104TH CONGRESS
1st Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
104–149

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

JUNE 20, 1995.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1905]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the *Budget of the United States Government, 1996.* The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1995, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1996.

	1995 appropriation	1996 estimate	1996 recommendation	1996 recommendation compared with—	
				1995 appropriation	1996 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	3,408,919,000	3,307,450,000	3,219,610,000	−189,309,000	−87,840,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	881,399,000	833,017,000	857,190,000	−24,209,000	+24,173,000
Title III—Department of Energy	15,701,676,000	16,633,269,000	14,761,611,000	−940,065,000	−1,871,658,000
Title IV—Independent Agencies	470,408,000	369,063,000	275,870,000	−194,538,000	−93,193,000
Subtotal	20,462,402,000	21,142,799,000	19,114,281,000	−1,348,121,000	−2,028,518,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	−169,403,000	−410,343,000	−410,343,000	−240,940,000	
Grand total of bill	20,292,999,000	20,732,456,000	18,703,938,000	−1,589,061,000	−2,028,518,000

INTRODUCTION

In the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, the rhetoric of deficit reduction becomes a reality. The Committee has confronted difficult and painful choices, resulting in substantial reductions in programs throughout the Committee's jurisdiction. Although the task has been monumental, the Committee has acted responsibly to downsize and streamline activities of the Federal government. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has established thoughtful priorities and has endeavored to fund those activities that are necessary, cost-effective, and vital to the Nation's welfare.

The Committee has conducted exhaustive hearings on the programs and projects provided for in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996. The record of these hearings is contained in eight published volumes containing over 12,000 pages. The Committee received testimony from Members of Congress; cabinet secretaries; federal, state and local governmental officials; and private citizens. These witnesses, and hundreds of others who have contacted the Committee, have requested funding for projects of all sorts. Because of dramatic funding constraints, the Committee has been able to accommodate only a modest number of these requests. The Committee recognizes that funding restrictions will be even more pronounced in future years and is reluctant to pursue projects that involve large outyear mortgages.

The Committee understands that authorizing legislation for various projects and agencies funded by this bill is in various stages of consideration by jurisdictional committees of the House. The Committee has worked closely with these panels to establish the funding levels recommended in the bill. Funding has been provided for certain programs in anticipation and advance of authorization in order to avoid unnecessary disruptions in the provision of government services.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CORPS OF ENGINEERS' CIVIL WORKS MISSION

In the fiscal year 1996 budget request, the Administration proposed radical changes in the Civil Works mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Under these proposals, beginning in fiscal year 1996, the Corps would only be involved in projects and programs of "national scope and significance." While it may at first seem reasonable that the Federal Government only be involved in programs of "national significance", a closer look at these proposals makes it apparent that they were ill-conceived and are counterproductive to the well-being of the Nation.

The most far reaching of these proposals involves the Corps of Engineers' role in protecting our citizens from the devastating effects of floods. Under the Administration's proposal, the Corps would only participate in projects that meet the following three criteria: (1) more than half of the damaging flood water must come from outside the boundaries of the state where the damage is occurring; (2) the project must have a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2 or greater; and (3) the non-Federal sponsor must be willing and able to pay 75 percent of the first cost of the project. The practical effect of applying those three criteria against all proposed projects would be to terminate the Federal Government's role in flood control activities. The first criterion alone would eliminate the Corps' role in flood control throughout much of the country, including three of our largest states: California, Texas, and Florida. The Committee strongly disagrees that the Federal Government should end its historic role in protecting our citizens from the devastating effects of floods. The Corps of Engineers has presented testimony before the Committee indicating that every dollar invested in flood control projects has yielded $6 in benefits. Terminating the Federal Government's role in flood control activities as a way to save money is clearly the wrong way to go.

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

Therefore, in making recommendations for fiscal year 1996, the Committee has provided funds for projects without regard to these proposed new policies. The Committee expects the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to proceed with those projects, all of which are fully authorized. The Committee further directs the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to continue to process all decision documents, including the transmission of feasibility reports to the Congress for authorization, without regard to whether or not projects comply with the Administration's proposed new policies.

As stated above, the Committee believes that these proposals were ill-conceived and urges the Administration to reconsider them in light of the benefits that these programs have provided to the Nation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1995	$181,199,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	155,625,000
Recommended, 1996	129,906,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−51,293,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−25,719,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE L&D, AL	238,000	---	238,000	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	208,000	---	208,000	---
(SPE)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	---	237,000	---	237,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	70,000	---	70,000	---
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	---	186,000	---	186,000
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	175,000	---	---	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	NORTHERN SEA ROUTE, AK	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	100,000	---	100,000	---
	ARIZONA				
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, ARIZONA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, N SCOTTSDALE DRAINAGE AREA,	400,000	---	450,000	---
	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, GILLESPIE DAM TO YUMA, AZ	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, TORTOLITA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	200,000	---	300,000	---
	RIO DE FLAG, AZ	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, AZ	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	180,000	---	180,000	---
	ARKANSAS				
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR	---	---	280,000	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	450,000	---	450,000	---

8

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000
(SPE)	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJECT, CA	375,000	---	375,000	---
	CITY OF ARCADIA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION, CA	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	CITY OF ENCINITAS, CA	169,000	---	169,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA	---	410,000	---	410,000
	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	460,000	---	460,000	---
(SP)	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	234,000	---	234,000	150,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	200,000	---	200,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS & VICINITY, CA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	---	787,000	---	787,000
	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	---	375,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA	---	559,000	---	559,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	---	760,000	---	760,000
	RUSSIAN RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, LITTLE HOLLAND TRACT	290,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, PROSPECT ISLAND, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---
	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA TRACT	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	150,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CITIES OF OCEANSIDE AND CALSBAD, CA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	240,000	---	---	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	100,000	---	100,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),.	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP,.	171,000	---	171,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FIREBAUGH AND MENDOTA, CA....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA.....	40,000	---	40,000	260,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STRMS	500,000	---	500,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	---	---	600,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA.....	---	---	200,000	---
	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA.....	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	81,000	---	81,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
	SANTA MONICA WATER SUPPLY, CA.....	---	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(N)	SF BAY, LEONARD RANCH (DISPOSAL), CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL, CA.....	240,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	285,000	---	285,000	---
	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA.....	370,000	---	370,000	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(FDP)	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.....	65,000	---	65,000	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	57,000	---	57,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	880,000	---	880,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	145,000	---	145,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ, & PA...	---	780,000	---	780,000

	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	---	200,000	---	200,000
	FLORIDA				
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WW, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	---	---	150,000	---
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	107,000	---	107,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA STUDY, FL	750,000	---	750,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL	112,000	---	112,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	414,000	---	414,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	---	415,000	---	415,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	---	285,000	---	285,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	233,000	---	233,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	---	400,000	---	400,000
	GEORGIA				
(SPE)	ATLANTA WATERSHED STUDY, GA	350,000	---	---	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	25,000	---	25,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK & DAM, GA	130,000	---	---	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	332,000	---	332,000	---
	HAWAII				
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	MAUI SECOND HARBOR, MAUI, HI	130,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	175,000	---	175,000	---
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	362,000	---	362,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(HDP)	FREEPORT, IL	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	---	150,000	---	150,000
(RCP)	SNY ISLAND, IL	248,000	---	248,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST CHICAGO, IL	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	6,205,000	---	6,205,000	---
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	25,000	---	25,000	---
	INDIANA				
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	---	2,000,000
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	55,000	---	55,000	200,000
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CALUMET TOWNSHIP, IN	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, DYER, IN	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION (INDIANA SHORELINE), IN	275,000	---	---	---
	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY, IN	---	---	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, IN & IL (MIDDLE REAC	153,000	---	228,000	---
	IOWA				
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, IA, IL & MO	50,000	---	50,000	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, KS	475,000	---	475,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	111,000	---	111,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	---	670,000	---	---

	KENTUCKY				
	GREEN RIVER LOCK AND DAM NO. 6	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN	---	1,487,000	---	---
	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN/OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM STUDY, KY, IL & IN	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
	LOUISIANA				
(FDP)	BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW, LA	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	900,000	---	900,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	34,000	---	34,000	---
(N)	LAKE CHARLES SHIP CHAN, BY-PASS AND GEN ANCHORAGE AREA	47,000	---	587,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION, LA	25,000	---	25,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	60,000	---	60,000	---
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	---	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND				
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SPE)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESS, MD &.	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD	291,000	---	291,000	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC	335,000	---	335,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE - REALLOCATION, MD & VA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	LOWER EASTERN SHORE, MD & DE	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	300,000	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(FDP)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	---	185,000	---	185,000
	MICHIGAN				
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI.....	---	---	---	200,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(SPE)	POMME DE TERRE RIVER - MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY, MN.....	75,000	---	---	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
(FDP)	HANCOCK, HARRISON AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MS.....	62,000	---	62,000	---
	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS.....	---	---	---	1,299,000
(N)	LOWNDES COUNTY PORT BARGE FLEETING AREA, MS.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	10,000	---	10,000
	FABIUS RIVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO.....	---	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	ST LOUIS REGION, MO.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	144,000	---	144,000	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, NE.....	441,000	---	441,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE.....	---	200,000	---	200,000

	NEW JERSEY				
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ	---	---	550,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	115,000	---	115,000	---
(SP)	GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	---	963,000	---	963,000
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL	---	400,000	---	400,000
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (CLIFFWOOD BEACH), NJ	52,000	---	52,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	620,000	---	620,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	---	3,600,000	---	3,600,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	25,000	---	300,000	---
(SPE)	STONY BROOK, PRINCETON TOWNSHIP, NJ	250,000	---	---	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	80,000	---	80,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	118,000	---	118,000	---
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM	---	200,000	---	200,000
(SPE)	RIO DE CHAMA, ABIQUIU DAM TO ESPANOLA, NM	232,000	---	232,000	---
(FDP)	ROCKY ARROYO/DARK CANYON, PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES,	45,000	---	45,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	---	400,000	---	800,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	195,000	---	195,000	---
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	---	525,000	---	525,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	250,000	---	---	---
(SP)	MONTAUK POINT, NY	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	26,000	---	26,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	95,000	---	95,000	---
(N)	RARITAN BAY ANCHORAGES, NY AND NJ CHANNELS, NY & NJ	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	REYNOLD'S CHANNEL AND NEW YORK STATE BOAT CHANNEL, NY	170,000	---	170,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	30,000	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY	332,000	---	332,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, CHANNEL WIDENING, NC	---	570,000	---	570,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	225,000	---	225,000	---
	OHIO				
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH, KY.	---	300,000	---	300,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FDP)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, NM, CO, & KS	350,000	---	---	---
(RCP)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	100,000	---	---	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA.	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	55,000	---	55,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH SANTIAM FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	35,000	---	35,000	---

(SPE)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	500,000	---	500,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK, PA	---	570,000	---	570,000
(COM)	CONEMAUGH RIVER BASIN, PA	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	15,000	---	15,000	---
	MUSSERS DAM, MIDDLE CREEK, SNYDER CO, PA	---	---	---	300,000
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE - SEC 216	250,000	---	---	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	---	281,000	---	281,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	---	453,000	---	453,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING/WIDENING)	158,000	---	158,000	---
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	300,000	---	---	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	---	390,000	---	390,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD	10,000	---	10,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	---	20,000	---	20,000
	TENNESSEE				
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, NASHVILLE, TN	400,000	---	400,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	TEXAS				
	ALPINE, TX	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	500,000	---	500,000
(RDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES - ADDICKS & BARKER RESERVO	50,000	---	50,000	---
	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, TX	---	---	---	300,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	---	750,000	---	750,000
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX (SECTION 216)	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	150,000	---	---	---
(RDP)	GIWW-CC BAY TO PORT ISABEL, TX AA642	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBS SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	30,000	---	30,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	304,000	---	304,000	---
	UTAH				
	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	---	---	450,000	---
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	---	100,000	---	100,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(RDP)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	150,000	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, POQUOSON, VA	---	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	EASTERN SHORE, ACCOMACK AND NORTHAMPTON COUNTIES, VA	248,000	---	248,000	---
(RCP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	350,000	---	---	---
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, SUFFOLK, VA	370,000	---	370,000	---
(BE)	SANDBRIDGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	470,000	---	470,000
	WASHINGTON				
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COM)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM (ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WA	400,000	---	400,000	---
(RDP)	MOUNT ST HELENS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WA	15,000	---	---	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	98,000	---	98,000	---
(COM)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	200,000	---	---	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FDP)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV	65,000	---	65,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	703,000	---	703,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	---	5,319,000	---	5,319,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER WATERFRONT, WV	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR, WV &	275,000	---	275,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN, WV	---	---	600,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN (BARBOUR COUNTY), WV	---	---	500,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA PORT DEVELOPMENT, WV	---	---	300,000	---
	WYOMING				
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	270,000	---	270,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	3,605,000	---	3,205,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	4,000,000	---	3,600,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	14,790,000	---	7,540,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	160,000	---	---	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS	615,000	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	500,000	---	---	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	15,000,000	---	7,600,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	770,000	---	700,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	500,000	---	500,000	---
	NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF WATER SUPPLY DEMAND AND AVAILAB	3,000,000	---	---	---
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS	909,000	---	450,000	---
	NATIONAL SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE	2,050,000	---	---	---
	OHIO RIVER BASIN STUDY	---	---	1,000,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE)	550,000	---	500,000	---
	PRESIDENT'S CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN	600,000	---	---	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	400,000	---	300,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	40,574,000	---	28,432,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	350,000	---	175,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	770,000	---	770,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	950,000	---	950,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-26,988,000	---	-27,288,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	117,273,000	38,352,000	87,402,000	42,504,000

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

Gila River and Tributaries, North Scottsdale Drainage Area, Arizona.—The bill includes an additional $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for this project.

Rio Salado, Arizona.—The bill includes $300,000, the same as the budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to continue to study the feasibility of environmental restoration and associated recreation measures at the cities of Tempe and Phoenix, Arizona, along the Rio Salado reach of the Salt River.

Gila River, Tortolita Drainage Area, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of this study.

Gila River and Tributaries, Santa Cruz River Basin, Arizona.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to initiate a cost-shared feasibility study to develop a prioritized watershed management plan to include flood plain land use and maintenance plans to minimize future flood damages, identification of degraded habitats that can be restored as mitigation for permitted activities, water quality improvements, ground water supply, low flow augmentation, and recreation. Funds in the amount of $100,000 are provided to initiate the study.

Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, Arkansas.—The bill includes $280,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, Arkansas, project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Firebaugh and Mendota, California.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the San Joaquin River Basin, Firebaugh and Mendota, California, project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Tule River, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to resume feasibility phase studies of the Success Dam, California, enlargement project. The Committee finds the Corps' proposal to double the cost of the feasibility study to be unacceptable and expects the Corps to work with the local sponsor to complete the study at the least possible cost and in time for the project to be considered for authorization by the Congress in 1998.

San Joaquin River Basin, Kawaeh River, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $260,000 for initiation of preconstruction engineering and design of a project to enlarge Terminus Reservoir on the Kawaeh River in California.

San Joaquin River Basin, Pine Flat Dam Fish and Wildlife Habitat Restoration, California.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to coordinate the conduct of the feasibility study phase of the Pine Flat Dam Fish and Wildlife Habitat Investigation with efforts by the California Department of Fish and Game and the non-Federal sponsor to develop reservoir and stream temperature models as part of a proposed Kings River fisheries management plan.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Western Delta Islands, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue into the feasibility phase of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Western Delta Islands, California, project.

Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties Shoreline, California.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of shoreline protection measures in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties in California. The study should in-

clude consideration of plans for using material from maintenance dredging of Federal navigation projects in the vicinity for storm damage reduction and other purposes.

Central Basin Groundwater Project, California.—The Committee has included $375,000 to initiate a feasibility study for the Central Basin Groundwater project. The study will identify and recommend remediation measures for implementation to address contamination within, and downgradient of, existing Federal facilities at Whittier Narrows Dam, Los Angeles County, California.

City of Arcadia Water Infrastructure Restoration Study, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study under the authority of section 116(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to identify problems and alternative solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, for providing a more dependable water supply for the city of Arcadia, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to the water system that might occur during an earthquake.

Imperial County Watershed, Colorado River and Tributaries, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of potential solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, to the flood control, water quality, water supply and environmental problems associated with the Colorado River and its tributaries, including the lower Salton Sea, within Imperial County. Such study shall include, as a priority, the timely completion of a Sanitary Watershed Survey.

San Antonio Creek, California.—The bill includes an additional $200,000 for the San Antonio Creek, California, project for the initiation of feasibility phase studies.

Mojave River Floodplain Management Plan, California.—The amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program includes $35,000 to complete the floodplain maintenance plan being undertaken in cooperation with the San Bernardino County Flood Control District.

