Committee directs that adequate funding be provided to maintain the activities at the Hanford tank farm on a schedule to ensure that waste will be available to meet the operating schedule for the proposed Hanford waste vitrification plant.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $288,251,000 for program direction, a reduction of $100,000,000 from the budget request of $388,251,000. This reflects a $40,000,000, or 15 percent, reduction in funding for personnel costs and travel expenses for Federal employees, and a reduction of $60,000,000 in support service contractors, advisory and assistance services, and training.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes a general reduction of $40,000,000 to be applied to non-safety related contractor training throughout the environmental management programs.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1997	$1,605,733,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	1,605,981,000
Recommended, 1998	1,580,504,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−25,229,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−25,477,000

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

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United States response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities. Due to funding constraints, the Committee rec-

ommendation is $190,000,000, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request of $210,000,000. The Committee is aware that the nonproliferation and national security program organization makes extensive use of management and operating contractors detailed to Headquarters to provide program expertise and direction. This funding reduction should be applied to the costs associated with these contractor employee details.

ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION

The arms control and nonproliferation program supports the nation's arms control and nonproliferation policies by securing nuclear materials and expertise in Russia and the Newly Independent States; limiting weapons-usable fissile materials; establishing transparent and irreversible nuclear reductions; and controlling nuclear exports. The Committee recommendation is $220,000,000, a reduction of $14,600,000 from the budget request of $234,600,000. This recommendation includes $15,000,000, a reduction of $14,600,000 from the budget request for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program, formerly the Industrial Partnering Program. The Committee is concerned that not enough of the funding appropriated for the Department's program for Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention is actually reaching the Russian scientists who are supposed to benefit from the program. It appears that approximately half of the funding stays in the United States with the Department's laboratories. Of the remaining funds that go to Russia, it is reported that approximately half is siphoned off by duties, regional taxes, and overhead charges, leaving only 25 percent of the funding actually going to pay salaries of the Russian scientists. The Department is to report to the Committee on the expenditure of funds for the IPP program in fiscal years 1996, 1997, and estimated for 1998, and include a detailed description by activity and recipient of the expenditures, a listing of all duties, taxes and overhead charges paid by the program in each country, the number of individual Russian scientists who are funded through this program, and an accurate accounting of the annual amount which actually ends up in the paycheck of an individual Russian scientist.

The recommendation includes the budget request of $137,008,000, an increase of $24,371,000 over fiscal year 1997, for the materials protection, control and accounting program to secure and safeguard nuclear materials in Russia and the Newly Independent States.

INTELLIGENCE

The intelligence program provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the Former Soviet Union. The Committee recommendation is $33,600,000, the same as the budget request.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The emergency management program encompasses all Departmental emergency management and threat assessment related activities, with the exception of the nuclear response activities funded in the Weapons Activities account, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting Departmental operations and activities or requiring Departmental assistance. The Committee recommendation for funding is $17,000,000, a reduction of $10,700,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $206,000 over fiscal year 1997.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The nuclear safeguards and security program provides policy, programmatic direction, and training for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. The Committee recommendation for nuclear safeguards and security is $47,200,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee directs the Department to assess and survey their security containers used to hold sensitive classified material to determine how many do or do not meet Federal specification FF–L–2740. This survey should include all DOE facilities and contractor facilities. This survey should be completed so that the results of the survey will be available at the same time the Department sends its fiscal year 1999 budget request to Congress.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The security investigations program funds background investigations for Department of Energy and contractor personnel who, in the performance of their official duties, require access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material. The Committee recommendation is $20,000,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $68,900,000 for program direction is a reduction of $26,000,000 from the budget request of $94,900,000. This reflects a $6,000,000, or 15 percent, reduction in funding for personnel costs and travel expenses for Federal employees, and a reduction of $20,000,000 in support service contractors, advisory and assistance services, and training.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Environment, Safety and Health activities included in this account provide oversight processes to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department's environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security programs; fund epidemiologic studies to examine possible linkages between conditions at DOE sites and adverse health effects among workers and offsite populations; and oversee epidemiologic studies on the health of population groups in the Marshall Islands who have been exposed to ionizing radiation. The Committee recommendation is $73,000,000, an increase of $19,000,000 over the budget request of $54,000,000. Included in this recommenda-

tion is the budget request of $6,800,000 for Marshall Islands support.

In its fiscal year 1998 budget proposal, the Department moved to the non-defense portion of this bill some environment, safety and health activities which had been funded in this defense account in prior years. These activities should clearly be funded in the defense account because they include studies of the health effects that may have resulted from past operations at Department of Energy nuclear weapons research and production facilities. Additionally, this account included a portion of the salaries and expenses for the Federal employees who administer these programs. The Committee's recommendation includes $14,731,000 to continue collaboration in epidemiologic studies conducted under the Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Health and Human Services; $4,000,000 for the final year of funding for State Health Agreements; and $10,000,000 for Federal employee expenses. Any programmatic reductions necessary to accommodate these transferred activities should be applied to the use of support service contractors and non-safety related training.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $56,000,000, a decrease of $14,500,000 from the budget request of $70,500,000. The worker and community transition program was established to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities of contractor workforce restructuring by providing enhanced severance payments to employees at defense sites, and assisting community planning for defense conversion through Federal grants. Using these tools, the Department of Energy contractor workforce has been successfully downsized from almost 150,000 to approximately 105,000 contractor employees through the end of fiscal year 1997. However, the cost of this program has not been insignificant. From fiscal year 1993 through fiscal year 1997, enhanced severance payments and benefits have totaled $661,231,000, and Federal grants to communities have totaled $168,611,000, for a total cost of $829,842,000.

Since passage of this legislation, the Department has taken many steps to mitigate the impacts of DOE program reductions through community investment initiatives. These initiatives are intended to stimulate the regional economy by job creation through means other than DOE funding. One of the most successful appears to be the use of a contract incentive that requires DOE contractors to propose corporate (non-DOE) investment in the community and the region. This is intended to diversify the regional economy to help offset the impact of changing DOE missions.

