105TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
105–581

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999

JUNE 16, 1998.—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. 4060]

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, 1999, 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, 1999. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1998, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1999.

	1998	1999 estimate	1999 recommendation	1998 recommendation compared with—	
				1998 appropriation	1999 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,169,599,000	3,222,000,000	3,966,028,000	(−203,571,000)	744,028,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	916,134,000	934,297,000	803,757,000	(112,377,000)	(130,540,000)
Title III—Department of Energy	15,898,574,000	17,070,365,000	16,203,560,000	304,986,000	(866,805,000)
Title IV—Independent Agencies	277,600,000	498,800,000	103,000,000	(174,600,000)	(395,800,000)
Subtotal	21,261,907,000	21,725,462,000	21,076,345,000	(−185,562,000)	(649,117,000)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(529,705,000)	(424,000,000)	(424,000,000)	105,705,000	
Grand total of bill	20,732,202,000	21,301,462,000	20,652,345,000	(−79,857,000)	(649,117,000)

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1999 represents an opportunity to do more with less. Because of deep reductions in available resources for domestic discretionary programs, total spending in the bill is below that of fiscal year 1998. But by reordering the Administration's often misguided priorities, focusing resources on those areas of investment promising the greatest returns, and demanding greater efficiencies from program administrators, the Committee has produced a bill that is balanced, responsible, and protective of the Federal taxpayer.

The Committee has soundly rejected the Administration's attempt to eviscerate the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Administration's antipathy toward water infrastructure is reflected in a budget that decimates the construction program of the Corps. The budget withholds resources from the vital national priorities of flood control, navigation and shoreline protection. At the same time, the budget continues its insidious subversion of the Corps' traditional missions, neglecting cost-effective infrastructure investments in order to expand the Corps' involvement in environmentally related programs.

The Committee strongly believes in protecting and restoring the natural environment, and it acknowledges that the Corps has an important role to play in the restoration of aquatic resources. The Committee's commitment to the environment is, in fact, reflected in the Energy and Water Bill, which increases funding for numerous environmental restoration projects above the budget request.

The Committee, however, does not believe that protection of the environment can be pursued only at the expense of our economy and physical security. By shifting considerable sums of money away from navigation improvements, the Administration suggests that our competitiveness in international markets is a secondary priority. By withdrawing funds from flood protection projects, the Administration makes a similar comment on the safety and well being of the American people.

With its budget for fiscal year 1999, the Administration asserts that there are insufficient resources available to continue ongoing flood protection projects across the country. Congress is told that, because of budgetary constraints, it is necessary to cancel harbor maintenance and shoreline protection projects that are currently in the construction pipeline. At the same time, however, the budget requests $25 million for a brand new, unauthorized spending program, the Challenge 21 Riverine Ecosystem Restoration and Flood Hazard Mitigation program. This demonstrates that the Administration is not so much constrained by budget realities as it is driven by an aversion to water infrastructure and a blindness to its wealth producing benefits for the Nation.

In fiscal year 1996, the Administration requested funding for three Corps of Engineers projects identified as environmental in nature. In fiscal year 1997, that number shot up to thirty-two. In fiscal year 1998, the Administration's request included fifty-two such projects. For fiscal year 1999—*a year for which the Administration proposes to cut the construction budget in half, terminate scores of ongoing projects, and increase the exposure of the citizenry*

to the devastating consequences of flooding—the budget includes eighty-eight environmental restoration projects. In three short years, the number of environmental projects for which the Administration has sought funding has increased by 2,833%.

The Committee rejects the proposition that the principal mission of all Federal agencies should be environmental protection. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency are, for example, aggressive stewards of the environment, unhesitatingly bringing to bear the full force of their regulatory powers in pursuit of their goals. Having already witnessed the unbidden transformation of the Bureau of Reclamation from a dam-building agency to a water resources management and protection agency, the Committee is wary of further efforts to sap the nation of its water infrastructure expertise in order to feed the unrestrained growth of a Federal environmental bureaucracy.

Although funding for the Bureau of Reclamation is reduced from the fiscal year 1998 level, the Committee has provided the funding necessary to maintain, operate and rehabilitate Bureau projects throughout the western United States. The Committee remains deeply committed to protecting the substantial Federal investment in these important national resources.

The Committee observes that, as dam construction and water distribution activity dwindles, the funding requirements for these capital-intensive activities will continue to shrink. The West, in short, has been reclaimed, and serious consideration is due the question of the Bureau's appropriate and abiding role in this fully developed region of our country.

In the oldest tradition of bureaucracy, however, the Bureau has already embraced new missions in a crusade of institutional perpetuation. The Bureau, having proclaimed its new mission to be water resource management and protection, is pursuing with vigor a new range of activities through which it will aspire to demonstrate its indispensability. These activities include partnering, technical assistance, water conservation and management planning, strategic analyses, development of integrated management programs and system integration alternatives, resource inventories, and environmental enhancements. Although the Committee has provided generously for these activities in fiscal year 1999, it intends to intensively scrutinize their value to the taxpaying public.

Management of the Department of Energy continues to be unfocused and inefficient. On almost any issue, all of the right words are said, but implementation seldom lives up to the advance notice. As the Committee has noted previously, the Department of Energy lacks a corporate vision, and exhibits little coordination among the countless activities that substitute for a departmental mission. However, many of these programs are important for the national well being. Accordingly, the Committee has provided adequately for those programs intended to: promote the national defense; cleanup the hazardous and radioactive waste that is the legacy of our nuclear weapons complex; and advance the sciences.

Like last year, the Committee has included statutory provisions to improve the management of the Department of Energy's programs through increased contract competition and standard contract language. Direction has also been provided instructing the

Department to: review the current Headquarters and field organization structure to eliminate overlap, duplication, and inefficiencies; develop a plan to assign responsibility for Department-wide computer security to a single, accountable individual; review overhead rates charged by contractors in an attempt to gain more direct program funding; reduce the number of support service and management and operating (M&O) contractors assigned to Headquarters; and reduce excessive contractor training costs.

In fiscal year 1998, Congress provided final-year funding for stewardship activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, TVA is empowered and directed to fund these activities, including flood control navigation, and management of aquatic vegetation growth along the Tennessee River and tributaries, with internally generated savings and revenues. The Committee is confident that TVA, consistent with its public service responsibilities as a Federal agency, will continue to make the necessary investments in these programs. The Committee observes that assumption of these modest costs by the Federal utility—which is projected to receive $6.5 billion in revenues in fiscal year 1999—would have no measurable effect on the region's ratepayers, who have for generations enjoyed below-market rates for Federally produced power. The Committee further observes that there is economic value to TVA in retaining the Tennessee River system as an integrated system for hydropower production, flood control, navigation, and related purposes, and that this value may well exceed the costs of the so-called non-power activities.

Authorization for projects and agencies funded by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations 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 vital government services.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Administration's fiscal year 1999 budget request for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is breathtaking in its recklessness. In halving the construction program of the Corps, the Administration has submitted the lowest construction budget, in terms of real dollars, in the history of the civil works program. Moreover, this irresponsible budget terminates scores of water infrastructure projects currently in the construction pipeline. It provides nothing more than fragile life support for dozens more. It dictates excessive delays in project completion schedules. It results in alarming cost increases. It squanders untold sums that the American taxpayer has already invested in civil works projects nationwide. Most shocking, it unnecessarily increases the exposure of the American people to the devastating threats of floods, and it weakens our competitiveness in international commerce.

In fact, the Administration knows that Congress cannot, will not, accept these draconian reductions in a program that produces such important and demonstrable economic benefits for the Nation. In relying on Congress to do the right thing and restore funding for civil works, the Administration has proposed these reductions as yet another in an endless series of gimmicks to fund new spending programs and to increase spending on pet initiatives. If one wonders whether the Administration submitted a phony budget for fiscal year 1999, one need look no further than the Energy and Water Bill to discover the answer.

Unlike the Administration, the Committee recognizes that the Nation's water infrastructure needs are not at an all-time low. Furthermore, the Committee appreciates the value that the civil works program has in protecting American life and property and in promoting our international competitiveness. As a consequence, the Committee has produced a balanced and responsible budget for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers—one that bears little resemblance to the Administration's proposal.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1998–	$156,804,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999	150,000,000
Recommended, 1999	162,823,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	+6,019,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	+12,823,000

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				
	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	---	---	500,000	---
	BALDWIN COUNTY, AL	---	---	100,000	---
	BAYOU LABATRE, AL	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	BIRMINGHAM WATERSHEDS, VILLAGE CREEK, AL	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL	500,000	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	100,000	---	100,000	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	300,000	---	300,000	---
	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROV., BREVIG MISSION, AK	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	KENAI RIVER NAVIGATION, AK	100,000	---	---	---
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	110,000	---	---	---
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	---	209,000	---	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	10,000	---	10,000	---
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	---	217,000	---	217,000
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	---	150,000	---	150,000
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	150,000	---	---	---
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY, AK	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	118,000	---	---	---
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	---	60,000	---	---
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	67,000	---	67,000	---
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
	TUTUILA, AMERICAN SAMOA	---	---	100,000	---

	ARIZONA				
	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.-MEXICO BORDER, AZ AND TX	---	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTH SCOTTSDALE, AZ	272,000	---	272,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	407,000	---	407,000	---
	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER WATERSHED, AZ	---	---	100,000	---
	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	460,000	---	613,000	---
(E)	RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, AZ	---	938,000	---	2,000,000
	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	---	---	200,000	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	610,000	---	610,000	---
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	329,000	---	329,000
	ARKANSAS				
	ARKANSAS RIVER, FORT SMITH, AR	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	---	400,000	---	400,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(E)	ALISO CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	100,000	---	250,000	---
	CITIES OF ARCADIA AND SIERRA MADRE, CA	---	---	247,000	---
	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA	---	---	700,000	---
	CLEAR LAKE BASIN WATERSHED RESTORATION, CA	---	---	500,000	---
(E)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	500,000	---	500,000	---
	HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	265,000	---	---	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	---	1,165,000	---	1,165,000
(FDP)	KERN RIVER VALLEY, ISABELLA LAKE, CA	100,000	---	---	---
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, RUSSIAN RIVER, CA	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	520,000	---	520,000	---
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, FAIRFIELD STREAMS AND CORDELIA MARSH, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	250,000	---	---	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE, DIXON AND VICINITY, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	744,000	---	439,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	142,000	---	142,000	---
	NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA	---	---	350,000	---
	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	---	---	500,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	---	300,000	---	300,000
,	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	433,000	---	325,000
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	30,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	333,000	---	333,000	---
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	---	---	300,000
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	285,000	---	285,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	555,000	---	555,000	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	3,500,000	---	5,500,000	---
	SACRAMENTO WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	---	---	500,000	---
	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(BE)	SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	460,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	265,000	---	265,000	---
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	18,000	---	18,000	---
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	103,000	---	103,000	100,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	40,000	---	40,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	535,000	---	535,000	---
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	100,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.	129,000	---	129,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	400,000	---	800,000	---
	SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES CNTY WATER CONSERVATION & SUPPLY	---	---	717,000	---
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AQUATIC RESOURCES, CA	---	---	600,000	---
	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	---	---	100,000	---
	SUTTER BASIN, CA	---	---	100,000	---

(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	400,000	---	---	---
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	150,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	575,000	---	575,000
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	310,000	---	310,000	---
	COLORADO				
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	158,000	---	158,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	250,000	---	---	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEPE	---	600,000	---	600,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	51,000	---	51,000	519,000
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	150,000	---	150,000	250,000
	FLORIDA				
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	---	242,000	---	242,000
	DADE COUNTY WATER REUSE, FL	---	---	277,000	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	270,000	---	270,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	262,000	---	262,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	---	270,000	---	270,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	600,000	---	600,000
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	---	297,000	---	297,000
	LIDO KEY BEACH, FL	---	---	268,000	---
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	---	86,000	---	86,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	---	370,000	---	370,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	262,000	---	262,000
	ST JOHNS RIVER, FL	---	---	---	223,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	---	205,000	---	205,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA CHANNEL, FL	---	---	---	200,000
	GEORGIA				
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	CHATHAM COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL, GA	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	CITY OF SAVANNAH FLOOD CONTROL, GA	125,000	---	125,000	---
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, 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
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	550,000	---	550,000	---
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA & SC	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	250,000	---	250,000
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	300,000	---	300,000	---
	HAWAII				
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	136,000	---	136,000	---
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	318,000	---	318,000	---
(FC)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	---	40,000	---	40,000
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	178,000	---	178,000	---
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	300,000	---	300,000
(RCP)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	479,000	---	479,000	---
	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION (INTERIM IV), IL	---	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	940,000	---	940,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL	195,000	---	195,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	325,000	---	325,000
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	377,000	---	377,000	---
	ROCK RIVER DRAINAGE BASIN, IL	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	1,331,000	---	1,331,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	5,700,000	---	5,700,000	---
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	73,000	---	73,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MADISON COUNTY	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	100,000	---	100,000	---
	INDIANA				
	BEAUTY CREEK WATERSHED, VALPARAISO, IN	---	---	100,000	---
	DEEP RIVER BASIN, IN	---	---	100,000	---
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN	---	---	---	100,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CADY MARSH DITCH, IN	---	---	---	200,000
(FC)	MIDDLE WABASH, GREENFIELD BAYOU ENVIRON RESTORATION, I	---	200,000	---	200,000
(E)	TIPPECANOE RIVER, IN	200,000	---	---	---
	WOLF AND GEORGE LAKES, IN	---	---	100,000	---

	IOWA				
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	218,000	---	218,000	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	400,000	---	400,000
	KENTUCKY				
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, KY	318,000	---	318,000	---
	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	255,000	---	255,000	---
	GREENUP, KY	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER TRIBUTARIES, FRANKFORT, KY	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	228,000	---	228,000	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, FALMOUTH, KY	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	---	356,000	---	356,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	295,000	---	295,000	---
	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	---	---	155,000	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	10,150,000	---	10,150,000	---
(FDP)	OLIVE HILL, KY	218,000	---	218,000	---
(FDP)	PANTHER CREEK, KY	150,000	---	150,000	---
	RUSSELL, KY	---	---	100,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER, DARLINGTON RESERVOIR, LA	400,000	---	400,000	---
	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	---	100,000	---	1,100,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	395,000	---	395,000
	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	---	---	---	1,800,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	428,000	---	428,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	550,000	---	550,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	415,000	---	415,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	574,000	---	574,000	---
	PORT FOURCHON, LA	---	---	---	50,000
(FDP)	WALLACE LAKE AREA, LA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	388,000	---	388,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, NORTHWEST BRANCH, MD & DC	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC	231,000	---	231,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA.....	---	207,000	---	207,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD.....	35,000	---	35,000	---
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD.....	---	50,000	---	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD.....	199,000	---	199,000	---
(E)	HAVRE DE GRACE, MD.....	110,000	---	---	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, WICOMICO AND ST MARY'	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER, GEORGES CREEK, MD.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MD.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.....	360,000	---	360,000	---
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	393,000	---	393,000	---
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA.....	100,000	---	---	---
	MICHIGAN				
	PAW PAW RIVER, MI.....	---	---	100,000	---
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI.....	---	---	---	500,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN.....	---	255,000	---	255,000
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN.....	---	945,000	---	945,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
(E)	BAYOU PIERRE, MS.....	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, BAYOU CASOTTE EXTENSION, MS.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS.....	---	400,000	---	100,000
	MISSOURI				
(FDP)	BALLWIN, ST LOUIS COUNTY, MO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	457,000	---	457,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO.....	61,000	---	61,000	---
(FC)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO.....	---	153,000	---	---
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO & KS.....	245,000	---	245,000	---
(FC)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	64,000	---	---

(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	30,000	---	30,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	311,000	---	311,000	---
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	314,000	---	314,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	196,000	---	196,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	74,000	---	74,000
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	160,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	310,000	---	310,000	---
	NEVADA				
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	230,000	---	230,000	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	500,000	---	500,000
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	150,000	---	150,000	---
	NEW JERSEY				
	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, PERTH AMBOY, NJ	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	400,000	---	400,000	---
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	322,000	---
	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	313,000
	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	300,000	---
	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	---	---	---	100,000
	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	---	400,000
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY TO SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	425,000	---	900,000	200,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	382,000	---	382,000	---
	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	---	---	---	500,000
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	100,000	---	100,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(E)	RIO GRANDE WATER MANAGEMENT, NM, CO & TX	210,000	---	---	---
(E)	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	210,000	---	---	---
	NEW YORK				
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	92,000	---	92,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	845,000	---	1,518,000
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	BRONX RIVER, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY & PA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	100,000	---	---	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	7,902,000	---	7,902,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	125,000	---	125,000	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	210,000	---	210,000	---
	ONEIDA LAKE, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	125,000	---	125,000	---
	OTSEGO LAKE, NY	---	---	350,000	---
	SAW MILL RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	320,000	---	320,000	---
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	351,000	---	351,000	---
(E)	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY.	300,000	---	500,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	658,000	---	658,000
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	342,000	---	342,000	---
	LOCKWOODS FOLLY INLET, NC	---	---	200,000	---
	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, EASTERN BAND CHEROKEE NATIO	300,000	---	300,000	---
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC.	305,000	---	305,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	300,000	---	300,000	---
	OHIO				
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	100,000	---	---	---
(E)	GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OXBOW AREA, OH	250,000	---	---	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH.	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	223,000	---	223,000	---

	OKLAHOMA				
(FDP)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM & CO.....	100,000	---	---	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	335,000	---	335,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	---	300,000	---	300,000
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR.....	275,000	---	275,000	---
(E)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR & WA...	100,000	---	---	---
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR...	168,000	---	168,000	---
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA.....	240,000	---	240,000	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR.....	440,000	---	440,000	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR.....	278,000	---	278,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR.....	---	29,000	---	1,374,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
	BEAVER RIVER, PA.....	---	---	---	444,000
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
	BUCK AND BROCK CREEKS, PA.....	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	---	227,000	---	227,000
(E)	LOWER WEST BR, SUS RIVER, ENV RESTORATION, BUFFALO CRE	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, LYCOMING CREEK, P	200,000	---	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, BRUSH CREEK ENV RESTORATION, PA...	150,000	---	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, LYONS RUN ENV RESTORATION, PA.....	150,000	---	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	150,000	---	150,000	---
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE, PA.....	148,000	---	148,000	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR.....	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR.....	---	306,000	---	306,000
	RHODE ISLAND				
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & SRTM DMG REDU	350,000	---	---	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC.....	175,000	---	---	---
(SP)	PAWLEY'S ISLAND, SC.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(E)	YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC.....	150,000	---	150,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	---	380,000	---	380,000
	TENNESSEE				
	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	---	---	100,000	---
	DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	300,000	---	---	---
	FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	---	250,000	---	250,000
	NOLICHUCKY WATERSHED, TN	---	---	200,000	---
(E)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	250,000	---	250,000	---
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	280,000	---	280,000	---
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	1,330,000	---	1,330,000
(FC)	FORT WORTH SUMPS 14 AND 15, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN,	---	490,000	---	490,000
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	935,000	---	935,000	---
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	---	64,000	---	64,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	500,000	---	500,000
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	1,050,000	---	1,050,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	180,000	---	180,000	---
	ONION CREEK, TX	---	---	100,000	---
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	---	350,000	---	350,000
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	400,000	---	400,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	600,000	---	600,000
	SULPHUR RIVER, TX	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---

(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	150,000	---	150,000	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	---	130,000	---	130,000
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	425,000	---	425,000	---
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA	---	---	150,000	---
(SPE)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	JAMES RIVER, VA	190,000	---	190,000	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	POQUOSON, VA	100,000	---	100,000	---
	PULASKI, VA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	200,000	---	200,000	---
	WASHINGTON				
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	---	176,000	---	176,000
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	49,000	---	49,000	---
	COLUMBIA RIVER, TRI-CITIES AREA, WA	---	---	100,000	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	428,000	---	428,000	---
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	600,000	---	600,000
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	665,000	---	665,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	678,000	---	678,000	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	156,000	---	156,000	---
	TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	---	---	550,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(E)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, BEAVER CREEK ENVIRON RESTORATION, W	215,000	---	215,000	---
(E)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, SOVERN RUN ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV	137,000	---	137,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	800,000	---	800,000	---
	MORGANTOWN, WV	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	69,000	---	69,000	---
(E)	TYGART THREE-WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FORDS RU	100,000	---	100,000	---
(E)	TYGART THREE-WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MAPLE RU	287,000	---	287,000	---

	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	202,000	---	202,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,500,000	---	1,300,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	500,000	---	400,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,400,000	---	9,000,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	600,000	---	500,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	1,900,000	---	340,000	---
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	8,400,000	---	8,000,000	---
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	5,300,000	---	5,300,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	450,000	---	400,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	400,000	---	400,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	30,000,000	---	27,000,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100,000	---	100,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	900,000	---	900,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	850,000	---	800,000	---
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	650,000	---	650,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-25,777,000	---	-27,240,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	123,151,000	26,849,000	126,944,000	35,879,000

Baldwin County, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to investigate flood damage reduction and environmental restoration in the watersheds in Baldwin County.

Bayou LaBatre, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to evaluate an alternative, more efficient navigation route from the mouth of the bayou to the Gulf of Mexico.

Coastal Studies for Navigation Improvements, Brevig Mission, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study on the development of a small boat harbor at Brevig Mission, Alaska.

Tutuila, American Samoa.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of alternative locations for the development of a harbor at Tutuila, American Samoa. –

Colonias Along U.S.-Mexico Border, Arizona and Texas.—The recommendation includes $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide planning and design assistance for water infrastructure improvements in Cochise County, Arizona, Old Nogales Highway Colonia, Pima County, Arizona, and the City of San Luis in Yuma County, Arizona.

Little Colorado River Watershed, Arizona.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Little Colorado River Watershed in northern Arizona.

Rillito River, Pima County, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility phase of a project to address the environmentally degraded, flood-prone area between Craycroft Road and Country Club Road on the Rillito River in Pima County, Arizona.

Santa Cruz River (Paseo de Las Iglesias), Arizona.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility phase of a project to address the environmentally degraded, flood-prone area upstream of the City of Tucson downtown area on the Santa Cruz River, in Pima County, Arizona.

Arkansas River, Fort Smith, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flooding in unprotected areas outside of the existing flood control levee at Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas.—The Committee has included language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to continue 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.

Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration, California.—The recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete technical study and design efforts for restoration of the Clear Lake Basin Watershed under Section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Huntington Beach, Blufftop Park, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the feasibility study of protecting the shoreline and bluff from further erosion damages.

Newport Bay (LA–3 Site Designation Study), California.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to coordinate report preparation and field studies with the Environmental Protection Agency to complete the designation process at Newport Bay, California.

Newport Bay/San Diego Creek Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a feasibility study of environmental preservation, restoration and related purposes in the San Diego Creek Watershed, north of Newport Bay, California.

Rancho Palos Verdes, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Rancho Palos Verdes, California, project.

Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, California.—The recommendation includes $5,500,000, an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request, for this critical effort. The additional resources will be used to continue the feasibility studies on an optimum schedule and advance completion by twelve months.

Sacramento Watershed Management Plan, California.—The recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide planning, technical and design assistance, as authorized under Section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act, for such priority tasks as are identified by the City of Sacramento, the non-Federal sponsor of the project.

San Bernardino County, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to investigate flood damage prevention and related opportunities along the Wilson Creek and in the Lytle Creek Confluence Area in California.

San Pablo Bay Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to provide the San Pablo Baylands Partnership, the non-Federal sponsor of the project, with technical assistance, as authorized under section 503 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, on the development of a sustainable and environmentally beneficial levee maintenance and restoration program.

Santa Margarita River and Tributaries, California.—The recommendation includes $800,000 to accelerate completion of the feasibility study that will address flood control, environmental enhancement, and recreation for Murrieta Creek.

Seismic Reliability Studies, California.—The Committee has provided funding to bring to a conclusion demonstration studies on the seismic reliability of public infrastructure in Southern California. Follow-on funding has been provided for the Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre, California, project; the City of Huntington Beach, California, project; and the Southeast Los Angeles County Water Conservation and Supply, California, project. The Committee recognizes that other communities throughout the region, such as Newport Beach, can benefit from the information collected and knowledge derived as a result of these studies. Accordingly, the Corps is

directed to widely disseminate such information as is useful and to assist in the development of broadly applicable seismic reliability standards for the benefit of communities subject to seismic risk.

Southern California Aquatic Resources, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the special area management plan of aquatic and riparian resources in Orange County, California.

Strong and Chicken Ranch Sloughs, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance report on flooding problems along the Strong and Chicken Ranch Sloughs in California.

Sutter Basin, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of levee improvement measures for existing levee systems and additional areas of flood protection for the Sutter Basin in California.

Upper Santa Ana River Watershed, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Upper Santa Ana River Watershed, California.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $119,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Villas and Vicinity portion, $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Roosevelt/Lewes Beach portion, $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Broadkill Beach portion, and $200,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Port Mahon portion of the project.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to advance completion of preconstruction engineering and design for the Rehoboth Beach/Dewey Beach portion and $100,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach portion of the project.

Dade County Water Reuse, Florida.—The Committee has provided $277,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue hydraulic, hydrology and economic studies of the Dade County Water Reuse, Florida, project.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida.—In designing navigational improvements to the St. Johns River Channel, the Secretary of the Army shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the channel improvements which would be needed for accommodating a nuclear aircraft carrier at the Mayport Naval facility.

Lido Key Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $268,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study of the Lido Key Beach, Florida, project.

St. Johns River, Florida.—The Committee has provided $223,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop and calibrate the Phase III water quality model for the St. Johns River.

Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Tampa Harbor, Alafia Channel, Florida, project.

Illinois Shoreline Erosion (Interim IV), Illinois.—The Committee has provided $140,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the

wave flume model test, revise the feasibility report, and complete review requirements associated with the Illinois Shoreline Erosion, Illinois, project.

Rock River Drainage Basin, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study on environmental restoration opportunities in the Rock River Drainage Basin, Illinois.

Beauty Creek Watershed, Valparaiso, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study on flooding and ecosystem restoration opportunities in the Beauty Creek Watershed in Indiana.

Deep River Basin, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study for watershed management, flood damage prevention, ecosystem restoration, and the safety of Lake George Dam.

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

Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the general design memorandum and initiate plans and specifications for the Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana, project.

Wolf and George Lakes, Hammond, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of alternatives for restoring the environmental quality of Wolf and George Lakes in Indiana.

Greenup, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flood damage reduction alternatives for Greenup, Kentucky.

Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $155,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility phase of the Metropolitan Louisville, Southwest, Kentucky, project.

Russell, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flood damage reduction alternatives for Russell, Kentucky.

Calcasieu Lock, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance study of the Calcasieu Lock, a feature of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

Comite River, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $1,100,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request, to complete plans and specifications and finalize preparations for construction of the Comite River, Louisiana, project.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $1,800,000 above the request to complete preliminary engineering and design and prepare for construction of the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock Replacement project in Louisiana. Although the Committee has been compelled to defer the initiation of new construction starts due to budget constraints, it

is aware of the dire need to begin this project, and, in doing so, to provide funding for the community impact mitigation plan.

Port Fourchon, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $50,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design activities associated with the Port Fourchon, Louisiana, project.

Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin preparation of the General Design Memorandum.

Arthur Kill Channel, Howland Hook Marine Terminal, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee has included an additional $673,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the first set of plans and specifications for the 41–foot project and continue the evaluation of the 45–foot deep project.

Arthur Kill Channel, Perth Amboy, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of extending the channel to Perth Amboy from the Howland Hook Marine Terminal.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $322,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility phase of this project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $113,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Absecon Island element and $200,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Brigantine Island element of the project.

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study for this project.

Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design.

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

Raritan Bay to Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $275,000 to continue the feasibility study of the Cliffwood Beach element, $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study of the Highlands element, $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study of the Keyport element, $325,000 to continue the feasibility study of the Union Beach element, $100,000 to continue the feasibility study of the Leonardo element, and $200,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Port Monmouth element of the project.