Upper Penitencia Creek, California.—The bill includes $300,000 for the initiation of feasibility phase studies for the Upper Penitencia Creek, California project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study to determine the extent and nature of a flood control project for the Stockton, California, area. Funds may also be spent to determine the viability of Farmington Dam for conjunctive use and flood control purposes.

San Juan and Aliso Creeks, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study of water resource problems and solutions in the San Juan Creek and Aliso Creek watersheds.

Northern California Streams, Middle Creek, California.—The bill includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of alternatives to restore the natural functions of the Middle Creek/Clear Lake ecosystem including the restoration of wetlands at the historic Robinson Lake.

Prado Dam, California.—From within available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use $100,000 to investigate the feasibility of modifying the operation of Prado Dam in California.

San Joaquin River Basin, Caliente Creek Stream Group, California.—The Committee has provided $171,000 for the completion of the Caliente Creek, California, feasibility study, the same as the budget request. The Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers take all steps necessary to ensure that this twelve-year old study is completed in fiscal year 1996.

Santa Monica Water Supply Study, California.—The Committee has provided $350,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study under the authority of section 116(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 to identify problems and alternative solutions, including governmental roles and responsibilities, for providing a more dependable water supply for the city of Santa Monica, California, particularly with respect to minimizing damages to the water system that might occur during an earthquake.

Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Baltimore Harbor Connecting Channels, Delaware and Maryland.—In carrying out the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Baltimore Harbor Connecting Channels, study, the Corps of Engineers is directed to complete studies concerning improvement of the Reedy Point Flare and relocation of the Arnold Point Anchorage to Howell Point.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Palm Beach County, Florida.—The bill includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of navigation improvements along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in Palm Beach County, Florida.

Indianapolis, White River (North), Indiana.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Indianapolis, White River (North), Indiana, project.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with detailed design for the elements of the Master Plan of the Central Waterfront project in Indianapolis, Indiana. The Master Plan was developed by the Corps of Engineers to address multipurpose water resource requirements in the project area. The Corps is directed to conduct this work in close cooperation with the city of Indianapolis.

Wabash River Basin Comprehensive, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $75,000 to continue detailed planning of the Wabash River Scenic Corridor in west central Indiana.

Ohio River Greenway, Indiana.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design of the Ohio River Greenway project in Indiana.

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana.—The Committee has been advised by the Corps of Engineers that previously appropriated funds will be utilized in fiscal year 1996 to complete the General Design Memorandum and initiate plans and specifications for the Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, project.

Little Calumet River Basin, Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana.—The Committee has been advised by the Corps of Engineers that previously appropriated funds will be utilized in fiscal year 1996 to complete the General Design Memorandum for the Cady Marsh Ditch, Indiana, project.

Metropolitan Lexington, Fayette County, Kentucky.—The bill includes $400,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study to identify potential solutions to flooding problems in Lexington, Kentucky.

Green River Lock and Dam No. 6, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study to determine the feasibility of deauthorizing and disposing of Green River Lock and Dam No. 6.

Lake Charles Ship Channel, By-Pass and General Anchorage Area, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $540,000 for the Lake Charles Ship Channel, By-Pass and General Anchorage Area, Louisiana, study to be used to investigate the feasibility of developing a support service facility for the Calcasieu Ship Channel at Hackberry, Louisiana, in the interest of improved navigability in the ship channel.

West Shore-Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of hurricane flooding problems west of Bonnet Carre Spillway.

Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the preparation of a Limited Reevaluation Report for the construction of a replacement lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.

Fabius River Drainage District, Missouri.—The bill includes $125,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control and related water resources problems at the Fabius River Drainage District in Missouri.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey.—The bill includes $550,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study of storm damage reduction measures for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey, project.

South River, New Jersey.—The bill includes an additional $275,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the South River, New Jersey, project.

South Shore of Staten Island, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 to initiate feasibility phase studies for the South Shore of Staten Island, New York, project.

Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete engineering and design for the Mussers Dam, Middle Creek, Snyder County, Pennsylvania, project.

Black Fox, Murfree and Oakland Springs Wetlands Areas, Tennessee.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Black Fox, Murfree and Oakland Springs Wetlands Areas project in Tennessee.

Colonias Along the U.S.-Mexico Border, Texas.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide technical and planning and design assistance to colonias along the United States-Mexico border.

Tygart River Basin, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate reconnaissance level environmental mitigation investigations in the Fords Run, Three Forts Creek, and Sandy Creek watersheds of the Tygart River Basin in West Virginia.

Tygart River Basin (Barbour County), West Virginia.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies of potential projects to reduce flood damages in the vicinity of Belington and Philippi in Barbour County, West Virginia.

West Virginia Port Development, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the West Virginia Port Development study. Of the total, $100,000 is to be used to conduct feasibility studies on the Ohio River near the community of Millwood between and including rivers miles 230 and 210 near the community of Murraysville. In addition, $200,000 has been provided for feasibility studies near the town of Buffalo between river miles 23 and 25 on the Kanawha River.

Tolchester S-Turn, Maryland.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to complete its ongoing studies and related design work pertaining to the dangerous S-Turn in the Tolchester Channel, and to complete its report addressing the economic, environmental and safety concerns of this modification.

Research and Development.—The Committee has included $28,432,000 for research and development activities in fiscal year 1996. Included in this total is: $24,432,000 for the Corps of Engineers' base research and development program; $2,000,000 to continue the earthquake engineering effort; and $2,000,000 to continue research into zebra mussel control. The Committee has deleted the funds requested for the following programs: CPAR; Economic Impacts of Global Warming; Evaluation of Environmental Investments; Characterization and Restoration of Wetlands; and Geographic Information Systems. The Committee has again included $300,000 for the continuation of the Construction Technology Transfer Project between the Corps of Engineers' research institutions and Indiana State University. Under the project, the Corps will continue to work with the university's School of Technology to develop mechanisms to transfer the results of Corps construction-related research to small- and medium-sized companies throughout the Wabash Valley region.

Roller-Compacted Concrete.—The Committee understands that several divisions and districts utilize roller-compacted concrete in flood control projects. This technology has proven to be cost-effective and has demonstrated its reliability during flood conditions. The Committee encourages the use of roller-compacted concrete whenever feasible.

Ohio River Basin Study.—The Committee has included $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study to assess the water quality, biological and ecological aspects of the Ohio River Basin and develop such methodologies as may be necessary to make adequate improvements. The Corps is directed to work with the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission on this study.

Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway Navigation Study.—The Committee has provided $6,205,000 for the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway study, the same as the budget request. The Committee has learned that there may be proposals made by Federal and state resource agencies for additional environmental studies that would raise the total cost of the study

by $25,000,000. The purpose of this study is to address the need for navigation capacity expansion on the Upper Mississippi River and the Illinois Waterway. The Committee believes that the environmental component of the study should be limited to the impacts associated with expanding the capacity of the two systems. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to not expand the scope of the study such that its total cost exceeds that presented in the fiscal year 1996 budget request.

In addition, because of the need for a timely review of future navigation needs on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to complete the study and issue recommendations to Congress no later than December 1999.

Program Reductions.—Due to the severe budgetary situation, the Committee has deleted or reduced the funds requested by the Administration for a number of non-project specific activities funded under the General Investigations account.

Coordination Studies With Other Agencies.—For fiscal year 1996, the Committee recommends the following amounts for Coordination Studies With Other Agencies: Cooperation with Other Agencies, $480,000; Section 22 Planning Assistance to States, $2,000,000; Special Investigations, $3,400,000; Gulf of Mexico Program, $300,000; Interagency Water Resources Development, $1,000,000; National Estuary Program $180,000; and North American Waterfowl Management Plan, $180,000. In addition, the Committee has deleted the funds requested for the National Marine Fisheries Coordination Program, and the National Inventory of Dams Program.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1995	$983,668,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	785,125,000
Recommended, 1996	807,846,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−175,822,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+22,721,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	6,278,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,141,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	67,300,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
	ALASKA			
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	15,464,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	9,900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	11,000,000	2,261,000	2,261,000
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	6,400,000	76,000	76,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	26,000,000	4,894,000	4,894,000
	ARKANSAS			
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	28,700,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR AR RVR NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	648,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	---	6,000,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	41,850,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	83,300,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	282,000,000	11,367,000	11,367,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	100,700,000	100,000	428,000
	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	---	800,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,300,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	85,800,000	700,000	700,000
	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	---	800,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,200,000	124,000	124,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	89,235,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	28,780,000	3,286,000	3,286,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	112,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	24,800,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR)	76,375,000	-100,000	100,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	---	---	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	28,800,000	1,870,000	1,870,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	---	---	1,300,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	172,250,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	70,248,000	70,248,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	17,100,000	300,000	2,300,000
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	---	200,000
(N)	SONOMA BAYLANDS WETLAND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, CA	8,375,000	500,000	500,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	34,240,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	18,200,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	17,700,000	1,240,000	1,240,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA	7,170,000	720,000	720,000
	COLORADO			
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	8,850,000	800,000	800,000
	FLORIDA			
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	---	---	480,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,358,000,000	3,726,000	4,026,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	170,400,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	---	148,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	8,770,000	2,590,000	2,590,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	30,800,000	800,000	800,000
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	8,200,000	800,000	800,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	18,884,000	1,480,000	1,480,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	26,800,000	3,202,000	3,202,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	81,068,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	---	---	3,000,000
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	55,200,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY (ST AUGUSTINE BEACH), FL	---	---	380,000
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	575,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	ILLINOIS			
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	FOUR LOCKS, ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200,000	3,254,000	3,254,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	23,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	21,400,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,100,000	780,000	780,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	738,500,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	1,050,000,000	32,100,000	32,100,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,300,000	300,000	300,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN	248,899,000	19,459,000	19,459,000
	INDIANA			
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	15,800,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	33,865,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	1,500,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	104,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	---	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)..	20,800,000	700,000	700,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	89,900,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	128,417,000	128,000	128,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA.....	6,640,000	220,000	220,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.....	40,600,000	168,000	168,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA.....	15,300,000	4,040,000	4,040,000
	KANSAS			
	WINFIELD, KS.....	---	---	870,000
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY.....	157,298,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY).....	19,600,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	FRANKFORT, SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY.....	8,630,000	2,823,000	2,823,000
	MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, KY, IN.....	---	---	3,487,000
	SALYERSVILLE, KY.....	---	---	800,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALGNA - RIGOLETTE, LA.....	7,078,000	2,379,000	2,379,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	515,000,000	7,848,000	11,848,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)....	79,100,000	1,440,000	1,440,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	564,000,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	168,000,000	3,380,000	3,380,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, TX.....	---	---	3,800,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,726,418,000	16,673,000	16,673,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)...	61,600,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MARYLAND			
	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD.....	---	---	339,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD.....	2,500,000	230,000	230,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
	ROUGHANS PT, REVERE, MA.....	---	---	710,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA.....	25,200,000	990,000	990,000
	MICHIGAN			
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI.....	---	---	82,000
	MINNESOTA			
(FC)	CHASKA, MN.....	28,600,000	3,740,000	3,740,000
	MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	35,170,000	2,812,000	2,812,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL.....	35,746,000	4,686,000	4,686,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	185,000,000	9,600,000	9,800,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO.....	32,900,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	210,900,000	5,700,000	4,700,000
	STE GENEVIEVE, MO.....	---	---	1,000,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	21,000,000	20,000	20,000
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	169,900,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	NEW JERSEY			
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	23,600,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	15,380,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND,NJ.....	8,318,000	70,000	70,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ.....	6,828,000	3,578,000	3,578,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	1,104,900,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM.....	4,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.....	63,900,000	120,000	120,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	31,800,000	100,000	100,000
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	64,698,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	524,000,000	10,400,000	10,400,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &.	127,000,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE, NY (DEF CORR).....	5,100,000	4,015,000	4,015,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.....	80,600,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.....	185,480,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(BE)	FORT FISHER, NC.....	4,170,000	2,094,000	2,094,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	6,230,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	18,000,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,240,000	853,000	853,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	31,600,000	500,000	500,000
	OHIO			
	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	---	190,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	63,250,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	13,425,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	78,500,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	31,600,000	530,000	530,000
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,100,000	6,530,000	6,530,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	86,400,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	500,000	500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA			
	BROAD TOP REGION, PA	---	---	4,100,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	38,500,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
	GLEN FOERD, PA	---	---	200,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	10,900,000	240,000	240,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	18,400,000	387,000	387,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 & 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	884,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	99,827,000	480,000	480,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	22,401,000	1,984,000	1,984,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	100,000,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	415,700,000	12,451,000	12,451,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	62,400,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	305,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	160,551,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
	TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY)	13,800,000	904,000	904,000
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	3,980,000	1,816,000	1,816,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	24,616,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	113,400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX	78,800,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	7,270,000	110,000	110,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	318,202,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	36,800,000	9,474,000	9,474,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	148,300,000	7,087,000	7,087,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	212,700,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	9,880,000	300,000	300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	---	8,000,000
	VIRGINIA			
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA	38,500,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	29,800,000	400,000	400,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	---	1,100,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	8,561,000	928,000	928,000
	WASHINGTON			
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS, WA	10,700,000	1,377,000	1,377,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	583,800,000	78,800,000	68,800,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,947,000	1,687,000	1,687,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,447,800,000	8,300,000	24,000,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	16,900,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	17,700,000	7,800,000	7,800,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	384,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	377,000,000	11,840,000	11,840,000
	WISCONSIN			
	PORTAGE, WI	---	---	250,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	3,000,000	2,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING (SECTION 208)	---	800,000	300,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	10,000,000	10,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	18,984,000	18,984,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	22,000,000	22,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES	---	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES	---	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION (SECTION 111)	---	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	5,000,000	2,500,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	24,280,000	12,000,000
	WETLAND AND AQUATIC HABITAT CREATION	---	15,000,000	2,500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-33,401,000	-33,401,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL		755,125,000	807,845,000

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

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System (Montgomery Point Lock and Dam), Arkansas.—The bill includes $6,000,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation project, the same as the budget request. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $2,000,000 of the funds requested for additional land acquisition at the project to complete construction of the access road and service facilities for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1946, as amended, and as described in the District Engineer's Report approved November 1, 1991. These funds are in addition to the $3,400,000 included in the budget request for activities related to Montgomery Point Lock and Dam. The Committee notes that no authority currently exists to utilize funds available in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund for construction of the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas.—The bill includes $6,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete construction of the Dickson Revetment.

San Diego River and Mission Bay, California.—The bill includes $1,900,000 for the Corps of Engineers to construct a permanent rubblemound breakwater at the Quivira Basin.

Silver Strand Shoreline, Imperial Beach, California.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a General Reevaluation Report for Federal shore protection improvements along the Silver Strand Shoreline in Imperial Beach, California.

Sacramento River Flood Control Project, (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the riffle restoration project and continue participation in, and, when necessary, provide direct support to, the state-Federal effort to develop a long-term solution to the fish passage problem at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant.

Los Angeles Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $325,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct wave monitoring throughout Los Angeles Harbor to verify assumptions about the prevailing wave climate.

Klamath-Glen Levee Repairs, California.—The Committee is aware that the Klamath-Glen Levee in Del Norte County, California, was constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1972 with 100 percent Federal funding. The levee faces serious likelihood of failure due to design deficiencies which the Corps of Engineers acknowledges were its fault. Failure of the levee could have catastrophic human and economic consequences in an already distressed area. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with repairs to the Klamath-Glen Levee, using available funds appropriated for fiscal year 1995, under the same financial terms as the original construction. In view of the admitted responsibility of the Corps for the design flaws, the Committee does not believe it is appropriate for the Corps to require a local contribution in this instance.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The amount provided for the Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, project includes $5,000,000 for the continuation of construction of the San Timoteo Creek project element.

Fort Pierce Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $148,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the preparation of a General Reevaluation Report for the Fort Pierce Beach, Florida, project.

St. Johns County (St. Augustine Beach), Florida.—The bill includes $350,000 for the continuation of a General Reevaluation Report to develop a comprehensive solution to the beach erosion problems at St. Augustine Beach, Florida.

Broward County, Pompano Beach/Lauderdale By-the-Sea, Florida.—The Committee has provided $450,000 for the Corps of Engineers to review design documents prepared by the county for the next renourishment of the Broward County, Florida, project.

Central and Southern Florida, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Central and Southern Florida project to be used to continue the preparation of a General Reevaluation Report for the Bolles and Cross Canals feature of the project.

Pinellas County, Florida.—The Corps of Engineers has advised the Committee that $1,500,000 in available funds will be used to complete the interim nourishment contract, complete the feature design memorandum, and initiate plans and specifications for the Long Key feature of the project and that $500,000 in available funds will be used to complete the feature design memorandum, and initiate plans and specifications of the Treasure Island feature of the project. In addition, the Committee has provided $3,000,000 which, along with $750,000 in available funds, is available to continue Phase IV of the Sand Key element of the project.