From within available funds, the Committee directs the Department to continue to support those commitments which have been made for facilities where the Department of Energy's production mission has ended. However, the Department should not enter into any long-term commitments for community assistance which extend beyond fiscal year 1998. The Committee is aware that ending the nuclear weapons production mission at the Pinellas Plant in Florida which employed 2,000 people at its peak and had a direct economic impact on the region of $200,000,000 seriously disrupted

the community. Departmental assistance has mitigated these reductions, and the Committee believes continued support is necessary to complete the successful conversion of the Pinellas plant from its national security mission to commercial ventures.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) documented that the Department is providing generous separation and severance benefits to contractor employees who are separated, and that these generous packages are being offered to contractor employees hired after 1991. Further, GAO and the Department's Inspector General (IG) have identified instances at some sites where the contractors subsequently either rehire some of the separated workers or hire new employees with the skills of the separated workers because the Department and contractor failed to properly manage the downsizing. The Committee expects the Department to revise this program to prevent its abuse.

The Committee directs that the fiscal year 1998 funding be used to mitigate the impact to workers at current or former defense nuclear facilities who were hired prior to September 27, 1991, the day President Bush announced the first unilateral reduction of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and the date used by the Department as the end of the Cold War. The Committee expects the Department to use the funding in a manner that most effectively mitigates the impact to displaced workers. The Committee further directs that no other Departmental funds be used to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits authorized under the provisions of Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484, and that the Department provide a report by March 30, 1998, regarding the future need and justification for the program.

The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for this program be used for additional severance payments and benefits for Department of Energy employees. The Committee has been informed by the Secretary of Energy that the Department plans to extend the provisions of section 3161 to Federal employees at Department of Energy sites. This would provide to Department of Energy employees additional benefits which are not available to any other Federal employees. This was never the intent of this legislation. Federal employees are covered by a multitude of laws which control employee benefits and protections during the downsizing of Federal agencies.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The fissile materials disposition program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense needs. The Committee recommendation is $103,451,000, a reduction of $345,000 from the budget request of $103,796,000. Additional funding for Federal salaries and expenses has not been provided.

The Committee commends the Department on the progress made in developing a storage and disposition strategy for the excess weapons-grade fissile materials. The Committee believes that the

dual track strategy for disposition of excess plutonium is critical to completing the disposition mission as rapidly as possible and maintaining the credibility of the process. Additionally, the Committee believes that international confidence in the arms control process may hinge on the Department's adherence to the dual track strategy and, specifically, the mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel option. Accordingly, the Committee expects the Department to complete the process for selection of contractors for the mixed-oxide fuel plant and reactors in fiscal year 1998.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

The budget request for nuclear energy activities includes funding for the nuclear technology research and development on the electrometallurgical program, the international nuclear safety program which funds the Soviet-designed reactor program, the nuclear security program for spent nuclear fuel management, the Chornobyl shutdown initiative, and the Russian plutonium reactor core conversion program. Descriptions of these programs follow.

Nuclear Technology Research and Development.—This program supports research and development on the electrometallurgical treatment of spent nuclear fuels for storage and ultimate disposal in a geologic repository. For fiscal year 1998, the Department requested $25,000,000 for this program in the defense portion of this bill while last year this program was funded in the non-defense portion of the bill. The Committee recommendation includes $12,000,000 in this account and an additional $8,000,000 in the Energy Supply appropriation account, for a total of $20,000,000. The Department is directed to request all funding for this program in the Energy Supply account in fiscal year 1999.

International Nuclear Safety.—The international nuclear safety program is designed to reduce the threats posed by the operation of unsafe Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in Russia and the Newly Independent States. The Committee recommendation for this program is $25,000,000, a decrease of $25,000,000 from the budget request of $50,000,000. The Committee continues to believe that this program is more appropriately funded through the Department of State and the foreign operations appropriations bill.

The Committee is aware that the Department has been spending money on Soviet-designed research and test reactors, and directs that these activities be halted. This program is intended specifically to address the safety concerns and risks associated with the 67 nuclear power reactors.

The Committee directs the Department to provide a report showing the status of each of the Soviet-designed reactors, the work to be accomplished, the schedule by fiscal year for accomplishing this work, and the cost of each task by fiscal year.

Nuclear Security.—The nuclear security program seeks funding to transfer nuclear safety concepts to Eastern Europe and Asia, implement safety upgrades for a nuclear breeder reactor in Kazakstan, and develop a spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste management plan for countries of the former Soviet Union. The budget request for these new initiatives is $4,000,000, but the Committee has recommended no funding for these activities. These activities are not perceived as critical national security issues.

Chornobyl Shutdown Initiative.—This new initiative for the Department of Energy would augment work already being funded by the United States. The budget request for this initiative is $2,000,000, but the Committee has recommended no funding for this activity which is already being funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). USAID provided $25,000,000 for Chornobyl sarcophagus and decontamination and decommissioning efforts in fiscal year 1997, and $27,000,000 is anticipated in fiscal year 1998.

Russian Plutonium Reactor Core Conversion.—In fiscal year 1997, funding of $3,500,000 was provided for preparatory work for converting the fuel in three Russian production reactors so that they do not produce weapons-grade plutonium while producing heat and electricity. The Department requested no funding for this activity in fiscal year 1998 as it was to be funded by the Department of Defense. Consistent with the recommendations of the House National Security Committee, the Committee recommends $10,000,000 to continue this program in fiscal year 1998.

OFFICE OF HEARING AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. In fiscal year 1997, OHA was funded in the Office of Nonproliferation and National Security. Consistent with the fiscal year 1997 funding level, the Committee recommendation is $1,900,000, a reduction of $785,000 from the budget request of $2,685,000.

INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROJECTS

As noted in the introduction to Title III, the Committee has serious concerns about the Department's ability to manage construction projects and is equally concerned that there is a lack of strong internal, independent oversight of projects at the Department. The Committee has directed the Corps of Engineers to review all Departmental construction projects funded in fiscal year 1998. The Corps will review and assess the quality of the technical scopes, cost estimates, schedules, and supporting data, and make recommendations on the validity of the proposed scopes, costs, and schedules. If DOE's proposed approach is unreasonable, unjustified, or not integrated into the overall program activities, the Corps will recommend alternatives. Recommendations will be focused on those projects upon which net savings can be made. The Committee has included statutory language providing that no funds be obligated for any new fiscal year 1998 construction projects until the cost, schedule, and scope of each construction project has been validated by an independent assessment of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee believes that the root cause of the Department's failure to manage projects is the lack of qualified Federal personnel to manage the contracts and the lack of internal project management systems supporting this critical contract oversight. As such, the Committee has provided funding for an independent assessment of the Department of Energy's project management systems and facility acquisition management processes by the Corps of Engineers working with private industry, if appropriate, and the Na-

tional Academy of Engineering. The evaluation should focus on the process and management structure that DOE uses to identify and meet the identified requirements of the users of the proposed facilities, and ultimately, deliver the facilities meeting these needs as cost effectively and timely as possible.