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Bronx River, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance report for flood control, environmental restoration and related purposes.

Oneida Lake, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnais-

sance study on the removal of silt and aquatic growth at Oneida Lake.

Otsego Lake, New York.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a feasibility study for the environmental restoration of Otsego Lake.

Saw Mill River Basin, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of the Saw Mill River in Westchester County.

Lockwoods Folly Inlet, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the Lockwoods Folly Inlet, North Carolina, project.

Neuse River Basin, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of basin-wide flood damage reduction alternatives, ecosystem restoration, and related purposes in the Neuse River Basin, North Carolina.

Beaver River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $444,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Beaver River, Pennsylvania, project.

Buck and Brock Creeks, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flood damage reduction alternatives for Buck and Brock Creeks in Pennsylvania.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee River, Tennessee.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study on the Federal interest in rehabilitation or replacement of Chickamauga Lock for navigation on the Tennessee River.

Davidson County, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flood damage reduction alternatives for Davidson County, Tennessee.

French Broad Watershed, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of ecosystem restoration alternatives for the French Broad Watershed in Tennessee.

Nolichucky Watershed, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the Nolichucky Watershed, Tennessee, project.

Onion Creek, Texas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study for flood damage prevention and ecosystem restoration along Onion Creek in Texas.

Sulphur River, Texas.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study that will identify potential measures for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration along the Sulphur River in Texas.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a feasibility study for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia, project.

Pulaski, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study

of flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration alternatives for Pulaski, Virginia.

Tri-Cities Area Rivershore Enhancement, Washington.—The Committee has provided $550,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate studies of modifications to the existing levee system for improved shoreline habitat in the Tri-Cities area of Washington.

Other Coordination Programs.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000, a reduction of $400,000 from the budget request, for Other Coordination Programs. Within this amount, $300,000 is provided for Interagency and International Support. These funds will permit the Corps of Engineers to continue its participation with other Federal agencies and international organizations in addressing domestic and international issues related to water resources, infrastructure planning and development, and environmental protection and restoration. The Committee has also fully funded the budget request of $250,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Program in order for the Corps to continue its important role in Chesapeake Bay coordination activities.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee has provided $5,300,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the Section 22 program. Within the amount provided, $300,000 is for the preparation of a county-wide flood hazard mitigation plan for Lycoming County, Pennsylvania. $150,000 is provided to initiate and complete a special study leading to a Master Plan for the Cherokee Reservation in North Carolina.

Research and Development.—Within the $27,000,000 provided for Research and Development, $1,500,000 is dedicated to the Zebra Mussel Research Program. These funds will be used by the Corps to continue development of control strategies for navigation structures, hydropower and other utilities, vessels and dredges, and other water control structures. Within available funds the Committee urges the Corps to further implement the Environmental Modeling, Simulation, and Assessment Center at the Waterways Experiment Station.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1998	$1,473,373,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	784,000,000
Recommended, 1999	1,456,529,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−16,844,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	+672,529,000

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	15,102,000	500,000	500,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	37,000,000	1,000,000	---
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB).....	28,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	ALASKA			
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK.....	10,959,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ.....	16,000,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
	ARKANSAS			
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)..	28,700,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	632,500,000	550,000	550,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	242,000,000	19,000,000	44,000,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR.....	---	---	2,500,000
	RED RIVER WTRWY, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, AR,LA,OK,TX	---	---	1,400,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	47,600,000	1,000,000	20,000,000
	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (COMMON ELEMENTS) (NATOMAS)..	---	---	10,100,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA.....	43,800,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.....	43,300,000	100,000	100,000
	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	---	---	370,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	78,500,000	4,000,000	8,000,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	12,300,000	3,600,000	9,200,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	180,000,000	11,000,000	90,000,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA.....	116,200,000	12,000,000	63,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	3,910,000	952,000	952,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	29,400,000	746,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	91,800,000	500,000	900,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	13,250,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA.....	---	---	4,400,000
	PORT OF LONG BEACH, CA.....	---	---	8,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	179,900,000	7,080,000	10,080,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	700,000	2,000,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	13,150,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	885,900,000	20,035,000	53,000,000
	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	---	---	3,026,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA.....	22,100,000	2,700,000	4,800,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	4,900,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA.....	16,300,000	2,500,000	13,000,000
	CONNECTICUT			
	FAULKNER ISLAND, CT.....	---	---	2,600,000
	DELAWARE			
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.....	12,100,000	233,000	233,000
	FLORIDA			
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	1,700,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL.....	6,600,000	640,000	640,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	1,444,100,000	40,800,000	20,969,000
	DADE COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	6,200,000
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000,000	20,000,000	3,000,000
	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	200,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	35,600,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL.....	247,400,000	27,300,000	3,500,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	300,000
	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL.....	---	---	25,300,000
	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL.....	---	---	2,600,000
	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL.....	---	---	6,500,000
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	5,679,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY, FL.....	---	---	250,000
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB).....	28,300,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB).....	20,800,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	599,085,000	1,685,000	1,685,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB).....	69,700,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
	TYBEE ISLAND, GA.....	---	---	1,200,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR).....	14,381,000	270,000	270,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	9,920,000	230,000	230,000
	ILLINOIS			
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	22,270,000	700,000	700,000
	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	---	---	500,000
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	144,000,000	5,050,000	10,050,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	28,460,000	500,000	500,000
	EAST ST LOUIS & VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL), IL.	---	---	375,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 1, MISS RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	24,990,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 2, MISS RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	38,370,000	2,400,000	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	22,384,000	4,900,000	8,500,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL.....	21,900,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL.....	491,000,000	900,000	4,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

	TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	739,562,000	1,330,000	1,330,000
		O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	---	---	1,000,000
	(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	1,020,000,000	54,500,000	54,500,000
	(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	242,862,000	18,355,000	19,000,000
		INDIANA			
	(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	37,239,000	6,900,000	7,500,000
		INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	700,000
		INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	4,000,000
	(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	119,000,000	4,000,000	7,950,000
		OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	---	1,700,000
	(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,200,000	3,600,000	---
		WABASH RIVER, NEW HARMONY, IN	---	---	2,000,000
		IOWA			
	(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	21,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
	(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	79,100,000	1,391,000	8,000,000
	(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	136,769,000	824,000	850,000
	(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,760,000	290,000	290,000
	(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	42,186,000	1,367,000	1,367,000
		KANSAS			
	(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	26,200,000	300,000	300,000
	(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	6,100,000	2,330,000	2,330,000
		KENTUCKY			
	(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	157,599,000	300,000	2,100,000
	(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	13,700,000	900,000	900,000
		KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, KY	---	---	11,500,000
	(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN	268,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000
	(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	12,083,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
		SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	---	4,000,000
		LOUISIANA			
	(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	7,078,000	320,000	320,000
	(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	508,000,000	5,676,000	10,000,000
		LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA	---	---	3,000,000
	(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,000,000	280,000	1,750,000
	(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	622,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	169,000,000	500,000	500,000
	(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,886,847,000	5,392,000	6,392,000
	(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	330,000,000	16,278,000	85,200,000
	(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	183,000,000	3,936,000	6,894,000
8700		MARYLAND			
8800	(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	12,000,000	36,000	2,872,000
8900	(BE)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	16,900,000	4,000,000	---
9000	(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	270,300,000	100,000	100,000
9100	(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	23,000	543,000
9110		CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND			
9120		PROTECTION PROGRAM, MD, VA, PA	---	---	1,000,000
9200	(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000,000	157,000	9,500,000
9300		MASSACHUSETTS			
9400	(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	19,500,000	40,000	8,000,000
9500	(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	18,400,000	5,443,000	5,443,000
9600	(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	8,000,000	2,680,000	2,680,000
9700	(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	30,000,000	20,000	20,000
9800		MINNESOTA			
9900	(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	12,400,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
10000	(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,350,000	40,000	40,000
10100	(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	9,610,000	1,487,000	1,487,000
10110		ST CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN	---	---	2,400,000
10150		MISSISSIPPI			
10160		JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	---	7,000,000
10170		PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	---	---	12,000,000
10200		MISSOURI			
10300	(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	196,000,000	9,600,000	15,300,000
10400	(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	35,187,000	400,000	2,200,000
10500	(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	17,926,000	1,980,000	4,400,000
10600	(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	272,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
10700	(FC)	ST GENEVIEVE, MO	33,858,000	4,617,000	6,617,000
10800	(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
10900		NEBRASKA			
11000	(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	125,000	125,000
11100	(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	9,969,000	69,000	69,000
11200		NEVADA			
11300	(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	178,500,000	12,295,000	20,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NEW JERSEY			
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	83,800,000	60,000	60,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	367,000,000	180,000	180,000
(FC)	HOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	20,600,000	4,170,000	4,170,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	16,975,000	300,000	6,300,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	14,800,000	200,000	1,000,000
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	5,000,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	9,300,000	75,000	3,700,000
	RARITAN BAY TO SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	---	---	150,000
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	---	12,000,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,026,000,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	6,200,000	3,569,000	3,569,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600,000	150,000	3,470,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800,000	510,000	510,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	59,500,000	300,000	300,000
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	92,500,000	300,000	300,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	62,000,000	300,000	4,435,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	329,330,000	200,000	4,108,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	542,000,000	2,400,000	6,400,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	847,000,000	10,000,000	32,000,000
	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	---	---	10,000,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	---	---	2,000,000
	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	---	---	3,000,000
	ORCHARD BEACH, NY	---	---	2,000,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	75,630,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	242,600,000	5,300,000	8,300,000
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	40,030,000	2,000,000	---
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	29,000,000	16,000,000	---
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	37,142,000	274,000	274,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,900,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,700,000	499,000	499,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	28,000,000	400,000	400,000
	OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,400,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,896,000	1,131,000	1,131,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	12,574,000	669,000	669,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,758,000	1,800,000	16,000,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	75,400,000	6,328,000	6,328,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	9,500,000	500,000	500,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	37,100,000	25,000	25,000
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	75,100,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	300,000	300,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,664,000	4,450,000	6,450,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	9,800,000	50,000	14,400,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	51,850,000	100,000	43,551,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000,000	4,500,000	30,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	58,835,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575,000	400,000	1,200,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENT IMPROVEMENT, PA	---	---	45,000,000
	SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	---	1,500,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,300,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	422,617,000	6,082,000	6,082,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	63,300,000	426,000	5,600,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	7,052,000	7,052,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	34,400,000	500,000	3,300,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	---	---	27,000,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	207,791,000	500,000	500,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,635,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	27,800,000	2,200,000	---

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..	---	---	1,000,000
	TENNESSEE RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN.....	---	---	2,000,000
	TEXAS			
	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX.....	---	---	1,600,000
	BRAYS BAYOU, TX.....	---	---	6,000,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	24,430,000	1,860,000	1,560,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	75,323,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX.....	114,800,000	400,000	5,000,000
	GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE, REFUGE, TX.....	---	---	3,500,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	321,641,000	5,220,000	60,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	11,050,000	1,514,000	1,514,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	152,600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	209,820,000	9,450,000	18,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY).....	6,260,000	500,000	3,934,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	---	---	5,500,000
	UTAH			
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT.....	9,660,000	200,000	200,000
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA.....	23,100,000	383,000	4,800,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	137,496,000	420,000	420,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	23,900,000	200,000	200,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.....	---	---	13,000,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT).....	---	---	1,460,000
	WASHINGTON			
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID.....	1,376,217,000	117,000,000	7,758,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	650,000	650,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	94,000,000	900,000	900,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,758,337,000	3,000,000	29,730,000
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB).	20,200,000	1,700,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV.....	285,700,000	1,800,000	9,000,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH.....	363,474,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	SOUTHERN WEST VA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROG, WV	---	---	2,000,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY).....	8,200,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL.....	---	---	750,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	221,600,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
	WISCONSIN			
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI.....	---	---	3,300,000
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI.....	7,590,000	3,199,000	3,199,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM.....	---	2,000,000	2,500,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206).....	---	2,000,000	11,200,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	---	2,600,000	2,000,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204).....	---	200,000	500,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT (SECTION 208).....	---	100,000	300,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM.....	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	---	15,000,000	7,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	---	18,289,000	18,289,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	---	26,500,000	40,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE.....	---	45,000	45,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE.....	---	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111).....	---	100,000	200,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	2,700,000	2,700,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	5,300,000	4,100,000
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA	---	25,000,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	---	-32,388,000	-59,545,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....		784,000,000	1,452,628,000

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of Hurricane Revetments, Phase II, in Arkansas.

Red River Waterway, Index, Arkansas to Denison Dam, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,400,000 to continue design and construction for a bendway weir demonstration project at the U.S. Highway 271 bridge between Oklahoma and Texas.

American River Watershed, California (Natomas).—The Committee has provided $10,100,000 for reimbursement to the sponsor of the American River Watershed, California (Natomas), project.

Norco Bluffs, California.—The bill includes $4,400,000 to complete construction of the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

Port of Long Beach, California.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the deepening project at the Port of Long Beach, California.

Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, California.—The bill includes an additional $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering, design and construction of sites on the lower American River and to complete construction of Reclamation District 108–Colusa Basin Drain.

Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the gradient restoration project, $1,300,000 more than the budget request. The project is an important component of the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District fish protection program that must stay on schedule.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The Committee has provided $53,000,000 to complete the Seven Oaks and Reach Eight elements of the Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, project. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue with construction of the San Timoteo Creek element utilizing previously appropriated funds.

Faulkner Island, Connecticut.—The Committee has provided $2,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of shoreline protection measures.

Broward County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $1,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to execute a Project Cooperation Agreement and initiate reimbursement to the sponsor of the Broward County, Florida, project.

Dade County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $6,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design efforts and ongoing construction work associated with the Dade County, Florida, project.

Indian River County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design for construction at Vero Beach.

Lee County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to complete the General Reevaluation Report (GRR) for Estero and Gasparilla Islands.

Miami Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $25,000,000 to reimburse the Miami-Dade County Seaport Department for the Federal share of dredging work which has been accomplished and an additional $300,000 to initiate a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) to determine the feasibility of further Port deepening.

Palm Valley Bridge, Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,600,000 for the continuation of efforts to replace the existing bridge.

Panama City Beaches, Florida.—The Committee has provided $6,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide reimbursement to the sponsor for the Federal share of construction of the Panama City Beaches, Florida, project.

Pinellas County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $5,679,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the beach renourishment project at Pinellas County, Florida.

St. Johns County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the St. Johns County, Florida, project.

Tybee Island, Georgia.—The Committee has provided $1,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the Tybee Island, Georgia, project.

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

Chicago Shoreline Protection Project.—The Committee notes that Section 101 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorizes the Secretary of the Army to carry out this storm damage reduction and shoreline erosion project. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to proceed immediately with design and construction of the Chicago Shoreline, Illinois, project, with 2003 as the expected completion date of the project. The Committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to use, to the maximum extent possible, work of the non-Federal sponsors to reach the 2003 completion schedule. The Committee considers this project to be a priority and expects the Corps to proceed with construction on an optimum schedule.

Des Plaines Wetlands Demonstration Project, Illinois.—The Committee remains supportive of this project and understands that sufficient funds will be carried forward into fiscal year 1999 to meet project requirements for the coming year.

East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois (Interior Flood Control).—The Committee has provided $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the general reevaluation report on the East St. Louis and Vicinity, Illinois (Interior Flood Control), project.

O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to pay settled contractor claims associated with the O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, project.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to modify the third construction contract to complete the initial placement of beach material and continue the associated monitoring program of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, project.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications for additional construction contracts for the Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, project.

Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,700,000 for the continuation of ongoing construction of the Ohio River Flood Protection, Indiana, project.

Wabash River, New Harmony, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the Wabash River, New Harmony, Indiana, project.

Missouri River Levee System, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to complete plans and specifications for Levee Unit L–385 and $450,000 to continue engineering and design of the Levee Unit L–142 of the Missouri River Levee System.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $11,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, project.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Kentucky and Indiana.—The recommendation includes $6,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the budget request, for the McAlpine Locks and Dam, Kentucky and Indiana, project. The Corps is encouraged to consider the acquisition of replacement miter gates for the lock that will remain in service during construction.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The bill includes $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction of selected environmental infrastructure projects in southern and eastern Kentucky.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee has provided an additional $12,324,000 above the budget request for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection), project. The Corps is directed to use these additional funds to continue construction of parallel protection, fronting protection, flood proofing and other authorized features in Orleans Parish; landside runoff, fronting protection and flood proofing in Jefferson Parish; and floodwall and levee contracts in St. Charles Parish.

Lake Pontchartrain Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Lake Pontchartrain Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana, project.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana, (Hurricane Protection).—The recommendation includes an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design activities and to initiate the A-east levee, third lift, of the Larose to Golden Meadow hurricane protection project.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 above the budget request for continued construction of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project. These additional funds are for the development of recreation sites and boat launch facilities at lock and dams 3, 4, and 5, and pool 3.

Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has determined, pursuant to the requirements of Section 533(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, that additional work to be carried out on the Southeast Louisiana, Louisiana, project with funds in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated in Section 533(c) of said Act is tech-

nically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economic. Therefore, the Committee has provided $69,921,000 above the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue with design and construction of the entire Southeast Louisiana project.

West Bank—Vicinity of New Orleans, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee acknowledges that the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 modifies the ongoing West Bank Hurricane Protection Levee, Louisiana, project (commonly referred to as the Westwego to Harvey Canal, Louisiana, project), to add the East of Harvey Canal, Louisiana, project, and the Lake Cataouatche, Louisiana, project, as a single project for concurrent construction. The Committee has provided an additional $2,958,000 to continue construction of the Westwego to Harvey Canal and East of Harvey Canal components of the project.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to implement the Tylerton project and initiate the design of additional projects recommended for implementation in the programmatic decision document.

St. Croix River, Stillwater, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $2,400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the levee and retaining wall extension of the St. Croix River, Stillwater, Minnesota, project. Funds are also provided for the Corps to initiate design of the secondary floodwall upon demonstration of feasibility.

Jackson County, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Federal portion of the Jackson County, Mississippi, project.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Pascagoula, Mississippi, project.

New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey Channel, New Jersey.—The bill includes an additional $6,000,000 above the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the 41-foot project at Port Jersey Channel.

Passaic River Streambank Restoration, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Joseph J. Minish Waterfront park and Historic Area in New Jersey.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to provide sand for pre-existing projects in Old Bridge Township, Keansburg, and North Middletown.

Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Lower Basin and Stony Brook portions of the Raritan River Basin, Green Brook Sub-Basin, New Jersey, project.

Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York.—The Committee has provided $4,108,000 to complete planning, engineering and design and to award and complete a construction contract for nourishment of Gilgo and Tobay beaches.

Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 above the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York, project, including sand bypass activities in the vicinity of Shinnecock Inlet to preserve access to the Shinnecock commercial fishing dock.

Kill van Kull and Newark Bay Channels, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee has provided an additional $22,000,000 above the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the 45-foot project at the Kill van Kull and Newark Bay Channels in New York and New Jersey.

New York City Watershed, New York.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction activities for individual projects within the New York City Watershed.

New York State Canal System, New York.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction for various repair and rehabilitation projects along the canal system.

Orchard Beach, New York.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction activities.

Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.—Funds provided herein and funds previously appropriated for the Elk Creek Lake, Oregon, project, are available to plan and implement long term management measures at Elk Creek Dam, to maintain the project in an uncompleted state, and to take necessary steps to provide for trap and haul transport around the project.

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $45,000,000 to continue the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program. Among other project purposes, funds are available to address flooding problems associated with combined sewer overflows in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania (East Central Incinerator Site).—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the preparation of plans and specifications for demolition of the east central incinerator.

Charleston Harbor, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $27,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, project.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oakland Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of wetland restoration sites. Appropriated funds are not to be used for construction of the environmental education center.

Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee, project in accordance with the Detailed Project Report completed in 1998.

Beals Creek, Big Spring, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the Beals Creek, Big Spring, Texas, project.

Brays Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000 for the Secretary of the Army to use in the implementation of Section 211(f)(6) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303, 110 Stat. 3683) and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for a portion of the Federal share of the project costs for the Brays Bayou, Texas, project.

GIWW, Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of shoreline protection measures at the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge.

Sims Bayou, Houston, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $8,550,000 above the budget request to continue construction of the Sims Bayou, Houston, Texas, project on the optimum schedule.

Waco Lake, Texas (Dam Safety).—The Committee has provided an additional $3,434,000 to advance the construction schedule for the Waco Lake, Texas, dam safety project.

Wallisville Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided $5,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Wallisville Lake, Texas, project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $13,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction activities associated with the Virginia Beach, Virginia, project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Reimbursement).—The Committee has provided $1,460,000 to reimburse the local sponsor of the Virginia Beach, Virginia, project for the Federal share of fiscal year 1998 beach nourishment costs.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has previously expressed its deep concerns regarding the vast sums of taxpayer dollars pouring into this project with little apparent effect. For all its reliance on technological fixes and fish barging, there is no clear evidence that the salmon recovery efforts in the Pacific Northwest are, or will become, successful. A decision on fish recovery options in the lower Snake River, expected in 1999, may have dramatic impacts on mitigation measures currently being pursued. Accordingly, the Committee has recommended $3,730,000 to continue the John Day drawdown study and $4,028,000 to continue the lower Snake River feasibility study.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big and Sandy River and Upper Cumberland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—The bill includes $1,000,000 to continue land acquisition, relocations, and engineering and design for the Grundy, Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks project. In addition to the amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes: $10,000,000 to continue construction of the Harlan/Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,500,000 to continue construction of the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the project; $5,000,000 to continue construction of the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,900,000 to continue floodproofing and acquisition efforts for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,600,000 to continue floodproofing and acquisition efforts for the Martin County, Kentucky, element; and $730,000 to complete the Detailed Project

Report for the Town of Martin, Floyd County, Kentucky, element of the project.

Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure Program, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to select and initiate at least two additional pilot projects of the Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure Program.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and continue the preparation of detailed project reports for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania, project.

Lafarge Lake, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin.—The Committee has provided $3,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to: undertake necessary safety modifications to the water control structures at Lafarge Lake; remediate identified contamination sites; close wells; complete real estate transfer documents; and pursue other activities associated with transfer of project land to the State of Wisconsin.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorizes the Corps of Engineers to 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 $11,200,000. This amount is $9,200,000 above the budget request and $5,200,000 above the fiscal year 1998 level. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $125,000 for the Cache Creek Gravel Pit Restoration, California, project; $300,000 for the Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration, California, project; $500,000 to continue an aquatic ecosystem restoration project along Henessey Creek, California to assist in the rehabilitation of Suisun Marsh; $500,000 for the Corps' participation in the Pacific Flyway Center project in the Yolo Wetlands for planning, land acquisition and environmental restoration, provided that none of these funds may be used for building construction; $3,740,000 to continue the cleanup of the abandoned Penn Mine site in California; $325,000 for an environmental mitigation project at Santa Anita Creek, California; $120,000 for the Upper Truckee River, Trout Creek and Vicinity, California, project; $500,000 to continue the environmental restoration of Indian River Lagoon in Florida; $1,000,000 for the Koontz Lake, Indiana, project; $200,000 for the restoration of Parker Pond in Gardner, Massachusetts; $60,000 for construction of a biofilter at Albermarle City Lake in North Carolina; $500,000 to continue efforts to restore Nine Mile Run in Pennsylvania; $1,000,000 for environmental restoration efforts in the Lake Wallenpaupack watershed in Pennsylvania, including the continuation of studies, design and construction of projects on Morgan Cove, Mill Brook, and Wallenpaupack Creek in Delran Township; $750,000 for wetlands restoration projects within the Seely Creek Watershed in Bradford County, Pennsylvania; and $750,000 for the Upper Jordan River restoration project in Utah; $148,000 for ecosystem restoration efforts along the Tucannon River at Starbuck, Washington. The balance of funds previously appropriated under the authority of Sec-

tion 1135 of Public Law 99–662 to construct project modifications for improvement of the environment as part of the Anacostia River Flood Control and Navigation project within Prince Georges County, Maryland, is to be used under the authority of Section 206 of Public Law 104–303 for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct aquatic system restoration projects in the same watershed in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

The Committee is aware of the serious problems of stream and river degradation associated with acid drainage from mining operations. The Committee further observes that the Corps of Engineers has the experience and capability to participate meaningfully in acid drainage remediation efforts. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Corps to participate in the Acid Drainage Technology Initiative of the National Mine Land Reclamation Center, using available funds and to the extent authorized by law.

–Beach Erosion Control Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has recommended $2,000,000, a reduction of $600,000 from the budget request, for the Section 103 program. Of the amount provided, $750,000 is for the Sylvan Beach Breakwater, New York, project.

Clearing and Snagging for Flood Control (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Section 208 program. Of the amount provided, $100,000 is for the removal of log jams from the Rolling Fork River in Kentucky, and $100,000 is provided for channel debris removal in Dickenson County, Virginia. Within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is urged to design and construct clearing and snagging projects on selected sites along the San Joaquin River and its tributaries in California.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $7,000,000, a decrease of $8,000,000 from the budget request, for the Section 14 program. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $628,000 for the Whittier Bank Stabilization, Alaska, project; $365,000 for repair of Whittier Creek Dike in Alaska; $40,000 for the Rising Sun, Indiana, project; $40,000 to initiate planning and design of a streambank protection project along the Little Arkansas River in the City of Halstead, Kansas; $50,000 to address an erosion problem along the Ohio River bank in the vicinity of Owensboro Dam in Kentucky; $875,000 for emergency streambank and erosion protection of the Belle Isle shoreline near Detroit, Michigan; $40,000 to remedy a streambank erosion problem along Shot Rock Creek in the City of Wildwood, St. Louis County, Missouri; $150,000 to address an erosion problem on the Niagara River in the City of Tonawanda, New York; $400,000 for the Bryson City, Swain County, North Carolina, project; $240,000 for the French Broad River, Water Treatment Plant, Rosman, North Carolina, project; $300,000 for the Glouster, Ohio, project; $130,000 for the Sardis, Monroe County, Ohio, project; $100,000 for the Little Muncy Creek, Franklin Township, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, project; $100,000 for streambank restoration projects in Tioga County, Pennsylvania; and $150,000 for the Columbia, Maury County, Tennessee, project.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $40,000,000 for the Section 205 program. This is

$13,500,000 above the budget request and the full amount authorized by law. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $200,000 for the Coosa River, Etowah County, Alabama, project; $300,000 for the Dallas Branch and Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $1,250,000 for the Huntsville Spring Branch, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $350,000 for the City of Novato, California, project; $100,000 for a small flood control project in Hamilton City, California; $300,000 for flood control improvements at Ledgewood Creek, Fairfield, California; $1,650,000 for the Magpie Creek, Sacramento, California, project; $225,000 for the Rock Creek and Keefer Slough, California, project; $100,000 for the Tehama, California, small flood control project; $30,000 for appraisal investigations of flooding along Hogans Creek and McCoys Creek in Jacksonville, Florida; $395,000 for the Deer Creek, Illinois, project; $150,000 for the Oak Forest and Midlothian (Natalie Creek), Illinois, project; $100,000 for the small flood control project at Tinley Park/Hickory Creek, Illinois; $1,000,000 for the Flatrock River, Indiana, project; $15,000 to initiate construction of the Pipe Creek, Alexandria, Indiana, project; $63,000 for the White River, Anderson, Indiana, project; $25,000 for the Canoe Creek, Henderson, Kentucky, project; $100,000 for the Hopkinsville, Kentucky, project; $400,000 for a flood warning system in the Licking River Watershed of Kentucky; $100,000 for a study of flooding on the North Fork of Panther Creek in Daviess County, Kentucky; $100,000 for the Oak Grove, Christian County, Kentucky, project; $50,000 for the Ohio River, Lewisport, Kentucky, project; $50,000 for an investigation of flooding problems near the Red River in Stanton, Kentucky; $50,000 for an investigation of flooding along the Town Branch Stream in the City of Nicholasville, Kentucky; $100,000 for the Crown Point, Louisiana, project; $58,000 for the Fisher School Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $100,000 for the Goose Bayou, Louisiana, project; $100,000 for the Lockport to Larose, Louisiana, project; $100,000 for the Lower Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $100,000 for the Pailet Basin, Barataria, Louisiana, project; $80,000 for the Rosethorne Basin, Jean Lafitte, Louisiana, project; $55,000 for the Blackwater River, Salisbury, Massachusetts, project; $750,000 for the Cass River, Spaulding Township, Michigan project; $100,000 for the Wellston Branch, Upper River Des Peres Creek, Missouri, project; $225,000 for the Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersey, project; $225,000 for the Poplar Brook, Borough of Deal and Ocean Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey, project; $125,000 for the Buffalo and Cazenovia Creeks ice retention project in New York; $200,000 for the Dry Creek, Cortland, New York, project; $150,000 for a flood control project in Bakersville, North Carolina; $200,000 for the French Broad River, North Carolina, project; $100,000 for the Mud Creek, Hendersonville, North Carolina, project; $300,000 to initiate feasibility studies on Upper Little Sugar Creek, Briar Creek, Irwin Creek and McMullen Creek in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; $200,000 for the Lower West Branch Susquehanna River Project at Lycoming Creek, Pennsylvania; $500,000 for a project to control flooding along Loyalsock Creek in the Borough of Dushore, Sullivan County, Pennsylvania; $5,000,000 for the Lycoming County (Heshborn to Hepburnville, Pennsylvania, project; $737,000 for

flood damage prevention efforts along Muncy Creek in Muncy Creek Township, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania; $117,000 for flood damage reduction efforts along the McClure Run in the Poco Farm Area, Loyalsock Township, Lycoming County, Pennsylvania; $300,000 for an integrated flood forecasting system for Lycoming County, Pennsylvania; $100,000 for the Baxter Bottom, Tipton County, Tennessee, project; $150,000 for the Doe River, Carter County, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for the Huntington, Tennessee, project; $350,000 for the Richland Creek, Morgantown, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for the Rossville, Tennessee, project; $1,000,000 for the Cedar River at Renton, King County, Washington, project; and $200,000 for the Stillaguamish River at Stanwood, Snohomish County, Washington, project.