O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois.—The Corps of Engineers has advised the Committee that any additional funds which may be required to complete the O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, project will be reprogrammed from within available funds. The Committee approves of this procedure and directs the Corps of Engineers to take all steps necessary to complete the project as soon as possible.

Ohio River Flood Protection (Indiana Shoreline), Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare plans and specifications and initiate work on the rehabilitation of flood control projects along the Indiana shoreline of the Ohio River.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate construction of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion project authorized in Public Law 99-662.

Salyersville, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Salyersville, Kentucky, cut-through project.

McAlpine Lock and Dam, Kentucky and Indiana.—The Committee has provided $3,487,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete engineering and design and initiate construction of the McAlpine Lock and Dam, Kentucky and Indiana, project.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of parallel protection along the Orleans Avenue and London Avenue outfall canals.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $339,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Limited Re-evaluation Report for the Brewerton Channel Extension.

Red River below Denison Dam, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas.—The Committee has provided $3,800,000 to continue work on the Red River below Denison Dam, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, project. Within the amount provided, $500,000 has been provided to continue the Bowie County Levee, Texas, portion of the project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to continue to prepare plans and specifications for restoration or replacement of the Bowie County Levee as authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946 for incorporation into the Federal levee system to provide the same level of protection as the adjoining Miller County Levee in Arkansas under the terms and conditions of section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936, Public Law 74-738.

Southeast Louisiana Flooding, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of the devasting record flooding due to torrential rainfalls in southeast Louisiana that occurred May 8 through May 10, 1995. At least seven lives were lost and over 35,000 homes were flooded along with thousands of businesses and public facilities. There was significant street and highway damage. Estimated property and infrastructure losses exceed $3,000,000,000. More flood insurance claims have been filed already from this disaster than any other incident nationwide except for a storm that hit five northeastern states in December 1992. Flood insurance claims alone for six major rainfall floods in this area between 1978 and 1989 have already totaled $227,000,000. This Committee and the House Infrastructure and Transportation Committee have received proposals for authorizing and funding rainfall drainage flood control projects for this area which have preliminary positive benefit-cost ratios. The Committee believes that despite current Corps of Engineers policies and the Administration's proposed radical changes in the Civil Works mission of the Corps, Congress may want to consider funding urban rainfall flood control projects that prevent the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in future Federal disaster claims, grants, and public assistance. The Committee is carefully reviewing these proposals and has deferred action without prejudice at this time on this and all other flood control projects requiring new legislative authority pending future action later this year by the authorization committees on an omnibus water resources bill. The Corps has informed the Committee that ongoing studies for urban rainfall mitigation in southeast Louisiana are fully funded so they can proceed as quickly as possible. As in past years, the Committee has provided full funding for these studies. However, the current Corps project study process takes too long. Therefore, with a goal towards completing these studies faster than the current Corps process allows, the Committee directs the Corps to provide a report to the Committee, prior to the conference with the Senate on this bill, on a plan for having the private sector assist with or conduct this and other important Corps project study work.

Ste. Genevieve, Missouri.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers plans to use up to $3,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for construction of the Ste. Genevieve, Missouri,

project in fiscal year 1996. Because of the urgent need to complete this project as soon as possible, the Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for construction of the project in fiscal year 1996. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to take all steps necessary to expedite construction of this project.

Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channels, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee has been advised by the Corps of Engineers that $3,100,000 in previously appropriated funds will be available in fiscal year 1996 to continue engineering and design of Phase II of the Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay Channels, New York and New Jersey, project.

Onondaga Lake, New York.—In fiscal years 1994 and 1995, the Committee provided a total of $4,000,000 for design of the Onondaga Lake, New York, combined sewer overflow project authorized by section 307 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. At that time, the scope of the project had not yet been finalized and, therefore, construction costs had not yet been determined. Since then, the local sponsor has better defined the project and determined that design and construction of the project can be fully funded using the $4,000,000 of Federal funds already appropriated. In addition, the Committee is aware that the sponsor has agreed to finance any excess funding requirements over the Federal appropriation of $4,000,000. Accordingly, the Committee has no objection to the Corps of Engineers utilizing the $4,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for construction of the Onondaga Lake project.

Acequias Irrigation System, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $120,000 for the Acequias Irrigation System project in New Mexico, the same as the budget request. Those funds, combined with $1,900,000 in programmed carryover will provide a total of $2,020,000 for acequia rehabilitation projects in fiscal year 1996. The Committee remains concerned about the slow pace of work on this program and directs the Corps of Engineers to work more closely with acequia district members in order to accelerate the number of acequia projects undertaken. In addition, the Committee encourages the Corps to work with acequia district members to permit them to perform some of their own repairs.

Glen Foerd, Pennsylvania.—The bill includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate construction of the Glen Foerd, Pennsylvania, project authorized in section 106 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $4,100,000 for wetlands restoration and the completion of acid mine drainage mitigation projects for the Broad Top region of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties in Pennsylvania.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma.—From within funds previously appropriated for the Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, project, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use $150,000 to develop and implement an environmental monitoring plan for the project in fiscal year 1996.

Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has reduced the Administration's request for the Columbia River Juvenile Fish Mitigation program by $10,000,000 to $68,800,000. The amount appropriated for this activity in fiscal year 1995 was $36,300,000. The Committee is ex-

tremely concerned about the seemingly uncontrolled growth of this program. In fiscal year 1994, the Corps of Engineers reported that the total estimated cost of the program was $345,000,000. In this year's budget request, the Corps reported the total estimated cost as $583,600,000. The Committee is concerned that the Columbia/Snake River salmon recovery efforts have become a black hole for money even though there appears to be no consensus among all the parties involved in this effort about what needs to be done to restore the salmon runs.

The Committee has not included any funding for the continuation of advanced planning and design for public and private facilities affected by the operation of the John Day project at minimum pool levels. There is no regional consensus on this project, the cost of implementation would be exorbitant, and any improvement in fish mortality is expected to be marginal. The Corps should move ahead expeditiously in testing, and where applicable, installation of surface collection and bypass systems which do have regional consensus and may help salmon pass hydropower dams more successfully than conventional bypass systems. The final construction decision on the conventional bypass system at The Dalles should be held pending completion of surface bypass testing at that project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—The Committee has provided a total of $24,000,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. In addition to amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes $12,000,000 to continue phase III of the Harlan, Kentucky, element of the project, $4,100,000 for the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the project to continue floodproofing, complete real estate acquisition and perform levee/floodwall construction, and $1,600,000 for design work, the acquisition of real estate, and the continuation of floodproofing on the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project. In addition, the Corps is directed to continue construction of the Pike County, Kentucky, element using funds previously appropriated.

Poplar Island, Maryland.—The Committee recognizes the national economic importance of the Baltimore Harbor, and therefore urges the Corps to support, out of the funding provided for Wetland and Aquatic Habitat Creation (Section 204 funds), the Poplar Island Maryland Restoration Project.

Continuing Authorities Programs.—The Committee believes that the proposal of the Administration to terminate funding for the section 103, section 208, section 14, section 205, section 111, and section 107 continuing authorities programs beginning in fiscal year 1997 to be counterproductive to the well-being of the Nation. For relatively modest amounts of money these programs have provided significant benefits to many of our citizens, particularly those in smaller communities. The Committee notes that while proposing to terminate the traditional Corps of Engineers continuing authorities programs that help people, the Administration has proposed that the two newer environmentally oriented programs be funded at their full authorized levels. The Committee hopes that the Administration will reconsider this proposal and request adequate funding in fiscal year 1997 to continue these valuable programs.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $2,000,000 to design and construct modifications to upgrade the pump station and enlarge the detention pond at Sinkhole 7 in Muscle Shoals, Colbert County, Alabama; $350,000 to initiate plans and specifications for a project to rehabilitate the levees at Elba, Alabama, and Geneva, Alabama; $225,000 to complete the feasibility study, initiate and complete plans and specifications, and initiate construction of the Mission Zanja Creek, California, project; $370,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Magpie Creek, California, project; $200,000 for the Tehama-Hamilton City flood control study; $1,387,000 to initiate and complete construction of the North Libertyville Estates, Illinois, project; $184,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Flatrock River, Rushville, Indiana, project; $50,000 to complete design activities and initiate construction at Feather Creek in Clinton, Indiana; $30,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Pipe Creek, Alexandria, Indiana, project; $100,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along the White River in Anderson, Indiana; $95,000 to initiate a feasibility study of flood control improvements along the Red River at Clay City, Kentucky; $60,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for flood control measures along Beech Fork in Bardstown, Kentucky; $180,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications of the cut-through project at Cy Bend in Jackson, Kentucky; $400,000 to conduct reconnaissance studies and initiate feasibility studies of flood control projects on Fulmer, Moyer, and Steele Creeks in Herkimer County, New York; $200,000 to complete the feasibility study and prepare plans and specifications for the Cross Lake/Seneca River, New York, project; and $100,000 to initiate and complete a feasibility study for First Creek in Knoxville, Knox County, Tennessee.

The Committee directs the Army Corps of Engineers, within available funds under the Section 205 program, to proceed with the feasibility study of the Mill Creek project in Garfield Heights, Ohio, as recommended by the Corps in its initial assessment.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $200,000 for planning, design, and construction of an erosion control project at Big Racoon Creek at Bridgeton in Parke County, Indiana; $102,000 to initiate and complete construction of bank stabilization measures along the Ohio River in the vicinity of the Masterson House in Carrollton, Kentucky; $500,000 to construct two erosion control projects in Letcher County, Kentucky, at Kentucky Route 15 and River Road along the North Fork of the Kentucky River; $200,000 to design and construct streambank protection measures along the bank of the Tennessee River, river mile 158.7, at Clifton, Tennessee; $500,000 to design and construct streambank protection measures along the Tennessee River between river miles 645.0 and 647.3; $500,000 for design and construction of streambank protection measures along the Tennessee River at Tennessee Riverpark in Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tennessee; $500,000 for design and construction of streambank protection measures along the Tennessee River at Ross's Landing in Chattanooga, Hamilton County,

Tennessee; and $450,000 for a streambank erosion control project along the Ohio River in the city of Moundsville, West Virginia.

Small Beach Erosion Control Projects (Section 103).—Within available funds, the bill includes $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of measures to reduce storm damages along the area adjacent to Aqua Hedionda Lagoon in the city of Carlsbad, California, and, if a project is found to be feasible, to construct the project.

Project Modifications for Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—Within available funds, the bill includes: $300,000 for the development and planning of a turbine bypass device at Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River in California to improve temperature control for fishery habitat restoration; $500,000 for a habitat restoration project along the San Lorenzo River in California; $500,000 for an environmental restoration project along the Sacramento River at Golden State Island in Colusa County, California; and $200,000 to complete plans and specifications for environmental restoration activities at Drakes Creek and Memorial Parks at Old Hickory Lake, Tennessee.

Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.—The Committee has learned that the Corps of Engineers has been providing $200,000 per year to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for its role in this program and that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has requested the amount be increased by about $120,000 per year. The Committee believes that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should obtain the funds it needs to carry out its role in connection with this program through its own budget. The Committee, therefore, directs that the Corps of Engineers not provide funds available under this program to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in fiscal year 1996.

Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Program, Batchtown, Illinois.—The Batchtown Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project is an important part of the Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Plan. Batchtown provides important habitat to migratory waterfowl and fish.

A major threat to this area is sedimentation due to hillside erosion. Control of hillside erosion is essential to the long-term success of this project. Within available funds, the Committee expects the Corps to fund a hillside erosion component in the Batchtown Habitat Rehabilitation and Enhancement Project.

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

Appropriation, 1995	$328,138,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	319,250,000
Recommended, 1996	307,885,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−20,253,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−11,365,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,080,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS	9,582,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	2,092,000	238,000	238,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	325,000	325,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	114,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR	58,400,000	200,000	200,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		5,263,000	5,263,000
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,570,000,000	63,090,000	60,000,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	8,520,000	580,000	580,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,341,000,000	32,450,000	30,000,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	381,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	168,430,000	11,284,000	11,284,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	3,340,000	850,000	850,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	184,000,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,660,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA	57,200,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	92,800,000	13,300,000	13,300,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	2,400,000	148,000	148,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,438,497,000)	(47,928,000)	(47,928,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	101,894,000	8,928,000	8,928,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	526,550,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	7,248,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	207,400,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,406,000	2,810,000	2,810,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	248,309,000	2,948,000	2,948,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	314,891,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	18,400,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	128,000,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		217,940,000	212,400,000
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	61,626,000	56,000,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	146,000	146,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	115,000	115,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	5,630,000	5,630,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	9,363,000	9,363,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,628,000	2,628,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	1,258,000	1,258,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	206,000	206,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	13,341,000	13,341,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	150,000	150,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	87,000	87,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	875,000	875,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	77,000	77,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA	---	415,000	415,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	4,821,000	4,821,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,740,000	2,740,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	258,000	258,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	223,000	223,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	---	(22,638,000)	(22,638,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	2,012,000	2,012,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	860,000	860,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	4,329,000	4,329,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,380,000	1,380,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,135,000	1,135,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	---	474,000	474,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	529,000	529,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	709,000	709,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	3,601,000	3,601,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	1,415,000	1,415,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	1,368,000	1,368,000
(FC)	MAPPING	---	1,008,000	1,008,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		134,188,000	128,363,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-36,141,000	-36,141,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		319,250,000	307,885,000