The Committee has also provided funding to the Corps of Engineers to complete the environmental management site assessments which were initiated in fiscal year 1997 at the request of the Department. The Committee expects the Corps to not just make recommendations for cost savings, but also to report back to the Committee on the success with which the Department is implementing these recommendations.

The Committee recommendation includes $35,000,000 to be provided to the Corps of Engineers for this independent review of the Department's construction projects and project management system.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of Naval nuclear propulsion—from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. This program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. These efforts are critical to the continued success of over 110 reactors in operating nuclear-powered submarines and surface ships, and to the New Attack Submarine class currently under development.

The Committee recommendation is $673,500,000, an increase of $25,700,000 over the budget request of $647,800,000, but $8,432,500 less than fiscal year 1997. Additional funding of $38,000,000 has been provided to continue test reactor inactivation efforts and preclude inefficiencies due to delaying environmental cleanup activities which are scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 2002.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $3,000,000 in prior year balances remaining in the canceled new production reactor program, and $3,047,000 from other available prior year balances. The budget request did not propose the use of any prior year balances.

DEFENSE ASSET ACQUISITION

The President's budget request proposed creating a new appropriation account for all atomic energy defense construction projects and requested $2,166,859,000 for full funding of all construction projects. The Committee recommendation does not include this proposed change.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1997	$200,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	190,000,000
Recommended, 1998	190,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

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 1996, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was approximately $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 repository program. Through fiscal year 1997, a total of $797,800,000 has been appropriated to support the nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommends the fiscal year 1998 budget request of $190,000,000.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1997	$4,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	1,000,000
Recommended, 1998	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−3,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

The Alaska Power Administration is responsible for operation, maintenance, and marketing of power for Alaska's two Federal hydroelectric projects. The operating projects are the 30 MW Eklutna Project near Anchorage and the 78 MW Snettisham Project near

Juneau. Project facilities include dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission systems, and necessary maintenance facilities.

The Committee recommendation is $1,000,000, the same amount as the budget request. The Committee was assured last year that no further funding would be needed. If additional funding is required after carryover balances are depleted, the Department should provide a reprogramming request. The Committee supports the transfer of assets authorized by the Alaska Power Administration Asset Sale and Termination Act (Public Law 104–58). If the transfer is completed before the end of fiscal year 1998, any unobligated appropriations must be returned to the Treasury.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Department of Energy's 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 inter-regionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of 14,800 circuit-miles of transmission line and 400 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 MW. Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, region-wide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

Borrowing Authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation for these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 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, power services, conservation and energy efficiency, and capital equipment programs.

Fish Facilities.—The Administration requested language to authorize construction of facilities as required by the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act for new fish and wildlife facilities of $1,000,000 and an economic life greater than 15 years (Public Law 96–501, section 4. (H)(10)(B)). The Committee recommendation modifies the proposed language to identify the specific facilities which are approved. The statutory language includes anadromous fish supplementation facilities in the Yakima River Basin, Methow River Basin, and Upper Snake River Basin, for the Billy Shaw Reservoir resident fish substitution project, and

for the resident trout fish culture facility in Southeast Idaho. These facilities were reviewed and approved for implementation by the Northwest Power Planning Council.

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

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1998, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $805,000,000, of which $228,000,000 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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1997	$16,359,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	14,222,000
Recommended, 1998	12,222,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−4,137,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−2,000,000

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.

The Committee recommendation is $12,222,000, $4,137,000 less than the amount provided in the current fiscal year and $2,000,000 less than the budget request. The reduction from the budget request reflects an increase in the estimate of carryover balances available to supplement the appropriation for fiscal year 1998.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1997	$25,210,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	26,500,000
Recommended, 1998	25,210,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	.....
Budget Estimate, 1998	−1,290,000

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

its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The recommendation is $25,210,000, the same amount as the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee has been informed that no carryover balances will be available to offset the appropriation for fiscal year 1998. Therefore, the Department is directed to reduce spending in fiscal year 1998.

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

Appropriation, 1997	$182,230,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	194,334,000
Recommended, 1998	189,043,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+6,813,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−5,291,000

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

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins Power Marketing Fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River Storage Facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

The Committee recommendation for Western is $189,043,000, a decrease of $5,291,000 from the budget request. Because Western was able to supplement the appropriation for the current fiscal year with $66,461,000 in carryover balances, and is able to supplement the appropriation for fiscal year 1998 with a substantially lower amount, $26,389,000, the recommendation actually represents a substantial reduction of $14,532,000.

The Committee is aware of the Western Area Power Administration's proposed distribution of projected fiscal year 1998 costs across several financing sources, including funds appropriated by the Committee. As Federal appropriated funds are reduced while electricity rates drop in the marketplace, the Committee directs that Western maximize efficient use of all available resources to keep its wholesale rate as competitive as possible and thereby maintain as robust a repayment stream back to the Treasury as possible.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 1997	$970,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	1,065,000
Recommended, 1998	970,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−95,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	

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

The Committee recommendation is $970,000, the same amount as the budget request.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1997	$146,290,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	167,577,000
Recommended, 1998	162,141,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+15,851,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−5,436,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1997	−146,290,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−167,577,000
Recommended, 1998	−162,141,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−15,851,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+5,436,000

The Committee recommendation is $162,141,000, an increase of $15,851,000 over the amount provided last year. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

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

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 301 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures. This provision would permit an exception only for the research and development portion of the work performed at any DOE facility. All remaining activities at the facility such as environmental restoration are to be separated from the research activities and competitively awarded.

Section 302 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to award, amend, or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any appropriations Act may be used to award, amend, or modify any contract for support services unless a cost comparison conducted under the procedures and requirements of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shows that the cost of performing the support services by contractor personnel is lower than the cost of performing such services by Department of Energy personnel.

Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to make payments under a management and operating contract for providing products or services for use by Department of Energy personnel.

Section 305 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Department of Energy employees under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

Section 306 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to augment the $56,000,000 made available for obligation in this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

Section 307 provides that none of the funds provided in this Act to initiate new construction projects in fiscal year 1998 by the Department of Energy may be obligated until the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, has performed an independent assessment of the cost, scope, and schedule of each construction project, has validated the accuracy of the Department of Energy's estimates, and reported to Congress on the results of this assessment.

