

# Calendar No. 688

106TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
{ 106-395

---

---

## ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 2001

---

AUGUST 30, 2000.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999

---

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

### REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 4733]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

*Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001*

Budget estimates considered by Senate .....	\$23,153,068,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate .....	22,918,441,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Below the budget estimate, 2001 .....	234,627,000
Over enacted bill, 2000 .....	1,271,394,000

# CONTENTS

## TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:	
Corps of Engineers—Civil:	Page
General investigations .....	10
Construction, general .....	31
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries .....	51
Operation and maintenance, general .....	56
Flood control and coastal emergencies .....	80
Regulatory program .....	80
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program .....	81
General expenses .....	82

## TITLE II

Department of the Interior:	
Central Utah project completion account .....	84
Bureau of Reclamation: Water and related resources .....	84
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account .....	96
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	99
California bay-delta ecosystem restoration .....	99
Policy and administrative expenses .....	100

## TITLE III

Department of Energy:	
Energy Supply .....	102
Renewable energy resources .....	102
Nuclear energy programs .....	106
Environment, safety, and health .....	110
Energy support activities .....	110
Environmental management (nondefense) .....	110
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund .....	111
Nuclear waste fund .....	111
Science .....	112
High energy physics .....	112
Nuclear physics .....	112
Biological and environmental research .....	113
Basic energy sciences .....	113
Other energy research programs .....	114
Fusion energy sciences .....	115
Departmental administration .....	115
Miscellaneous revenues .....	115
Inspector General .....	115
Atomic energy defense activities:	
National Nuclear Security Administration:	
Weapon activities .....	116
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	124
Naval reactors .....	129
Office of the Administrator .....	129
Other defense related activities:	
Defense environmental restoration and waste management .....	130
Defense facilities closure projects .....	134
Defense environmental management privatization .....	134
Other defense activities .....	135

	Page
Department of Energy—Continued	
Atomic energy defense activities—Continued	
Other defense related activities—Continued	
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	139
Power marketing administrations:	
Operations and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration ....	142
Operations and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration ....	142
Construction, rehabilitation, operations and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	142
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	143
General provisions .....	164
TITLE IV	
Independent Agencies:	
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	167
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	167
Delta Regional Authority .....	168
Denali Commission .....	168
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	168
Office of Inspector General .....	169
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	169
TITLE V	
Fiscal year 2000 supplemental: Cerro Grande fire activities .....	170
TITLE VI	
Rescission .....	171
TITLE VII	
General provisions .....	172
Compliance with paragraph 7(c), rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	173
Compliance with paragraph 12, rule XXVI, of the Standing Rules of the Senate .....	174
Budgetary impact statement .....	181

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 2001 beginning October 1, 2000, and ending September 30, 2001, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy’s energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission, Denali Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 2001 budget estimates for the bill total \$23,153,068,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals \$22,918,441,000. This is \$234,627,000 below the budget estimates and \$1,271,394,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 302(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals \$22,470,000,000 in budget authority and \$22,229,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 2001 in budget authority and outlays.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes \$13,410,379,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Weapon activities .....	\$4,883,289,000
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	908,967,000
Naval reactors .....	694,600,000
Other defense activities .....	579,463,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration .....	4,635,763,000
Defense facilities closure projects .....	1,082,297,000
Defense environmental privatization .....	324,000,000

## ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of \$691,520,000 for energy research programs including:

Renewable energy resources .....	\$444,117,000
Nuclear energy .....	262,084,000

## NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of \$309,141,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

## SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of \$2,870,112,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research .....	\$677,030,000
Nuclear physics .....	350,274,000
Basic energy sciences .....	914,582,000
Biological and environmental R&D .....	444,000,000
Fusion energy sciences .....	227,270,000
Other energy research .....	174,900,000

## REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is \$162,700,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission .....	\$66,400,000
Delta Regional Authority .....	20,000,000
Denali Commission .....	30,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission .....	175,200,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission .....	481,900,000

## WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General investigations .....	\$139,219,000
Construction .....	1,361,449,000
Flood control Mississippi River and tributaries .....	324,450,000
FUSRAP .....	140,000,000
Operations and maintenance .....	1,862,471,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities .....	120,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
California Bay-Delta restoration .....	
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	38,382,000
Water and related resource .....	655,192,000
Central Utah project completion .....	39,940,000

The Committee has recommended appropriations totaling approximately \$4,892,696,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

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

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

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

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

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

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development. In 1999, flood control projects prevented \$21,200,000,000 in damages, and U.S. ports and harbors annually handle about \$600,000,000,000 in international cargo generating over \$14,500,000,000 in tax revenues, nearly \$515,000,000,000 in personal income, contributing \$783,000,000,000 to the Nation's gross domestic product, and \$1,600,000,000,000 in business sales.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 2001 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Information, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 2001 therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By a vote of 28 to 0 the Committee on July 18, 2000, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee recommendation for the Corps of Engineers totals \$4,104,589,000. This is \$40,889,000 above the budget request for fiscal year 2001, but is \$21,971,000 below the appropriation for the current year.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS

The budget allocation for non-Defense discretionary programs contained in the Energy and Water Development for fiscal year 2001 are severely constrained and require reductions of \$625,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 2001. Faced with these budget realities, the Committee has had to make tough decisions and choices in the development of the Corps of Engineers budget request for fiscal year 2001. However, while the budget resources for non-Defense discretionary programs continue to decline, the number of requests of the subcommittee continue to increase. This year the Committee received nearly 1,000 requests for funding for water projects within the Corps' civil works program. Many supported the funding level in the budget request, but a majority of the requests made of the Committee sought increases over the budgeted amounts or new items not contained in the President's budget for fiscal year 2001.

To compound pressures on the budget this year, the Committee was faced with the recently enacted Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (WRDA 99). That legislation authorized construction of many new projects, extended credit and reimbursement authorities, and significantly expanded new mission and responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers into areas which historically have been a State and local responsibility. The best example of this is the environmental and other infrastructure authorities which the Committee estimates will cost over \$800,000,000. It should also be pointed out that the backlog of authorized but unfunded projects totals \$45,000,000,000 to \$50,000,000,000.

It is clear that, with the ever increasing level of authorized projects, the expansion of the Corps' areas of responsibility, and the continued reductions in non-Defense discretionary funding available to the Committee, the projects which the Committee is able to fund will have extended completion schedules and delayed benefits both to the local areas involved and to the Nation as a whole. These extended completion schedules and delayed benefits projected by the fiscal year 2001 budget are estimated at over \$4,000,000,000 in benefits foregone and nearly \$500,000,000 in in-



creased project costs, a significant portion of which State and local sponsors will have to fund.

The Committee is concerned about the Corps' incursion into non-traditional areas of responsibility and areas where the private sector has demonstrated capability and capacity to perform. Programs such as school modernization, while important and well intended, should be pursued only after careful review and consultation with the Congress, in full compliance with applicable procedures and regulations, and mindful of the private sector's capability to perform the work in question.

Further, the Committee believes the Corps should not be unduly constrained in carrying out its traditional role in providing inherently governmental engineering and environmental services to other Federal agencies or in assisting States consistent with existing law.

#### MANAGEMENT REFORMS

Earlier this year, following unsubstantiated allegations by a Corps of Engineers' employee and several press stories, the Secretary of the Army announced a number of Civil Works program management reforms. The Committee feels that the efforts of the Department of the Army and the Executive Branch to consult with the Congress prior to implementing these significant reforms was totally inadequate. As the result of Congressional concern, the Secretary of the Army agreed to withhold implementation for a reasonable period of time to allow for consultation. As yet, there has been little or no substantive dialogue regarding the need for or the impact of the proposed reforms on the historic role of the Corps of Engineers in the development of professional, impartial recommendations related to water resource development projects.

While the Committee does not take issue with the need for civilian oversight of the top Corps commanders, this oversight and management must not infringe on the responsibilities of the Corps, as a whole, to develop and finalize recommendations that, to the greatest extent possible, are balanced, representing the best solution possible to meet development needs and protect the environment. The Committee believes that a number of the reforms proposed by the Secretary of the Army fundamentally change the Corps' ability to provide such balance, and interject political or other considerations much earlier in the process thus jeopardizing the objectivity and balance which existing water resource development procedures require.

Further, the Committee believes that the executive branch's insistence that reform of the Corps of Engineers be based solely on the findings of the Inspector General's investigation of allegations of misconduct, which addresses the allegations of a single individual, is too narrow in scope to be meaningful to the issue of management of the Corps as an organization. Other studies and investigations, such as the National Research Council study of the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Navigation Study, initiated by the Secretary of the Army; and an investigation by the House Appropriations Committee, will address basic, systemic issues of the Corps management process. The Committee feels it important to

have the results of these reviews before making conclusions as to what reforms should to be instituted.

Finally, the Committee has not proceeded with legislative language which would prohibit reform of the Corps management structure with the expectation that the Executive Branch would engage the Congress in a meaningful dialogue as to what reforms should be instituted in the near term. However, there are indications that the Secretary of the Army and elements of the Executive Branch still plan to proceed with the original reforms irrespective of Congressional desires and views on the matter. The Committee has not included legislative language in this measure, but will reassess the need for such language as the process moves forward.

#### BASIS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Specifically, in development of the fiscal year 2001 funding recommendation for the Corps of Engineers, the Committee is not able to include any new construction starts, has recommended only a limited number of new study starts, and has had to reduce numerous funding levels below the amount requested in the budget in an effort to restore balance to the water resource program of the Corps, and to address high priority requests made to the Committee—all within a budget allocation for non-Defense discretionary program that is \$625,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 2001. The limited resources available have been focused on on-going projects where the Corps has contractual commitments. While the Committee has not been able to fund projects at the optimum level, it has endeavored to provide sufficient funding on each project to mitigate delays and increased costs, to the greatest extent possible, across the entire Corps' civil works program.

Finally, the Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the energy and water development appropriations bill. In an effort to support and honor congressional authorizing committees jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

#### GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$161,994,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	137,700,000
House allowance .....	153,327,000
Committee recommendation .....	139,219,000

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

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
ALABAMA									
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL .....	2,617	740	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL .....	750	170	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL .....	600	170	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL .....	15,035	456	521	.....	521	.....	521	.....
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL .....	750	170	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL .....	1,150	150	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
	COOSA RIVER, AL .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL .....	1,651	919	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
(FDP)	LUBBUB CREEK, AL .....	600	86	50	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
	LUXAPALILA CREEK, LAMAR COUNTY, AL .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED) .....	1,423	746	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
ALASKA									
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK .....	612	504	108	.....	108	.....	108	.....
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK .....	9,600	.....	.....	150	.....	150	.....	150
	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK .....	676	256	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(SP)	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK .....	600	86	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
(SPE)	CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK .....	500	86	50	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK .....	777	477	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
	CRAIG HARBOR, AK .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(N)	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK .....	1,850	70	422	.....	422	.....	700	.....
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK .....	316	207	109	.....	109	.....	109	.....
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK .....	4,000	.....	.....	50	.....	50	.....	50
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK .....	4,800	.....	.....	250	.....	250	.....	250
	FIRE ISLAND, AK .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(N)	GASTINEAU CHANNEL MODIFICATION, AK .....	500	86	50	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
	HAINES HARBOR, AK .....	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK .....	900	150	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK .....	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
	KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK .....	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK .....	900	100	100	.....	100	.....	.....	.....
	MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)	NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK .....	500	100	50	.....	50	.....	.....	.....
(N)	NAPASKIAK HARBOR, AK .....	250	.....	69	.....	69	.....	.....	.....
(N)	PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK .....	160	20	120	.....	120	.....	120	.....
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK .....	400	229	107	.....	107	.....	107	.....
(N)	QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK .....	290	.....	100	.....	100	.....	50	.....
	SAINT GEORGE HAROBR IMPROVEMENT, AK .....	600	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK .....	474	319	53	.....	53	.....	53	.....
	SITKA HARBOR, AK .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(N)	SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK .....	450	86	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK .....	300	.....	74	.....	74	.....	74	.....
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK .....	450	241	209	.....	209	.....	209	.....
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK .....	9,000	.....	.....	58	.....	58	.....	58
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK .....	451	408	43	.....	43	.....	43	.....
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK .....	451	.....	.....	150	.....	150	.....	150
	WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK .....	200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	169	.....
	AMERICAN SAMOA								
(N)	TUTUILA HARBOR, AS .....	400	125	275	.....	275	.....	275	.....
	ARIZONA								
	COLONIAS ALONG THE U.S./MEXICO BORDER, AZ AND TX .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	260	.....	.....
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ .....	1,985	1,723	212	.....	212	.....	212	.....
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ .....	1,675	150	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	PIMA COUNTY, AZ .....	1,100	100	75	.....	175	.....	75	.....
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ .....	1,100	150	290	.....	290	.....	290	.....
(FC)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ .....	18,200	129	.....	250	.....	375	.....	250
(E)	RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ .....	800	100	175	.....	175	.....	175	.....
(E)	RIO SALADO OESTE, AZ .....	800	100	175	.....	400	.....	175	.....
	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (GRANT RD. TO LOWELL RD.), AZ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	.....	.....
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ .....	1,350	338	100	.....	335	.....	100	.....
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ .....	55,250	43	.....	250	.....	500	.....	250

(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	19,400	600	432	800	432	800	432	800
	ARKANSAS								
(N)	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	5,800	919	753	400	753	400	753	432
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR AND OK	840	593	247		247		247	
(FC)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	19,500	25		200		200		500
(N)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	2,800	2,182	200		200		200	
	RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR								
	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR								
(COM)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR AND MO	2,000		500		900		500	
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR					300			
	WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW STUDY, AR	850						850	
	CALIFORNIA								
(E)	ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	1,100	50	50		500		50	
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	329,300	18,896			3,285		3,285	
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	159,600	100			500		500	
(E)	BOLLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	11,250				300		300	
(FDP)	CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	1,000	75	175		175		175	
	COAST OF CALIFORNIA STORM AND TIDAL WAVE STUDY, CA								
	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA								
	HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA								
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	1,975	272	200		211		200	
(FC)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	19,000	250			200		200	
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	1,100	75	225		240		240	
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA								
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	15,000	215			375		375	
	MALIBU CREEK, CA								
	MARE ISLAND, CA								
(SPE)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA								
(E)	MATILJA DAM, CA	1,100	75	150		500		500	
(E)	MIDDLE CREEK, CA	16,250							
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA	1,100	205	200		160		160	
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	600	186	250		200		200	
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	700	262	250		250		250	
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	19,500							
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	400	129	150		150		150	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	1,970	821	237		237		237	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	1,095	1,005	90		90		90	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SUISUN MARSH, CA	1,100	60	65		65		65	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA .....	1,806	1,219	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA .....	1,100	100	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	NCS, LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VIC, .....	1,970	745	300	.....	500	.....	300	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA .....	9,750	120	.....	350	.....	350	.....	350
	NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	800	.....	.....	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA .....	1,220	332	381	.....	381	.....	381	.....
	ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	475	.....	.....	.....
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA .....	1,175	186	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA .....	9,300	3,494	.....	600	.....	600	.....	1,200
(E)	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA .....	1,100	100	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
	PENINSULA BEACH (CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	.....	.....
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION, .....	16,250	86	.....	300	.....	300	.....	300
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA .....	1,350	125	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
(FDP)	POSO CREEK, CA .....	1,050	62	150	.....	500	.....	150	.....
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA .....	16,250	120	.....	200	.....	200	.....	200
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA .....	1,610	196	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA .....	3,677	459	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO—SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA .....	5,940	5,366	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY, .....	15,500	8,913	1,500	.....	3,000	.....	1,500	.....
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA .....	800	75	125	.....	125	.....	125	.....
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA .....	850	186	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	325	.....	.....	.....
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA .....	1,600	143	125	.....	125	.....	125	.....
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA .....	1,110	626	250	.....	700	.....	250	.....
	SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA .....	1,000	75	225	.....	225	.....	225	.....
	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D .....	9,750	.....	.....	150	.....	150	.....	.....
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D .....	804	704	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS, .....	2,375	150	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CORRAL HOLLOW CREEK, CA .....	1,100	60	65	.....	65	.....	65	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA .....	1,100	60	65	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C .....	1,611	1,431	180	.....	180	.....	180	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA .....	1,600	125	150	.....	300	.....	150	.....

(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	747	534	213	213	213	213	213
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,470	1,420	50	200	200	50	50
(FDP)	SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	1,100	50	50	50	50	170	170
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA	800	75	170	200	200	200	300
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	2,800	613	200	300	350	200	200
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	1,216	481	300	200	200	200	200
(FC)	SOLANA BEACH, CA	46,100	1,379	200	1,882	1,882	200	200
(FDP)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	800	125	150	300	300	150	150
(FDP)	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS, CA	1,350	125	150	150	150	150	150
(E)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	1,200	235	150	150	150	150	150
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	1,100	170	205	500	500	205	205
(SPE)	TUJANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	1,100	180	400	400	400	400	400
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA	55,000	1,541	500	500	500	500	500
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	1,845	661	300	300	300	300	300
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,100	186	100	100	100	100	100
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	1,300	362	400	400	400	400	400
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	1,050	63	150	150	150	150	150
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(FC)	WESTMINSTER, CA	22,200	200	400	400	400	400	400
(FC)	WHITWATER RIVER BASIN, CA							
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA							
	COLORADO							
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	1,350	510	250	250	250	250	250
	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	100						100
	ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	100						100
	COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS							
(N)	NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, CNMI	100		100				100
	CONNECTICUT							
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	357	242	80	80	80	80	80
	DELAWARE							
(N)	C&D CANAL- BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEPE	3,750	3,650	100	100	100	100	100
	DELAWARE COAST FROM BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY, DE	803					33	
	DELAWARE COASTLINE PROTECTION, DE AND NJ	803						428
	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET/LEWES BEACH, D	803	100	803			124	
	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE						304	

**CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued**

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
<b>FLORIDA</b>									
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL .....	3,420	1,572	543	.....	543	.....	543	.....
(FDP)	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL .....	600	86	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL .....	600	86	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
(N)	MILE POINT, FL .....	600	86	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL .....	932	772	160	.....	160	.....	160	.....
(FDP)	WITHLACOCHEE RIVER, FL .....	550	86	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
<b>GEORGIA</b>									
(FDP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, ETOWAH RIVER, GA .....	525	279	90	.....	90	.....	90	.....
(E)	ALLATOONA LAKE, LITTLE RIVER, GA .....	350	172	40	.....	40	.....	40	.....
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA .....	1,700	299	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA .....	35,957	2,276	.....	50	.....	50	.....	50
(E)	INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS, .....	1,100	86	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA .....	1,100	86	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	LUBBUB CREEK, GA .....	600	86	50	.....	.....	.....	50	.....
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA .....	2,230	1,731	499	.....	499	.....	499	.....
(E)	SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA .....	1,690	430	450	.....	450	.....	450	.....
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA .....	144,302	211	.....	100	.....	100	.....	100
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC .....	3,020	650	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....
(E)	UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA .....	1,100	86	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
<b>HAWAII</b>									
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI .....	900	134	140	.....	140	.....	140	.....
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI .....	23,200	327	.....	173	.....	173	.....	173
	HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT, HI .....	500	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI .....	750	418	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI .....	700	175	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
(N)	KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI .....	900	100	40	.....	40	.....	40	.....
	KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....



(FDP)	IDAHO	BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID .....	100	165	.....	.....	165	.....
(FC)		GOOSE CREEK, OAKLEY, ID .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)		KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID .....	50	60	.....	.....	60	.....
(FDP)		LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID .....	100	165	.....	.....	165	.....
		PAYETTE AND SNAKE RIVER, ID .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
		ILLINOIS						
(E)		ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL .....	.....	200	.....	200	.....	200
(FC)		DES PLAINES RIVER, IL .....	261	400	.....	400	.....	400
(FDP)		DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II) .....	.....	750	.....	.....	250	.....
		ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL .....	.....	.....	.....	325	.....	.....
(E)		ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL .....	377	500	.....	.....	500	.....
(FDP)		KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL AND IN .....	987	300	.....	.....	300	.....
(SPE)		PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL .....	1,060	400	.....	.....	400	.....
(E)		ROCK RIVER, IL AND WI .....	158	700	.....	.....	700	.....
(RCP)		UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO .....	57,875	2,105	.....	.....	2,105	.....
(N)		UPPER MISS AND ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO .....	5,418	.....	.....	4,707	.....	4,707
(SPE)		UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M .....	5,477	888	.....	.....	888	.....
(N)		WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL .....	150	.....	.....	300	.....	300
(FC)		WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL .....	173	.....	.....	310	.....	310
		INDIANA						
(N)		INDIANA HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, IN .....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....	.....
		JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN AND KY .....	476	.....	.....	2,210	.....	2,210
		LITTLE CALUMET RIVER (CADDY MARSH DITCH), IN .....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....	.....
		OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN .....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	.....
		WHITE RIVER, MUNICE, IN .....	.....	250	.....	.....	.....	.....
		IOWA						
(FDP)		DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA .....	439	400	.....	.....	400	.....
(FDP)		INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA .....	100	80	.....	.....	80	.....
		KANSAS						
(RCP)		TOPEKA, KS .....	897	200	.....	.....	200	.....
(FC)		TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO .....	847	.....	.....	353	.....	353
		UPPER TURKEY RUN CREEK, KS .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(E)		WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS .....	86	200	.....	.....	200	.....

**CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued**

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
<b>KENTUCKY</b>									
(FDP)	BANKLICK CREEK, KY .....	850	100	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND OH .....	238,800	.....	.....	1,300	.....	1,300	.....	1,300
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY .....	850	365	260	.....	260	.....	260	.....
(E)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY .....	850	100	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY .....	850	367	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY .....	1,784	1,523	161	.....	161	.....	161	.....
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV .....	45,300	39,648	4,141	.....	4,141	.....	4,141	.....
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	400	.....	.....	.....
<b>LOUISIANA</b>									
(E)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA .....	2,100	100	200	.....	400	.....	200	.....
	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, BAYOUS CHENE, BOENF AND BLACK, LA .....	500	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	250	.....
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA .....	2,900	429	339	.....	339	.....	339	.....
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA .....	2,100	100	100	.....	300	.....	100	.....
	HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA .....	5,380	4,694	686	.....	686	.....	686	.....
(FC)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA .....	153,800	.....	.....	215	.....	500	.....	215
(FC)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA .....	60,000	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....	200
(E)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA .....	17,500	1,500	1,750	.....	1,750	.....	1,750	.....
(FC)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA .....	71,200	.....	.....	164	.....	300	.....	164
(FDP)	ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA .....	1,700	100	100	.....	500	.....	100	.....
	ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
	PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA .....	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA .....	1,850	1,504	346	.....	346	.....	346	.....
<b>MARYLAND</b>									
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M .....	3,000	2,167	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC .....	1,453	954	455	.....	455	.....	455	.....
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD .....	1,232	1,164	68	.....	68	.....	68	.....
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD .....	750	.....	.....	700	.....	700	.....	700
(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD .....	1,200	186	400	.....	400	.....	400	.....

(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	460	304	100	100	100	100	100	100
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST WARY'S, MD	650	132	250	250	250	250	250	250
(E)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	3,250	43	100	100	100	100	100	100
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	5,655							
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,627	888	310	310	310	310	310	310
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL)	1,100	100	150	150	150	150	150	150
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	600		100					
	MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA					500			
(E)	SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA AND VT	382	82	100	100	100	100	100	100
	MICHIGAN								
	BELL ISLE SHORELINE, DETROIT, MI	100						100	
	MUSKOGON LAKE, MI								
	GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA, AND WI	1,000							
(N)	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	130,600	1,488	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
	MINNESOTA								
(E)	UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	1,310	100	250	250	250	250	250	250
	MISSISSIPPI								
	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS								
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	19,825	950	312	250	250	250	250	250
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO AND KS	2,460							
(COM)	MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJE	500		500					
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460-471, MO	1,570	1,136	220	220	220	220	220	220
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO	17,400	530		330	330	330	330	330
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	15,524	3,201		265	265	265	265	265
(FC)	ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	6,000	245		445	445	445	445	445
(FC)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	6,500			170	170	170	170	170
	MONTANA								
(COM)	LOWER YELLOWSTONE RIVER DIVERSION DAM, MT								100
	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	2,000		500					500
	NEBRASKA								
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	19,000	100		275	275	275	275	275

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE .....	2,431	1,944	217	.....	217	.....	217	.....
(FC)	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE .....	12,350	176	.....	220	.....	220	.....	220
	NEVADA								
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV .....	1,400	1,100	100	.....	100	.....	500	.....
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV .....	39,200	6,186	.....	500	.....	500	.....	500
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV .....	1,360	300	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
	NEW HAMPSHIRE								
	MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN .....	2,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....
	NEW JERSEY								
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ .....	6,000	.....	.....	50	.....	50	.....	50
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	450	.....	.....
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ .....	563	172	.....	.....	.....	391	.....	390
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ AND DE .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	222	.....	.....
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	135	.....	.....
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS AND VICINITY, NJ AND DE .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	155	.....	.....
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSEDS INLET, NJ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS TO CAPE MAY POINT, NJ .....	723	200	.....	.....	.....	345	.....	350
(FDP)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	.....
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ .....	1,540	1,322	218	.....	218	.....	218	.....
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ .....	1,375	293	550	.....	550	.....	550	.....
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ .....	1,775	1,484	291	.....	291	.....	291	.....
(FDP)	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES IN MONMOUTH COUNTY, N .....	1,500	86	120	.....	120	.....	120	.....
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ .....	2,800	2,280	450	.....	450	.....	450	.....
(E)	STONY BROOK, NJ .....	1,500	86	120	.....	120	.....	120	.....
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT .....	800	356	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ .....	1,400	356	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
(FDP)	WOODBIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ .....	1,500	246	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....

	NEW MEXICO										
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	920	846	50						50	
(COM)	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO AND TX	2,000		500							
(E)	SANTA CRUZ DAM SEDIMENT STUDY, NM	100								100	
	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	1,450	586	330						330	
	NEW YORK										
(N)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK MONITORING PROGRAM, NY										
(FDP)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	221,800	6,253			347					347
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	800	179	200						200	
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	800	179	200						200	
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	800	150	250						250	
(FDP)	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY										
(FDP)	CLINTON COUNTY, NY	1,500	86	150						150	
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	1,614	708	520						520	
(E)	HUDSON—RARITAN ESTUARY, NY AND NJ	6,100	86	800						800	
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	6,000	86								
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	2,399	1,213	50		50				50	
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, HUDSON, NY	1,500	86	120						120	
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY	1,000		50						50	
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	1,850	1,554	296						296	
	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY										
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY	800	174	100						100	
	MONTAUK POINT, NY	450	163								
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	400,000	2,030			2,528					2,528
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	1,200	616	259						259	
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	1,800	659	300						300	
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	1,670	1,014	250						250	
(E)	SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	800	150	50						50	
	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY										
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,100	225	90						90	
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	2,000	1,266	400						400	
(E)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	3,250	52			100					100
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	1,300	150	776						776	
	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY										
	NORTH CAROLINA										
	BOGUE BANKS, NC										
(E)	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	1,100		100							100
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,247	2,197	50							50

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLAND, NC .....					500			
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC .....	1,470	356	600		600		600	
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC .....	84,557	9,250		250		250		250
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC .....	1,100	100	100		100		100	
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND .....	3,733	2,856	50		2,050			4,000
(FC)	GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND .....		50		900		900		900
	OHIO								
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH .....		516		384		384		384
(FDP)	BUTLER COUNTY, OH .....	850		100				100	
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH .....	1,600	358	600		600		600	
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH .....	556	200	306		306		306	
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH .....	700	50	200		200		200	
	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH AND PA .....					500			
(E)	MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH .....	1,600	100	100		100		100	
	OHIO RIVER FLOW COMMODITY STUDY, OH .....					200			
(FDP)	RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO .....	600	100	100		100		100	
	SANDUSKY RIVER, TIFFIN, OH .....	100						100	
	STEBENVILLE, OH .....					175			
	WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN AND MI .....	100						100	
	OKLAHOMA								
(E)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM AND CO .....	2,600	86	200		200		200	
(E)	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK .....	4,100	86	200		700		200	
(FDP)	WARR ACRES, OK .....	1,100	86	200		200		200	
	OREGON								
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA .....	1,800	877		923		923		923
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR .....	1,808	452	274		274		274	
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR .....	2,284	1,973	210		210		210	
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR .....	1,100	86	114		114		114	



CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX .....	4,370	2,396	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX .....	6,007	5,279	728	.....	728	.....	728	.....
(N)	GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX .....	.....	.....	.....	100	.....	200	.....	100
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX .....	4,510	1,488	653	.....	653	.....	653	.....
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX .....	166,657	5,976	.....	434	.....	434	.....	434
(E)	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX .....	2,500	344	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX .....	90,488	1,000	.....	100	.....	337	.....	500
(E)	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX .....	9,825	514	600	.....	1,500	.....	600	.....
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX .....	1,560	857	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
(E)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX .....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....	50	.....	50
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX .....	19,500	360	.....	164	.....	164	.....	1,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX .....	975	430	280	.....	280	.....	280	.....
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX .....	5,540	.....	.....	100	.....	100	.....	100
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX .....	77,100	338	.....	100	.....	700	.....	100
(N)	SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX .....	3,515	643	544	.....	544	.....	544	.....
(E)	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX .....	4,835	86	114	.....	114	.....	114	.....
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX .....	150,050	6,359	.....	574	.....	574	.....	574
(E)	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX .....	580	295	50	.....	50	.....	50	.....
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX .....	9,310	7,487	500	.....	1,100	.....	1,100	.....
	UTAH								
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT .....	1,495	595	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
	VIRGINIA								
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA .....	1,168	826	342	.....	342	.....	342	.....
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA .....	22,168	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....	200
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, VA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	170	.....	.....	.....
(E)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD .....	1,301	1,054	247	.....	247	.....	247	.....
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA .....	9,795	168	.....	277	.....	277	.....	277
(FDP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (SECTION 216) .....	1,100	100	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
	LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAM AND SPILLWAY, VA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....
(E)	LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA .....	700	100	300	.....	300	.....	300	.....
	NEW RIVER BASIN, VA, NC, AND WV .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	.....



(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	3,050	1,213	1,188	.....	1,188	.....	1,188	.....
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	1,477	1,022	165	.....	165	.....	165	.....
(E)	POWELL RIVER, STRAIGHT, REEDS AND JONES CREEK, VA	5,000	.....	.....	200	.....	200	.....	200
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	775	396	205	.....	205	.....	205	.....
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	697	440	257	.....	257	.....	257	.....
	WASHINGTON								
(E)	BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	400	50	60	.....	60	.....	60	.....
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	56,000	3,440	.....	250	.....	500	.....	1,750
(E)	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	700	86	150	.....	150	.....	150	.....
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	50,825	.....	.....	222	.....	222	.....	222
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	40,456	2,779	.....	600	.....	600	.....	1,500
(RCP)	LAKE WALLULA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, COLUMBIA RIVER, WA	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	2,566	1,271	350	.....	350	.....	350	.....
	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA AND OR	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
(SP)	OCEAN SHORES, WA	850	150	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	2,124	1,348	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
(E)	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	700	86	65	.....	65	.....	65	.....
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	2,547	1,495	270	.....	270	.....	270	.....
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	600	110	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	31,100	.....	.....	225	.....	225	.....	225
(E)	TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	800	269	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FC)	ERICSONWOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	.....
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	13,546	1,975	200	.....	200	.....	200	.....
(FDP)	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	18,750	600	650	.....	650	.....	650	.....
	MERCER COUNTY, WV	414	307	107	.....	107	.....	107	.....
	WERTON PORT, WV	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	750	.....	.....
	WISCONSIN								
	FOX RIVER, WI	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	SAXON HARBOR, WI	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	WYOMING								
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	8,000	.....	.....	100	.....	100	.....	300
	MISCELLANEOUS								
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	.....	.....	2,300	.....	2,200	.....	1,500	.....
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	.....	.....	700	.....	100	.....	100	.....

**CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued**

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA .....			400		400		400	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES .....			9,000		8,200		8,000	
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM .....					600			
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES .....			500		500		500	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES .....			500		500		500	
	NATIONAL SHORELINE .....			300					
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS .....			8,900		8,000		7,900	
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES .....			6,500		5,600		6,700	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE) .....			400		400		400	
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT .....			300		300		300	
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....			26,000		25,000		23,000	
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS .....			100		100		100	
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY) .....			800		700		700	
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS .....			800		700		700	
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER .....			650		650		650	
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES .....			-23,250		-35,971		-35,050	
	<b>TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS .....</b>			<b>101,569</b>	<b>36,181</b>	<b>105,076</b>	<b>48,151</b>	<b>92,552</b>	<b>46,667</b>

TYPE OF PROJECT:

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

*Fire Island, AK.*—The Committee has provided \$100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the need for a causeway to Fire Island, AK in an effort to relieve transportation pressure at Anchorage International Airport.

*Kotzebue Small Boat Harbor, AK.*—An appropriation of \$150,000 is included for the Corps to undertake a study of the need for harbor facilities at Kotzebue, AK. Currently, there are no harbor facilities to serve the community and residents are forced to tie their boats directly to the beach.

*Saint George Harbor Improvement, AK.*—The Committee understands that large waves are entering the entrance and inner harbor area at Saint George Harbor in Alaska making ingress and egress into the harbor almost impossible. Therefore, the Committee has included \$200,000 for a feasibility study that will look at ways to reduce wave action in the inner harbor, but more importantly, to create a safe entrance channel wave environment into the harbor.

*Sitka Harbor, AK.*—The Committee has included \$100,000 for a reconnaissance study of possible modifications to the western channel breakwater in Sitka Harbor, AK.

*Whittier, AK, Breakwater.*—The Committee has provided \$169,000 for the Corps to investigate the need for a breakwater at Whittier, AK to protect the boat launch facility.

*Luxapalila Creek, AL.*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in the Luxapalila Creek flood control project in Alabama.

*North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR.*—The Committee has included \$500,000 for the Corps to continue on an expedited basis the preconstruction engineering and design for the North Little Rock, Dark Hollow, AR flood control project.

*White River Minimum Flows, AR.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$850,000 for the White River Minimum Flows Study in Arkansas. This work is required in order to develop a water allocation and environmental restoration plan to provide sufficient minimum flows from the White River Basin Lakes to sustain trout fisheries and to provide for aquatic ecosystem enhancements.

*Llagas Creek, CA.*—The Committee has included \$700,000 for the Corps to expedite the preconstruction engineering and design on the Llagas Creek, CA flood control project.

*Pajaro River at Watsonville, CA.*—The Committee is aware that the preconstruction engineering and design on the Pajaro River at Watsonville, CA project was already underway when the Pajaro River Mainstem study was funded in fiscal year 2000. Because of the interrelationship of the two projects, both studies were combined and now are funded in Pajaro River at Watsonville. In a effort to maintain the schedule of this important flood control project, the Committee has provided an additional \$600,000 over the budget request to continue the effort on the General Reevaluation Report, including an evaluation of the Pajaro River Mainstem.

*San Joaquin River Basin, Farmington Dam, CA.*—Severe budget constraints do not allow the Committee to include funding for the San Joaquin River Basin, Farmington Dam planning and design. However, the Corps is urged to work cooperatively with the project sponsor and other non-governmental organizations with experience

in wetland restoration in an effort to explore options to accomplishing this work.

*City of Westminster, CA.*—An amount of \$100,000 is recommended by the Committee to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flood damage prevention measures for protection of flood prone areas within the City of Westminster, California.

*Fountain Creek and Tributaries, CO.*—The Committee is aware that recent floods along Fountain Creek in Colorado caused an estimated \$100,000,000 in damages to roads, bridges, residential and other improvements. In an effort to begin to address solutions to the flooding problem, the Committee has provided \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to determine the Federal interest in potential solutions for flood control.

*Delaware Coastline Protection, DE and NJ.*—The Committee recommendation of \$428,000 for the Delaware Coastline Protection project includes \$124,000 for the Corps to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Roosevelt Inlet to Lewes Beach reach, and \$304,000 to complete the preconstruction engineering and design of the Broadkill Beach segment of the project.

*Hawaii Water Management Study.*—An important part of Hawaii's water resource system are antiquated ditches developed by sugar companies to deliver water through portions of the Hawaiian islands. The Hawaii Water Management Study includes development of a plan to increase the efficiency of various existing delivery systems. The Committee recommendation includes \$200,000 for the Corps to continue previous efforts to study these systems and to assist the State in diversification by helping to define the cost of repairing and maintaining selected ditch systems.