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1995	$1,646,535,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	1,749,875,000
Recommended, 1996	1,712,123,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+65,588,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−37,752,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,668,000	5,668,000
(N)	BAYOU CODEN, AL	231,000	231,000
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	455,000	455,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,820,000	16,820,000
(N)	BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	551,000	551,000
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	252,000	252,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	506,000	506,000
(N)	FLY CREEK, AL	249,000	249,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,172,000	3,172,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	5,156,000	5,156,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,780,000	17,780,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	350,000	350,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,688,000	3,688,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	21,090,000	21,090,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	8,434,000	8,434,000
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,380,000	1,380,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,849,000	1,849,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	599,000	599,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	265,000	265,000
(N)	KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK	564,000	564,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	182,000	182,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	305,000	305,000
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,167,000	1,167,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	3,736,000	3,736,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	112,000	112,000
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,983,000	3,983,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,640,000	4,640,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,153,000	1,153,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,575,000	4,575,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,385,000	6,385,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,188,000	4,188,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,086,000	1,086,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	997,000	997,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,009,000	1,009,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,447,000	4,447,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR	500,000	500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	25,248,000	25,248,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,789,000	1,789,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,524,000	3,524,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,363,000	1,363,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,582,000	3,582,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	453,000	453,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,304,000	5,304,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,178,000	4,178,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	142,000	142,000
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,534,000	1,534,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	890,000	890,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,410,000	2,410,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,172,000	3,172,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	158,000	158,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,705,000	1,705,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,670,000	4,670,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	702,000	702,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	180,000	180,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,413,000	3,413,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER, CA	---	600,000
	MARINA DEL RAY, CA	---	900,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	172,000	172,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	217,000	217,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,580,000	2,580,000
(N)	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	845,000	845,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	883,000	883,000
	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	1,255,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,205,000	2,205,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,045,000	1,045,000
	OCEANSIDE HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	---	750,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA	1,690,000	1,690,000
	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	---	400,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,451,000	2,451,000
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	135,000	135,000
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,481,000	6,481,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	457,000	457,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	872,000	872,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	117,000	117,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	1,085,000	1,085,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	150,000	150,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,195,000	2,195,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,825,000	1,825,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,659,000	1,659,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,060,000	1,060,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,889,000	2,889,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,356,000	2,356,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	885,000	885,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,474,000	1,474,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,286,000	2,286,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	30,000	30,000
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	429,000	429,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	978,000	978,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,475,000	1,475,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	609,000	609,000
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	249,000	249,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	375,000	375,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	264,000	264,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	724,000	724,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	349,000	349,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	325,000	325,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	248,000	248,000
(N)	STONY CREEK, CT	412,000	412,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	471,000	471,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	486,000	486,000
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	16,090,000	16,090,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	40,000	40,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,513,000	2,513,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	785,000	785,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	75,000	75,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	187,000	187,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,736,000	4,736,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,846,000	9,846,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	3,275,000	3,275,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	886,000	886,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,623,000	1,623,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	712,000	712,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	221,000	221,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,293,000	3,293,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,119,000	6,389,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA	5,111,000	5,111,000
(N)	JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	400,000	400,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	296,000	296,000
(N)	NEW PASS, SARASOTA, FL	1,086,000	1,086,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,933,000	3,933,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	127,000	127,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,459,000	1,459,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	717,000	717,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	2,147,000	2,147,000
(N)	PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	72,000	72,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	4,000	804,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	88,000	88,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	3,744,000	3,744,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,894,000	5,894,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	4,321,000	4,321,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,411,000	3,411,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,377,000	7,377,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	5,218,000	5,218,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	10,364,000	10,364,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	9,480,000	9,480,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA	7,307,000	7,307,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,377,000	8,377,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	2,476,000	2,476,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	5,114,000	5,114,000
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	143,000	143,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI	480,000	480,000
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,467,000	4,467,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	9,144,000	9,144,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,064,000	1,064,000
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	ANDALUSIA HARBOR, IL	71,000	71,000
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	600,000	600,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,715,000	3,715,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,545,000	2,545,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	610,000	610,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	273,000	273,000
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	465,000	465,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	1,440,000	1,440,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN	20,844,000	20,844,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,717,000	1,717,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	648,000	648,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,399,000	6,399,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	12,437,000	12,437,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	73,347,000	73,347,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,434,000	3,434,000
(N)	ROCK ISLAND SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IL	123,000	123,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	970,000	970,000
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BEVERLY SHORES, IN	35,000	35,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	711,000	711,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,545,000	1,545,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	95,000	95,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	825,000	825,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	782,000	782,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	843,000	843,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	320,000	320,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	540,000	540,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,073,000	1,073,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	680,000	680,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	790,000	790,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	807,000	807,000
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,654,000	2,654,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	61,000	61,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	6,068,000	6,068,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,028,000	2,028,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,539,000	3,539,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,956,000	4,956,000
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,014,000	2,014,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	488,000	488,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	785,000	785,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	892,000	892,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	1,128,000	1,128,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,238,000	2,238,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,485,000	1,485,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	2,533,000	2,533,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,587,000	1,587,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,886,000	1,886,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	893,000	893,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,819,000	1,819,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,939,000	1,939,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	330,000	330,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,202,000	2,202,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,307,000	1,307,000
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	7,026,000	7,026,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,696,000	1,696,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,272,000	1,272,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,593,000	1,593,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	879,000	879,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,092,000	1,092,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	400,000	400,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,607,000	1,722,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	986,000	986,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,378,000	1,378,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,904,000	1,904,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,059,000	1,059,000
	KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	3,000,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,261,000	1,261,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	30,000	30,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	648,000	648,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	88,000	88,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,986,000	1,986,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	53,568,000	53,568,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	8,025,000	8,025,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	940,000	940,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,780,000	1,780,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	963,000	963,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	6,488,000	6,488,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,033,000	1,033,000
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	12,786,000	12,786,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	921,000	921,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	804,000	804,000
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	727,000	727,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	159,000	159,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	4,095,000	4,095,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,659,000	1,659,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	16,110,000	16,110,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,897,000	3,897,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	292,000	292,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	37,000	37,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,081,000	2,081,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA	51,837,000	51,837,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	12,084,000	12,084,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,645,000	1,645,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT	9,714,000	9,714,000
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,865,000	1,865,000
(N)	TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	186,000	186,000
	MAINE		
(N)	CRIEHAVEN HARBOR, ME	293,000	293,000
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	13,425,000	13,425,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455,000	455,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	520,000	520,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, MD	380,000	380,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD	660,000	660,000
(N)	CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	65,000	65,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	104,000	104,000
(N)	FISHING BAY, MD	70,000	70,000
(N)	HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	40,000	40,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,604,000	1,764,000
(N)	KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	782,000	782,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	260,000	260,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	128,000	128,000
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	150,000	150,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	615,000	615,000
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	342,000	342,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	336,000	336,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	331,000	331,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,087,000	8,087,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	153,000	153,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	236,000	236,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	385,000	385,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	364,000	364,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	339,000	339,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	356,000	356,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	326,000	326,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	241,000	241,000
(N)	NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	645,000	645,000
(N)	SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	208,000	208,000
(N)	SESUIT HARBOR, MA	217,000	217,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	384,000	384,000
(N)	WELLFLEET HARBOR, MA	1,214,000	1,214,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	479,000	479,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	369,000	369,000
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR, MI	29,000	29,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	245,000	245,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118,000	118,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	4,729,000	4,729,000
(N)	EAGLE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	372,000	372,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	817,000	817,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	123,000	123,000
(N)	GRELICKVILLE, MI	83,000	83,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	417,000	417,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	31,000	31,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	1,641,000	1,641,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	280,000	280,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	224,000	224,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	136,000	136,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	495,000	495,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	440,000	440,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	32,000	32,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	772,000	772,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	805,000	805,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	455,000	455,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	799,000	799,000
(N)	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	301,000	301,000
(N)	PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	260,000	260,000
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	103,000	103,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	297,000	297,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,802,000	1,802,000
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	918,000	918,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	868,000	868,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,080,000	1,080,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	14,982,000	14,982,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	434,000	434,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	475,000	475,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,396,000	3,396,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	550,000	550,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	145,000	145,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	4,077,000	4,077,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	302,000	302,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,515,000	3,515,000
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	461,000	461,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	153,000	153,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	203,000	203,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,876,000	2,876,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	113,000	113,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,773,000	1,773,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,988,000	2,988,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	280,000	280,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	410,000	410,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	3,000	3,000
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,279,000	5,279,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,065,000	2,065,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,549,000	8,549,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	1,403,000	1,403,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	731,000	731,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BETWEEN OHIO AND MO RIVERS, MO & IL (REG WO	18,858,000	18,858,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,668,000	1,668,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,030,000	1,030,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	150,000	150,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,528,000	3,528,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,565,000	5,565,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	15,000	15,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,050,000	4,050,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	5,009,000	5,009,000
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,363,000	6,363,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,488,000	1,488,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE , SD	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	742,000	742,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	811,000	811,000
	NEVADA		
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	378,000	378,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	163,000	163,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	387,000	387,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	346,000	346,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	614,000	614,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	827,000	827,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	392,000	392,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	401,000	401,000
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,455,000	1,455,000
(N)	CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	2,590,000	2,590,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	485,000	485,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	850,000	850,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	18,157,000	18,157,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,255,000	1,255,000
	MANASQUAN INLET, NJ	---	100,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	3,729,000	3,729,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	410,000	410,000
(N)	SHARK RIVER, NJ	1,190,000	1,190,000
(N)	TOMS RIVER, NJ	290,000	290,000
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,352,000	1,352,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,040,000	2,040,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,134,000	1,134,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	244,000	244,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	398,000	398,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	998,000	998,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	356,000	356,000
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	438,000	438,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	226,000	226,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	230,000	230,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,205,000	3,205,000
(N)	BROWNS CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	455,000	455,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	820,000	820,000
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	309,000	309,000
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	195,000	195,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	930,000	930,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	483,000	483,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	1,568,000	1,568,000
(N)	GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	130,000	130,000
(N)	GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,380,000	1,380,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,520,000	2,520,000
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY HARBOR, NY	160,000	160,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	220,000	220,000
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	3,880,000	3,880,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	1,930,000	1,930,000
(N)	LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	1,560,000	1,560,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	570,000	570,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,810,000	1,810,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	205,000	205,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,886,000	4,886,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740,000	740,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,020,000	6,020,000
(N)	OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	496,000	496,000
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	200,000	200,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	853,000	853,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	515,000	515,000
(N)	WILSON HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,097,000	5,097,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,237,000	1,237,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350,000	350,000
(N)	BELHAVEN HARBOR NC	415,000	415,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	855,000	855,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	852,000	852,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,070,000	1,070,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	857,000	857,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,506,000	6,506,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	4,650,000	4,650,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,108,000	3,108,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,695,000	1,695,000
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	840,000	840,000
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	125,000	125,000
(N)	SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	200,000	200,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,848,000	2,848,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,048,000	6,048,000
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,154,000	9,154,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	149,000	149,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230,000	1,230,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	405,000	405,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	101,000	101,000
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	861,000	861,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,088,000	1,088,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,907,000	1,907,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,186,000	1,186,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	722,000	722,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	13,038,000	13,038,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	655,000	655,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	620,000	620,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	623,000	623,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	914,000	914,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	820,000	820,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	407,000	407,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	922,000	922,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,287,000	8,287,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	213,000	213,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	521,000	521,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
(N)	ROCKY RIVER, OH	12,000	12,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,030,000	1,030,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,502,000	3,502,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	430,000	430,000
(N)	VERMILION HARBOR, OH	10,000	10,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	609,000	609,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	850,000	850,000
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	292,000	292,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	749,000	749,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,059,000	2,059,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	1,692,000	1,692,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	874,000	874,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	4,405,000	4,405,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,271,000	4,271,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	847,000	847,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	337,000	337,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	784,000	784,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,827,000	1,827,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	451,000	451,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,702,000	1,702,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,819,000	3,819,000
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,373,000	1,373,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	511,000	511,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	5,000	5,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,168,000	1,168,000
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,882,000	4,882,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	857,000	857,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	788,000	788,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,371,000	3,371,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,884,000	1,884,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,818,000	3,818,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	947,000	947,000
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	664,000	664,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	442,000	442,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	18,788,000	18,788,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	900,000	900,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,017,000	11,017,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	8,013,000	8,013,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	420,000	420,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,348,000	4,348,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	484,000	484,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	719,000	719,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,282,000	1,282,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	3,000	3,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,247,000	2,247,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	862,000	862,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	989,000	989,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	920,000	920,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,568,000	2,568,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	752,000	752,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	14,988,000	14,988,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	5,438,000	5,438,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,914,000	3,914,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,861,000	12,861,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	435,000	435,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	816,000	816,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	864,000	864,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	81,000	81,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	43,000	43,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,094,000	1,094,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	848,000	848,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	70,000	70,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	482,000	482,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,868,000	1,868,000
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	12,736,000	12,736,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	612,000	612,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	208,000	208,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,429,000	1,429,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,089,000	2,089,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	3,112,000	3,112,000
(FC)	CONNEMAUGH LAKE, PA	2,084,000	2,084,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,201,000	1,201,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	669,000	669,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,036,000	1,036,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	468,000	468,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	683,000	683,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	676,000	676,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	331,000	331,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,243,000	1,243,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,589,000	1,589,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,188,000	1,188,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,844,000	1,844,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	16,586,000	16,586,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	483,000	483,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	37,000	37,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,426,000	6,926,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,930,000	1,930,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,074,000	2,074,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	373,000	373,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,418,000	2,418,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,296,000	1,296,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	296,000	296,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,242,000	1,242,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	3,044,000	3,044,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,833,000	1,833,000
	PUERTO RICO		
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	10,000	10,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,430,000	2,430,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,436,000	5,436,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,468,000	3,468,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	386,000	386,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,509,000	3,509,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	64,000	64,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, SC	65,000	65,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,192,000	1,192,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	428,000	428,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	491,000	491,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	5,079,000	5,079,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	190,000	190,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184,000	184,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,520,000	8,520,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	573,000	573,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,363,000	9,363,000
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,281,000	5,281,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,886,000	5,886,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,192,000	4,192,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,062,000	4,062,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,410,000	4,410,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	7,281,000	7,281,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,637,000	13,637,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	650,000	650,000
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	823,000	823,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,139,000	1,139,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,210,000	1,210,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,249,000	2,249,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,610,000	1,610,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,038,000	1,038,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,649,000	3,649,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	1,667,000	1,667,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT BANSFIELD, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	874,000	874,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,190,000	2,190,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,033,000	6,033,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS, TX	12,000	12,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,130,000	2,130,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,870,000	2,870,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	136,000	136,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,886,000	1,886,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,484,000	1,484,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,986,000	1,986,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	17,806,000	17,806,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,007,000	1,007,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,823,000	5,823,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	810,000	810,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	218,000	218,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,303,000	2,303,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,788,000	2,788,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,145,000	5,145,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,780,000	1,780,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,386,000	1,386,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,840,000	1,840,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,120,000	1,120,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	873,000	873,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,628,000	1,628,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	783,000	783,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,846,000	11,846,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,317,000	4,317,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,282,000	2,282,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,819,000	1,819,000
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,628,000	1,628,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,802,000	1,802,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,370,000	1,370,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,014,000	2,014,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	473,000	473,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,688,000	3,688,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,326,000	2,326,000
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	548,000	548,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	648,000	648,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	388,000	388,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	483,000	483,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	606,000	606,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	363,000	363,000
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	3,169,000	3,169,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	880,000	880,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	42,000	42,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	36,000	36,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	888,000	888,000
(N)	CRANES CREEK, VA	321,000	321,000
(N)	DEEP CREEK, VA	887,000	887,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,169,000	2,169,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	647,000	647,000
(N)	HORKINS CREEK, VA	386,000	386,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	1,816,000	1,816,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,770,000	8,770,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,681,000	1,681,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	200,000	200,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	8,131,000	8,131,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	351,000	351,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,266,000	2,266,000
(N)	QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	337,000	337,000
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	570,000	570,000
(N)	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	389,000	389,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	487,000	487,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,355,000	1,355,000
(N)	TYLERS BEACH, VA	34,000	34,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,268,000	1,268,000
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,038,000	12,038,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	26,000	26,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	7,000	7,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, ID, MT & O	559,000	559,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	870,000	870,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	10,688,000	10,688,000
(FC)	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	1,373,000	1,373,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	14,884,000	14,884,000
(N)	KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	202,000	202,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,877,000	6,877,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,978,000	4,978,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	10,618,000	10,618,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,318,000	5,318,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA	731,000	731,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA	432,000	432,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,922,000	1,922,000
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	12,000	12,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,158,000	1,158,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	2,280,000	2,280,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	678,000	678,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	174,000	174,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	56,000	56,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	12,270,000	12,270,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	431,000	431,000
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	956,000	956,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,741,000	1,741,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,296,000	1,296,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	3,000	3,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	10,000	10,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	11,376,000	11,376,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,632,000	1,632,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	957,000	957,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,310,000	1,310,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,783,000	1,783,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,618,000	1,618,000
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	117,000	117,000
(N)	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	107,000	107,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	560,000	560,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	2,215,000	2,215,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,028,000	1,028,000
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	130,000	130,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	300,000	300,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	43,000	43,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	257,000	257,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	3,123,000	3,123,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	883,000	883,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	2,831,000	2,831,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	760,000	760,000
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	979,000	979,000
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	CIVIL WORKS ENERGY DATA SYSTEM	50,000	---
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	2,000,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	480,000	480,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	3,000,000	---
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	3,350,000	1,675,000
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	1,250,000	800,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS (ERGO)	2,000,000	---
	HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE RESTORATION	3,000,000	---
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	7,818,000	7,000,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAINSTEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	1,000,000	---
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	2,100,000	1,900,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	7,000,000	5,000,000
	NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION	4,000,000	2,000,000
	NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY (NRI)	500,000	---
	NATURAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SUPPORT (NRTS)	1,800,000	---
	PEER REVIEW PROGRAM	400,000	---
	PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS FOR O&M	3,500,000	---
	POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	4,000,000	---
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	11,498,000	7,000,000
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
	REAL TIME WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM (WCRP)	1,000,000	---
	REINVESTED USER FEES FOR RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS	5,000,000	---
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	---
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	500,000
	REPAIR EVALUATION MAINTENANCE RESEARCH (REMR II)	6,000,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH	1,150,000	---
	SCANNING HYDROGRAPHIC OPERATIONAL AIRBORNE LIDAR SURVE	1,750,000	1,750,000
	SCHEDULING REBERVOIR OPERATIONS	3,058,000	3,000,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	4,108,000	3,000,000
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	1,600,000	---
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,200,000	4,200,000
	WETLANDS ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	500,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-55,770,000	-55,770,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,749,875,000	1,712,123,000

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

Program Reductions.—The budget request proposed an increase of $103,340,000 in the Corps of Engineers operation and maintenance program for fiscal year 1996. The need to bring Federal spending under control, however, makes it impossible for the Committee to provide that level of funding. In order to provide as much money as possible for operation and maintenance of projects, the Committee has made significant reductions in the non-project specific activities funded under the Operation and Maintenance, General account.

Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint and Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa Basins Comprehensive Water Study, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.—The Committee is aware that the study's Executive Coordination Committee and the study partners have recommended that the study be extended for an additional year to complete the technical elements of the study and to develop a coordination mechanism for future water resources decisions. The Committee supports this effort and directs the Corps of Engineers to reprogram any additional funds required to complete the study.

Newport Bay Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $1,265,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair the jetties at Newport Bay Harbor, California.

Marina del Ray, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake the environmental documentation required in preparation for maintenance dredging of Marina del Ray in California.

Los Angeles River, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to address the shoaling problem at the mouth of the Los Angeles River, including the need to develop a disposal site for contaminated material.

Pillar Point Harbor, California.—The bill includes $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake repairs to the breakwater at Pillar Point Harbor, California.