Navigation Mitigation Projects (Section 111).—The recommendation includes $200,000, an increase of $100,000 over the budget request for the Section 111 program. These funds are to be used to conduct a study of beach erosion at Ogden Dunes, Indiana.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $2,700,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the Section 107 program. From within the funds provided, the bill includes: $200,000 for the Duluth (McQuade Road) Harbor, Minnesota, project; $31,000 for the Union Ship Canal, Buffalo and Lackawanna, New York, project; $140,000 for the Port of Morrow, Oregon, project; and $1,416,000 for the Blair Waterway Navigation Improvement Study, Pierce County, Washington.

Project Modifications for Improvement to the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $4,100,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the funds provided, the bill includes: $250,000 for the Rillito/Swan Wetlands Ecosystem Restoration Study, Arizona; $1,500,000 for the Gunnerson Pond Environmental Restoration, City of Lake Elsinore, California, project; $150,000 for the Wildcat-San Pablo Creeks, California, project; $300,000 for the Chicopit Bay, Florida, project; $200,000 for the Manatee Protection at Port Canaveral, Florida, project; $450,000 for the Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana, project; $150,000 for the Little Sugar Creek Habitat Restoration, North Carolina, project.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 1998	$296,212,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	280,000,000
Recommended, 1999	312,077,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	15,865,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	32,077,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL AND SCOTT	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	1,600,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	5,023,000	755,000	755,000
(FDP)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	2,925,000	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	1,982,000	66,000	66,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	1,329,000	190,000	190,000
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	125,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	19,500,000	450,000	450,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	360,000	360,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		5,721,000	5,721,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,620,000,000	44,599,000	44,599,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	9,020,000	581,000	581,000
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	229,800,000	11,500,000	11,500,000
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,193,000	910,000	910,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,496,000,000	23,750,000	28,666,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	381,000,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	3,300,000	674,000	674,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	185,000,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,730,000,000	21,023,000	30,500,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY, LA	25,100,000	400,000	3,000,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	64,500,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	98,500,000	14,000,000	16,000,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	169,342,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,157,208,000)	(18,665,000)	(26,765,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	106,175,000	3,450,000	3,450,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	229,126,000	3,900,000	12,000,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	208,800,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408,000	1,840,000	1,840,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	243,000,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	338,000,000	9,250,000	9,250,000
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	56,300,000	250,000	4,734,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	17,925,000	122,000	622,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	143,000,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		162,974,000	196,051,000
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	53,329,000	53,329,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	---	293,000	293,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	---	457,000	457,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	---	112,000	112,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	---	124,000	124,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	6,271,000	6,271,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	7,600,000	7,600,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,374,000	2,374,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	---	47,000	47,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	---	26,000	26,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	613,000	613,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	9,425,000	9,425,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	146,000	146,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	90,000	90,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	975,000	975,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	---	368,000	368,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	1,773,000	1,773,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	---	402,000	402,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	4,100,000	4,100,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,820,000	2,820,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	361,000	361,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	---	195,000	195,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	247,000	247,000
	YAZOO BASIC, MS:	---	(20,966,000)	(20,966,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	3,193,000	3,193,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	242,000	242,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	3,273,000	3,273,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	837,000	837,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	4,330,000	4,330,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,631,000	1,631,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	4,320,000	4,320,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,238,000	1,238,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	---	498,000	498,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	621,000	621,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	783,000	783,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	---	210,000	210,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	6,833,000	6,833,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	---	118,000	118,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	---	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	MAPPING	---	998,000	998,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-12,768,000	-12,768,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		111,305,000	111,305,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		280,000,000	312,077,000

The Committee has provided $32,077,000 above the budget request to continue ongoing construction of Mississippi River and Tributaries projects and to expedite award of contracts in fiscal year 1999 to alleviate the impacts of continued flooding and to relieve the suffering of affected communities.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee recognizes the importance of the Mississippi River Levees project by providing $28,666,000 for fiscal year 1999. This amount is $4,916,000 above the budget request. Within the amount provided, the Corps is directed to advance construction of mainline levees in the Vicksburg District; initiate construction on Items 503–R, 487–R, and 489–R; advance items 496–L, 502–L, and 490–L, as well as three levee enlargement items; and initiate seepage control items. The Committee regards these activities to be of the highest priority and expects the Corps to commit such sums as are necessary from within the amount provided for their expeditious prosecution. Of the amount provided, $1,010,000 is for the Commerce to Birds Point Levee component of the project.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $9,477,000 above the budget request to initiate flood proofing measures for Morgan City and Berwick and to initiate construction of a pumping station at Bayou Yokely.

Atchafalaya Basin, Floodway System, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $7,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue acquisition of real estate interests for environmentally sensitive lands in the Atchafayla Basin.

Louisiana State Penitentiary, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $2,600,000 above the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Louisiana State Penitentiary, Louisiana, project.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes an additional $2,000,000 above the budget request to keep the Mississippi Delta Region freshwater diversion project closer to the scheduled completion date.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $12,000,000 for the Demonstration Erosion Control program. Within the amount provided, $2,300,000 is to be used to initiate work on Black Creek at Lexington, Mississippi, in accordance with Alternative III of the "Technical Report Lexington Flooding" developed by the Vicksburg District, under the terms and conditions of the Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control project.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1998	$1,845,210,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	1,603,000,000
Recommended, 1999	1,637,719,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−207,491,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	+34,719,000

NOTE.—The fiscal year 1998 appropriation includes $105,185,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 105–174.

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	4,900,000	4,900,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,800,000	1,800,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,000,000	20,000,000
	BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	---	500,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	7,726,000	7,726,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	30,000	30,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	4,000,000	7,325,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	21,000,000	24,000,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300,000	300,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,900,000	5,944,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	20,000	20,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	17,000,000	22,000,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,400,000	6,400,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,591,000	1,591,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	592,000	592,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	243,000	243,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	20,000	20,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	200,000	200,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	265,000	265,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	489,000	489,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,114,000	1,114,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	73,000	73,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,079,000	1,079,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	25,000	25,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	192,000	192,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,585,000	3,585,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,464,000	5,464,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	998,000	998,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,652,000	4,652,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,961,000	5,861,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,988,000	3,988,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	965,000	965,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	954,000	954,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	896,000	896,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,148,000	4,148,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	278,000	278,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	253,000	253,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	22,093,000	25,993,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,571,000	1,571,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,834,000	3,834,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,397,000	1,397,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,471,000	3,471,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	383,000	383,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,332,000	6,332,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,185,000	4,185,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	4,000	4,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,747,000	2,747,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	119,000	119,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,782,000	1,782,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,820,000	1,820,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,246,000	3,246,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,121,000	3,121,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,060,000	4,060,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	374,000	374,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,843,000	1,843,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,910,000	3,910,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	973,000	973,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,401,000	1,401,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,613,000	3,613,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	288,000	288,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	237,000	237,000
	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	---	1,000,000
	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	650,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,732,000	1,732,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,101,000	1,101,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	3,424,000	3,424,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	622,000	622,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,197,000	2,197,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,100,000	1,100,000
	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	4,230,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,384,000	5,384,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,182,000	2,182,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,069,000	1,069,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	133,000	133,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,211,000	2,211,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,392,000	2,392,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,339,000	2,339,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	3,004,000	3,004,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,023,000	3,023,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,541,000	1,541,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,081,000	1,081,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,890,000	2,390,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,044,000	1,044,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,570,000	1,570,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,705,000	2,705,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	35,000	35,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	460,000	460,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	648,000	648,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	965,000	965,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	101,000	101,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,771,000	1,771,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	398,000	398,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	767,000	767,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	440,000	440,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	516,000	516,000
	FIVE MILE RIVER, CT	---	700,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	216,000	216,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	867,000	867,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	33,000	33,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	418,000	418,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	319,000	319,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	971,000	971,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	295,000	295,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	672,000	672,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	496,000	496,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CEDAR CREEK, DE	250,000	250,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	280,000	280,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,816,000	12,816,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	43,000	43,000
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	225,000	225,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50,000	50,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	5,590,000	5,590,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	5,000	5,000
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	880,000	880,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	183,000	183,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	32,000	32,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &.	30,000	30,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,367,000	3,367,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	8,598,000	8,598,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	40,000	2,000,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,615,000	1,615,000
	FORT MYERS BEACH, FL	---	1,000,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	441,000	441,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	75,000	75,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	88,000	88,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,153,000	3,153,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,625,000	7,625,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,400,000	5,400,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	20,000	20,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	200,000	200,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,169,000	3,169,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	5,000	5,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,190,000	5,190,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	20,000	20,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	30,000	4,034,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	50,000	50,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	425,000	425,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	34,000	34,000
	SCIPIO CREEK, FL	---	600,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	60,000	60,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	60,000	60,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	5,201,000	5,201,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,900,000	4,900,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	4,700,000	5,400,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,162,000	2,162,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	9,728,000	9,728,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,400,000	6,400,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,600,000	4,600,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	8,588,000	8,588,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41,000	41,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	8,200,000	8,200,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,380,000	6,380,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,161,000	14,500,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	200,000	200,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	4,800,000	4,800,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	916,000	916,000
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	1,580,000	1,580,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	262,000	262,000
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	910,000	910,000
(N)	NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	962,000	962,000
(N)	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	292,000	292,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	416,000	416,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,432,000	1,432,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	3,743,000	3,743,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	89,000	89,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	975,000	975,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	190,000	190,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	62,000	62,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	1,444,000	1,444,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	6,337,000	6,337,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	4,889,000	4,889,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362,000	362,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	135,000	135,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	22,934,000	22,934,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	657,000	657,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	2,273,000	2,273,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	537,000	1,037,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,219,000	4,919,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	96,985,000	88,985,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	72,000	72,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,868,000	3,868,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	96,000	96,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	995,000	995,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	776,000	776,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	925,000	925,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	797,000	797,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	924,000	924,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	564,000	564,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	80,000	80,000
(FC)	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	733,000	733,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	57,000	57,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	851,000	851,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	806,000	806,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	836,000	836,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	67,000	67,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	768,000	768,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	62,000	62,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,615,000	2,615,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	170,000	170,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA.	154,000	154,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,280,000	6,280,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,156,000	2,156,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,365,000	3,365,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,170,000	4,170,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,389,000	2,389,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	956,000	956,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	461,000	461,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	585,000	585,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,092,000	1,092,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	949,000	949,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	267,000	267,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	913,000	913,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,352,000	1,352,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,206,000	1,206,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,683,000	1,683,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,699,000	1,699,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	787,000	787,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,850,000	1,850,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,632,000	1,632,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	333,000	333,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	440,000	440,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,977,000	1,977,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,655,000	1,655,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	8,005,000	8,005,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,077,000	2,077,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,170,000	1,170,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,317,000	1,317,000
(FC)	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,406,000	1,406,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	808,000	808,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,431,000	1,431,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	325,000	325,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,450,000	1,450,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,048,000	1,048,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,601,000	1,601,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,672,000	1,672,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	105,000	105,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	4,488,000	4,488,000
	LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	---	750,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,266,000	1,266,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	17,000	17,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	686,000	686,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52,000	52,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,764,000	1,764,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	59,814,000	55,814,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,447,000	5,447,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	920,000	920,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	4,000	4,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,531,000	1,531,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,056,000	1,056,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	3,927,000	3,927,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,090,000	1,090,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	7,681,000	7,681,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	1,450,000	1,450,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	481,000	481,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5,000	5,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	50,000	50,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	140,000	2,000,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	114,000	114,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	6,980,000	7,125,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,960,000	2,960,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	19,561,000	19,561,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	841,000	841,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	423,000	423,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	368,000	368,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	43,000	43,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,808,000	2,808,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,095,000	1,095,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	46,220,000	46,220,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	11,580,000	11,580,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80,000	80,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	8,337,000	9,337,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,960,000	1,960,000
	TCHEFUNCTE RIVER AND BOGUE FALAYA RIVER, LA	---	250,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	184,000	184,000
(N)	WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	5,000	5,000
(N)	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	165,000	165,000
	MAINE		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	15,000	15,000
(N)	KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	301,000	301,000
(N)	PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	400,000	1,400,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,596,000	1,596,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17,000	17,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	440,000	440,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	570,000	570,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	14,558,000	14,558,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD	335,000	335,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	105,000	105,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	32,000	32,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,492,000	1,492,000
(N)	KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	70,000	70,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	75,000	75,000
	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	---	550,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	330,000	330,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	306,000	306,000
(N)	ROCK HALL HARBOR, MD	260,000	260,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	83,000	83,000
	SHALLOW CREEK, MD	---	250,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	575,000	575,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	305,000	305,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
	AUNT LYDIA'S COVE, MA	---	1,000,000
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	409,000	409,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	695,000	695,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	367,000	367,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,416,000	8,416,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	232,000	232,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	133,000	133,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	273,000	273,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	349,000	349,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	72,000	72,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	381,000	381,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	526,000	526,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	329,000	329,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	594,000	594,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	873,000	873,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	401,000	401,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	633,000	633,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	333,000	333,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	110,000	110,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	194,000	194,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,392,000	2,392,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	49,000	49,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	704,000	704,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	497,000	497,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	286,000	286,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	154,000	154,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	259,000	259,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	1,641,000	1,641,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	421,000	421,000
(N)	MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	247,000	247,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	4,000	4,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	622,000	622,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	881,000	881,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	724,000	724,000
	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	---	1,953,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	367,000	367,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	416,000	416,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,275,000	1,275,000
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,003,000	2,003,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	571,000	571,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,422,000	1,422,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	20,720,000	20,720,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,192,000	3,192,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,874,000	1,874,000
	MINNESOTA		
	ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT, DULUTH, MN	---	500,000
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	566,000	566,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	4,085,000	4,085,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	97,000	97,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	490,000	490,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	155,000	155,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	797,000	797,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	17,000	17,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	444,000	444,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,699,000	3,699,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	31,000	31,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	10,000	10,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8,000	8,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	120,000	120,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	101,000	101,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,700,000	1,700,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,900,000	2,900,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	263,000	263,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	4,000	4,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	415,000	415,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	159,000	159,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,445,000	4,445,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,067,000	2,067,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,444,000	7,444,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	377,000	377,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	777,000	777,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	814,000	814,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,908,000	13,908,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	206,000	206,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,789,000	1,789,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,049,000	1,049,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	280,000	280,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,560,000	3,560,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,051,000	5,051,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,671,000	4,671,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	23,000	23,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,670,000	1,670,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	67,000	67,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	7,138,000	7,138,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,679,000	1,679,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	170,000	170,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	---	350,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO	1,900,000	1,900,000
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	200,000	200,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	597,000	597,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	786,000	786,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	113,000	113,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	36,000	36,000
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	588,000	588,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	284,000	284,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	410,000	410,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	522,000	522,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	591,000	591,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	964,000	964,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	10,000	10,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	493,000	493,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	126,000	126,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	485,000	485,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	390,000	390,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	305,000	305,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	16,650,000	16,650,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	429,000	429,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,195,000	2,195,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	590,000	590,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	805,000	805,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,944,000	1,944,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	277,000	277,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	83,000	83,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	339,000	339,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	969,000	969,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	124,000	124,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	337,000	337,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	449,000	449,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	227,000	227,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	76,000	76,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	4,057,000	4,057,000
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY	700,000	700,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,027,000	1,027,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	730,000	730,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	434,000	434,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	384,000	384,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	900,000	900,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	1,650,000	1,650,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	75,000	75,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,380,000	2,380,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	543,000	543,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MAMARONECK HARBOR, NY	---	3,000,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,340,000	1,340,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	760,000	760,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,930,000	4,930,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740,000	740,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,310,000	3,310,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	345,000	345,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,710,000	1,710,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	680,000	680,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	715,000	715,000
(N)	STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15,000	15,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	538,000	538,000
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	700,000	700,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	517,000	517,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
	AVON HARBOR, NC	---	1,000,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,454,000	5,454,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,119,000	1,119,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350,000	350,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	490,000	490,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	667,000	667,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	700,000	700,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	842,000	842,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	503,000	503,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,865,000	4,865,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,885,000	3,885,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	800,000	800,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	575,000	575,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	75,000	75,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	75,000	75,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,472,000	1,472,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,700,000	5,700,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	179,000	179,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,471,000	9,471,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	177,000	177,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	105,000	105,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,206,000	1,206,000
	LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND (MOSQUITO CONTROL)	---	50,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	409,000	409,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	276,000	276,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	31,000	31,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	628,000	628,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,420,000	1,420,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,189,000	3,189,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,060,000	1,060,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	724,000	724,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,456,000	6,456,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	325,000	325,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	720,000	720,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	680,000	680,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	768,000	768,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	385,000	385,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	217,000	217,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	530,000	530,000
	MAHONING RIVER, OH AND PA	---	250,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,032,000	1,032,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,234,000	1,234,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,186,000	6,186,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	319,000	319,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	595,000	595,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	75,000	75,000
	ROCKY RIVER, OH	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	935,000	935,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	166,000	166,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,385,000	3,385,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	251,000	251,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	543,000	543,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	818,000	818,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	347,000	347,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	635,000	635,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,350,000	1,350,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	18,000	18,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,509,000	1,509,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	618,000	618,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	4,074,000	4,074,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,647,000	3,647,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	696,000	696,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	240,000	240,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	651,000	651,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,285,000	1,285,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	433,000	433,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	75,000	75,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,446,000	1,446,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,367,000	3,367,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,915,000	1,915,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	54,000	54,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	36,000	36,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,112,000	1,112,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,695,000	3,695,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	908,000	908,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	344,000	344,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	869,000	869,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,296,000	3,296,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,393,000	1,393,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,795,000	3,795,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	1,201,000	1,201,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	740,000	740,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	233,000	233,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,111,000	5,111,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	383,000	383,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	12,122,000	12,122,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	6,960,000	6,960,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	391,000	391,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,601,000	4,601,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	421,000	421,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	751,000	751,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	855,000	855,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	9,000	9,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	951,000	951,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	399,000	399,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	523,000	523,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	905,000	905,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,245,000	1,245,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	422,000	422,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	180,000	180,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	3,936,000	3,936,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,941,000	1,941,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,889,000	2,889,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	3,304,000	3,304,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	502,000	502,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	135,000	135,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	1,056,000	1,056,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	120,000	120,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	878,000	878,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	175,000	175,000
(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	1,294,000	1,294,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	497,000	497,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	499,000	499,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	590,000	590,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,891,000	3,960,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,791,000	8,291,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	659,000	659,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	223,000	223,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	916,000	916,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,236,000	2,236,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,149,000	1,149,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,512,000	1,512,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,648,000	1,648,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	672,000	804,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	916,000	916,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	15,000	15,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	723,000	723,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	688,000	688,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	271,000	271,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	215,000	215,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	288,000	1,388,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,423,000	1,423,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,121,000	1,121,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,930,000	1,930,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,438,000	14,438,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	15,000	15,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	408,000	408,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	14,000	14,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,084,000	4,690,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	56,000	56,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	50,000	50,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,167,000	2,167,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	333,000	333,000
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	66,000	66,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,917,000	1,917,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,437,000	1,437,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	284,000	284,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	798,000	798,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	566,000	566,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	1,795,000	1,795,000
	RHODE ISLAND		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	5,000	5,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	527,000	527,000
(N)	PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	1,143,000	1,143,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,325,000	3,325,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,716,000	6,616,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,211,000	3,211,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	230,000	230,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	2,414,000	2,414,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	24,000	24,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	40,000	40,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	270,000	270,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	340,000	340,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,476,000	6,476,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	204,000	204,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184,000	184,000
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,417,000	7,417,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	14,000	14,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	1,440,000	1,440,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	3,000,000	3,000,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	8,467,000	8,467,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	70,000	70,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,635,000	5,635,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,826,000	4,826,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,554,000	4,554,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,810,000	3,810,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	18,000	18,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,571,000	3,571,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,926,000	5,926,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	5,000	5,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	12,886,000	12,886,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	285,000	285,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	585,000	585,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,090,000	1,090,000
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	909,000	909,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,465,000	1,465,000
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,170,000	1,170,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,835,000	2,835,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,080,000	2,080,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,175,000	2,175,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,516,000	2,516,000
	CHANNEL TO LIBERTY, TX	---	600,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	1,790,000	1,790,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,845,000	6,845,000
	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (RINCON CANAL), TX	---	275,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,895,000	5,895,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14,000	14,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,584,000	2,584,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,050,000	4,050,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	1,755,000	1,755,000
(N)	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
(N)	GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	100,000	100,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,578,000	1,578,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,388,000	2,388,000
(N)	GREENS BAYOU CHANNEL, TX	660,000	660,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	18,381,000	18,381,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,378,000	1,378,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,930,000	7,930,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	355,000	355,000
(FC)	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	3,302,000	3,302,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	863,000	863,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	208,000	208,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	3,851,000	3,851,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,170,000	3,170,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	110,000	110,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,770,000	1,770,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,554,000	1,554,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,817,000	1,817,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	893,000	893,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	928,000	928,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,711,000	1,711,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50,000	50,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	777,000	777,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	7,200,000	7,200,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,346,000	4,346,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	222,000	222,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,033,000	3,033,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,888,000	1,888,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,612,000	1,612,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,299,000	2,299,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	780,000	780,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,815,000	3,815,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,605,000	2,605,000
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	55,000	55,000
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	496,000	496,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	731,000	731,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	28,000	28,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	536,000	536,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	586,000	586,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	680,000	680,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	547,000	547,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	602,000	602,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	45,000	45,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	800,000	800,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,602,000	1,602,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

	TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	912,000	912,000
	(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	84,000	84,000
[illegible]	(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,333,000	5,100,000
74700	(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	7,950,000	7,950,000
74800	(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,246,000	1,246,000
74900	(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	280,000	280,000
75000	(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,483,000	6,483,000
75100	(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	333,000	333,000
75200	(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,027,000	2,027,000
75300	(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	180,000	180,000
75400	(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	723,000	723,000
75500	(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	794,000	794,000
75600	(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	159,000	159,000
75700	(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,115,000	1,115,000
75800		WASHINGTON		
75900	(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	1,019,000	1,019,000
76000	(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	3,000	3,000
76100	(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6,000	6,000
76200	(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,212,000	1,212,000
76300	(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	6,900,000	10,900,000
76400	(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,421,000	1,421,000
76500	(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,269,000	2,269,000
76600	(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	175,000	175,000
76700	(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,608,000	7,608,000
76800	(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,069,000	1,069,000
76900	(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,389,000	2,389,000
77000	(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,169,000	1,169,000
77100	(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	1,722,000	1,722,000
77200	(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA	404,000	404,000
77300	(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,188,000	2,188,000
77400	(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	302,000	302,000
77500	(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,013,000	1,013,000
77600	(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,213,000	1,213,000
77700	(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	400,000	400,000
77800	(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	780,000	780,000
77900	(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	180,000	180,000
78000	(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	58,000	58,000
78100	(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	457,000	457,000
78200	(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	68,000	68,000
78300	(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	1,929,000	1,929,000
78400	(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	75,000	75,000
78500		WEST VIRGINIA		
78600	(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	976,000	976,000
78700	(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,021,000	1,441,000
78800	(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,294,000	1,294,000
78900	(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,513,000	1,513,000
79000	(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	385,000	385,000
79100	(FC)	ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
79200	(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	103,000	103,000
79300	(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,130,000	8,130,000
79400	(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,484,000	1,484,000
79500	(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	914,000	914,000
79600	(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,298,000	1,298,000
79700	(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,470,000	1,470,000
79800	(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	2,235,000	2,235,000
79900		WISCONSIN		
80000	(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	171,000	171,000
80100	(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	674,000	674,000
80200	(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	2,360,000	3,360,000
80300	(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,212,000	1,212,000
80400	(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,603,000	3,603,000
80500	(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	42,000	42,000
80600	(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	325,000	325,000
80700	(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	51,000	51,000
80800	(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	274,000	274,000
80900	(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,629,000	1,629,000
81000	(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	201,000	201,000
81100	(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	8,000	8,000
81200	(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	619,000	619,000
81300	(N)	STURGEON BAY, WI	475,000	475,000
81400	(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	27,000	27,000
81500		WYOMING		
81600	(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,506,000	1,506,000
81700	(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	340,000	340,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	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	1,075,000	500,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000,000	4,000,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,000,000	1,500,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	2,000,000	1,900,000
	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	---	500,000
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575,000	500,000
	MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	600,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAIN STEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	2,000,000	---
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000,000	1,500,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000,000	5,500,000
	NATIONAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT (NRMS) PROGRAM	1,850,000	---
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	515,000	415,000
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	500,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	500,000
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	850,000	650,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,400,000	4,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-22,918,000	-37,253,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,603,000,000	1,640,499,000

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.—The recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 above the budget request of $17,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance activities along the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, including dredging, development of disposal areas and access roads, wildlife mitigation efforts, and recreational development.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas.—The recommendation includes $25,993,000 for operation and maintenance of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System, Arkansas, project. Of the amount provided, $3,900,000 is for the acquisition and installation of tow haulage equipment for system locks.

Ouachita and Black Rivers, Arkansas and Louisiana.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to plan the award of contracts for dredging the Ouachita River during periods of high water level to maximize dredging efficiency.

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated 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, 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.

Santa Ana River Basin, California (Arundo Eradication).—Within available funds, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to participate with local agencies, including agencies managing the Santa Ana Conservation Trust Fund, for ongoing arundo removal activities in the Santa Ana River Basin, California.