*Goose Creek Watershed, Oakley, ID.*—An amount of \$100,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study to determine possible flood damage reduction, water conservation, ecosystem restoration and other related needs along the Goose Creek watershed near Oakley, ID.

*Upper Turkey Creek Basin, KS.*—The Committee has provided \$100,000 for the Upper Turkey Creek Basin, KS study for the Corps to complete the reconnaissance phase investigation. The study will examine a full range of structural and nonstructural measures to reduce recurring flood damages from overflow for the Turkey Creek channel in the upper portion of the Basin.

*Atchafalaya River, Bayou Chene, Bouef and Black, LA.*—The Committee has provided \$250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake activities necessary to determine if the deepening of the Atchafalaya River, Bayou Chene, Bourf and Black navigation channel is technically sound, environmentally acceptable and economically justified. The Corps should complete its determination as soon as possible using funds provided herein and other available funds.

*Hurricane Protection, LA.*—Recent hurricanes and tropical storms impacting coastal areas of the United States have highlighted the concerns regarding the need for adequate coastal flood damage protection. The State of Louisiana and many local governments there have expressed concern that the current hurricane protection measures do not provide adequate protection for large storm events. If such storms were to impact the coastal area of

Louisiana, extreme damages and loss of life could be anticipated. In order to address these concerns, the Committee has included \$100,000 for the Corps to review currently authorized hurricane protection projects and determine if modifications are required to provide a higher level of protection.

*Urban Flood Control Studies, LA.*—The Committee has provided \$100,000 each for the Plaquemines Parish and St. Charles Parish Urban Flood Control studies. The funds will be used by the Corps to initiate reconnaissance studies of flood control measures in the Parishes.

*Belle Isle Shoreline, Detroit, MI.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$100,000 for the Belle Isle Shoreline, Detroit, Michigan study. The funding will be used to initiate and complete a Section 905(b) analysis, and to prepare a study management plan, if appropriate.

*Sault Ste Marie, Lock Replacement, MI.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of a replacement lock at Sault Ste Marie in Michigan.

*Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, NJ.*—An amount of \$390,000 is recommended to complete preconstruction engineering and design on the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, NJ project.

*Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, NJ.*—The Committee has recommended inclusion of \$350,000 for the Corps to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Lower Cape May Meadows, Cape May Point, NJ shore protection project.

*Rio Grande River Basin, NM.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$600,000 for the Rio Grande River Basin study in New Mexico. The funding will allow the Corps to undertake studies focused on a Geographic Information System for the acequia system in New Mexico, regional water planning within New Mexico, and detailed analyses of water conveyance and delivery, and ecosystem degradation, including fish mobility studies, on the Rio Grande River mainstem from San Acacia Diversion Dam to Elephant Butte Reservoir. These studies are to be performed under the authority of Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

*Santa Cruz Dam Sediment Study, NM.*—The Committee has included \$100,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study of causes and potential solutions to sediment buildup behind Santa Cruz Dam in New Mexico.

*Las Vegas Wash Wetlands, NV.*—An amount of \$500,000 is provided for the Corps to advance the completion of the Las Vegas Wash Wetlands feasibility report. The Committee expects the Corps to make every effort to complete the feasibility phase as soon as practicable.

*Hudson-Raritan Estuary, NY and NJ.*—The Committee urges the Secretary to include in the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, NY and NJ, study an evaluation of environmental restoration measures in the Lower Passaic River, from Dundee Dam to Newark Bay.

*Montauk Point, NY.*—The Committee understands the combined forces of storm induced erosion and long term constant erosion threaten the historic Montauk Point lighthouse in New York. Further, the Committee understands that the State is now prepared to

support the effort and has funds available. Therefore, the Committee has recommended \$287,000 for the Corps to develop alternative solutions to the erosion threatening the lighthouse, and complete the feasibility report.

*Sandusky River, Tiffin, OH.*—An appropriation of \$100,000 is recommended for the Sandusky River, Tiffin, Ohio study. The funds will be used by the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of possible solutions or improvements to flood damage protection works along the Sandusky River in the vicinity of Tiffin, OH.

*Western Lake Erie Basin, OH, IN, and MI.*—The Committee has provided \$100,000 for the Corps to prepare a Section 905(b) report, and, if appropriate, to develop a study management plan for the Western Lake Erie Basin study. The study will address measures to improve flood control, navigation, water quality, and other water resource needs in a comprehensive manner in the western Lake Erie Basin of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan.

*New Castle, PA.*—The Committee has included \$100,000 for the Corps to undertake a Section 905(b) study of water and related improvements along Neshanock Creek in the vicinity of New Castle, PA.

*Broad River Basin, SC.*—The Santee, Cooper, and Congaree reconnaissance study, completed in 1997, identified a need for site specific investigations in each sub-basin. The Broad River Basin is one of the upper four sub-basins in the Santee, Cooper, and Congaree Basin and includes portions of 18 counties. The Committee has included \$200,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of potential solutions to flooding in the Broad River Basin.

*Waccamaw River, SC.*—An appropriation of \$100,000 is provided for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flooding along the Waccamaw River in South Carolina.

*Freeport and Vicinity Hurricane Flood Protection, TX.*—The Committee is aware of the change in existing conditions and new hurricane data that may severely impact the existing Freeport Harbor and Vicinity Hurricane Flood Protection, TX project. Therefore, the Committee has provided \$100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to determine the need to reconstruct the existing Federal project to reflect current conditions and future threats from hurricane events.

*Upper Trinity River Basin, TX.*—The Committee has provided \$1,100,000 for the continuation of the Upper Trinity River Basin, TX feasibility study. The additional funding over the amount included in the budget request will allow initiation of the Big Fossil Creek Watershed study.

*Lake Wallula Navigation Channel, Columbia River, WA.*—The Committee has included \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study to determine if Federal assumption of maintenance of the Lake Wallula navigation channel is economically justified and environmentally acceptable.

*Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration, WA and OR.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study of the ecosystem restoration opportunities along the Lower Columbia River. The Committee un-

derstands that the Columbia River Channel Deepening project, the lower Columbia River Estuary Plan Implementation Team, and the "All H" paper on Salmon Recovery, have identified possible restoration opportunities. Therefore, a comprehensive ecosystem restoration study would serve as a catalyst to bring together and implement current efforts by a number of governmental and private organizations.

*Saxon Harbor, WI.*—The Committee has included \$50,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study of the operation of the completed project at Saxon Harbor, WI.

*Planning assistance to States.*—The Committee has provided \$6,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers' planning assistance to States program. The Corps is to work with the city of Laurel, MT to provide appropriate assistance to ensure reliability in the city's Yellowstone River water source. The Committee has included in the recommendation \$200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to assist the city of Memphis, TN in developing a master plan for riverfront development within the city along the Mississippi River.

*Flood Plain Management Services.*—Within the \$8,000,000 recommended for Flood Plain Management Services, the Committee has included \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a flood plain management study at Glendive, Montana.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$1,385,032,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	1,346,000,000
House allowance .....	1,378,430,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,361,449,000

An appropriation of \$1,361,449,000 is recommended for ongoing construction activities.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA						
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO .....	18,950	3,404	2,000	2,000	2,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL .....	331,021	29,964	499	499	499
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH .....	38,700	643	3,000	3,000	3,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	31,200	6,398	2,500	2,500	2,500
ALASKA						
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK .....	6,050	652	1,312	1,312	1,312
	GALENA, AK .....	4,100	1,100	.....	.....	3,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK .....	18,000	12,492	5,508	5,508	5,508
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK .....	22,925	8,818	5,616	5,616	5,616
(N)	OUZINKIE HARBOR, AK .....	8,500	4,200	.....	.....	3,000
ARIZONA						
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ .....	61,630	3,957	2,000	.....	.....
ARKANSAS						
(N)	MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR .....	651,000	610,530	3,300	3,300	3,300
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR .....	242,000	138,341	20,000	25,000	34,000
(MP)	OZARK POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB) .....	51,800	.....	1,230	.....	.....
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....
CALIFORNIA						
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA .....	72,200	26,288	10,000	10,000	10,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS) .....	97,500	2,400	5,000	.....	.....
	BERRYESSA CREEK, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA .....	21,900	12,556	100	100	100
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA .....	78,500	73,416	3,500	3,500	7,000
	IMPERIAL BEACH, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	800	.....



(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA .....	23,500	3,616	500	3,000	500
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA .....	150,000	140,179	9,821	9,821	7,821
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA .....	4,810	3,325	1,485	1,485	1,485
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA .....	32,550	30,750	760	760	760
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA .....	91,800	18,907	500	500	500
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA .....	14,900	11,786	2,000	2,000	2,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA .....	91,000	17,712	4,000	4,000	4,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA .....	11,250	5,580			3,225
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA .....	179,900	111,611	3,300	5,000	4,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA .....	20,000	10,372	4,100	4,100	4,100
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA .....				250	
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA .....	16,330	8,050	4,000	4,000	4,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA .....	883,000	651,880	18,000	23,000	15,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA .....	5,450	450	5,000	5,000	5,000
	STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA .....				5,000	
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY) .....	30,900	872	1,000	1,000	1,000
	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CA .....				5,000	
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA .....	5,720	4,055	1,665	1,665	1,665
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA .....	17,700	15,925	1,775	1,775	1,775
	DELAWARE					
	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE .....				3,000	3,000
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE .....	13,000	5,343	254	254	254
	FLORIDA					
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL .....				5,000	6,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL .....	133,750	35,885	847	847	847
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL .....	12,300	760	200	200	200
(E)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL .....	2,109,274	515,696	92,423	80,423	65,510
(SP)	DADE COUNTY, FL .....	177,300	67,185	3,058	8,000	3,058
(SP)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL .....	111,200	20,527	3,800	3,800	3,800
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL .....	74,792	14,351	20,525	20,525	15,525
(E)	HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FL .....	13,500		4,562		
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R .....	30,600	15,266	4,500	4,500	4,500
(E)	KISSIMEE RIVER, FL .....	224,800	64,300	20,000	20,000	16,000
(SP)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL .....	43,600	5,898	200	200	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL .....	25,185	6,614	10,828	10,828	9,828
(SP)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL .....	35,800	5,870	2,419	2,419	2,419
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL .....	49,059	20,620	6,591	6,591	6,591
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL .....	18,700	5,839	4,000	7,500	4,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL .....	25,449	2,621	706	706	706
(SP)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL .....	167,200	43,090	1,321	1,321	1,321
	ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL .....	.....	.....	.....	4,000	.....
	ST. LUCIE INLET, FL .....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
	TAMPA HARBOR, FL .....	.....	.....	.....	300	.....
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	33,700	3,024	2,455	2,455	2,455
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA AND SC .....	3,167	671	1,500	1,500	1,500
	MAYO'S BAR LOCK AND DAM, GA .....	1,500	.....	.....	.....	400
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR) .....	11,208	9,536	332	.....	332
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	619,570	601,852	2,666	2,666	2,666
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB) .....	69,700	23,707	5,000	5,000	5,000
	HAWAII					
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR) .....	14,807	1,023	239	239	239
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI .....	5,039	1,268	3,437	3,437	3,437
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI .....	11,446	3,499	325	325	325
	ILLINOIS					
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR) .....	23,728	2,301	2,100	2,100	2,100
(E)	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL .....	2,130	1,400	400	400	400
(SP)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL .....	170,071	45,319	19,192	19,192	18,192
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL .....	37,861	28,643	900	900	900
	EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL .....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....

(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH .....	69,994	20,396	5,750	5,750	5,750
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL .....	21,000	12,985	4,010	4,010	4,010
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL .....	503,828	29,141	2,800	7,800	5,600
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO .....	740,700	730,071	1,400	1,400	1,400
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL AND KY .....	1,000,000	429,016	38,142	38,142	53,142
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO .....	532,740	197,875	18,000	21,000	17,000
INDIANA						
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN .....	35,991	34,903	1,088	1,088	1,088
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY) .....	60,000	1,860	3,291	3,291	3,291
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN .....				1,000	
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN .....				7,000	4,000
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN .....	12,746	1,067	934	934	934
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN .....	134,509	70,566	5,343	8,843	5,343
(FC)	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN .....	15,500		1,500		
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB) .....	7,200	2,000	5,200	5,200	5,200
IOWA						
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	24,600		3,210		
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	15,500	1,972	5,260	5,260	4,300
(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K .....	84,500	51,523	12,000	12,000	10,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO .....	140,518	99,956	4,400	4,400	4,650
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA .....	45,400	32,064	7,178	7,178	7,178
KANSAS						
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS .....	27,800	8,372	5,100	5,100	5,100
KENTUCKY						
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN .....	161,199	160,199	1,000	1,000	1,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY) .....	14,700	5,788	3,832	3,832	3,832
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY .....	533,000	49,090	14,900	19,000	27,700
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY AND IN .....	268,000	35,356	14,000	18,000	14,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY .....	13,524	3,717	4,000	4,000	4,000
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY .....				4,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	<b>LOUISIANA</b>					
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA .....	107,200	9,131	10,000	10,000	10,000
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA .....	575,000	44,155	14,349	14,349	16,349
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA .....				500	
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA .....	1,893,651	1,714,647	18,040	21,040	18,040
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT .....	525,000	401,564	3,100	8,100	10,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION) .....	80,000	73,534	1,414	2,414	1,414
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA .....				500	
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L .....	176,000	25,766	719	719	719
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION) .....	173,000	145,078	1,800	1,800	1,800
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA .....	399,000	168,343	47,260	47,260	69,000
(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA .....	199,000	56,218	8,065	7,565	8,065
	<b>MARYLAND</b>					
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC .....	12,000	8,049	3,951	3,951	3,951
(SP)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD .....	16,900		2,500		1,500
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD .....	270,300	34,795	185	185	185
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND VA .....	21,000	675	5,000		
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA .....	900	292	608	608	1,058
	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD AND VA .....				500	4,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD .....	320,000	48,618	19,190	19,190	17,190
	<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>					
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	31,400	4,350	8,600	8,600	8,600
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA .....	32,850	32,750	100	100	100
	<b>MINNESOTA</b>					
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB) .....	16,200	2,584	5,000	5,000	5,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN .....	8,010	6,698	1,312	1,312	1,312

(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY) .....	10,200	6,327	3,873	3,873	3,873
	MISSISSIPPI					
	JACKSON COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, MS .....	20,000	19,200			2,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS .....	47,101	26,720	6,663	6,663	6,663
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS .....	2,740	1,403	1,337	1,337	1,337
	PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF WALKIAH BLUFF, MS AND LA .....	1,000				1,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO .....	216,000	170,092	10,500	10,500	14,500
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO .....	36,694	30,502	2,350	2,350	2,350
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO .....	29,232	17,090	3,000	3,000	3,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO .....	274,327	192,971	6,500	6,500	6,500
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO .....	34,532	20,337	6,000	6,000	6,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY) .....	60,200	16,844	5,920	5,920	5,920
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD .....	21,000	3,523	300	300	1,800
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE .....	10,536	1,936	1,600	3,000	2,100
	NEVADA					
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV .....	209,700	87,668	20,000	20,000	21,600
	NEW JERSEY					
	BRIGANTINE INLET/GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON ISL) .....				5,000	
(SP)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ .....	92,700	16,150	100	100	100
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA AND DE .....	224,000	20,101	29,756	29,756	26,756
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ .....	393,000	31,529	5,100	5,100	5,100
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN .....	82,200	5,304	5,649	10,000	8,649
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N .....	19,300	3,224	1,700	1,700	1,700
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ .....				2,300	3,000
	RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH, NJ .....				750	
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ .....	11,700	6,098	2,717	2,717	2,717
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ .....	295,600	30,475	4,000	4,000	4,000
(SP)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ .....	1,162,900	114,227	6,383	6,383	6,383

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>						
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM .....	66,000	12,631	900	900	900
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM .....	41,400	5,575	3,000	3,000	3,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM .....	6,600	3,759	2,841	2,841	2,841
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE .....	46,800	9,406	600	600	600
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE, .....	62,300	5,065	600	600	600
<b>NEW YORK</b>						
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY .....	221,700	4,600	5,000	.....	.....
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT, .....	101,000	14,942	500	500	500
(SP)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY, .....	64,000	44,944	1,000	1,000	1,000
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY .....	236,000	35,117	500	1,500	500
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY .....	573,100	53,424	3,000	3,000	3,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ .....	607,600	255,580	53,000	53,000	44,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY .....	.....	.....	.....	3,000	.....
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY .....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>						
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC .....	70,200	69,200	1,000	1,000	1,000
	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC .....	.....	.....	.....	4,200	4,200
(SP)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC .....	193,970	24,036	2,000	2,000	2,000
	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC .....	.....	.....	.....	330	.....
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC .....	248,100	30,660	40,600	40,600	33,600
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>						
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N .....	40,129	9,482	4,700	4,700	6,000
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND .....	76,600	11,600	24,000	.....	.....
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB) .....	37,122	11,909	5,300	5,300	5,300
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN .....	180,900	15,018	13,044	13,044	13,044

(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY) .....	15,900	4,183	8,000	8,000	8,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND .....	30,890	26,113	2,600	2,600	2,600
OHIO						
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY) .....	3,500	2,603	897	897	897
	LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH .....				1,000	
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH .....	16,913	4,531	3,024	3,024	3,024
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH .....	163,000	99,642	500	500	500
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH .....	97,000	69,834	6,000	10,000	11,000
OKLAHOMA						
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY) .....	9,700	663	2,400	2,400	2,400
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY) .....	39,800	9,135	4,500	4,500	4,500
OREGON						
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	110,800	45,414	6,110	6,110	6,110
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA .....	75,860	32,714	5,000	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR .....	176,900	109,854	500	500	500
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR AND WA .....	27,800	21,504	200	200	200
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR .....	72,900	6,054	8,200	8,200	8,200
PENNSYLVANIA						
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB) .....	32,500	21,552	7,000	7,000	7,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA .....	705,000	128,696	35,000	35,000	55,000
(SP)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT) .....	66,335	17,423	580	580	580
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA .....	10,575	3,320	4,300	4,300	4,300
	SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....				20,000	
	WILLIAMSPORT, PA .....				446	
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEEVE RAISING) .....	108,300	58,634	23,092	23,092	20,092
PUERTO RICO						
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR .....	12,500	3,102	4,102	4,102	5,402
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR .....	430,300	388,179	9,590	9,590	9,590
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR .....	64,900	6,113	3,493	3,493	3,493
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR .....	150,700	2,713	743		
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR .....	8,900	1,088	198		

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR .....	321,000	63,379	11,000	13,800	11,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR .....	26,400	18,408	6,940	6,940	6,940
SOUTH CAROLINA						
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING) .....	98,444	46,249	16,227	16,227	14,227
	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC .....				3,000	
SOUTH DAKOTA						
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD .....	30,450	3,700	1,500	1,500	1,500
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD .....	108,000	2,286	4,000	4,000	4,000
(MP)	PIERRE, SD .....	35,000	6,772	4,000	4,000	6,000
TENNESSEE						
(E)	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN .....				1,000	
	HAMILTON COUNTY, TN .....				1,500	
TEXAS						
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX .....	306,113	18,908	5,500	6,000	5,500
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX .....	27,378	20,425	6,104	6,104	6,104
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX .....	88,660	23,583	1,525	1,525	1,525
(FC)	EL PASO, TX .....	116,300	106,550	5,200	5,200	5,200
(N)	GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX .....	17,900	16,724	1,176	1,176	1,176
(N)	HOUSTON—GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX .....	418,736	134,700	53,492	53,492	48,492
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX .....	42,795	7,822	9,000	9,000	9,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX .....				1,300	
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX .....				900	
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX .....	154,500	152,409	900	900	900
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX .....	220,087	86,486	11,820	11,820	11,820



		UTAH				
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT .....	9,660	2,309	800	800	800
		VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA .....	24,054	7,639	8,492	8,492	8,492
	ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, FRONT ROYAL, VA .....				7,000	
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA AND NC (MAJOR REHAB) .....	62,300	1,201	4,000	4,000	4,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA .....	137,496	23,413	600	600	600
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA .....	29,700	6,016	1,000	1,000	1,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION) .....				5,000	18,500
(SP)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT) .....				1,100	1,100
		WASHINGTON				
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID .....	1,376,330	624,524	91,000	80,000	81,000
(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR .....	232,000	229,774	1,000	1,000	1,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA .....	198,400	115,417	710	710	710
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY) .....	80,918	78,918	2,000	2,000	2,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH .....	101,000	15,062	7,000	7,000	7,000
		WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY) .....	115,800	4,620	6,300	3,300	10,000
(FC)	GREENBRIAR RIVER BASIN, WV .....	47,000	1,930		1,000	1,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V .....	1,853,766	726,712	12,100	32,000	16,200
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB) .....	22,200	2,510	1,800	1,800	1,800
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV .....	313,000	33,802	6,500	6,500	10,200
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV AND OH .....	369,474	358,834	2,700	2,700	2,700
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV .....				3,000	
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY) .....	9,500	4,608	4,293	4,293	4,293
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV AND PA .....				3,000	
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV .....	227,500	225,622	300	300	300
		WISCONSIN				
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI .....				2,000	2,000
		MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206) .....			10,000	14,500	9,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	3,000	3,000	4,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204) .....	.....	.....	4,000	4,000	2,000
	DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	3,000	3,000	7,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	5,000	5,000	5,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14) .....	.....	.....	9,000	6,000	8,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION .....	.....	.....	19,200	19,200	19,200
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205) .....	.....	.....	25,000	30,000	32,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE .....	.....	.....	45	45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE .....	.....	.....	185	185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111) .....	.....	.....	300	300	300
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107) .....	.....	.....	7,000	9,000	9,500
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME .....	.....	.....	14,000	18,000	17,000
	RECREATION MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	27,000	.....	.....
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA .....	.....	.....	20,000	.....	.....
	SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103) .....	.....	.....	2,500	2,500	2,500
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208) .....	.....	.....	200	600	200
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES .....	.....	.....	- 165,253	- 218,967	- 166,253
	<b>TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL .....</b>	.....	.....	<b>1,346,000</b>	<b>1,378,430</b>	<b>1,361,449</b>

42

TYPE OF PROJECT:

- (N) NAVIGATION
- (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL
- (FC) FLOOD CONTROL
- (MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

*Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, AR.*—An appropriation of \$34,000,000 is recommended for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas project. This is an increase of \$14,000,000 over the budget request and, while a significant increase, is still far below the amount needed to fund the project at an optimum level.

*Guadalupe River, CA.*—The Committee recommendation for Construction, General includes \$7,000,000 for the Guadalupe River, CA flood control project. This is an increase of \$3,500,000 over the budget request and will allow the Corps to continue mitigation planning and implementation, and award construction contracts on additional phases of the project.

*Norco Bluffs, CA.*—An amount of \$3,225,000 is recommended for the Norco Bluffs, California project. The Committee is disappointed that the project will not be completed during the current year as expected. The funding recommended should, barring any unforeseen complications, complete the project. The Committee is aware that unforeseen work has caused the project cost to exceed the authorized limit, and, therefore, has included a provision in the bill to raise project cost ceiling in order that the project may be completed during fiscal year 2001 without further delay.

*Sacramento River Bank Protection, CA.*—The Committee has provided an additional \$700,000 for the Sacramento River Bank Protection project in California. The \$4,000,000 recommended will allow the Corps to advance completion of this important flood control project.

*Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, DE.*—An appropriation of \$3,000,000 is provided for the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach shoreline protection project. The Committee understands that carryover fiscal year 2000 funding and the funding recommended herein will allow the Corps to execute a project cost sharing agreement with the non-Federal sponsor and proceed with the first construction contract.

*Central and Southern, Everglades, and Kissimmee River Projects, FL.*—In light of the severe budget constraints, the Committee has had to make many difficult recommendations in developing the funding levels for fiscal year 2001. Confronted with a highly constrained budget environment and program imbalances put forth in the President's budget request, the Committee has recommended reductions to many important water resource projects and programs, including the Everglades, Kissimmee River and the Central and Southern projects. Additional non-Defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if these projects are to proceed at or near the desired schedule.

*Mayo's Lock and Dam, GA.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 for the Corps to provide technical assistance for the reconstruction of the Mayo's Bar Lock and Dam, GA project.

*Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation, IA, NE, KS, and MO.*—Due to constrained budget allocations, the Committee is only able to recommend \$10,000,000 for the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife, IA, NE, KS and MO project. This action is taken without prejudice and does not indicate a diminution of support for the project. The Committee directs that the funding provided be

prioritized to address critical habitat aimed at the recovery of endangered species designated by the Endangered Species Act.

*Chicago Shoreline, IL.*—The Committee has provided \$17,192,000 for the Chicago Shoreline project in Illinois. As stated earlier, due to a highly constrained budget environment and program imbalances put forth in the President's budget request, the Committee has had to make many difficult choices in developing the funding levels for fiscal year 2001. Additional non-Defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if the project is to proceed at or near the desired schedule.

*Olmstead Locks and Dam, Ohio River, IL and KY.*—An appropriation of \$53,142,000 is provided for the Olmstead Lock and Dam, Illinois project. The administration's budget request for fiscal year 2001 significantly under funded the construction needs and the Committee has, therefore, recommended an additional \$15,000,000 in an effort to mitigate delays on this important facility on the Nation's inland waterway system. No funds are included for reimbursement of the Claims and Judgement Fund.

*White River, Indianapolis Central Waterfront, IN.*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the Corps to continue construction on the White River, Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana project. The Committee regrets that budgetary constraints do not allow funding at a more optimum level. Additional non-Defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if the project is to proceed at or near the Corps' schedule.

*Missouri River Levee System, IA, NE, KS and MO.*—The Committee has provided an increase of \$250,000 for the Corps to complete the General Reevaluation Report and to proceed with plans and specifications for the L-142, Jefferson City, MO feature of the Missouri River Levee System, IA, NE, KS, and MO project.

*Kentucky Lock and Dam, KY.*—An appropriation of \$27,700,000 is provided for the Kentucky Lock and Dam project in Kentucky to help mitigate delays as the result of the less than optimum funding level contained in the administration's budget request. As stated on many other projects, additional non-Defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if the project is to proceed at or near the desired schedule.

*Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, LA.*—Funding in the amount of \$16,349,000 is recommended for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock project in Louisiana. The recommended appropriation provides the full budget request of \$3,000,000 for community impact activities. The Committee urges the Corps to continue construction of this project with the least possible disruption to the surrounding community. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers has finally determined a formula for the allocation of construction costs as between inland navigation and general cargo navigation. The Committee supports this allocation of costs and notes that the proposed formula is consistent with Committee direction to the Corps in fiscal year 2000 and the authorized cost sharing on the project.

*J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.*—An appropriation of \$18,040,000 is recommended to continue construction related to the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway project in Louisiana. The Com-

mittee is informed that the proposed location of the Regional Visitors Center in Shreveport and the expected public visitation has resulted in the demand for a level of service greater than originally anticipated. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill which would allow the use of available Construction, General funds in addition to those provided in Public Law 104-206 to complete design and construction of the visitors center at an estimated cost of \$6,000,000.

*Southeast Louisiana, LA.*—The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of \$69,000,000 for continued construction of the Southeast Louisiana flood protection project.

*Assateague Island, MD.*—The Committee has provided \$1,500,000 for the Assateague Island project in Maryland which Congress addressed in the fiscal year 2000 appropriation bill. In approving the project last year, the Congress provided for reimbursement by the National Park Service. The Committee understands, however, that Corps constructed jetties at Ocean City Inlet are disrupting the flow and supply of sediments available to replenish the shoreline at Assateague Island National Seashore. Given this, the Committee has included an additional \$1,500,000 to continue the project and allow the Corps to proceed with initial sand placement.

*Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, MD and VA.*—The Committee is aware that a healthy oyster population is essential to improving water quality and restoring the Chesapeake ecosystem as a whole. Further, the Committee understands that early data indicates that manmade three dimension reefs stocked with oyster spat show great promise in producing oysters that are “disease tolerant”, and that these protected areas are reproducing and building up adjacent oyster beds. In order to increase the number of oyster beds and strengthen the Federal involvement in this program, the Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$4,000,000 to continue this program in fiscal year 2001. The funds provided are to be used to construct reefs and related clean shell substrate for man-made three dimensional oyster reefs in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries in Maryland and Virginia which are preserved as permanent sanctuaries, consistent with the recommendations of the scientific consensus document on the Chesapeake Bay oyster restoration dated June 1999.

*Pearl River, Vicinity of Walkiah Bluff, MS and LA.*—The Committee is aware of emergency repairs to the weir at the Pearl River in the vicinity of Walkiah Bluff in Mississippi and Louisiana. These repairs were the result of design problems and were beyond the scope of the work originally included as a part of the project cooperation agreement. As a result, the non-Federal sponsor should not have been required to share in the cost of the emergency repairs. Therefore, the Corps is directed to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for their share of the construction costs associated with emergency repairs in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000.

*Blue River Channel, Kansas City, MO.*—The Committee has provided \$14,500,000, an increase of \$4,500,000 over the budget request, for the Corps to expedite work on the Blue River Channel, Kansas City, Missouri flood control project.

*Missouri National Recreation River, NE and SD.*—The Committee has provided \$1,800,000 for the Missouri National Recreational River, NE and SD project. This is \$1,500,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 2001 to expedite activities related to the Ponca restoration project.

*Delaware River Channel Deepening, NJ, PA, & DE.*—Due to constrained budget allocations, the Committee is only able to recommend \$26,756,000 for the Delaware River Channel Deepening, NJ project. This action is taken without prejudice and does not indicate a diminution of support for the project.

*Tropicana and Flamingo Washes, NV.*—The Committee has provided \$21,600,000 for the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes project in Nevada to advance completion of this important flood control project. In an effort to reduce alkali silica (ASR) reactivity on concrete, the Corps of Engineers is urged to consider incorporating the use of lithium salts, or other such means, if appropriate, in test sections of the concrete to demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods in ameliorating the effects of ASR. The Committee recommendation includes \$1,600,000 for reimbursement of work performed by project non-Federal sponsor in accordance with Section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

*Devils Lake Emergency Outlet, ND.*—The Committee is aware that the budget for fiscal year 2001 included a request of \$24,000,000 for construction of an outlet at Devils Lake in North Dakota. Because of delays in proceeding with required feasibility, and engineering and design work which is expected to take a minimum of 18 months to complete, construction will not be able to commence in fiscal year 2001 as originally envisioned. Therefore, the Committee has not provided the funding requested for construction. This action is recommended without prejudice in recognition that Corps has authority to use up to \$10,000,000 of previously appropriated funds to initiate construction of an outlet once certain conditions mandated by Congress are met.

*Flints Pond, Hollis, NH.*—The Committee directs the Corps to use \$75,000 of available Construction general funds to initiate and complete a decision document for the removal of silt and aquatic growth from Flints Pond, Hollis, NH.

*West Columbus, OH.*—The Committee has provided an additional \$11,000,000 over the budget request for the West Columbus, Ohio flood control project to allow the Corps to continue construction on a more optimum schedule and to mitigate delays due to the inadequate funding request proposed in the administration's budget for fiscal year 2001.

*Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, PA.*—The Committee has recommended \$55,000,000 to continue construction of the Locks and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River navigation project in Pennsylvania. While providing an increase of \$20,000,000 over the budget request, budget constraints do not allow the Committee to reach the capability level of the Corps which is significantly higher than the amount recommended herein. Additional non-Defense discretionary budgetary resources will be needed in future years if the project is to proceed at or near the desired construction schedule.

*Presque Isle, PA.*—The full budget request of \$580,000 is recommended for the Presque Isle, PA project. The Committee notes that Lake Erie is experiencing the lowest lake levels since the 1960's and, as a result, annual sand nourishment allocations necessary to replenish Presque Isle State Park beaches in Erie County, PA have been reduced substantially. Efficiencies in delivery, reductions in cost, and timely completion are the primary goals in the ongoing beach nourishment program at Presque Isle State Park. The Park's North Pier, which can be used to stockpile sand for use in future years, will play a vital role in meeting these goals. The Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should make available any surplus project funds from fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the improvement and maintenance of the North Pier at Presque Isle State Park as appropriate.

*Wyoming Valley, PA.*—Due to constrained budget allocations, the Committee is only able to recommend \$18,092,000 for the Wyoming Valley, PA project. This action is taken without prejudice and does not indicate a diminution of support for the project.

*Virginia Beach, Hurricane Protection, VA.*—An appropriation of \$18,500,000 is recommended to continue construction activities on the Virginia Beach, Hurricane Protection project in Virginia. Given the current budgetary constraints and the fact that this project is nearly completed, the Committee urges the Secretary of the Army and the administration to seek opportunities to complete the Virginia Beach project in fiscal year 2001 if at all possible. To this end, the Corps is directed to consider allowing the city to use sand that will be available from the deepening of a nearby channel which would be less expensive for all parties, to review industry practices and to schedule the work to maximize potential savings from bidding efficiency, and to reprogram additional funding to the project in fiscal year 2001 if the Corps, based on bids for the work, finds it possible to complete sand placement.

*Columbia River Fish Mitigation, WA and OR.*—The Committee recommends \$79,000,000 to continue the Columbia River Fish Mitigation project and \$2,000,000 to address potential flooding in Lewiston, Idaho, as a result of a weakened section of the Federal levee embankment along the Snake River. This problem is the direct result of the Corps of Engineers drawing the Lower Granite Reservoir down in 1992 for a salmon-related experiments. The Committee therefore directs that necessary repairs to the levee embankment be begun immediately. The recommended level of funding is necessary due to the severe budget constraints. In addition, no part of any appropriation contained herein shall be used to begin Phase II of the John Day drawdown study or to start a study of the drawdown at McNary Dam. The amount recommended includes funding over the budget request for avian control studies.

*Greenbrier River Basin, WV.*—An appropriation of \$1,000,000 is recommended to continue the Greenbrier River Basin project in West Virginia. The additional funding will be used to continue detailed design, complete the detailed project report, and complete NEPA compliance for the Marlinton, WV local protection project.

*Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV-KY-VA.*—The Committee has provided a total of

\$16,200,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project.

The Committee recommendation also includes \$1,500,000 for the Upper Mingo County, West Virginia, element; \$1,600,000 for the Kermit, Lower Mingo County (Kermit), WV, element; \$400,000 for the Wayne County, WV, element; and \$600,000 for the McDowell County, WV, element.

Finally, \$11,500,000 is provided for the Grundy, VA, element.

*Aquatic plant control program.*—The Committee has included \$4,000,000 to continue the aquatic plant control program. In light of severe budget constraints and the fact that this is a nationwide program, the Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark the small amount of funding available for fiscal year 2001. The appropriations are to undertake the highest priority activities. The Committee recognizes that there is a shortage of funding to harvest nuisance aquatic plants, while there are other programs to aid aquatic plant control research. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to place a higher priority on actual plant harvesting and eradication through funding provided in this account. Finally, in an effort to maximize the use of the limited Federal funding, the Committee recommends that harvesting and eradication be undertaken only where a local sponsor agrees to provide at least 50 percent of the cost of the work.

The Committee recommendation includes \$400,000 for aquatic weed control at Lake Champlain in Vermont. The Committee recommendation also included \$250,000, to be matched by an equal amount by the State of South Carolina for aquatic plant control activities in that State.

*Dam Safety and Seepage Stability Correction Program.*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$7,000,000 for the Dam Safety and Seepage Stability Correction Program, an increase of \$4,000,000 over the budget request. While the Committee prefers not to earmark funding for this program thus allowing the Corps of Engineers the flexibility to respond to the greatest need based on the potential risk to life and property, the Corps' attention is directed to the need for repairs to the Mississinewa Lake, IN and Waterbury Dam, VT projects which have been brought to the Committee's attention.

*Emergency streambank and shoreline protection, (sec. 14).*—The Committee has included \$8,000,000 for the section 14, emergency streambank and shoreline erosion protection program.

The Committee recommendation includes \$600,000 for the Lake Michigan Center, Muskegon, MI project; \$40,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis for the Belle Isle South Shore, Detroit, MI project; \$40,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis for the Detroit River Shoreline, MI project which addresses erosion from Riverfront Towers to the Renaissance Center; \$80,000, subject to a request by a non-Federal sponsor, to initiate and complete a planning and design analysis for the Tioga County, PA project; \$780,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Dayton Pike Bridge, North Chickamauga Creek, TN project; \$100,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Pistol Creek, Marysville, TN project, and \$304,000 for the Bogachiel, WA project.



*Small navigation projects (sec. 107).*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$9,500,000 for small navigation projects under the section 107 program. The recommendation includes \$2,500,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Port Hueneme, CA project; and \$205,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Westport River, MA project if determined to be in the Federal interest.