Oceanside Harbor Experimental Sand Bypass, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $750,000 for the Oceanside Harbor sand bypass system. The funds will be used to complete the installation of various components as well as operate and test the system.

Success Lake, California.—The bill includes $700,000 for the completion of seismic studies at Success Lake in California, the same as the budget request. In preparing this report, the Committee expects the Corps to perform an analysis of the stability of the structure with a raised spillway as directed in House Report 103-533.

St. Augustine Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 for the St. Augustine Harbor, Florida, project for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging and utilize the material to nourish the beaches at St. Augustine Beach.

Jacksonville Harbor, Florida.—The bill includes an additional $2,250,000 for the repair of the existing training wall at St. Johns Bluff. This work will prevent shoaling in the Federal navigation channel for the Jacksonville Harbor, Florida, project.

Carlyle Lake, Illinois, Flood Release Policy.—Area residents have raised concerns about the Corp's water release policy at Carlyle Lake during flooding. Within available funds, the Army Corps of

Engineers is directed to update the economic and environmental analysis of its water management plan at Carlyle Lake.

Kentucky River Locks and Dams 5–14, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to make repairs to Kentucky River Locks and Dams 5–14 in preparation to transferring the project to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Fishtrap Lake, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $115,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a detailed update of the project master plan and accompanying environmental assessment to include plans for horseback riding and hiking trails, and ancillary facilities at Fishtrap Lake, Kentucky.

Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 45-foot Mississippi River channel is subject to rapid shoaling during high water periods causing draft restrictions. At times this shoaling reduces usable depth by as much as 2 to 3 feet. To lessen this problem, the Committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should consider performing a minimum of 2 feet of overdepth dredging, or such other overdepth as the Corps determines most effective, early in the dredging season to ensure that project depth can be maintained.

Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 36-foot Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet channel is experiencing serious bank failures on its north bank due to land subsidence, which is significantly increasing dredging costs. The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers recently experienced serious dredging delays, which caused draft restrictions, while attempting to resolve environmental issues in the process of obtaining Coastal Zone Consistency to dredge the Mile 50–56 reach. To resolve this particular issue, the only available solution was to construct a rock dike that provided bank stabilization before dredging could be accomplished. The Committee is of the opinion that to minimize future dredging costs and preserve wetlands the north bank Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet should be stabilized with riprap or similar hardened protection, as necessary, using available operation and maintenance funds.

Jennings Randolph Lake, Maryland and West Virginia.—The Committee has provided an additional $160,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on a revised master plan for Jennings Randolph Lake to reflect changing demand for public use facilities.

Pearl River, Mississippi and Louisiana.—The Committee has funded the budget request of $280,000 for this project. These funds are not for dredging and are only to be used to maintain the project in caretaker status and correct any safety problems, including lightning and boat trolley system improvements, at Pool's Bluff Sill or other lock locations.

New York Harbor, New York.—The amount provided for operation and maintenance of the New York Harbor, New York, project includes $4,500,000 for activities authorized under section 326 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, the same as the budget request.

Manasquan Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for engineering and design in preparation for maintenance dredging at Manasquan Inlet, New Jersey.

Abiquiu Dam, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers is in the process of acquiring land adjacent to Abiquiu Dam in New Mexico to assure proper recreational access to the project as authorized by Public Law 100–522. In carrying out that authorization, the Committee directs the Corps, to the extent practicable, to obtain land only from willing sellers.

Conchas Lake Dam, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware that there are approximately 70 residential dwellings located within the boundaries of the Conchas Lake, New Mexico, project and that the owners of those dwellings desire to purchase the land they currently lease from the Corps of Engineers. The Committee directs the Corps to cooperate with those individuals and permit them to purchase the land at fair market value.

Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania.—In fiscal year 1993, $1,000,000 was provided to the Corps of Engineers for dredging of an access channel and berthing area for the vessel NIAGARA at Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania, in an area known as the East Canal. The Committee has been advised that additional funds may be required to complete the project. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to continue to work with the city to see this project through to completion and directs that the Corps reprogram additional funds that may be required to complete the work.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to implement the updated master plan for the Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, project.

Cooper Lake and Channels, Texas.—The Committee has provided language in the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to transfer not to exceed 300 acres of land at the Cooper Lake, Texas, project from mitigation or low-density recreation to high-density recreation and to take whatever steps are necessary to accomplish that transfer.

Pat Mayse Lake, Texas.—The Committee has provided $873,000 for operation and maintenance of Pat Mayse Lake, Texas, the same as the budget request. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to maintain the current operating status of all recreation areas at this project.

John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir, Virginia.—From within funds provided for operation of the John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir project, the Corps of Engineers is directed to use $50,000 to complete studies associated with increasing whitewater releases.

Semi-Annual Hydrographic Surveys.—The Committee understands that in the Ports of New York and New Jersey the severe problem of insufficient dredged material disposal options has caused navigation channels to be dredged less frequently than in the past. As a consequence, the Committee is aware of the need for additional periodic hydrographic surveys to provide for the safe operation of the channels and to help harbor pilots avert the significant environmental damage that could occur with vessel groundings and collisions. In recent weeks it was announced by the City of New York that the quality of the harbor-estuary waters is the best it has been in sixty years of monitoring. That is an accomplishment worth protecting. Thus the Committee directs that within available project specific funds, the Corps of Engineers shall con-

duct semi-annual controlling depth hydrographic surveys and provide the results to the operating pilots so they will have best available information to safely move vessels in and out of port. The project channels reported by the pilots to be most in need of the semi-annual surveys are the Sandy Hook Channel, the Raritan Bay Channel, the Arthur Kill Channel, the Kill van Kull Channel, and the Newark Bay Channels, including Port Newark Channel and the Port Elizabeth Channel.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1995	$101,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	112,000,000
Recommended, 1996	101,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	
Budget Estimate, 1996	−11,000,000

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

In fiscal year 1996, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $101,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers' Regulatory Program, which is $11,000,000 below the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 1995 level. The Committee directs that the reduction below the budget request be derived from enforcement activities.

Santa Rosa Plain Vernal Pools, California.—The Committee has been advised that the Vernal Pool Preservation Plan will be completed by the end of June of this year and that in order to implement the plan, an environmental impact statement is required. From within available funds, the Committee has provided $250,000 for the preparation of the environmental impact statement on the Vernal Pool Final Preservation Plan.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriation, 1995	$14,979,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	20,000,000
Recommended, 1996	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−4,979,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−10,000,000

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

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1995	$900,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	850,000
Recommended, 1996	850,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−50,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

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

As a member of the Interagency Coordinating Committee, the Corps of Engineers will participate in the research program through the development of advanced displays, maps, and data management utilizing satellite and/or aircraft imaging data. These management tools will be developed for the on-the-scene spill coordinator's use for optimal allocation of resources and timely response to the specific oil spill situation.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$152,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	164,725,000
Recommended, 1996	150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−2,500,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−14,725,000

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 has retained language contained in the Fiscal Year 1995 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act that places a ceiling on the amount of General Expenses funds available for general administration and related functions of the Office of the Chief of Engineers. The amount provided in the bill for general administration and related functions of the Chief of Engineers includes funds for civil program accounts. The Committee has also retained language in the bill which prohibits the use of other funds appropriated for Corps of Engineers activities for activities in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Division Offices.

The Committee remains concerned about the money required to provide executive direction and management to the Corps of Engineers. At a time when the Committee is being asked to reduce the funding for some aspects of the Corps' mission and projects, and eliminate funding for others, we believe it is necessary and prudent to tighten up on executive direction and management within the Corps. Paramount in that concern is the uneven distribution of such executive supervision as is shown by the wide variety in the number of districts each division office supervises. The Committee is convinced that the Nation can no longer afford such a superstructure to manage this program and has directed the Secretary of the Army to prepare and submit to the Congress, a plan reducing the number of division offices to 6, 7, or 8, and to maintain a minimum of at least 4 districts in each division without closing any districts or changing their function. In addition, the Committee notes that the title division office is inappropriately applied to organizations who do not supervise geographically separated districts, and the Committee encourages the Corps to develop a more consistent structure in their proposed plan. While the Committee appreciates the restructuring efforts recently undertaken by the

Corps, and believes the new structure is appropriate, the Committee believes the program of the Corps has shrunk sufficiently that simply reducing the size of division offices is not a reasonable solution. The Committee anticipates this action will provide a savings of approximately $20,000,000 per year after it is implemented. The Committee has provided for congressional review of this plan prior to its implementation by requiring the Secretary to withhold implementation until May 1, 1996.

The Committee further believes that the Corps should seek additional opportunities to decentralize authority and empower the district offices to make decisions.

For fiscal year 1996, the Committee has recommended an appropriation of $150,000,000 for General Expenses, $14,725,000 below the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISION

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Hopper Dredging.—Public Law 95–269 requires that the Secretary of the Army carry out dredging work by contract if the Secretary determines that industry has the capability to do the work and that it can be done at reasonable prices and in a timely manner. Under this authority, the Corps tested industry's capability in the 1980's through a program of competitive bidding that indicated industry could do a great deal of the dredging work far more efficiently than the government. The Committee notes that recent efforts to test industry's capability by advertising 7,500,000 cubic yards of dredging volume previously accomplished by government vessels which is assumed in this year's budget has been successful and that a further test is advisable.

For fiscal year 1996, the Administration has proposed that the dredge MCFARLAND undergo a major rehabilitation estimated to cost $8,000,000 plus expensive additional scheduled maintenance of the vessel. The Committee is also aware that the Corps of Engineers is also continuing its analysis of the minimum dredge fleet and that it expects to be in a position to make a decision on whether or not the current fleet should be reduced in about two years. The Committee believes that it would be unwise for the Corps of Engineers to spend $8,000,000 for rehabilitation and significant additional sums for scheduled major repairs of the MCFARLAND when the possibility exists that it may be recommended for decommissioning within the next two years. Therefore, the Corps of Engineers is directed not to proceed with rehabilitation and major repair of the dredge MCFARLAND in fiscal year 1996 and, instead, to advertise the work done by the vessel in fiscal year 1995 as a further test of industry's capability in addition to the 7,500,000 cubic yards assumed in the budget.

The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its analysis of the minimum dredge fleet and reach a final decision as soon as possible.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1995	$40,163,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	44,139,000
Recommended, 1996	44,139,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+3,976,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1996 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $44,139,000, the same as the budget request.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1995	$14,190,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	13,602,000
Recommended, 1996	13,114,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−1,076,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−488,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
ARIZONA			
TUCSON/PHOENIX WATER CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE STUDY..	830,000	50,000	50,000
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	500,000	125,000	125,000
CALIFORNIA			
DEL NORTE CNTY/CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ST	---	---	500,000
FORT BRAGG WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	---	---	750,000
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE STUDY.....	500,000	175,000	175,000
LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY.....	300,000	100,000	---
MALIBU CREEK FISHERY ENHANCEMENT STUDY.....	250,000	50,000	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	---	---	100,000
SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	4,790,000	700,000	1,500,000
SO CALIF COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	750,000	50,000	---
SO CALIF COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY & RECLAMATION STUD	3,000,000	750,000	750,000
COLORADO			
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	163,377	50,000	50,000
SOUTHWEST COLORADO RURAL WATER SUPPLY.....	275,000	75,000	---
YAMPA RIVER WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	250,000	50,000	50,000
IDAHO			
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	958,000	100,000	100,000
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION.....	500,000	150,000	150,000
KANSAS			
KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION.....	275,000	100,000	---
MONTANA			
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	699,000	200,000	200,000
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	320,000	140,000	---
NEBRASKA			
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT.....	300,000	100,000	---
NEW MEXICO			
RIO GRANDE/LOW FLOW CONVEYANCE CHANNEL.....	480,000	100,000	---
OKLAHOMA			
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	375,000	100,000	---
OREGON			
CARLTON LAKE RESTORATION.....	352,000	50,000	50,000
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG SYS CONSERVATION PROJ FEASIBILITY	900,000	200,000	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES PROJECT.....	1,120,000	50,000	50,000
GRANDE RONDE RIVER BASIN	684,000	200,000	200,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY.....	824,000	300,000	300,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY.....	816,000	150,000	150,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING	892,000	200,000	200,000
OWYHEE STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	453,000	50,000	50,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS.....	800,000	100,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	462,170	150,000	150,000
TEXAS			
EDWARDS AQUIFER REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES & MGMT STUDY.	851,000	240,000	240,000
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARSH WETLANDS RESTOR/ENHANCE PROJ	504,174	150,000	150,000
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMENT...	800,000	200,000	---
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE.....	---	---	200,000
UTAH			
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	475,000	75,000	---
WEBER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	459,807	100,000	100,000
WASHINGTON			
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING.....	500,000	75,000	---
VARIOUS			
BEAR RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	337,342	100,000	100,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM....	51,880,082	375,000	375,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS.....	533,000	40,000	40,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	---	1,877,000	1,300,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT..	200,760	80,000	---
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	---	2,435,000	2,035,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	---	540,000	432,000
LOWER COLORADO INDIAN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	375,000	75,000	---
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	---	150,000	120,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES IN NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA.	1,250,000	250,000	250,000
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	490,000	140,000	140,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	---	1,666,000	1,322,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	1,209,000	200,000	200,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY..	932,000	250,000	250,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		13,602,000	13,114,000

New Studies.—Due to the severe budgetary situation, the Committee has deleted the funds requested by the Administration in fiscal year 1996 for new studies.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Salton Sea, California, research study.

Del Norte County and Crescent City Wastewater Reclamation Study, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate a study of wastewater reclamation alternatives for Del Norte County and Crescent City in California.

Fort Bragg Reclamation Study, California.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate a study of water reclamation alternatives, including the use of desalinization, for Fort Bragg, California.

Rio Grande Conveyance Canal/Pipeline, Texas.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the development of a model that will guide the planning, implementation, and operation of a project that would convey water directly from Elephant Butte Dam to El Paso, Texas.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1995	$432,727,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	375,943,000
Recommended, 1996	417,301,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−15,426,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+41,358,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			
CALIFORNIA			
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:			
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,384,342,000	1,387,000	1,387,000
DELTA DIVISION	369,386,000	6,800,000	6,580,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	466,328,000	11,060,000	10,498,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	499,972,000	879,000	7,580,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	350,776,000	664,000	664,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,878,272,000	900,000	900,000
SHASTA DIVISION	307,938,000	748,000	18,748,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	338,743,000	5,067,000	5,067,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECT	68,128,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	---	---	600,000
BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY	---	---	2,000,000
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	172,880,000	2,940,000	2,940,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	34,000,000	6,788,000	6,788,000
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE-TITLE 16	112,000,000	1,780,000	1,780,000
COLORADO			
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	287,570,000	5,798,000	5,798,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	251,582,000	1,231,000	1,231,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	88,338,187	300,000	300,000
IDAHO			
MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	80,000	80,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,483,258,000	24,900,000	24,900,000
OREGON			
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	51,068,000	8,700,000	8,700,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	67,351,000	3,802,000	3,802,000
MID-DAKOTA PROJECT	113,458,000	2,900,000	11,500,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	250,341,000	10,900,000	23,300,000
TEXAS			
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	---	1,500,000
WASHINGTON			
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	1,778,176,944	1,898,000	3,673,000
YAKIMA BASIN ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	---	---	1,500,000
VARIOUS			
COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY	61,228,000	15,000,000	10,000,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	---	3,256,000	---
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG. UC R	---	6,373,000	6,373,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION/RECOVERY PROJ., LC RES	10,936,000	2,170,000	2,170,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG., PN R	---	170,000	170,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	---	4,367,000	4,367,000
TITLE I, DIVISION, CAPACITY	488,835,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
TITLE II, NEW PUMPAT, CAPACITY	---	6,000,000	---
WATER CONSERVATION CHALLENGE PARTNERSHIPS	48,000,000	6,000,000	---
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION		187,136,000	182,661,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:			
BOISE PROJECT, ID	48,748,480	810,000	810,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	189,921,868	680,000	680,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM, AZ - CA	193,158,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR - CA	89,748,000	2,818,000	2,818,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL, NM - TX	2,780,000	100,000	870,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY, CO	21,348,636	800,000	800,000
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT, OK	120,148,342	128,000	128,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	45,311,289	700,000	700,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, CA - NV	83,197,000	7,280,000	7,280,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TX	109,344,394	196,000	196,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TX	74,082,894	28,000	28,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:			
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP, NE	363,708,863	900,000	900,000
OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP, SD	480,000,000	80,000	80,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT-TITLE 28, VARI	28,128,776	3,800,000	3,800,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, AZ	1,900,000	800,000	800,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	29,117,287	2,330,000	6,690,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	47,737,000	1,210,000	1,210,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION		23,203,000	27,273,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAM:			
CROOKED RIVER, OSWEGO DAM, OR	10,525,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	14,965,530	1,270,000	1,270,000
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	374,190,000	26,175,000	26,175,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	65,796,498	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ	57,665,000	8,066,000	8,066,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ	24,464,000	1,103,000	1,103,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	46,743,000	974,000	974,000
UMATILLA PROJECT, COLD SPRINGS DAM, OR	12,372,000	8,290,000	8,290,000
YAKIMA, SUNPING LAKE DAM, WA	5,864,000	1,836,000	1,836,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS		65,162,000	62,162,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:			
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UT	11,962,460	978,000	978,000
RIVERTON, WY	7,000,000	1,292,000	1,292,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	19,864,000	2,474,000	2,474,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT		4,744,000	4,744,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:			
ENERGY/WATER EFFICIENCY STANDARDS	900,000	480,000	---
[illegible]	24,839,150	771,000	771,000
[illegible]	1,200,000	300,000	---
[illegible]	2,170,000	300,000	300,000
[illegible]	4,000,000	1,000,000	800,000
[illegible]	14,525,107	1,700,000	1,200,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	118,106,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY		8,321,000	8,231,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS		258,581,000	282,986,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
COLORADO			
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	427,073,500	4,979,000	10,000,000
DOLORES PARTICIPATING PROJECT	882,188,000	3,470,000	3,470,000
UTAH			
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,230,086,867	13,579,000	13,579,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES, AZ, CO, NM, UT, WY	---	1,896,000	1,020,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		23,948,000	28,069,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT			
ARIZONA			
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LOREDP)	4,120,237,380	83,729,000	84,329,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS	150,692,000	39,411,000	39,411,000
CENTAL ARIZONA PROJECT, GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY	---	---	1,842,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		122,139,000	126,478,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS			
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-28,632,000	-30,132,000
TOTAL, CONTRUCTION PROGRAM		376,949,000	417,301,000

New Initiatives.—Due to the severe budgetary situation, the Committee has not provided funds requested by the Administration for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, the Water Conservation Challenge Partnerships program, and the new format proposed for the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program. In addition, the Committee has not provided the funds requested for Energy/Water Product Efficiency Standards and Improved River Basin Management, which are new initiatives proposed under the Science and Technology program.