Section 308 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for programs which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Section 309 provides that none of the funds in this Act (including funds appropriated for salaries of employees of the Department of Energy) may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriations matters pending before Congress.

Section 310 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Solar energy			
Solar building technology research	2,307	4,000	3,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	59,921	77,000	64,500
Photovoltaic energy research	---	---	2,274
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	59,921	77,000	66,774
Solar thermal energy systems	22,187	19,800	17,800
Biomass/biofuels energy systems			
Power systems	27,488	36,500	30,100
Transportation	27,487	40,040	30,100
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	54,975	76,540	60,200
Biomass/biofuels energy research	---	---	38,635
Subtotal, Biomass	54,975	76,540	98,835
Wind energy systems	28,986	42,858	32,420
Wind energy research	---	---	295
Subtotal, Wind	28,986	42,858	32,715
Renewable energy production incentive program	2,000	4,000	3,000
International solar energy program	661	7,000	750
Solar technology transfer	---	1,360	---
National renewable energy laboratory	500	2,800	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	2,700
Total, Solar Energy	174,337	237,558	225,574
Geothermal			
Geothermal technology development	29,982	30,000	30,000
Hydrogen research	14,987	15,000	14,000
Hydrogen energy research	---	---	3,100
Total, Hydrogen	14,987	15,000	17,100
Hydropower development	984	1,000	---
Renewable Indian energy resources	4,000	---	---
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	12,130
Prior year projects	-1,424	---	---
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	266,344	344,700	329,304
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D			
Light water reactor	37,992	---	---
Advanced radioisotope power system	38,262	47,000	38,800
Nuclear technology R&D	20,000	---	---
Oak Ridge landlord	11,484	9,500	9,500
Test reactor area landlord	2,000	3,217	3,000
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	7,425
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	777	2,000	800
University reactor fuel assistance and support	4,000	6,000	7,000
Nuclear energy security	---	39,761	---
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	115,515	111,903	63,525
Termination costs	76,889	76,035	77,535
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	77,535

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Uranium programs	---	79,135	57,466
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	2,465
Subtotal, Construction	---	6,400	2,865
Total, Uranium programs	---	85,535	60,331
Isotope support	12,704	21,704	11,314
Program direction	13,502	16,700	15,890
Prior year projects	-920	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	219,890	311,877	228,595
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	46,703	62,731	43,200
Program direction	37,300	46,185	31,300
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	84,003	108,916	74,500
ENERGY RESEARCH			
Fusion energy sciences program	232,436	225,000	225,000
Prior year projects	-99	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	232,337	225,000	225,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	2,200	2,427	1,000
Program direction	8,700	8,560	6,000
Construction	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	11,900	11,987	8,000
Field offices and management	98,400	100,233	88,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	110,300	112,220	96,000
Subtotal, Energy supply	912,874	1,102,713	953,399
Renewable energy research program	---	---	-44,304
Use of prior year balances	-48,177	-18,535	-18,535
General reduction for contractor training	---	---	-9,830
Prior year projects	-197	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY 1/	864,500	1,084,178	880,730
(Energy asset acquisitions)	---	(15,322)	---
(Energy supply, research and development)	(864,500)	(1,068,856)	(880,730)
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, 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	275,000
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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
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
Subtotal, Non-defense environmental management	591,711	684,684	502,059
General reduction for contractor training	---	---	-4,440
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	591,711	684,684	497,619
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	200,200	248,788	220,200
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	210,000	205,240	210,240
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	680,035
Nuclear physics	250,925	256,525	261,525
Construction			
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	65,000	59,400	59,400
Total, Nuclear physics	315,925	315,925	320,925
Biological and environmental research			
Biological and environmental research R&D	352,962	376,710	381,710
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	381,710
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	332,051	392,475	364,522
Chemical sciences	171,601	199,933	180,584
Engineering and geosciences	41,225	41,371	39,701
Energy biosciences	28,161	27,461	27,061
Capital equipment	45,695	---	49,372
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	147,831
Energy research analyses	1,834	1,500	1,500
Program direction	28,500	30,600	---
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations 1/	---	7,259	7,259

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
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
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	6,960	14,701	14,701
Environment, safety and health			
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, Environment, safety and health	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	170,591
Program direction	10,000	10,200	37,600
Subtotal, Science	2,239,517	2,275,377	2,259,101
Use of prior year SSC balances	---	-15,000	-35,000
Use of other prior year balances	---	---	-13,800
General reduction for contractor training	---	---	-2,669
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,239,517	2,260,377	2,207,632
(Science asset acquisitions)	---	(138,510)	---
(Science)	(2,239,517)	(2,121,867)	(2,207,632)
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	1,300
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	1,000
Scientific and technical training	500	800	500
Information management	---	8,000	4,000
Subtotal, Program support	5,090	15,806	7,390
Total, Administrative operations	188,685	200,542	184,585
Cost of work for others	26,336	32,062	32,062
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	215,021	232,604	216,647
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	---	---	-1,924
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	215,021	232,604	214,723
Miscellaneous revenues	-125,388	-131,330	-131,330
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	89,633	101,274	83,393
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	1,158,290
Construction			
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	46,300	46,300

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
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
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	1,257,100
Inertial fusion	234,560	217,000	217,000
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD 1/	131,900	876,400	197,800
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	366,460	1,093,400	414,800
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	59,400	60,000	52,500
Education	10,000	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	69,400	69,000	61,500
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,641,767	2,493,716	1,733,400
Stockpile management	1,834,470	1,828,465	1,868,265
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	---
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	155,885
Total, Stockpile management	1,943,831	2,281,434	2,024,150
Program direction	325,600	303,500	208,500
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,911,198	5,078,650	3,966,050