The Committee recommendation also includes \$200,000 for the Lake Shore Park, City of Milwaukee, WI navigation project. In order to expedite construction of this project, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to consider using the feasibility and other study documents and designs developed by the State of Wisconsin.

*Small flood control projects (sec. 205).*—The Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects is \$32,000,000.

The Committee recommendation includes \$500,000 to initiate and complete a detailed project report, and initiate the feasibility phase of the Mare Island, CA project; \$203,000 for the Coyote Creek at Rock Springs, CA project to continue the feasibility phase; \$100,000 to complete the detailed project report for the City of Folsom, Humbug and Willow Creeks, CA project; \$490,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications, and to initiate and complete construction of the St. Joe River at St. Maries, ID; \$100,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Coeur d'Alene River at Cataldo, ID project; \$130,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Weiser River, ID project; \$100,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Spy Run Creek, IN project; \$100,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Montevideo, MN project; \$900,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Breckenridge, MN project; \$450,000 to complete the feasibility phase and initiate plans and specifications for the Ada, MN project; \$100,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Yellowstone River at Glendive, MT project; \$100,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Tongue and Yellowstone Rivers at Miles City, MT project; \$500,000 to initiate construction of the Mill Brook, Highland Park, NJ project; \$200,000 to initiate plans and specifications of the Poplar Brook, Monmouth, NJ project; \$25,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Tawny Run Creek, Springdale, PA project; \$175,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Erwin, TN project; and \$1,500,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Snoqualmie River at Snoqualmie, WA project.

The Committee is aware that an error during dredging of the Cedar River in Washington has led to significant environmental impacts and that the Corps of Engineers has accepted responsibility for the over dredging mistake. Further, the Committee understands that the estimated mitigation costs of \$300,000 raises the cost of the project over Federal limit for Section 205 projects. In order to ensure that the local sponsor is not adversely impacted by the Federal mistake, the Committee has included a provision in the bill to provide for reimbursement for mitigation costs incurred by the City of Renton, WA as a result of the over dredging of the Corps of Engineers.

*Aquatic ecosystem restoration (sec. 206).*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$9,000,000 for section 206 aquatic ecosystem restoration projects for fiscal year 2000.

The recommended funding level includes \$350,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Hayden Diversion, Steamboat Springs, CO project; \$300,000 for the Lake Natoma, Highway 50 Pond, CA project; \$352,000 to initiate plans and specifications and construction of the Comite River at Hooper Road, LA project; \$400,000 plus \$80,000 of carryover funds to complete the feasibility phase and initiate plans and specifications and construction of the Lake St. Clair, Metropolitan Beach, MI project; \$200,000 for environmental restoration studies outside the superfund site, particularly tributaries of the Kalamazoo River within Kalamazoo County, MI; \$65,000 for Carson River Watershed Bank Protection, NV, to initiate and complete the Preliminary Restoration Plan, and to initiate the Environmental Restoration Report; \$65,000 for Steamboat Creek, Washoe County, NV to initiate and complete the Preliminary Restoration Plan, and to initiate the Environmental Restoration Report; Little Sugar Creek, Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, NC, \$315,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction; \$286,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the Springfield Millrace, OR project; \$1,300,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Nine Mile Run, Pittsburgh, PA project; \$100,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Lonsdale Drive-In Restoration, RI project; \$500,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Upper Jordan River restoration project; \$500,000 to complete the environmental restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the West Jordan, UT project; \$100,000 to initiate the environmental restoration report for the Winooski River, VT project; \$150,000 to complete the environmental restoration report and related activities for the Salmon Creek, WA project.

The Committee understands that there are sufficient carryover funds to allow the Corps to continue work on the West Lafayette, LA project.

The Committee funding recommendation supports the Corps continued activities to evaluate the disposition of the John P. Grace Memorial Bridge and the Silas N. Pearman Bridge as part of the section 206 program.

*Projects modifications for improvement of the environment (sec. 1135).*—The Committee recommendation includes \$17,000,000 for section 1135 Project Modification for the Improvement of the Environment Program.

The recommendation includes \$2,000,000 to complete construction of the Pine Flat Turbine Bypass, CA project; \$750,000 for the St. Louis, MO urban habitat restoration project; \$167,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Rahway River Environmental Restoration, NJ project; and \$100,000 to improve the habitat of the Silvery Minnow in the Rio Grande River between San Acacia and Elephant Butte Dam.

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

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$309,416,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	309,000,000
House allowance .....	323,350,000
Committee recommendation .....	324,450,000

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

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
<b>GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b>						
<b>SURVEYS:</b>						
<b>GENERAL STUDIES:</b>						
ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO .....	3,150	619	519	750	750	750
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA .....	3,500	500	275	1,100	1,100	1,100
SPRING BAYOU, LA .....	2,600	96	96	100	100	100
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN ABOVE ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS .....	1,500	.....	.....	350	350	350
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS .....	2,100	.....	.....	100	.....	100
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS .....	2,075	419	416	657	657	657
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR .....	125,000	5,717	1,917	6,500	6,500	6,500
MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO .....	88,400	955	955	2,000	2,000	2,000
REELFOOT LAKE, TN AND KY .....	20,152	432	430	318	368	368
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN .....	11,765	309	309	216	216	216
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA .....	.....	.....	.....	435	435	435
<b>SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS .....</b>	.....	.....	.....	<b>12,526</b>	<b>12,476</b>	<b>12,576</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>						
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN .....	3,697,000	2,566,817	35,991	35,690	35,690	35,690
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR .....	9,100	4,365	469	2,110	2,110	2,110
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR .....	208,000	17,542	2,875	22,800	22,800	17,800
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR .....	8,380	4,711	1,592	2,450	2,450	2,450
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR .....	15,100	2,899	96	750	750	750
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN .....	2,117,000	878,478	28,647	40,621	37,621	42,483
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO .....	389,000	369,028	4,682	3,195	4,195	3,195
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA .....	184,000	80,883	7,163	10,000	10,000	10,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA .....	1,870,000	870,637	21,011	26,000	26,000	26,000
LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA .....	19,500	10,978	8,595	5,500	5,500	5,500
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS .....	74,600	7,940	96	100	100	100
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA .....	99,500	86,653	9,933	5,000	5,000	5,000
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA .....	168,310	127,338	8,529	2,330	2,330	2,330

	(1,125,294)	(429,975)	(16,830)	(11,195)	(26,195)	(11,195)
YAZOO BASIN:						
BACKWATER PUMP, MS .....	190,343	11,804	905	500	500	1,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS .....	110,000	94,622	2,998	3,500	3,500	4,500
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS .....	277,953	238,852	19,101	.....	15,000	8,000
MAIN STEM, MS .....	199,543	34,605	19	25	25	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS .....	32,408	28,560	1,499	300	300	300
TRIBUTARIES, MS .....	250,000	107,545	325	84	84	84
UPPER YAZOO PROJECT, MS .....	343,000	152,839	11,084	6,786	6,786	13,700
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO .....	59,609	14,608	6,360	700	5,000	3,500
NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS .....	17,925	12,842	2,388	2,000	2,000	2,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN .....	147,000	54,050	290	500	500	500
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION .....	.....	.....	.....	170,941	188,241	187,017
MAINTENANCE						
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN .....	.....	.....	.....	58,954	55,954	58,954
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	421	421	421
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	442	442	442
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	407	407	407
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	10	10	10
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN .....	.....	.....	.....	6,160	6,160	10,260
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO .....	.....	.....	.....	6,775	7,775	8,775
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA .....	.....	.....	.....	2,384	2,384	2,384
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR .....	.....	.....	.....	1,070	1,070	1,070
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL .....	.....	.....	.....	45	45	45
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY .....	.....	.....	.....	25	25	25
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	1,499	1,499	1,499
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	9,482	9,482	9,482
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	210	210	210
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	56	56	56
BONNET CARRE, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	1,340	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	389	389	389
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	5,739	5,739	5,739
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	916	916	916
OLD RIVER, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	4,720	4,720	4,720
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA .....	.....	.....	.....	3,048	3,048	3,048
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS .....	.....	.....	.....	626	626	626
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS .....	.....	.....	.....	193	193	193
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS .....	.....	.....	.....	480	480	480

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

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
YAZOO BASIN:				(24,185)	(28,185)	(24,185)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS .....				6,242	7,242	4,265
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS .....				137	137	4,500
ENID LAKE, MS .....				3,376	4,376	4,214
GREENWOOD, MS .....				1,007	1,007	1,007
GRENADA LAKE, MS .....				4,232	5,232	4,232
MAIN STEM, MS .....				1,254	1,254	1,254
SARDIS LAKE, MS .....				5,180	6,180	5,180
TRIBUTARIES, MS .....				1,162	1,162	1,162
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS .....				358	358	358
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS .....				431	431	431
YAZOO CITY, MS .....				806	806	806
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO .....				202	202	202
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO .....				7,000	7,000	7,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN .....				113	113	113
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN .....				1,085	1,085	1,085
MAPPING .....				1,129	1,129	1,129
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE .....				322,572	341,822	348,022
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE .....				— 13,572	— 18,472	— 23,572
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES .....				309,000	323,350	324,450

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

The Committee believes that it is essential to provide adequate resources and funding to the Mississippi River and Tributaries program in order to protect the large investment in flood control facilities. Although much progress has been made, considerable work remains to be done for the protection and economic development of the rich national resources in the Valley. The Committee expects the additional funds to be used to advance ongoing studies, initiate new studies, and advance important construction and maintenance work. In conjunction with efforts to optimize use of the additional funding provided, the Committee expects adjustments in lower priority activities and non-critical work in order to maximize the public benefit within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program.

*Lower Red River, South Bank Levees, LA.*—The Committee is aware that the Lower Red River, South Bank Levee and the Bayou Rapides drainage structure and pumping plant, have served to contain flows and reduce interior flooding from high river stages on the Red River. The current age and badly deteriorated condition of the structure threatens the integrity of the Lower Red River, South Bank Levee and failure of the structure could inundate approximately 60 percent of the City of Alexandria, LA. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to expeditiously initiate construction of the replacement structure and further directs the Corps to budget for subsequent funding, through completion of the replacement structure, through the maintenance category of the MR&T appropriations.

*Greenville Inner Harbor, MS.*—The Committee is aware that Section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 provided for the Federal maintenance dredging of the Greenville Inner Harbor Channel in Mississippi following the determination that such maintenance is economically justified, environmentally acceptable, and that the channel was constructed in accordance with applicable permits and appropriate engineering design standards. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army is directed to complete a feasibility study in accordance with the provisions of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 utilizing available funding under the Mississippi River and Tributaries appropriations.

*Reelfoot Lake, TN and KY.*—The Committee is aware of the concerns of Kentucky interests regarding potential flooding impacts. The Committee understands that local interests believe that operation of the proposed new spillway would increase the severity of flooding of adjacent lake lands over that which occurs with the existing spillway and operation. The Committee, therefore, has included a total of \$368,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of which \$50,000 is for the Corps to perform an analysis to determine and identify any potential flooding impacts with the new spillway and its operation.

*Mississippi River Channel Improvement.*—The Committee is aware of the critical importance of navigation and commerce to the Nation, and that the lower Mississippi River is vital to our Nation, serving as the primary commerce link between our Nation's heartland and foreign and domestic markets. The Committee understands that a 12-foot channel is authorized and currently exists for much of the time below Cairo, Illinois. The Committee urges the Corps to use available funds within the Mississippi River and Trib-

utaries appropriation, to evaluate the current availability of a 12-foot navigation channel and the feasibility of ensuring a dependable 12-foot navigation channel on the lower Mississippi River below Cairo, Illinois.

*Mississippi River Levees.*—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding to advance completion of construction of high priority, critical levee and other flood control facilities within the Mississippi River and Tributaries program.

*Yazoo basin, Big Sunflower River, MR&T.*—The Committee has provided \$1,000,000 for the Corps to expedite construction of various features of the Big Sunflower River, MS, project.

*Yazoo basin, demonstration erosion control, MR&T.*—An appropriation of \$8,000,000 is recommended for the demonstration erosion control project, to continue a joint effort by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo basin of the Mississippi. The funds provided will permit the Corps to undertake construction of additional flood water retarding structures, pipe and culvert grade control structures, channel improvements, and bank stabilization items in various watersheds. Design of future work, acquisition of real estate and monitoring of results will be accomplished for all watersheds in order to facilitate work in fiscal year 2001 and for all future work as required for completion of the total program.

*St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, MO.*—The Committee has included \$3,500,000 for construction activities on the St. Johns and New Madrid Floodway in Missouri, including additional funding to initiate construction of the New Madrid pumping station.

*Yazoo Basin, Big Sunflower River, MS.*—An appropriation of \$4,500,000 is recommended for the Big Sunflower River maintenance portion of the Yazoo Basin feature. The Committee understands the need to restore channel capacity in order to alleviate flooding caused by deterioration of the channel as originally constructed. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional \$2,000,000 for the Corps to continue the maintenance on the Big Sunflower river project.

*Yazoo basin maintenance.*—The Committee has been informed of inadequate maintenance of road surfaces and slides on Mississippi levees in the Yazoo basin. Additional levee maintenance funding has been provided for the Corps to address this and other problems.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$1,853,618,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	1,854,000,000
House allowance .....	1,854,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,862,471,000

The Committee recommendation for Operation and Maintenance activities of the Corps of Engineers totals \$1,862,471,000 for fiscal year 2001.

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



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA			
ALABAMA—COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL .....	1,100	1,100	1,100
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL .....	5,355	5,355	5,355
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL .....	1,999	1,999	1,999
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL .....	19,204	20,204	20,704
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL .....	60	60	60
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL .....	66	66	66
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL .....	4,734	4,734	4,734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL .....	50	50	50
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA .....	4,999	4,999	4,999
MOBILE HARBOR, AL .....	18,665	18,665	22,665
MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL .....		150	
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL .....	350	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL .....	4,962	4,962	4,962
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL .....	120	120	120
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS .....	23,547	24,547	24,547
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA .....	7,373	7,373	7,373
ALASKA			
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK .....	1,777	1,777	1,777
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK .....	1,364	1,364	1,364
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK .....	423	423	423
HOMER HARBOR, AK .....	191	191	191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK .....	35	35	35
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK .....	186	186	186
NOME HARBOR, AK .....	386	386	386
PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK .....	394	394	394
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK .....	512	512	512
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK .....	2,438	2,438	3,838
ARIZONA			
ALAMO LAKE, AZ .....	1,166	1,166	1,166
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ .....	69	69	69
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ .....	1,186	1,186	1,186
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ .....	74	74	74
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ .....	168	168	168
ARKANSAS			
BEAVER LAKE, AR .....	4,520	4,520	4,520
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR .....	5,758	5,758	5,758
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR .....	1,200	1,200	1,200
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR .....	4,565	4,565	4,565
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR .....	5,937	5,937	5,937
DEGRAY LAKE, AR .....	4,218	4,218	4,218
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR .....	1,058	1,058	1,058
DIERKS LAKE, AR .....	988	988	988
GILLHAM LAKE, AR .....	929	929	929
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR .....	5,933	5,933	5,933
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR .....	304	304	304
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR .....	294	294	294
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR .....	19,988	19,988	19,988

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR .....	1,602	1,602	1,602
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR .....	3,604	3,604	3,604
NIMROD LAKE, AR .....	1,416	1,416	1,416
NORFORK LAKE, AR .....	3,626	3,626	3,626
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR .....	419	419	419
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA .....	6,402	6,402	6,402
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR .....	4,072	4,072	4,072
WHITE RIVER, AR .....	2,258	2,258	2,258
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR .....	125	125	125
CALIFORNIA			
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA .....	1,854	1,854	1,854
BODEGA BAY, CA .....		200	
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA .....	1,580	1,580	1,580
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA .....	3,000	3,000	3,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA .....	3,403	3,403	3,403
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA .....		500	
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA ..	4,437	4,437	4,687
FARMINGTON DAM, CA .....	313	313	313
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA .....	1,616	1,616	1,616
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA .....	4,710	4,710	4,710
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA .....	843	843	843
ISABELLA LAKE, CA .....	793	793	793
JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL (SAN LEANDRO MARINA), CA .....		1,500	
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA .....	170	170	170
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA .....	3,910	3,910	3,910
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA .....	3,956	3,956	3,956
MARINA DEL REY, CA .....	5,335	5,335	5,335
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA .....	288	288	288
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA .....	251	251	251
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA .....	170	170	1,170
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA .....		700	
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA .....	1,778	1,778	1,778
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA .....	1,135	1,135	1,135
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA .....	40	40	40
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA .....	8,118	8,118	8,118
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA .....	1,535	2,035	1,535
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA .....	2,248	2,248	2,248
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA .....	1,256	1,256	1,256
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA .....		400	
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA .....	5,774	5,774	5,774
SACRAMENTO RIVER + 30 FOOT PROJECT, CA .....	2,037	2,037	2,037
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CON- TROL), CA .....	1,113	1,113	1,113
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA .....	163	163	163
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA ....	2,382	2,382	2,382
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRAT- EGY, CA .....		200	
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA .....	2,000	2,000	2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA .....	2,573	2,573	2,573
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA .....	2,028	2,028	2,028
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA .....	3,086	3,086	3,086

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA .....	1,615	1,615	1,615
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA .....	1,153	1,153	1,153
SUCCESS LAKE, CA .....	1,898	1,898	1,898
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA .....	3,117	3,117	3,117
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA .....	1,659	1,659	1,659
VENTURA HARBOR, CA .....	2,240	3,440	2,240
YUBA RIVER, CA .....	74	74	74
COLORADO			
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO .....	425	425	425
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO .....	1,568	1,568	1,568
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO .....	707	707	707
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO .....	67	67	67
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO .....	1,543	1,543	1,543
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO .....	209	209	209
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO .....	619	619	619
CONNECTICUT			
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT .....	309	309	309
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT .....	399	399	399
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT .....	269	269	269
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT .....	819	819	819
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT .....	335	335	335
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT .....	344	344	344
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT .....	311	311	311
THOMASTON DAM, CT .....	581	581	581
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT .....	506	506	506
DELAWARE			
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESA- PEAKE BAY, D .....	19,707	14,757	14,707
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELA- WARE BAY, D .....	433	433	433
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE .....	3,217	3,217	3,217
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC .....	910	910	910
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC .....	235	235	235
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC .....	38	38	38
FLORIDA			
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & .....	1,660	1,660	1,660
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL .....	7,625	7,625	7,625
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL .....	10,558	10,558	10,558
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL .....	1,000	1,000	1,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL .....	2,705	2,705	2,705
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL .....	1,051	1,051	1,051
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL .....	100	100	100
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R, .....	147	147	147
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL .....	4,035	4,035	4,035
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL .....	7,755	7,755	7,755

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA .....	5,855	5,855	5,855
MANATEE HARBOR, FL .....	3,080	3,080	3,080
MIAMI HARBOR, FL .....	1,323	1,323	1,323
MIAMI RIVER, FL .....		4,000	
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL .....	5,811	5,811	5,811
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL .....	4,577	4,577	4,577
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL .....	50	50	50
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL .....		2,000	
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL .....	46	46	46
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL .....		500	
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL .....	600	600	600
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL .....	3,340	3,340	5,340
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL .....	50	50	50
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL .....	3,280	6,580	3,280
TAMPA HARBOR, FL .....	6,308	6,308	6,308
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL .....	35	35	35
GEORGIA			
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA .....	4,520	4,520	5,520
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL & .....	5,055	6,055	5,055
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA .....	2,460	2,460	2,460
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA .....	5,271	5,271	5,271
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA .....	7,275	7,275	7,275
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA .....	7,489	7,489	7,489
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC .....	11,875	11,875	11,875
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA .....	100	100	100
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	10,585	10,585	10,585
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC .....	6,190	6,190	6,190
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA .....	13,869	14,369	13,869
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA .....	650	650	650
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL .....	3,977	4,977	3,977
HAWAII			
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI .....	153	153	153
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI .....	165	165	165
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI .....	1,296	1,296	1,296
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI .....	706	706	706
IDAHO			
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID .....	2,291	2,291	2,291
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID .....	2,689	2,689	2,689
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID .....	73	73	73
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID .....	1,206	1,206	1,206
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID .....	332	332	332
ILLINOIS			
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN .....	4,758	4,758	4,758
CARLYLE LAKE, IL .....	5,112	5,112	5,112
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL .....	2,762	2,762	2,762
CHICAGO RIVER, IL .....	362	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL .....	195	195	195
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL .....	562	562	562
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL AND IN .....	22,808	23,808	22,808

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL AND IN .....	1,598	1,598	1,598
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL .....	473	473	473
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL .....	2,081	2,081	2,081
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL .....	837	837	837
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL .....	5,209	5,209	5,209
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION) .....	39,842	43,842	39,842
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION) .....	14,499	14,499	16,999
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL .....	43	43	43
REND LAKE, IL .....	3,904	3,904	3,904
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL ...	97	97	97
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL .....	1,473	1,473	1,473
INDIANA			
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN .....	782	782	782
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN .....	1,937	1,937	1,937
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN .....	732	732	732
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN .....	864	864	864
INDIANA HARBOR, IN .....	429	429	429
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN .....	101	101	101
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN .....	824	824	824
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN .....	806	1,206	806
MISSISSINAWA LAKE, IN .....	1,182	1,182	1,182
MONROE LAKE, IN .....	799	799	799
PATOKA LAKE, IN .....	731	731	731
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN .....	42	42	42
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN .....	749	749	749
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN ...	62	62	62
IOWA			
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA .....	2,952	2,952	2,952
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA .....	738	738	738
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLEERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA .....	146	146	146
MISSOURI RIVER—RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO .....	5,250	5,250	5,950
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA AND NE .....	2,111	2,111	2,111
RATHBUN LAKE, IA .....	2,058	2,058	2,058
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA .....	3,827	5,071	4,827
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA .....	4,074	4,074	4,074
KANSAS			
CLINTON LAKE, KS .....	1,621	1,621	1,621
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS .....	1,197	1,197	1,197
EL DORADO LAKE, KS .....	487	487	487
ELK CITY LAKE, KS .....	728	728	728
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS .....	1,429	1,429	1,429
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS .....	908	908	908
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS .....	36	36	36
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS .....	1,186	1,531	1,186
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS .....	1,541	1,541	1,541
MARION LAKE, KS .....	1,354	1,354	1,354
MELVERN LAKE, KS .....	1,872	1,872	1,872

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MILFORD LAKE, KS .....	1,906	1,906	1,906
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS .....	1,074	1,074	1,074
PERRY LAKE, KS .....	1,966	1,966	1,966
POMONA LAKE, KS .....	1,830	1,830	1,830
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS .....	193	193	193
TORONTO LAKE, KS .....	673	673	673
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS .....	2,546	2,546	2,546
WILSON LAKE, KS .....	2,017	2,017	2,017
KENTUCKY			
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN .....	10,330	10,330	10,330
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY .....	2,544	2,544	2,544
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY .....	1,497	1,497	1,497
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY .....	1,685	1,685	1,685
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY .....	1,542	1,542	1,542
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY .....	868	868	868
DEWEY LAKE, KY .....	1,429	1,429	1,429
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY .....	361	361	361
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY .....	1,890	1,890	1,890
GRAYSON LAKE, KY .....	1,366	1,366	1,366
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY .....	1,079	1,079	1,079
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY .....	2,917	2,917	2,917
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY .....	123	123	123
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY .....	1,149	1,149	1,149
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5—14, KY .....	.....	750	.....
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY .....	1,357	1,357	1,357
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY .....	21	21	21
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY .....	714	714	714
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY .....	100	100	100
NOLIN LAKE, KY .....	2,285	2,285	2,285
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN AND OH .....	31,813	31,813	31,813
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN AND OH ..	6,007	6,007	6,007
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,016	1,016	1,016
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY .....	1,827	1,827	1,827
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,048	1,048	1,048
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY .....	5,892	5,892	5,892
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY .....	1,211	1,211	1,211
LOUISIANA			
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L .....	14,026	14,026	14,026
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA .....	570	570	570
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA .....	509	509	509
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA .....	726	726	726
BAYOU PIERRE, LA .....	25	25	25
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA .....	735	735	735
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA .....	48	48	48
BAYOU TECHE, LA .....	132	132	132
CADDO LAKE, LA .....	127	127	127
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA .....	12,117	12,117	12,117
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA .....	5,354	5,354	5,354
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA .....	19,478	19,478	21,478
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA .....	3,175	3,175	3,175

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA .....	268	268	268
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA .....	8,907	10,907	11,907
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA .....	559	559	559
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA .....	108	108	108
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA .....	1,933	1,933	1,933
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA .....	2,773	2,773	2,773
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO, .....	63,359	63,359	63,359
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA .....	11,286	11,286	11,286
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA .....	80	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA .....	2,000	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA .....	233	233	233
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA .....	45	45	45
MAINE			
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME .....	1,060	1,060	1,060
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME .....	17	17	17
UNION RIVER, ME .....	.....	900	.....
WELLS HARBOR, ME .....	1,455	1,455	2,205
MARYLAND			
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD .....	455	455	455
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), .....	710	710	710
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS + 50 FOOT), MD ..	16,354	16,354	16,354
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV .....	141	141	141
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD .....	55	55	55
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD .....	327	327	327
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV .....	1,616	1,616	1,616
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD .....	1,810	1,810	1,810
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD .....	450	450	450
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD .....	70	70	70
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD .....	140	140	140
ST JEROME CREEK, MD .....	175	175	175
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD .....	5,801	6,801	5,801
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD .....	75	75	75
UPPER THOROFARE, MD .....	220	220	220
WICOMICO RIVER, MD .....	740	740	740
MASSACHUSETTS			
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA .....	368	368	368
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA .....	439	439	439
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA .....	361	361	361
CAPE COD CANAL, MA .....	8,787	8,787	8,787
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA ..	213	213	213
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA .....	147	147	147
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA .....	267	267	267
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA .....	462	462	462
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA .....	125	125	125
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA .....	390	390	390
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA .....	461	461	461

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA .....	310	310	310
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, .....	480	480	480
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA .....	500	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA .....	3,113	3,113	3,113
SALEM HARBOR, MA .....	200	200	200
TULLY LAKE, MA .....	436	436	436
WEST HILL DAM, MA .....	647	647	647
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA .....	342	342	342
MICHIGAN			
ALPENA HARBOR, MI .....	203	203	203
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI .....	85	85	85
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI .....	306	306	306
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI .....	.....	1,000	.....
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI .....	458	458	458
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI .....	118	118	118
DETROIT RIVER, MI .....	2,342	2,342	2,342
DULUTH ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY .....	.....	.....	320
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI .....	130	130	130
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI .....	1,264	1,264	1,264
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI .....	905	905	905
INLAND ROUTE, MI .....	33	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI .....	205	205	305
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI .....	256	256	256
LELAND HARBOR, MI .....	168	168	168
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI .....	663	663	663
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI .....	272	272	272
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI .....	239	239	239
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI .....	174	174	174
MONROE HARBOR, MI .....	695	695	695
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI .....	.....	150	.....
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI .....	603	603	603
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI .....	450	450	450
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI .....	1,974	1,974	1,974
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI .....	275	275	275
ROUGE RIVER, MI .....	417	417	417
SAGINAW RIVER, MI .....	1,453	1,453	1,453
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI .....	10	10	10
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI .....	481	481	481
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI .....	996	996	996
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI .....	1,194	1,194	1,194
ST MARYS RIVER, MI .....	20,502	20,502	23,502
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI ..	3,197	3,197	3,197
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI .....	290	290	290
MINNESOTA			
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD .....	178	178	178
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI .....	5,310	5,310	5,310
DULUTH ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY STUDY, MN .....	.....	320	.....
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN .....	186	186	186
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN .....	154	154	154
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN .....	453	453	453
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN .....	196	196	196



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION) .....	42,765	42,765	42,765
ORWELL LAKE, MN .....	315	315	315
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN .....	25	25	25
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN .....	101	101	101
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN .....	2,805	2,805	2,805
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN .....	64	64	64
TWO HARBORS, MN .....	208	208	208
MISSISSIPPI			
BILOXI HARBOR, MS .....	801	801	801
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS .....	122	122	122
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS .....	150	150	150
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS .....	2,500	2,500	2,500
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS .....	360	360	360
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS .....	133	133	133
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS .....	955	955	955
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS .....	3,406	5,406	5,406
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA .....	250	250	250
ROSDALE HARBOR, MS .....	645	645	645
YAZOO RIVER, MS .....	115	115	115
MISSOURI			
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO .....	184	184	295
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO ...	5,196	5,196	5,196
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO .....	2,015	2,015	2,015
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO .....	7,688	7,688	7,688
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO .....	473	473	473
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO .....	854	854	854
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO .....	931	931	931
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO .....	13,384	13,384	13,384
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO .....	259	354	354
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO .....	2,065	2,065	2,065
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO .....	26	26	26
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO .....	1,160	1,160	1,160
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO ....	401	401	401
STOCKTON LAKE, MO .....	3,486	3,486	3,486
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO .....	6,485	6,485	6,485
UNION LAKE, MO .....	10	10	10
MONTANA			
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT .....	3,620	3,620	3,620
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT .....	2,273	2,273	2,273
NEBRASKA			
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD .....	6,151	6,151	6,241
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE .....	2,198	2,198	2,198
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO, .....	709	709	709

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK) .....	125	125	125
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO) .....	125	125	125
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE .....	721	721	721
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE .....	796	796	796
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE .....	327	327	327
NEVADA			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV .....	34	34	34
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA .....	522	522	522
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV .....	193	193	193
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
BLACKWATER DAM, NH .....	389	389	389
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH .....	412	412	412
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH .....	478	478	478
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH .....	984	984	984
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH .....	554	554	554
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH AND ME .....			250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH .....	469	469	469
NEW JERSEY			
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ .....	1,400	1,400	1,400
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ .....	580	580	580
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ .....	19	19	19
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE .....	16,355	16,355	17,855
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ ...	3,180	3,180	3,180
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ .....	2,005	2,005	2,005
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ ...	120	120	120
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ .....	425	425	425
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ .....	140	140	140
RARITAN RIVER, NJ .....	120	120	120
SALEM RIVER, NJ .....	278	278	278
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ .....	175	175	175
NEW MEXICO			
ABIQUIU DAM, NM .....	1,315	1,315	1,315
COCHITI LAKE, NM .....	1,766	1,766	3,266
CONCHAS LAKE, NM .....	1,037	1,037	1,537
GALISTEO DAM, NM .....	305	305	305
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM .....	50	50	50
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM .....	445	445	445
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM .....	846	846	1,026
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM .....	73	73	73
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM .....	313	313	313
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM ...			1,250
NEW YORK			
ALMOND LAKE, NY .....	468	468	468
ARKPORT DAM, NY .....	257	257	257
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY ..	2,966	2,966	2,966
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY .....	176	176	176

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY .....	310	310	310
EAST RIVER, NY .....	750	750	750
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY .....	2,250	2,250	2,250
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY .....	473	473	473
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY .....	340	340	340
FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY .....	1,000	1,000	1,000
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY .....	490	490	490
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY .....	1,540	1,540	1,540
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY .....	1,265	1,265	1,265
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT) .....	2,485	2,485	2,485
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C) .....	1,340	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY .....	460	460	460
JAMAICA BAY, NY .....	1,410	1,410	1,410
JONES INLET, NY .....	200	200	200
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY .....	2,190	2,190	2,190
MORICHES INLET, NY .....	980	980	980
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY .....	1,958	1,958	1,958
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY .....	6,720	6,720	6,720
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ .....	5,030	5,030	5,030
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), .....	740	740	740
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY .....	12,319	12,319	12,319
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY .....	353	353	353
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY .....	200	200	200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY .....	3,038	3,038	3,038
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY .....	725	725	725
SAG HARBOR, NY .....	1,600	1,600	1,600
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY .....	2,000	2,000	2,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY ..	739	739	739
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY .....	15	15	15
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY ..	564	564	564
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY .....	517	517	517
NORTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC .....	5,831	5,831	5,831
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC .....	1,500	1,500	1,500
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC .....	350	350	350
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC .....	627	627	627
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC .....	897	897	897
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC .....	1,430	1,430	1,430
FALLS LAKE, NC .....	1,276	1,276	1,276
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC .....	22	22	22
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC .....	455	455	455
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC .....	4,995	4,995	4,995
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC ....	45	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC .....	4,737	4,737	4,737
NEW RIVER INLET, NC .....	825	825	825
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC ...	610	610	610
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC .....	139	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC .....	64	64	64
ROANOKE RIVER, NC .....	100	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC .....	1,742	1,742	1,742
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC .....	8,405	8,405	8,405

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
NORTH DAKOTA			
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND .....	241	241	241
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND .....	8,513	8,563	8,563
HOMME LAKE, ND .....	153	153	153
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDILL DAM, ND .....	1,230	1,230	1,230
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND .....	401	401	401
SOURIS RIVER, ND .....	292	292	292
OHIO			
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH .....	790	790	790
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH .....	750	750	750
BERLIN LAKE, OH .....	3,270	3,270	3,270
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,309	1,309	1,309
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH .....	1,175	1,175	1,175
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH .....	3,915	3,915	5,915
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH .....	735	735	735
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH .....	745	745	745
DELAWARE LAKE, OH .....	777	777	777
DILLON LAKE, OH .....	709	709	709
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH .....	1,785	1,785	1,785
HURON HARBOR, OH .....	790	790	790
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH .....	240	240	240
LORAIN HARBOR, OH .....	2,152	2,152	2,152
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH .....	25	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH .....	1,033	1,033	1,033
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH .....	1,329	1,329	1,329
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH .....	7,993	7,993	7,993
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH .....	544	544	544
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH .....	661	661	661
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH .....	85	85	85
ROCKY RIVER HARBOR, OH .....			590
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH .....	30	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH .....	870	870	870
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH .....	174	174	174
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH .....	4,550	4,550	4,550
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH .....	350	350	350
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH .....	565	565	565
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH .....	821	821	821
OKLAHOMA			
ARCADIA LAKE, OK .....	417	417	417
BIRCH LAKE, OK .....	480	480	480
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK .....	1,471	1,471	1,971
CANDY LAKE, OK .....	18	18	18
CANTON LAKE, OK .....	2,656	2,656	2,656
COPAN LAKE, OK .....	823	823	823
EUFAULA LAKE, OK .....	7,240	7,240	7,240
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK .....	5,954	5,954	5,954
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK .....	838	838	838
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK .....	209	209	209
HEYBURN LAKE, OK .....	557	557	557
HUGO LAKE, OK .....	1,639	1,639	1,639
HULAH LAKE, OK .....	447	447	447

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK .....	72	72	72
KAW LAKE, OK .....	1,756	1,756	1,756
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK .....	6,435	6,435	6,435
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK .....	4,588	4,588	4,588
OLOGAH LAKE, OK .....	2,353	2,353	2,353
OPTIMA LAKE, OK .....	63	63	63
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK .....	32	32	32
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK .....	1,160	1,160	1,160
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK .....	4,001	4,001	4,001
SARDIS LAKE, OK .....	944	944	944
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK .....	386	386	386
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK .....	947	947	947
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK .....	3,178	3,178	3,178
WAURIKA LAKE, OK .....	1,441	1,441	1,441
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK .....	3,297	3,297	3,297
WISTER LAKE, OK .....	729	1,229	1,429
OREGON			
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR .....	748	748	748
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR .....	332	332	332
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	6,250	6,250	6,250
CHETCO RIVER, OR .....	435	435	435
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA .....	16,274	16,274	18,874
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA .....	7,403	7,403	7,403
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O .....	357	357	357
COOS BAY, OR .....	4,144	4,144	4,144
COQUILLE RIVER, OR .....	316	316	316
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR .....	919	919	919
COUGAR LAKE, OR .....	705	705	705
DEPOE BAY, OR .....	3	3	363
DETROIT LAKE, OR .....	672	672	672
DORENA LAKE, OR .....	580	580	580
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR .....	619	619	619
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR .....	1,277	1,277	1,277
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR .....	1,050	1,050	1,050
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR .....	408	408	408
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR .....	220	220	220
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	4,507	4,507	4,507
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR .....	1,990	1,990	1,990
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR .....	2,919	2,919	2,919
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA .....	4,989	4,989	4,989
PORT ORFORD, OR .....	702	702	702
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR .....	200	200	200
ROGUE RIVER, OR .....	641	641	641
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR .....	67	67	67
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR .....	822	822	822
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR .....	176	176	176
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR .....	134	134	134