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $94,225,000 to continue construction of the Central Arizona Project, $1,500,000 above the budget request. From within that amount, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to utilize $5,850,000 for work related to the Tucson Terminal Storage Facility, including $3,000,000 to acquire lands for the terminal storage site.

Central Arizona Project, Gila River Indian Community, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $1,842,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to reimburse the Gila River Indian Community for construction of irrigation works on the Sacaton Ranch as authorized by Public Law 103–435.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $80,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to support work to determine fish screening requirements, define an approach to meet those requirements, and develop a design concept, project schedule and funding plan for Contra Costa Canal intake at Rock Slough.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—

Fish Screen Criteria.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and appropriate resources agencies of the State of California to review and, where necessary, revise criteria for sweeping and approach velocities for new fish screens in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. Existing criteria were developed for tidally influenced areas and therefore appear unsuitable for at least some riverine conditions. Additionally, these tests will help develop suitable screening criteria for candidate species for which no screening criteria currently exist. The Committee is hopeful this review will lower the design and construction costs of fish screens in riverine environments.

Spring Run and Coho Salmon Programs.—The Committee has provided funds to be deposited with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to be used in support of activities to enhance and protect the Spring Run Salmon ($500,000) and the Coho Salmon ($250,000).

Salmon Stamp Program.—The Committee, pursuant to section 3407(e) of Public Law 102–575, has provided $350,000 for the Salmon Stamp Program, which is directed and overseen by representatives of commercial salmon fishermen, charter boat operators, and the California Department of Fish and Game for programs and activities that will increase the production of young salmon in Central Valley Project impacted streams or fishery habitat.

Little Holland Tract.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to acquire, in whole or in part, Little Holland Tract, California, with any and all appurtenant water rights, for wetland restoration, and waterfowl and fishery habitat enhancement purposes. The value of Little Holland Tract shall be determined in conformance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal land acquisitions, except that the appraisal shall be based upon the condition of the tract in its pre-1983 condition and the highest and best use of agricultural land at current fair market values.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—

Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District (Hamilton City Pumping Plant).—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete design and engineering work and initiate construction on a new fish screen and fish recovery facilities associated with the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's Hamilton City Pumping Plant. Costs incurred for work undertaken to construct and evaluate the interim fish protection improvements shall be included as a part of the Federal-state cost share, pursuant to section 3406(b)(20) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, of the long-term program to mitigate the fishery impacts associated with the district's operations.

Pilot Research Pumping Facility Evaluation.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue construction of the test pumps and to evaluate the effectiveness of the pilot research pumping facility.

Fish Passage Program.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue work on finding solutions for passage of endangered and threatened fish species at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam.

Alternative Fish Protection Facilities.—The Committee has provided an additional $650,000 for the installation and evaluation of electric fish guidance systems at Reclamation District 108's Wilkins Slough pumping plant and an additional $215,000 for the installation and evaluation of an alternative fish guidance system at Reclamation District 1004. Such funds are provided as a continuation of the Bureau of Reclamation's unscreened diversion technology demonstration program.

Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program. The Committee strongly supports this program's objectives.

Colusa Basin Drainage District.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 to continue work on the Colusa Basin Drainage District's integrated resource management project, which seeks to develop and demonstrate a cooperative approach to meeting multiple needs within the watershed, including the need to increase groundwater recharge, expand surface water supplies and improve flood protection.

Central Valley Project, Shasta Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $20,000,000 for continuing construction of the Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device, includ-

ing an additional $1,000,000 to be derived from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund. These funds, together with funds requested by the Administration, provide a total of $31,830,000 for construction of the temperature control device in fiscal year 1996. The need for the Congress to add these funds has been brought about by the failure of the State of California to thus far live up to its obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, which requires that the state contribute 25% of the cost of the temperature control device. The Committee has added these funds only because continued operation of Shasta Dam without the temperature control device in place can cost the taxpayers as much as $11,000,000 a year to replace power lost when water is bypassed away from the turbines.

Future funding for projects authorized in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act will be dependent on the State of California meeting its obligations under the law. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare a report on the extent to which the State of California has lived up to its cost-sharing obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and provide that report to the Committee on Appropriations by November 15, 1995.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division, California.—The Committee has provided $5,067,000 for the Trinity River Restoration Program, the same as the budget request. Included in that total is $500,000 to carry out the interagency agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Hoopa Valley Tribe regarding the Cooperative for Comprehensive Fisheries Management.

Central Valley Project, San Luis Unit, California.—On March 1 of this year the Commissioner of Reclamation submitted to the Committee a report concerning repayment of past and anticipated future expenditures for the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program. The report concludes that funds such as those that have already been appropriated for costs associated with irrigation-related project features are reimbursable and cannot be reallocated as nonreimbursable absent further direction from Congress. The Report also expresses Reclamation's intent to commence billing its contractors in the San Luis Unit for all those costs if Congress does not act to make certain costs nonreimbursable by the end of this session. The Committee is aware that the San Luis Unit contractors desire to pursue negotiations with the Bureau of Reclamation to develop a reasonable and cost-effective drainage solution. The Committee believes it is premature for Reclamation to collect any costs before these negotiations are complete and appropriate drainage service is provided. Therefore, the Committee directs that the Bureau of Reclamation take no action to collect costs associated with the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program or the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program until drainage service negotiations are complete, drainage service is provided, or the authorizing Committee has acted on this issue.

Orange County Regional Water Reclamation Project, California.—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete environmental and health effects studies and

begin preliminary design for the Orange County Water Reclamation Project.

Brackish Water Reclamation Demonstration Facility, California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 in support of the Port Hueneme Water Agency's brackish water reclamation demonstration project.

Animas-La Plata Project, Colorado.—The Committee remains extremely concerned about the slow pace of work on the Animas-La Plata project, which is the major element of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement. The Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Tribes negotiated in good faith with the United States to reach this agreement. The tribes and the non-Indian participants in the projects have met all their commitments. The only thing lacking has been the commitment of the Federal Government to complete construction of the project. Therefore, the Committee has provided $10,000,000 for construction of the Animas-La Plata project in fiscal year 1996.

Northwest Wastewater Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Northwest Wastewater Reuse Project being undertaken in cooperation with the El Paso, Texas, Water Utilities Public Service Board. This project will provide up to 17,500,000 gallons per day of treated sewage effluent for use in place of potable water that is currently used to irrigate schools, parks, and golf courses.

Columbia Basin Project, Washington.—The Committee has included an additional $875,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on drainage facilities for the Columbia Basin project in Washington.

Wetlands Development.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,600,000 for the Wetlands Development program to continue the Caddo Lake Wetlands Project.

Columbia/Snake River Salmon Recovery.—The Committee has reduced the Administration's request for Columbia/Snake River salmon recovery activities by $5,000,000 to $10,000,000. The amount appropriated for this activity in fiscal year 1995 was $5,600,000. The Committee is extremely concerned about the rate of growth of this program. In the fiscal year 1995 budget request, the Bureau of Reclamation reported that the total cost of this program was $30,850,000. In this year's budget request, Reclamation reported the total cost as $61,226,000. The Committee is concerned that Columbia/Snake River salmon recovery efforts have become a black hole for money even though there appears to be no consensus among all the parties involved in this effort on what needs to be done to restore the salmon runs.

Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee has no objection to the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Pima County Flood Control District to proceed with the Rillito Creek, Arizona, High Plains Groundwater Recharge Demonstration project at a site on the lower Santa Cruz River.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1995	$284,300,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	288,759,000
Recommended, 1996	278,759,000

Comparison:
Appropriation, 1995 ..... −5,541,000
Budget Estimate, 1996 ..... −10,000,000

In 1996, a total of 36 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects will be operated and maintained for power, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits with funds made available under this appropriation.

Provision is also made for administration of 13 associated programs. These programs seek to maximize benefits from existing projects. Project benefits and operations will be enhanced through water conservation measures, examination of existing structures, environmental considerations, improvement of recreation opportunities, and water quality improvement.

The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $278,759,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation's Operation and Maintenance program, $10,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee directs that this reduction is taken within the various Associated O&M Programs. The Associated O&M Programs have grown from about 10% of the overall Operation and Maintenance budget in fiscal year 1989 to a level of almost 17% in the fiscal year 1996 budget request.

The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to continue its efforts to transfer operation and maintenance responsibilities of projects to the beneficiaries of those projects.

Central Valley Project, California.—The Committee has provided $59,681,000 for operation and maintenance of the Central Valley Project, the same as the budget request.

From within that total, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to provide $5,454,000 for operation and maintenance activities of the Trinity River Division. The additional funds provided above the budget request will be available to repair damages incurred during the winter and to complete the Environmental Impact Statement to support the instream flow decision the Secretary of the Interior is required to render in 1996.

The Committee is pleased that the Bureau of Reclamation has requested $4,625,000 for replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items. However, the Committee is concerned that the canal authorities, which operate the vast majority of the project, are not being adequately consulted in determining how such funds are allocated. Therefore, from within the $4,625,000 provided for replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items, the Committee directs the Bureau to provide $750,000 to repair the damaged lining at M.P. 47 to M.P. 16 of the Tehama-Colusa Canal, $1,000,000 to rehabilitate or replace radial gates at 17 check structures and four wasteway structures associated with the Delta-Mendota Canal, and $700,000 to rehabilitate the Kern River Check Outlet and make repairs to service roads associated with the Friant-Kern Canal.

The Committee notes that the backlog in replacements, additions, and extraordinary maintenance items continues to grow and now exceeds an estimated $81,000,000. The Committee is very concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to comply with the Committee's directive to submit a plan, by February 1995, for reducing the backlog in replacements, additions and extraordinary

maintenance items in a timely manner. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to submit this previously requested plan as soon as possible.

Solano Project, California.—The Committee encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the city of Vallejo, California, to find a way to permit the city to use Bureau facilities to transport water from Lake Curry.

Solano Project, California.—The Committee is concerned that resort concessionaries on Lake Berryessa in California have been unable to make improvements to facilities because of uncertainties regarding extension of their leases by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee believes that the Bureau should either take action to extend the existing leases for a period long enough to permit cost recovery or, in the alternative, assure that concessionaires will be compensated for long-term improvements if their leases are not renewed.

The Committee is also concerned about late objections raised by the Department of the Interior to the settlement agreement for the Putah Creek Adjudication, Lake Berryessa, and encourages the Department to work with all parties to swiftly resolve these objections.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1995	$9,600,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	16,668,000
Recommended, 1996	11,668,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+2,068,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−5,000,000

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.

New Loan Program Activity.—Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee has deleted the $5,000,000 requested by the Administration for the proposed new loan program.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
ARIZONA			
TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION - SCHUK TOAK DISTRICT	5,307,000	3,043,000	3,043,000
CALIFORNIA			
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	16,036,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT	9,984,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 3	13,395,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY	10,212,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT-ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATE	8,001,000	700,000	700,000
COLORADO			
UTE MOUNTAIN UTE	3,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
OREGON			
DOUGLAS COUNTY - MILLTOWN HILL	17,274,000	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	---	425,000	425,000
NEW LOAN PROGRAM ACTIVITY	---	5,000,000	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM		16,668,000	11,868,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 1995	$45,385,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	43,579,000
Recommended, 1996	43,579,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−1,806,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative, California.—The Committee directs that the $1,000,000 requested for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative not be expended for that purpose. This action is consistent with the action of the Congress during consideration of H.R. 1158. In the reports accompanying that bill, the Bureau of Reclamation was directed not to obligate any additional funds in fiscal year 1995 for the San Joaquin River Basin Management study.

Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for construction of the Shasta Dam Temperature Control Device.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$54,034,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	50,327,000
Recommended, 1996	48,630,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−5,404,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−1,697,000

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

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

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Funding recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 1996 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 1996 budget request in many areas. Absorbing these reductions will require much effort on the part of the Department to prioritize activities and seek the most cost-effective means for accomplishing program goals. The Department must focus on specific program missions and reduce the number of activities currently being performed which may be nice to do, but are not possible in a severely constrained funding environment.

While the Committee acknowledges that these program reductions will be difficult, recent reviews such as the Galvin Task Force list numerous areas where improvements should be made. Examples of areas where the Committee expects to see reductions include: the number of federal employees at headquarters who micromanage field and laboratory activities instead of setting policy and allowing implementation of these policies at the field level; the number of individual sites and offices throughout the country where Department of Energy employees are stationed; the number of support service contractors paid to do work which should be performed by federal employees at headquarters and in field offices; the number of internal Departmental regulations requiring facilities and laboratories to far exceed the requirements applied to comparable commercial facilities; and the subsequent compliance reviews conducted by every level of federal and contractor management.

LABORATORY CONSOLIDATION

The Committee believes the Department is maintaining a facility and laboratory structure larger than necessary to manage and execute programs, forcing overhead and administrative costs to remain at high levels while direct program costs are decreasing. Consequently, the Committee expects the Department to review critically its facility needs and be prepared to justify the existence of all current facilities and laboratories in the next budget cycle. Ad-

ditionally, the Committee expects the Department to review the comparative costs charged by each laboratory to perform work for federal programs to ensure that the most cost-effective laboratories are fully utilized and that efforts are made to reduce the costs of maintaining the most expensive laboratories.

SUPPORT SERVICE CONTRACTORS

Extensive use of support service contractors by the Department of Energy at headquarters and the field offices is a circumstance which had not been fully recognized by the Committee. The Committee understands that services such as janitorial services, mail room operations, and grounds maintenance are activities which often are more cost-effective when performed by the private sector. A cost-benefit analysis will support contracting out these activities. However, other support services contracts comprise a "shadow government" which performs functions traditionally performed by federal employees—administrative and clerical support, preparation of budgets, performance of compliance reviews of contractor activities, and extensive preparation of analyses used by decision-makers. Current estimates indicate over 6,000 support service contractors are employed by the Department. Federal employees have adopted roles as contract managers rather than program managers, and the hazards of this arrangement are becoming very clear. Program managers do not appear to be fully cognizant of issues under their purview. There is no "corporate view" of Departmental issues which have broad ranging ramifications for other program areas. There is a proliferation of computer and information systems which are not compatible throughout the agency. And there often appears to be little regard for recommending ways to reduce program costs and save taxpayers' money.

Funding for support service contracts has been significantly reduced in the Committee's recommendations. The Department is directed to submit quarterly reports on the use of all support services contracts at headquarters and in the field. This report should include the name of the contractor, annual funding for fiscal year 1996, number of employees, and a brief description of the work performed. The Committee expects to see funding for support services contracts drop during fiscal year 1996 by 50% from the fiscal year 1995 levels with the goal of eliminating by the following year all support service contracts which cannot be justified on the basis of a cost-benefit analysis or as a short-term requirement for expertise in a technical specialty area.