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Use of prior year balances	---	---	-2,608
General reduction for contractor training	---	---	-20,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,911,198	5,078,650	3,943,442
(Defense asset acquisitions)	---	(1,502,395)	---
(Weapons activities)	(3,911,198)	(3,576,255)	(3,943,442)
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Environmental restoration	1,385,546	1,356,573	612,973
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	376,648	388,000	388,000
Total, Environmental restoration	1,762,194	1,744,573	1,000,973
Closure projects	15,000	15,000	905,800
Waste management	1,490,320	1,455,576	1,455,576
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
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	1,536,344
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	1,173,718	1,118,114	1,159,114
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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
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	1,244,021
Technology development	303,771	257,881	182,881
Policy and management	23,155	23,104	20,000
Environmental science program	62,136	50,000	55,000
Hanford tank waste vitrification project	170,000	---	70,000
Program direction	411,511	388,251	288,251
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,617,704	5,695,163	5,303,270
Savannah river pension refund	-8,000	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-150,400	---	---
General reduction for contractor training	---	---	-40,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,459,304	5,695,163	5,263,270
(Defense asset acquisitions)	---	(642,664)	---
(Defense environmental restoration and waste mgmt)	(5,459,304)	(5,052,499)	(5,263,270)
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	160,000	1,006,000	---
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	211,919	210,000	190,000
Arms control	216,244	234,600	220,000
Intelligence	34,185	33,600	33,600
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	462,348	478,200	443,600
Emergency management	16,794	27,700	17,000
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	68,900
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	634,472	668,000	596,700
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	68,094	54,000	63,000
Program direction - EH	10,706	---	10,000
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	78,800	54,000	73,000
Worker and community transition	57,659	65,800	54,000
Program direction - WT	4,341	4,700	2,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	62,000	70,500	56,000
Fissile materials disposition	83,163	99,451	99,451
Program direction - MD	3,633	4,345	4,000
Construction			
97-D-140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	17,000	---	---
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	103,796	103,796	103,451
Nuclear energy (Defense)			
Nuclear technology research and development:			
Electrometallurgical program	---	25,000	12,000
International nuclear safety:			
Soviet designed reactors	45,000	50,000	25,000
Nuclear security: Spent fuel management	---	4,000	---
Chornobyl shutdown initiative	---	2,000	---
Russian plutonium reactor core conversion	3,500	---	10,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	48,500	81,000	47,000
Office of hearings and appeals	---	2,685	1,900
Total, Other national security programs	927,568	979,981	878,051
Independent assessment of DOE projects	---	---	35,000
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development	641,130	605,920	643,920
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,200	---	---
98-D-200 Site laboratory facility upgrade, various locations 1/	---	1,200	1,200
97-D-201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID 1/	400	4,600	4,100
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	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
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	9,500
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	663,030	627,720	653,420
Program direction	18,902	20,080	20,080
Total, Naval reactors	681,932	647,800	673,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,609,500	1,627,781	1,586,551
Use of prior year balances	-3,767	---	-6,047
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,605,733	1,627,781	1,580,504
(Defense asset acquisitions)	---	(21,800)	---
(Other defense activities)	(1,605,733)	(1,605,981)	(1,580,504)
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	10,977,216
(Defense asset acquisitions)	---	(2,166,859)	---
(Atomic energy defense activities)	(11,336,235)	(11,430,735)	(10,977,216)
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,000	1,000	1,000
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	11,909
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	27,445	16,222	16,222
Use of prior year balances	-11,086	-2,000	-4,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	16,359	14,222	12,222
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	2,793	2,382	2,200
Purchase power and wheeling	1,095	57	1,095
Program direction	17,862	17,309	15,862
Construction	6,054	6,752	6,053
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	27,804	26,500	25,210
Use of prior year balances	-2,594	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,210	26,500	25,210
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	54,886
Program direction	105,807	106,157	106,157
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,432	5,432	5,432
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	248,691	229,964	229,964
Use of prior year balances	-66,461	-35,630	-40,921
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(3,774)	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	182,230	194,334	189,043
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	970	1,065	970
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	228,769	237,121	228,445
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	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1997 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	182,000	190,000	150,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	15,757,418	18,433,515	15,282,735

1/ The Request for this account was $2,999,497. The lower totals shown for the Request and prior year 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

Appropriation, 1997	$160,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	165,000,000
Recommended, 1998	160,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	.....
Budget Estimate, 1998	−5,000,000

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

The Committee recommends $160,000,000 for fiscal year 1998. This is the same amount appropriated for fiscal year 1997.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1997	$16,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	17,500,000
Recommended, 1998	16,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	.....
Budget Estimate, 1998	−1,500,000

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

Consistent with agency reductions that the Committee has made throughout this bill in personnel salaries and expenses, the Committee recommendation is $16,000,000, a decrease of $1,500,000 from the budget request of $17,500,000, and the same level as last year. The Committee urges the Board to focus on those defense nuclear production facilities that are operational and represent the highest radiological risk to workers and the public. Low risk environmental restoration projects are overseen by many state and Federal regulators, and should not demand the attention of the Board.

The Committee supports the Department of Energy's initiative to seek external regulation of Departmental facilities. The Committee expects the Board to begin planning for a smooth transition of

those projects and facilities now being overseen by the Board which could quickly and effectively be moved to external regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1997	$471,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	476,500,000
Recommended, 1998	462,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−9,100,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−13,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1997	−$457,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−457,500,000
Recommended, 1998	−446,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+10,600,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	+10,800,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1997	$14,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	19,000,000
Recommended, 1998	16,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	1,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−3,000,000

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $462,700,000 for fiscal year 1998, $9,100,000 less than last year and $13,800,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee notes that while the workload of the Commission decreases with closure of Yankee Rowe and self-regulation by agreement States, there has not been a commensurate reduction reflected in budget requests. The Committee was especially concerned that the Commission has proposed that licensee fees be raised by eight percent.

The Committee includes $13,000,000 for activities related to the implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and in support of the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. This funding is to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and the funds are provided subject to authorization of Nuclear Waste Fund expenditures for Department of Energy program activities. The recommendation is $2,000,000 more than the current fiscal year and $4,000,000 less than the budget request.

The recommendation also includes $2,000,000, the same amount as the budget request, for activities related to commercial vitrification at the Hanford site. This funding is to be derived from general funds, not to be offset by fees and collections.

The recommendation also includes $1,000,000 to provide the resources needed to evaluate the costs and benefits of establishing independent oversight of certain Department of Energy nuclear facilities. Currently, the Department of Energy operates its facilities in a self-regulatory environment. The Department has taken steps to participate in a pilot program to identify facilities over which the Commission could exercise independent regulatory oversight. This demonstration effort should not interfere with ongoing national security programs, nor with current regulatory and other oversight authorities for nuclear safety at Department facilities. The Commission is directed to provide a status report to the Committee as part of the fiscal year 1999 budget justification.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1997	$5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	4,800,000
Recommended, 1998	4,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−200,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1997	−$5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−4,800,000
Recommended, 1998	−4,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	+200,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	.....