Success Lake, California.—The bill includes an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue with seismic studies and remediation design to prevent foundation liquefaction that could lead to a catastrophic failure of the dam at Success Lake, California.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama and Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct model studies of the Chipola Cutoff to the Corley Slough reach of the river to determine environmentally acceptable ways of reducing the amount of dredging and associated costs for beneficial uses of dredged material and an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct model studies to develop a design that would alleviate safety problems on the downstream approach to the George W. Andrews Lock and Dam.

Lake Michigan Diversion, Illinois.—The recommendation includes an additional $500,000 for activities specified in the 1996 Great Lakes Mediation Memorandum of Understanding. Specifically, funds are provided to: initiate testing on the lakefront measurement and reporting system at the Chicago River Controlling Works and the O'Brien Lock; continue operation and maintenance of two acoustic velocity meters; initiate and complete a quality as-

surance/quality control program on the accuracy of domestic and industrial withdrawals from Lake Michigan or its watershed; and initiate and complete a technical review on the accuracy of the sluice gate rating curve at Wilmette Lock, Illinois.

Lake Shelbyville, Illinois.—The recommendation includes an additional $700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to dredge the harbors and boat ramps at the Sullivan and Findlay marinas.

Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the debris rack at Lake Cumberland, along with landscaping, fencing, and bank paving.

Bayou Teche, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes an additional $1,860,000 to initiate the dredging of Bayou Teche, in the vicinity of Iberia Parish, Louisiana, and to repair the Keystone Lock as required to upgrade the facility for restoration of navigation along Bayou Teche.

Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $145,000 above the budget amount for the Corps of Engineers to dredge the Calcasieu Ship Channel in addition to budgeted operation and maintenance activities.

Tchefuncte River and Bogue Falaya River, Louisiana.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to remove fallen trees from the Bogue Falaya in Louisiana.

Owasco Outlet, Owasco Seawall, New York.—The Committee is concerned about the apparent unwillingness of the Corps of Engineers to work with state and local officials to address the severe erosion problems along the Owasco Lake Seawall. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to make the repair and rehabilitation of the Owasco Seawall outlet a priority and directs the Corps to initiate the study and design of modifications for rehabilitation of the Owasco seawall using previously appropriated funds.

Mahoning River, Ohio and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance report for the Pennsylvania portion of the Mahoning River.

John Day Lock and Dam, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee directs the Corps to execute a transfer of land to the City of Umatilla for the expansion of its wastewater treatment facility upon the completion of appropriate studies.

Allegheny River, Pennsylvania.—The recommendation includes an additional $1,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair the vertical concrete walls at Lock and Dam 7 on the Allegheny River in Pennsylvania. The recommendation also includes an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to maintain traditional levels of service.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee River, Tennessee.—The recommendation includes $4,200,000, subject to authorization, for the Corps of Engineers to conduct repairs of Chickamauga Lock on the Tennessee River.

Corpus Christi Ship Channel (Rincon Channel), Texas.—The recommendation includes $275,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete its review of the feasibility study and environmental assessment of the Rincon Channel prepared by the local sponsor and to initiate dredging.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.—The recommendation includes an additional $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue implementation of the South Jetty Maintenance project at Grays Harbor in Washington.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The recommended amount includes $3,360,000 for the repair and rehabilitation of the De Pere, Little Kaukana and Menasha Locks.

Dredging Operations and Environmental Research (DOER) Program.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue its research effort on contaminated sediments and dredged material management. The Committee expects the Corps to focus its efforts principally on the area of contaminated sediment characterization, management and treatment.

Great Lakes Confined Disposal Facilities Assessment.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to initiate its assessment of the general conditions of confined disposal facilities in the Great Lakes, using available funds.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1998	$106,000,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999	117,000,000
Recommended, 1999	110,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	4,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−7,000,000

NOTE.—Of the $117,000,000 budget estimate, $7,000,000 is to be derived from permit fees dependent upon the enactment of proposed legislation.

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 1999, the Committee recommends $110,000,000, a $4,000,000 increase above the fiscal year 1998 level. This also represents the full amount of new discretionary budget authority requested by the Administration. Within the amount provided, $320,000 is for the development of a Special Area Management Plan for the Upper Yellowstone River, from Gardiner to Springdale, Montana.

In fiscal year 1998, the Committee unambiguously stated its expectation that the Corps of Engineers would move rapidly to implement a nationwide administrative appeals process for the Regulatory program. Furthermore, Congress provided $5,000,000 for the effort. It has come to the Committee's attention that the Corps has not fully implemented the administrative appeals process for wetlands decisions. Accordingly, the Committee restates its direction to establish the administrative appeals process without delay.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1998	$4,000,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999	.....
Recommended, 1999	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−4,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	.....

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.

No funds are required for fiscal year 1999, because carryover balances from previous appropriations are adequate to meet anticipated needs.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1998	$140,000,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999	140,000,000
Recommended, 1999	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	.....
Budget Estimate, 1999	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $140,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 1998, Congress transferred responsibility for cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy. The Committee expects the Department to continue to provide the institutional knowledge and expertise needed to best serve the Nation and the affected communities in executing this program.

The Corps of Engineers has extensive experience in the cleanup of hazardous, toxic, and radioactive wastes through its work for the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The Committee intends for the Corps expertise to be used in the same manner for the cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP, and expects the Corps to continue programming and budgeting for FUSRAP as part of the civil works program.

There were concerns that the transfer of FUSRAP to the Corps would unnecessarily delay the program. This did not happen and the Committee has been very pleased to date. However, the Department of Energy and the Corps of Engineers have been unable to enter into an agreement on the functions of the program assumed by the Corps. The Department's Oak Ridge, Tennessee, office has been very helpful during the transition of the program, but issues which must be resolved at the Headquarters level have not been addressed expeditiously. The Committee directs the Department and the Corps of Engineers to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to remedy any misunderstanding that may exist between the two agencies as to the roles and responsibilities related to the cleanup program. This is essential to improving the exchange of information and resolution of future issues.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1998	$148,000,000

Budget Estimate, 1999	148,000,000
Recommended, 1999	148,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	
Budget Estimate, 1999	

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.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1998	$41,153,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	40,948,000
Recommended, 1999	40,948,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−205,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	

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 1999 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $40,948,000, the same as the budget request. Within the total amount, however, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 above the budget request for project planning and construction activities of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The Committee has provided $2,000,000 less than the budget request for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1998	$698,868,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	640,124,000
Recommended, 1999	596,254,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−102,614,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−43,870,000

NOTE.—The amount shown as the fiscal year 1998 appropriation includes $4,520,000 in emergency appropriations enacted in Public Law 105–174.

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				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	7,080,000	---	7,080,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	49,908,000	---	46,190,000	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	2,407,000	6,966,000	2,407,000	6,966,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	2,950,000	---	2,950,000	---
NORTHERN AZ WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	650,000	---	---	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000
SOUTH/CENTRAL AZ WATER MANAGEMENT & TECH ASST PROGRAM	1,050,000	---	525,000	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	400,000	---	1,200,000	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	---	22,213,000	---	22,213,000
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT	531,000	6,160,000	531,000	6,160,000
CALIFORNIA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	1,863,000	---	350,000	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	1,300,000	---	---	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	9,722,000	9,558,000	9,476,000	9,558,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT	1,222,000	---	1,222,000	---
DELTA DIVISION	13,216,000	4,791,000	13,216,000	4,791,000
EAST SIDE DIVISION	413,000	3,543,000	413,000	3,543,000
FRIANT DIVISION	2,602,000	2,196,000	2,602,000	2,196,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	15,846,000	2,754,000	15,846,000	2,754,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	11,926,000	735,000	14,376,000	735,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	692,000	---	692,000	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	7,900,000	---	7,900,000	---
SHASTA DIVISION	4,457,000	8,965,000	4,457,000	8,965,000
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	3,653,000	6,759,000	3,653,000	6,759,000
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	1,014,000	5,063,000	1,014,000	5,063,000
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	5,331,000	6,993,000	5,331,000	6,993,000
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---

LONG BEACH/LA COUNTY WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	1,300,000	---	---	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
LOWER COLORADO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.	500,000	---	150,000	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,300,000	---	---	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	1,000,000	---	---	---
ORLAND PROJECT	---	685,000	---	685,000
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	400,000	---	400,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	13,000,000	---	13,000,000	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	2,500,000	---	2,500,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
SOLANO PROJECT	906,000	975,000	906,000	975,000
SO. CALIF. COMPREHENSIVE WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	200,000	---	200,000	---
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	680,000	---	320,000	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 & 8	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	1,206,000	1,039,000	1,206,000	1,039,000
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	104,000	7,158,000	104,000	7,158,000
COLORADO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	733,000	---	125,000	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	50,000	12,000	50,000	12,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	160,000	4,447,000	160,000	4,447,000
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	506,000	150,000	506,000	150,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	722,000	908,000	720,000	908,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP	---	318,000	---	318,000
MANCOS PROJECT	55,000	18,000	55,000	18,000
PARADOX UNIT, CRBSCP	---	2,474,000	---	2,474,000
PINE RIVER PROJECT	76,000	46,000	76,000	46,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS	234,000	3,152,000	234,000	3,152,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	79,000	18,000	79,000	18,000
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN SELENIUM STUDY	440,000	---	440,000	---
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,837,000	2,340,000	2,837,000	2,340,000
COLUMBIA-SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	13,116,000	---	9,723,000	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	50,000	---	50,000	---
IDAHO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	715,000	---	547,000	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,639,000	1,832,000	3,639,000	1,832,000
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	300,000	---	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
KANSAS				
EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.	---	---	600,000	---
KANSAS WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	613,000	---	515,000	---
WICHITA PROJECT.....	---	188,000	---	188,000
MONTANA				
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT.....	---	770,000	---	770,000
MILK RIVER PROJECT.....	250,000	479,000	250,000	479,000
MONTANA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	863,000	---	315,000	---
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WTR RIGHTS SETTLEMENT STUDY.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT.....	44,000	22,000	44,000	22,000
NEBRASKA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	337,000	---	180,000	---
NEVADA				
NEWLANDS PROJECT.....	5,360,000	344,000	5,360,000	344,000
SOUTHERN NEVADA/UTAH WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.	125,000	---	---	---
WASHOE PROJECT.....	1,021,000	590,000	808,000	590,000
NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT.....	845,000	490,000	845,000	490,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	2,015,000	8,929,000	2,015,000	8,929,000
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT.....	---	178,000	---	178,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT.....	685,000	2,972,000	685,000	2,972,000
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.	171,000	---	---	---
SOUTHERN NM/WEST TX WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM..	225,000	---	200,000	---
UPPER RIO GRANDE BSN WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.	356,000	---	100,000	---
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT.....	3,995,000	---	3,995,000	---

NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTA TRIBES WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM..	165,000	---	165,000	---
DAKOTA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	362,000	---	250,000	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	20,402,000	3,712,000	20,402,000	3,712,000
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT.....	---	140,000	---	140,000
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT.....	---	493,000	---	493,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT.....	---	193,000	---	193,000
NORMAN PROJECT.....	---	126,000	---	126,000
OKLAHOMA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	367,000	---	255,000	---
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT.....	---	599,000	---	599,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT.....	---	223,000	---	223,000
OREGON				
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG. SYS. CONSERVATION FEASIBILITY...	125,000	---	125,000	---
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT.....	116,000	318,000	116,000	318,000
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT.....	105,000	115,000	100,000	115,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
KLAMATH PROJECT.....	5,429,000	354,000	5,429,000	354,000
OREGON WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM.....	910,000	---	525,000	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION.....	93,000	1,105,000	93,000	1,105,000
TUALATIN PROJECT.....	13,000	96,000	13,000	96,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
UMATILLA PROJECT.....	331,000	1,815,000	331,000	1,815,000
SOUTH DAKOTA				
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT.....	10,000,000	---	10,000,000	---
MNI WICONI PROJECT.....	26,717,000	4,627,000	26,717,000	4,627,000
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT.....	---	16,000	---	16,000
TEXAS				
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT.....	---	92,000	---	92,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT.....	---	324,000	---	324,000

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
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	---	504,000	---	504,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	2,017,000	---	2,017,000
TEXAS WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	325,000	---	400,000	---
UTAH				
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE	800,000	451,000	800,000	451,000
HYRUM PROJECT	38,000	23,000	38,000	23,000
MOON LAKE PROJECT	11,000	19,000	11,000	19,000
NEWTON PROJECT	33,000	9,000	33,000	9,000
NORTHERN UTAH WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	278,000	---	260,000	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	47,000	12,000	47,000	12,000
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	265,000	197,000	241,000	197,000
SCOFIELD PROJECT	40,000	3,000	40,000	3,000
SOUTHERN UTAH WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	403,000	---	200,000	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	84,000	3,000	84,000	3,000
TOOELE WASTEWATER TREATMENT & REUSE PROJECT	800,000	---	800,000	---
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,445,000	3,525,000	1,427,000	3,525,000
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	210,000	7,000	210,000	7,000
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,865,000	6,749,000	3,712,000	6,749,000
WASHINGTON WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	395,000	---	100,000	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	204,000	9,764,000	204,000	9,764,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WTR ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	8,980,000	---	8,980,000	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4,000	2,660,000	4,000	2,660,000
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	84,000	1,126,000	84,000	1,126,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT	34,000	845,000	34,000	845,000
WYOMING WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	300,000	---	150,000	---
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, T. II BASINWIDE	12,300,000	---	12,300,000	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SEC. 5	1,931,000	902,000	1,931,000	902,000

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECT. 8, REC, FISH & WILDLIFE.	3,682,000	---	3,476,000	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	75,000	---	75,000	---
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	3,505,000	---	3,103,000	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	5,250,000	---	3,000,000	---
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	15,007,000	---	15,007,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	1,993,000	---	1,979,000	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	---	3,898,000	---	3,898,000
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	281,000	---	281,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	2,247,000	---	1,000,000	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	6,129,000	---	6,129,000	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	6,603,000	---	5,752,000	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	24,000	950,000	24,000	950,000
NATIONAL FISH & WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS	8,905,000	---	7,680,000	---
NEGOTIATION & ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	884,000	---	662,000	---
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	85,000	464,000	85,000	464,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN - OTHER PROJECTS	2,668,000	23,678,000	2,379,000	23,678,000
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,023,000	550,000	1,023,000	550,000
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	371,000	9,000	371,000	9,000
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	4,873,000	---	4,696,000	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE 28	4,440,000	---	4,400,000	---
RECREATION & FISH & WILDLIFE PROG. ADMININISTRATION	1,891,000	---	1,891,000	---
SAFETY OF DAMS:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION & MODIFICATION	---	56,550,000	---	45,763,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,140,000	---	3,242,000	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	250,000	---	250,000	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTR. PROTECTION & ENHANCE	700,000	---	700,000	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	300,000	---	285,000	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	1,500,000	---	958,000	---
SITE SECURITY	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000
SOIL & MOISTURE CONSERVATION	144,000	---	144,000	---
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE STUDY	2,100,000	---	---	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES	100,000	---	62,000	---
UNSCHEDULED MAINTENANCE	---	1,500,000	---	---
WATER MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM	7,551,000	---	6,000,000	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	7,296,000	---	5,356,000	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-30,093,000	---	-30,093,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND TRANSFER	-25,800,000	---	-25,800,000	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	396,863,000	243,261,000	365,280,000	230,974,000

Transfer from the Working Capital Fund.—The recommendation accepts the budget proposal to transfer $25,800,000 from the Working Capital Fund for program activities under the Water and Related Resources account.

Reductions from the Budget Request.—Except as otherwise noted, project-specific reductions from the budget request are to be applied against proposed increases for water and energy management and fish and wildlife activities.

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—Reductions from the budget are to be applied as follows: $190,000 from Tucson Reliability Division and $3,528,000 from Native Fish Protection. Pending the reopening of the consultation, the Secretary may not expend any current or previously appropriated funds for Central Arizona Project native fish protection major contracts that are in response to the Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion on Transportation and Delivery of Central Arizona Project Water to the Gila River Basin in Arizona and New Mexico, dated April 15, 1994.

In Situ Copper Research Mining Project, Arizona.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with a timely close-out of the In Situ Copper Research Mining Project in Arizona.

South/Central Arizona Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Arizona and New Mexico.—$200,000 is provided for the West Salt River Valley Water Management Study. Funds are also provided to continue the cost-shared Southern Arizona Regional Water Management Study and Verde River Basin Management Study at the amounts requested in the budget.

Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration, Arizona.—The recommendation provides $1,200,000, an increase of $800,000 over the budget request, for continuation of the Tres Rios Wetlands Demonstration project in Arizona.

California Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, California.—Funds are provided to continue the following cost-shared studies at the budgeted amounts: California Water Augmentation Program, and Delta Model Development Study.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—

Folsom Dam Temperature Control Device.—Because of budget constraints, and in deference to the prerogative of jurisdictional committees to specifically authorize it, the initiation of construction of the Folsom Dam Temperature Control Device is deferred without prejudice.

Permanent Pumping Facility, Placer County Water Agency.—The Committee has provided $5,200,000, which is $3,200,000 above the budget request, for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue construction of a permanent pumping facility for the Placer County Water Agency.

City of Folsom.—The City of Folsom has incurred police, fire and emergency response costs exceeding $300,000 since July 17, 1995, the day Folsom Dam Gate No. 3 failed. The Committee believes partial reimbursement of these costs to be both reasonable and appropriate. The Committee believes the Bureau of Reclamation should make available up to $100,000, from within the amount provided to the Bureau of Reclamation for the Central Valley Project, American River Division, to the City of Folsom to reimburse the City for public safety and po-

lice, fire and other emergency response costs it has incurred as a result of the closure of Folsom Dam Road. Folsom Dam Road is one of two main arteries connecting the two halves of the City of Folsom and has been either completely or partially closed for significant periods of time since the gate failed.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request, including full funding of fiscal year 1999 requirements for construction of the fish screen at the Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough. The recommendation also includes $1,200,000, the full amount of the budget request, for Bay Delta Oversight. Of the amount provided, $250,000 is for the Delta Wetlands Project.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs.—Within the amount provided, $5,500,000—an increase of $2,000,000 above the budget request—is for Refuge Water Supply.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—

Colusa Basin Drainage District.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for continued work on elements of Colusa Basin Drainage District's integrated resources management program.

Hamilton City Pumping Plant (Glenn Colusa Irrigation District).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000, an addition of $1,100,000 to the budget request, to continue construction of a fish screen and fish recovery facility associated with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant. Elsewhere in the bill, under the Construction, General account of the Corps of Engineers, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 for continued 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. Consequently, the Committee repeats its direction from last year for 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 coordinated in every respect.

Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to continue the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.

Operations and Maintenance.—Last year, the Committee directed the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare a report on the allocation of operation and maintenance costs at all of its projects and to re-evaluate its policy regarding the application of payments to operation and maintenance deficits in the Central Valley Project. The Committee also directed the Bureau to create opportunities for water and power users to participate in the preparation of annual operation and maintenance budgets. The Bureau has assured the Committee that it is working to carry out these directives, but it has yet to produce tangible results. The Bureau is directed to move expeditiously to complete its work and provide the required reports to Congress.

Central Valley Project, Shasta Division, California.—The Committee recommends the full amount of the budget request for the

Shasta Division of the Central Valley Project. Within this amount, $311,000 is provided to complete the Shasta Temperature Control Device Ecology Study, and $500,000 to continue the Clear Creek Restoration Program. The recommendation also fully funds the budget request for continuation of the hatchery ozone plant at the Coleman Fish Hatchery.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division, California.—The Committee recommends full funding of the budget request for the Trinity River Restoration Program. Within the funds provided, the Bureau is directed to continue its cooperative effort with the Hoopa Valley Tribe.

Lower Colorado Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, California, Arizona, and Nevada.—Funds have been provided to complete the cost-shared Imperial Valley Water Reclamation and Reuse Study.

San Gabriel Project, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000, the full amount of the budget request. The Committee understands that this is the maximum amount that could be effectively utilized by the Bureau in fiscal year 1999.

Southern California Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, California.—The funds provided are to continue the following cost-shared studies at the levels requested in the budget: Mammoth Lakes Water Optimization Study, Southern California Coastal Water Supply Study, and Lower Owens River Environmental Study.

Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado and New Mexico.—The Committee continues its longstanding support of the Animas-La Plata Project and has included $3 million, the full amount of the budget request, for project development. The Bureau is directed to use these funds to assist in the implementation of the modification to the project required by the proposed amendments to the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988. The Bureau is further directed to discontinue the needless study of so-called alternatives that have been rejected by the parties to the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Final Settlement Agreement.

Colorado Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Colorado.—Funds are provided to continue the Mesa County Water Conservation Study.

Idaho Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Idaho.—Funds are provided to continue the following cost-shared activities at the levels requested in the budget: Lower Boise River Water Quality Plan, Treasure Valley Hydrologic Analysis, Lower Payette River Water Quality Plan, and Upper Salmon River Water Optimization.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The Bureau is directed to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate prior to reprogramming any funds from this project in fiscal year 1999.

Kansas Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Kansas.—The funds provided are to continue the cost-shared Cheney Reservoir Water Quality Assessment and the Cheyenne Bottoms Investigation at the budgeted amounts.

Montana Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Montana.—The recommended funding is to continue the cost-

shared Montana River System Study, Jefferson River Basin Return Flow Study, the turbidity and sediment analysis at Nevada Reservoir, and the North Fork of the Blackfoot River investigation. Funds are also provided to complete the Upper Whitefish Lake investigation and the Hungry Horse Reservoir investigation.

Nebraska Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Nebraska.—The recommendation provides funding to continue the cost-shared Nebraska Water Supply Assessment and the Nebraska Rainwater Basin Wetlands study at the requested levels.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee supports ongoing efforts in New Mexico to enhance the habitat of the endangered silvery minnow. Therefore, the Committee directs the Bureau to use existing Federal water allocations to the maximum extent possible and to enhance silvery minnow habitat without negatively affecting current water policy on the Rio Grande.

Southern New Mexico/West Texas Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, New Mexico and Texas.—Funds are provided to continue the cost-shared Rio Grande/Rio Bravo International Basin Assessment and the Rio Grande Project Drains Water Quality Study at the requested amounts.

Upper Rio Grande Basin Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, New Mexico and Colorado.—Funds are provided to complete the cost-shared Rio Grande Riparian Tree Species Consumptive Use Study.

Dakota Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, North Dakota and South Dakota.—$250,000 has been provided for the Black Hills Water Management Investigation. The additional funding above the budget request of $125,000 for this investigation has been provided to complete the Integrated Ground and Surface Water Model and the Water Quality Models essential to the success of the study.

Oklahoma Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Oklahoma.—The funds provided are to complete the cost-shared Oklahoma Water Supply Study and to continue the Lugert-Altus Water Resources Management Options Study at the amounts requested in the budget.

Klamath Project, Oregon.—The Committee recognizes that the creation of additional storage capacity is critical to alleviating the pressures inherent in allocating water for competing uses. Consequently, the Committee directs that funds for the Agency Ranch project be applied solely for the purpose of water storage and that additional water supplies be available for all Klamath Basin users without discrimination among user groups.

Umatilla Basin Project, Phase III Study, Oregon.—Within the funds provided, the Bureau is directed to begin the examination of alternatives for increasing the surface water supply available to local cities and agricultural areas suffering from groundwater shortages in the Stage Gulch area.

Oregon Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Oregon.—The funds provided are to continue the cost-shared activities in the Malheur/Owyhee and Powder River Basins, the Rogue River Basin, the John Day River Basin, and the Deschutes River Basin, and the Grande Ronde River Basin.

Texas Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Texas.—The funds provided are for the cost-shared Rio Grande Conveyance Canal Pipeline Study, otherwise known as the El Paso-Las Cruces Regional Sustainable Water Project.

Northern Utah Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Utah, Wyoming and Idaho.—The funds provided for this program are to continue the cost-shared Ashley/Brush Creeks Optimization Study and the Ogden River Basin Water Quality Management Plan.

Southern Utah Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Utah and Nevada.—The funds provided are for continued development of the cost-shared Carbon/Emery Counties Water Quality Management Plan.

Washington Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Washington.—The funds provided are to complete the cost-shared Warden Coulee investigation.

Wyoming Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, Wyoming and Nebraska.—The funds recommended for this program are for tribal assistance.

Reclamation Recreation Management.—Of the amount provided, $1,500,000 is for the Yuma West Wetlands Restoration project. The remaining funds are provided for the Bonny Reservoir Project in Colorado.

Unscheduled Maintenance.—The Committee has rejected the Administration's initiative to create an unscheduled maintenance program to address unanticipated needs associated with the Bureau's water and power infrastructure. The Committee notes that it has fully funded the Administration's request for facilities operations, maintenance and rehabilitation for Bureau projects throughout the West. The Committee expects the Bureau to reorder priorities and utilize its existing reprogramming authority to address unanticipated needs as they arise.

Wetlands Development.—Of the amount provided, $377,000 is for the Sahuarita Constructed Wetlands Demonstration Project in Arizona.

In fiscal year 1997, the Committee directed the Bureau to use funds provided to the Wetlands Development program to continue the Caddo Lake Scholars and other wetland development components of the Caddo Lake Wetlands project. The Committee is concerned that this direction was not followed. Consequently, the Bureau is redirected to use previously appropriated funds for the purposes described above.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1998	$10,425,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	12,425,000
Recommended, 1999	12,425,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	+2,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	.....

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l), loans and/or grants may 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	15,379,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION	10,300,000	2,114,000	2,114,000
SALINAS VALLEY	9,876,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
SAN SEVAINE PROJECT	28,100,000	781,000	781,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	6,541,000	801,000	801,000
OREGON			
MILLTOWN HILL, DOUGLAS COUNTY	18,624,000	4,004,000	4,004,000
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	---	425,000	425,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM		12,425,000	12,425,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 1998	$33,130,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	49,500,000
Recommended, 1999	33,130,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	
Budget Estimate, 1999	−16,370,000

The Central Valley Project Restoration Fund was authorized in Title 34 of Public Law 102–575, the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. 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 Committee has provided $33,130,000 for the CVP Restoration Fund. The recommended level of funding is due to severe budget constraints. The Committee is very supportive of the activities carried out with funds collected into this account, which is comprised of assessments on Central Valley Project water and power users. The Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to fully coordinate and integrate ecosystem restoration activities funded by the Restoration Fund with similar activities funded through the CALFED program.

The Committee intends, to the greatest extent possible, that the Bureau of Reclamation take such steps as are necessary to ensure that amounts appropriated from the Restoration Fund equal funds assessed and collected. It is not the intent of the Committee to allow unappropriated balances to accrue in the CVP Restoration Fund.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriation, 1998	$85,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	143,300,000
Recommended, 1999	75,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−68,300,000

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. The funds appropriated in this account are 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.

The Committee has provided $75,000,000 for the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration Program, $68,300,000 less than the

budget request of $143,300,000. While the Committee is unable to provide the full budget request for this important program due to severe budget constraints, the Committee is supportive of the program and believes that significant progress has been made during the last year.

The Committee is well aware of important ongoing efforts of the CALFED-established Ecosystem Roundtable to better coordinate and, where possible, integrate the ecosystem funding and implementation activities currently underway as part of the 1992 CVPIA, the 1994 Bay-Delta Accord, the 1996 Bay-Delta Act, and a number of related state and local funding initiatives. Such work will be an important part of the development and implementation of a fiscally responsible and scientifically sound near-term restoration coordination strategy for CALFED—one that embraces the longer-term ecosystem restoration program plan, as well as current and proposed appropriations for this important ecosystem work.

The Committee understands and anticipates that the Roundtable's revised priority-setting and funding allocation process will be in place and underway as part of the timely allocation and distribution of funds in fiscal year 1999.