OPERATING AND CAPITAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

Discussions initiated by the report of the Galvin Task Force reviewing Department of Energy laboratory operations have highlighted instances where the current budget structure and Congressional funding limitations may result in excessive administrative and procedural oversight. This micromanagement leads to increased costs and diminished productivity in the operation of the Department's laboratories and facilities. The Committee proposes to merge capital equipment, general plant projects, and most accelerator improvements project funding with the operating funding to expedite the allocation of resources for operations and infrastruc-

ture activities and to ensure the operation of the Department's laboratories and facilities in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

Construction activity that exceeds the general plant project threshold of $2,000,000 will continue to require specific authorization and appropriation by Congress. Any construction activity that does not exceed the $2,000,000 threshold will be included in the operation and maintenance account.

In implementing this change, the Committee directs the Department to continue to reflect the capital equipment, general plant projects, and accelerator improvement projects in the financial and accounting reports. The Committee does not seek to control these expenditures, but to be informed if there are major differences between the funding requested for capital items in the fiscal year 1996 budget request and the actual execution of the programs under these new guidelines. Also, specific details for planned capital equipment and general plant projects will continue to be reported in the annual budget justifications. Appropriate headquarters oversight will be necessary from a corporate facility viewpoint to ensure the proper allocation of resources for ongoing operations versus investments in assets. However, the Committee expects the facility managers to have sufficient flexibility to allocate resources in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR THE TOTAL PROJECT COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

The cost of construction projects for the Department of Energy includes activities funded from operating as well as construction accounts. In addition to the preparation of the conceptual design report, project-related costs funded from operating expenses include items such as research and development, preparation of design criteria, safety analyses, and environmental documentation. As a result, the Department may conduct activities related to construction projects prior to the authorization of the specific project by Congress.

To ensure that all project-related activities funded by operating expenses are identified and reviewed by Congress, the Department is directed to identify in the annual budget justifications: (1) funding by project for all conceptual design reports where the cost of preparation will exceed $3,000,000, and (2) funding by project for all project-related activities which will exceed $3,000,000 on proposed construction projects which have a completed conceptual design report but for which specific construction project authorization has neither been requested nor provided by Congress.

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS

The quality of the Department's budget justifications has declined—the number of pages has increased while actual budget information has decreased. Much information must be gleaned through additional program briefings and questions for the record. This additional work could be reduced by devoting more attention to the information provided in the initial budget submission.

Program budget justifications consistently fail to place activities in the context of how they help achieve major program goals and

objectives, and how they are related to other Departmental program objectives and activities. Each Assistant Secretary and program director is responsible for preparation of the budget documents submitted to Congress. Attention should be given to making the best possible case for programs in the initial budget submission rather than waiting until preparation of testimony for Congressional budget hearings is required before trying to articulate a cohesive program strategy.

The Committee staff will be working with the Department's budget office and individual program offices to reduce the volume and improve the quality of the budget justifications for the next fiscal year and to explore means for possible electronic transmission of some information.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1995	$3,314,548,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	3,396,535,000
Recommended, 1996	2,596,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−717,848,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−799,835,000

The appropriations recommended for Energy Supply, Research and Development activities provide for the Department of Energy's solar and renewable energy programs; environment, safety and health; nuclear energy programs; energy research programs including fusion, biological and environmental research, and basic energy sciences; and environmental restoration programs.

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1996 supports to the extent possible the role of Federal participation in basic research and development programs in energy supply activities. Due to budget constraints, significant reductions in certain of the Department's programs were necessary. To provide more flexibility in program execution in a time of declining budgetary resources, the recommended funding levels have merged operating, capital equipment and general plant project funding. Funding for programs which have accelerator improvement projects which are less than $2,000,000 has also been merged to provide flexibility.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable energy is $221,622,000, a decrease of $201,775,000 from the budget request of $423,397,000.

Solar Energy.—Funding for fiscal year 1996 is $149,184,000 which reflects the redirection of budget priorities for energy research and development programs from commercial applications to basic research. Accordingly, funds are not provided for the international solar energy program, the solar technology transfer program, the solar buildings technology research program, and solar program support.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $25,729,000, a decrease of $11,243,000 from the budget request of $36,972,000. Funding has not been included to maintain the Energy Technology Engineering Center in this program.

Included within available funds is $2,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the final Department of Energy contribution to the approximately $40,000,000 cost-shared project to inject treated wastewater effluent from Lake County, California, into the geothermal heat reservoir at the Geysers field in California.

Within available funds, the Committee provides $400,000 to study the feasibility of piping treated effluent from Santa Rosa to the Geysers for injection, and supports the Department's budget request to proceed with the Geysers decline mitigation study.

The Committee is aware of the promising conservation attributes of geothermal heat pump technology and the Department's efforts to advance this emerging technology through cooperative efforts with electric utilities. The Committee has again included $5,000,000 for the Department to carry out a geothermal heat pump market mobilization and technology demonstration program. This funding will be supplemented by the private sector's cost-sharing contribution to the program.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee has increased funding for hydrogen research to $15,000,000, an increase of $7,666,000 over the budget request of $7,334,000. Authorization for this program has passed the House and is awaiting action in the Senate.

Hydropower.—Due to severe budget constraints, no funds are provided for this program.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation for electric energy systems and storage is $28,909,000. Funding constraints did not permit continuing the reliability research program and the energy storage systems program.

The Committee recommendation includes the Administration's budget request of $9,924,000 for the electric and magnetic fields research program.

The Committee supports the budget request for the Superconductivity Partnership Initiative. The Committee is pleased that the Department is heeding last year's directive regarding the Superconductivity Partnership Initiative (SPI) by expediting coordination among industry consortia and academic research and development programs. This government-industry-university collaboration brings scientific accountability to SPI and should hasten significant accomplishments in material characterization and high-temperature superconducting wire development. The Committee expects this collaboration to continue as a core feature of SPI and directs the Department to provide adequate program support.

Biofuels.—Within available funds, the Committee has provided $3,000,000 as the Federal contribution to an ethanol production plant begun by the City of Gridley, California, with Department of Energy assistance in fiscal year 1995. Primarily using rice straw, this plant will establish on a commercial scale the technologies and processes required for cost-effective conversion of biomass into ethanol fuel.

The Committee has sought to restore somewhat the cuts recommended in the solar and renewable energy accounts by the authorizing committee to allow for a more orderly transition from current levels of spending in these programs to their new levels focused more exclusively on research. In view of the United States'

use of 70 percent of its energy in the form of liquid fuels for transportation, much of it imported, the Committee wishes to note that it supports the levels recommended for biomass conversion by the authorizing Committee. The Committee has, therefore, added additional funds to the biofuels energy systems account to mitigate somewhat for abrupt losses that will occur to the biomass electric activities.

Policy and management.—The Committee recommendation for this account reflects the reductions in the solar and renewable energy programs.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation is $255,698,000, a decrease of $127,119,000 from the budget request of $382,817,000.

The recommendation includes $40,000,000 for the design certification and standardization activities for the advanced light water reactor program.

The Committee recommendation provides $20,000,000 to support continuation of the gas turbine-modular helium reactor program. This is an increase of $12,750,000 over the budget request of $7,250,000 which had been proposed for termination of this program. The termination cost account has been reduced to reflect this shifting of funds.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee's recommendation does not include any funding to investigate new missions for the nuclear energy research and development program at the Argonne National Laboratory. Funding of $18,000,000 is included in the nuclear technology research and development program to evaluate the use of electrometallurgical technology to treat spent fuel, contingent upon a favorable conclusion from the current National Academy of Science study.

The Committee's recommendation does not include funding for two new initiatives. The budget request of $78,764,000 for the Soviet-Designed Reactor Safety program has not been included. This program has previously been funded by the Agency for International Development (AID), and AID should continue funding responsibility for this program if additional activities are required in fiscal year 1996. Also, the recommendation does not include funding of $5,000,000 requested for the Russian Replacement Power Initiative program.

Due to the downsizing of the nuclear energy program, the Committee's recommendation for program direction and policy and management is adjusted accordingly.

Isotope Support.—The Committee recommendation is $24,658,000, a reduction of $700,000 from the budget request of $25,358,000.

Within available funds, $1,000,000 is provided to continue conceptual investigation of a National Biomedical Tracer Facility (NBTF). This is in addition to $3,000,000 of funding provided in fiscal year 1995. These funds are to be used for conceptual design and site specific design work on the NBTF that meets the criteria cited in the Institute of Medicine Panel's report on Isotopes for Medicine. The Committee expects to be kept informed of the progress being made on this activity.

In order to consolidate related isotope production activities, $1,400,000 for the Test Reactor Area Hot Cells has been transferred from nuclear energy research and development to the isotope support program and included within available funds.

The Committee is concerned about the level of administrative oversight supporting the Isotopes Support program. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for program direction, a reduction of $700,000 from the budget request of $1,700,000.

Termination Costs.—The National Academy of Sciences' Committee on "Electrometallurgical Techniques for DOE Spent Fuel Treatment" concluded that electrometallurgical techniques being developed at the Argonne National Laboratory could represent a sufficiently promising technology for treating a variety of DOE spent fuels and warrant continued research and development. In order to preserve the unique capabilities of the assets at Argonne-West, activities related to bringing EBR–II to a safe and stable configuration may proceed, but such activities must leave the Argonne-West facilities, including EBR–II, capable of later utilization.

General Reduction.—Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee has included a general reduction of $8,000,000 to be applied equally among all program activities.

CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee has not provided the requested funding of $699,000 for this program in fiscal year 1996.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation of $128,433,000 is $38,326,000 less than the budget request of $166,759,000. Much criticism has been heard regarding excessive compliance reviews and audits of field facilities and laboratories. With the reduction in funding resources, the Committee expects the Department to make every effort to coordinate reviews and eliminate excessive oversight by headquarters and field organizations, and to reduce the use of support service contract employees to perform federal functions.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation of $379,645,000 is $52,019,000 less than the budget request of $431,664,000.

The Committee recognizes that there exists a critical need to develop the appropriate and effective technology to support the Department's environmental remediation activities. The Department is encouraged to use the expertise and scientific achievements of the Energy Research programs and the national laboratories to address the environmental cleanup technology issues.

Within available funding, the Committee supports the National Institute for Global Environmental Change.

The Committee encourages the Department to support research in the development and shared use of high MR instruments for the

study of brain function in centers where these research efforts can lead to improved diagnosis and treatment of the mentally ill.

The Committee is pleased to note the progress that has been made with the Centers of Excellence for Laser Medical Applications. It is apparent that the competitive edge has been maintained, the U.S. citizens are benefiting from this cost-effective technology. Therefore, the Committee recommends that funding for the work of these Centers remain at the current level of $1,500,000.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000 for the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory which is the same as fiscal year 1995, and $10,000,000 less than the budget request.

FUSION PROGRAM

The Committee recommendation for the fusion program is $229,144,000, a decrease of $136,901,000 from the budget request of $366,045,000.

Given the mandate to reduce the budget deficit, the Committee is not able to provide funding to support the direction of the fusion energy program as requested by the Department. It will be necessary for the Department to develop a revised program strategy for fusion energy at a much reduced funding level. Budget realities dictate that future funding will not be available to pursue the course envisioned by the Department's budget request which included funding both the International Thermal Experimental Reactor and the Tokamak Physics Experiment project.

The fusion program is currently being reviewed by the President's Council on Science and Technology, but results of this review are not yet available. With the funding provided in fiscal year 1996, the Committee expects the Department to propose a fusion program which supports advancement of key research areas and exploration of alternatives at a much smaller scale in laboratories and universities. This plan should be developed in consultation with the fusion community and Congress, but with the understanding that future funding levels are unlikely to increase and could well decrease below the fiscal year 1996 recommendation. The Department should also to the extent possible make effective use of the investment in existing facilities.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for Basic Energy Sciences is $792,661,000, a decrease of $18,758,000 from the budget request of $811,419,000.

The Committee acknowledges the important and essential contributions of the Department in the Nation's basic science and research programs. The collaboration between the national labs and the university community has provided the foundation for scientific breakthroughs and achievements in energy-related research. To continue this progress, the Committee recommendation strongly supports the budget request to enhance the utilization of the Department's fundamental science and user facilities.

The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 to continue the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program at the fiscal year 1995 level.

Within available funds, $1,000,000 is provided to fund peer-reviewed research on the potential energy applications of sonoluminescence. Sonoluminescence is an effect in which highly concentrated sound waves in liquids generate very short bursts of light from bubbles in the liquid. Calculations have suggested the possibility of its use in inertial fusion applications.

The Midwest Superconductivity Consortium is continued at the fiscal year 1995 funding level of $3,200,000.

The Committee has included the budget request of $8,000,000 for research and design and conceptual design activities for a spallation neutron source. The preferred alternative site for the spallation source is the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee to maximize the use of the expertise already developed through preparation of the advanced neutron source design and to take advantage of the laboratory's experience in operating particle accelerators and conducting neutron scattering research.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Other energy research programs such as energy research analyses, laboratory technology transfer, advisory and oversight, multiprogram energy laboratory support, and policy and management are funded in this section. The Committee recommendation for Other Energy Research programs is $45,256,000, a decrease of $79,979,000 from the budget request of $125,235,000.

No funding has been provided for the Laboratory Technology Transfer program. Technology transfer activities in energy research should be funded only to the extent that they directly support ongoing energy research programs and can compete for direct program funding.

The Committee recommendation for the Advisory and Oversight program is reduced as a result of redundant environmental, safety and health departmental oversight and the termination of the laboratory technology transfer activities.

The Committee supports the budget request for the construction projects in the Multiprogram Energy Laboratories program. The capital equipment and general plant projects accounts are merged with the Energy Research program that is supported by the specific capital items.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommendation for Energy Support Activities is $12,000,000, a decrease of $92,810,000 from the budget request of $104,810,000.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendations does not include funding for the University and Science Education programs. It is recognized that certain educational activities, such as graduate fellowships and intern programs, are a direct byproduct of the line programs and are, therefore, included in the budget request of those programs. Those educational activities that are an integral part of program activities should be continued within existing program funds.

The Committee recommendation for the Technical Information Management program is $12,000,000, a reduction of $5,450,000

from the budget request of $17,450,000 due to severe budget constraints.

Due to the significant reduction in funding for technology transfer activities throughout the Department, the Committee recommendation does not include funds for a separate Technology Partnership organization.

The In-house Energy Management program has been in existence over twenty years. The Committee recognizes the success of the Department's efforts to incorporate energy efficiency provisions into the operations of its facilities. After twenty years, it appears that energy efficiency is an integral part of the operating philosophy of the Department's facilities; therefore, the Committee does not see the need for a separate funding source for these alternatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(NON-DEFENSE)

The Committee recommendation of $626,541,000 is a decrease of $86,449,000 from the budget request of $712,990,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $15,998,000 to continue the Maywood, New Jersey project, and $6,080,000 for the Wayne, New Jersey project, as contained in the budget request for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program.

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

Due to the relationship between corrective activities and waste management, the operating expenses for corrective activities have been combined with waste management. In addition, beginning in fiscal year 1997 all new corrective activities construction projects should be included in the waste management program.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Department proposed to use $79,300,000 of prior year balances to offset current year funding requirements and $50,000,000 to be achieved by implementing savings recommended by the Galvin Task Force. The Committee recommendation includes the use of prior year balances, but not the undistributed general reduction. Specific program reductions have been taken which will reflect savings from implementing recommendations of the Galvin Task Force.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

Gross Appropriation:	
Appropriation, 1995	$63,310,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	42,292,000
Recommended, 1996	29,294,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−34,016,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−12,998,000

Revenues:	
Appropriation, 1995	−9,900,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−34,903,000
Recommended, 1996	−34,903,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−25,003,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

The budget request for fiscal year 1996 includes $102,898,000 for operation, maintenance, and construction activities, and is offset by the receipt of $34,903,000 in revenues and the use of $25,703,000 from unobligated balances carried over from prior years' funding, resulting in a net budget request of $42,292,000. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends a reduction of $12,998,000 from the budget request. This includes a fifteen percent reduction for program direction expenses, with the remainder to be taken to the extent possible against funds requested for support service contracts and technology partnerships. Efforts to correct deficiencies and maintain the depleted uranium hexafluoride containers should be continued.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 1995	$301,327,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	288,807,000
Recommended, 1996	278,807,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−22,520,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−10,000,000

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

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $288,807,000. However, the recommendation includes full funding of $42,000,000 to implement the reimbursement for disposal of mill tailings in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

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

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1995	$984,031,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	1,017,530,000
Recommended, 1996	991,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+6,969,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−26,530,000

The General Science and Research Activities programs are concerned with understanding the nature of matter and energy and the fundamental forces and particles of nature. The knowledge acquired in this basic research is an essential part of the intellectual foundation of other scientific disciplines and technical permits. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base. The General Science and Research Activities programs are organized into two interrelated scientific programs, high energy physics and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near- or mid-term, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee's funding recommendation for General Science and Research Activities reflects the continued role of the federal government in fundamental scientific research where research is not market-driven and is difficult for the private sector to conduct. The Committee strongly supports the budget request for the Scientific Facilities Utilization Initiative to enhance and increase the use of fundamental science and user facilities, but due to severe funding constraints, has found it necessary to reduce the overall budget request. It is the Committee's hope that Congressional actions such as merging operating and capital funding along with a lessening of departmental internal regulations and oversight reviews will compensate in part for this reduction.