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, equal to the Administration's budget request. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2214, this appropriation must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 1997	$2,531,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	3,200,000
Recommended, 1998	2,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−131,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−800,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,400,000, a five percent reduction from the fiscal year 1997 level.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1997	$106,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	106,000,000
Recommended, 1998	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1997	−106,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1998	−106,000,000

The Committee recommendation includes no appropriated funding for the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) in fiscal year 1998. The bill does, however, provide for the funding of essential nonpower activities with power and nonpower revenues and programmatic savings. As TVA has repeatedly observed, its nonpower programs constitute a tiny fraction of the Authority's $5.8 billion program. The Committee is confident that the relatively modest costs for nonpower activities can be absorbed by TVA with no detrimental effects on ratepayers or the maintenance of essential services. Furthermore, the Committee fully expects TVA to fund its essential nonpower programs to the extent necessary to protect the substantial Federal investment in TVA facilities and to provide for the continued enjoyment of vital TVA services by Tennessee Valley stakeholders. The Committee will exercise vigorous oversight during the coming year to ensure that this expectation is fulfilled.

A New Deal agency with a storied history, the TVA was established in 1933 to promote development of the Tennessee Valley. As enumerated in the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, the agency's principal purposes include flood control, navigation, power production, land management, reforestation and economic development. In a concession that its Depression-era missions have been largely achieved, TVA has proposed termination of its nonpower programs after fiscal year 1998. Enthused by the Administration proposal to discontinue direct appropriations, the Committee has decided to accelerate its implementation.

The Committee's recommendation accommodates the many stakeholders and interested parties who have urged that precipitous action not be taken to strip TVA of its nonpower responsibilities. While providing for the continued operation of nonpower programs by TVA in fiscal year 1998, the recommendation: preserves the prerogative of Congress and its committees to determine the ultimate disposition of TVA's appropriated programs; provides for the continuation of the TVA Task Force process to its logical conclusion; and does not arbitrarily transfer responsibilities to other entities.

The requirement that TVA absorb the costs of its nonpower program within its own internally generated revenues and savings is neither onerous nor unfair. According to TVA's testimony to the Committee, its $5.7 billion in electric power sales last year set an all-time record for revenue, and its power business is performing better than ever. The Chairman of TVA characterizes the financial condition of the Authority as "excellent." The assumption of financial responsibility for nonpower programs—1.8% of the Authority's total budget—should have little appreciable effect on an agency as financially robust as TVA claims to be. (The Committee parenthetically observes that the costs of the nonpower programs are dra-

matically lower than the financial liability TVA would face if it were subject to federal income taxation.)

The Committee also observes that, compared to multi-purpose projects managed by other Federal agencies (viz., the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation), taxpayers bear a disproportionate share of the costs to operate and maintain TVA dams and reservoirs. It is consistent with the policies and methodologies of these Federal agencies to require TVA's power program to assume a greater share of such costs.

The Committee is cognizant of a proposal for the future of TVA stewardship programs propounded by the Tennessee River Valley Association (TVRA), a coalition of some 350 members representing diverse interests throughout the Tennessee Valley (including, among others, small and large businesses, municipalities, academic institutions, and TVA distributors). In recent testimony to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, TVRA proposed that:

> TVA's Resource Management Program be given authority and management responsibility over the hydropower system to integrate it into the river basin management charge of TVA * * * Revenues generated from the sale of hydropower could finance all the Resource Management Programs (non-power programs) of TVA.

The Committee applauds TVRA for this bold and visionary proposal. The TVA stakeholders who comprise TVRA have developed a plan that is consistent with the Committee's recommendation for fiscal year 1998. TVA is directed to fully evaluate the benefits of this proposal as the Authority continues to consider the future of its nonpower programs.

Stewardship.—TVA has estimated the annual cost of statutorily required stewardship programs at $58.1 million. The Committee is confident that TVA will incorporate significant cost efficiencies into these programs and will depress total expenditures in fiscal year 1998 to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with the maintenance of essential services.

Land Between the Lakes.—The Committee expects TVA to provide such sums as are necessary for the proper operation, maintenance and improvement of Land Between the Lakes. The Committee observes, however, that staffing levels and administrative and program costs for LBL remain higher than those for similarly situated national recreation areas. TVA is directed to take action to reduce these costs in fiscal year 1998 without compromising the public's ability to enjoy vital services at LBL.

Economic Development.—In testimony before the Committee last year, TVA acknowledged that Economic Development is not an essential appropriated activity of the Authority. The Committee agrees and has provided no funding for this activity in fiscal year 1998.

The Committee urges TVA's favorable consideration of a proposal to allocate monies from the Northeast Mississippi Area Development Trust Fund for the purchase of land to expand the industrial park near the City of Fulton, Mississippi, located in Itawamba County.

Environmental Research Center.—In testimony before the Committee last year, TVA acknowledged that the Environmental Research Center is not an essential appropriated activity of the Authority. The Committee agrees and, as it has for the past two years, recommends no operational funding for fiscal year 1998.

The Committee is seriously concerned about TVA's future plans for the Environmental Research Center (ERC). The Committee would view with pronounced disfavor any proposal that fails to account for the taxpayers' substantial long-term investment in the ERC. Any plans to fold the ERC into a profit-making center of TVA would, for example, fail to address the Committee's concerns. Accordingly, the Committee directs TVA to provide a full and fair opportunity for outside entities to participate in the acquisition, management, and operation of the ERC. This direction contemplates the establishment of a public process to evaluate proposals for the disposition of ERC assets. If it is determined that the ERC lacks market value, then TVA is directed to consider termination of the center.

Chickamauga Lock.—The Committee recommendation includes no funding for activities associated with the replacement of Chickamauga Lock. Given the Administration's proposal to terminate all of TVA's appropriated programs after fiscal year 1998, the Committee considers it prudent to withhold commitment to this $300 million project until the jurisdictional responsibility for its execution is fixed and its relative priority among navigational needs nationwide is determined. If, however, TVA regards the replacement of Chickamauga Lock as sufficiently urgent to expend internally generated revenues and savings on activities associated with such replacement, then it may do so to the extent permitted under previously existing authorities.

Power Program.—Although it applauds TVA's initiative in proposing the elimination of appropriated programs, the Committee is disappointed that the agency did not include its power production operations among those Federally subsidized activities it proposes to terminate. To the contrary, the agency has made it clear that its proposal to shed appropriated programs is motivated by a desire to concentrate on its "core business" of electricity production and sale.