The Committee recognizes a need to develop criteria and/or performance standards to evaluate the effectiveness of expenditures for environmental enhancement as part of the CALFED process. The Committee believes that such an evaluation program should be developed through a peer review process. No individual should be selected to participate in this peer review process who—(1) has actively participated in advocating or opposing the issuance of funding for a type of project; (2) has a direct financial interest in the proposed plans; or (3) is employed by or related to any person having a direct financial interest in the proposed plan.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1998	$47,558,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	48,000,000
Recommended, 1999	46,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−1,558,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−2,000,000

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, 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 1999, the Committee has recommended $46,000,000, a $2,000,000 reduction from 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 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 1999 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 1999 budget request, but are generally consistent with the fiscal year 1998 funding levels. The Administration's proposed budget requests for the Department of Energy continue to be unrealistically high, resulting in much wasted effort by the Department in preparing these inflated budgets and the Committee in reviewing them. Perhaps the Administration could review the funding trends for the Department of Energy over the past three years and note that raising expectations for large budget increases and new programs is a significant waste of time and resources.

COMPUTER SECURITY AND THE YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEM

The Committee is aware that breaches of computer security are an increasing concern at all government agencies, and is concerned about the possible vulnerability of publicly-accessible unclassified computer systems maintained by the Department. A report by the Department's Office of Oversight identified numerous weaknesses that need to be addressed, including the presence of classified information on computers that were accessible to anyone with an Internet connection. The Secretary is directed to take the steps necessary to ensure that the security and integrity of DOE's electronic information is not compromised and that sensitive data is adequately protected throughout the Department's computational networks. Within the funding provided for Departmental computing systems, highest priority should be given to the expenditure of funds that reduce the vulnerability of DOE corporate computer systems and networks. The Secretary should also identify a single individual in the Department who is responsible for computer security issues at Headquarters and field installations.

The Secretary shall submit to Congress by March 30, 1999, a computer security policy and implementation plan that states the overall Departmental policy on computer security, the roles and responsibilities of Departmental organizations for computer security

both in headquarters and field installations, the steps being implemented to protect the Department's publicly accessible computer systems from external attempts to alter or delete data, and the steps being taken to ensure that all sites remove classified and sensitive information from Internet-accessible computers and strengthen the programs to prevent recurrences. The report should specifically identify actions which the Department has taken to address identified weaknesses and strengthen computer security at headquarters and field installations, address any needed changes to current policies and guidance, and identify specific milestones for completing the necessary improvements.

As noted in a recent General Accounting Office report, there are concerns that the Department's performance is below the government average in addressing mission-essential computer systems with regard to the Year 2000 computer problem. The Secretary of Energy should provide a report to the Committee by November 30, 1998, that outlines the status of efforts to address the Year 2000 problems and actions that are being taken to complete this effort within established milestones.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

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

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

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

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal re-

programming flexibility in fiscal year 1999, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

At the request of Congress, the Department conducted a study of how it manages the nuclear weapons program, including an analysis of the functions performed at Headquarters, operations offices, and applicable area and site offices. The March 1997 report, prepared by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), identified a series of problems with Defense Program's management processes. Further, it noted that many of the issues could not be addressed by a single program, but required Department-wide management changes. It has been over one year since the report was published, and few of the recommendations have been implemented. While apparently aware of the problems, correcting them seems to be much harder and take much longer than was anticipated. The Committee directs the Department to undertake a much broader analysis of the current management and field structure to create a management framework which will take the Department into the next century. The Laboratory Operations Board has now spent several years reviewing the laboratory and field structure and may be in a position to support this review. The IDA study provides an initial basis for the review. The General Accounting Office has issued several reports on improving the management of Federal agencies. The Department is directed to report back to the Committees on Appropriations by November 30, 1998, with a proposal for performing a comprehensive management and field structure review during fiscal year 1999.

FUNCTIONAL SUPPORT COST SYSTEM

The Committee commends the Department on the development of the Functional Support Cost Report and encourages the Department to continue efforts to improve its accuracy and usefulness. The report has proven to be a useful tool in better understanding the Department's operating costs and provides evidence that the Department is actively working to control and reduce functional support costs. There are significant concerns that the overhead rates charged by the Department's contractors are quite high, and often duplicative when charged by prime contractors and subcontractors on the same project. The Department is directed to work with the Committee to determine what steps can be taken to better understand the existing overhead structure and possible changes that could reduce overhead rates and provide more funds for direct program activities.

EXCESSIVE CONTRACTOR TRAINING COSTS

The Department of Energy provides funding to train contractor employees on a wide variety of subjects to improve such things as managerial expertise, job knowledge, working relationships, and

professional development. Spending for these courses has dropped dramatically from $465,000,000 in 1995 to $322,000,000 in 1997 since the Committee began reviewing these programs, but improvements are still needed. A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report determined there are significant differences in the way training is provided at various Departmental sites, and these differences offer several opportunities for cost savings. For example, Departmental contractors may maintain more than one independent training operation at a single DOE field location. These independent training operations have led to the creation of redundant training staffs which offer redundant training courses to contractor employees on many subjects. GAO found as many as 216 redundant training courses offered by the four prime contractors at one DOE field location. Another issue is the same course offered at different sites varied in length from 4 to 24 hours and in cost per classroom hour from eight dollars to thirty-eight dollars. The independent development of training courses by Departmental contractors, rather than seeking training materials from other DOE locations or acquiring the training from an outside vendor, has contributed to these variations and resulted in a waste of resources and non-standardized training across the Department. In addition, the Department has not developed a set of performance measures to evaluate contractor training across the complex.

The Committee is also aware of an October 1997 report to the Secretary on the Status of the Department of Energy Safeguards and Security Program which identified significant duplication of effort in the area of security training, and ". . . growing concern over both the quality and cost of training that is provided and the inefficiency caused by duplication of facilities and capabilities." This report recommended that the Department conduct a comprehensive review to identify and eliminate redundant training capabilities and coordinate activities at each site.

To address this issue, the Committee directs the Department to conduct a comprehensive review of all training facilities and capabilities in light of the recommendations contained in the GAO report and any internal Departmental reports of training programs. The Department is to report to the Committees on Appropriations on the implementation of these recommendations by February 16, 1999.

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. Excessive use of support service contractors and management and operating contractors detailed to Headquarters organizations persists at the Department despite Inspector General reviews documenting the excessive use of contractor employees. The Committee expects the Department to continue to monitor this and reduce use of contractor employees at Headquarters in fiscal year 1999 by 10% below the fiscal year 1998 level of usage.

The Committee directs the Department to provide a report at the end of fiscal year 1998 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 employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, 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, 1997 through September 30, 1998, and estimates for fiscal year 1999, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 1999.

INAPPROPRIATE USE OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee continues to be very concerned about the inappropriate use of contractors in the development of budget requests and execution of Department programs. The Committee has learned that certain contractors have been reimbursed by the Department for the following activities: answering the organization's phones, faxes and e-mails; updating web sites of the organizations; getting industry together to develop "consensus positions" on Department programs; conference calls with Department employees once a month; publishing association journals and other publications; and attending domestic and international conferences to represent their industry members. These contracts and grants are especially suspect considering that they are routinely awarded noncompetitively.

While there may be instances where it is necessary for the Department to procure the services of a contractor for a specific task, it is inappropriate for the Department to routinely fund the operating budgets for these outside groups. As a rule, the Department should procure services from contractors in arms-length arrangements. In cases where it is determined that a specific service or product is needed and it is in the interest of the Department to secure the service or product through a grant or contract, the Department should procure or award using competitive procedures.

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, 1998–	$906,807,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	1,129,042,000
Recommended, 1999	882,834,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−23,973,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−246,208,000

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: solar and renewables; nuclear energy; fusion; environment, safety and health; and energy support activities. In prior years, the Committee recommended significant reductions to programs in this account, with reductions to solar and fusion programs of about 30%. This year, the Committee recommendation is generally supportive of the level of funding provided in the current fiscal year.

The Committee has been actively working to improve the scope and management of the Department's research and development programs. Before it can be determined whether more funding is needed for existing programs, there are basic questions about the purpose and value of these activities. These questions include: the balance of basic research versus development; the prioritization of technologies; the wisdom of awarding non-competitive grants and contracts to the same groups of beneficiaries year after year; the ability (and desire) to actually track and collect the thousands of research and development "deliverables"; the inability to spend funds appropriated in prior years; and the very basic question of the applicability of some of these activities to the lives of American taxpayers.

The Committee notes that the Department has acknowledged that improvements must be made. Secretary Peña, in response to hearing questions this year, criticized Departmental procedures that "often provided inadequate competition for grant awards and inadequate requirements for peer review." The Secretary also cited "inadequacies" as detailed by a recent report of the Department's Inspector General (IG). The IG surveyed five of nineteen procurement offices and cited the Department's failure to collect the actual work product of 718 grants with a total value of $232,000,000.

In its report to the President in November 1997, the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) reported that: "In the course of this study, the Panel observed a number of problems in DOE management of R&D, including: "stovepiping" of programs and a frequent lack of effective coordination, micromanagement of R&D programs, burdensome oversight; limited technical skills among a significant number of DOE staff, resulting in misdirection of some R&D programs; and sometimes a lack of clear leadership . . . These are not new observations; the SEAB Alternative Futures and SEAB Strategic Energy R&D studies reported similar findings. As far as the Panel has been able to tell, however, DOE actions in response to the findings and recommendations of these past Task Forces have been insufficient and major deficiencies remain."

The Secretary of Energy, Inspector General, Government Accounting Office, and Assistant Secretary all agree with the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology. Reforms are needed. The way to reform a program is not to increase spend-

ing by 30% to 100%. Having identified many of the problems, the next step is to follow through with improved management.

Last year, and again this year, the Committee included statutory language to improve contracting practices and prohibit lobbying with Federal funds. The Committee is continuing to examine programs and identify deficiencies. The Committee looks forward to working with the new management team to reduce the current emphasis on the preparation and justification of future year budgets and increase the emphasis on current year management. There is widespread agreement that there is greater value that can be gained from the current level of spending, which is substantial. There may never be agreement on what amount of spending is appropriate, but there should be no disagreement on the need to get better value for the dollars being spent by the Department.

With regard to the Administration's request to increase spending for programs it identifies as part of the Climate Change Technology Initiative, the Committee questions the premise of the Administration's argument for more spending. The Committee believes that the $272,200,000 in fiscal year 1998 funds identified by the Administration is an arbitrary amount considering the programs not included. Why not include the $44,304,000 the Office of Energy has budgeted for solar and renewable energy research? Why wouldn't the $8,200,000 provided for the National Institute for Global and Environmental Change be counted in the effort to study global and environmental change?

In short, the Committee believes that the tens of billions of dollars spent on renewable energy, nuclear energy, fusion energy, and the Federal workforce needed to manage these programs, has been a significant amount of funding. The hundreds of millions recommended by the Committee last year and in this bill again this year represent a serious and significant level of funding. Rather than suggesting this funding is insufficient by proposing unrealistic and dramatic increases, the Committee observes that American taxpayers are supporting a level of effort for these technologies unrivalled by any other nation.

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 research and development is $351,405,000, an increase of $5,139,000 over the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee continues to be concerned that, over the years, the Department has placed a higher priority on providing funds to commercialize technologies that are not yet ready to fully compete in the marketplace. These efforts have come at the expense of a more proper role for government: fostering peer-reviewed research which could lead to cutting-edge discoveries in plant research, chemical and materials sciences, and other areas fundamental to development of these technologies. Last year, the Committee combined the solar and renewable energy-related research performed by the Office of Energy Research with the research and development activities performed

by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. The Committee directed the Department to submit a comprehensive research and development request for fiscal year 1999, representing a new partnership between the two Offices. The Committee is pleased that the Department has worked to coordinate the efforts of these two Offices that have each justified their budgets based on common goals. The Committee further encourages program managers in both Offices to explore the opportunities for more relevant research and better directed development of these technologies.

Million Solar Roofs.—In June of last year, in an address to the United Nations, President Clinton announced the Million Solar Roofs Initiative. The Committee was concerned about the cost of one million solar roofs and the initiation of a program not funded by Congress. These concerns were confirmed in a DOE press release announcing the award of $5,000,000 to selected business ventures to install 1,000 solar systems. Assuming the Department's estimates are accurate, at this rate, each roof system will cost an average of $32,000, of which taxpayers will pay $5,000. To install one million roof systems by 2010 would require thirty-two billion dollars, of which five billion dollars would be taxpayer-funded.

The Committee can neither contemplate the source of this massive funding requirement nor the justification for taking taxpayer funds and selecting business ventures and rooftops to equip with these solar systems. As no funding has been provided for this program, the Committee urges the Department to use lower case letters when touting the goal of outfitting one million solar roofs. The Committee has not rejected the goal of this program. The Committee observes that the attainment of this goal relies primarily on the affordability of these systems for consumers rather than the ability of the government to force these systems onto one million rooftops.

Following are specific recommendations for programs:

Solar building technology research.—The Committee recommendation of $2,200,000 does not include funding for the Solar Rating and Certification Corporation "to remove restrictions to the use of solar energy in communities" as requested in the budget justification.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee continues to strongly support the goals of this program. The Committee recommendation provides $69,683,000, including $2,883,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The recommendation includes full support for basic research and thin-film partnerships. The recommendation does not include an increase over the current fiscal year for PV Building Opportunities activities.

The Committee encourages the Department to fully consider the qualifications of Arizona State University when evaluating institutions participating in the photovoltaic energy systems development research program.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommendation of $17,100,000 includes a total of $1,000,000 for activities directly or indirectly related to Solar Two. The Department is directed to prepare a plan to complete this project in fiscal year 2000 which includes all termination costs. The recommendation does not in-

clude funding for systems and markets/industrial assistance activities.

Biomass/biofuels energy systems.—The total Committee recommendation is $100,799,000, including $27,199,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The recommendation includes $31,100,000 for power systems, of which $17,700,000 is provided for rural development, $3,000,000 is provided for co-firing biomass with coal, and $1,000,000 is provided for demonstration of black liquor gasification. No increase is provided for modular systems development. The recommendation includes $42,500,000 for transportation, of which $5,000,000 is included for the Gridley rice straw project. The recommendation includes increases for research and development of advanced fermentation organisms, advanced cellulases, and pretreatment of feedstocks. The recommendation also includes $2,500,000 for the Plant Biotechnology Consortium to be funded from the $27,199,000 provided for the Office of Energy Research. The $4,600,000 for feedstock development and $2,500,000 for regional biomass is to be equally derived from the power systems and transportation programs.

Wind energy systems.—The total Committee recommendation is $33,483,000, including $283,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The recommendation includes a minimum of $1,700,000, the amount requested, for certification and standards activities. The Committee has been assured that the certification program will be in place in fiscal year 1999. The Committee welcomes the attainment of one of the goals of the wind energy program.

Renewable energy production incentive.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000, a $1,000,000 increase over the amount requested.

International solar energy.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 exclusively for the U.S. Initiative on Joint Implementation. No funds provided in this or any prior Act are to be made available for the America's 21st Century or CORECT programs.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL).—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000, of which $1,000,000, the amount requested, is provided for infrastructure and general purpose equipment. The remaining $1,000,000 is to be made available following submission of a program plan by the winner of the competition for the management and operating contract.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation of $27,500,000 includes $6,500,000 for the geothermal heat pump deployment program. The Committee continues to be concerned about the Department's reluctance to provide adequate funding to meet its commitment to this partnership.

Hydrogen.—The total Committee recommendation is $18,008,000, including $3,008,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research funded through the Office of Energy Research. The recommendation includes $3,000,000 for core research and development.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for cost-shared research and development of "fish-

friendly" turbines, an increase of $1,250,000 over the amount provided last year.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The recommendation includes $34,000,000 for high-temperature superconductivity, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee fully supports the efforts to demonstrate truly first-of-a-kind high-temperature superconducting technologies. The recommendation also includes $4,000,000 for energy storage systems, an increase of $50,000 over the current fiscal year. The Committee strongly supports the goals of this program. Superconducting transmission lines, motors and storage devices have the potential to greatly enhance the viability of renewable energy resources in the near term. The recommendation does not include funding for the climate challenge program.

The Committee has been made aware that the Department has fallen behind schedule on its commitment to the Superconductivity Partnership Initiative. The Committee provided the full amount of the budget request last year and is not aware of any failure of the industry partner to fulfill its commitment to the initiative. Unless the Department has identified a problem with its partner, the Department is directed to finalize contracts under the Superconductivity Partnership Initiative on schedule to ensure that this important research is not delayed.

Transmission reliability.—The Committee is concerned that the transition to a deregulated, competitive electricity market not be accompanied by a decrease in transmission system reliability, and urges the Department to coordinate and integrate research and technology development to address critical concerns related to the reliability of the emerging electricity market.

Federal buildings initiative.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to be awarded for installation of renewable power sources for Federal facilities. All proposals must include a cost benefit analysis. The Department may only approve proposals that have verifiable, favorable cost benefits over a period of not more than ten years. Cost benefits shall be based exclusively on actual monetary costs and savings.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $15,600,000, approximately the same as the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy continues to lead the Department in the ratio of salaries and expenses to program dollars. The recommendation for program direction includes all funding for support service contractors and Assistant Secretary/cross-cutting activities.

The Committee is aware that restructuring of the electricity industry is related to implementation of certain technologies funded under this account. The Committee will work with the Department to outline a more clearly defined electricity restructuring program.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS –

The Committee recommendation is $227,769,000, a decrease of $15,291,000 from the current fiscal year. Unless otherwise specified, the Committee has accepted reductions identified in the budget request and denied funding increases identified in the budget justification.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The recommendation includes $35,000,000, a $5,500,000 reduction from the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of interest the Department has shown in streamlining management, reducing the infrastructure, and reducing the extensive level of support service contractors in this program. The Department is directed to prepare a plan to streamline and reduce costs for this program. The plan is to be included with the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Test reactor area landlord.—The recommendation includes $6,101,000, a net reduction of $1,324 from the current fiscal year, considering the $2,000,000 reduction in the amount requested for construction as proposed in the budget request.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The recommendation includes $12,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the peer-reviewed Nuclear Engineering Education Research grant program (NEER), $1,000,000 for the university graduate fellowship program, and $1,000,000 for the industry-matching program. The recommendation also provides support to the university nuclear engineering community with full funding for the reactor fuel, sharing, and instrumentation programs.

Nuclear energy research initiative.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 as the first year of funding for this research program, a reduction of $19,000,000 from the budget request. The Committee supports this program, which would award grants to laboratories, universities and consortiums using a formal peer-review process. Possible research topics include: nuclear safety and risk analysis, proliferation-resistant reactor and fuel technologies and new technologies for nuclear wastes.

Termination costs.—The recommendation is $81,150,000, a $4,115,000 increase over the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes $45,000,000 for electrometallurgical-related activities including $20,000,000 for the nuclear technology research and development program to continue study of treating spent fuel using electrometallurgical technology and $25,000,000 to demonstrate electrometallurgical technology at the Fuel Conditioning Facility. The budget request of $31,200,000 to maintain the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) has been included in the non-defense environmental management account.

The Committee is concerned that the schedule for the shutdown activities at the Experimental Breeder Reactor II (EBR-II) at the Argonne National Laboratory-West site in Idaho continues to slip. The Office of Nuclear Energy is directed to submit to the Committee a validated baseline project schedule by December 31, 1998. The baseline should include the cost, schedule, and major milestones for each activity by fiscal year, the total cost, and the Department's confidence level that this schedule is accurate and can be executed. The report should also include an analysis of any weak points in the schedule and the technical issues which must be resolved to maintain the project cost and schedule. The program should work with the Committee during development of this report to ensure that sufficient detail is being provided.

Uranium programs.—The Committee recommendation includes $53,518,000, an $11,082,000 reduction from the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes a $3,000,000 reduction, the same as the budget request, in construction. The recommendation also reflects acceptance of the decreases proposed in the budget request and the elimination of increases proposed in the budget request.

Security at the Gaseous Diffusion Plants.—The Committee is aware there have been disagreements among the Department of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the United States Enrichment Corporation as to the appropriate implementation of Section 511 of the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act which relates to authority of the Department's contractors to carry firearms and make arrests in providing security at Federal installations. The Committee directs the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the United States Enrichment Corporation, to provide to the Committee by December 30, 1998, a report on the current status of implementing the provision, a finding as to which agency has the final authority to determine arming and arresting needs at the facilities, and a recommendation to the Committee on steps which will be taken to ultimately resolve this issue.

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation is $14,000,000, $2,000,000 less than the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes neither the full amount requested for production of molybdenum–99, nor the new construction start requested.

Nuclear energy plant optimization.—The recommendation does not include funding for this new spending program.

Program direction.—The recommendation includes $21,000,000, of which no more than $1,700,000 is available for all program direction expenses to support the Federal employees managing the nuclear energy programs recently transferred to the Office of Nonproliferation.

The Committee notes that the Office failed to observe internal budget procedures by providing funding for support service contracts from program funds. The Committee directs that support service contracts be funded from the amount provided for program direction.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

The recommendation includes $46,000,000, a reduction of $30,000,000 from the budget request of $76,000,000. Funding for support service contractors who assist the Federal employees in the execution of their duties has been reduced by $10,000,000. As the Committee has consistently noted, the Department relies too much on outside contractors for level-of-effort activities which should be performed by Federal government employees.

For program direction, the Committee recommendation is $18,398,000, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request of $38,398,000. Consistent with the funding for program direction expenses in fiscal year 1998, the Committee has provided $24,769,000 for program direction in the Other Defense Activities appropriation

account. The total funding recommended for program direction is the same as the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation is $232,000,000, a $3,840,000 increase over the budget request. The Committee continues to be very supportive of the increased emphasis on innovative confinement concepts and university-based experiments. The Committee encourages the Department to provide sufficient resources for these efforts. In particular, special emphasis should be placed on funding operations, upgrades, and enhanced design work on both existing research and proposals for new alternative concept experiments at the proof-of-principle level.

In addition to magnetic fusion, there are several promising technologies that have potential for producing electricity. The Department is directed to comprehensively review all known technologies and submit a program plan that includes activities funded in this account and potentially-related activities funded elsewhere in the Department. Recognizing the significant advances in Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) sponsored by the national security program, the Committee strongly supports the complementary work to be funded in this account including heavy-ion drivers, high gain target concepts, and reactor concepts.

International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor.—The Congress has been very clear that no obligation exists for future participation in ITER beyond the fiscal year 1998 contribution for engineering and design activities (EDA). The Committee is concerned about the recent announcement that the Department has already proposed to enter into a new agreement to start engineering and design of a newly-conceived, less costly reactor: "ITER-Lite". The Committee observes that the proponents of ITER have seized upon only one of the concerns the Congress has about ITER. The Committee continues to question whether the tokamak is the most promising technology and whether the current partners in ITER are willing and able to meet their commitments. The Committee observes that after ten years and a U.S. contribution of $345 million, the partnership has yet to even select a site for this construction project. The Committee objects to the proposed extension of the EDA and has not provided any additional funds for ITER, ITER-Lite or the Joint Central Team. The Department may use prior year funds for closeout costs related to ITER.

Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR).—In fiscal year 1997, Congress terminated funding for the TFTR. The Committee notes that TFTR has ceased operation and that many parts of the TFTR facility will be re-used for the new National Spherical Torus Experiment. Currently, the Department is spending approximately $4,000,000 annually for care-taking of the remaining TFTR components. The Department has no immediate plans for the decommissioning of the TFTR unit, proposing to continue care-taking expenses indefinitely. The Committee has been made aware of decommissioning proposals to complete decommissioning in three years, with estimated savings of $25,000,000. The Committee directs the Department to prepare a reasonable, timely and cost-effective decommissioning plan and to submit this plan with the fiscal year

2000 budget request. The Department shall consult with the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory throughout the development of this plan.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

–The Committee recommendation for Energy Support Activities is $105,100,000, a $21,781,000 reduction from the amount requested. The recommendation includes the Department's proposal to remove responsibility for funding Oak Ridge landlord activities from the Office of Nuclear Energy to the Office of Chief Financial Officer.

Technical information management program.—The Committee recommendation is $9,100,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 from the current fiscal year. The reduction reflects the elimination of construction funding as recommended in the budget request. The Department is directed to reduce the redundancy currently found between its database and the National Technical Information Service database maintained by the Department of Commerce. The Committee supports the continued downsizing of this program and directs that the Department provide a program plan detailing the program and funding requirements anticipated through fiscal year 2002.

Field offices.—The Committee recommendation is $85,000,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the amount provided for the current fiscal year. The Committee has provided funding for Federal employees at the Idaho field office in the Environmental Management program direction account.

Oak Ridge landlord.—The Committee recommendation of $11,000,000 reflects a reduction of $1,500,000 as a result of the reprogramming approved by the Committee on March 16, 1998.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation includes two funding adjustments. The $47,905,000 adjustment represents the funding provided for renewable energy research programs managed by the Office of Energy Research and funded in the Science account. The $31,535,000 adjustment for prior year balances reflects the availability of funds appropriated in prior years that have not yet been costed or obligated. This is the same amount identified as available in the current fiscal year.

ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Last year, Congress made a change to provide funding for this account on an annual basis (appropriation expires at the end of the fiscal year) rather than providing "no-year" funds which are made available until expended. The Committee cited the Department's continuation of programs eliminated by Congress and other inappropriate reprogrammings of funds appropriated in prior years. While the continuation of these spending programs does not violate the law, it certainly violates the clear intent of Congress.

It has come to the attention of the Committee that there is a potential contracting problem associated with the change to annual appropriations. The Committee notes that there are specific remedies for multi-year procurements in the law. The Committee is

currently working with the Department and the General Accounting Office to resolve the issues the Department has identified with regard to the potential use of these remedies. The Committee is very much aware of the need to operate facilities under multi-year agreements and fully intends to remedy any potential problem before final action on this bill.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1998–	$497,059,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	462,000,000
Recommended, 1999–	–466,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	−30,359,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	4,700,000

For fiscal year 1999, the Environmental Management program has established a new structure that more closely aligns funding with the goals of accelerating cleanup and moving to a project-based management approach. This new structure should improve the ability of the Department and Congress to track costs and measure progress at each Departmental site. The three major activities are: Site Closure, where cleanup will be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006 and no further DOE mission is anticipated; Site/Project Completion, where cleanup will be completed by 2006 but DOE programs will continue; and Post 2006 Completion, where cleanup activities at the site will extend beyond 2006. The fiscal year 1998 appropriation is shown in the new structure for comparability purposes.

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.

–The Committee recommendation is $466,700,000, an increase of $4,700,000 over the budget request of $462,000,000. The budget request included $26,500,000 for science and technology activities which were funded in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account in fiscal year 1998. The Committee recommendation retains that funding structure in fiscal year 1999, and $26,500,000 has been included in the Defense Environmental Management program. The budget request also transferred funding for the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at the Hanford site in Washington to the nuclear energy program. The Committee does not support this transfer, and has provided the budget request of $31,200,000 in this account to maintain the FFTF in a safe condition pending a final decision to proceed with the potential restart option for tritium production or to resume deactivation of the facility.

The Committee urges the Department to seek additional funding in fiscal year 2000 to accelerate the cleanup of many of the smaller sites and laboratories. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee was unable to provide additional funding in fiscal year 1999, but considers this an important activity.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 1998–	$220,200,000
Budget Estimate, 1999–	277,000,000
Recommended, 1999—	225,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	4,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1999–	–52,000,000

The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Fund supports D&D, remedial actions, waste management, and surveillance and maintenance associated with preexisting conditions at sites leased and operated by the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC), as well as Department of Energy facilities at these and other uranium enrichment sites. The sites covered by this D&D Fund include the operating uranium enrichment facilities at Portsmouth, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, and the inactive K–25 site in Tennessee, formerly called the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Environmental restoration efforts at these three sites are supported from the D&D Fund established by a tax on domestic utilities and by Congressional appropriations. In fiscal year 1999, the Department of Energy will transfer $398,088,000 into this Fund.

The Committee recommends $225,000,000, a reduction of $52,000,000 from the budget request of $277,000,000. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the budget request for this program, but the recommendation is an increase of $4,800,000 over fiscal year 1998. 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. The Committee continues to believe there are many efficiencies to be made in all areas of the environmental management program.