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR .....	148	148	148
UMPQUA RIVER, OR .....	1,421	1,421	1,421
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR .....	1,234	1,234	1,234
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR .....	285	285	285
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR .....	646	646	646
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR .....	7,895	7,895	7,895
PENNSYLVANIA			
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA .....	6,905	6,905	6,905
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA .....	608	608	608
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA .....	216	216	216
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA .....	832	832	832
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA .....	2,121	2,121	2,121
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA .....	1,259	1,259	1,259
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA .....	1,785	2,035	1,785
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA .....	1,491	1,491	1,491
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA .....	659	659	659
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA .....	903	903	903
ERIE HARBOR, PA .....	125	125	125
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA .....	713	713	713
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA .....	663	663	663
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA .....	321	321	321
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA .....	95	95	95
JOHNSTOWN, PA .....	13	13	13
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA .....	1,472	1,472	1,472
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA .....	1,778	1,778	1,778
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA .....	1,392	1,392	1,392
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA .....	14,293	14,293	14,293
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH AND WV .....	22,407	22,407	22,407
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH AND WV .....	218	218	218
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA .....	88	88	88
PROMPTON LAKE, PA .....	437	437	437
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA .....	13	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA .....	3,533	4,783	3,533
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA .....	740	740	740
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA .....	2,644	2,644	2,644
STILLWATER LAKE, PA .....	334	334	334
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA ..	70	70	70
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA .....	2,382	3,352	2,382
TIONESTA LAKE, PA .....	1,788	1,788	1,788
UNION CITY LAKE, PA .....	258	258	258
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA .....	817	817	817
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA .....	517	517	517
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD .....	2,011	2,011	2,011
RHODE ISLAND			
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI .....	584	584	584
SOUTH CAROLINA			
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC .....	3,629	3,629	5,629
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC .....	7,145	7,145	7,145
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC .....	3,235	3,235	3,235
FOLLY RIVER, SC .....	266	266	266
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC .....	5,234	5,234	5,234

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC .....	26	26	26
MURRELLS INLET, SC .....			1,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC .....	21	21	21
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC .....	60	60	60
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC .....	477	477	477
TOWN CREEK, SC .....	398	398	398
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD .....	6,422	6,422	6,502
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD .....	496	496	496
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD .....	172	172	172
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD .....	8,852	8,852	8,942
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN .....	580	580	580
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT .....	586	586	586
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND .....	11,192	11,192	11,282
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD .....	306	306	306
TENNESSEE			
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN .....	6,070	6,070	6,070
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN .....	5,307	5,307	5,307
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN .....	1,900	1,900	1,900
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN .....	4,916	4,916	4,916
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN .....	4,191	4,191	4,191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN .....	5	5	5
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN .....	3,278	3,278	3,278
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN .....	6,326	6,326	6,326
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN .....	14,484	14,484	14,484
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN .....	348	348	348
TEXAS			
AQUILLA LAKE, TX .....	738	738	738
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL— AREA VI .....	1,340	1,340	1,340
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX .....	314		
BARDWELL LAKE, TX .....	1,453	1,453	1,453
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	1,810	1,810	1,810
BELTON LAKE, TX .....	3,103	3,103	3,103
BENBROOK LAKE, TX .....	1,975	1,975	1,975
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX .....	4,802	4,802	4,802
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX .....	2,029	2,029	2,029
CANYON LAKE, TX .....	2,689	2,689	2,689
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX .....	2,627	2,627	2,627
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	5,036	5,036	5,036
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX .....	5,517	5,517	5,517
DOUBLE BAYOU, TX .....	805	805	805
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX .....	10	10	10
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX .....	2,801	2,801	2,801
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX .....	4,802	4,802	4,802
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX .....	87	87	87
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX .....	752	752	752
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	1,573	1,573	1,573
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX .....	2,433	2,433	2,433
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX .....	21,765	21,765	21,765

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX .....	1,203	1,203	1,203
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	8,137	8,137	8,137
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX .....	393	393	393
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX .....	1,144	1,144	1,144
JOE POOL LAKE, TX .....	759	759	759
LAKE KEMP, TX .....	201	201	201
LAVON LAKE, TX .....	2,439	2,439	2,439
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX .....	2,959	2,959	2,959
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	4,315	4,315	4,315
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX .....	2,953	2,953	2,953
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX .....	1,524	1,524	1,524
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX .....	1,785	1,785	1,785
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	1,005	1,005	1,005
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX .....	941	941	941
PROCTOR LAKE, TX .....	1,709	1,709	1,709
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX .....	75	75	75
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX .....	1,002	1,002	1,002
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX .....	10,013	10,013	10,013
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX .....	4,191	4,191	4,191
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX .....	249	249	249
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX .....	2,773	2,773	2,773
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX .....	1,744	1,744	1,744
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX .....	371	371	371
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX .....	2,007	2,007	2,007
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX .....	29	29	29
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT .....			1,500
WACO LAKE, TX .....	2,301	2,301	2,301
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX .....	1,208	1,208	1,208
WHITNEY LAKE, TX .....	4,680	4,680	4,680
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX .....	2,643	2,643	2,643
UTAH			
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT .....	55	55	55
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT .....	305	305	305
VERMONT			
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT .....	607	607	607
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT .....			1,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY .....	46	46	46
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT .....	561	561	561
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT .....	583	583	583
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT .....	629	629	629
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT .....	464	464	464
VIRGINIA			
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA .....	593	593	593
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—ACC, VA .....	1,750	1,750	1,750
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY—DSC, VA .....	1,325	1,325	1,325
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA .....	120	120	120
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA .....	877	877	877
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA .....	1,465	1,465	1,465
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM .....	995	995	995



## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA .....	77	77	77
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA .....	4,294	4,294	4,294
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC .....	8,041	8,041	8,041
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA .....	1,525	1,525	1,525
LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA .....	605	605	605
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DE- POSITS), V .....	225	225	225
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA .....	6,105	6,105	6,105
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA .....	406	406	406
OCCOQUAN RIVER, VA .....	.....	1,000	.....
PAGAN RIVER, VA .....	145	145	145
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA .....	3,060	3,060	3,060
POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA .....	410	410	410
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA .....	617	617	617
RUDEE INLET, VA .....	646	646	646
STARLINGS CREEK, VA .....	551	551	551
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA .....	204	204	204
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA .....	1,185	1,185	1,185
WASHINGTON			
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA .....	2,113	2,113	2,113
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR .....	3	3	3
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA .....	6	6	6
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA .....	1,212	1,212	1,212
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA .....	9,820	10,470	11,920
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA .....	1,849	1,849	1,849
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	6,094	6,094	6,094
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA .....	146	146	146
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA .....	6,797	6,797	6,797
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	1,537	1,537	1,537
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	4,291	4,291	4,291
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA .....	2,821	2,821	2,821
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA .....	925	925	925
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA .....	312	312	312
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA .....	2,440	2,440	2,440
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA .....	316	316	316
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA .....	967	967	967
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA .....	37	1,007	1,037
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA .....	415	415	415
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEP- ENING, WA .....	100	100	450
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA .....	714	714	714
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA .....	205	205	205
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA .....	56	56	56
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA .....	78	78	78
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR .....	3,432	3,432	3,432
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA .....	.....	650	.....
WEST VIRGINIA			
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV .....	1,137	1,137	1,137
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV .....	1,689	3,200	1,689
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV .....	1,723	1,723	1,723

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV .....	1,714	1,714	1,714
ELKINS, WV .....	16	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV .....	91	91	91
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV .....	7,782	7,782	7,782
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY AND OH .....	15,934	15,934	15,934
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY AND OH .....	2,786	2,786	2,786
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV .....	1,934	1,934	1,934
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV .....	1,216	1,216	1,216
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV .....	1,526	1,526	1,526
SUTTON LAKE, WV .....	1,903	1,903	1,903
TYGART LAKE, WV .....	3,568	3,568	3,568
WISCONSIN			
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI .....	170	170	170
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI .....	735	735	735
FOX RIVER, WI .....	3,252	3,252	3,252
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI .....	1,640	1,640	1,640
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI .....	925	925	925
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI .....	490	490	490
LA FARGE LAKE, WI .....	53	53	53
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI .....	738	738	738
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI .....	819	819	819
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI .....	290	290	290
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI .....	1,534	1,534	1,534
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI ..	28	28	28
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI .....	537	537	537
WYOMING			
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY .....	1,163	1,163	1,163
MISCELLANEOUS			
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM .....	3,000	2,500	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION) .....	3,000	1,500	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE .....	13,500	9,000	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM .....	1,166	500	1,016
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER) .....	8,000	6,500	7,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM .....	2,100	1,500	1,500
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES .....	600	500	500
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS .....	.....	500	.....
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION .....	975	575	575
MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M .....	1,100	500	500
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS .....	2,000	1,000	1,700
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM .....	40	40	40
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM .....	25	20	25
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP) .....	6,000	5,000	3,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM .....	1,650	415	415

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3 .....	50	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,950	1,000	1,950
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM .....	1,500	1,500	.....
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION .....	675	500	675
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS .....	500	500	500
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM .....	1,500	700	700
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS .....	4,600	4,000	4,000
WETLANDS FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY ....	1,000	.....	.....
ZEBRA MUSSEL CONTROL .....	700	700	700
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE ..	-16,867	-37,941	-33,867
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	1,854,000	1,854,000	1,862,471

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

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

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. As more and more projects enter the inventory and budgetary constraints continue, it is clear that the Corps will need to find innovative ways to accomplish required maintenance work while reducing operational and other costs. Adjustment in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be made in conjunction with efforts to optimize the use of the limited resources in order to maximize the public benefit.

*Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, AL.*—An additional \$1,500,000 is recommended for the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers in Alabama for engineering and design for replacement gates at Bankhead Lock, and to repair spillway gates at Coffeeville Lock and Dam.

*Mobile Harbor, AL.*—The Committee has provided \$22,665,000 for maintenance activities at Mobile Harbor in Alabama, including

an additional \$4,000,000 to dredge the Arlington Channel to a depth that is sufficient to support the navigation needs of the U.S. Coast Guard. The Committee is aware the a new Coast Guard buoy tender is scheduled to arrive at the Coast Guard facility in fiscal year 2002 and the current channel depth cannot accommodate the new vessel. Therefore, it is critical that the Arlington Channel be deepened prior to the arrival of the new buoy tender.

*Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel, CA.*—The additional amount above the budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Dry Creek (Warm Springs) Lake and Channel is provided for the Corps to perform operations and maintenance of dam and facilities miscellaneous repairs to facilities.

*Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE.*—The amount recommended by the Committee for the Intracoastal Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, DE project does not include funding proposed in the budget for demolishing the St. George bridge contingent upon the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress resolving policy issues related to the continued use of the bridge.

*Canaveral Harbor, FL.*—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has not proceeded to implement section 310 of Public Law 106–53, and that the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works recently signed the project cooperation agreement for the Brevard County, Florida storm damage reduction project which is located just south of Canaveral Harbor. Given that erosion of the Brevard County beach may be in part the result of the navigation project, the Committee directs the Corps to utilize funds appropriated herein to determine if mitigation is warranted and to mitigate such damage consistent with the intent of section 310. The Committee believes that use of operation and maintenance funds is consistent with section 201(e) of Public Law 104–303. It is not intended that the mitigation assessment delay construction of the Brevard County project.

*Allatoona Lake, GA.*—The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$1,000,000 for the Allatoona Lake, Georgia project for the Corps to undertake additional high priority maintenance and repair work, including camping facilities.

*Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock, IA.*—An appropriation of \$4,827,000 is provided for the Red Rock Dam and Lake Red Rock project in Iowa for the Corps to repair scouring of the South-East Des Moines levee.

*Rock Island, Arsenal, IL.*—The Committee is aware that the Army's Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, and the Army Corps of Engineers have enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship with the Corps providing installation support to the Arsenal and the Arsenal providing engineering and manufacturing support to the Corps and believes this relationship should continue.

*Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Bouef, and Black, LA.*—The Committee is concerned about the safety and navigation problems on the Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Bouef, and Black, LA navigation project caused by "fluff" on the channel bottom. The Corps is directed to take immediate action necessary to resume safe, unimpeded navigation at the true authorized 20 foot depth. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to work with the Water-

ways Experiment Station to determine the cause of this phenomenon and to develop and implement long term solutions to this problem.

*Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, LA.*—The Committee has provided an additional appropriation of \$2,000,000 over the budget request for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Louisiana for the Corps to fabricate one set of spare miter gates at Leland Bowman Lock.

*J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, LA.*—The Committee understands that the lack of certified stoplogs for lock and dam closures continues to be a key element causing deferral of routine maintenance and creates the potential for inability to make closure in the event of an urgent or emergency situation. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional \$3,000,000 above the budget request for the Corps to expedite repairs to lock and dam stoplogs, and to undertake other critical maintenance work.

*Belfast Harbor and Narraguagus River, ME.*—The Corps is to use \$50,000 and \$30,000 of available Operation and Maintenance funding, respectively, to complete an environmental assessment and initiate plans and specification for preparation for maintenance dredging of Belfast Harbor and Narraguagus River, ME projects.

*Clinton Spillway, MI.*—The Committee has included an additional \$100,000 under Inspection of Completed Projects, MI for the Corps to conduct an evaluation to determine whether the Clinton River Spillway in Michigan has a design deficiency requiring remediation.

*St. Marys River, Vidal Shoals, MI.*—An additional amount of \$3,000,000 is recommended for the St. Marys project in Michigan for the Corps to initiate and complete dredging of the Upper St. Mary's (Vidal Shoals) reach for continued safe navigation.

*Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, MN, IL (MVS Portion).*—The Committee has included an additional \$2,500,000 for the Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, MVS portion, project for the Corps to complete emergency lift gate repairs necessary to avoid high water lock closure.

*Missouri River-Rulo to Mouth, MO.*—An increase of \$700,000 is provided in order to upgrade projects identified in the Northwestern Division Comprehensive Plan necessary to accommodate the needs of the public during the Lewis and Clark Expedition Bicentennial celebration activities.

*Caruthersville Harbor, MO.*—The Committee recommendation for the Caruthersville Harbor in Missouri includes an additional \$111,000 to perform necessary maintenance dredging at the Harbor. The Committee understands that the work is needed to improve conditions restricting industrial activities in the area.

*Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake, NE and SD.*—The Committee has provided an additional \$90,000 above the budget request for the Gavins Point Dam, Lewis and Clark Lake project for additional work at the project in support of activities related to the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration.

*Delaware River, Philadelphia to the Sea, NJ, PA, and DE.*—The Committee has provided an additional \$1,500,000 for the Corps to continue construction of facilities to control erosion of the shoreline in the vicinity of Pea Patch Island located in the Delaware River east of Delaware City, DE.

*Cochiti Lake, NM.*—The recommendation includes an additional \$1,500,000 for the Corps to address impacts of recent fires and to perform other essential maintenance work at Cochiti Lake in New Mexico.

*Upper Rio Grande water operation model, NM.*—The Committee has provide \$1,250,000 for the Upper Rio Grande Water Operations Model for the Corps to complete testing, continued model refinement and data base development, and continue the water operations review and EIS, including stakeholder coordination and involvement, and data collection.

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

*New York Harbor, NY.*—The Committee is concerned about a serious safety issue that exists at the entrance to the authorized 45-foot Ambrose Channel. Submerged obstructions and debris near the entrance to the channel were previously marked by the Ambrose Light Tower. The light tower marked the entrance to the navigation channel and, incidentally, marked the submerged obstructions and debris. The Ambrose Light Tower was seriously damaged by an incoming container ship and was subsequently dismantled in 1999. The Coast Guard has located a new light tower in anticipation of future deepening of the channel. The obstructions are now marked by a buoy that may not be considered an effective permanent solution for heavy weather conditions. The Committee directs the Corps to prepare the necessary documentation and to initiate removal of the submerged obstructions and debris in the interest of improving safe access to the navigation channel and to ensure the authorized depths are maintained.

*Rocky River Harbor, OH.*—The Committee has included \$590,000 for the Rocky River Harbor project in Ohio for the Corps to undertake and complete construction to repair to the deteriorated East Breakwater.

*Broken Bow Lake, OK.*—The Committee recommends an additional appropriation of \$500,000 over the budget request for the Corps to initiate a reallocation study and conduct other activities which will address the need for allocation of water to support the Mountain Fork trout fishery located downstream of Broken Bow Dam in Oklahoma.

*Wister Lake, OK.*—The Committee has provided an additional \$700,000 above the budget request for the Corps to conduct a reallocation study and prepare documentation necessary to address the permanent seasonal pool increases at Wister Lake in Oklahoma.

*Columbia and Lower Willamette River Below Vancouver, OR and WA.*—The Committee recommendation includes an additional \$2,600,000 to continue repairs to the Astoria East Boat Basin.

Within the \$18,874,000 recommended, the Committee has included \$500,000 to remove and reinstall the docks and causeway in-kind.

*Depoe Bay, OR.*—The Committee has provided \$360,000 for the Corps to undertake work to halt the movement of a retaining wall at Depoe Bay in Oregon.

*Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC.*—An additional appropriation of \$2,000,000 over the budget request is recommended for the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway project in South Carolina. The additional funding will enable the Corps of Engineers to undertake bank stabilization in the area on the AIWW from Little River to Bucksport.

*Port Royal, SC.*—The Corps is directed to use \$50,000 of available Operation and Maintenance, General funding to collect data and develop a site management plan for ocean dredge material disposal in accordance with the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 of the Port Royal, SC navigation project.

*Murrells Inlet, SC.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to dredge the entrance channel at Murrells Inlet, SC.

*Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration Activities, SD.*—The Committee has included additional funding to support activities related to the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Commemoration at several sites in South Dakota as follows: Big Bend Dam, Lake Sharpe, \$80,000; Fort Randell Dam, Lake Francis Case, \$90,000; and Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, \$90,000.

*Texas Water Allocation Assessment, TX.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for the Texas Water Allocation Assessment. The assessment will enable the Corps to assist the water regions in determining if existing water can be better allocated to support more balanced water use in light of future needs. The Committee understands that Texas regional water planning groups are working together to explore water supply opportunities in Texas to meet these future needs. The Committee supports the Corps' involvement in addressing the broad range of issues related to water supply throughout the State and has recommended this funding to allow the Corps to participate in this effort. Lake Whitney and Lake Sam Rayburn are excluded from this reallocation assessment.

*Burlington Harbor Breakwater, VT.*—The Committee has provided \$1,000,000 for the Corps to complete repairs to the breakwater end segments, and to initiate underwater investigation and engineering and design work associated with the repair of an additional 500-foot section of the south breakwater, which preliminary investigations indicated are in need of repair. If confirmed by underwater investigations, funding is provided for construction of necessary repairs to the mid-section of the breakwater.

*Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA.*—The Committee recommendation included an additional \$2,100,000 for continued rehabilitation work on the North Jetty of the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, WA navigation project.

*Quillayute River Navigation Project, WA.*—In addition to the work proposed in the budget request, the Committee has recommended an increase of \$1,000,000 to provide for necessary minimum maintenance to keep the entrance channel open and the harbor accessible.

In addition, the attention of the Corps of Engineers is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance or review and for which the Committee has received requests: maintenance dredging

at Helena Harbor and Osceola Harbor, AR and maintenance and dredging at Union River, ME.

*Funding Adjustments.*—Severe budget constraints have made it necessary for the Committee to recommended additional reductions to program funding levels proposed in the budget request. The Committee regrets having to take this actions in order to bring the bill in compliance with the allocations required by congressional budget caps, and to correct programmatic imbalances proposed in the President’s fiscal year 2001 request.

It is the Committee’s understanding that the Civil Works program of the Corps of Engineers is now funding the costs related to national emergency preparedness activities undertaken by the entire Corps of Engineers, both for civil works and military construction. Severe budget constraints have required the Committee to recommend a reduction in the Corps’ National Emergency Preparedness Programs. The Committee directs that the funding for activities which primarily benefit the military side of the Corps not be funded from the Civil Works program.

The Committee has reduced the amount requested for ready reserve status to \$8,000,000, which is consistent with the current year and the net cost to keep the dredge *Wheeler* in ready reserve. If during the year, the need for the dredge *Wheeler* does not materialize so that the amount appropriated for ready reserve is insufficient to pay all ready reserve costs, the Corps is directed to reduce hopper dredging work proportionately based on capacity in order to keep the dredge *Wheeler* in ready reserve.

The Committee notes that the report required by Section 237 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1996 addressing whether the Federal hopper dredge *Wheeler* should be returned to active status or continued in ready reserve, and if another Federal hopper dredge should be placed in ready reserve status has only recently been transmitted to the Congress. The Committee believes that, given the policy implications, the future status of dredge *Wheeler* or the recommendation of placing another dredge in ready reserve should be carefully reviewed and authorized by the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress before being implemented.

#### FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The Committee has been informed that severe erosion is endangering the structural integrity of the seawall at Bethel, AK and that the seawall may collapse threatening public facilities including the village’s fuel supply. The Committee directs the Corps to utilize its emergency authorities to make immediate repairs to protect the Federal investment in the area, including the seawall and other public facilities. The Corps should report back to the Committee as soon as possible on its recommendations for a long-term solution to the erosion problem.

#### REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$117,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	125,000,000
House allowance .....	125,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	120,000,000



An appropriation of \$120,000,000 is recommended for regulatory programs of the Corps of Engineers.

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

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$650,000 of appropriations recommended for the regulatory program to continue the cumulative impact study of the Yellowstone River in the vicinity of Park County and Livingston, Montana. The Corps is directed to undertake this task in cooperation with the Governor's Yellowstone Task Force.

The Committee recommendation concurs with language contained in the House passed bill which seeks to improve the analysis and increase the information available to the public and Congress regarding the costs of the regulatory program nationwide permit program and permit processing times. The language directs the Corps of Engineers to: (1) revise a cost analysis of modified nationwide permits based on promulgated rules rather than proposed rules; (2) prepare a plan to manage and reduce backlog associated with new and replacement permits issued on March 9, 2000, and develop criteria to measure progress in reducing the backlog; (3) provide quarterly reporting on program performance based on the above criteria; (4) provide quarterly reporting, on a 1 year pilot basis, of all Regulatory Analysis and Management System data for the South Pacific and North Atlantic Divisions; (5) publish in Division Office website decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process and allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the appeals conference; and (6) record in its data base the dates of initial permit application or notification.

#### FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$150,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	140,000,000
House allowance .....	140,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	140,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$140,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 2001. This is the same as the amount requested.

The responsibility for the cleanup of contaminated sites under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] was transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 105-62. The Committee is pleased that the Department of Energy and the Corps of Engineers have finally entered into an agreement on the functions of the program assumed by the Corps. This should help eliminate any uncertainties as the program moves forward.

The FUSRAP Program is not specifically defined by statute. The program was established in 1974 under the broad authority of the Atomic Energy Act and, until fiscal year 1998, funds for the cleanup of contaminated defense sites had been appropriated to the De-

partment of Energy through existing appropriation accounts. 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 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 always intended for the Corps expertise be used in the same manner for the cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP. The Committee expects the Corps to continue programming and budgeting for FUSRAP defense production sites cleanup program as part of the Corps of Engineers—Civil program.

The Committee recommendation includes up to \$5,000,000 for the Corps to determine the appropriate response action under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act to address FUSRAP-related contamination at the Parks Township Shallow Land Disposal Area, Parks Township, Armstrong County, PA; and to initiate remediation activities as appropriate. The Committee understands that the Department of Energy has determined that the site contains waste resulting from activities which supported the Nation's early atomic energy program.

#### GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$149,500,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	152,000,000
House allowance .....	149,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	152,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$152,000,000.

The Committee recommendation is based on a concern about the ability of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to provide adequate and effective executive direction and management of its civil works program given the requested level of General Expenses funding. The Corps has reorganized, reducing the number of division offices and assigning increased responsibilities to district offices. It has reduced its headquarters staffing and has made great strides in refining the headquarters mission to eliminate overlaps and redundant review layers. These changes have been beneficial, resulting in a more efficient and cost effective Corps.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Language included under Section 101 restates language contained in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60, and earlier Energy and Water Appropriations Acts which requires that no fully allocated funding policy shall be applied to projects for which funds are identified in the Committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2001 Act in certain accounts.

Language included under Section 102 restates language contained in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60 which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually.

Language included under Section 103 restates language contained in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60, and earlier Energy and Water Appropriations Acts which prohibits the use of funds to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual when a Federal official knows that such revisions provides for increase in springtime water releases during spring heavy rainfall or snow melt.

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$39,233,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	39,940,000
House allowance .....	39,940,000
Committee recommendation .....	39,940,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 2001 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act totals \$39,940,000. An appropriation of \$19,566,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction; \$14,158,000 for fish, wildlife, and recreation, mitigation and conservation; and \$5,000,000 for the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account. Finally, the Committee recommendation provides \$1,216,000 for program administration and oversight.

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, recreation, mitigation, and conservation; establishes an account in the Treasury for the deposit of these funds and of other contributions for mitigation and conservation activities; and establishes a Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to administer funds in that account. The Act further assigns responsibilities for carrying out the Act to the Secretary of the Interior and prohibits delegation of those responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation.

### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

#### WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$605,992,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	643,058,000
House allowance .....	635,777,000
Committee recommendation .....	655,192,000

An appropriation of \$655,192,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
<b>ARIZONA</b>								
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT .....				6,762		6,762		6,762
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT .....	4,363,086	3,491,993	33,667		39,467		38,667	
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I .....	451,578	410,172	1,068	10,315	1,068	10,315	1,068	10,315
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM .....	145,018	98,406	3,722	380	3,722	380	3,722	380
HOPI/WESTERN NAVAJO WATER DEVELOPMENT PLAN .....	2,000						1,000	
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			300		300		300	
SOUTH CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			690		890		690	
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT .....	64,983	20,435	5,189		5,189		5,189	
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION .....	6,190	4,639	550		550		550	
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY .....	1,000	600	300		300		300	
YUMA AREA PROJECTS .....			1,738	17,450	1,738	17,450	1,738	17,450
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>								
CACHUMA PROJECT .....	38,197	36,681	666	401	666	401	666	401
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			1,293		1,793		793	
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJ .....	20,000	1,500	500		500		824	
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:								
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT .....	2,824,760	536,086	4,740	10,708	10,240	10,708	4,740	10,708
DELTA DIVISION .....	352,157	220,117	14,636	4,706	14,636	4,706	14,636	4,706
EAST SIDE DIVISION .....			585	3,595	585	3,595	585	3,595
FRIANT DIVISION .....	477	198	4,170	2,531	4,170	2,531	4,170	2,531
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS .....	721,442	372,716	11,824	1,009	11,824	1,009	11,824	1,009
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, EXTRAORDINARY MAINT .....				8,013		8,013		8,013
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION .....	526,208	403,573	6,171	1,612	8,691	1,612	7,691	1,612
SAN FELIPE DIVISION .....	361,717	310,473	897		897		897	
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION .....	287,301	83,037	2,608		2,608		2,608	
SHASTA DIVISION .....	300,078	292,555	3,474	7,356	3,474	7,356	3,474	7,356
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION .....	357,451	326,856	7,116	4,791	7,116	4,791	7,116	4,791

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS .....			897	6,490	897	6,490	897	6,490
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT .....	1,553,060	579,294	6,385	5,447	7,385	5,447	6,385	5,447
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION .....			1,800		1,800		1,800	
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT .....	13,970	1,500	2,000		2,000		2,000	
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJ .....	69,970	69,230	740		740		740	
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO .....					503			
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJ .....	20,000	1,500	2,000		5,000		2,000	
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJ .....	20,000	1,500	2,000		2,000		2,000	
ORLAND PROJECT .....				617		617		617
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT .....	10,000	3,700	1,000		5,000		1,000	
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM .....	172,590	50,300	7,500		7,500		7,500	
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT .....	38,090	24,942	2,000		2,000		2,000	
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROG .....	109,959	19,076	3,500		3,500		3,500	
SOLANO PROJECT .....			1,084	1,088	1,084	1,088	1,084	1,088
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			624		624		624	
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM .....	37,182	27,600		5,500		5,500		5,500
COLORADO								
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 AND 8 .....		69,856	2,000		2,000		2,000	
COLLBRAN PROJECT .....			132	967	132	967	132	967
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT .....			355	7,381	355	7,381	355	7,381
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			188		188		188	
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT .....			102	16	102	16	102	16
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT .....			285	4,653	285	4,653	285	4,653
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP .....			412	507	412	507	412	507
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT .....			469	1,291	469	1,291	469	1,291
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			69		69		69	
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II .....				332		332		332
MANCOS PROJECT .....			42		42		42	
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II .....				2,058		2,058		2,058

PINE RIVER PROJECT .....	90	58	90	58	90	58	90	58
PUEBLO DAM, FRVINGPAIN-ARKANSAS PROJECT .....	410	2,812	410	2,812	410	2,812	410	2,812
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS DIV .....	287	23	287	23	287	23	287	23
UNCOMPAGHRE PROJECT .....								
IDAHO								
BOISE AREA PROJECTS .....	1,746	5,683	1,746	5,683	1,746	5,683	1,746	5,683
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT .....	91,834	47,675	4,622	7,122	7,122		7,122	
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT .....	825	225	250	1,500	1,500		1,500	
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	248		248		248		248	
MINDOKA AREA PROJECTS .....	3,466	1,841	3,766	1,841	3,466	1,841	3,466	1,841
MINDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT .....	1,791	71	288		288		288	
KANSAS								
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	400		400		400		400	
WICHITA PROJECT .....		226		226		226		226
MONTANA								
CANYON FERRY RESERVOIR .....	325	75			325		325	
FORT PECK RURAL COUNTY WATER SYSTEM .....	5,800	4,800			1,500		1,500	
FORT PECK DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTEM .....	1,595	1,160			435		435	
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT .....				283		283		283
MILK RIVER PROJECT .....			325	512	325	512	325	512
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			251		251		251	
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT .....			16,000		16,000		16,000	
NEBRASKA								
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT .....			35	53	35	53		53
NORTH LOOP DIVISION, MIRDMAN CANAL .....	2,000							1,750
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			17		17		17	
NEVADA								
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM .....			800		800		1,500	
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT .....			6,864	1,577	6,864	1,577	6,864	1,577
NEWLANDS PROJECT WATER RIGHTS FUND .....	7,000	1,500					2,700	
WALKER RIVER BASIN PROJECT .....							300	
NEW MEXICO								
CARLSBAD PROJECT .....			2,345	607	2,345	607	2,345	857
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY .....			250		250		250	

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT .....			2,604	8,480	2,604	8,480	6,362	8,480
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT .....							450	
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT .....				176		176		176
RIO GRANDE PROJECT .....			947	2,287	947	2,287	947	2,287
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			183		183		183	
SO. NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS .....			238		238		238	
TUCUMARI PROJECT .....			18	5	18	5	18	5
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			164		164		164	
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT .....	29,464	25,584	3,880		3,880		3,880	
NORTH DAKOTA								
DAKOTA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			387		387		387	
DAKOTA TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			187		187		187	
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP .....	1,526,449	646,298	17,416	3,875	17,416	3,875	21,416	3,875
OKLAHOMA								
ARBUCKLE PROJECT .....				168		168		168
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT .....				535		535		535
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT .....				232		232		232
NORMAN PROJECT .....				163		163		163
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			234		234		234	
W.C AUSTIN PROJECT .....				262		262		262
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT .....				638		638		638
OREGON								
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT .....			384	307	384	307	384	307
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT .....	1,990	990	500		500		1,000	
DESCHUTES PROJECT .....			294	137	294	137	294	137
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS .....			205	249	205	249	205	249
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY .....	1,767	1,117	50		50		50	



KLAMATH PROJECT .....	10,837	348	10,837	348	10,837	348	10,837	348
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	601	.....	601	.....	601	.....	601	.....
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION .....	260	623	260	623	260	623	260	623
TUALATIN PROJECT .....	197	123	197	123	197	123	197	123
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY .....	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY .....	790	640	100	.....	100	.....	100	.....
UMATILLA PROJECT .....	571	1,723	571	1,723	571	1,723	571	1,723
SOUTH DAKOTA								
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT .....	137,000	40	10,960	40	6,000	40	6,000	40
MINI WICONI PROJECT .....	375,970	6,165	27,570	6,165	23,570	6,165	23,570	6,165
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT .....	.....	30	.....	30	.....	30	.....	30
TEXAS								
BALMORHEA PROJECT .....	.....	31	31	.....	31	.....	31	.....
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT .....	.....	131	.....	131	.....	131	.....	131
NUECES RIVER PROJECT .....	.....	393	.....	393	.....	393	.....	393
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT .....	.....	546	.....	546	.....	546	.....	546
SAN ANGELO PROJECT .....	.....	262	.....	262	.....	262	.....	262
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	.....	346	596	.....	346	.....	346	.....
UTAH								
HYRUM PROJECT .....	.....	11	62	11	62	11	62	11
MOON LAKE PROJECT .....	.....	5	15	5	15	5	15	5
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY .....	875	.....	250	.....	250	.....	250	.....
NEWTON PROJECT .....	.....	14	39	14	39	14	39	14
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	.....	29	76	29	76	29	76	29
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT .....	.....	340	401	340	401	340	401	340
PROVO RIVER PROJECT .....	.....	24	91	24	91	24	91	24
SCOFFIELD PROJECT .....	.....	235	235	.....	235	.....	235	.....
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	.....	7	88	7	88	7	88	7
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT .....	19,639	141	1,267	141	1,267	141	1,267	141
WEBER BASIN PROJECT .....	.....	32	296	32	296	32	296	32
WEBER RIVER PROJECT .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WASHINGTON								
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT .....	.....	7,524	3,600	7,524	3,600	7,524	3,600	7,524
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....	.....	264	264	.....	264	.....	264	.....
YAKIMA PROJECT .....	.....	7,483	523	7,483	523	7,483	523	7,483
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT .....	178,920	22,388	11,056	11,056	11,056	11,056	11,056	11,056

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
<b>WYOMING</b>								
KENDRICK PROJECT .....			4	5,597	4	5,597	4	5,597
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT .....			19	1,295	19	1,295	19	1,295
SHOSHONE PROJECT .....			42	905	42	905	42	905
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM .....			70		70		70	
<b>VARIOUS</b>								
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II .....	75,000	35,886	11,085		11,085		11,085	
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5 .....			3,813	1,455	3,813	1,455	3,813	1,455
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, RFW .....	90,440	56,153	7,135		7,135		7,135	
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT .....	61,000	40,435	150		75		150	
<b>DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:</b>								
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM .....				1,700		1,700		1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION .....				51,600		51,600		51,600
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS .....				17,500		17,500		17,500
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES .....				1,000		1,000		1,000
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM .....			3,000		2,000		2,500	
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM .....			500		1,900		5,000	
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM .....			3,169		3,000		3,169	
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROG .....				309		309		309
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENT. PROG .....	162,153	71,320	12,179		12,179		12,179	
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION .....			1,824		1,000		874	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION .....			2,155		1,500		1,755	
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES .....			30	4,740	30	3,892	30	4,240
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM .....				1,400		1,000		1,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES .....			1,842		1,700		1,842	
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM .....			6,484		5,232		5,884	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM .....			13,729		13,729		7,981	
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS .....				506		506		506

NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION .....	1,300	1,300	.....	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM .....	8,500	7,680	.....	8,200	.....	8,200	.....
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING .....	1,254	884	.....	1,254	.....	1,254	.....
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	169	96	.....	169	538	169	865
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM—OTHER PROJ .....	3,232	3,232	.....	3,232	27,417	3,232	25,667
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES .....	1,023	1,023	.....	1,023	473	1,023	473
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM .....	464	436	.....	464	.....	464	.....
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION .....	4,914	4,696	.....	4,914	.....	4,914	.....
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT—TITLE XXVIII .....	3,743	3,743	.....	3,743	.....	3,743	.....
RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMIN .....	2,766	1,891	.....	2,766	.....	2,766	.....
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:							
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM .....	21,727	13,802	.....	1,225	.....	1,225	.....
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	99,967	64,783	.....	3,249	.....	3,249	.....
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM .....	21,300	.....	.....	300	.....	1,300	.....
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTEHANCE .....	4,044	584	.....	660	.....	660	.....
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM .....	8,199	3,091	.....	283	.....	283	.....
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM .....	19,996	6,313	.....	933	.....	933	.....
SITE SECURITY .....	.....	.....	.....	1,043	.....	.....	1,043
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION .....	.....	.....	.....	263	.....	263	.....
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES .....	.....	.....	.....	1,840	.....	1,000	.....
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	.....	1,460	.....	1,960	.....
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES- TECH SUPPORT .....	.....	.....	.....	50	.....	50	.....
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	.....	7,605	.....	7,100	.....
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT .....	.....	.....	.....	3,750	.....	3,250	.....
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS .....	.....	.....	.....	-31,120	.....	-49,686	.....
FY 2000 RESCISSION—P.L. 106-113 .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
NATIONAL BUSINESS CENTER .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES .....	353,822	289,236	.....	346,655	289,122	364,856	290,336

## BUDGET LIMITATIONS AND REDUCTIONS

Severely constrained spending limits imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution have made it most difficult for the Committee to formulate a balanced Energy and Water Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. In order to adhere to the subcommittee's allocations, address the critical ongoing activities, correct program imbalances contained in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget, and respond to the numerous requests of the Members, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend numerous reductions and adjustments to funding levels proposed in the budget. Finally, the Committee regrets that many worthwhile projects could not be recommended for funding because of the lack of authorization and the shortfall in resources.

The Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. However, in an effort to support and honor congressional authorizing committees' jurisdiction, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

*Central Arizona project, Arizona.*—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$38,667,000 for the central Arizona project. This is \$5,000,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 2001. The Committee recommendation includes \$27,600,000 for the Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project and \$1,900,000 for the San Carlos Project. The Committee urges the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with rehabilitation of the facilities of the Federal San Carlos Project pursuant to the San Carlos Project Act of 1924, as amended. The Committee believes the Bureau of Reclamation should consider using the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District to perform this work, if appropriate, and urges the Bureau of Reclamation to work cooperatively with the District in this regard.

*Hopi/Western Navajo Water Development Study, AZ.*—The Committee has included \$1,000,000 for the Bureau to initiate a comprehensive study of the water development requirements to serve the municipal and industrial needs on the Hopi and Western Navajo Indian Reservations.

Almost all domestic municipal and industrial water in the area is supplied from groundwater, primarily from the "N" aquifer which is a finite resource. Concerns about the adequacy and impacts of continued reliance on groundwater have led to a number of studies of alternative water supply projects, including pipelines from Lake Powell, new well fields, and development of surface supplies near the southwest corner of the Navajo Reservation. These studies have been conducted by the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, the Department of the Interior, and others involved in ongoing negotiations to settle the various Indian water rights claims in the Little Colorado watershed. However, a comprehensive water development plan is needed to identify the most cost-effective projects to meet the objectives of providing good quality, reliable municipal and industrial water to the major communities on the Hopi Reservation, and the western Navajo Reservation, and to minimize impacts to environmental resources, including but not limited to, springs flowing from the "N" aquifer.

*Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, CA.*—The Committee recommendation for the Sacramento River Division includes \$9,303,000, an increase of \$1,520,000 over the budget request. The recommendation includes an additional \$1,000,000 fish passage improvements at Red Bluff Dam; and \$520,000 for the captive broodstock program.

*Salton Sea Study, CA.*—The Committee is aware of ongoing efforts by the Bureau of Reclamation to complete a feasibility study identifying potential options to stabilize and reclaim the Salton Sea. The authorizing legislation for this study (Public Law 105–372) expressly prohibits consideration of any option that relies on the importation of new or additional water from the Colorado River. The Committee is concerned that, in preparing its Draft EIS, the Bureau has expended funds to evaluate the potential use of flood flows from the Colorado River for the Salton Sea despite the clear prohibition expressed in the authorizing legislation, and the potential impacts to other lower Colorado River basin States. The Committee intends to carefully monitor this matter, and expects the Bureau to abide by the prohibitions expressed in Public Law 105–372.

*Columbia and Snake River Salmon Recovery Project, ID, OR, and WA.*—The Committee has provided an increase of \$2,500,000 over the budget request for acquisition of water to increase streamflows through flow augmentation to aid in salmon and steelhead recovery. The Committee directs that any water acquired from these or any other funds provided herein will be acquired in compliance with existing State water law and only from willing sellers.

*Canyon Ferry Reservoir, MT.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$325,000 to deepen Broadwater Bay once environmental compliance work has been completed.

*Fort Peck Rural Water System, MT.*—The Committee has recommended \$1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete construction of the Fort Peck County Rural Water System, MT project.

*Fort Peck, Dry Prairie Rural Water System, MT.*—An amount of \$435,000 is included for the Bureau to continue planning on the Fort Peck, Dry Prairie rural water system in Montana.

*Mirdan Canal, North Loup Division, NE.*—The Committee understands that in May 1999 the Mirdan delivery canal of the North Loup project in Nebraska experienced major subsidence problems, and that in order to provide continued service the Twin Loup Reclamation District has undertaken temporary repairs. Further, the Bureau of Reclamation has completed a Technical Memorandum Report on the subsidence, and based on that report has recommended that approximately 3,300 feet of the canal be replaced. The estimated cost of the repair work is \$2,000,000, and the Committee understands that the Bureau has \$250,000 available in fiscal year 2000 to allow completion of technical studies and contract specifications. The Committee has provided \$1,750,000 for fiscal year 2001 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the canal repairs.

*Garrison Diversion Project, ND.*—The Committee has included \$25,291,000, an increase of \$4,000,000, for the Garrison Diversion, ND project. The additional funds will allow the Bureau of Reclama-

tion to continue development of municipal, rural, and the industrial Indian water systems. The recommendation includes an additional \$2,000,000 each for State and Indian municipal, rural and industrial programs.

*Jamestown Reservoir, ND.*—Except for the 14 boat docks receiving the 1999 temporary permits by the Stutsman County Park Board, the Bureau of Reclamation's managing partner, the Committee recognizes and supports the Resource Management Plan (RMP) issued by the Reclamation's Dakotas Area Office for Jamestown Reservoir in North Dakota. The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to take necessary steps to implement the RMP and to continue efforts to eliminate the private exclusive use of public lands at their reservoirs. The 14 docks shall be made a non-transferable permanent life estate to the annual permittee under the conditions that (1) that the docks meet Bureau of Reclamation design and construction standards for health and safety, (2) that the docks continue as removable features, (3) that the Reclamation continues appropriate maintenance within the lands excluded for the Jamestown reservoir, (4) that the Reclamation continues, through its managing partner, to provide an annual non-transferable permit based on fair market value, and (5) that the permittees continue to accept all liability associated with the structure and its use.

Further, the Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to take the actions necessary to meet the increasing public recreation needs at Jamestown and at other facilities by locating public boat docks in the immediate vicinity of existing private docks. Nothing in this provision shall modify and/or amend any other existing law, projects or reservoirs.

*Eastern New Mexico Water Supply, NM.*—An amount of \$250,000 is recommended for the Eastern New Mexico Water Supply project to allow for feasibility study completion by the Bureau of Reclamation.

*Jicarilla Water System Study, NM.*—The Committee directs that \$200,000 of the funds recommended for the Native American Affairs Program be used to undertake studies, in consultation and cooperation with the Jicarilla Apache Tribe, of the most feasible method of developing a safe and adequate municipal, rural and industrial water supply for the residents of the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation in New Mexico.

*Middle Rio Grande Project, NM.*—An appropriation of \$14,842,000 is recommended for the Middle Rio Grande Project in New Mexico.

The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for acquisition of water for endangered species purposes; and an increase of \$500,000 over the budget request for research, monitoring, and modeling evapotranspiration from open water and riparian vegetation to provide water use information for use in daily water management activities. The Bureau is to work cooperatively with the interagency workgroup on these activities.

The Committee has provided \$258,000 for the Bureau to implement a program for the transplant of minnow larvae and young-of-year and related monitoring activities (including fish relocation, transplant site evaluation, collection and spawning of adults, stock-

ing larvae, collecting eggs, rearing stocking juveniles, and monitoring stocked fish). The Committee understands that there will be matching funds for these activities by State and local entities.

The Committee has provided \$3,000,000 for habitat conservation and restoration activities along the middle Rio Grande River valley from below Cochiti Dam to the headwaters of Elephant Butte Lake. The Bureau is to continue to work with interested parties to evaluate and define the scope of the habitat and restoration measures to be undertaken in order to ensure that proposed work complements, rather than duplicates, other ongoing activities.

Finally, all parties, Tribal, State and local governments, Federal agencies, and water users, are to be commended for their efforts to address the complex issues related to recovery activities along the Rio Grande in New Mexico. But more can and must be done to establish a single entity, reflecting the range of interests, along the Rio Grande if the recovery effort is to be successful and to ensure the efficient use of available resources. Further, a single comprehensive group will ensure that activities undertaken are based on sound science and contribute directly to silvery minnow recovery. Future funding will be dependent upon a program plan for recovery activities that is supported by State and local governments, Federal agencies, Tribes, and water users. Coming to consensus will not be easy and will surely take time to reach, but in the long term will result in success in species recovery with minimum impacts to all parties. To this end, the attention of all parties is directed to the successful effort on the Upper Colorado to address the endangered species issues in that region.

*Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project, NM.*—The Committee has provided \$450,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete all remaining feasibility studies for the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply project in New Mexico. The feasibility report, which includes costs, benefits, environmental analysis, and recommendations on a potential project, is needed in order to proceed with a project construction authorization. The Committee understands that the Navajo Tribe and the City of Gallup have agreed to a plan, which was begun last year, to complete this work over about a 2-year period, and to support construction of what ever project may be supported at the conclusion of the feasibility phase.

*Upper Colorado River Endangered Species Program.*—The Committee recommendation for the Upper Colorado River Endangered Species Program includes the full budget request for habitat conservation and restoration activities in the San Juan River Basin proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

*Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash, NV.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$1,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue development of a comprehensive project plan for the restoration of wetlands and associated water resource issues at Lake Mead and Las Vegas Wash in Nevada.

*Newlands Project Water Rights Fund, NV.*—The Committee has included \$2,700,000 for the Newlands Water Rights Fund authorized by the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act to be utilized to pay for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Carson Division of the Newlands Reclamation Project.

*Walker River Basin Project, NV.*—An appropriation of \$300,000 is recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin the preparation of an EIS for water rights acquisition in the basin, recovery of the Walker Lake ecosystem and recovery of the Lahontan cutthroat trout fishery.

*Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project, UT.*—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use available funds, estimated to be \$43,614, to complete the Federal share of the Tooele Wastewater Reuse, UT project as provided under title XVI of Public Law 102–575.

*Columbia Basin Project, WA.*—The Committee is aware that the Bureau of Reclamation suspended publication of annual crop reports for the 1993 through 1998, but is currently compiling data for a 1999 crop report which is to be published later this year. The Committee supports the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to resume publishing these reports again. To the extent practicable, the Committee believes that the Bureau should compile crop reports for the Columbia Basin Project for the period of 1993 through 1998 and make them available to interested parties.

*Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.*—An additional \$500,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with the City of Espanola, NM in a feasibility study to investigate opportunities to reclaim and reuse municipal wastewater, and naturally impaired surface and groundwater.

*Drought Emergency Assistance.*—The Committee has included \$5,000,000 for Drought Emergency Assistance. The additional funding over the budget request is required due to continuing severe drought conditions that currently exist in New Mexico and several other western States. The funding provided herein shall be used in accordance with Section 202 of Public Law 106–60.

#### BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$11,577,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	9,369,000
House allowance .....	9,369,000
Committee recommendation .....	9,369,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,369,000, the same as the budget request, for the small reclamation program of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

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

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



BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—LOAN PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
LOAN PROGRAM								
CALIFORNIA								
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT .....	14,284	11,864	1,300	.....	1,300	.....	1,300	.....
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION .....	9,557	8,200	800	.....	800	.....	800	.....
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT .....	28,100	15,681	6,844	.....	6,844	.....	6,844	.....
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
VARIOUS								
LOAN ADMINISTRATION .....	.....	.....	425	.....	425	.....	425	.....
FISCAL YEAR 2000 RESCISSION—PUBLIC LAW 106-113 .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM .....	.....	.....	9,369	.....	9,369	.....	9,369	.....

## CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$42,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	38,382,000
House allowance .....	38,382,000
Committee recommendation .....	38,382,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$38,382,000, the same as the budget request for the Central Valley project restoration fund.

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

## CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$60,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	60,000,000
House allowance .....	
Committee recommendation .....	

The CALFED Program was established in May 1995 for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, long-term solution to the complex and interrelated problems in the San Francisco Bay-Delta area of California. The program's focus is on the health of the ecosystem and improving water management. In addition, this program addresses the issues of uncertain water supplies, aging levees, and threatened water quality.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2001 proposes language which would extend, through the appropriations process, the funding authority for the CALFED program. The Committee has consistently expressed concern regarding the duplication and overlap of CALFED activities with Central Valley Improvement Act programs and other activities funded under various other programs within the Bureau of Reclamation, and that the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress should thoroughly review and specifically authorize the CALFED program. The Committee believes that it is essential the committees of jurisdiction in these complicated matters have the opportunity to develop legislation to address these issues. While some hearings have been held, no authorization has been enacted. Therefore, the Committee is not able to recommend an appropriation for fiscal year 2001. However, the Committee understands that there is significant funding in the pipeline which will allow activities to continue in fiscal year 2001.

## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

*Boise Project Office Replacement.*—The Committee has been informed that the Boise Project Office, which was built in 1912, does not meet current building codes and is inadequate for modern day

technology, and is in serious need of replacement. The Committee would not object to the Bureau of Reclamation using the Working Capital Fund to replace the facility if justified based on a normal lease, purchase analysis required by OMB. Further, the Committee understands that the proposed replacement facility will be jointly funded by the U.S. Geologic Survey who would share the new office space.

#### POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$47,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	50,224,000
House allowance .....	47,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	50,224,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is \$50,224,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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

#### GENERAL PROVISION—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Language is included under Section 203 which limits to not more than \$7,687,000, adjusted for inflation, funding for the Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Program.

In the past, the Committee has expressed concern about the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program's increased funding requirements and the steadily expanding scope of its activities. In fiscal year 2001 the requested funding level continued the upward trend and as a result, the Committee included language in Section 203 that limits the funding level from power revenues for the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program to no more than \$7,687,000, adjusted for inflation. The Committee encourages the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program to prioritize its work based on project importance and to seek additional funding from outside non-Federal sources if necessary.

### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Title III provides for the Department of Energy's defense and nondefense functions, the power marketing administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

#### SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY BUDGET AMENDMENT

The President submitted a safeguards and security budget amendment as reflected in House Document 106–251 on June 6, 2000. The amendment's intent is to reorganize all safeguards and security functions at the Department under the Office of Security and Emergency Operations. The effect of the amendment would be to impose centralized Department-wide management of security costs and operations, including the security of nuclear weapons, nuclear secrets, nuclear materials and defense nuclear facilities. The Committee views the amendment to be inconsistent with the requirements of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act enacted as part of Public Law 106–65, which gives the Administrator of the NNSA authority over and responsibility for safeguards and security for all programs and activities within the NNSA. As such, the Committee has not considered the budget amendment.

The Committee has sought to accurately represent the President's budget request, including the safeguards and security amendment, in the report and accompanying tables. The Committee concurs with, and has recommended the amounts requested for safeguards and security and has reflected those amounts within each of the individual program lines as proposed in the original budget request.

#### CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

For fiscal year 2000, the conference agreement included a statutory provision limiting reimbursement of Department of Energy management and operating contractors for travel expenses to no more than \$150,000,000 and required contractor travel to be consistent with the rules and regulations for Federal employees. The substantial reduction in allowable travel reimbursements has successfully imposed efficiencies into the system for managing contractor travel and has produced cost savings due to the use of standard Federal travel rules. However, the Committee is concerned that the fiscal year 2000 travel ceiling has caused an unintended reduction in programmatic and scientific travel that is necessary for fulfilling the Department's mission. The Committee recommendation limits contractor travel for fiscal year 2001 at the level proposed by the administration—\$200,000,000—and believes that to be an appropriate level for travel, but still well below the previous baseline.

## LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee views laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) as an integral and essential component of the Department's ability to respond to changing needs and requirements. The LDRD program is necessary to maintain the preeminence of the national laboratories in the areas of science and engineering, and significantly strengthens the laboratories ability to attract and retain the best scientific talent. In fiscal year 2000, Congress limited LDRD expenditures to 4 percent for defense programs and eliminated the use of LDRD funding within environmental management programs. The Department has testified that the reduction of LDRD funding produced serious and negative impacts to ongoing research, resulted in lost knowledge and capabilities to meet future national defense needs, and caused the cancellation of important weapons related research.

The administration has proposed that LDRD funding be restored to at least 6 percent for fiscal year 2001. Both the Department's Stockpile Stewardship Program Review (the 30-day review) of November, 1999, and the Laboratory Operations Board Report of January, 2000, recommended restoring LDRD to the previous level. The Committee strongly endorses the administration's proposal. Furthermore, the Committee strongly endorses the use of funds within the environmental management program for the purpose of LDRD as a way to strengthen the nation's clean-up efforts substantially. Investments in science and technology in this area have successfully reduced the long-term clean-up and mortgage costs of our nation's most contaminated sites. Finally, the Committee has included a provision to establish an analogous program within the nuclear weapons production plants to attract and retain the highest quality people through a variety of activities, including the development of new production and design concepts and the establishment of intern and cooperative student programs. All of these efforts will be critical to maintaining the Department's most valuable assets—its people.

## ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$637,962,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 730,692,000
House allowance .....	616,482,000
Committee recommendation .....	691,520,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects reductions totaling \$22,203,000 contained in budget amendment H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

## RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$362,240,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 454,817,000
House allowance .....	390,519,000
Committee recommendation .....	444,117,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects reductions totaling \$1,783,000 contained in budget amendment H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation provides \$444,117,000, for renewable energy resources, an increase of \$81,877,000 over the current year appropriation.

The Committee is unable to draw conclusions regarding the full extent or effects of global climate change. However, in the face of uncertainty regarding global climate change and the human health effects of atmospheric pollution, prudence merits consideration be given to energy production technologies that reduce the emission of pollutants that accumulate in the atmosphere.

In that regard, the Committee considers the administration's use of base-year metrics, that is: the recommendation that the United States reduce its emissions of certain pollutants to 1990 levels, to be an inappropriate metric. The Committee recommends that the accumulation of pollutants in the atmosphere be considered in terms of their historical concentrations; not their annual production rates since it is the concentration levels not the rate of accumulation which are alleged to have global climate change implications.

When considered in those terms, the commitments made in Kyoto will have a negligible effect on the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> and other pollutants in the atmosphere. If prudence merits the development of new energy production technologies, it also requires a recognition that existing technology does not provide a means to meet increasing global energy requirements while stabilizing the production of atmospheric pollutants and certainly does not provide a means to reduce atmospheric pollution concentrations.

The Committee has modified the request for low emission energy technologies; including hydro, renewable, and nuclear, with the view toward post 2010 application of new technologies. As a result, with few exceptions, the Committee recommends basic research that will provide significant improvements over existing technologies rather than on the deployment or incremental improvement of commercial or near commercial technologies. The Committee is well aware of the proposition that appropriated funds can demonstrate the reliable operation of low emission technologies before they become commercially attractive. In a few cases, the Committee has provided funds for just such demonstrations. However, in general, the Committee expects non-Federal financing to support the final stages of product development and all stages of market development.

*Solar building technology research.*—The Committee recommends \$4,500,000 to fund solar building technology development. The Committee does not support new activities in solar lighting and technology coordination.

*Photovoltaic energy systems.*—The Committee recommends \$76,500,000 for photovoltaic energy systems. Within that amount, \$18,000,000 is provided for fundamental research including: \$5,500,000 for measurement and characterization, \$7,000,000 for basic research/university programs, and \$3,500,000 for high-performance advanced research. \$24,000,000 is provided for advanced materials and devices. \$32,500,000 is provided for technology development including: \$10,000,000 for manufacturing R&D, \$15,200,000 for systems engineering and reliability, and \$3,300,000 to be allocated to the PV building integrated R&D, partnerships for technology introduction, and million solar roof initiative. No funds are provided for the international clean energy initiative. Of the amount provided for systems engineering and reliability, \$2,000,000 shall be used to continue the ongoing research in

photovoltaics conducted by the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiment stations.

*Concentrating solar power.*—The Committee recommends \$14,000,000 for concentrating solar power. Within that amount, \$3,200,000 is provided for distributed and dispatchable power system development, and \$10,800,000 is provided for advanced components and system research.

*Biomass/biofuels—power systems.*—The Committee recommends \$47,600,000 for biomass/bio-fuels—power systems. \$2,000,000 is provided for thermochemical conversion. \$32,600,000 is provided for systems development, but the total does not include funds requested for new initiatives within that area. \$2,000,000 is provided for the feedstock development base program. No funds are provided for the regional biomass energy program. \$11,000,000 is provided for the bioenergy/bioproducts initiative.

Within the amount provided for systems development, \$1,000,000 is provided for the continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center on the integration of biomass with fossil fuels for advanced power systems transportation fuels. The Iowa switch grass project is fully funded at a level of \$6,200,000.

The recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the McNeil biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont, \$395,000 for the Vermont Agriculture Methane project, and \$1,000,000 for the University of Louisville to continue research into the commercial viability of refinery construction for the production of P-series fuels.

The Committee directs the Department to accelerate the large-scale biomass demonstration at the Winona, Mississippi site and provide a report on its progress by December 31, 2000.

*Biomass/biofuels—transportation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$43,750,000 for biomass/biofuels transportation. \$32,000,000 is provided for ethanol production, \$1,750,000 is provided for renewable diesel alternatives, \$3,000,000 is provided for feedstock production, and \$7,000,000 is provided for the bioenergy/bioproducts initiative.

*Wind.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$43,617,000 for wind energy systems. Within that amount, \$20,500,000 is provided for applied research, and \$16,500,000 is provided for turbine research including: \$7,100,000 for the next generation turbine project, \$3,000,000 for advanced turbine concepts, \$300,000 to conduct small wind turbine projects, \$100,000 for the cold weather turbine project, \$5,000,000 for turbine research and testing and \$3,617,000 for cooperative research and testing.

*Renewable energy production incentive.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive.

*Renewable program support.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for technical analysis and assistance within renewable program support.

*International renewable programs.*—The Committee strongly supports the U.S. international joint implementation program funded in this account and recommends only \$6,000,000 for that purpose. No funds are recommended for the international clean energy initiative. The Committee supports efforts to increase international

market opportunities for the export and deployment of advanced clean energy technologies—end-use efficiency, fossil, renewable, and nuclear energy technologies. The Administration should improve the Federal Government's role in the national and international development, demonstration, and deployment of advanced clean energy technologies by establishing an interagency working group jointly chaired by the Departments of Energy and Commerce and the U.S. Agency for International Development. This working group should also include representation from the Departments of State and Treasury, Environmental Protection Agency, Export-Import Bank, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Trade and Development Agency, and other departments and agencies, as appropriate. The Administration should also consult with the private sector and other interest groups on the export and deployment of clean energy technologies through the establishment of an advisory panel. Progress on the international deployment of clean energy technologies should be reported annually to Congress by March 1. The Administration should analyze technology, policy, and market opportunities for further international clean energy program development and provide Congress a 5-year strategic plan by June 1, 2001. This plan should be developed in consultation with the advisory panel.

*National Renewable Energy Laboratory.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$4,000,000, an increase of \$2,100,000, for capital equipment and general plant projects at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

*Geothermal.*—The Committee recommends \$28,000,000 for geothermal technology development, including \$3,000,000 for GeoPowering the West. The Committee recognizes drilling technology improvements as the area most likely to achieve enhanced economic viability of geothermal energy and provides \$13,000,000 for that purpose, an increase of \$3,500,000 over the request. No funds are provided for small-scale verification, the international clean energy initiative, or industry support.

*Hydrogen research.*—The Committee strongly supports research and development of hydrogen technology and recognizes it to be one of the most promising and cost effective energy sources for the future. The Committee recommends \$30,950,000, an increase of \$6,950,000 over the budget request and \$6,100,000 more than last year's enacted level. The recommendation includes \$350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, MT to continue the ongoing resource inventory, feasibility study, and development of a Solid Waste Hydrogen Fuel Cell manufacturing capability, and \$250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switch grass and its use in fuel cells and \$1,500,000 for the ITM Syngas project.

The Committee encourages demonstration of a dedicated fleet of vehicles powered by hydrogen.

*Hydropower.*—The Committee commends the Department of Energy for recognizing the benefits of and developing advanced “fish-friendly” turbines for hydro-electric generation. The Committee recommendation includes \$5,500,000 for that effort.

*Renewable Indian energy resources.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$6,600,000 for renewable Indian energy resource development including: \$1,000,000 to complete the Nome



diesel efficiency project; \$2,300,000 for the Power Creek hydroelectric project; \$2,000,000 for the Swan Lake Intertie; and \$1,300,000 for the Indian River hydroelectric turbine upgrades.

*Electric energy systems and storage.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$59,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage including: \$12,000,000 for transmission reliability; \$41,000,000 for high-temperature superconducting research and development; and \$6,000,000 for energy storage systems. The Committee strongly supports the Department's high temperature superconductivity research and development program, which promises to revolutionize the generation, transmission and conditioning of electricity. The Committee has added \$9,000,000 to accelerate the development, commercialization, and application of high temperature superconductor technologies through joint efforts among DOE laboratories, universities, and industry. The Committee directs Los Alamos and Oak Ridge National Laboratories, based on their advances in coating deposition technologies for these materials, to lead and support this effort by improving their own capabilities, including equipment, facilities, and technical expertise.

The Committee recommendation of \$12,000,000 for transmission reliability represents a \$9,000,000 increase over last year's enacted level, and shall be used as follows: \$500,000 for the completion of the distributed power demonstration begun last year at the Nevada Test Site for the purpose of developing and validating interconnection standards; and \$11,500,000 for power system reliability. The Committee notes that with modern supercomputers, it is possible to simulate the electric grid system, and accurately predict, avoid or respond to local, regional and national outages. Such simulation capabilities could prove highly useful in evaluating options for electric power generation and distribution. As such, the Committee urges the Department to begin a research program to develop solutions for grid reliability issues through the use of advanced computer simulation capabilities available within the national laboratories.

*Renewable program direction.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$18,000,000 for program direction within this account; an increase of \$180,000 over the current year.

#### NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$288,700,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 288,286,000
House allowance .....	231,815,000
Committee recommendation .....	262,084,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects reductions totaling \$20,159,000 contained in budget amendment H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguard and Security.

The Committee recommendation provides \$262,084,000 for nuclear energy, a decrease of \$26,616,000 from the current year appropriation.

Nuclear energy presently contributes almost 22 percent of our nation's electrical power and emits no atmospheric pollutants. And, new nuclear technologies promise tremendous benefits from an environmental, safety, and cost standpoint. The United States has not yet determined how it will dispose of spent nuclear fuel, and the Committee does not underestimate the technical and social

challenges entailed in this challenge. However, unlike the emissions of coal, gas, and fuel oil plants, the byproducts of fission can be contained. In making its recommendations for low emission energy technologies, the Committee seeks to achieve a prudent balance among technologies that may assist in the future reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

*Advanced radioisotope power systems.*—The Committee recommends \$34,200,000 for advanced radioisotope power systems. In making its recommendation, the Committee is providing an additional \$3,000,000 in order to maintain the infrastructure necessary to support future national security activities and NASA missions to explore deep space and the surfaces of planets.

*Nuclear energy plant optimization.*—The recommendation includes \$5,000,000, the same amount as the request for the nuclear energy plant optimization program.

*Nuclear energy research initiative.*—The Committee recommends \$41,500,000 for the nuclear energy research initiative and encourages the Department to pursue reactor based transmutation in coordination with studies of accelerator based transmutation.

The Committee believes any opportunity to expand the prospects for building new nuclear power plants around the world is dependent on developing the next generation of plants. In recent Congressional testimony, a senior utility executive expressed the view that the next nuclear plant to be built in the United States would likely be a small, modular design. Such “generation IV” plants would have improved safety, minimized proliferation risks, reduced nuclear waste, and much lower costs. The DOE’s nuclear energy research initiative has begun some of the promising research for developing such innovative advanced nuclear reactor designs. While the Committee encourages the DOE’s Generation IV activities, it is clear that unless the Department initiates a rigorous, open planning process to define the technologies needed and the research that must be conducted, this effort will not lead to a program that can usher next generation nuclear technologies into reality. Therefore the Committee recommends \$4,500,000 to develop a road map for the commercial deployment of a next generation power reactor that will, to the extent possible, have the following characteristics: superior economics, no possibility of a core melt-down and/or no requirement for a public evacuation plan, substantially reduced production of high level waste, highly proliferation resistant fuel and waste, and substantially improved thermal efficiency. The road map should contain an assessment of all available technologies; a summary of actions needed for the most promising candidates to be considered as viable options within the next 5 to 10 years with consideration of regulatory, economic, and technical issues; and an evaluation of opportunities for public/private partnerships. The road map and supporting technical studies should lead to a report by March 2003 providing a recommendation for a preferred technology and a conceptual design for the selected option for purposes of cost estimating to determine if the selected option is economically competitive.

The Committee also directs the use of \$1,000,000 from within available funds for the preparation of a detailed assessment that analyzes and describes the changes needed to existing ALWR de-

signs in order for such designs to be considered viable in the U.S. marketplace within the next 5 to 10 years, considering the regulatory, economic, and technological development issues that would need to be resolved.

The primary purpose of the joint United States-Russian program for the development of an advanced reactor is the design and eventual construction of a demonstration reactor in Russia for the purpose of surplus weapons plutonium disposition. However, it is important that the United States take full advantage of the development of this attractive technology for a possible next generation nuclear power reactor for United States and foreign markets. Therefore, the Committee instructs the Department to explore opportunities to develop and exploit this technology for commercial purposes. To further this purpose, the bill includes \$1,000,000 for the Office of Nuclear Energy to begin planning and implementation of initiatives such as, but not limited to, commercial fuel development and testing, licensing interaction with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, plant cost evaluations, and waste disposal assessments.

The Committee is aware that recent improvements in reactor design might make feasible small modular reactors with attractive characteristics for remote communities that otherwise must rely on shipments of relatively expensive and sometimes environmentally undesirable fuels for their electric power. To be acceptable, such a reactor would have to be inherently safe, be relatively cost effective, have intrinsic design features which would deter sabotage or efforts to divert nuclear materials, have infrequent re-fuelings, and be largely factory constructed and deliverable to remote sites. The Committee recommendation provides \$1,000,000 for the Department to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of and issues associated with the deployment of such small reactors and provide a report to Congress by May, 2001.

*Fast flux test facility.*—The Committee has provided \$44,010,000 to keep the FFTF in hot standby until the Department of Energy determines whether the facility should be decommissioned or restarted.

*Nuclear facilities management.*—The Committee has provided \$74,000,000, the amount of the budget request. The Committee recommends the name of the budget line be changed from “Termination costs” to “Nuclear facilities management” to reflect more accurately and more adequately the use of these funds.

*Isotopes.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$16,715,000, the same as the budget request, for isotope support. The Committee recommends \$4,500,000 for the Isotope Production Facility at LANSCE, the amount needed for completion of the facility.

*Uranium Programs.*—The Committee directs that the uranium programs activity be transferred from the Office of Nuclear Energy to the Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management, beginning in fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the Committee recommendation provides no funds within nuclear energy for this purpose. Instead, the Committee recommendation provides \$23,800,000 under defense environmental management, and \$38,600,000 under non-defense environmental management for uranium program activities. The Committee believes that these ac-

tivities are an integral part of the Department's response to the environmental issues at the gaseous diffusion plant sites in Kentucky, Ohio and Tennessee and that these activities are better managed by a single organization. The Committee remains concerned that the Department has not fully characterized all of the waste at the gaseous diffusion plants and has not produced a plan that accurately represents both the total costs and timetable for clean-up. The Department is instructed to provide a plan to this Committee by December 31, 2000, detailing how it intends to apply resources, including funds received from the U.S. Enrichment Corporation under memoranda of agreement, the uranium enrichment D&D fund, and new appropriations, to assure that the depleted uranium tailings conversion project remains on track to meet the schedule provided in Public Law 105-204.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recognizes that this appropriation changes the programmatic responsibilities of the Offices of Defense Programs, Nuclear Energy, and Environmental Management. Nevertheless, the Committee expects each office to apply the Program Direction funds appropriated for the use of each office to carry out these purposes without need for additional shifting of funds between the offices. Should additional Program Direction funds be required, the Committee will entertain reprogramming requests from the Department to move programmatic funds to Program Direction to support personnel and other needs directly related to the successful execution of the affected programs.

*Domestic energy fuel cycle.*—The Committee is very concerned that the front end of the U.S. nuclear fuel cycle, particularly the conversion and mining industries, are under severe market pressures and that elements could be lost in the very near term. Current market condition may well be related to the large amounts of excess material transferred to the United States Enrichment Corporation at the time of the privatization, to material brought into the United States under the Russian HEU agreement, and to liquidation of other inventories. The Committee directs the Secretary to work with the President and other Federal agencies to ensure that current laws with respect to the privatization of USEC and with respect to the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and their impact on United States domestic capabilities are carried out. In addition, the Secretary is instructed to take timely measures to ensure that conversion capability is not lost in the United States. The Committee expects that any such measures will not interfere with the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and the important national security goals it is accomplishing.

The Committee directs the Secretary to undertake an evaluation and make specific recommendations on the various options to sustain a domestic uranium enrichment industry in the short and long term to be delivered to Congress no later than December 31, 2000. The Secretary's evaluation shall include recommendations for dealing with the Portsmouth facility and its role in maintaining a secure and sufficient domestic supply of enriched uranium. Further, this investigation should consider the technological viability and commercial feasibility of all proposed enrichment technologies including various centrifuge options, AVLIS and SILEX technologies or other emerging technology. The evaluation should also consider

the role of the Federal Government in developing and supporting the implementation and regulation of these new technologies in order to secure a reliable and competitive source of domestic nuclear fuel. The Committee expects to be notified by the Department of its need for additional funding or decision to reprogram funding in order to carry out its priorities with regard to domestic enrichment industry.

#### ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$38,998,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	39,904,000
House allowance .....	35,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	38,321,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$38,321,000 for non-defense environment, safety, and health which includes \$18,998,000, the same amount as the current year, for program direction.

#### ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$9,600,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	9,137,000
House allowance .....	8,600,000
Committee recommendation .....	8,450,000

*Technical information management.*—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is \$8,450,000.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

##### (NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$332,350,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 282,812,000
House allowance .....	281,001,000
Committee recommendation .....	309,141,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106–251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation provides \$309,141,000 for non-defense environmental management, an increase of \$23,140,000 over the original budget request.

The non-defense environmental management program is responsible for managing and addressing the environmental legacy resulting from nuclear energy and civilian energy research programs, primarily the Office of Science within the Department of Energy. Research and development activities of DOE and predecessor agencies generated waste and other contaminants which pose unique problems, including unprecedented volumes of contaminated soils, water and facilities. The funding requested and provided here supports the Department's goal of cleaning up as many of its contaminated sites as possible by 2006 in a safe and cost-effective manner.

*Site completion.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$54,721,000 for site completion. The recommendation does not include funds requested for the removal of the Atlas tailings pile, which has not been authorized.

*Post 2006 completion.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$178,244,000, including \$29,600,000 transferred from the Office of Nuclear Energy for uranium programs activities and an additional

\$9,000,000 to support depleted uranium conversion at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING  
FUND

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$249,247,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 294,588,000
House allowance .....	301,400,000
Committee recommendation .....	297,778,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106–251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation provides \$297,778,000, including a \$5,260,000 general reduction from the original budget request for the uranium enrichment and decontamination and decommissioning fund. The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund was established in accordance with title XI of Public Law 102–486, the National Energy Policy Act of 1992. The funds provided for the environmental cleanup of the Department’s uranium enrichment plants, two of which are currently leased to the USEC, and the cleanup of uranium mill tailings and thorium piles resulting from production and sales to the Federal Government for the Manhattan project and other national security purposes.

The Committee remains concerned by the growing backlog and gap between the amount of claims approved for payment and the funding requested by the Department to pay those claims. The problem is compounded by an estimated \$130,000,000 of additional potential claims in future years. Since these payments go to reimburse operating uranium and thorium licensees for their costs of cleanup related to Federal activities, the Committee believes the Department should be doing more to ensure additional funds are available to make timely payments for approved claims.

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$239,601,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	318,574,000
House allowance .....	213,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	59,175,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$351,175,000 for nuclear waste disposal, the same as the current year appropriation. Of that amount, \$59,175,000 is derived from the nuclear waste fund, and \$292,000,000 shall be available from the “Defense nuclear waste disposal” account.