The Committee is concerned that a Federal agency would reinvent itself as a business opportunist. Furthermore, the Committee vigorously disagrees that TVA should be loosed to participate as a full competitor in the domestic electricity industry. By virtue of its status as an agency of the Federal government, TVA enjoys a broad range of competitive advantages, both direct and indirect. These advantages have operated to facilitate the transformation of the Authority into an electric utility of massive dimensions and enormous debt. The continued exploitation of these advantages in furtherance of the Authority's naked ambition to compete can be reconciled with neither basic tenets of free enterprise nor the appropriate role of a limited Federal government.

The conditions that prevailed in 1933 to justify the Authority's involvement in power production no longer obtain in 1997. With the electrification of the Tennessee Valley, the incipient deregulation of the electric utility industry, and the development of industries and national agencies capable of providing traditional TVA

services, the rationale for the perpetuation of this New Deal agency has steadily eroded. Rather than concentrate on the continued growth of its power business, the Committee has concluded that it is far more appropriate for TVA to plan for its immediate reform.

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 501 states the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that: "Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution."

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law * * *"

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

[In millions of dollars]

	602(b) Allocation		This bill .	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	20,010	20,512	20,003	20,511
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....

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

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

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

	Millions
Budget authority	20,003
Outlays:	
1998	13,164
1999	5,904
2000	832
2001	68
2002 and beyond	35

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of Public Law 93–344, the new budget authority and outlays provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments are as follows:

	Millions
Budget authority	163
Fiscal year 1998 outlays resulting therefrom	15

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

Under Title I, Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program:

> * * * That the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for these activities in this Act or any previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation account, and thereafter, may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

> * * * of which $12,758,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $54,242,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, and of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund: *Provided,* That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

> * * * That the unexpended balances of the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation accounts for "Construction Program (Including Transfer of Funds)", "General Investigations", "Emergency Fund", and "Operation and Maintenance" shall be transferred to and merged with this account, to be available for the purposes for which they originally were appropriated.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration:

> * * * of which such amounts as may be necessary to conform with such plans shall be transferred to appropriate accounts of such Federal agencies * * *

Under Title III, General Provisions—Transfer of unexpended balances:

SEC. 310. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

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

Under Title IV, Office of Inspector General:

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

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

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

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction. Language is also included under General Investigations directing the Secretary of the Army to use $600,000 of the funds appropriated in Public Law 102–377 for the feasibility phase of the Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas, study and directing the Secretary of the Army to use $470,000 of the funds appropriated in the bill to initiate the feasibility phase of the Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky, project.

Language is included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Language is also included under Construction, General, providing that $10,000,000 of the funds provided for the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program is available only for work in Lackawanna, Lycoming, Susquehanna, Wyoming, Pike,

and Monroe Counties. Language is also included under Construction, General, directing the Secretary of the Army to proceed with design and construction of the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana, project. Language is included under Construction, General, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to combine three projects into a single project. Under Construction, General, language is included directing the Secretary of the Army to incorporate the economic analyses for the Green Ridge and Plot sections of the Lackawanna River, Scranton, project with the Albright Street section of the project and to cost share all elements as a single project. Under Construction, General, language is included earmarking funds for the Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, project.

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

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

Also under Operation and Maintenance, General, language is included providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities and permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Language is included under Operation and Maintenance, General, directing the Secretary of the Army to use previously appropriated funds to reimburse the local sponsor of the Fort Myers Beach project for dredging performed by the local sponsor.

Under the Regulatory Program, language is included regarding the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands of the United States.

Under General Expenses, language is included relating to the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Engineering Strategic Studies Center, the Water Resources Support Center, and the USACE Finance Center. Language is also included under General Expenses prohibiting the use of other Title I funds for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Division Offices. Language is also included under General Expenses permitting the use of funds to implement a plan to reduce the number of division offices.

Language is included under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program providing that increased funds in fiscal year 1998 are only available for those sites which have a technical plan, schedule, and life-cycle cost estimate for the work to be performed; the remedy selected for cleanup meets reasonably anticipated future land and ground water uses; the remedy selected reduces, where practicable, the amount of materials to be treated or disposed; and the cleanup plan has been presented to the affected communities and other regulators, and has not received substantial disagreement.

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

Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds are available for fulfilling Federal responsibilities to Native Americans and for grants to and cooperative agreements with state and local governments and Indian tribes. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund. Language is included under Water and Related Resources which permits funds transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund of the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i). Language is included under Water and Related Resources which provides that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure. Language is provided under Water and Related Resources providing the cost of safety of dams work at Coolidge Dam, Arizona, is in addition to the amount authorized for safety of dams work in 43 U.S.C 506. Language is included under Water and Related Resources transferring to and merging with Water and Related Resources the unexpended balances in Bureau of Reclamation accounts for Construction Program, General Investigations, and Operation and Maintenance.

For the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account, language is included providing that funds may be derived form the Reclamation Fund.

Under the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account, language is included providing that funds may be transferred to other participating Federal agencies. Language is included under the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account providing that funds may be obligated only as non-Federal sources provide their share in accordance with section 102(d) of the California Bay-Delta Environmental Enhancement and Water Security Act. Language is provided under the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration account providing that funds may be obligated prior to completion of a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement only if consistent with 40 C.F.R. 1506.1(c) and used for purposes that the Secretary of the Interior finds are of sufficiently high priority to warrant such expenditure.

Under Policy and Administration, language is included making the funds available until expended. Language is included under Policy and Administration providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund. Language is included under Policy and Administration referring to the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation. Language is included under Policy and Administration prohibiting the use of other appropriations for policy and administration functions.

Under Administrative Provisions language is included providing for the purchase of motor vehicles.

Language is included under the Science account providing that $35,000,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances originally available for Superconducting Super Collider temination activities.

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

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

Language is included under the Bonneville Power Administration account precluding any new direct loan obligations, and approving expenditures for anadromous fish supplementation facilities in the Yakima River Basin, Methow River Basin, and Upper Snake River Basin, for the Billy Shaw Reservoir resident fish substitution project, and for the resident trout fish culture facility in Southeast Idaho, and prohibiting any new direct loan obligations.

Language is included under the Southeastern Power Administration to permit Southeastern to utilize reimbursements for transmission wheeling and ancillary services, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302.

Language is included under the Southwestern Power Administration to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

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

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

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that management and operating contracts must be awarded using competitive procedures.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, requiring 60 days notice to the Committees on Appropriations if the Secretary of Energy awards, amends, or modifies a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, requiring that all contracts for support services be supported by OMB Circular A–76 studies showing that the contract costs are lower than the cost of performing such services by Department of Energy personnel.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting payments to a management and operating contractor to provide products or services for use by Department of Energy personnel.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare workforce restructuring plans or to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Department of Energy employees under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to augment the funding provided for section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to provide an independent assessment of the Department of Energy's new construction projects before funds can be obligated in fiscal year 1998.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for programs which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress.