The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request of $35,000,000, to implement the reimbursement program authorized under Title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act for active uranium and thorium processing sites which sold uranium and 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.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 1998	$2,235,708,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	2,482,460,000
Recommended, 1999	2,399,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	163,792,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	–82,960,000

The Science account includes the following programs: high energy and nuclear physics; biological and environmental research; basic energy sciences; computational and technology research and other research-related programs. The Committee continues its very

strong support for these basic science programs. While the Committee has eliminated many Department of Energy programs and substantially reduced funding for others, the Committee has provided generous increases for physics programs and other basic research activities funded under this account.

–The Committee has taken extraordinary steps to provide the increases included in this recommendation. This year, the Committee was forced to reduce net funding for domestic programs by over four hundred million dollars. In addition, the Committee had to identify an additional $27,400,000 that was available last year from unobligated balances for termination of the superconducting super collider and not available this year. Nevertheless, the Committee continues its strong support for basic research and development activities funded in this account.

CLIMATE CHANGE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

The Committee has strongly supported the fundamental science pursued by the Department. The value and credibility of the Department's science program is dependent upon responsible leadership that would ensure that research is properly peer-reviewed and wholly independent from the policy positions of any Administration. While it is critical that science inform policy, it is equally critical that policy not direct scientific conclusions.

In the area of climate-related research, the Committee is concerned that this independence is being compromised. The Committee is disturbed that the Department has been publishing "reports" and "papers" and "assessments" that are heavy on conclusions and recommendations and light on new data and sound logic. Examples of these policy-driven testimonials include: *Scenarios of U.S. Carbon Reductions: Potential Impacts of Energy-Efficient and Low-Carbon Technologies by 2010 and Beyond* (September 1997); *Carbon Management: Assessment of Fundamental Research Needs* (August 1997); *and Technology Opportunities to Reduce U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions* (October 1997).

The Office of Energy Research has requested $27,000,000 for the Climate Change Technology Initiative (CCTI). Since much of the work done to date has been half-science and half-policy, the Committee reduction reduces the requested amount by one-half, or $13,500,000. No funding has been provided for the Office of Energy Research to publish policy-related materials. Full funding has been provided for the underlying science needed to better understand the complexities of the changes in the Earth's climate.

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 strong support for these fundamental pursuits.

–The recommendation is $696,500,000, a $16,465,000 increase over the amount provided in the current fiscal year and a $5,500,000 increase over the amount of the budget request. The recommendation includes a $3,000,000 increase over the budget re-

quest for facility operations, and a $2,500,000 increase for the research and technology program.

LARGE HADRON COLLIDER

–The recommendation includes $65,000,000, an increase of $30,000,000 over the amount provided in the current fiscal year, and the same amount as the budget request. The recommendation does not include the advance appropriation for fiscal years 2000 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 will carefully monitor this program 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.

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 $335,100,000, a $14,175,000 increase over the amount provided in the current fiscal year and a $2,500,000 increase over the amount requested.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $405,900,000, an $810,000 reduction from the current fiscal year, and a $13,300,000 increase over the budget request. The Committee recognizes the ongoing valuable work being done in the fight against Parkinson's disease. The recommendation includes funding to increase the Department's research of cell structures, diagnostic techniques and efforts related to drug development.

Within available funds, $8,800,000 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.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $779,100,000, an increase of $110,860,000 over the current fiscal year, and a $57,000,000 reduction from the budget request.

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

cal year 1999, 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).

SPALLATION NEUTRON SOURCE (SNS)

–The recommendation includes $100,000,000 for a new neutron source, a $77,000,000 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. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the full amount of the request.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for the Computational and Technology Research program is $138,640,000, a reduction of $22,000,000 from the budget request. The recommendation does not include funds for the Next Generation Internet program (NGI). The Committee has had to cut existing programs and make hard choices and 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.

UNIVERSITY AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

–The Committee has not provided funds for a new university and science education program. The Office of Energy Research informs the Committee that grants to colleges and universities are approximately one-half billion dollars in the current fiscal year. This level of funding is consistent with the Committee's direction that the Department fully support higher education. Two years ago, 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 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 recommendation does include funding for the Laboratory Cooperative, National Science Bowl, and Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowships programs in the program direction account as described below.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The recommendation is $43,100,000, a $3,240,000 increase over the amount requested. The Committee has provided $38,600,000 for standard program direction activities, and an additional $4,500,000 to fund the Laboratory Cooperative, National Science Bowl, and Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowships programs. The Committee takes this action to establish a legitimate funding mechanism for these activities. The Office of Energy Research is directed to provide full funding for programs as directed by the Congress. In the past, the Department has funded these and other Secretary/Director initiatives despite the lack of appropriations and at the expense of other programs. The Committee directs that the Department refrain from surreptitiously funding programs not included in the budget request and programs for which funding has been specifically denied by Congress.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

–The recommendation includes two funding adjustments. The $7,600,000 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 Super Collider. The $13,500,000 adjustment represents an estimate of the policy-related work requested as part of the Climate Change Technology Initiative. This adjustment is to be made exclusively to the Basic Energy Sciences and Biological and Environmental Research programs.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation, 1998	$160,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	190,000,000
Recommended, 1999 –	160,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998 –	
Budget Estimate, 1999 –	−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.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends $160,000,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 1999. Combined with the appropriation of $190,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $350,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 1999, the same as fiscal year 1998.

The Department is to review all cost components to see what savings can be achieved in fiscal year 1999. The Committee has not provided funding for the State of Nevada or the affected units of local government. The Committee continues to be concerned about the excessive use of support service contractors at the Yucca Mountain Project Office and Headquarters and directs the Department

to reduce their usage by a minimum of 10 percent in fiscal year 1999.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1998–	$224,155,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	245,788,000
Recommended, 1999–	175,365,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	−48,790,000
Budget Estimate, 1999–	−70,423,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1998–	−$136,738,000
Budget Estimate, 1999–	−136,530,000
Recommended, 1999—	−136,530,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	208,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	

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. In fiscal year 1999, the Committee has provided funding for Departmental Administration activities in two appropriation accounts. The Committee has provided $175,365,000 in this account, and $60,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account, for total funding of $235,365,000, a reduction of $10,423,000 from the budget request. For many years, full funding for all corporate and administrative activities of the Department has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that over 70 percent of the Department's funding is provided in the defense accounts. The Committee has distributed these costs more equitably in fiscal year 1999.

In a change from fiscal year 1998, where funding for general management expenses was provided as a lump sum program, the Committee recommendation provides funding for individual administrative offices at the same level of detail as included in the budget justification. The Committee continues to believe that Headquarters staffing for many administrative functions is excessive, and has reduced the funding for certain offices accordingly. These changes are shown in the accompanying table.

Office of Contract Reform.—The Department has established an Office of Contract Reform to guide and coordinate the Department's contract reform initiatives and the "privatization" proposals to pursue fixed-price contracts and private sector financing for major construction projects. Through contract reforms aimed at increasing competition, the Department seeks to improve contractor and project performance and gain cost and schedule efficiencies. The Department's budget request included no funding for this new office, but the Committee has recommended $3,200,000 to staff this office in fiscal year 1999.

Information management.—The recommendation includes the budget request of $8,000,000 for a new Corporate Management In-

formation System. Last year the Committee requested a detailed project plan for acquisition of this system. The report provided by the Department was late and not complete. The Committee believes that the investment in these systems has the potential to generate substantial savings over the next five years, but is concerned that the project management is not sufficient to ensure success. The Department is directed to provide the Committee with a semi-annual status report starting November 1, 1998, showing project milestones, cost schedules, performance measures, and progress to date. The report should also describe any current issues or concerns which could adversely impact the cost or schedule of the project.

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 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 2000 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 working capital fund is to be audited each year by the Department's Inspector General to ensure the integrity of the accounts. 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.

Official Reception and Representation Expenses.—Consistent with recommendations made throughout this bill for agency representation expenses, the Committee has provided $5,000 in the Departmental Administration account.

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 1999 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 $44,312,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee recognizes that funds received from reim-

bursable 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 1999 is $136,530,000, the same as the budget request, and a decrease of $208,000 from the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1998.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1998 –	$27,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	29,500,000
Recommended, 1999—	14,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	– 13,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	– 15,000,000

–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.

–In fiscal year 1999, the Committee has provided funding for the Inspector General in two appropriation accounts. The Committee has provided $14,500,000 in this account, and $15,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account, for a total of $29,500,000, the same as the budget request. The funding increase over fiscal year 1998 is necessary because unobligated balances were available to offset funding requirements in prior fiscal years. For many years, full funding for the Office of the Inspector General has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that over 70% of the Department's funding is provided in the defense accounts. The Committee has distributed these costs more equitably in fiscal year 1999.

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 Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Other Defense Activities; and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1998–	$4,146,692,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999—	4,500,000,000
Recommended, 1999—	4,142,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	– 4,592,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	– 357,900,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to maintain high confidence in the safety, security, reliability and performance 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 in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. The program must maintain indefinitely the safety, reliability and performance of the current nuclear weapons stockpile without underground nuclear testing; maintain the capability to return to the design and production of new weapons and to underground nuclear testing, if directed by the President; and dismantle excess weapons safety and dispose of or store excess components.

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

The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $4,142,100,000, a decrease of $4,592,000 from the fiscal year 1998 appropriation, and a decrease of $357,900,000 from the budget request of $4,500,000,000. An adjustment of $305,436,000 has been made to the total account to reflect the use in fiscal year 1999 of funding balances carried over from prior fiscal years. The Committee will work with the Department to assure the accuracy and availability of these balances as costs are incurred during execution of the nuclear weapons program in fiscal year 1998.

The reduction to the fiscal year 1999 budget request reflects the Committee's concern that the Department is using a very broad brush to define activities which are essential to maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile and should look closely at all of the individual activities which are being performed at the nuclear weapons laboratories and production plants. Cost controls and project management at the laboratories have been inadequate as evidenced by many examples of projects which have experienced scope creep, missed milestones, and cost overruns. Funds are used for numerous multi-colored publications, education activities, conferences, contractor training that is not essential to work performance, and extensive contractor travel. In addition, six percent of all operating funding provided to each laboratory is allocated to the laboratory director to fund discretionary research. The Committee will not argue there is no value to some of these activities, but questions whether they are all critical to maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile.

Stockpile stewardship appears to be a very large rug under which to sweep a broad and diverse group of activities. The Committee is not convinced that the Department has made a critical assessment of all activities being performed throughout the nuclear weapons complex in the name of stockpile stewardship nor that the Department has exercised sufficient oversight of costs and project management. Until such an assessment is performed and the De-

partment can assure the Committee that stringent cost controls and project management systems have been put in place, large budget increases will be difficult to maintain.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

–The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in stockpile safety and reliability without nuclear testing through a technically challenging science-based stockpile stewardship program using upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities. Funding of $2,123,075,000, an increase of $255,925,000 over fiscal year 1998, has been recommended for fiscal year 1999. For core stockpile stewardship operating expenses, the Committee recommendation reduces funding by $30,000,000 from the budget request of $1,505,832,000. As noted above, the Committee believes there are many cost efficiencies to be achieved throughout the laboratory complex.

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 supports the ASCI program, and the budget request of $329,100,000 for fiscal year 1999. This is a significant increase from the fiscal year 1998 funding level of $223,529,000. 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 Fusion.—The Committee recommends $508,000,000 for the inertial fusion program, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request of $498,000,000. The recommendation includes the budget request of $291,000,000 for the National Ignition Facility, and $29,000,000 for the University of Rochester's OMEGA laser. Recognizing the impact that laser technology has made in the national security missions of the Department, the Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 to further the development of high average power lasers.

Technology Transfer and Education.—The Committee recommendation includes $49,000,000 for technology transfer and education programs, a decrease of $20,000,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes the budget request of $10,000,000 for the AMTEX cooperative research and development agreement.

Construction projects.—The budget request of $115,543,000 for stockpile stewardship construction includes funding for many ongoing projects throughout the nuclear weapons complex, including seven new starts in fiscal year 1999. The Committee's recommendation reduces funding for new starts in stockpile stewardship by $25,300,000. In light of the concerns expressed by the Committee last year about the Department's costly project management failures, initiating a large number of new projects before the causes of prior project failures have been fully identified does not seem

prudent. An independent assessment of the entire project management system in the Department and separate assessments of individual projects are underway. Pending completion of this review, the Committee has deferred without prejudice many of these new starts. Specific details by project are shown in the accompanying table.

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 $2,084,461,000, an increase of $33,336,000 over the budget request of $2,051,125,000. The recommendation provides funding for activities necessary to sustain a reliable, quality production capability to support the nuclear weapons stockpile as it ages.

Nuclear weapons production complex.—Additional funding of $53,500,000 over the budget request of $1,935,803,000 for stockpile management operating expenses has been provided to maintain adequate production capability throughout the Department's nuclear weapons production complex. Additional funding of $15,500,000 is provided for the advanced manufacturing, design and production technologies (ADAPT) program; $25,000,000 is provided for core stockpile management weapons activities at the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas; and $13,000,000 is provided for handling uranium materials and infrastructure upgrades at the Y–12 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

–*Tritium.*—The Committee's recommendation fully funds the budget request of $157,000,000 for continued research and development on a new source of tritium to support the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.

Construction projects.—The Committee has not included fiscal year 1999 funding of $9,164,000 for Project 97–D–122, the nuclear materials storage facility renovation project, at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and has reduced funding for Project 95–D–102, the chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, to $5,000,000. The Committee is concerned that a validated baseline for the cost and schedule of these two ongoing projects does not exist.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $240,000,000 for program direction is a reduction of $20,500,000 from the budget request of $260,500,000. This reflects a reduction in funding for personnel costs and travel expenses for Federal employees, support service contractors, advisory and assistance services, and training.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Weapons Activities includes the use of uncosted obligations and unobligated balances carried forward from prior year balances. The Committee recommends the use of $305,436,000 to offset fiscal year 1999 funding requirements.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1998–	$4,429,438,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	4,259,903,000
Recommended, 1999—	4,358,554,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	–70,884,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	98,651,000

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; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Non-Defense Environmental Management; and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

In fiscal year 1999 the Environmental Management program has established a new structure that more closely aligns funding with the goals of accelerating cleanup and moving to a project-based management approach. This new structure should improve the ability of the Department and Congress to track costs and measure progress at each Departmental site. The three major activities are: Site Closure, where cleanup will be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006 and no further DOE mission is anticipated; Site/Project Completion, where cleanup will be completed by 2006 but DOE programs will continue; and Post 2006 Completion, where cleanup activities at the site will extend beyond 2006. The fiscal year 1998 appropriation is shown in the new structure for comparability purposes.

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account includes site/project completion, post 2006 completion, science and technology, the environmental science program, and a variety of crosscutting and program management activities. –The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $4,358,554,000, an increase of $98,651,000 over the budget request of $4,259,903,000. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

The Committee commends the environmental management organization for the current effort to develop a project basis for the environmental cleanup program. This approach will make it easier for Congress to review projects and track the status of individual project costs, schedules, and milestones at each site. It will provide additional accountability for the Department's managers who oversee the cleanup and contractors who perform the work. This can only improve the performance of the program and the credibility of the Department in managing the program.

Budget Justifications.—The Committee directs the Department to submit a fiscal year 2000 budget request which is based on these individual projects, including costs, schedules, and milestones for

each. The current system of identifying activities by operational units and waste streams may be one useful metric for tracking performance, but it tends to lose sight of the overall goal of this program which is to complete cleanup as quickly and efficiently as possible. The Department should work with the Committee to establish the level of detail required in the budget document.

Complex-Wide EM Integration Project.—The Committee believes the systems engineering and analysis process developed under DOE's Complex-Wide Integration Project can significantly improve overall management of the environmental management and civilian radioactive waste management programs. There is a need to expand the development of core capabilities in the complex to apply systems engineering and analysis on a broader, national scale. The Committee expects the Department to provide sufficient funding to establish systems engineering and analysis as a basis for the requirements and resource decisions in the environmental management and civilian radioactive waste management programs.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for greater flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at former defense sites which are undergoing remedial cleanup activities. In fiscal year 1999, each site manager may transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs and construction projects to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This 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 economic development funding for communities, and this is the proper forum for evaluating the merits of the many proposals which the Department receives for economic development funding.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The site/project completion account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission will continue beyond the year 2006. This account focuses management attention on completing specific environmental projects at sites where the Department anticipates continuing missions, and distinguishes these projects from the long-term cleanup activities such as those associated with high level waste streams.

The Committee's recommendation for site/project completion activities is $1,067,253,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request of $1,047,253,000. The recommendation includes an additional $20,000,000 to process tritium-contaminated heavy water currently being stored at the Savannah River Site. This material

could be sold if cleaned up to customer specifications, resulting in a projected net revenue of approximately $38,000,000.

POST 2006 COMPLETION

Environmental Management projects currently projected to require funding beyond fiscal year 2006 are funded in the Post 2006 completion account. This includes a significant number of projects at the largest DOE sites—the Hanford site in Washington; the Savannah River Site in South Carolina; the Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee; and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho—as well as the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, the Nevada Test Site, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico. A variety of multisite activities are also funded in this account. The Committee's recommendation for Post 2006 completion is $2,758,451,000, an increase of $85,000,000 over the budget request of $2,673,451,000.

The recommendation includes an additional $18,000,000 for Hanford tank farm operations including single shell tank drainage which has been delayed. An additional $12,000,000 has been provided to continue the successful project to decontaminate and decommission reactors at the Hanford site. From within available funds, the Department is encouraged to provide an additional $800,000 to operate the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response Training facility at the fiscal year 1998 funding level.

The Committee is aware that existing pretreatment processes for the Defense Waste Processing Facility at Savannah River have been found to be inadequate, and the Department is reviewing treatment alternatives. Equipment modifications will be needed in fiscal year 1999, and the Committee has provided an additional $30,000,000 to support the preferred treatment option.

Additional funding of $5,000,000 has been provided for the Waste Isolation Pilot Project in New Mexico to support operational needs of the facility which is scheduled to open this summer, and an additional $5,000,000 has been allocated to continue the National Spent Fuel Program at Idaho.

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund Contribution.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $398,088,000 for the defense contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486, the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Health Effects Studies.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 for worker and public health effects studies to be managed by the Office of Environment, Safety and Health. The Department has not previously budgeted for this activity in the environmental management account, but has taxed each of the program areas to support this activity during the fiscal year. The Committee does not support taxing programs for any reason, and, to clarify the funding levels, has provided a specific appropriation for health effects studies. This funding will be combined with the $41,456,000, provided in the Defense Environment, Safety and Health account for a total health effects studies program of $56,456,000.

Transportation.—The Department has a Motor Carrier Evaluation Program to screen carriers used to transport hazardous materials. –The Committee directs the Department to review its current rating system for selecting carriers which is based on a variety of factors, including cost, safety, and other issues. Evaluations currently can be very subjective, and the Committee recommends the Department move more to performance-based evaluations, including evaluating the need to raise the current minimum safety standards for determining the eligibility of a motor carrier to transport hazardous or radioactive materials. The Department should examine the costs and benefits of changing the evaluation standards, including increasing the current safety standards, and report back to the Committee by January 31, 1999 on the results of this evaluation.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for science and technology development is $270,750,000, an increase of $77,750,000 over the budget request of $193,000,000. The recommendation includes the budget request of $193,000,000 included in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account, the budget request of $26,500,000 included in the Non-Defense Environmental Management appropriation account, and an additional $51,250,000 to be allocated toward activities noted below.

Technology Deployment.—The Committee has provided $30,000,000 to continue the Department's efforts to deploy cost-effective new technologies. Deployment of new technologies is a strategic activity affecting virtually all environmental management programs and sites, and should be strongly supported as a complex-wide program to help meet compliance agreement milestones within a resource constrained budget. This funding should be used to accelerate the use of new technologies and leverage funding already available for deployment activities.

Environmental Management Science Program.—The Committee recommendation includes $42,000,000 for the environmental management science program, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request of $32,000,000. This is a collaborative program between the Department's Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Energy Research that identifies long-term, basic science research needs and targets the research and development toward critical cleanup problems. This program has been given high marks by the National Research Council and the Department's Environmental Management Advisory Board. Unfortunately, the Department has not requested funding for new research and development grants in fiscal year 1999. The budget request only continues grants awarded in prior years. The Committee believes it is critical to provide continuity of funding for this research program, and has provided $10,000,000 for the next round of new and innovative research grants in fiscal year 1999.

Risk Policy.—The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the risk policy program, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request of $5,000,000. The Committee has been concerned that the Department's risk policy program is not well integrated. There are several groups doing risk policy work, but the

national program perspective does not appear to be well formed. The Committee understands that the Department has created a Center for Risk Excellence in Chicago. This Center will be the focal point for coordination of risk-related activities within the Department's Environmental Management program which will use the Center to facilitate risk-related planning profiles, risk assessments, risk-informed decision-making, and communication. The Center will also manage and coordinate risk-related grants and cooperative agreements. The Committee supports continuing the Risk Center management of the national technical peer review program for the technology development program.

Within the funding provided, the Committee recommends $3,000,000 to continue the cooperative agreement with the Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) and $2,000,000 to continue support for the Consortium for Environmental Risk Evaluation (CERE).

Annual Report.—In fiscal year 1998 the Committee directed submission of a semi-annual report on the technologies under development by the Department. The Committee has received the first report, and has determined that an annual report on the science and technology development program will be sufficient. The annual report for fiscal year 1998 is to be submitted to Congress by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management by February 15, 1999. The annual report should document the prior year accomplishments of all the science and technology development program activities. It should also include a description of each technology research and development program, with costs, schedules and major milestones for each, and a description of the critical environmental problems which each technology addresses. The Department should consult with the Committee on the specific elements to be included and the format of this annual report.

–*University Robotics Program.*—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $4,000,000 for the university robotics program.

Asset Management.—The conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act provided $3,500,000 to initiate a national pilot program for electronics recovery and recycling. For a variety of reasons, the Department was unable to execute this program in fiscal year 1998. The Committee recommendation includes the same amount in fiscal year 1999 in the Environmental Management program to initiate this activity.

Other.—The Committee supports partnerships between the Office of Science and Technology and university research institutions. One such partnership is the Hemispheric Center for Environmental Technology at Florida International University in Miami, Florida. The Committee encourages the Department to continue this partnership and investigate and develop new ways to expand the partnership.

The Committee continues to be concerned with the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. The Committee encourages the Department to seek out and support innovative cleanup technologies offered by small companies which can be used to lower the costs

of the management and surveillance of long-term, on-site, and landfill storage of hazardous and radioactive materials. Many of these technologies have been successfully demonstrated at Departmental sites, but no funding has been provided to use the technologies for full scale cleanup projects. Funding of $2,000,000 is provided to use a technology that will safely and effectively destroy the asbestos removed from Federal facilities during the decontamination and decommissioning process. The Department is also urged to expedite the use of the macroencapsulation method for immobilizing and treating low-level mixed waste. The use of these technologies should not be limited to the funding provided in this account, but should be incorporated throughout the complex using any available funds.

The Committee recommendation includes $350,000 to cover the cost of an on-line tritium monitor to provide early warning for the City of Savannah, Georgia, when high levels of tritium are present in the Savannah River, which the city uses for drinking water.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $356,200,000 for program direction, an increase of $10,001,000 over the budget request of $346,199,000. The funding increase is accompanied by the transfer of the salaries and expenses of the Federal employees performing administrative functions at the Idaho operations office. These employees had originally been funded in the program account for multi-purpose DOE offices, while the remaining two-thirds of the Idaho Federal employees were funded in the environmental management account. Since the majority of the funding for the Idaho site is for environmental management activities, the administrative personnel should be funded from the same account. To accommodate this additional requirement, funding reductions should be made to support service contractors both in the field and at Headquarters.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).—The Committee is disappointed that the Department has not yet reached agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the transfer of responsibilities under FUSRAP. The Committee expects the Department to fulfill its responsibilities at FUSRAP sites, exclusive of the remedial actions to be performed by the Corps. Last year when the program was transferred to the Corps, the Committee continued to fund approximately 27 employees at the Department who had worked on the program. The funding provided in fiscal year 1999 in this account and the departmental administration account will support continued Departmental involvement in the transition of the FUSRAP program.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management includes the use of uncosted obligations and unobligated balances carried forward from prior year balances. The Committee recommends the use of $94,100,000 to offset fiscal year 1999 funding requirements.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriation, 1998–	$890,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	1,006,240,000
Recommended, 1999—	1,038,240,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998—	+147,440,000
Budget Estimate, 1999—	+32,000,000

The Defense Facilities Closure Projects account includes funding for sites which have established a goal of completing cleanup by the end of fiscal year 2006. After completion of cleanup, no further Departmental mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance, and the sites will be available for some alternative use. Sites to be completed by 2006 include the Rocky Flats Closure Project in Colorado, and several sites in Ohio: Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, and Battelle Columbus Laboratory.

Establishment of this account is intended to highlight those sites where cleanup can be accelerated and substantial savings achieved by the resulting reduction in long-term program costs and ongoing support costs. The Committee strongly supports this program, and the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1999 funding is $1,038,240,000, an increase of $32,000,000 over the budget request. Funding levels for each of the sites are addressed below.

Rocky Flats Closure Project.—The Committee has challenged the Department to close the Rocky Flats Site in Colorado by 2006 within a total project cost of $6 billion. The Department's current plan is for site closure by fiscal year 2010 at a total project cost of $7.3 billion. Accelerating the cleanup schedule can save $1.3 billion. The Committee is aware that to meet the 2006 deadline, stable funding will be required over several years, and critical path work activities must be successfully completed, not only at Rocky Flats, but at other sites throughout the Department's complex. The Department should ensure that complex-wide funding issues are addressed as they relate to the closure of the Rocky Flats Site. It is only through the closure of smaller sites like Fernald and Rocky Flats that funds will be made available to support expensive future cleanup projects like the vitrification plants needed at Hanford and Idaho.

The Committee intends to do everything possible to ensure project closure by 2006, and has provided fiscal year 1999 funding of $657,200,000, an increase of $32,000,000 over the budget request. Stable and assured funding for the life of the project is a critical element in managing the total cleanup. Another critical element is the interdependence of Rocky Flat's cleanup activities with the activities being conducted at other sites throughout the complex. The Department is expected to coordinate the Department-wide decision-making process to address these issues in a timely manner.

Fernald Environmental Management Project.—The Fernald site in Ohio has implemented an accelerated cleanup schedule which provides for site closure with the completion of all currently established in-situ contaminant source remediation and risk mitigation by fiscal year 2005. Follow-up activities for fiscal years 2006 through 2008 include finalizing treatment and disposal of the silo wastes and structures. The site is currently seeking to complete all of these activities by 2006, and the Committee strongly supports

these efforts. 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 for the Fernald site is $275,347,000, the same as the budget request.

Mound Plant.—The Department plans to complete cleanup at this Miamisburg, Ohio, site by fiscal year 2005. The Committee recommends the budget request of $89,988,000.

Ashtabula.—The goal at the Ashtabula site in Ohio is to achieve complete cleanup by fiscal year 2003, with an associated cost reduction of $39,000,000 from the original baselines. The Committee supports the budget request of $15,405,000.

Columbus Environmental Management Project.—This project consists of two geographic sites in Columbus, Ohio. Activities at one of the sites will be completed in 1998, and at the remaining site by fiscal year 2005. The budget request of $300,000 has been provided.

Report Requirement.—As part of the fiscal year 2000 budget submittal, the Department is directed to provide adequate detail showing the major projects to be accomplished and the project cost, scope, schedule, and technical assumptions which support 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 by project on an annual basis.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriation, 1998–	$200,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	516,857,000
Recommended, 1999–	286,857,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	+86,857,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−230,000,000

The Department requested $516,857,000 for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program. The Committee has recommended $286,857,000 for fiscal year 1999, a reduction of $230,000,000 from the budget request.