The proposed funding level as provided by the Committee is intended to allow the Department to meet the programmatic milestone associated with making a site recommendation in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee has provided \$2,500,000 for the State of Nevada and \$5,887,000 for affected units of local government in accordance with the statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

## SCIENCE

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$2,787,627,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 3,162,639,000
House allowance .....	2,830,915,000
Committee recommendation .....	2,870,112,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

Severely constrained spending limits for fiscal year 2001 have forced the Committee into very difficult decisions regarding many otherwise outstanding programs and initiatives under the Office of Science. In order to adhere to the subcommittee's allocation, address critical ongoing research and development efforts, and balance congressional priorities with those of the administration, the Committee regrets that it is not able to recommend many of the substantial increases requested for programs, and in some cases, had to cut programs below current year levels. Furthermore, the Committee regrets that it cannot recommend funding for many worthwhile new initiatives.

## HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$707,890,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 709,272,000
House allowance .....	714,730,000
Committee recommendation .....	677,030,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

Due to severe budget restraints, the Committee recommendation provides \$677,030,000 for high energy physics, a reduction of \$30,860,000 from the current year appropriation.

The Committee strongly supports the goals of the high energy physics program and reductions to the accounts are made without prejudice and as a result of the severe budget constraints within which it must provide funding. As such, the Committee directs the Department to allocate the resources provided in full consultation with the field and without prejudice to any site.

## NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$352,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 365,069,000
House allowance .....	369,890,000
Committee recommendation .....	350,274,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

Due to severe budget restraints, the Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is \$350,274,000, a reduction of \$19,616,000 from the original request. The Committee recommendation does not provide \$5,957,000 requested for the waste treatment program and directs the Department to achieve efficiencies in waste treatment by charging the costs to users where appropriate, or handling such costs within existing operational budgets. Due to budget constraints, funding for new research initiatives is reduced by \$5,659,000, and funding for increased facility operations is reduced by \$8,000,000.

## BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$441,500,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 438,454,000
House allowance .....	404,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	444,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation includes \$444,000,000 for biological and environmental research including \$2,500,000 for construction of the laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The recommendation for research is at the same level as the current year appropriation. The Committee recommendation does not provide \$1,200,000 requested for waste management and directs the Department to achieve efficiencies in waste management by charging the costs to users where appropriate, or handling such costs within existing operational budgets. The recommendation does not include the proposed \$9,507,000 increase to fund new initiatives to image the expression of genes in cells and does not support the development of new infrastructure and facilities to support this initiative. Due to severe budget constraints, the recommendation includes \$4,735,000 requested for new initiatives in the Microbial Cell Project, a reduction of \$5,000,000 from the request; and continues the free air carbon dioxide experiments at the current year level.

*Low dose effects program.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$20,135,000, of which \$11,682,000 is within biological and environmental research and \$8,453,000 is within defense environmental restoration and waste management science and technology for the low dose effects program.

*Medical Applications.*—The Committee recognizes the University of Missouri-Columbia's commitment to building a state-of-the-art cancer research and treatment program and provides \$3,000,000 to expand the Federal investment in the University's nuclear medicine and cancer research capital program begun by the Committee last year, focusing on the enhancement of the campus' clinical cancer treatment and research facilities.

## BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$783,127,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,003,920,000
House allowance .....	791,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	914,582,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation includes \$914,582,000 for basic energy sciences, an increase of \$131,455,000 over the current year appropriation.

*Materials sciences.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$408,363,000 for materials sciences, a \$3,363,000 increase over the current year appropriation and \$47,748,000 below the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes the amount of the request, \$9,815,000, for the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research. The Committee recommendation does not provide \$8,073,000 requested for waste management and directs the Department to achieve efficiencies in waste manage-



ment by charging the costs to users where appropriate, or handling such costs within existing operational budgets. The Committee recommendation does not include \$8,000,000 for the SPEAR 3 upgrade at the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Laboratory. The Committee recommendation includes \$203,596,000 for facility operations, the same amount as the current year and \$23,675,000 below the request.

*Spallation neutron source.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$241,000,000 to continue the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS), including \$221,900,000 for construction and \$19,100,000 for other activities related to the project. The amount represents a \$121,900,000 increase over current year construction funding. The Committee recognizes the importance the SNS offers in advancing the frontiers of science and technology and the opportunities it will provide for future scientific and industrial research and development for the United States. The design and construction of this next-generation, accelerator-based, neutron scattering facility, located at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, is a collaborative effort involving six DOE national laboratories (Argonne, Brookhaven, Jefferson, Lawrence Berkeley, Los Alamos, and Oak Ridge). Due to the allocated budget constraints, the Committee is unable to provide the full budget request. The Committee endorses and supports the SNS as it enters the construction phase and hopes additional resources can be made available so as to limit any impact on the project's schedule and cost.

*Nanotechnology.*—The Committee strongly supports the Department's role in the government-wide investment in nanotechnology and recognizes it may revolutionize the ability to craft highly specialized materials with unique properties. The Department has requested an increase of \$36,140,000 over the current year appropriation for new initiatives in this areas. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation provides only \$20,140,000 for new initiatives in nanoscale science, engineering, and technology research, a reduction of \$16,000,000 from the request, but a significant increase over last year. The reductions in nanotechnology research are taken from the following sub accounts: \$8,000,000 from materials sciences; \$7,000,000 from chemical sciences; and \$1,000,000 from engineering and geosciences.

*Energy biosciences.*—Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation does not provide funding for the \$2,440,000 in new research initiatives for microbial cell research, as funding is already provided under biological and environmental research.

#### OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$166,060,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	211,362,000
House allowance .....	171,930,000
Committee recommendation .....	174,900,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$174,900,000 for other energy research programs, an increase of \$8,840,000 over the current year appropriation.

*Advanced Scientific Computing Research.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$139,970,000 for advanced scientific computing research, an increase of \$7,970,000 over the current year

level of funding. The Department requested an increase of \$50,611,000 over current year spending to support substantial new investments in scientific computing. The Committee recognizes the need for enhanced scientific computing capabilities within the Department's science programs, but is unable to support such a large increase given current budget constraints. The Committee recommendation does not provide \$11,963,000 requested for the laboratory technology research program, and instead provides the entire recommended amount of \$139,970,000 to mathematical, information, and computational sciences, an increase of \$20,899,000 over current year funding, and directs the Department to accordingly initiate the most important new scientific computing initiatives.

#### FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$250,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 243,907,000
House allowance .....	255,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	227,270,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is \$227,270,000, a reduction of \$22,730,000 from the current year appropriation. While, in the past, the Committee has supported increases above the level of the request for this program, severe budget constraints and shortfalls elsewhere in the Department's request necessitate the reduction at this time.

#### DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$205,581,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 214,421,000
House allowance .....	153,527,000
Committee recommendation .....	210,128,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

#### (MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$106,887,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	128,762,000
House allowance .....	111,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	128,762,000

#### INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$29,500,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	33,000,000
House allowance .....	31,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,988,000

The Committee has provided \$28,988,000 for the Office of the Inspector General.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

## ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The atomic energy defense activities programs of the Department of Energy are divided into two separate categories—National Nuclear Security Administration and Other Defense Related Activities.

As a result of the enactment of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act, the Committee recommends a new account structure that includes the following separate appropriation accounts for the NNSA: weapons activities; defense nuclear non-proliferation; naval reactors; and Office of the Administrator.

Under Other Defense Related Activities, the Committee has included separate appropriation accounts as follows: 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.

### NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

#### WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$4,427,052,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 4,639,225,000
House allowance .....	4,579,684,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,883,289,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106–251 for Safeguards and Security.

Weapons activities support the Nation’s national security mission of nuclear deterrence by preserving nuclear weapons technology and competence in the laboratories and maintaining the reliability and safety of the weapons in the enduring nuclear stockpile. The United States continues to retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter future hostile countries from seeking a nuclear advantage. In the past, confidence in the nuclear weapons stockpile was assured through a combination of underground nuclear and laboratory testing. Since October 1992 the United States has maintained a moratorium on underground nuclear testing and has explored other means to assure confidence in the safety, reliability, and performance of nuclear weapons.

The mission of weapons activities is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation’s enduring nuclear weapons stockpile within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, utilizing a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex. Future nuclear stewards will rely on scientific understanding and expert judgment, rather than on underground nuclear testing and the development of new weapons, to predict, identify, and correct problems affecting the safety and reliability of the stockpile. Enhanced experimental capabilities and new tools in computation, surveillance, and advanced manufacturing will become necessary to certify weapon safety, performance, and reliability without underground nuclear testing. Weapons will be maintained, modified, or retired and dismantled as needed to meet arms control objectives or remediate potential safety and reliability issues.

As new tools are developed and validated, they will be incorporated into a smaller, more flexible and agile weapons complex in-

frastructure for the future. Traditionally, the activities of the three weapons laboratories and the Nevada test site have been regarded separately from those of the weapons production plants. However, all stockpile stewardship and management activities will achieve a new, closer linkage to each other under the NNSA.

During the CTBT debate last year, there was strong testimony from committed and well respected public servants that the science-based stockpile stewardship program was underfunded and under stress. Thereafter, the Secretary of Energy ordered a comprehensive internal 30-Day review of stockpile stewardship. The Review generally concluded that the Stockpile Stewardship Program was “on track”, but that “additional pressures such as increased security requirements, newly discovered stockpile issues, and resource limitations have collectively forced the program, overall, to be ‘wound too tight’ with too little program flexibility for contingencies.” The Committee is concerned that the program is not on schedule, given the current budget, to develop the tools, technologies and skill-base to refurbish our weapons and certify them for the stockpile. As such, the Committee recommendation provides substantial increases across many weapons programs.

A successful Stockpile Stewardship Program requires at least four things: qualified and motivated nuclear-weapons experienced personnel, modern and well maintained facilities, the special experimental and computational facilities needed for stewardship in the absence of testing, and a sound management structure. The Committee remains very concerned that each year the nation continues to lose to retirement our most experienced weapons designers and engineers and our most highly skilled technicians. Recruiting and retaining the next generation of nuclear weapons stewards has been made more difficult by resource constraints, fewer opportunities for exploratory research, and diminished morale from a perceived lack of trust in the nuclear weapons scientists.

Furthermore, DOE has failed to keep good modern facilities. The 30-Day Review said this has “resulted in a huge bow wave of deferred improvements. For example, 70 percent of the facilities at Y-12, 80 percent of the facilities at the Kansas City Plant, 40 percent of the facilities at the Pantex Plant, and 40 percent of the facilities at the Savannah River tritium facilities are more than 40 years old.” The Committee recommendation provides substantial increases for facility modernization.

The Committee continues to be concerned that the Department has experienced tremendous difficulty in constructing its special experimental and computational facilities within budget and within schedule. The National Ignition Facility is only the most recent example. If the new NNSA is implemented consistent with the law, it will resolve a number of long-standing management problems within the Department’s weapon activities.

The Department has changed the manner in which it presents the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the stockpile stewardship program. In recent years, the program request was structured along two primary control levels—stockpile stewardship and stockpile management. For the upcoming year, the Department proposes a new budget and reporting structure based on the three elements of its integrated stockpile stewardship program: directed stockpile

work, campaigns, and readiness in technical base and facilities. The Committee commends the Department for its more detailed and transparent budget structure and directs the Department to submit future requests that clearly identify the required funding for each program element under directed stockpile work, each campaign, and each program element under readiness in technical base and facilities.

#### DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

An appropriation of \$906,603,000 is recommended for directed stockpile work of the NNSA, an increase of \$87,427,000 over the budget request.

Directed stockpile work encompasses all activities that directly support specific weapons in the nuclear stockpile as directed by the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Plan. These activities include current maintenance and day-to-day care of the stockpile as well as planned refurbishments as outlined by the stockpile life extension program (SLEP). This category also includes research, development and certification activities in direct support of each weapon system, and long-term future-oriented research and development to solve either current or projected stockpile problems.

*Stockpile research and development.*—The Committee recommends \$268,300,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the request, to support B61, W80, and W76 life extension development activities and to support additional sub-critical experiments at the Nevada test site. The recommendation includes an additional \$6,000,000 for a cooperative research effort with the Department of Defense regarding defeat of hard and deeply buried targets.

*Stockpile maintenance.*—The Committee recommends \$282,994,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the request, to support life extension operations on the W87, and development and engineering activities for the B61, W80, and W76.

*Stockpile evaluation.*—The Committee recommends \$171,710,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 over the request, to eliminate the testing backlog, and for joint test equipment procurements.

*Production plants.*—From the additional funds provided within directed stockpile maintenance and evaluation, \$4,000,000 is intended for the Kansas City Plant; \$8,000,000 is intended for the Pantex Plant; \$8,000,000 is intended for the Y-12 Plant; and \$3,000,000 is intended for the Savannah River Site.

#### CAMPAIGNS

An appropriation of \$1,352,239,000 is recommended for the campaigns of the NNSA, an increase of \$100,935,000 over the budget request.

Campaigns encompasses focused scientific and technical efforts to develop and maintain critical capabilities needed to enable continued certification of the stockpile for the long term. The efforts are technically challenging, multi-function efforts that have definitive milestones, specific work plans, and specific end dates. The Committee notes, however, that campaigns must not become so focused on short-term milestones that long range research and maintenance of core capabilities are compromised.

*Primary certification.*—The Committee recommends \$51,400,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the request, to support sub-critical experiments and other activities necessary to support the required delivery date for a certified pit.

*Advanced radiography.*—The Committee recommends \$58,000,000, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the request, to support research, development and conceptual design for an advanced hydrodynamic test facility including further development and evaluation of proton radiography techniques.

*Enhanced surveillance.*—The Committee recommends \$106,651,000, an increase of \$17,000,000 over the request, to support the accelerated deployment of test and diagnostic equipment to monitor and assess the health of the stockpile. From the additional funds provided, \$3,000,000 is intended for the Kansas City plant; \$7,000,000 is intended for the Pantex plant; \$4,000,000 is intended for the Y-12 plant; and \$1,000,000 for the Savannah River site.

*ICF ignition and high yield, Project 96-D-111 National Ignition Facility.*—The Committee recommends \$74,100,000, the amount of the budget request.

The original fiscal year 2001 baseline estimate for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) included a total project cost of \$1,198,900,000 and other related costs of \$833,100,000, for total project related costs of \$2,032,000,000. The Secretary of Energy has indicated that construction problems and delays will cause total project related costs to escalate to \$3,257,500,000, an increase of \$1,225,500,000.

The Conference Report accompanying the Fiscal Year 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act directed the Secretary to complete and certify a new cost and schedule baseline for NIF and submit that certification to the Committees by June 1, 2000. The Secretary indicated by letter dated June 1, 2000 a desire to continue with the project on an interim baseline, and requested additional time for final certification of the revised baseline. The interim baseline proposes increased construction funding of \$135,000,000 in fiscal year 2001; \$180,000,000 in fiscal year 2002; \$179,100,000 in fiscal year 2003; \$150,000,000 in fiscal year 2004; \$130,000,000 in fiscal year 2005; \$110,000,000 in fiscal year 2006; \$33,000,000 in fiscal year 2007; and \$4,000,000 in fiscal year 2008. Furthermore, associated operational costs are projected to exceed the current baseline by a total of \$304,400,000 during the construction period.

The Secretary has stated that NIF remains a cornerstone requirement of the Stockpile Stewardship Program and should be completed despite an estimated \$1,225,500,000 cost escalation. However, the Department previously acknowledged that current mission requirements were already potentially exceeding the available budget for the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP). The Department's 30-Day Review of the SSP noted that "additional pressures such as increased security requirements, newly discovered stockpile issues, and resource limitations have collectively forced the program, overall, to be 'wound too tight' with too little program flexibility for contingencies." In light of this problem, the Committee questions whether NIF is essential to the Stockpile Stew-

ardship program at a cost of \$3,257,500,000. Furthermore, the Administration has failed to request an increase in the overall weapons activities budget or identify current activities that could be scaled back or eliminated in order to accommodate the increased cost of NIF over the next 8 years.

The Department recently submitted a proposed reallocation of \$135,000,000 within weapons activities to support a revised baseline for fiscal year 2001. Although the revised budget request would see the project through the immediate future, the Committee remains concerned that the Department has failed to develop a path forward for NIF that properly balances the scientific importance of NIF with the overall needs of the Stockpile Stewardship Program over the next 10 to 15 years. For example, the Committee believes the Department has failed to examine adequately options for NIF that involve completing a subset of the 192 beams as soon as possible (either 48 or 96), bringing the reduced NIF into operation, and performing the necessary scientific and technical tests to evaluate whether a 192 beam NIF is cost effective or programmatically required. Furthermore, all options should be analyzed for the potential impacts and risks they impose on the rest of the weapons programs and the ability of the Department to complete the full suite of required facilities at other sites and laboratories around the complex. Until these important issues can be resolved to the satisfaction of the Committee, it will only recommend funding for the project as requested in the President's fiscal year 2001 budget submission.

While the future of the NIF project is uncertain, it is essential that the Department continue to support and maintain the ongoing work at the Omega, "Z", and NIKE facilities and efforts in diagnostics, target fabrication and cryogenic target development. These other elements of the ICF program not only enable the goals of NIF, but have important roles in meeting the overall goals of Stockpile Stewardship. With significant delays in NIF, increased use of existing facilities and the continued development of the supporting activities are essential to the long term success of the program.

*ICF Ignition and High Yield, Petawatt Laser.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$2,500,000 within available funds for fiscal year 2001 to transfer the Petawatt Laser from Lawrence Livermore National Lab to the University of Nevada-Reno (UNR). The Committee directs the Department to facilitate an agreement between UNR and Lawrence Livermore National Lab to achieve operational status of the Petawatt Laser as soon as possible.

*Pit manufacturing readiness.*—As part of the stockpile stewardship plan, the Department made a commitment to produce the hardware necessary to replace all parts of any warhead in the nuclear stockpile—evidenced by a requirement to manufacture a certifiable W88 pit by December 2001. The Committee is alarmed that resources previously appropriated to support pit production in fiscal year 2000 were redirected to other work within the program. The Committee believes the Department has failed to give the pit production program sufficient priority and management attention, resulting in the program now being behind schedule and over cost. The Committee directs the NNSA to provide a report to the Com-

mittees of jurisdiction in the House and the Senate by December 1, 2000, that includes the following: (1) a description of the program requirements for production of the W88 pit; (2) a proposed production schedule that is consistent with the programmatic needs of the Department of Defense; (3) a detailed description of the budget required to meet production on the proposed schedule; (4) a description of the number and kinds of non-nuclear tests and computations necessary for certification of the W88 pit; (5) a proposed certification schedule that is consistent with the programmatic needs of the Department of Defense; and, (6) a detailed description of the budget required to meet certification on the proposed schedule. The report should contain specific dates and milestones against which progress shall be measured.

The Committee recommendation provides \$123,038,000 for pit manufacturing readiness, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee intends this level of funding to be sufficient to allow the NNSA to complete pit production on a revised schedule that still meets commitments to the Department of Defense. The Committee has also provided an additional \$10,000,000 to support the primary certification campaign, as described earlier in the report. If the NNSA Administrator believes, after completing the above described review and report, that the \$25,000,000 in funding above the current budget request is not sufficient to meet required production and certification schedules, the Committee strongly urges the submission of a supplemental appropriations request for fiscal year 2001.

*Secondary readiness.*—The Committee recommends \$25,000,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 over the request, to address facility planning, technology, critical skills, and capabilities required for full-scale secondary production at the Y-12 Plant, Tennessee.

*Tritium readiness.*—The Committee recommends a total of \$133,000,000, a decrease of \$19,000,000 from the request, including \$58,000,000 for support of the commercial light water reactor program and \$75,000,000 for construction. The Committee recommendation does not include within this campaign \$19,000,000 requested to support accelerator production of tritium as a back-up technology. That funding is provided under advanced accelerator applications within Other Defense Activities.

*Cooperative agreements.*—The Committee recognizes that cooperative agreements with university systems are important resources for developing essential technical data for stockpile stewardship. The Committee notes the current cooperative research and development agreement with the University of Nevada system will expire on March 31, 2001 and urges the Department to renew the agreement for another 2-year period at a level consistent with prior year funding.

#### READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

An appropriation of \$2,263,947,000 is recommended for readiness in technical base and facilities, an increase of \$171,289,000 over the original budget request. Readiness in technical base and facilities encompasses efforts to provide for the physical infrastructure and operational readiness required to conduct the directed stock-



pile work and campaign activities at the laboratories, the test site and the production plants.

*Operations of facilities.*—The Committee recommends \$1,449,721,000, an increase of \$136,289,000 above the budget request. The recommendation includes an additional \$10,000,000 for operation of pulsed power facilities, and an additional \$20,000,000 for microsystems and microelectronics activities in support of planned stockpile refurbishments at Sandia National Laboratories. The recommendation includes an additional \$7,000,000 for planning for a replacement of the CMR facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and an additional \$43,000,000 for replacement of critical equipment and infrastructure repairs and upgrades throughout the weapons production complex in the following amounts: \$20,000,000 at the Kansas City Plant, Missouri; \$13,000,000 at the Pantex Plant, Texas; \$8,000,000 at the Y-12 Plant, Tennessee; and \$2,000,000 at the Savannah River Site, South Carolina.

The Committee recommendation includes \$44,205,000 associated with the nuclear emergency search team and \$12,084,000 associated with the accident response group. The administration's budget requested funding for these items under the Office of Security and Emergency Operations. The Committee recommendation provides the requested funding within readiness in technical base and facilities, under the responsibility of the NNSA, as required by Public Law 106-65.

*Material recycle and recovery.*—The Committee recommends \$37,018,000, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the request, to maintain restart schedules for hydrogen fluoride and wet chemistry operations at the Y-12 Plant, Tennessee.

*Uranium-233.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,000,000 to process uranium-233 stored in building 3019 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, to obtain thorium-229 needed for cancer treatment and to down-blend uranium-233 with uranium-238. By blending the high-assay uranium-233 with uranium-238, the NNSA will ensure that the assay of the resultant depleted uranium will be below safety and safeguard limits. In order to meet the quality, cost, and schedule requirements with the commercial use of the extremely short-lived actinium-225, the Committee recommends that the Department utilize a well qualified contractor for this project. In order for the cancer treatment project to receive the required private financing in a timely manner, the NNSA shall transition the responsibility and control of the nuclear material processing and the medical isotope extraction to a commercial contractor to achieve the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) required Good Manufacturers Practice (GMP) material availability by April 2001. This material required on April 2001 must be produced by the long-term production process to demonstrate FDA reliability and quality.

*Special Projects.*—The Committee recommends \$53,297,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee recommendation provides \$3,000,000 for the final year of funding for the American Textiles Partnership (AMTEX), and \$2,000,000 to support a program in partnership with university systems to meet the needs of the NNSA and address the concerns of the Chiles Commission by forming a transitional pipeline of qualified students

into the defense programs of the NNSA. The Committee recommendation fully funds the budget request for educational support activities.

*Construction projects.*—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$154,085,000, an increase of \$15,469,000, for construction projects under Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities.

*Project 01–D–103 Preliminary project design and engineering, various locations.*—The Committee recommends \$29,500,000, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the request. Within the amount provided, \$20,000,000 shall be used to complete Title I and II design and provide supporting infrastructure upgrades to the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Applications facility, Sandia National Laboratories.

The Committee is pleased the Department established the Office of Engineering and Construction Management (OECM) within the Office of Chief Financial Officer. With the establishment of this office, the Committee expects the Department to strengthen its capabilities in the area of construction management oversight. The Committee continues to support the use of external independent reviews (EIRs) for all new line item capital projects, conducted by non-proponent, recognized professional project management firms and managed by OECM. EIRs should be conducted prior to construction and after establishing the final performance baseline, and shall include an independent cost estimate, and required corrective action plans and updates.

The Committee further notes the Department's proposed request for Project Engineering and Design for certain of its projects in the Defense area for fiscal year 2001, and that the purpose is to achieve a 30–35 percent level of engineering design for new construction projects, prior to providing data to the Congress in support of construction funding. Such an advanced design should provide a more mature technical and cost baseline, ensuring greater likelihood of achieving project cost and schedule adherence. Therefore, the requirement to restrict the availability of funding for new project until an EIR has been reviewed by the Committee can be lifted. OECM is to work with the Committee to establish guidelines to ensure final performance baselines are developed for each new project, that EIRs are undertaken to validate these baselines, and procedures are developed which make the availability of funding contingent upon successful review and approval by OECM.

*Technology transfer and industrial partnerships.*—The Committee recognizes that partnerships with industry may enable the weapons complex to accomplish its missions more efficiently. Such partnerships can provide access to new technologies, new processes, or new business procedures that improve the NNSA's mission capabilities. Since these partnerships should support mission needs, they should be accomplished within funds already designated for mission-related work by the weapons laboratories and plants. The Committee notes that the budget request includes \$14,000,000 in technology partnership funding and recommends that at least \$30,000,000 of the work supported by the NNSA be accomplished through such partnerships. An annual report to the relevant committees of Congress on the utilization of industrial partnerships for these purposes shall be provided.

*Technology Infrastructure.*—The Committee notes that the Senate National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 approved a 3-year pilot program for national laboratories to conduct a Technology Infrastructure Pilot Program. The Committee recommends up to \$3,000,000 from within available funds, be utilized by the National Nuclear Security Administration to initiate a pilot program to improve the mission capabilities of its laboratories through development of technology clusters in the regions near these facilities.

*Defense directed energy activities.*—The Committee recognizes that the High Energy Laser Master Plan approved by the Department of Defense (DOD) in March 2000, acknowledges the vital role that the NNSA could play in meeting the technological needs of the DOD in directed energy weapons systems. The Committee strongly recommends that the NNSA work to complete a comprehensive agreement with the DOD to ensure that the expertise and technologies already existent at the national laboratories are leveraged for these purposes.

*Advanced Simulation and Computing.*—The Committee recommendation provides the full amount of the budget request, including \$55,675,000 for collaborations with university partnerships, alliances, institutes, and fellowships. The Committee understands that the Department's budget request reassigned items to this category and reduced the operations category accordingly, but did not clearly identify this change in its submission to Congress. This error caused confusion regarding the actual level of increase, which is 6.7 percent above last year.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of \$224,071,000 is recommended for program direction activities. This is the same as the original budget request.

Program Direction provides funds for all Federal personnel-related expenses for Defense Programs offices at the NNSA headquarters and the field operations offices. It also provides technical support throughout the Defense Programs complex in the areas of environment, safety and health; safeguards and security; NEPA compliance, and compliance with Federal and State laws, and recommendations of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$729,100,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 865,590,000
House allowance .....	861,477,000
Committee recommendation .....	908,967,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommendation provides \$908,967,000, an increase of \$2,932,000 over the original budget request.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities of the NNSA are focused towards reducing the serious global danger of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The NNSA utilizes the highly specialized scientific, technical, analytical, and operational capabilities of the NNSA and its national laboratories as well as other Department of Energy laboratories. Its mission is to prevent the spread of WMD materials, technology and expertise; detect the proliferation of

WMD worldwide; reverse the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities; dispose of surplus materials in accordance with terms set forth in agreements between the United States and Russia; and store surplus fissile materials in a safe manner pending disposition. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

*Nonproliferation and verification research and development.*—The Committee recommends \$245,990,000, an increase of \$20,000,000 over the original budget request. The funding level recommended by the Committee provides significant increases over the current year level for the NNSA to deliver enhanced ground-based and space-based monitoring equipment to support planned upgrades to existing treaty monitoring systems; to deploy new detection technologies; and to meet urgent needs for technology to respond to the threat of chem/bioterrorism against civilians.

The Nonproliferation and Verification, Research and Development program is essential for stable long-term research and the development of unique science and technology competencies needed for the increasing demands of arms control, nonproliferation, domestic nuclear safeguards and security, energy security, and emergency management.

The Committee has received the report from the Nonproliferation and National Security Advisory Committee reviewing the Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program. The Committee is pleased to see the external peer review advisory committee found that the program “addresses U.S. nonproliferation and national security objectives in a manner consistent with Executive and Congressional mandates,” and that the “technical quality of the work in each program area is high.” The advisory committee highlighted and the Committee recognizes that the majority of the program is primarily longer-term, developmental projects with a very small research component. The Committee notes that while not entirely competitively selected, over 20 percent of program funds go to universities and industry primarily through the national laboratories. The Committee believes that this is an excellent way to ensure that work conducted at the national laboratories and within universities and industry are closely coupled and focused on meeting operational needs. Based on the advisory committee’s review, the developmental nature of the program, and the percentage of program funds provided to universities and industry, the Committee believes the Department is satisfying the intent of the language in last year’s conference report.

*Project 00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), Los Alamos National Laboratory.*—The Committee recommends \$17,000,000 to accelerate construction and completion of the facility.

*Arms Control.*—The Committee recommends \$138,014,000 for arms control and nonproliferation, an increase of \$15,000,000 over the original budget request.

The Arms Control and Nonproliferation program is the focal point within the Department of Energy which support the U.S. arms control and nonproliferation policies, and provides leadership and representation within the Department in the international arms control and nonproliferation community. The goal is to reduce

the threat of nuclear proliferation by integrating the Department's assets and efforts, including those of the national laboratories and contractors, by providing technical support to the U.S. Government's foreign policy and national security objectives.

The Committee recommendation provides \$30,000,000 for the nuclear cities initiative, an increase of \$12,500,000 over the budget request. The Committee remains concerned that progress in restructuring of the Russian nuclear weapons complex is not proceeding at a pace commensurate with the risks that this complex presents to the United States. It is in our nation's interest to take full advantage of instant opportunities to achieve restructuring and downsizing of the Russian complex in a manner that lessens the risk that Russian personnel possessing critical skills will be recruited to other countries interested in developing or improving their weapons programs. The Committee recommendation provides \$30,000,000 for restructuring and commercialization efforts in the nuclear cities in fiscal year 2001, and directs the NNSA to make the availability of the funds provided in excess to the request contingent on the development of a Russian plan outlining specific, transparent and verifiable milestones that provide the United States confidence that the downsizing and restructuring is proceeding as planned. The Committee recognizes that the end result of the restructuring should be a self-sustaining, significantly smaller, complex and to that end encourages development of commercial ventures that contribute to this restructuring process. The Committee also recognizes that contract research may facilitate progress towards the final makeup of the complex, but recommends that contract research should comprise no more than one-quarter of the appropriated funds for U.S. assistance in Russia's efforts to restructure that complex. In addition, the Committee recognizes the importance of educational programs in non-proliferation studies that can contribute to managing conversion of weapons activities through approaches that minimize any risks of proliferation of materials or expertise.

The recommendation provides \$24,500,000 for the Initiative for Proliferation Prevention, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the request. These programs contribute to the international non-proliferation effort by engaging highly qualified and knowledgeable scientists, engineers, and technicians from Russia and the former states of the Soviet Union in cooperative commercial and other high technology non-military activities.

The recommendation includes \$3,000,000 for the Russian Reactor Spent Fuel Acceptance Program.

*Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia.*—Independent of the budget request for arms control, the Department requested funding for a new series of initiatives referred to collectively as the long-term nonproliferation program for Russia. The initiative proposes to achieve a 20-year moratorium on accumulation of separated plutonium from civil power reactors by offering incentives, including a program for the joint development of proliferation resistant reactor technologies, the construction of a dry spent fuel storage facility, and the exploration of permanent disposition options for spent nuclear fuel and high level waste. Implementation of the program is dependent on the Russians' adherence to a commitment

not to engage in nuclear cooperation with Iran beyond the Bushehr Unit 1 project. The Committee commends the administration on its efforts in this important area of nonproliferation and endorses the overall concept. However, the Committee remains concerned that the United States and Russia have not completed an agreement to support the initiative, and Russia has not moved to resolve issues regarding nuclear cooperation with Iran. Pending resolution of these concerns, the Committee recommendation does not provide at this time the \$70,000,000 requested for nonproliferation and the nuclear fuel cycle.

The long-term nonproliferation program for Russia also included additional funds for ongoing efforts in the area of materials protection, control and accounting; and the accelerated closure of serial production facilities within Russian nuclear cities. The Committee supports the additional funding for these ongoing programs and has considered them in conjunction with the regular budget requests.

*International materials protection, control, and accounting.*—The recommendation provides \$173,856,000 for international material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities, an increase of \$24,000,000 over the original budget request. The Committee continues to consider these activities extremely important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union. The increased funding will allow for additional material consolidation and control work, an expanded program of MPC&A at several Russian Navy sites, and expanded MPC&A efforts within defense-related and important civilian and regulatory sites in Russia. The Committee continues to believe that these activities are critical elements of the United States non-proliferation efforts.

*HEU (Highly Enriched Uranium) Transparency Implementation.*—The Committee recommendation includes \$15,190,000, the amount of the budget request for the HEU Transparency Implementation program of the Department of Energy. This program is responsible for ensuring that the non-proliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This Agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium [LEU] derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the Agreement, conversion of the HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of this program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides, that permit the United States to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the Agreement.

*International Nuclear Safety.*—The Committee recommendation is \$20,000,000, the full budget request for the International Nuclear Safety program.

The purpose of the International Nuclear Safety program is to improve nuclear power plant safety by transferring U.S. technology, equipment, methods, know-how and experience in the areas of training and simulators, operating and emergency procedures, safety maintenance, safety system upgrades, fire safety, reactor safety analysis to host country through joint agreements with the U.S. Efforts are primarily focused in Russia and the States of the Former Soviet Union.

The Committee supports DOE's efforts to use the experience and expertise of scientists of the former Soviet Union to address waste management and environmental remediation challenges within the DOE complex. The International Centers for Environmental Safety have demonstrated the potential for realizing considerable cost savings through the selected use of Russian expertise for that purpose.

*Fissile Materials Disposition.*—The Committee recommends \$251,367,000 for fissile materials disposition, an increase of \$27,932,000 over the budget request. This 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.

Excess weapons grade plutonium in Russia is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States because of the possibility that it will fall into the hands of non-Russian entities or provide Russia with the ability to rebuild its nuclear arsenal at a rate the United States may be unable to equal. For that reason, the Committee considers the Department's material disposition program of equal importance to weapons activities; both are integral components of our national effort to reduce any threat posed to the United States and to deter the threat that remains. The Committee commends the administration for its substantial progress in completing the United States/Russian plutonium disposition agreement.

The Committee recommendation includes \$135,517,000 for U.S. surplus materials disposition, the same as the original budget request. The Committee recommendation includes a reduction of \$10,000,000 in projected savings from the NNSA's decision to not pursue production of the lead test assemblies for MOX fuel at the TA-55 facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee strongly urges the NNSA not to close out the LTA operation at TA-55 until it has a workable commitment for LTA production elsewhere. The Committee recommendation includes the transfer of \$37,932,000 associated with the highly enriched uranium blend down project.

The Committee recommendation includes \$10,000,000 to support the joint United States-Russian program to develop an advanced reactor to consume large quantities of excess weapons plutonium. The primary purpose of the joint United States-Russian program for the development of an advanced reactor is the design and eventual construction of a demonstration reactor in Russia for the purpose of surplus weapons plutonium disposition. However, the United States must take full advantage of the development of this attractive technology for a possible next generation nuclear power reactor for United States and foreign markets. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to explore opportunities to develop and exploit this technology for commercial purposes. The Office of Nuclear Energy should take the lead in planning and implementation of initiatives to support this effort.

Preliminary studies, funded under the Department's Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program that involved the Kurchatov Institute and Brookhaven National Laboratory, explored the utili-

zation of weapons-grade plutonium in thorium-based fuel assemblies in light water reactors. These studies suggest that plutonium may be consumed at rates well in excess of other reactor designs and with greatly reduced impacts on existing reactor safety and control systems. The Committee encourages the Department to investigate this technology, evaluate its feasibility as an additional alternative for the disposition of weapons-surplus plutonium in light water reactor designs that are utilized in significant numbers around the world, and submit a report to the Committee no later than March 1, 2001.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation includes \$41,550,000 for program direction within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, the amount of the budget request.

#### NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$677,600,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 673,083,000
House allowance .....	677,600,000
Committee recommendation .....	694,600,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Naval Reactors Program within the NNSA provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is \$694,600,000, an increase of \$17,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee has provided an additional \$17,000,000 to optimize the program to shutdown prototype reactors and complete all major inactivation work by fiscal year 2002. The Committee supports this effort and urges the Department to review the need for additional funding in future years, and to take appropriate action to request additional resources as may be needed in future budgets.

#### OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Appropriations, 2000 .....	
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	
House allowance .....	
Committee recommendation .....	\$10,000,000

The Committee has included \$10,000,000 to cover the expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). Legislation to create the NNSA was only recently enacted, and the fiscal year 2001 budget request did not contain necessary funding for the Administrator to carry out his management and oversight responsibilities. In an effort to ensure appropriate and effective oversight of the programs and activities under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001. The Committee expects to be fully and currently informed of the details



of the makeup of the Office of the Administrator. Further, the Committee expects that future budget request for the Office of the Administrator will be developed by the Administrator.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

### OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

#### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$4,467,308,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 4,562,057,000
House allowance .....	4,522,707,000
Committee recommendation .....	4,635,763,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,635,763,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management programs for fiscal year 2001. This is \$84,236,000 over the budget request.