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing the unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be transferred and merged with new appropriation accounts established in this Act.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language is included under Appalachian Regional Commission waiving Section 405 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

Language is included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allowing transfer of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities. Language is included to exclude the costs of NRC reviews and assistance to the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies from license fee revenues. Language is also included to permit the NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under the Office of Inspector General to permit transfer of funds to other agencies for performance of work, and to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under Tennessee Valley Authority providing for the funding of nonpower activities with internally generated savings and revenues, notwithstanding sections 11, 14, 15, 29, or other provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:
- Construction, General
- Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program

Department of Energy:
- Energy Supply
- Non-Defense Environmental Management
- Science
- Departmental Administration
- Office of Inspector General
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund
- Weapons Activities
- Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
- Other Defense Activities
- Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal
- Power Marketing Administrations

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Appalachian Regional Commission
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspector General

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

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3 (RAMSEYER)

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

The accompanying bill would amend Section 114 of Public Law 101–101, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1990, as follows:

Sec. 114. Notwithstanding section 601(b) of Public Law 99–662, the project for flood damage prevention, along the Rillito River, Pima County, Arizona, is authorized for construction in accordance with the plans described in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 22, 1988, at a [total cost of $19,600,000] *total cost of $40,000,000* with an estimated first Federal cost of $14,600,000.

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

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1997 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1998 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1997 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1998 (6)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	153,872,000	150,000,000	157,260,000	+3,388,000	+7,260,000
Construction, general	1,081,942,000	1,062,470,000	1,475,892,000	+393,950,000	+413,422,000
(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	285,450,000	-24,924,000	+19,450,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18)	20,000,000	.....	.....	-20,000,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, general	1,697,015,000	1,618,000,000	1,726,955,000	+29,940,000	+108,955,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-208)	19,000,000	.....	.....	-19,000,000	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18)	150,000,000	.....	.....	-150,000,000	.....
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	112,000,000	+11,000,000	.....
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	+4,000,000	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-18)	415,000,000	.....	.....	-415,000,000	.....
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	.....	.....	110,000,000	+110,000,000	+110,000,000
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	4,029,557,000	-77,646,000	+659,087,000
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	(-1,000,000)	.....

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	.....	.....
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 (P.L. 105-18)	7,355,000	.....	.....	-7,355,000	.....
Water and related resources	.....	651,552,000	651,931,000	+651,931,000	+379,000
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	143,300,000	120,000,000	+120,000,000	-23,300,000
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	47,658,000	+1,658,000	.....
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-3,774,000)	.....	.....	(+3,774,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	38,096,000	39,130,000	39,130,000	+1,034,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	782,748,000	892,065,000	869,144,000	+86,396,000	-22,921,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	826,375,000	933,218,000	910,297,000	+83,922,000	-22,921,000
(By transfer)	(-3,774,000)	.....	.....	(+3,774,000)	.....

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

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1997 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1998 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1997 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1998 (6)
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	2,699,728,000	2,999,497,000	880,730,000	-1,818,998,000	-2,118,767,000
Energy assets acquisition	.....	43,582,000	.....	.....	-43,582,000
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	.....
Non-defense environmental management	.....	.....	497,619,000	+497,619,000	+497,619,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	200,200,000	248,788,000	220,200,000	+20,000,000	-28,588,000
Science	996,000,000	875,910,000	2,207,632,000	+1,211,632,000	+1,331,722,000
Science assets acquisition	.....	110,250,000	.....	.....	-110,250,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	182,000,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	-22,000,000	-30,000,000
Departmental administration	215,021,000	232,604,000	214,723,000	-298,000	-17,881,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-125,388,000	-131,330,000	-131,330,000	-5,942,000	.....
Net appropriation	89,633,000	101,274,000	83,393,000	-6,240,000	-17,881,000
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)	(5,263,270,000)	(-356,034,000)	(-795,229,000)
Non-defense function	(791,911,000)	(933,472,000)	(717,819,000)	(-74,092,000)	(-215,653,000)
Total	(6,411,215,000)	(6,991,971,000)	(5,981,089,000)	(-430,126,000)	(-1,010,882,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities	3,911,198,000	3,576,255,000	3,943,442,000	+32,244,000	+367,187,000
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	5,459,304,000	5,052,499,000	5,263,270,000	-196,034,000	+210,771,000
Defense environmental management privatization	160,000,000	1,006,000,000	.....	-160,000,000	-1,006,000,000
Other defense activities	1,605,733,000	1,605,981,000	1,580,504,000	-25,229,000	-25,477,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	200,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	-10,000,000	.....
Defense assets acquisition	.....	2,166,859,000	.....	.....	-2,166,859,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,336,235,000	13,597,594,000	10,977,216,000	-359,019,000	-2,620,378,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-3,000,000	.....
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	25,210,000	.....	-1,290,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	182,230,000	194,334,000	189,043,000	+6,813,000	-5,291,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(3,774,000)	.....	.....	(-3,774,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	970,000	1,065,000	970,000	.....	-95,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	228,769,000	237,121,000	228,445,000	-324,000	-8,676,000

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

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1997 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1998 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1997 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1998 (6)
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	15,282,735,000	-474,683,000	-3,150,780,000
(By transfer)	(3,774,000)	.....	.....	(-3,774,000)	.....
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	16,000,000	.....	-1,500,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	471,800,000	476,500,000	462,700,000	-9,100,000	-13,800,000
Revenues	-457,300,000	-457,500,000	-446,700,000	+10,600,000	+10,800,000
Subtotal	14,500,000	19,000,000	16,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000
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	16,000,000	+1,500,000	-3,000,000

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,531,000	3,200,000	2,400,000	-131,000	-800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	106,000,000	106,000,000	.....	-106,000,000	-106,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	299,031,000	310,700,000	194,400,000	-104,631,000	-116,300,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	20,990,027,000	23,047,903,000	20,416,989,000	-573,038,000	-2,630,914,000
Appropriations	(20,378,672,000)	(23,047,903,000)	(20,416,989,000)	(+38,317,000)	(-2,630,914,000)
Emergency appropriations	(611,355,000)	.....	.....	(-611,355,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	(-1,000,000)	.....