The Department has always relied on the private sector to accomplish environmental cleanup at DOE sites, usually through cost-reimbursement contracts. In an effort to reduce costs and improve the timeliness of cleanup of environmental problems, the Department is pursuing an approach referred to as "privatization". This requires the use of fixed price contracts and private financing of the construction of waste treatment facilities. The General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the Department's proposal and found that fixed-price contracting can be successfully used for environmental cleanup projects when certain conditions are met. For example, fixed-price contracts are appropriate when projects are well-defined, uncertainties can be allocated between the parties, and sufficient price information and/or multiple competing bidders are available to help determine a fair and reasonable price for the work. In addition, managing fixed-price contracts takes managerial and procurement skills that are different from those required for managing cost-reimbursement contracts.

Total private financing—the second feature of "privatization"—represents one end of a continuum of construction financing while government financing is the opposite end. Private financing transfers performance risk from the government to the private contractor, but costs for this approach are significant because of the increased risk assumed by the contractor. With government financing, financing costs are minimized, but performance risk, which has also proven to be costly, remains with the government. In between these two extremes, other financing options exist that attempt to strike a balance between performance risk and financing costs.

The GAO analysis clearly shows that "privatization" is not a one size fits all option. When the scope of work for an environmental project has not been clearly defined or the technology is not readily available, the use of fixed-price contracts will not prevent cost overruns and schedule delays. Fixed price contracts and private financing of construction projects are tools to be used under the right circumstances, not a magic bullet to correct the Department's project management problems or remedy a chronic shortfall of funds to meet compliance agreements. The Committee will support alternative financing proposals when deemed appropriate, but will expect sufficient justification from the Department to support each of the proposed projects.

Hanford Tank Waste Vitrification Project.—The budget proposed $330,000,000 for the Hanford tank waste vitrification project, also referred to as the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS), in Richland, Washington, but the Committee recommendation is $100,000,000 in fiscal year 1999. This will provide a total of $385,000,000 when added to the $285,000,000 which was provided for this project in prior years. None of these prior year funds have been obligated, and they will be carried over into the new fiscal year.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1998–	$1,666,008,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	1,667,160,000
Recommended, 1999–	1,761,260,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	95,252,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	94,100,000

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); National Security Programs Administrative Support; the Office of Hearings and Appeals; and Naval Reactors. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United

States response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities. The Committee recommendation is $210,000,000, the same as the budget request.

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program consists of hundreds of projects executed primarily at the nuclear weapons laboratories. The value of these disparate projects is difficult to ascertain as there does not appear to be an overriding program plan or technology roadmap which identifies how the individual projects contribute to the overall objectives. An external, peer-review process to examine each of the projects, their progress, and their value to the overall needs of the program would lend credibility to this effort which right now looks much like a fairly static, generally unfocussed, level-of-effort research program.

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 $256,900,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation fully supports the budget request of $152,263,000, an increase of $15,255,000 over fiscal year 1998, 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 Department recently announced the reorganization of this program to improve counterintelligence capabilities and enable better coordination with national law enforcement agencies. The Committee recommendation is $39,600,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request of $33,600,000, to support the new counterintelligence organization. The Committee expects this new organization to seriously evaluate the issue of computer security throughout the Department and the employment of foreign nationals at the Department's nuclear weapons laboratories.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The emergency management program encompasses all Departmental emergency management and threat assessment related ac-

tivities, 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 $20,000,000, a reduction of $3,700,000 from the budget request of $23,700,000, but the same level as fiscal year 1998.

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 $55,200,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request, and an increase of $8,000,000 over fiscal year 1998.

The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 to study the susceptibility of security equipment to existing and emerging technologies such as radio frequency weapons, and to assist in the development of safeguards to ensure that commercial off-the-shelf equipment does not introduce vulnerabilities in DOE security systems. These studies should be coordinated with any other activities the Department is pursuing in the area of safeguards and security.

The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the procurement of security locks that meet the Federal Specification FF–L–2740A for containers that hold sensitive classified material. The Department should initiate a retrofit program to ensure that the containers holding sensitive classified material are protected with security locks meeting the Federal specification.

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 $30,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 1999 the program organizations which request background investigations for contractors and non-Federal employees will fund the investigations. This will provide a $20,000,000 funding offset to the budget request of $30,000,000.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $84,900,000 for program direction is a reduction of $4,000,000 from the budget request of $88,900,000, but an increase of $2,000,000 over fiscal year 1998. The reduction should be applied to the use of support service contractors in all accounts except the Intelligence program.

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 $94,000,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request of $74,000,000, but the same as fiscal year 1998. The increase reflects the transfer of $20,000,000 from the non-defense environment, safety and health program to this account, consistent with the fiscal year 1998 appropriation.

Health Effects Studies.—For fiscal year 1999, the Committee recommendation for health effects studies is $56,456,000, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request. This funding consists of $15,000,000 provided in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account, and $41,456,000 in the Defense Environment, Safety and Health program. In addition to this, $14,000,000 has been provided for the Radiation Effects Research Foundation (RERF) to continue to analyze the medical effects of radiation on man or diseases that may be affected by radiation.

The Department funds a large number and wide variety of epidemiologic and other health-related activities to address the potential effect of DOE operations on the health of DOE workers and communities. Through a Memorandum of Understanding between DOE and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), studies of worker and community health are funded through the Office of Environment, Safety and Health and independently peer-reviewed and administered by HHS Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Similar activities are separately funded by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management and independently administered by the HHS Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATDSR) under its statutory authority under CERCLA. Still other health studies and medical monitoring programs are funded directly by both the offices of Environment, Safety and Health, and Environmental Management. To date, hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on such studies.

The Committee is concerned that, under the current arrangement, there is no focal point within the Department responsible for funding these various health studies and for ensuring that the results of these efforts are used for the maximum benefit of DOE workers and communities. Further, there appears to be little evidence of a coherent, prioritized agenda for selecting and conducting these studies or assurances that their results are being effectively communicated to workers and communities and used to improve public and occupational health.

The Committee is aware that the DOE, in partnership with the various agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services, has begun a process that will result in a consolidated and coherent strategy to include a public health agenda for each DOE site. The Committee understands that the result of this process will be clearly defined goals, objectives and priorities for ongoing and future health activities to ensure that it is directed at the issues of greatest concern to DOE workers and communities. Beginning in fiscal year 1999, the Committee expects that all newly-funded health activities will be consistent with the priorities established by this process. The Committee further expects that the Department will

not initiate major new programs, such as the proposed medical monitoring project at Hanford, that are not specifically identified in its budget request or otherwise approved by Congress.

The Committee further directs that beginning in fiscal year 1999, all DOE-funded studies or other activities associated with the health effects of radiation or other hazardous substances on DOE workers or communities be managed through the Office of Environment, Safety and Health and that funding for all HHS-managed health activities, (either through CDC or ATSDR) be incorporated into a single Memorandum of Understanding with HHS. In addition, the Department should submit with its annual budget request a list of projects which includes those that have been completed, those currently being funded, the total and annual cost of each study, and a summary of findings.

Annual Oversight Report Requirement.—The Committee has found the reports on environment, safety and health, and safeguards and security issues as well as the periodic briefings prepared by the Office of Oversight to be very informative. The Committee directs the Office of Oversight to prepare and provide to the Committee an annual report on the status of environment, safety, and health; and safeguards and security at the DOE sites. This report should provide an overview of the status of DOE programs, and identify trends, systemic weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $24,769,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request of $4,769,000. In its fiscal year 1999 budget proposal, the Department moved salaries and expenses, which had been funded in the defense account in fiscal year 1998, to the nondefense environment, safety and health program, This recommendation transfers the funds to the defense account and maintains the fiscal year 1999 funding allocation.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $29,800,000, a decrease of $15,200,000 from the budget request of $45,000,000. This reduction should be applied to the excessive prior year balances being carried in this program. The program currently has uncosted balances equal to the total new funding provided in fiscal year 1998.

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 $718,997,190, and Federal grants to communities have totaled $191,426,006, for a total cost of $953,207,951.

Funding at DOE cleanup sites and the nuclear weapons complex has stabilized and, in some instances, is increasing. The need for

enhanced severance payments to contractor employees and grants to local communities has declined. The Committee concurs with the House National Security Committee which has established fiscal year 2000 as the final year for this program. Any multi-year community assistance grants which extend beyond fiscal year 2000, such as the agreement with the State of Idaho, should be included in the appropriate program budget.

The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for this program be used for additional severance payments and benefits for Federal employees.

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 $168,960,000, the same as the budget request.

The Committee continues to support the Department's dual strategy of immobilization and mixed-oxide fuel (MOX) for reactors to dispose of stockpiles of surplus weapons plutonium. The Committee strongly endorses the use of existing reactors for the disposition of MOX fuel derived from excess weapons plutonium, and sees no requirement or value in expending limited budgetary resources to develop new and advanced reactor technologies in Russia for the disposition of weapons plutonium.

The Committee supports the Administration's efforts to reach agreement with the Russian Federation on a bilateral program for the conversion and disposition of weapons derived plutonium. The Department of Energy should proceed with preparations for plutonium disposition to include the design and licensing of key disposition facilities as well as qualification of MOX fuel in order to send a signal to Russia of the seriousness with which the U.S. views the disposition of stockpiles of excess weapons plutonium. The United States, however, should not proceed unilaterally to dispose of excess plutonium without parallel progress on the Russian side. Further, the Committee does not intend to authorize the expenditure of funds for the actual construction of these facilities without such an agreement.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

The international nuclear safety program is designed to reduce the threats posed by the operation of unsafe and aging Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in Russia and the Newly Independent States. The Committee recommendation for this program is $35,000,000, the same as the budget request.

There have been delays in many of the milestones for this program, and there are large uncosted balances which indicate that program execution is lagging. The Committee directs the Department to provide an annual report showing the status of each of the Soviet-designed reactors, the work to be accomplished, the total cost of completing the upgrades to each of the reactors, the schedule by fiscal year for accomplishing this work, and the cost of each

task by fiscal year. The Department should work with the Committee on the level of detail which should be included in the annual report.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $75,000,000 to support a new initiative to provide administrative support for national security programs. This recommendation includes $60,000,000 for support of national security programs performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs. The recommendation also provides $15,000,000 for support of national security programs provided by the Office of the Inspector General.

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. The Committee recommendation is $2,400,000, the same as the budget request.

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 $681,500,000, an increase of $16,000,000 over the budget request of $665,500,000. Additional funding of $16,000,000 has been provided to continue test reactor inactivation efforts and preclude inefficiencies due to delaying environmental cleanup activities that are scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 2002.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $20,000,000 from user organizations which will fund security investigations through other program accounts. The use of $2,000,000 of prior year balances from the new production reactor program is also included.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1998–	$190,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	190,000,000
Recommended, 1999–	190,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	
Budget Estimate, 1999	

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 1997, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was approximately $1,039,000,000 (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 1998, a total of $987,800,000 has been appropriated to support the nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommendation is $190,000,000, the same as the budget request.

POWER MARKETING ACTIVITIES

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

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

Electricity Restructuring.—The Committee continues to be concerned about the reliability of the grid and the changing role for Federal power marketers in the emerging restructured electricity markets. The Committee is fully supportive of efforts to promote full and open access to improve affordability and efficiency of the nation's power transmission and marketing systems. The Committee is committed to working with the Department to ensure that the Federal marketers have the resources to ensure reliability and fully support the implementation of open markets.

The Committee recommendation includes repeal of the prohibitions on using funds to conduct studies related to the Federal power authorities. As restructuring proposals are being implemented, there are many potential changes that involve Federal power authorities that deserve serious analysis. The Committee would like to make it very clear that there is no intention to implement changes in authorization. However, the Committee feels that the current prohibitions on even studying proposals is overly broad and not in the best interests of full and fair consideration of pro-

posals to improve the efficiency and management of Federal programs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Administration did not request funding for the Alaska Power Administration (APA) with its submission of the fiscal year 1999 budget. The Department has made it clear that it expects to complete the sale of the APA in the current fiscal year, and that no additional funding is needed.

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 1999, the Committee recommendation includes an additional increment of $258,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, power services, conservation and energy efficiency, and capital equipment programs.

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 require Bonneville to obligate borrowing authority in excess of such amounts.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1999, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $614,000,000, of which $164,000,000 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 1999.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1998–	$12,222,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	8,500,000
Recommended, 1999–	8,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	−3,722,000
Budget Estimate, 1999–	

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 $8,500,000, the same amount as the budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1998–	$25,210,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	26,000,000
Recommended, 1999–	24,710,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	−500,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−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.

–Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation is $24,710,000, a reduction of $500,000 from the current fiscal year.

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

Appropriation, 1998–	$189,043,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	215,435,000
Recommended, 1999	205,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	15,957,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−10,435,000

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.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation is $205,000,000, a reduction of $10,435,000 from the budget request. Last year, Western was able to supplement the appropriation with $40,921,000 in carryover balances. This year, the current estimate of carryover funding is substantially lower. Because prior-year funds are not available this year, the recommendation actually represents a reduction in available resources from the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee has recommended $5,036,000, the same amount as the budget request, for deposit in the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 1998–	$970,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	1,010,000
Recommended, 1999	970,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998–	
Budget Estimate, 1999	−40,000

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, a reduction of $40,000 from the amount requested.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1998	$162,141,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	168,898,000
Recommended, 1999	166,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	4,359,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−2,398,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1998	−162,141,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−168,898,000
Recommended, 1999	−166,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−4,359,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	2,398,000

The Committee recommendation is $166,500,000, an increase of $4,359,000 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 is very concerned about the reliability of the grid in a restructured regulatory environment. The Committee will work with the Commission during the budget process to ensure that sufficient resources are available to ensure reliability.

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 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES			
Solar energy			
Solar building technology research	2,720	6,000	2,200
Photovoltaic energy systems	66,511	78,800	66,800
Photovoltaic energy research	2,274	2,883	2,883
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	68,785	81,683	69,683
Solar thermal energy systems	16,775	22,600	17,100
Biomass/biofuels energy systems			
Power systems	28,600	42,900	31,100
Transportation	31,150	46,891	42,500
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	59,750	89,791	73,600
Biomass/biofuels energy research	38,635	27,199	27,199
Subtotal, Biomass	98,385	116,990	100,799
Wind energy systems	33,030	43,500	33,200
Wind energy research	295	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	33,325	43,783	33,483
Renewable energy production incentive program	3,000	4,000	6,000
Solar program support	---	14,000	---
International solar energy program	1,375	8,800	500
Solar technology transfer	---	1,360	---
National renewable energy laboratory	1,000	5,000	2,000
Construction			
96-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	2,200	---	---
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	3,200	5,000	2,000
Solar photoconversion (ER)	---	14,532	14,532
Total, Solar Energy	227,565	317,648	245,297
Geothermal			
Geothermal technology development	29,500	33,000	27,500
Hydrogen research	16,250	24,000	15,000
Hydrogen energy research	3,100	3,008	3,008
Total, Hydrogen	19,350	27,008	18,008
Hydropower	750	4,000	2,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	4,000	---	---
Electric energy systems and storage			
Electric and magnetic fields R&D	8,000	---	---
High temperature superconducting R&D	32,500	32,000	34,000
Energy storage systems	3,950	6,000	4,000
Climate challenge	---	500	---
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	44,450	38,500	38,000
Federal building/Remote power initiative	5,000	---	5,000
Program direction	15,651	17,000	15,600
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES	346,266	437,166	351,405
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D			
Advanced radioisotope power system	40,500	40,500	36,000
Nuclear technology R&D	---	25,000	---
Oak Ridge landlord	9,500	---	---
Test reactor area landlord	3,000	4,634	3,336
Construction			
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	341	341
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,425	2,425	2,425
Subtotal, Construction	4,425	2,766	2,766
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	7,425	7,400	6,101
University reactor fuel assistance and support	7,000	10,000	12,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	---	24,000	6,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	64,425	106,900	58,101

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Facilities	---	96,150	---
Termination costs	77,035	---	81,150
Uranium programs	61,600	66,700	53,518
Construction			
98-U-200 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	400	---	---
96-U-201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	2,600	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	3,000	---	---
Total, Uranium programs	64,600	66,700	53,518
Isotope support	16,000	16,450	14,000
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility, LANL	---	6,000	---
Total, Isotope support	16,000	22,450	14,000
Nuclear energy plant optimization	---	10,000	---
Program direction	21,000	23,550	21,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	243,060	325,750	227,769
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	42,500	37,602	27,602
Program direction	23,550	38,398	18,398
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	66,050	76,000	46,000
ENERGY RESEARCH			
Fusion energy sciences program	232,000	228,160	232,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	2,340	1,600
Program direction	7,500	7,500	7,500
Construction	1,000	---	---
Total, Technical information management program	10,100	9,840	9,100
Field offices and management	95,000	104,541	85,000
Oak Ridge Landlord	---	12,500	11,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	105,100	126,881	105,100
Subtotal, Energy supply	992,476	1,193,947	962,274
Renewable energy research program	-44,304	-47,905	-47,905
Use of prior year balances	-31,535	-17,000	-31,535
General reduction for contractor training	-9,830	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	906,807	1,129,042	882,834
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	269,911	254,344	254,344
Site/project completion	113,950	97,248	97,248
Post 2006 completion	82,294	83,908	83,908
Science and technology	---	26,500	---
Fast flux test facility standby/shutdown	30,904	---	31,200
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	497,059	462,000	466,700
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	180,200	242,000	195,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	40,000	35,000	30,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	220,200	277,000	225,000
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	210,240	213,365	215,865
Facility operations	418,945	456,635	459,635
Construction			
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	---	6,700	6,700
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	5,500	14,300	14,300

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
98-G-305 C-Zero area experimental hall, Fermilab	5,000	---	---
97-G-303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC	9,400	---	---
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	30,950	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	50,850	21,000	21,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	469,795	477,635	480,635
Total, High energy physics	680,035	691,000	696,500
Nuclear physics	261,525	315,980	318,480
Construction			
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	59,400	16,620	16,620
Total, Nuclear physics	320,925	332,600	335,100
Biological and environmental research	406,710	392,600	405,900
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	392,475	417,216	417,216
Chemical sciences	199,933	209,582	209,582
Engineering and geosciences	41,371	44,413	44,413
Energy biosciences	27,461	32,489	32,489
Construction			
99-E-334 Spallation Neutron Source,ORNL	---	128,400	71,400
96-E-300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	7,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	7,000	132,400	75,400
Total, Basic energy sciences	668,240	836,100	779,100
Other energy research			
Computational and technology research	180,907	160,640	138,640
Energy research analyses	1,500	1,000	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Infrastructure support	---	1,160	1,160
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	7,259	14,924	14,924
95-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	3,442	---	---
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	4,000	4,908	4,908
Subtotal, Construction	14,701	19,832	19,832
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	14,701	20,992	20,992
Environment, safety and health			
Construction			
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	5,273	268	268
95-E-307 Fire safety imp. III (ANL)	718	---	---
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	568	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	6,559	268	268
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	21,260	21,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research	173,667	182,900	160,900
University science education programs			
Laboratory cooperative science centers	---	15,000	---
Program direction	37,600	39,860	43,100
Subtotal, Science	2,287,177	2,490,060	2,420,600
Use of prior year SSC balances	-35,000	-7,600	-7,600
Use of other prior year balances	-13,800	---	---
General reduction for contractor training	-2,669	---	---
General reduction for policy papers for CCTI	---	---	-13,500
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,235,708	2,482,460	2,399,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	2,500	4,251	4,100
Board of contract appeals	---	---	703
Chief financial officer	---	---	22,500
Contract reform	---	---	3,200
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	---	---	4,800
Economic impact and diversity	---	---	4,500
Field management	---	---	7,000
General counsel	---	---	19,000
Human resources and administration	---	---	97,000
Policy office	---	---	14,000
Public affairs	---	---	3,300
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	2,500	4,251	180,203
General management - personnel compensation and benefits	101,695	106,210	---
General management - other expenses	73,000	77,578	---
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,650	1,880	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies	500	500	200
Consumer affairs	40	19	---
Public affairs	50	38	---
Environmental policy studies	1,750	2,500	750
Scientific and technical training	500	500	400
Information management	6,000	8,000	8,000
Subtotal, Program support	10,490	13,437	10,850
Total, Administrative operations	187,685	201,476	191,053
Cost of work for others	37,470	44,312	44,312
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	225,155	245,788	235,365
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-1,000	---	---
Transfer from other defense activities	---	---	-60,000
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	224,155	245,788	175,365
Miscellaneous revenues	-136,738	-136,530	-136,530
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	87,417	109,258	38,835
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	27,500	29,500	29,500
Transfer from other defense activities	---	---	-15,000
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	27,500	29,500	14,500
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,288,290	1,505,832	1,475,832
Construction			
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	6,500	---
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facility,LLNL Livermore, CA	---	4,000	---
99-D-104 Protection of real property(roof reconstruction, Phase II),LLNL,Livermore CA	---	7,300	---
99-D-105 Central health physics calibration facility,LANL,Los Alamos,NM	---	3,900	---
99-D-106 Model validation and system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	---	1,600	---
99-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory,JCEL,SNL,Albuquerque,NM	---	1,800	1,800
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site,NV	---	2,000	---
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	46,300	36,000	36,000
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	19,810	20,423	20,423
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	13,400	6,400	6,400
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	---	18,920	18,920

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	19,300	6,700	6,700
Subtotal, Construction	98,810	115,543	90,243
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,387,100	1,621,375	1,566,075
Inertial fusion	217,000	213,800	223,800
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	197,800	284,200	284,200
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	414,800	498,000	508,000
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	56,250	60,000	40,000
Education	9,000	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	65,250	69,000	49,000
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,867,150	2,188,375	2,123,075
Stockpile management	1,891,265	1,936,803	1,989,303
Construction			
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation,various locations	---	11,200	11,200
99-D-123 Replace mechanical utility systems, Y-12, Oak Ridge, TN	---	1,900	1,900
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls Kansas City Plant, Kansas City,MO	---	1,000	1,000
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	---	13,700	13,700
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	---	1,108	1,108
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	---	9,700	9,700
98-D-123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	11,000	27,500	27,500
98-D-124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	6,450	10,700	10,700
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SC	9,650	---	---
98-D-126 Acceleration prod. of tritium, VL	67,865	---	---
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	9,200	9,164	---
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	---	6,400	6,400
97-D-124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,900	---	---
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	6,900	3,700	3,700
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant	2,700	---	---
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	5,000	15,000	5,000
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant	12,600	---	---
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	1,400	---	---
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	2,000	---	---
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	2,100	3,250	3,250
92-D-126 replace emergency notification system, VL	3,200	---	---
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	18,920	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	160,885	115,322	95,158
Total, Stockpile management	2,052,150	2,051,125	2,084,461
Program direction	250,000	260,500	240,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,169,300	4,500,000	4,447,536
Use of prior year balances	-2,608	---	-305,436
General reduction	-20,000	---	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,146,692	4,500,000	4,142,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	863,792	848,090	868,090
Construction			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	2,745	2,745
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, Id	---	950	950
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	1,000	3,120	3,120
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	8,136	26,814	26,814
98-D-700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID	500	7,710	7,710
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	18,000	79,184	79,184
97-D-451 B-Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	2,000	---	---
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and biossay lab, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	5,600	7,000	7,000
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	16,744	38,680	38,680
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, Kansas City Plant and SR	8,200	4,512	4,512
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	2,927	---	---
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	14,985	11,544	11,544
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	8,500	8,000	8,000
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,713	---	---
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID	602	485	485
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades Savannah River, SC	---	3,667	3,667
92-D-172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant	5,000	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	11,250	4,752	4,752
Subtotal, Construction	106,157	199,163	199,163
Total, Site/project completion	969,949	1,047,253	1,067,253
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,297,764	2,194,107	2,279,107
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	388,000	398,088	398,088
Construction			
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastrucure support, Richland, WA	---	14,800	14,800
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	13,961	22,723	22,723
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, Richland, WA	---	171	171
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service, WIPP, AL	176	---	---
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	3,800	---	---
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	2,500	---	---
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	1,219	---	---
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	16,100	32,860	32,860
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	17,520	10,702	10,702
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	1,042	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	55,318	81,256	81,256
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,741,082	2,673,451	2,758,451

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Site closures	106,085	---	---
Science and technology	274,322	193,000	270,760
Program direction	346,000	346,199	356,200
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,435,438	4,259,903	4,452,654
Use of prior year balances	-6,000	---	-94,100
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,429,438	4,259,903	4,358,554
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Closure projects	890,800	1,006,240	1,038,240
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	200,000	516,857	286,857
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	5,520,238	5,783,000	5,683,651
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	210,000	210,000	210,000
Arms control	234,600	256,900	256,900
Intelligence	33,600	33,600	39,600
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	478,200	500,500	506,500
Emergency management	20,000	23,700	20,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	47,200	53,200	55,200
Security investigations	30,000	30,000	30,000
Program direction - NN	82,900	88,900	84,900
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	658,300	696,300	696,600
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	74,000	69,231	69,231
Program direction - EH	20,000	4,769	24,769
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	94,000	74,000	94,000
Worker and community transition	57,659	41,000	26,000
Program direction - WT	3,500	4,000	3,800
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	61,159	45,000	29,800
Fissile materials disposition	99,451	111,372	111,372
Program direction - MD	4,345	4,588	4,588
Construction			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion Facility, Various locations	---	25,000	25,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Various locations	---	28,000	28,000
Subtotal, Construction	---	53,000	53,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	103,796	168,960	168,960
Nuclear energy (Defense)			
Nuclear technology research and development:			
Electrometallurgical program	12,000	---	---
International nuclear safety:			
Soviet designed reactors	35,000	35,000	35,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	47,000	35,000	35,000
National Security programs administrative support	---	---	75,000
Office of hearings and appeals	2,300	2,400	2,400
Total, Other national security programs	966,555	1,021,660	1,101,760
Independent assessment of DOE projects	35,000	---	---
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development	635,920	623,600	639,600
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	---	9,000	9,000
98-D-200 Site laboratory facility upgrade, various locations	5,700	7,000	7,000
97-D-201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID	4,600	---	---
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	1,100	---	---
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National			
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,100	5,800	5,800
Subtotal, Construction	14,500	12,800	12,800

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1998 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	650,420	645,400	661,400
Program direction	20,080	20,100	20,100
Total, Naval reactors	670,500	665,500	681,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,672,055	1,687,160	1,783,260
Use of prior year balances	-6,047	---	-2,000
Offset to user organizations	---	-20,000	-20,000
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,666,008	1,667,160	1,761,260
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	190,000	190,000	190,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,522,938	12,140,160	11,777,011
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	3,500	---	---
Capital assets acquisition	10,000	---	---
TOTAL, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	13,500	---	---
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,313	4,370	4,370
Purchase power and wheeling	11,909	6,130	6,130
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	16,222	10,500	10,500
Use of prior year balances	-4,000	-2,000	-2,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	12,222	8,500	8,500
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	2,382	2,722	2,722
Purchase power and wheeling	57	59	59
Program direction	17,309	16,402	16,402
Construction	6,752	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	26,500	26,000	26,000
Use of prior year balances	-1,290	---	-1,290
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,210	26,000	24,710
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	24,243	20,802	20,802
System operation and maintenance	39,246	36,469	36,469
Purchase power and wheeling	54,886	53,886	53,886
Program direction	106,157	107,383	107,383
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,432	5,036	5,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	229,964	223,576	223,576
Use of prior year balances	-40,921	-8,141	-18,576
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(5,592)	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	189,043	215,435	205,000
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	970	1,010	970
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	240,945	250,945	239,180
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	162,141	168,898	166,500
FERC revenues	-162,141	-168,898	-166,500
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	160,000	129,511	109,511
Program direction	---	60,489	50,489
Total, Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	160,000	190,000	160,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	15,898,574	17,070,365	16,203,560

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—Section 301 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or 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 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

The Committee's concerns regarding the Department's contracting procedures result from the Department's history of having management and operating contracts which had never been bid competitively, in some cases for over four decades. Ensuring competition for these situations in particular, and establishing competition as the norm for the Department's contracting, is imperative. However, the Committee is well aware that there may be circumstances where the existing contract has been competed in the past few years; the existing contractor has been doing a good job; the mission at a specific site has been scheduled to end in a limited amount of time; or the time required for a full competitive procurement would result in significant delays to an ongoing project. In particular, the Committee is concerned that the delays, additional costs, and loss of momentum involved in competing contracts for sites designated for accelerated closure could hamper the Committee's overriding interest in completing cleanup of these sites as quickly as possible. In those instances where it is clearly in the taxpayers' interest, the Committee would not object to a contract extension.