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. The "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" appropriation is organized into two program accounts, site/project completion and post-2006 completion to reflect the emphasis on project completion and site closures.

Fiscal year 1999 budget request was the first fiscal year that the environmental management program structure was aligned with DOE's 2006 plan. All activities have been organized into projects, which have more defined scopes, schedules, and costs that support a defined end state at each specific site. In addition, the environmental management budget is organized into program decision units that focus on the end-date of the project. Those decision units are site closure, site/project completion, post-2006 completion; science and technology; and program direction.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is beginning to turn the corner in the cleanup effort. Leadership within the Department has put in place initiatives which have produced greater efficiencies, reduced cost growth on many projects, and resulted in moving the program from the study phase to the cleanup of facilities. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 2001 is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

Budget constraints will continue to check future large increases and additional efficiencies will be required. However, even with

these constraints, tremendous progress continues to be made both in tangible, on-the-ground results and in the business practices within the program. The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough businesslike approaches to program execution. The Department should continue the critical review of the need and requirement for each individual support service contract, and duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements and functions.

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relatively small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintain buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible.

#### SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of \$939,519,000 is recommended for site and project completion activities, including \$897,975,000 for operation and maintenance, and \$41,544,000 for construction.

This account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission (for example, environmental management, nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship, or scientific research) will continue beyond 2006. These activities are focused on completing projects by 2006 and distinguishes these projects from the long-term projects or activities at the sites, such as high level waste vitrification or the Department's other enduring missions. The largest amount of funding requested is for activities at the Hanford, WA, Savannah River, SC, and Idaho sites. A significant amount of work is expected to be completed at these sites by 2006, although environmental management and other stewardship activities will continue beyond 2006.

The Committee recommendation provides an additional \$10,000,000 to accelerate the stabilization of nuclear materials under the 94-1 program at the Savannah River Site, including expediting rack construction and testing for Americium/Curium stabilization project, development of safety documentation and other pre-operational activities to support planned stabilization campaign, and continued operation of the process for plutonium residues. The Committee recommendation also reflects the transfer of \$37,932,000 associated with the highly enriched uranium blend down project to the fissile materials disposition program within defense nuclear nonproliferation, and a transfer of \$22,500,000 to the science and technology sub-account for technology validation and verification activities.

The Committee urges the Department to consider a proposal, if submitted, by the University of South Carolina's Center for Water Research and Policy that would extend their current partnership within the Savannah River Basin area.

Additional funding of \$19,000,000 is provided for ongoing environmental management activities and to maintain compliance with relevant clean-up agreements at Hanford as follows: \$12,000,000 is provided for the K-basin spent nuclear fuel project and should be used to accelerate activities associated with disposal of the residual sludge that will remain after removal and packaging of the spent fuel; and \$7,000,000 is provided to accelerate stabilization activities at the plutonium finishing plant to support Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board milestone activities and reduce safety risks associated with storing large quantities of plutonium-bearing materials.

#### POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for Post-2006 completion activities is \$3,167,725,000, which includes \$2,647,525,000 in operating expenses, a \$420,000,000 contribution to the UED&D fund and \$99,732,000 for construction.

The Post-2006 completion request supports projects that are projected to continue well beyond 2006. As cleanup is completed, it will be necessary for environmental management to maintain a presence at most sites to monitor, maintain, and provide information on the continued residual contamination. These activities are required to ensure the reduction in risk to human health is maintained.

Of the amounts recommended, the Committee has included an increase of \$10,000,000 for environmental restoration work at the Hanford Site to accommodate increased work, maintain the compliance schedule, and continue the successful program to cocoon the old production reactors. Within the \$10,000,000 additional funds provided for Environmental Restoration at Hanford, the Committee directs that up to \$950,000 in hazard mitigation funds be available to protect the health and safety of workers and to ensure safe, controlled public access to the 105 B Reactor to preserve its status as a historic building listed on the National Register.

A recent audit by the Environmental Protection Agency's Inspector General concludes that Hanford is behind schedule on several Tri-Party Agreement Milestones and this is increasing the risk of major contamination. The Committee recommendation provides an additional \$25,000,000 to the Hanford tank program to achieve compliance with the Tri-Party Agreement. This money should be used to pump high-level radioactive waste into double-shell tanks, protect the vadose zone, and ensure the tank waste is treated and readied in a timely manner for ultimate vitrification.

The Committee urges the Department to carry out the intent of the legislation that created the separate Office of River Protection by according to the Office and its manager the autonomy and authorities needed to manage all aspects of the tank waste cleanup effort at Hanford in an efficient and streamlined manner. Specifically, the Office should have line management responsibility for contracting, nuclear safety, financial, program management, and other authority necessary to manage the tank waste cleanup effort.

The Committee recommendation includes \$23,800,000 transferred from the Office of Nuclear Energy for uranium programs activities.

The Committee notes that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, as the world's only operating geological repository, has elements that are analogous to all future repositories. While WIPP does not store weapons grade materials, it is in a unique position to serve as a test bed for development and demonstration of transparency techniques and technologies for repositories that can assist in implementing future arms-reduction processes and reduce concerns over proliferation vulnerabilities associated with storage or disposal of weapons-grade materials in future repositories. The Committee recommends \$3,200,000 from within available funds for a transparency demonstration projects at WIPP under the direction of the Carlsbad Office to begin implementation of the plan for this effort that was required by the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000.

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An appropriation of \$252,948,000 is recommended for science and technology activities related to the environmental waste cleanup program, an increase of \$56,400,000 over the original budget request.

The Science and Technology Program provides new or improved technologies and research results that reduce risks to workers, the public and the environment; reduce cleanup costs; and/or provide solutions to environmental problems that currently have no solutions. New and improved technologies have the potential to reduce environmental restoration and cleanup costs by an estimated several billion dollars.

Of the amounts recommended, the Committee has included an increase of \$10,000,000 for the environmental management science program; an increase of \$8,000,000 for accelerated site technology deployment; and an additional \$5,500,000 for the long term environmental stewardship program at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), to address technology issues related to site monitoring and maintenance, environmental monitoring, application and enforcement of institutional controls, and information management. The Committee recommendation supports the University Research Program in Robotics at an amount of \$4,350,000; and includes an additional \$400,000 to begin conceptual design of the Subsurface Geosciences Laboratory at INEEL and expects the Department to include a request for final design activities with its fiscal year 2002 budget request. The Committee recommendation also reflects the transfer of \$22,500,000 from the "Site/project completion" sub-account to the "Science and technology" sub-account, and additional funding of \$6,500,000 for the low dose radiation effects program.

The Committee understands that the Department's Environmental Management Deactivation and Decommissioning mortgage is at least \$4,000,000,000 and that the D&D focus area has helped deploy a number of new technologies that have been cost effective in reducing this D&D mortgage, and thereby reducing risks to site workers, the public and the environment. The Committee recommendation provides \$20,372,000 for the D&D focus area, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the request.

The Committee recommends that the current cooperative agreement with the Waste-management Education and Research Consortium be extended for a 5 year period at a level of \$2,500,000 annually to continue their support for environmental education and technology development.

The Committee recognizes the work carried out by the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory [DIAL] for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program. This work has led to the development of instrumentation and technology of value to the Department's cleanup effort. The Committee recommendation supports DIAL at \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, an increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget request.

Upon successful completion of supplemental testing to which the Department has committed funding, the Department is directed to use \$4,000,000 of available funds to continue its evaluation, development and demonstration of the Advanced Vitrification System and its application to waste cleanup at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. The supplemental testing is to be completed by March 1, 2001, and a report submitted to the Congress.

#### PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals \$359,888,000, which is the same as the budget request.

Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

#### DEFENSE FACILITY CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$1,060,447,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 1,082,714,000
House allowance .....	1,082,297,000
Committee recommendation .....	1,082,297,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,082,297,000 for the site closure program.

The "Site closure" account includes funding for sites where the environmental management program has established a goal of completing the cleanup mission by the end of fiscal year 2006. After the cleanup mission is complete at a site, no further DOE mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance. This account provides funding to cleanup the Rocky Flats, Fernald, Mound, Ashtabula, and Battelle Columbus sites.

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund, which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near-term results in significantly reduced out-year costs, is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term.

#### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$188,282,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 514,884,000
House allowance .....	259,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	324,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

An appropriation of \$324,000,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee recommendation provides \$259,000,000 for the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) at Hanford, Washington; \$25,092,000 for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage in Idaho; \$65,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility; and presumes the use of \$25,092,000 in prior year balances.

The Department of Energy announced in May its decision to terminate the privatization contract with BNFL for construction and operation of the TWRS at Hanford. As a result of the significant change in circumstances, the Department has estimated a revised requirement of \$370,000,000 in budget authority for continuation of the TWRS project during fiscal year 2001, composed of \$259,000,000 in new appropriations and the use of \$111,000,000 appropriated to the project in previous years. The Committee recognizes the tremendous importance of this project to the total clean-up effort at Hanford, and understands that the recommended funding will allow the Department to maintain its ability to meet the Tri-Party Agreement milestone for facility hot start by December 2007 and other commitment dates within the proposed consent decree with the State of Washington.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

#### OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$309,199,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	<sup>1</sup> 575,617,000
House allowance .....	592,235,000
Committee recommendation .....	579,463,000

<sup>1</sup> Reflects budget amendment contained in H. Doc. 106-251 for Safeguards and Security.

#### INTELLIGENCE

The Committee recommendation totals \$38,059,000, an increase of \$2,000,000 over the current year appropriation.

The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the NNSA, 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.

#### SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is \$280,087,000, an increase of \$156,987,000 over the current year appropriation.

The Department submitted a fiscal year 2001 budget amendment which consolidates DOE-wide safeguards and security expenditures within the Office of Security and Emergency Operations. The effect of the amendment would be to impose centralized Department-wide

management of security costs and operations, including the security of nuclear weapons, nuclear secrets, nuclear materials and nuclear facilities. The amendment is inconsistent with section 3212(b)(6) of Public Law 106-65, which gives the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration authority over, and responsibility for, safeguards and security for all programs and activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration. As such, the Committee has not considered the budget amendment.

*Nuclear Safeguards.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$120,409,000 for nuclear safeguards, an increase of \$3,157,000 from the current year appropriation. The Committee recommendation provides \$9,000,000 for critical infrastructure protection, an increase of \$6,900,000 over the current year appropriation.

*Security Investigations.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$33,000,000, the amount of the budget request. The amount provided includes an off-set of \$20,000,000 from program organizations that will be responsible for funding additional security investigation requirements.

*Emergency Management.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$37,311,000 for emergency management. The amount provided reflects the transfer of \$44,205,000 associated with the nuclear emergency search team and \$12,084,000 associated with the accident response group to the NNSA, as required by Public Law 106-65. The Committee recommendation otherwise provides the amount of the budget request.

*Program Direction.*—The Committee recommendation provides \$89,367,000 for program direction, the amount of the budget request.

#### INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Committee recommendation provides \$14,937,000 for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

The independent oversight and performance assurance program provides independent evaluation and oversight of safeguards, security, emergency management and cyber security for the Department at the Secretary's direction.

#### COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

An appropriation of \$45,200,000 is provided for the counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy. This is an increase of \$6,000,000 over the current years appropriation.

The Counterintelligence program has the mission of enhancing the protection of sensitive technologies, information, and expertise against foreign intelligence, industrial intelligence, and terrorist attempts to acquire nuclear weapons information or advanced technologies from the National Laboratories.

#### ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS

The Committee recommendation includes \$60,000,000 to support advanced accelerator applications. That amount includes \$5,000,000 for research and development of technologies for eco-

conomic and environmentally sound refinement of spent nuclear fuel at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The Committee is encouraged by the possibilities for leveraging the work accomplished thus far in the accelerator production of tritium (APT) program to accomplish a wide range of science and technology missions. Importantly, advanced, high-energy accelerators could be central to a future strategy to transmute spent nuclear fuel into less toxic, shorter-lived materials, thereby ensuring greater public acceptance of a nuclear waste repository.

In order to pursue these important technology opportunities while still completing necessary design work for a facility capable of producing tritium to meet possible future defense requirements, the Committee directs the Department to establish an Office of Advanced Accelerator Applications (AAA) within the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. The mission of the AAA program shall include conducting scientific, engineering research, development and demonstrations on: (1) accelerator production of tritium as a back-up technology; (2) transmutation of spent nuclear fuel and waste; (3) material science; and (4) other advanced accelerator applications. The Committee further directs that the Department transfer the APT program from the Office of Defense Programs within the NNSA to the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology for integration into the AAA office. AAA should assure that any accelerator developed by the program will be capable of producing tritium for the nation's nuclear stockpile, based on requirements identified by the Office of Defense Programs. The Committee encourages the participation of international collaborators, industrial partners, and support for new graduate engineering and science students and professors at U.S. universities.

The Committee further directs the Department to provide the Committee with a plan by March 1, 2001, that details how the mission of the AAA program will be accomplished and the annual level of funding required to support these missions. The Department shall thereafter submit to Congress an annual report of the progress in each of its mission areas.

#### ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation provided \$133,680,000 for Environmental, Safety and Health activities including \$22,604,000 for program direction. The mission of the Office of Environmental, Safety and Health is to protect the health and safety of Department of Energy workers, the public, and the environment and is to be the Department's independent advocate for safety, health and the environment.

The Committee notes that the effective management, storage, retrieval, and integration of environmental, scientific and medical records is important to ensuring public health and safety throughout the Department of Energy complex. Current Department record keeping is managed at local offices using a variety of methods and formats. Furthermore, current approaches to digitization contain overlapping functions, are not standardized, and may result in records with a very short useful life. Integrated management of these records would ensure data preservation and access, and may result in substantial savings through reduced information tech-



nology operations and maintenance costs. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes \$5,000,000 to establish a program at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for Department-wide management of electronic records.

The Committee raises a concern that the Department's current program of medical screening and education at the gaseous diffusion plants will not be sufficient to complete all necessary screening and evaluation under the current contract period. Therefore, the Committee directs the Department to ensure that all necessary screening and evaluation of workers, both current and former, is adequate and that those workers with an elevated risk of lung cancer will receive a lung scan. The Committee recommendation also provides \$1,750,000 for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky to undertake epidemiological studies of workers to identify exposure pathways, and \$880,000 to provide medical screening for workers employed at the Amchitka Nuclear Weapons Test Site.

For nearly 50 years, the State of Nevada has been the principal location for the testing of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee is aware that the State of Nevada has identified deficiencies in its Cancer Registry, Vital Statistics, and Birth Defects Registry activities. The Committee recommendation makes available up to \$1,000,000 from within available funds to allow for the enhancement of these long-term health surveillance activities.

*Energy Employees Compensation Initiative.*—The Administration proposed to establish an occupational illness compensation program for current and former workers at the Department's nuclear facilities. The Committee recommendation includes \$17,000,000 for this initiative, the same as the budget request, within Environment, Safety and Health, and makes the appropriation contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation.

#### WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee has provided an appropriation of \$24,500,000 for these activities for fiscal year 2001. This is the same as the budget request and the level recommended by the Senate authorizing committee.

The Worker and Community Transition budget provides funding for activities associated with enhanced benefits beyond those required by contract, existing company policy or collective bargaining agreements at defense nuclear facilities. The goals of the program are to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities from contractor work force restructuring, and to assist community planning for all site conversions, while managing the transition to the reduced work force that will better meet ongoing mission requirements through the application of best business practices.

Under the USEC Privatization Act, the Department has a responsibility to mitigate the impact of layoffs at the Portsmouth, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, gaseous diffusion plants. On February 3, 2000, USEC announced its intention to reduce its workforce at the two plants by 850 positions with workers separating in July 2000. In light of the adverse economic conditions in these communities, the Office of Worker and Community Transition developed worker separation benefits, in consultation with stake-

holders, to encourage voluntary separations and mitigate the impact on separating workers. These effort required the utilization of all available funds, including prior year uncosted funds. The Committee recognizes that the need to divert funding to gaseous diffusion plant workers at Portsmouth and Paducah during the current fiscal year made it impossible for the Office of Worker and Community Transition to provide a full portfolio of community grants. Under the circumstances, the Committee supports the Department's decision to divert these funds, but expects communities that were denied funding this year be granted priority status in fiscal year 2001. These communities include the Nevada Test Site; Miamisburg, Ohio; Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Pinellas, Florida; Hanford, Washington, northern and central New Mexico and the Savannah River Site in South Carolina.

The Committee strongly objects to the Department's decision to remove the requirement that management and operating contracts at DOE sites include provisions for economic development activities in the communities surrounding such sites. The Committee directs the Department to include, to the greatest extent practicable, a requirement that such contractors make a significant financial contribution to local area economic development, job creation activities, and other community activities. The Department should develop such requirements in consultation with the local elected officials representing the impacted communities.

#### OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

An appropriation of \$3,000,000 is recommended for the Office of Hearings and Appeals. The Office of Hearings and Appeals conduct all of the Department's adjudicative process and provides various administrative remedies as may be required. The goal is to promote successful and uninterrupted DOE operations through the deliberate, expeditious and equitable resolution of all claims of adverse impact emanating from the operations of the Department.

#### DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$111,574,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	112,000,000
House allowance .....	200,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	292,000,000

The Committee recommends \$292,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal, an increase of \$180,000,000 over the current year appropriation.

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 1998, the balance owed by the Federal Government to the nuclear waste fund was approaching \$1,500,000,000 (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 1999, a total of \$1,176,830,000 has been appropriated to support nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

## RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

## POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Public Law 95-91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

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

The fiscal year 2001 budget request provides authority for the use of offsetting collections from the sale of electricity to finance purchase of power and wheeling expenses previously funded by direct appropriations.

The Committee is aware that in response to FERC Order No. 2000 concerning Regional Transmission Organizations (RTOs), efforts are underway throughout the PMAs' marketing territories to explore and pursue formation of RTOs. The PMAs are actively participating in those efforts. We understand that if a PMA ultimately participates in an RTO, the impacts on certain PMA employees could be significant. The Committee encourages the PMA Administrators to use whatever administrative authorities are at their disposal with regard to accrued leave, seniority, health and retirement benefits, and other related matters to ensure that PMA employees have an equitable opportunity to compete for jobs in the RTOs. If it becomes apparent that existing administrative tools are inadequate to address these matters, legislative action may be necessary.

## BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 29 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates, and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of over 15,000 cir-

cuit-miles of transmission line and 324 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 megawatts.

Public Law 93-454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96-501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, regionwide energy conservation, and acquiring generating resources to meet these requirements.

*Borrowing authority.*—A total of \$3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommends an additional increment of \$331,200,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capitol equipment programs.

*Repayment.*—During fiscal year 1999, Bonneville will pay the Treasury \$595,000,000, 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 2001.

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

Language is included in the bill which specifically approves the expenditure of funds to initiate work on the Nez Perce Tribe resident fish substitution program, and the Couer D'Alene Tribe trout production facility.

The Committee is aware of and supports BPA's efforts to replace outdated microwave communications systems with fiber optics. Given the potential benefits, BPA is urged to continue efforts related to open-access policy.

The Committee is aware that in response to FERC's Order 2000 respecting Regional Transmission Organizations (RTO), efforts are underway in the Pacific Northwest to explore and pursue formation of an RTO. The Bonneville Power Administration is actively participating in those efforts. The Committee understands that if BPA ultimately participates in an RTO, the impacts on BPA Transmission Business Line employees could be significant. The Committee encourages the BPA Administrator to use available administrative authorities with regard to accrued leave, seniority, health and retirement benefits, and other related matters to ensure that BPA Transmission Business Line employees have an equitable opportunity to compete for jobs in the RTO. If it becomes apparent that existing administrative tools are inadequate to address these matters, legislative action may be necessary.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$39,579,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	3,900,000
House allowance .....	3,900,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,900,000

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 10 Southeastern States. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through transmission 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 concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER  
ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$27,891,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	28,100,000
House allowance .....	28,100,000
Committee recommendation .....	28,100,000

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

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$192,602,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	164,916,000
House allowance .....	160,930,000
Committee recommendation .....	164,916,000

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

with 257 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

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

The Committee concurs with the financing of purchased power and wheeling costs as proposed in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

#### FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95. This legislation also directed that the fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas.

The Committee recommendation is \$2,670,000, the same as the budget request.

#### RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

#### FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$174,950,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	175,200,000
House allowance .....	175,200,000
Committee recommendation .....	175,200,000

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$174,950,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	175,200,000
House allowance .....	175,200,000
Committee recommendation .....	175,200,000

The Committee recommendation provides \$175,200,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regulates key interstate aspects of the electric power, natural gas, oil pipeline, and hydroelectric industries. FERC chooses regulatory approaches that foster competitive markets whenever possible, assures access to re-

liable service at a reasonable price, and gives full and fair consideration to environmental and community impacts in assessing the public interest of energy projects. Due to major changes in the energy sector over the past decade, FERC will be shifting away from its traditional regulation of energy industries to combining its regulation of energy markets into one program.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendation for programs in Title III, Department of Energy, are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
<b>ENERGY SUPPLY</b>				
<b>RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES</b>				
Renewable energy technologies:				
Biomass/biofuels energy systems:				
Power systems .....	32,500	47,830	33,462	47,600
Transportation .....	39,500	54,110	46,160	43,750
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems .....	72,000	101,940	79,622	91,350
Biomass/biofuels energy research .....	26,740	26,740	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass .....	98,740	128,680	106,362	118,090
Geothermal technology development .....	24,000	26,970	26,925	28,000
Hydrogen research .....	25,000	22,940	23,000	30,950
Hydrogen energy research .....	2,970	2,970	2,970	2,970
Subtotal, Hydrogen .....	27,970	25,910	25,970	33,920
Hydropower .....	5,000	5,000	3,488	5,500
Solar energy:				
Concentrating solar power .....	15,410	14,940	13,800	14,000
Photovoltaic energy systems .....	67,000	81,450	75,775	76,500
Photovoltaic energy research .....	2,847	2,847	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic .....	69,847	84,297	78,622	79,347
Solar building technology research .....	2,000	4,470	3,950	4,500
Solar photoconversion energy research .....	14,260	14,260	14,260	14,260
Subtotal, Solar energy .....	101,517	117,967	110,632	112,107
Wind energy systems .....	33,000	50,140	36,900	43,617
Wind energy research .....	283	283	283	283



Subtotal, Wind .....	33,283	50,423	37,183	43,900
Total, Renewable energy technologies .....	290,510	354,950	310,560	341,517
Electric energy systems and storage:				
High temperature superconducting R&D .....	31,910	31,900	31,900	41,000
Energy storage systems .....	3,500	5,000	4,000	6,000
Transmission reliability .....	3,000	10,960	5,975	12,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage .....	38,410	47,860	41,875	59,000
Renewable support and implementation:				
Departmental energy management .....	.....	4,988	2,000	2,000
International renewable energy program .....	4,000	11,460	4,000	6,000
Renewable energy production incentive program .....	1,500	4,000	3,925	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources .....	4,000	5,000	2,000	6,600
Renewable program support .....	5,000	6,500	4,000	3,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation .....	14,500	31,948	15,925	21,600
National renewable energy laboratory .....	1,100	1,900	4,000	4,000
Program direction .....	17,720	18,159	18,159	18,000
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES .....	362,240	454,817	390,519	444,117
NUCLEAR ENERGY				
Advanced radioisotope power system .....	34,500	30,864	29,200	34,200
Isotopes: Isotope support and production .....	13,000	16,218	22,715	16,715
Construction: 99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL) .....	7,500	500	500	4,500
Subtotal, Isotope support and production .....	20,500	16,718	23,215	21,215
Offsetting collections .....	.....	.....	-8,000	.....
Total, Isotopes .....	20,500	16,718	15,215	21,215
University reactor fuel assistance and support .....	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
<b>Research and development:</b>				
Civilian research and development .....	9,000	.....	.....	.....
Nuclear energy plant optimization .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative .....	22,500	34,903	22,500	41,500
<b>Total, Research and development .....</b>	<b>36,500</b>	<b>39,903</b>	<b>27,500</b>	<b>46,500</b>
<b>Infrastructure:</b>				
ANL-West operations .....	.....	.....	39,150	.....
Fast flux test facility (FFTF) .....	28,000	38,524	39,000	44,010
Test reactor area landlord .....	6,070	7,415	7,575	7,575
Construction:				
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID .....	1,430	879	925	925
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID .....	1,500	458	500	500
<b>Subtotal, Construction .....</b>	<b>2,930</b>	<b>1,337</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>1,425</b>
<b>Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord .....</b>	<b>9,000</b>	<b>8,752</b>	<b>9,000</b>	<b>9,000</b>
<b>Total, Infrastructure .....</b>	<b>37,000</b>	<b>47,276</b>	<b>87,150</b>	<b>53,010</b>
<b>Nuclear facilities management .....</b>	<b>80,000</b>	<b>66,126</b>	.....	<b>74,000</b>
<b>Termination activities:</b>				
EBR-II shutdown .....	.....	.....	8,800	.....
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials .....	.....	.....	16,200	.....
Disposition technology activities .....	.....	.....	9,850	.....
<b>Total, Termination activities .....</b>	.....	.....	<b>34,850</b>	.....
<b>Uranium programs .....</b>	<b>43,500</b>	<b>47,779</b>	.....	.....
Program direction .....	24,700	27,620	25,900	24,700
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	-3,541

TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY .....	288,700	288,286	231,815	262,084
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
Environment, safety and health .....	20,000	19,906	15,002	20,000
Program direction .....	18,998	19,998	19,998	18,998
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	- 677
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH .....	38,998	39,904	35,000	38,321
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES				
Technical information management program .....	1,600	1,802	1,250	1,600
Program direction .....	7,000	7,335	7,350	7,000
Total, Technical information management program .....	8,600	9,137	8,600	8,600
Transfer to OSHA .....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	- 150
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	9,600	9,137	8,600	8,450
Subtotal, Energy supply .....	699,538	792,144	665,934	752,972
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-1,155	.....	.....	.....
Renewable energy research program .....	-47,100	-47,100	-47,100	-47,100
General reduction .....	6,000	.....	.....	.....
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC .....	-5,821	-12,000	.....	-12,000
Contractor travel savings .....	-1,500	.....	.....	.....
Offset from revenue sharing .....	.....	-2,352	-2,352	-2,352
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY .....	637,962	730,692	616,482	691,520
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT				
Site closure .....	216,946	81,248	81,636	81,636
Site/project completion .....	95,250	63,798	59,721	54,721
Construction: 93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL .....	2,500	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Total, Site/project completion .....	97,750	63,798	59,721	54,721
Post 2006 completion .....	18,922	137,766	139,644	178,244
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106–113) .....	– 1,268	.....	.....	.....
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	– 5,460
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT .....	332,350	282,812	281,001	309,141
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND				
Decontamination and decommissioning .....	220,198	264,588	.....	273,038
Uranium/thorium reimbursement .....	30,000	30,000	.....	30,000
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106–113) .....	– 951	.....	.....	.....
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	– 5,260
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING .....	249,247	294,588	.....	297,778
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION				
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund:				
Decontamination and decommissioning .....	.....	.....	230,000	.....
Uranium/thorium reimbursement .....	.....	.....	30,000	.....
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund .....	.....	.....	260,000	.....
Other Uranium Activities:				
Maintenance of facilities and inventories .....	.....	.....	29,193	.....
Pre-existing liabilities .....	.....	.....	11,330	.....
Depleted UF6 conversion project .....	.....	.....	12,877	.....
Total, Other uranium activities .....	.....	.....	53,400	.....
Subtotal, Uranium facilities maint AND remediation .....	.....	.....	313,400	.....

Transfer from USEC .....				— 12,000	
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION .....				301,400	
SCIENCE					
High energy physics:					
Research and technology .....	229,190	236,000	224,820	216,020	
Facility operations .....	450,000	440,872	457,510	428,610	
Construction:					
00-G-307 SLAC office building .....	2,000	5,200	5,200	5,200	
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab .....	4,700	4,200	4,200	4,200	
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab .....	22,000	23,000	23,000	23,000	
Subtotal, Construction .....	28,700	32,400	32,400	32,400	
Subtotal, Facility operations .....	478,700	473,272	489,910	461,010	
Total, High energy physics .....	707,890	709,272	714,730	677,030	
Nuclear physics .....	352,000	365,069	369,890	350,274	
Biological and environmental research .....	441,500	435,954	404,000	441,500	
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL .....		2,500		2,500	
Total, Biological and environmental research .....	441,500	438,454	404,000	444,000	
Basic energy sciences:					
Materials sciences .....	405,000	448,964	413,000	408,363	
Chemical sciences .....	209,582	219,090	209,000	216,229	
Engineering and geosciences .....	37,545	40,304	38,000	39,816	
Energy biosciences .....	31,000	33,662	31,000	28,274	
Construction: 99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL) .....	100,000	261,900	100,000	221,900	
Total, Basic energy sciences .....	783,127	1,003,920	791,000	914,582	
Other energy research:					
Advanced scientific computing research .....	132,000	179,817	137,000	139,970	
Energy research analyses .....	1,000	988	1,000	1,000	

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:				
Infrastructure support .....	2,160	1,023	1,160	1,160
Oak Ridge landlord .....	11,800	7,475	10,711	10,711
Construction: MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations .....	18,351	22,059	22,059	22,059
Multiprogram general purpose facilities:				
Construction: 94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL) .....	749	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs .....	33,060	30,557	33,930	33,930
Total, Other energy research .....	166,060	211,362	171,930	174,900
Fusion energy sciences program .....	250,000	243,907	255,000	227,270
Safeguards and security .....	.....	49,818	.....	.....
Program direction:				
Field offices .....	78,748	82,929	82,062	78,307
Headquarters .....	52,360	51,408	51,438	51,438
Science education .....	.....	6,500	4,500	3,000
Total, Program direction .....	131,108	140,837	138,000	132,745
Subtotal, Science .....	2,831,685	3,162,639	2,844,550	2,920,801
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	- 12,224	.....	.....	.....
Contractor travel savings .....	- 10,834	.....	.....	.....
General reduction .....	- 21,000	.....	- 13,635	- 50,689
TOTAL, SCIENCE .....	2,787,627	3,162,639	2,830,915	2,870,112
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
Administrative operations:				
Salaries and expenses:				
Office of the Secretary .....	4,940	6,648	5,000	6,648

Board of contract appeals .....	838	878	878	878
Chief financial officer .....	26,000	30,748	28,000	30,748
Contract reform .....	3,000	2,500	2,500	2,500
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs .....	4,910	5,146	5,000	5,146
Economic impact and diversity .....	4,700	5,126	5,100	5,126
Field management .....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
General counsel .....	20,750	22,724	21,800	22,724
International affairs .....	.....	9,400	7,000	9,400
Management and administration .....	98,000	78,882	77,800	78,882
Policy office .....	14,000	6,688	6,600	6,688
Public affairs .....	3,700	4,150	3,900	4,150
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses .....	181,838	172,890	163,578	172,890
Program support:				
Minority economic impact .....	1,700	1,498	1,500	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies .....	350	406	422	422
Environmental policy studies .....	1,000	1,600	1,000	1,000
Scientific and technical training .....	450	.....	.....	.....
Corporate management information program .....	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Program support .....	15,500	15,504	14,922	14,922
Total, Administrative operations .....	1,97,338	188,394	178,500	187,812
Cost of work for others .....	34,027	34,027	34,027	34,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration .....	231,365	222,421	212,527	221,839
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-784	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments .....	-15,000	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
Transfer from other defense activities .....	-10,000	.....	-51,000	.....
General reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	-3,711
Total, Departmental administration (gross) .....	205,581	214,421	153,527	210,128
Miscellaneous revenues .....	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000	-128,762
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net) .....	98,694	85,659	42,527	81,366

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL				
Office of Inspector General .....	29,500	33,000	31,500	28,988
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
Stewardship operation and maintenance:				
Core stockpile stewardship .....	1,610,355			
Stockpile management .....	1,804,621			
Directed stockpile work:				
Stockpile research and development .....		243,300	243,300	268,300
Stockpile maintenance .....		257,994	266,994	282,994
Stockpile evaluation .....		151,710	162,710	171,710
Dismantlement/disposal .....		29,260	29,260	29,260
Production support .....		149,939	149,939	149,939
Field engineering, training and manuals .....		4,400	4,400	4,400
Safeguards and Security Amend. reduction .....		– 17,427		
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work .....		819,176	856,603	906,603
Campaigns:				
Primary certification .....		41,400	41,400	51,400
Dynamic materials properties .....		64,408	64,408	64,408
Advanced radiography .....		43,000	43,000	58,000
Construction: 97–D–102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM .....	61,000	35,232	35,232	35,232
Subtotal, Advanced radiography .....	61,000	78,232	78,232	93,232
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins .....		52,964	52,964	52,964
Enhanced surety .....		40,600	40,600	40,600
Weapons system engineering certification .....		16,300	16,300	16,300
Certification in hostile environments .....		15,400	15,400	15,400
Enhanced surveillance .....		89,651	89,651	106,651



Advanced design and production technologies	75,735	75,735	75,735	75,735
Inertial confinement fusion	120,800	290,500	120,800	120,800
Construction:				
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	248,100	73,469	74,100	74,100
Subtotal, inertial confinement fusion	248,100	194,269	364,600	194,900
Defense computing and modeling		249,100	706,175	249,100
Construction:				
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA		2,300	2,300	2,300
00-D-103, Terascal simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,000	4,900	5,000	5,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	26,000	56,000	56,000	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,800	6,700	6,700	6,700
Subtotal, Construction	35,800	69,900	70,000	70,000
Subtotal, Defense computing and modeling	35,800	319,000	776,175	319,100
Pit manufacturing readiness		108,038	110,038	123,038
Secondary readiness		15,000	15,000	25,000
Materials readiness		40,511	40,511	40,511
Tritium readiness		77,000	77,000	58,000
Construction:				
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	33,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	36,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Subtotal, Construction	69,000	75,000	100,000	75,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	69,000	152,000	177,000	133,000
Safeguards and Security Amend. reduction		-52,204		
Subtotal, Campaigns	413,900	1,251,304	1,958,014	1,352,239
Readiness in technical base and facilities:				
Operations of facilities		1,313,432	1,198,732	1,449,721
Program readiness		75,800	75,800	75,800
Special projects		48,297	31,297	53,297
Material recycle and recovery		22,018	22,018	37,018
Containers		7,876	7,876	7,876
Storage		9,075	9,075	9,075
Advanced simulation and computing		477,075		477,075

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Safeguards and Security Amend. reduction .....		– 220,867		
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac .....		1,732,706	1,344,798	2,109,862
Construction:				
01–D–103 Preliminary project engineering and design, various locations .....		14,500	14,500	29,500
01–D–124 HEU storage facility, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN .....		17,749	17,800	17,800
01–D–126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX .....		3,000	3,000	3,000
99–D–102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	3,900			
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	2,000	4,975	5,000	5,000
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	2,400	2,786	2,800	2,800
99–D–105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM .....	1,000			
99–D–106 Model validation AND system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM .....	6,500	5,200	5,200	5,200
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV .....	5,000	1,874	2,000	2,000
99–D–122 Rapid reactivation, various locations .....	11,700			
99–D–125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO .....		13,000	13,000	13,000
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO .....	17,000	23,566	23,765	23,765
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX .....	3,429	4,998	4,998	4,998
98–D–123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC ....	21,800	30,767	30,767	30,767
98–D–124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN .....	3,150			
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS .....	4,800	2,864	2,918	2,918
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations .....	2,640			
96–D–104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory (SNL) .....	10,900			
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL) .....	15,000	13,337	13,337	13,337
Subtotal, Construction .....	111,219	138,616	139,085	154,085
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac .....	111,219	1,871,322	1,483,883	2,263,947
Total, Stewardship operation and maintenance .....	3,940,095	3,941,802	4,298,500	4,522,789
Inertial fusion .....	227,600			

154

Technology transfer/education:					
Technology transfer .....	14,500				
Education .....	18,600				
Total, Technology transfer/education .....	33,100				
Transportation safeguards division:					
Operations and equipment .....	60,000	79,357	79,357	79,357	79,357
Program direction .....	31,812	36,316	36,316	36,316	36,316
Total, Transportation safeguards division .....	91,812	115,673	115,673	115,673	115,673
Safeguards and security .....					
Construction:					
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM .....	11,300		18,043	18,043	18,043
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX .....	3,500		2,713	2,713	2,713
Subtotal, Construction .....	14,800		20,756	20,756	20,756
Total, Safeguards and security .....	14,800		20,756	20,756	20,756
Safeguards and security (S0):					
Operations and maintenance .....		356,840			
Construction:					
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, MN .....		18,043			
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX .....		2,713			
Total, Construction .....		20,756			
Program direction .....	209,000	204,154	216,871	224,071	224,071
Subtotal, Weapons activities .....	4,516,407	4,639,225	4,651,800	4,883,289	4,883,289
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	- 16,887				
Use of prior year balances .....	- 7,668				
Contractor travel savings .....	- 30,000		- 46,000		
Directed savings .....	- 5,000				
General reduction .....	- 29,800		- 26,116		

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES .....	4,427,052	4,639,225	4,579,684	4,883,289
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION				
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D .....	215,000	216,550	215,000	245,990
Construction: 500-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL .....	6,000	7,000	7,000	17,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D .....	221,000	223,550	222,000	262,990
Arms control .....	281,000	119,915	141,514	138,014
International materials protection, control, and accounting .....	.....	146,081	169,856	173,856
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia .....	.....	100,000	.....	.....
HEU transparency implementation .....	15,750	15,166	15,190	15,190
International nuclear safety .....	15,000	18,902	20,000	20,000
Fissile materials disposition .....	134,766	.....	.....	.....
U.S. surplus materials disposition .....	.....	117,912	139,517	135,517
Russian surplus materials disposition .....	.....	34,803	40,000	40,000
Program direction—MD .....	7,343	9,878	.....	9,918
Construction:				
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC .....	.....	.....	20,932	27,932
01-D-142 Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations .....	.....	3,000	3,000	3,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations .....	18,751	20,000	20,000	20,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations .....	12,375	15,000	18,000	21,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	31,126	38,000	61,932	71,932
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition .....	173,235	200,593	241,449	257,367
Program direction .....	89,000	41,383	51,468	41,550
Use of prior year balances .....	-49,000	.....	.....	.....
Directed savings .....	-5,000	.....	.....	.....
Contractor travel savings .....	-11,885	.....	.....	.....

TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION .....	729,100	865,590	861,477	908,967
NAVAL REACTORS				
Naval reactors development .....	633,000	623,063	627,500	644,500
Construction:				
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations .....	9,000	11,400	11,400	11,400
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY .....	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations .....	3,000	.....	.....	.....
90-N-102 Expanded core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID .....	12,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	24,000	28,700	28,700	28,700
Subtotal, Naval reactors development .....	657,000	651,763	656,200	673,200
Program direction .....	20,600	21,320	21,400	21,400
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS .....	677,600	673,083	677,600	694,600
Office of the Administrator .....	.....	.....	.....	10,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION .....	5,833,752	6,177,898	6,118,761	6,496,856
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.				
Site/project completion:	902,002	856,812	900,167	897,975
Operation and maintenance .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Construction:				
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID .....	.....	481	500	500
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC .....	.....	27,932	.....	.....
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	3,100	7,714	7,714	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID .....	5,000	4,277	4,300	4,300
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC .....	2,977	.....	.....	.....
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA .....	16,860	1,690	1,690	1,690
98-D-700 Road rehabilitation (INEL), ID .....	2,590	.....	.....	.....
97-D-450 Savannah River nuclear material storage, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC .....	4,000	.....	.....	.....
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	12,220	3,949	3,949	3,949
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA .....	20,941	.....	.....	.....
96-D-464 Electrical AND utility systems upgrade, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID .....	11,971	.....	.....	.....
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC .....	931	12,512	12,512	12,512

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
92–D–140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC .....		8,879	8,879	8,879
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA .....	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction .....	82,590	69,434	41,544	41,544
Total, Site/project completion .....	984,592	926,246	941,711	939,519
Post 2006 completion:				
Operation and maintenance .....	2,511,997	2,453,735	2,548,033	2,647,993
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution .....	420,000	420,000	420,000	420,000
Construction:				
01–D–403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA .....		1,300	1,300	1,300
00–D–401 Spent Nuclear Fuel treatment and storage facility Title I AND II, Savannah River, SC .....	7,000			
99–D–403 Privatization Phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA .....	13,988	7,812	7,812	7,812
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA .....	20,516	46,023	46,023	46,023
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA .....	4,060	17,385	17,385	17,385
93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC .....	8,987	27,212	27,212	27,212
Subtotal, Construction .....	54,551	99,732	99,732	99,732
Total, Post 2006 completion .....	2,986,548	2,973,467	3,067,765	3,167,725
Science and technology .....	230,500	195,032	242,548	252,948
Safeguards and security .....		203,748		
Program direction .....	339,409	347,881	355,000	359,888
Subtotal, Defense environmental management .....	4,541,049	4,646,374	4,607,024	4,720,080
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106–113) .....	– 17,041			
Use of prior year balances/general reduction .....	– 40,000	– 34,317	– 34,317	– 34,317
Contractor travel savings .....	– 6,000			
Pension refund .....	– 8,700	– 50,000	– 50,000	– 50,000
Directed savings .....	– 2,000			

TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT .....	4,467,308	4,562,057	4,522,707	4,635,763
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS				
Site closure .....	1,064,492	1,027,942	1,082,297	1,082,297
Safeguards and security .....	-4,045	54,772	.....	.....
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS .....	1,060,447	1,082,714	1,082,297	1,082,297
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION				
Privatization initiatives, various locations .....	233,000	539,976	284,092	349,092
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-718	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances .....	-44,000	-25,092	-25,092	-25,092
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION .....	188,282	514,884	259,000	324,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT .....	5,716,037	6,159,655	5,864,004	6,042,060
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
Other national security programs:	36,059	35,010	36,059	36,059
Intelligence .....	.....	1,975	2,000	2,000
Construction: 01-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Intelligence .....	36,059	36,985	38,059	38,059
Security and emergency operations:	69,100	123,566	116,409	120,409
Nuclear safeguards .....	33,000	38,597	33,000	33,000
Security investigations .....	21,000	91,773	90,000	37,311
Emergency management .....	.....	89,367	92,967	89,367
Program direction .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations .....	123,100	343,303	332,376	280,087
Counterintelligence .....	39,200	44,328	45,200	45,200
Advanced accelerator applications .....	.....	.....	.....	60,000
Independent oversight and performance assurance .....	3,000	.....	.....	.....
Program direction .....	2,000	14,937	14,937	14,937
Subtotal, Independent oversight .....	5,000	14,937	14,937	14,937

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued  
[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Environment, safety and health (Defense) .....	73,231	85,963	80,559	111,076
Program direction—EH .....	24,769	22,604	22,604	22,604
Subtotal, Environment, safety AND health (Defense) .....	98,000	108,567	103,163	133,680
Worker and community transition .....	21,000	21,497	21,500	21,500
Program direction—WT .....	3,500	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition .....	24,500	24,497	24,500	24,500
National Security programs administrative support .....	10,000	.....	51,000	.....
Office of hearings and appeals .....	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other national security programs .....	338,859	575,617	612,235	599,463
Contractor travel savings .....	-1,115	.....	.....	.....
Total, Other national security programs .....	337,744	575,617	612,235	599,463
Subtotal, Other defense activities .....	337,744	575,617	612,235	599,463
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-6,545	.....	.....	.....
Offset to user organizations .....	-20,000	.....	-20,000	-20,000
Directed savings .....	-2,000	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	309,199	575,617	592,235	579,463
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL				
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	112,000	112,000	200,000	292,000
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-426	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL .....	111,574	112,000	200,000	292,000



ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE			
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund .....	12,800		
Energy employees pilot project .....	2,000		
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund .....	2,200		
TOTAL, ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE .....	17,000		
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	13,042,170	12,775,000	13,410,379
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Purchase power and wheeling .....	34,463	34,463	34,463
Program direction .....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	39,463	39,463	39,463
Offsetting collections .....			
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-34,463	-34,463	-34,463
Use of prior year balances .....	-15		
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	-1,100	-1,100	-1,100
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	3,900	3,900	3,900
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses .....	3,795	3,795	3,795
Purchase power and wheeling .....	288	288	288
Program direction .....	18,388	18,388	18,388
Construction .....	6,684	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	29,288	29,288	29,288
Offsetting collections .....			
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106-113) .....	-288	-288	-288
Transfer from Southeastern Power .....	-109		
Use of prior year balances .....	-773		
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION .....	27,891	28,100	28,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
<b>WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION</b>				
Operation and maintenance:				
Construction and rehabilitation .....	26,802	23,115	23,115	23,115
System operation and maintenance .....	35,096	36,104	36,104	36,104
Purchase power and wheeling .....	41,886	35,500	35,500	42,500
Program direction .....	104,537	106,644	106,644	106,644
Utah mitigation and conservation .....	5,036	5,036	4,036	5,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance .....	213,357	206,399	205,399	213,399
Offsetting collections .....		– 35,500	– 35,500	– 42,500
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106–113) .....	– 755			
Use of prior year balances .....	– 20,000	– 5,983	– 8,969	– 5,983
<b>TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION .....</b>	<b>192,602</b>	<b>164,916</b>	<b>160,930</b>	<b>164,916</b>
<b>FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND</b>				
Operation and maintenance .....	1,309	2,670	2,670	2,670
<b>TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS .....</b>	<b>261,381</b>	<b>199,586</b>	<b>195,600</b>	<b>199,586</b>
<b>FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION</b>				
Federal energy regulatory commission .....	174,950	175,200	175,200	175,200
FERC revenues .....	– 174,950	– 175,200	– 175,200	– 175,200
<b>TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION .....</b>				
<b>NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL</b>				
Repository program .....	180,689	255,034	150,200	
Program direction .....	59,811	63,540	62,800	59,175
Across-the-board cut (.38 percent) (Public Law 106–113) .....	– 899			

TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL .....	239,601	318,574	213,000	59,175
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY .....	16,606,924	18,149,720	17,287,425	17,948,045

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts and new provisions as follows:

Language under section 301 and 302 prohibits the use of funds to award, amend or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulations unless on a case-by-case basis, a waiver is granted by the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Similar language was contained in last year's Energy and Water Development Act, Public Law 106-60. The recommendation contained herein, provided waiver authority for Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Administrator. Waiver authority for all other programs shall be provided by the Secretary of Energy.

Language is included under section 303 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to develop or implement a workforce restructuring plans or enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 484. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 304 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to initiate requests for proposals or expression 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. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 305 which permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 306 which provides that funds may be used to enter into or continued multi-year contracts without obligating the estimated costs associated with cancellation or termination of the contract. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 307 which provides that up to 6 percent of funds appropriated in this Act, including Environmental Management programs, may be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60 which provided a 4 percent limitation.

Language is included under section 308 which provides that not more than \$200,000,000 of the funds provided herein for the Department of Energy are available for reimbursement of contractor travel expenses.

Language is included under section 309 which provides that none of the funds in this Act or any future appropriations Act may be

expended under a contract for the management and operation of any of the Department's weapons laboratories except in accordance with a Laboratory Funding Plan that has been approved by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60 which provided for approval by Secretary of Energy.

Language is included under section 310 which provides that none of the funds in this Act or any future appropriations Act may be expended under a contract for the management and operation of certain Department's laboratories, except in accordance with a Laboratory Funding Plan, that has been approved by the Secretary of Energy. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 311 which prohibits the use of funds in this Act to establish or maintain any center or programmatic partnership at a Department of Energy Laboratory or facility unless such funds have been specifically identified in the budget submission. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 312 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 313 which provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or generated after such date. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 314 which provides that the term of Office of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy, of the first person appointed to that position, shall be 3 years.

Language is included under section 315 which limits the scope of authority of the Secretary of Energy to modify the organization of the of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Language is included under section 316 which prohibits the payment of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Language is included under section 317 which provides that the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize 2 percent of the amount allocated to a nuclear weapons production plant for the production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the Engineering and manufacturing capabilities of the plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at the plant.

Language is included under section 318 which limits the inclusion of certain costs of protection, mitigation of damage to, and enhancement of fish and wildlife, within rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration to the rate period in which the costs are

incurred. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106-60.

Language is included under section 319 which allows the Power Marketing Administrations to engage in activities and solicit, undertake and review studies and proposals relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

## TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$66,400,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	71,400,000
House allowance .....	63,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	66,440,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the 13 Appalachian States and a Federal cochairman who is appointed by the President.

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals \$66,440,000. Due to severe budget constraints the Committee recommendation continues programs and activities of the ARC at the current appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

Consistent with the administration's budget request, the Committee recommendation does not include funding for ARC highways. Funding for ARC development highways will be provided through the highway trust fund beginning in fiscal year 1999 through 2004 consistent with provision contained in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act.

The Committee recognizes the importance of trade and investment opportunities to the Appalachian region, and is encouraged by a preliminary trade report determining that Appalachian firms might find significant trade and investment opportunities, particularly in the energy, high technology, and transportation sectors, in the Republic of Turkey and the surrounding region. In this regard, the Committee supports the Appalachian-Turkish Trade Project (ATTP), a project to promote opportunities to expand trade, encourage business interests, stimulate foreign studies, and to build a lasting and mutually meaningful relationship between the Appalachian States and the Republic of Turkey, as well as the neighboring regions, such as Greece. The Committee commends the ARC for its leadership role in helping to implement the mission of the ATTP, and expects the ARC to continue to be a prominent ATTP sponsor.

### DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	18,500,000
House allowance .....	17,000,000
Committee recommendation .....	18,500,000

An appropriation of \$18,500,000 is recommended for fiscal year 2001. This is the same as the budget request.

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was created by the Fiscal Year 1989 National Defense Authorization Act. The Board,

composed of five members appointed by the President, provides advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at the Department's defense nuclear facilities. The Board is responsible for reviewing and evaluating the content and implementation of the standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy.

#### DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 2000 .....	
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	\$30,000,000
House allowance .....	
Committee recommendation .....	20,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority, subject of enactment of authorization by law. The recommended appropriations will be used to establish the Authority and to carry out its activities during fiscal year 2001.

#### DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$20,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	20,000,000
House allowance .....	
Committee recommendation .....	30,000,000

The Denali Commission is a regional economic development agency established in 1998 for the intended purpose of delivering basic utilities, including affordable power, and other essential infrastructure to the nation's most geographically isolated communities. The Committee is encouraged by the progress of the Denali Commission in assisting distressed communities throughout Alaska, and urges continued work among local and State agencies, non-profit organizations and other participants in meeting the most pressing infrastructure needs.

The Committee recommendation includes \$30,000,000 for the Denali Commission.

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$465,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	481,900,000
House allowance .....	481,900,000
Committee recommendation .....	481,900,000

##### REVENUES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$442,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	447,958,000
House allowance .....	457,100,000
Committee recommendation .....	457,100,000



## NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$23,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	33,942,000
House allowance .....	24,800,000
Committee recommendation .....	24,800,000

The Committee recommendation includes \$481,900,000, the same amount as the request, for the Commission, and includes a single year extension of the NRC's user fee collection authority. The Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the nuclear waste fund, by assessing licenses and annual fees. That authority expires in 2000, and unless additional fee collection authority is enacted prior to or concurrent to enactment of this Act, the Commission's authority to collect user fees would be limited to 33 percent of its budget. The Committee is aware that S. 1627 as passed by the Senate would extend this authority to fiscal year 2005 and would address the fairness and equity concerns associated with existing statutes. The Committee intends that the 1-year extension included in this measure serve as a safeguard should that legislation not be enacted by October 1, 2000.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	6,200,000
House allowance .....	5,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000

## REVENUES

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	6,076,000
House allowance .....	5,500,000
Committee recommendation .....	5,500,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,500,000 for fiscal year 2001.

## NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 2000 .....	\$2,600,000
Budget estimate, 2001 .....	3,200,000
House allowance .....	2,700,000
Committee recommendation .....	3,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

## TITLE V—FISCAL YEAR 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL

### CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation includes an emergency appropriation for fiscal year 2000 of \$203,460,000 for damages sustained by the Los Alamos National Laboratory in the Cerro Grande fire. The entire amount is designated an emergency by Congress pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Control Act, as amended; and requires transmission of an official budget request, including a designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement, by the President.

The Committee recommendation includes \$46,860,000 for repair and risk mitigation associated with physical damage and destruction; \$25,400,000 for restoring services; \$18,000,000 for emergency response; \$15,000,000 for resuming laboratory operations; \$5,200,000 for the DAHRT baseline change proposal for destroyed equipment and facilities; \$10,000,000 for the construction of replacement office space; \$20,000,000 for the replacement and relocation of the emergency operations center; \$25,000,000 for the site wide fire alarm replacement; \$30,000,000 for risk mitigation and fire protection upgrades at the technical area 54 waste management facility; and \$8,000,000 for a multi-channel communications system.

TITLE VI—RESCISSION  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
INTERIM STORAGE ACTIVITIES

The Committee has included a recommendation rescinding \$85,000,000 as proposed by the administration. In Public Law 104-46, the Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Congress set aside \$85,000,000 in the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriations account for activities to support interim storage of civilian spent nuclear fuel. These funds have remained unobligated and are now available to be rescinded.

## TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The following list of general provisions are recommended by the Committee. The recommendation includes several provisions which have been included in previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts:

Language is included under section 701 which provides that none of the funds appropriated in 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. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 702 which requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 703 which provides that no funds may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project until certain conditions are met. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 704 which provides for a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 705 which limits the use of funds to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementing the Kyoto Protocol. A similar provision was contained in the Energy and Water Development Act, 2000, Public Law 106–60.

Language is included under section 706 that repeals three provisions of Public Law 106–246. Two of the provisions shifted costs from fiscal year 2001 into 2000. The third provision shifted, for purposes of section 207 of House Concurrent Resolution 290, the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, decreased the national defense suballocation by \$2,000,000,000 in outlays and increased the non-defense suballocation by the same amount.

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

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

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2001, is currently being considered by the Senate.

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

Finally, in title IV, appropriations of \$15,000,000 is recommended for the Delta Regional Commission, subject to enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported en bloc, H.R. 4733, the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, and H.R. 4690, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations bill, both subject to amendment and subject to the section 302 budget allocation, with the exception of an amendment repealing three provisions in Public Law 106–246, by a recorded vote of 28–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	

Mr. Bennett  
 Mr. Campbell  
 Mr. Craig  
 Mrs. Hutchison  
 Mr. Kyl  
 Mr. Byrd  
 Mr. Inouye  
 Mr. Hollings  
 Mr. Leahy  
 Mr. Lautenberg  
 Mr. Harkin  
 Ms. Mikulski  
 Mr. Reid  
 Mr. Kohl  
 Mrs. Murray  
 Mr. Dorgan  
 Mrs. Feinstein  
 Mr. Durbin

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

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

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

UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED

\* \* \* \* \*

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAPTER 12H—PACIFIC NORTHWEST ELECTRIC POWER  
 PLANNING AND CONSERVATION

\* \* \* \* \*

§ 839e. Rates

\* \* \* \* \*

(m) Impact aid payments; formula

\* \* \* \* \*

*(n) Limiting the Inclusion of Costs of Protection of, Mitigation of Damage to, and Enhancement of Fish and Wildlife,*

***Within Rates Charged by the Bonneville Power Administration, to the Rate Period in Which the Costs are Incurred***

*Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, rates established by the Administrator, under this section shall recover costs for protection, mitigation and enhancement of fish and wildlife, whether under the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act or any other Act, not to exceed such amounts the Administrator forecasts will be expended during the fiscal year 2002–2006 rate period, while preserving the Administrator’s ability to establish appropriate reserves and maintain a high Treasury payment probability for the subsequent rate period.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**TITLE 42—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE**

\* \* \* \* \*

**CHAPTER 84—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SUBCHAPTER VI—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS**

\* \* \* \* \*

**PART C—GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS**

**§ 7253. Reorganization**

**【The Secretary】** *(a) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary is authorized to establish, alter, consolidate or discontinue such organizational units or components within the Department as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate. Such authority shall not extend to the abolition of organizational units or components established by this chapter, or to the transfer of functions vested by this chapter in any organizational unit or component.*

*(b) The authority of the Secretary to establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component of the National Nuclear Security Administration is governed by the provisions of section 3219 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65).*

\* \* \* \* \*

**RECLAMATION SAFETY OF DAMS ACT, PUBLIC LAW 95–578**

**SEC. 1.** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 4. (a)** \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

*(c) With respect to the additional \$650,000,000 authorized to be appropriated in The Reclamation Safety of Dams Act Amendments of 1984, and the additional \$95,000,000 further authorized to be appropriated by amendments to that Act in 2000, costs incurred in the modification of structures under this Act, the cause of which results from new hydrologic or*

seismic data or changes in state-of-the-art criteria deemed necessary for safety purposes, shall be reimbursed to the extent provided in this subsection.

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1979 and ensuing fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$100,000,000 and, effective October 1, 1983, not to exceed an additional \$650,000,000 (October 1, 1983, price levels), *and, effective October 1, 2000, not to exceed an additional \$95,000,000 (October 1, 2000, price levels)*, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein, to carry out the provisions of this Act to remain available until expended if so provided by the appropriations Act: *Provided*, That no funds exceeding \$750,000 shall be obligated for carrying out actual construction to modify an existing dam under authority of this Act prior to [sixty days (which sixty days shall not include days on which either the House of Representatives or the Senate is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain)] *30 calendar days* from that date that the Secretary has transmitted a report on such existing dam to the Congress. The report required to be submitted by this section will consist of a finding by the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that modifications are required to be made to insure the safety of an existing dam. Such finding shall be accompanied by a technical report containing information on the need for structural modification, the corrective action deemed to be required, alternative solutions to structural modification that were considered, the estimated cost of needed modifications, and environmental impacts if any resulting from the implementation of the recommended plan of modification.

\* \* \* \* \*

RECLAMATION STATES EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 1991,  
PUBLIC LAW 102-250

\* \* \* \* \*

TITLE III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in section 303 of this Act (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than the \$90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1999, [and 2000] *2000, and 2001*.

\* \* \* \* \*

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997,  
PUBLIC LAW 104-206

\* \* \* \* \*



## TITLE V

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. 511. The Administrator may offer employees voluntary separation incentives as deemed necessary which shall not exceed \$25,000. Recipients who accept employment with the United States within five years after separation shall repay the entire amount to the Bonneville Power Administration. **[This authority shall expire September 30, 2000.]** *This authority shall expire September 30, 2005.*

\* \* \* \* \*

## WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996, PUBLIC LAW 104-303

\* \* \* \* \*

## TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

**SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.**

(a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) **PROJECTS SUBJECT TO REPORT.**—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in a final report (or in the case of the project described in paragraph (10), a Detailed Project Report) of the Corps of Engineers, if the report is completed not later than December 31, 1996:

(1) CHIGNIK, ALASKA.— \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(4) **NORCO BLUFFS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.**—The project for bluff stabilization, Norco Bluffs, Riverside County, California, at a **[total cost of \$8,600,000]** *total cost of \$15,000,000*, with an estimated Federal cost of \$6,450,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of \$2,150,000.

\* \* \* \* \*

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000,  
PUBLIC LAW 106-60

\* \* \* \* \*

## TITLE III

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

\* \* \* \* \*

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

\* \* \* \* \*

## (TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

\* \* \* \* \*  
 SEC. 310. (a) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) For purposes of this section, “covered contract” means a contract for the management and operation of the following laboratories: Argonne National Laboratory, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, [Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories.] *Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.*

\* \* \* \* \*

## TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. 604. 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, 2000] and inserting *September 30, 2001*.

\* \* \* \* \*

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000,  
 PUBLIC LAW 106–65

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
 AUTHORIZATIONS**

**TITLE I—PROCUREMENT**

**Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

\* \* \* \* \*

**TITLE XXXII—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY  
 ADMINISTRATION**

\* \* \* \* \*

**Subtitle A—Establishment and Organization**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 3218. STAFF OF ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall maintain within the Administration sufficient staff to assist the Administrator in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Administrator.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The staff of the Administration shall perform, in accordance with applicable law, such of the functions of the Administrator as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall assign to the staff responsibility for the following functions:

- (1) Personnel.
- (2) Legislative affairs.
- (3) Public affairs.

(4) Liaison with other elements of the Department of Energy and with other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and local governments, and the public.

**SEC. 3219. SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO MODIFY ORGANIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION.**

*Notwithstanding the authority granted by section 643 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7253) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy may not establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component, or transfer any function, of the Administration, except as authorized by subsection (b) or (c) of section 3291.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Personnel**

\* \* \* \* \*

**SEC. 3244. CONTINUED COVERAGE OF HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.**

Section 8905a(d)(4)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, or the Department of Energy due to a reduction in force resulting from the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration” after “reduction in force”.

**SEC. 3245. PROHIBITION ON PAY OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN CONCURRENT SERVICE OR DUTIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE ADMINISTRATION.**

*(a) Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, no funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Energy may be obligated or utilized to pay the basic pay of an officer or employee of the Department of Energy who—*

*(1) serves concurrently in a position in the Administration and a position outside the Administration; or*

*(2) performs concurrently the duties of a position in the Administration and the duties of a position outside the Administration.”*

*(b) The provision of this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this section.*

\* \* \* \* \*

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001, PUBLIC LAW 106–246**

\* \* \* \* \*

**DIVISION B—FISCAL YEAR 2000 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS**

\* \* \* \* \*

**TITLE I—KOSOVO AND OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY MATTERS**

\* \* \* \* \*

**CHAPTER 2**

\* \* \* \* \*

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

\* \* \* \* \*

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds provided in this or any other Act may be used to further reallocate Central Arizona Project water or to prepare an Environmental Assessment, Environmental Impact Statement, or Record of Decision providing for a reallocation of Central Arizona Project water until further Act of Congress authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make allocations and enter into contracts for delivery of Central Arizona Project water. *This section shall be effective through September 30, 2001.*

\* \* \* \* \*

## TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS THIS DIVISION

\* \* \* \* \*

【SEC. 5105. Section 5527 of Public Law 105–33, The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, is repealed.】

【SEC. 5106. Section 9305 of Public Law 105–33 (111 Stat. 677) is repealed.】

\* \* \* \* \*

【SEC. 5108. (a) The enactment of this Act shall be deemed to fulfill the requirements for enactment of a law for purposes of section 206(b) of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress).

【(b) Section 312(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the Senate with respect to fiscal year 2001.】

【SEC. 5109. Section 207 of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress) is amended as follows:

【(1) by reducing the limit on outlays set forth in subsection (a)(1) by \$2,000,000,000; and

【(2) by increasing the limit on outlays set forth in subsection (a)(2) by \$2,000,000,000.】

\* \* \* \* \*

## BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

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

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 2001: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
General purpose, defense discretionary .....	13,484	13,484	13,184	<sup>1</sup> 13,184
General purpose, non-defense discretionary .....	8,986	13,228	9,115	13,348
Mandatory .....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
2001 .....	.....	.....	.....	<sup>2</sup> 18,624
2002 .....	.....	.....	.....	6,949
2003 .....	.....	.....	.....	1,176
2004 .....	.....	.....	.....	21
2005 and future years .....	.....	.....	.....	26
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 2001 .....	NA	101	NA	16

<sup>1</sup>Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

<sup>2</sup>Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers—Civil							
General investigations .....	161,994	137,700	153,327	139,219	- 22,775	+ 1,519	- 14,108
Construction, general .....	1,385,032	1,346,000	1,378,430	1,361,449	- 23,583	+ 15,449	- 16,981
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee .....	309,416	309,000	323,350	324,450	+ 15,034	+ 15,450	+ 1,100
Operation and maintenance, general .....	1,853,618	1,854,000	1,854,000	1,862,471	+ 8,853	+ 8,471	+ 8,471
Regulatory program .....	117,000	125,000	125,000	120,000	+ 3,000	- 5,000	- 5,000
FUSRAP .....	150,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	- 10,000	.....	.....
General expenses .....	149,500	152,000	149,500	152,000	+ 2,500	.....	+ 2,500
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil .....	4,126,560	4,063,700	4,123,607	4,099,589	- 26,971	+ 35,889	- 24,018
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Central Utah Project Completion Account							
Central Utah project construction .....	22,436	19,566	19,566	19,566	- 2,870	.....	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation .....	10,476	14,158	14,158	14,158	+ 3,682	.....	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account .....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal .....	37,912	38,724	38,724	38,724	+ 812	.....	.....
Program oversight and administration .....	1,321	1,216	1,216	1,216	- 105	.....	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account .....	39,233	39,940	39,940	39,940	+ 707	.....	.....
Bureau of Reclamation							
Water and related resources .....	605,992	643,058	635,777	655,192	+ 49,200	+ 12,134	+ 19,415

Loan program .....	11,577	9,369	9,369	9,369	9,369	-2,208	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(43,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(-16,000)	.....	.....	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund .....	42,000	38,382	38,382	38,382	38,382	-3,618	.....	.....	.....
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration .....	60,000	60,000	.....	.....	.....	-60,000	.....	-60,000	.....
Policy and administration .....	47,000	50,224	47,000	.....	50,224	+3,224	.....	.....	+3,224
Total, Bureau of Reclamation .....	766,569	801,033	730,528	730,528	753,167	-13,402	-47,866	-47,866	+22,639
Total, title II, Department of the Interior .....	805,802	840,973	770,468	770,468	793,107	-12,695	-47,866	-47,866	+22,639
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY									
Energy supply .....	637,962	730,692	616,482	616,482	691,520	+53,558	-39,172	-39,172	+75,038
(By transfer) .....	(5,821)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-5,821)	.....	.....	.....
Non-defense environmental management .....	332,350	282,812	281,001	281,001	309,141	-23,209	+26,329	+26,329	+28,140
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund .....	249,247	294,588	294,588	294,588	297,778	+48,531	+3,190	+3,190	+297,778
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation .....	.....	.....	301,400	301,400	.....	.....	.....	.....	-301,400
Science .....	2,787,627	3,162,639	2,830,915	2,830,915	2,870,112	+82,485	-292,527	-292,527	+39,197
Nuclear Waste Disposal .....	239,601	325,500	213,000	213,000	59,175	-180,426	-266,325	-266,325	-153,825
Departmental administration .....	205,581	214,421	153,527	153,527	210,128	+4,547	-4,293	-4,293	+56,601
Miscellaneous revenues .....	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000	-111,000	-128,762	-21,875	.....	.....	-17,762
Net appropriation .....	98,694	85,659	42,527	42,527	81,366	-17,328	-4,293	-4,293	+38,839
Office of the Inspector General .....	29,500	33,000	31,500	31,500	28,988	-512	-4,012	-4,012	-2,512
Environmental restoration and waste management:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Defense function .....	(5,716,037)	(6,148,824)	(5,864,004)	(5,864,004)	(6,148,824)	(+432,787)	.....	.....	(+284,820)
Non-defense function .....	(581,597)	(589,039)	(582,401)	(582,401)	(589,039)	(+7,442)	.....	.....	(+6,638)
Total .....	(6,297,634)	(6,737,863)	(6,446,405)	(6,446,405)	(6,737,863)	(+440,229)	.....	.....	(+291,458)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities									
National Nuclear Security Administration:	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Weapons activities .....	4,427,052	4,639,225	4,579,684	4,579,684	4,883,289	+456,237	+244,064	+244,064	+303,605
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	729,100	865,590	861,477	861,477	908,967	+179,867	+43,377	+43,377	+47,490
Naval reactors .....	677,600	673,083	677,600	677,600	694,600	+17,000	+21,517	+21,517	+17,000
Office of the Administrator .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,000	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration .....	5,833,752	6,177,898	6,118,761	6,118,761	6,496,856	+663,104	+318,958	+318,958	+378,095
Defense environmental restoration and waste management .....	4,467,308	4,562,057	4,522,707	4,522,707	4,635,763	+168,455	+73,706	+73,706	+113,056

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Defense facilities closure projects .....	1,060,447	1,082,297	1,082,297	1,082,297	+ 21,850	.....	.....
Defense environmental management privatization .....	188,282	514,884	259,000	324,000	+ 135,718	- 190,884	+ 65,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management .....	5,716,037	6,159,238	5,864,004	6,042,060	+ 326,023	- 117,178	+ 178,056
Other defense activities .....	309,199	575,617	592,235	579,463	+ 270,264	+ 3,846	- 12,772
Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	111,574	112,000	200,000	292,000	+ 180,426	+ 180,000	+ 92,000
Energy employees compensation initiative (proposal) .....	.....	17,000	.....	.....	.....	- 17,000	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....	11,970,562	13,041,753	12,775,000	13,410,379	+ 1,439,817	+ 368,626	+ 635,379
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration .....	39,579	3,900	3,900	3,900	- 35,679	.....	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration .....	27,891	28,100	28,100	28,100	+ 209	.....	.....
(By transfer) .....	(773)	.....	.....	.....	(- 773)	.....	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration .....	192,602	164,916	160,930	164,916	- 27,686	.....	+ 3,986
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund .....	1,309	2,670	2,670	2,670	+ 1,361	.....	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations .....	261,381	199,586	195,600	199,586	- 61,795	.....	+ 3,986
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses .....	174,950	175,200	175,200	175,200	+ 250	.....	.....
Revenues applied .....	- 174,950	- 175,200	- 175,200	- 175,200	- 250	.....	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy .....	16,606,924	18,156,229	17,287,425	17,948,045	+ 1,341,121	- 208,184	+ 660,620
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission .....	66,149	71,400	63,000	66,400	+ 251	- 5,000	+ 3,400
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....	16,935	18,500	17,000	18,500	+ 1,565	.....	+ 1,500



Delta Regional Authority .....	30,000	.....	20,000	+ 20,000	- 10,000	+ 20,000
Denali Commission .....	20,000	.....	30,000	+ 10,076	+ 10,000	+ 30,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Salaries and expenses .....	481,900	481,900	481,900	+ 16,987	.....	.....
Revenues .....	-447,958	-457,100	-457,100	- 15,100	- 9,142	.....
Subtotal .....	33,942	24,800	24,800	+ 1,887	- 9,142	.....
Office of Inspector General .....	5,000	5,500	5,500	+ 500	- 700	.....
Revenues .....	- 5,000	- 5,500	- 5,500	- 500	+ 576	.....
Subtotal .....	124	.....	.....	.....	- 124	.....
Total .....	22,913	24,800	24,800	+ 1,887	- 9,266	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board .....	2,589	2,700	3,000	+ 411	- 200	+ 300
Total, title IV, Independent agencies .....	128,510	107,500	162,700	+ 34,190	- 14,466	+ 55,200
TITLE V—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL						
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
Cerro Grande fire activities (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	.....	.....	203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460
Total, title V, Emergency Supplemental .....	.....	.....	203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460
New budget (obligational) authority .....	.....	.....	203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460	+ 203,460
Contingent emergency appropriations .....	.....	.....	(203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)
TITLE VI—RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers—Civil						
General investigations (rescission) .....	- 930	.....	.....	+ 930	.....	.....
Construction, general (rescission) .....	- 12,819	.....	.....	+ 12,819	.....	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)		
					2000 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil .....	- 13,749	.....	.....	.....	+ 13,749	.....	.....
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Nuclear Waste Disposal (rescission) .....	- 4,000	.....	.....	.....	+ 4,000	.....	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission) .....	.....	- 85,000	- 85,000	- 85,000	- 85,000	.....	.....
Power Marketing Administrations							
Southeastern Power Administration: Purchase power and wheeling (rescission) .....	- 3,000	.....	.....	.....	+ 3,000	.....	.....
Total, title VI, Rescissions .....	- 20,749	- 85,000	- 85,000	- 85,000	- 64,251	.....	.....
Grand total:							
New budget (obligational) authority .....	21,647,047	23,153,068	22,204,000	23,121,901	+ 1,474,854	- 31,167	+ 917,901
Appropriations .....	(21,667,796)	(23,238,068)	(22,289,000)	(23,003,441)	(+ 1,335,645)	(- 234,627)	(+ 714,441)
Contingent emergency appropriations .....	.....	.....	.....	(203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)
Rescissions .....	(- 20,749)	(- 85,000)	(- 85,000)	(- 85,000)	(- 64,251)	.....	.....
Total, fiscal year 2000 .....	.....	.....	.....	(203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)	(+ 203,460)
Total, fiscal year 2001 .....	(21,647,047)	(23,153,068)	(22,204,000)	(22,918,441)	(+ 1,271,394)	(- 234,627)	(+ 714,441)
(By transfer) .....	(6,594)	.....	.....	.....	(- 6,594)	.....	.....