Use of Standard Contracting Clauses.—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.

The Committee directs the Department, as contracts are awarded, amended or modified, to standardize its contracts in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Limitation on Benefits for Federal Employees.—Section 303 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 and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. The Committee has provided no funds to implement workforce restructuring plans which would provide benefits to Federal employees of the De-

partment of Energy which are not available to other Federal employees of the United States Government.

Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.—Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to augment the $29,800,000 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.

Limitation on Initiation of Requests for Proposals.—Section 305 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations Act may be used to initiate requests for proposals or expressions of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet been approved and funded by Congress.

Limit on Competition with the Private Sector.—Section 306 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity of the Department of Energy to produce or provide articles or services for the purpose of selling the articles or services to a person outside the Federal government, unless the Secretary of Energy determines that the articles or services are not available from a commercial source in the United States.

The Committee is aware of instances in which the Department of Energy's contractor-operated laboratories and facilities have been accused of competing with the private sector seeking to provide services and products. It is not the Committee's intent that Federal facilities use privileged information or access to facilities to compete in the market-place against a small business that raises and risks its own capital. Department of Energy laboratories and facilities receive billions of dollars a year in Federal appropriations, and the Department must be very careful that these appropriations are not used unfairly to compete with private sector companies. This provision does not apply to the transmission and sale of electricity by any Federal power marketing administration.

Transfer and Merger of Unexpended Balances.—Section 307 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1998	$170,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	67,000,000
Recommended, 1999	65,900,000–
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	– 104,100,000–
Budget Estimate, 1999	– 1,100,000

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 $65,900,000, a reduction of $1,100,000 from the budget request. The Committee observes that funding for the Appalachian Development Highway System will henceforth be provided through Highway Trust Fund revenues.

The Committee recognizes the substantial challenges faced by the Appalachian region in adapting to the changes presented by welfare reform and welfare-to-work programs. In order to meet these challenges and to ensure the ultimate success of welfare reform efforts in the Appalachian region, the Committee urges the ARC to commit a greater share of available resources to new and innovative activities to break the cycle of poverty and to provide for improved child care and child development programs throughout Appalachia.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1998	$17,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	17,500,000
Recommended, 1999	16,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	– 500,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	– 1,000,000

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

Consistent with agency reductions that the Committee has made throughout this bill, the Committee recommendation is

$16,500,000, a decrease of $1,000,000 from the budget request of $17,500,000. 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.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1998	$468,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	483,340,000
Recommended, 1999	462,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−5,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−20,640,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1998	−$450,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−152,341,000
Recommended, 1999	−444,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	5,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−292,359,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1998	$18,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	330,999,000
Recommended, 1999	18,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	.....
Budget Estimate, 1999	−312,999,000

The Committee recommendation is $462,700,000, a reduction of $5,300,000 from the current fiscal year and $20,640,000 from the budget request. The recommendation reflects the Committee's continued concerns over ever-increasing budget requests of the Commission, while, by its own admission, the Commission must place more emphasis on streamlining and making more efficient use of its resources.

The recommendation includes $14,800,000, a reduction of $200,000 from the current fiscal year in support of the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. Funding for these activities is to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. The recommendation also includes $3,200,000, the same amount as the budget request, for regulatory reviews and other assistance provided to the Department of Energy.

The Omnibus Budget 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. This authority expires at the end of the current fiscal year. The Committee has included a statutory provision providing for a one-year extension of this authorization. The extension of this authority is necessary to provide the resources needed to fund the activities of the Commission.

The Committee notes that while the workload of the Commission should continue to decrease with the closure of plants, overall im-

provements in plant safety and the increase in the number of agreement states, there has not been a commensurate reduction reflected in budget requests. Indeed, outyear budget projections for the Commission show steadily increasing budgets. The Commission has resisted recommended reforms including risk-informed, performance-based regulation. The Commission is directed to reduce its workforce, reduce the regulatory burdens on licensees, and streamline its adjudicatory process. The Committee observes that the Commission has resisted these and other reforms which have been recommended in six major reviews dating back to 1979.

In the Commission's strategic plan, the Commission claims that it will: "implement risk-informed, and, where appropriate, performance-based regulatory approaches for power reactors"; "make licensee performance and compliance with our requirements consequential by decreasing the inspection frequency for good performers and assessing penalties for poor performers"; "eliminate unnecessary regulatory requirements and policy statements, and streamline our processes"; and "adjust our regulatory oversight of facilities undergoing decommissioning to be commensurate with the safety risk." The Commission has stated its intention; the Committee urges the Commission to follow through with meaningful reforms.

In the strategic plan, the Commission also states that it will make improvements "in a continuous, systematic, and open manner with the support and input of our internal and external stakeholders." The Commission also rightly observes that: "The Administration, the Congress and the public will continue to expect cost-effective programs throughout the Government."

The Committee observes that much work remains to be done before the Commission can clear the bar of making these reforms with the support of its stakeholders. The Committee expects that these changes would result in lower budget requirements and has therefore recommended a lower amount for fiscal year 1999. The Committee is committed to the same goals of public safety as the Commission. The Committee is very much committed to working with the Commission throughout the budget process to resolve the current differences between the resources requested and the resources recommended by the Committee.

The Committee recognizes and has been strongly supportive of the Commission's commitment to establishing independent oversight of certain Department of Energy facilities. Currently, the Department of Energy operates its facilities in a self-regulating environment. The Commission and the Department have 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.

The Committee believes that one of the most important activities the Commission will undertake is license renewal of current operating reactors. The Committee is aware that the licensee for the Calvert Cliffs nuclear power plant has filed such an application with the agency. The Commission must have a fair, effective, predictable and efficient process for license renewal. The Committee is concerned, however, that the Commission may not be prepared to ensure a timely license renewal review. The Committee urges the

Commission to act expeditiously to resolve public comments received, and to streamline the hearing process. To that end, the Committee believes that such a process should take no more than two years for the submittal of the license application to approval by the Commission. The Commission shall issue detailed guidance by December 1998 on how the licensing process will be structured so that licensees, Commission staff, and the public will have a clear understanding of the regulatory framework in which these plants will continue to operate.

The Committee recommendation includes a statutory provision that permanently extends the authority for the Commission to expend funds for various purposes and retain moneys collected for the cooperative nuclear research program, services rendered to State governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs. The authority provided is identical to the authority the Committee has been including annually with the appropriation.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1998	$4,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	5,300,000
Recommended, 1999	4,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	.....
Budget Estimate, 1999	−500,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1998	$−4,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−1,749,000
Recommended, 1999	−4,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	.....
Budget Estimate, 1999	−3,051,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,800,000, equal to the the amount provided in the current fiscal year, and $500,000 less than the amount requested. 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, 1998	$2,600,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	2,950,000
Recommended, 1999	2,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	.....
Budget Estimate, 1999	−350,000

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 $2,600,000, the same as the current fiscal year, and a reduction of $350,000 from the budget request due to funding constraints.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1998	$70,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	76,800,000
Recommended, 1999	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1998	−70,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1999	−76,800,000

Public Law 105–62 provides that, for fiscal year 1999 and thereafter, funding for essential stewardship activities, including flood control navigation, and management of aquatic vegetation growth along the Tennessee River and tributaries, of the Tennessee Valley Authority are to be derived from TVA's own internally generated revenues and savings. As used in the public law, "stewardship activities" is intended to mean all nonpower functions for which funding was provided in Public Law 104–206.

The Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority is directed to submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate an itemized listing of the amounts of the reductions or increased receipts for fiscal year 1999 made pursuant to the paragraph under this heading in Public Law 105–62. This submission is to be made within thirty days of enactment of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, 1999.

The Committee restates its expectation that TVA shall provide such sums as are necessary for the proper operation, maintenance, and improvement of Land Between the Lakes (LBL). The Committee understands that proposals for the transfer of LBL to another Federal resource agency are under active consideration and is supportive of these efforts.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions pertaining to specific programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

Prohibition on Lobbying.—Section 501 provides that none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

Buy American.—Section 502 requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable.

Drainage of the San Luis Unit.—Section 503 provides language clarifying the funding requirements for the San Luis Unit.

Restart of the High Flux Beam Reactor.—Section 504 provides that no funds may be used to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York.

Extension of Authority for Nuclear Regulatory Commission to Collect Fees and Charges.—Section 505 provides a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds.

Extension of Authority for Nuclear Regulatory Commission to Expend Funds for Certain Purposes.—Section 506 provides permanent authority for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expend funds for various purposes for which the Committee on Appropriations has been providing annual authorization.

Repeal of Prohibitions on Studying Rate-Setting and Asset Sales at Federal Public Power Authorities.—Section 507 repeals section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act and section 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986. Section 505 prohibits the use of funds to conduct studies relating to consideration of market or other non-cost pricing of hydroelectric power sales by the six Federal public power authorities. Section 208 prohibits the use of funds to conduct studies relating to selling assets of the six Federal public power authorities.

External Regulation of Department of Energy Laboratory.—Section 508 provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Energy can no longer implement and enforce its own regulatory systems for environment, safety, and health at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California.

Recent Congressional hearings and a General Accounting Office (GAO) report have highlighted concerns that the Department of Energy is no longer moving expeditiously toward external regulation of its facilities. As GAO noted, the Department has long been

criticized for weaknesses in its self-regulation of the environment, safety, and health of its own facilities. Previous Departmental leaders recognized this, and in 1993, then-Secretary Hazel O'Leary announced that the Department would seek external regulation for worker safety. The benefits of external regulation include: increased credibility and public confidence; more effective and consistent safety management; enhanced competitiveness as uniform safety standards apply to both DOE and non-DOE laboratories; elimination of a conflict of interest whereby DOE regulates safety and directs program execution; and cost savings to the taxpayer by minimizing overlapping and conflicting requirements.

Last year at the request of Congress, the Department was asked to conduct a study of how it manages the nuclear weapons program, including an analysis of the functions performed at Headquarters, operations offices, and applicable area and site offices. The March 1997 report, prepared by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), noted that:

> The single largest problem uncovered in this study is that Defense Programs'—and, more generally, DOE's—practices for managing environmental, safety, and health (ES&H) concerns are constipating the system. The Department's ES&H practices are based on a hybrid of centralized and decentralized management practices that have evolved over the past decade. For example, in Defense Programs' review of key documents defining a contractor's safety envelope, the current system can best be described as one in which everybody reviews everything until everyone is satisfied. The "process" is ad hoc; there is inadequate discipline regarding who should participate and how that participation should take place.
>
> Compounding these process problems, there is no consensus among all these reviewers and checkers, and checkers of checkers regarding the desired end-state for a facility. That is to say, there is no agreement on what it means to be safe. Consequently, each of the organizations that review a document, decision, or process does so from its own perspective and insists that the facility meet its priority requirements for safety. At any time during what could be a multi-year process, the area office or contractor might, for example, receive a hundred pages of comments from just about anyone that must then be addressed. When conflicts arise between two or more reviewers, there is no formal method for resolving them.

Both outside advisory groups and internal reviews have voiced significant concerns over the Department's environment, safety, and health processes, but actions to resolve these concerns have been woefully slow. Changes in the leadership of the Department have delayed implementation of this effort. Departmental actions to submit legislation in support of this objective have lagged. Instead, a pilot program to simulate NRC's regulation at various facilities over a two year period was initiated. The Department now appears to be reevaluating the need for independent external regulation of safety and health.

Pilot Project for Simulated Regulation.—The first pilot project was conducted at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) in California. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff conducted the simulated regulation at LBNL through developing a mock license and performing typical NRC inspection activities. In recent testimony, the Chairman of the Commission noted that the license developed was typical of that of an NRC-licensed major research and development center such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or the University of Missouri. The inspection showed the current radiation safety program at LBNL to be acceptable, with some minor exceptions. The cost of NRC regulation at LBNL likely would be the same as that for a similar very large facility like the NIH.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Pilot Project.—A pilot project for OSHA regulation was completed at Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois in November 1996. Since completion of the Argonne pilot, DOE and OSHA cosponsored a report by the National Academy of Public Administration entitled, "Ensuring Worker Safety and Health Across the DOE Complex" (January 1997). The Academy panel concluded that with appropriate support from Congress, DOE should formally transfer regulatory authority for occupational safety and health across its complex to OSHA, and urged Congress and the Administration to expedite the transition. The President's fiscal year 1999 budget proposes a one-time increase of OSHA resources by five employees and $400,000, and a one-time reduction in DOE resources by an equal amount, to offset any extraordinary logistical burden on OSHA enforcement resources that might be imposed by DOE facilities during the pilot projects.

Implementation of External Regulation for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.—The Committee has included statutory language eliminating the Department's regulatory authority for the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California. The Committee wants to ensure that future changes in top management of the Department do not lead to further delays in implementing this important initiative. No later than March 31, 1999, the Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in California will no longer be subject to Department of Energy self-regulation of environment, safety and health activities.

Departmental Oversight Under External Regulation.—In response to an inquiry by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, several laboratory directors expressed their support for moving to external regulation by both the NRC and the OSHA. However, the laboratory directors were also unanimous in their concern that the move toward external regulation not create dual or overlapping regulatory roles between DOE and the NRC. The Committee is quite cognizant of this concern. For those facilities which are to be externally regulated, the Department is directed to eliminate all internal safety and health oversight staffs at Headquarters and in field offices with the exception of a small corporate group at Headquarters. The Department should establish a small Headquarters quality assurance program designed to complement, but not duplicate external regulation and enforcement, and it should be modeled after private industry cor-

porate safety organizations. This small organization would be responsible for understanding the external safety and health standards and regulations and determining that the laboratory or facility was in compliance with these standards.

Fiscal year 1999 Pilot Projects.—To continue progress toward external regulation of additional facilities, the Department is directed to include a nuclear reactor in the pilot projects to be conducted in fiscal year 1999. The Department and NRC should keep the Committee fully informed of these efforts.

Reimbursement for Cost of Regulation.—Departmental facilities which are subject to external regulation shall reimburse NRC and OSHA for the incremental cost of the services provided to Department of Energy facilities. These expenses should be identified in the Department's budget submission.

New Construction Consistent with NRC Standards.—In anticipation of future NRC regulation of DOE nuclear facilities, the Department is directed to ensure that, starting in fiscal year 2000, all new nuclear facilities, with the exception of the naval reactors program, are constructed in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing requirements. The Department should ensure that this requirement does not result in a program requirement to meet two separate sets of standards (both DOE and NRC standards), but should ensure a smooth transition for meeting NRC standards.

Department of Energy Reporting Requirement.—There are several issues which need to be addressed in the transition to external regulation. The report due October 31, 1998, should include, but not be limited to: identifying who will be the external regulator of radiation, and who will be named in the NRC license; addressing the issue of regulatory jurisdiction over accelerators, accelerator-produced isotopes, and other electronic sources of radiation not currently assigned to the NRC; determining the impact of NRC decommissioning requirements; analyzing the impacts on existing agreements for storing legacy waste materials; assessing the possibility of conflict of interest issues when DOE laboratories perform work for NRC; determining the impact of imposing civil penalties on government facilities; and identifying funding mechanisms for external regulation of DOE facilities.

The Department should coordinate development of the report with the NRC and OSHA and other affected units of government to ensure that the report to Congress is a fair and unbiased representation of the issues surrounding the elimination of Departmental regulation of LBNL.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Reporting Requirement.—The Committee recognizes that the Commission currently does not have the authority to regulate the use of accelerators, and that the primary regulatory authority for accelerator use lies at the state level. As accelerator regulation is an integral component of the external regulation of many DOE facilities, the Committee expects the Commission to provide a report by January 30, 1999, recommending what statutory changes, if any, would be needed to provide the Commission with the authority to regulate accelerator use; what additional Commission resources would be needed to accomplish such regulation; and what technical or regulatory hurdles to Commission regulation of accelerator use may exist.

Good Faith Effort.—The Committee understands there may be concerns about the transition of this authority, but expects each of the participants to act in a good faith manner to ensure a smooth transition, and to use external regulation to strengthen the integration of health, safety, and productivity throughout the Department of Energy complex.

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 302 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]

	302(b) Allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	20,820	20,514	20,652	20,425
Mandatory				

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) 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	20,652
Outlays:	
1999	12,862
2000	6,404
2001	1,185
2002	88
2003 and beyond	140

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) 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	74
Fiscal year 1999 outlays resulting therefrom	16

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

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

> * * * of which $1,873,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $49,908,000 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, 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. 307. 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 V, General Provisions, Section 506:

> (G) Transfers of funds to other agencies of the Federal Government for the performance of the work for which such funds are appropriated, and such transferred funds may be merged with the appropriations to which they are transferred.
>
> (H) Transfers to the Office of Inspector General of the Commission, not to exceed an additional amount equal to 5 percent of the amount otherwise appropriated to the Office for the fiscal year. Notice of such transfers shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations.

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.

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 $700,000 of the funds appropriated in Public Law 102-377 for the feasibility phase of the Red River navigation, Southwest Arkansas, study. Language is also included under General Investigations directing the Secretary of the Army to use $500,000 of the funds appropriated in the bill to implement section 211(f)(7) of Public Law 104-303 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the Hunting Bayou element of the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas, project and to use $300,000 of the funds appropriated in the bill to implement section 211(f)(8) of Public Law 104-303 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project costs for the White Oak Bayou watershed, Texas, project.

Language is included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Language is also included under Construction, General, providing that $15,000,000 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. 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. Language is also included under Construction, General, making funds appropriated by Public Law 103-126 for projects associated with the restoration of the Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, available for other projects and activities on the Lackawanna River in Pennsylvania. Language is included under Construction, General, directing the Secretary of the Army to use $6,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the bill to implement section 211(f)(6) of Public Law 104-303 and to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of project construction costs for the Brays Bayou element of the Buffalo Bayou and tributaries, Texas, 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.

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 Water Resources Support Center and headquarters support functions at 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.

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

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

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 fund 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.

For the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program Account, language is included providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

For the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, language is included directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102-575.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language is included under the Energy Supply account providing not to exceed $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses for transparency activities.

Language is included under the Science account providing that $7,600,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances originally available for Superconducting Super Collider termination activities.

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

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

Language is included under the Departmental Administration account, providing that notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-

Deficiency Act, such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others, as long as such increases are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amounts.

Language is included under the Weapons Activities account, providing for the purchase of one fixed-wing aircraft.

Language is included under the Bonneville Power Administration account precluding 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 $5,036,000 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 unless Congress is notified 60 days in advance.

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, 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, 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 by any Department of Energy program, project, or activity to produce or provide articles or services unless the Secretary of Energy determines that these are not available from a commercial source in the United States. This provision does not apply to electricity sold by any Federal power marketing administration.–

Language is included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that 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 to exclude the costs of NRC prelicensing activities related to the cleanup of the Hanford site from license fee revenues. Language is also included to permit the NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language is included under the Office of Inspector General to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language is included under 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 General Provisions, requiring, to the greatest extent practicable, that all equipment and products purchased should be American-made, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as "Made in America."

Language is included under General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to determine the point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of Interior and the State of California of a plan to minimize the impact of drainage waters.

Language is included under General Provisions, directing the Secretary of Interior to classify the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program as reimbursable or nonreimbursable.

Language is included under General Provisions, prohibiting the restart of the High Flux Beam Reactor.

Language is included under General Provisions providing a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds.

Language is included under General Provisions providing permanent authority for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to expend funds for various purposes for which the Committee on Appropriations has been providing annual authorization.

Language is included under General Provisions repealing section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act and section 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986.

Language is included under General Provisions, implementing external regulation of environment, safety, and health activities at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

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
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund
- Departmental Administration
- Office of the Inspector General
- Weapons Activities
- Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
- Defense Facilities Closure Projects
- Defense Environmental Management Privatization
- 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 (RAMSAYER)

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 italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman);

The accompanying bill would repeal section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the fiscal year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

[SEC. 505. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, subsequent Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts or any other provision of law hereafter, none of the funds made available under this Act, subsequent Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts or any other law hereafter shall be used for the purposes of conducting any studies relating or leading to the possibility of changing from the currently required "at cost" to a "market rate" or any other noncost-based method for the pricing of hydroelectric power by the six Federal public power authorities, or other agencies or authorities of the Federal Government except as may be specially authorized by Act of Congress hereafter enacted.**]**

The accompanying bill would repeal section 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986.

[SEC. 208. No funds appropriated or made available under this or any other Act shall be used by the executive branch for soliciting proposals, preparing or reviewing studies or drafting proposals designed to transfer out of Federal ownership, management or control in whole or in part the facilities and functions of the Federal power marketing administrations located within the contiguous 48 States, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, until such activities have been specifically authorized and in accordance with terms and conditions established by an Act of Congress hereafter enacted: *Provided,* That this provision shall not apply to the authority granted under section 2(e) of the Bonneville Project Act of 1937; or to the authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority pursuant to any law under which it may transfer facilities or functions in the normal course of business in carrying out the purposes of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; or to the authority of the Administrator of the General Services Administration pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, and the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to sell or otherwise dispose of surplus property.]

The accompanying bill would amend Section 6101(a)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended:

Section 6101(a)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 2214(a)(3)) is amended by striking "September 30, 1995" and inserting [**"September 30, 1998"**] "*September 30, 1999*."

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1999

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1998 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1999 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1998 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1999 (6)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	156,804,000	150,000,000	162,823,000	+6,019,000	+12,823,000
Construction, general	1,468,373,000	784,000,000	1,452,629,000	-15,744,000	+668,629,000
Contingent emergency appropriation	5,000,000	.....	.....	-5,000,000	.....
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	296,212,000	280,000,000	312,077,000	+15,865,000	+32,077,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,740,025,000	1,603,000,000	1,640,499,000	-99,526,000	+37,499,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-174)	105,185,000	.....	.....	-105,185,000	.....
Regulatory program	106,000,000	117,000,000	110,000,000	+4,000,000	-7,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	4,000,000	.....	.....	-4,000,000	.....
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	140,000,000	.....	.....	-140,000,000	.....
Defense function	.....	140,000,000	140,000,000	+140,000,000	.....
General expenses	148,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	.....	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,169,599,000	3,222,000,000	3,966,028,000	-203,571,000	+744,028,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	23,743,000	22,189,000	24,189,000	+446,000	+2,000,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,610,000	12,476,000	10,476,000	-1,134,000	-2,000,000

Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....
Program oversight and administration	800,000	1,283,000	1,283,000	+483,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	41,153,000	40,948,000	40,948,000	-205,000	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	694,348,000	640,124,000	596,254,000	-98,094,000	-43,870,000
(By transfer)	.....	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+25,800,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-174)	4,520,000	.....	.....	-4,520,000	.....
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	85,000,000	143,300,000	75,000,000	-10,000,000	-68,300,000
Loan program	10,425,000	12,425,000	12,425,000	+2,000,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(+7,000,000)	.....
Policy and administration	47,558,000	48,000,000	46,000,000	-1,558,000	-2,000,000
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-5,592,000)	.....	.....	(+5,592,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	33,130,000	49,500,000	33,130,000	.....	-16,370,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	874,981,000	893,349,000	762,809,000	-112,172,000	-130,540,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	916,134,000	934,297,000	803,757,000	-112,377,000	-130,540,000
(By transfer)	(-5,592,000)	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+31,392,000)	.....
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	906,807,000	1,129,042,000	882,834,000	-23,973,000	-246,208,000
Non-defense environmental management	497,059,000	462,000,000	466,700,000	-30,359,000	+4,700,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	220,200,000	277,000,000	225,000,000	+4,800,000	-52,000,000
Science	2,235,708,000	2,482,460,000	2,399,500,000	+163,792,000	-82,960,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	160,000,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	.....	-30,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1999—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1998 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1999 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1998 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1999 (6)
Departmental administration	224,155,000	245,788,000	175,365,000	-48,790,000	-70,423,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-136,738,000	-136,530,000	-136,530,000	+208,000	.....
Net appropriation	87,417,000	109,258,000	38,835,000	-48,582,000	-70,423,000
Office of the Inspector General	27,500,000	29,500,000	14,500,000	-13,000,000	-15,000,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(5,520,238,000)	(5,783,000,000)	(5,683,651,000)	(+163,413,000)	(-99,349,000)
Non-defense function	(717,259,000)	(739,000,000)	(691,700,000)	(-25,559,000)	(-47,300,000)
Total	(6,237,497,000)	(6,522,000,000)	(6,375,351,000)	(+137,854,000)	(-146,649,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities	4,146,692,000	4,500,000,000	4,142,100,000	-4,592,000	-357,900,000
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,429,438,000	4,259,903,000	4,358,554,000	-70,884,000	+98,651,000
Defense facilities closure projects	890,800,000	1,006,240,000	1,038,240,000	+147,440,000	+32,000,000
Defense environmental management privatization	200,000,000	516,857,000	286,857,000	+86,857,000	-230,000,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,520,238,000	5,783,000,000	5,683,651,000	+163,413,000	-99,349,000
Other defense activities	1,666,008,000	1,667,160,000	1,761,260,000	+95,252,000	+94,100,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	.....	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,522,938,000	12,140,160,000	11,777,011,000	+254,073,000	-363,149,000

Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,500,000	.....	.....	-3,500,000	.....
Capital assets acquisition	10,000,000	.....	.....	-10,000,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	12,222,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	-3,722,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,210,000	26,000,000	24,710,000	-500,000	-1,290,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	189,043,000	215,435,000	205,000,000	+15,957,000	-10,435,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(5,592,000)	.....	.....	(-5,592,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	970,000	1,010,000	970,000	.....	-40,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	240,945,000	250,945,000	239,180,000	-1,765,000	-11,765,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	162,141,000	168,898,000	166,500,000	+4,359,000	-2,398,000
Revenues applied	-162,141,000	-168,898,000	-166,500,000	-4,359,000	+2,398,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,898,574,000	17,070,365,000	16,203,560,000	+304,986,000	-866,805,000
(By transfer)	(5,592,000)	.....	.....	(-5,592,000)	.....
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	67,000,000	65,900,000	-104,100,000	-1,100,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,500,000	16,500,000	-500,000	-1,000,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	468,000,000	483,340,000	462,700,000	-5,300,000	-20,640,000
Revenues	-450,000,000	-152,341,000	-444,700,000	+5,300,000	-292,359,000
Subtotal	18,000,000	330,999,000	18,000,000	.....	-312,999,000

Office of Inspector General	4,800,000	5,300,000	4,800,000	.....	-500,000
Revenues	-4,800,000	-1,749,000	-4,800,000	.....	-3,051,000
Subtotal	.....	3,551,000	.....	.....	-3,551,000
Total	18,000,000	334,550,000	18,000,000	.....	-316,550,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,600,000	2,950,000	2,600,000	.....	-350,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	70,000,000	76,800,000	.....	-70,000,000	-76,800,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	277,600,000	498,800,000	103,000,000	-174,600,000	-395,800,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	21,261,907,000	21,725,462,000	21,076,345,000	-185,562,000	-649,117,000
Appropriations	(21,147,202,000)	(21,725,462,000)	(21,076,345,000)	(-70,857,000)	(-649,117,000)
Emergency appropriations	(109,705,000)	.....	.....	(-109,705,000)	.....
Contingent emergency appropriation	(5,000,000)	.....	.....	(-5,000,000)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	(25,800,000)	(25,800,000)	(+25,800,000)	.....