As described in the introductory section of this report, operating and capital funding requests have been merged to permit more effective operation of the research facilities and laboratories. The Committee recommendation reflects redistribution of the capital equipment, general plant projects, and accelerator improvements projects funding to the appropriate program accounts.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation for high energy physics is $677,000,000, a reduction of $8,552,000 from the budget request of $685,552,000. The recommendation for nuclear energy physics is $304,500,000, a reduction of $16,578,000

from the budget request of $321,078,000. Funding for program direction has been reduced to $9,500,000 from the request of $10,900,000.

Departmental changes in internal regulations and a reduction in the level of oversight and compliance audits should permit laboratories and facilities to reduce the number of personnel and resources needed to respond to requests from external oversight organizations. The Committee expects a good faith effort on the part of facility managers in doing their share to reduce administrative overhead and unnecessary costs as funding for the program activities will continue to be constrained.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriation, 1995	$392,800,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	.....
Recommended, 1996	226,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−166,200,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+226,600,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1992 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 authorize a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities. These laws establish the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste. The Committee recommends $226,600,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 1996. Combined with the appropriation to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $425,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 1996.

The Committee notes with disappointment and frustration that the President's request is wholly inadequate to support the waste disposal program developed by the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Committee further notes that the Administration's assumption that Congress would immediately enact legislation providing for a mandatory Nuclear Waste Fund appropriation, financed by receipts from the sale of the federal government's uranium enrichment enterprise, was fundamentally unrealistic.

The Committee is convinced that if the Administration were serious about solving our Nation's spent fuel problem, and if it were committed to the civilian waste disposal program of the Department of Energy, then it would have requested sufficient discretionary budgetary authority to pursue that program. This should not have been difficult, given the budget's inattention to the imperative of deficit reduction.

The Department, however, has apparently determined that the problem of nuclear waste disposal is of insufficient consequence to successfully compete for funding with other discretionary programs within the Department's jurisdiction. The Committee, on the other hand, recognizes the urgency of the problem and has discharged its

responsibility to prioritize among competing programs. Unlike the Department, the Committee has been willing to make the difficult choices necessary to preserve the civilian radioactive waste program.

The Committee, constrained to spend less to achieve a balanced budget, acknowledges that the funding provided for the waste program is insufficient to aggressively pursue site characterization activities at Yucca Mountain. Moreover, the Committee recognizes that it will be unable to provide resources to match the project's ambitious funding profile for the coming years. Consequently, the Department is directed to downgrade, suspend or terminate its activities at Yucca Mountain. The Department is further directed to concentrate available resources on the development and implementation of a national interim storage program. The Department should anticipate enactment of expanded authority to accept waste for interim storage and should refocus the civilian radioactive waste program accordingly. Funds provided herein are available to pursue those activities currently authorized by law (or authorized by Congress during the present session) that are consistent with a national interim storage program.

Consistent with the program redirection compelled by this appropriation, and pending the enactment of new authorizing legislation respecting the civilian radioactive waste program, no funds are included for the State of Nevada or units of local government affected by activities associated with the characterization of a permanent repository site. Subject to authorization, however, funds made available by this appropriation may be used by the Department to provide grants to units of state and local government affected by site characterization or interim storage activities. The use of such funds would be restricted to purposes authorized by law and subject to the conditions enumerated in prior Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy are divided into four separate appropriation accounts: Weapons Activities; Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Other Defense Programs; and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

Weapons Activities

Appropriation, 1995	$3,229,069,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	3,540,175,000
Recommended, 1996	3,273,014,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+43,945,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−267,161,000

This program supports 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 testing and laboratory testing. Since October 1992, the U.S. 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 Department's nuclear weapons program has two complementary elements—stockpile stewardship and stockpile management. Without the option of underground tests and with no new design or production requirements planned in the foreseeable future, confidence in safety and performance must be based on confidence in the engineering skills and scientific judgments exercised at the national laboratories and production facilities.

The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $3,273,014,000 which is an increase of $43,945,000 over the fiscal year 1995 appropriation, and a decrease of $267,161,000 from the budget request of $3,540,175,000. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

The Committee recommendation for stockpile stewardship reflects the merger of operating, capital equipment and general plant project funding to provide increased program flexibility as described in the introductory section of Title III of this report.

Core Stockpile Stewardship.—The Committee recommendation provides an additional $10,000,000 for operation of the Los Alamos Neutron Scattering Facility, for total funding of $35,000,000. Funding has not been included for Project 96-D-105, the contained firing facility addition at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee is pleased to recognize the achievements of the Naval Research Laboratory which has recently completed the Nike laser, and the University of Rochester which has completed the OMEGA laser. The Committee has consistently supported these facilities and expects both to contribute to the research and technology development efforts in the inertial confinement fusion program.

Funding for construction of the National Ignition Facility has been deferred without prejudice by the Committee. The Committee supports a strong stockpile stewardship program in the absence of underground nuclear testing, but is concerned that it will be difficult to assure funds are available in the future to support this project as well as other critical needs in the weapons program.

While not agreeing to the start of capital construction, the Committee has provided $33,600,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request, to continue preliminary design activities associated with the National Ignition Facility. This will permit the Department to move beyond the conceptual stage of the facility design and begin some construction design of the conventional facilities and the laser and target special equipment.

Technology Transfer and Education.—The Committee recommendation provides $25,000,000, a reduction of $224,405,000 from the budget request of $249,405,000 for technology transfer and education programs. Technology transfer and education activities should be funded only to the extent that they directly support

weapons program activities and can compete for direct program funding.

Marshall Islands.—Funding of $6,800,000 is provided for the Marshall Islands, the same as the budget request.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for stockpile management reflects the merger of operating, capital equipment, and general plant project funding.

The Committee is concerned with the Department's lack of initiative in appointing a permanent replacement to head the Nevada Operations Office in Las Vegas, Nevada, and urges the Department to appoint a qualified replacement as soon as possible.

Funding of $50,000,000 as requested in the budget is provided to initiate a project to provide a new tritium source. The Committee expects the Department to conduct a fair and impartial assessment of all possible alternatives for providing tritium including various types of reactors and the accelerator concept. The Committee is concerned that not all possible options have been given reasonable consideration. Establishing an assured supply of tritium for national security needs is the critical objective of this program. The Committee expects the Department to assure that consideration of additional missions for the new tritium source will not in any way jeopardize the schedule for providing tritium in the necessary timeframe.

The Committee has included the total cost of $12,200,000 for Project-D-126, tritium loading line modifications at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. This project, which was identified after the budget was submitted to Congress, will provide the capability to load a new tritium reservoir for existing weapons systems. No funding has been provided for Project-D-125, Washington measurement operations facility at Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

Program direction funding has been reduced to $118,000,000 to reflect the transfer of $20,085,000 for emergency management activities to the Other Defense Activities appropriation account.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Department's budget request includes a reduction of $25,000,000 to reflect savings from streamlining contractor operations. The Committee directs that these savings be achieved through the following actions: reducing the number of federal employees at headquarters and the field offices in areas such as environment, safety and health, and safeguards and security, where there is already a separate headquarters organization providing overall Departmental guidance to contractors; reducing the number of support service contracts; reducing the number of employees at field, site and area offices funded in the weapons activity account; and reducing laboratory employment which has grown exponentially to accommodate the requirements of internal Depart-

mental orders and regulations and subsequent increased oversight and compliance reviews.

The Committee recommends the use of $86,344,000 in unobligated balances as identified in the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1995	$4,892,691,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	6,008,002,000
Recommended, 1996	5,265,478,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+372,787,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−742,524,000

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The number of sites and facilities continues to grow as the Department shifts its focus from production efforts to environmental management activities. Environmental management is budgeted under three appropriation accounts: Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Energy Supply, Research and Development; and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account includes waste management functions, environmental restoration activities, technology development efforts, nuclear materials and facilities stabilization functions, and a variety of crosscutting and program support initiatives. The recommended funding for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $5,265,478,000, a reduction of $742,524,000 from the budget request of $6,008,002,000, and $372,787,000 over fiscal year 1995. The Committee has sought to the extent possible to protect funding necessary to meet the cleanup milestones established in compliance agreements with other federal agencies, states and local agencies by directing cuts against support service contracts, excessive headquarters and field oversight, large uncosted balances, and by reducing the number of new construction project starts proposed for fiscal year 1996. Funding reductions are consistent with the recommendations of the House National Security Committee.

Fiscal year 1996 is the first year of what can be expected to be severely constrained annual funding. To provide additional flexibility in managing program reductions, the Committee has merged funding for operating, capital equipment, and general plant projects, and has consolidated several new construction projects.

As noted in the introduction to Title III of this report, the Committee is directing a reduction in the number of support service contracts at the Department. Extensive use of support service contracts by the environmental management program can no longer be justified. Current estimates indicate there are 1,200 support service contractor employees, far exceeding the 800 federal employees

in the program at headquarters. In essence, there are over 2,000 employees in environmental management at headquarters alone. Estimates of support service contract employees in the field also reflect increased reliance on contractual services for activities which have traditionally been performed by federal employees.

The Galvin Task Force had many recommendations for reducing costs and increasing program effectiveness. Reducing the number of support service contracts, eliminating duplicative and overlapping organizational arrangements, and reducing employees performing functions such as safeguards and security, and environment, safety and health, which have separate headquarters organizations to provide guidance to contractors, should go a long way toward increasing productivity in the environmental management program.

An additional concern of the Committee is the excessive funding being allocated for site advisory groups and other state and local advisory groups to perform oversight activities. A recent reprogramming request to provide over $4,000,000 for advisory and planning groups at Hanford in fiscal year 1995 was rejected by the Committee which expects these costs to be held to a minimum.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

No funding reductions have been identified for this program, but the Committee expects the program in fiscal year 1996 to reduce by at least fifty percent the funds spent in fiscal year 1995 for support service contracts at headquarters and in the field, reduce the number of federal employees performing oversight reviews at multiple levels, and implement recommendations of the Galvin Task Force to reduce costs and work more effectively. These savings are to be used to accelerate cleanup activities.

The Committee is aware that options for accelerating the cleanup schedule of the Fernald site in Ohio are under review by the Department. If adopted, most remedial activities could be accomplished in seven years rather than the current proposal of nearly 20 years, and total costs could be reduced by more than $2 billion. Achieving this schedule and reducing costs assumes the use of standard, commercial nuclear practices, and the waiver of certain Departmental orders and other requirements. The Committee supports this proposal to reduce costs and accelerate cleanup activities and expects the Department to make every effort to increase funding for this project.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The waste management program seeks to protect the public and workers by seeking to minimize, treat, store and dispose of radioactive and hazardous waste. The Committee recommendation of $2,351,596,000 is a reduction of $150,000,000 from the budget request of $2,501,596,000. This reduction should be taken to the extent possible against support service contracts and duplicative headquarters oversight functions.

In addition to merging operating, capital, and general plant project funding to provide additional program flexibility, the Committee recommendation consolidates five separate construction project requests into two consolidated projects, Project 96–D–407, mixed waste low-level waste treatment projects at the Rocky Flats

site, and Project 96–D–408, waste management upgrades at various locations.

Startup of the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), which will vitrify the high-level waste at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina, is scheduled for December 1995. The Committee is concerned that the Department and the site contractor are using the possibility of any funding reduction to slip this schedule. Successful startup and operation of this facility on schedule is absolutely critical to the credibility of the Department's waste management program. The Committee expects the Department to maintain the current schedule for startup and operation of the DWPF, if necessary, by reducing lower priority activities at the site.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development is $380,510,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $390,510,000. The funding reduction is to be applied to support service contracts in this program.

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT

Transportation management is reduced by $6,000,000 from the budget request of $16,158,000. This program should be critically reviewed by the Department to ensure that only the highest priority activities are funded.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION

The Committee recommendation is $1,502,802,000, a reduction of $93,226,000 from the budget request of $1,596,028,000. Funding reductions are primarily directed toward program support and program integration activities at headquarters and the field offices. Program support and program integration funding includes support service contracts to provide technical support and contract expertise to assist the federal staff with its line management and oversight functions. Additionally, none of these funds should be used for economic development activities.

The remaining reductions are proposed in the area of new construction projects in fiscal year 1996. The Committee is concerned with the proposal to initiate several new construction projects at Departmental sites and facilities which will be undergoing considerable scrutiny and review of activities over the next year. Several projects begun last year are being reevaluated in view of current Departmental contract reform initiatives and privatization efforts. Rather than start new projects and risk wasting money on preliminary efforts only to be stopped later, the Committee has deferred funding for these new projects without prejudice.

Surveillance and maintenance costs for surplus activities are expensive and labor intensive. The Department should review the possibility of reducing costs without compromising safety by defining the minimum safety requirements that need to be met at surplus facilities, and by developing a requirement-based estimate of surveillance and maintenance costs.

COMPLIANCE AND PROGRAM COORDINATION

The Committee recommendation of $31,251,000 is a reduction of $50,000,000 from the budget request of $81,251,000. As outlined by the Galvin Task Force, the Department is mired in layers of management and oversight which hinder efficient program operations. Many functions proposed in this program area should be performed by the line program managers in the environmental management organization or by separate headquarters organizations such as environment, safety and health. In a time of severely constrained resources, use of existing resources for direct cleanup activities must have first priority.

ANALYSIS, EDUCATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for analysis, education, and risk management is $77,022,000, a reduction of $80,000,000 from the budget request of $157,022,000. Funding in this account provides for federal salaries, support service contracts, education and training, risk management assessments, and public accountability and outreach activities. The Department proposes to increase public accountability efforts from less than $4,000,000 in fiscal year 1995 to more than $32,000,000. The Committee does not agree to this increase. The remaining savings are to be gained by reducing support service contracts and better utilization of federal employees.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $630,240,000 of prior year balances, an increase of $353,298,000 to the budget request of $276,942,000, and the use of $37,000,000 from the Savannah River pension fund.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1995	$1,849,657,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	1,432,159,000
Recommended, 1996	1,323,841,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−525,816,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−108,318,000

This account includes the following programs: Verification and Control Technology, Nuclear Safeguards and Security, Security Investigations, Security Evaluations, the Office of Nuclear Safety, Worker and Community Transition Assistance, Fissile Materials Control and Disposition, Emergency Management and Naval Reactors. In prior years this account funded the Materials Support program conducted at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina. This program has been transferred to the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation in fiscal year 1996. Descriptions of each of the remaining accounts are provided below.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Verification and Control Technology program includes activities related to Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development, Arms Control, and Intelligence. The Department is engaged in an active nuclear nonproliferation program through research and development activities performed at the national laboratories, by providing technical and analytical support to treaty development and implementation, and by providing intelligence support to these efforts. The budget request for Verification and Control Technology was $430,842,000, an increase of $82,287,000 over the fiscal year 1995 appropriation of $348,555,000. The Committee recommendation of $353,200,000 does not support the tremendous growth requested in this program activity.

Research and Development.—The objective of the Research and Development program is to conduct applied research, development tests, and evaluations of systems and technologies in support of nonproliferation and treaty verification requirements. Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation for this program is $163,500,000, a reduction of $62,642,000 from the budget request of $226,142,000.

Arms Control.—The Arms Control program supports the development and implementation of U.S. and international policies aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It also promotes effective international safeguards and physical protection of nuclear materials and control of the export of nuclear related equipment, technologies, and materials. The Committee recommendation of $147,364,000 for Arms Control activities is $15,000,000 less than the budget request of $162,364,000. Funding has not been included for either the Industrial Partnering Program or additional treatment of North Korean spent fuel.

Intelligence.—The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy related matters to policy makers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the Former Soviet Union. The Committee recommends the budget request of $42,336,000.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

This program includes activities to assure adequate protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft, sabotage, espionage, and terrorist activities. As Departmental sites and facilities are decommissioned, safeguards and security costs would be expected to decrease Department-wide, but this does not seem to be the case. The Committee urges the Department to review these costs and make necessary adjustments since it does not seem reasonable that projected fiscal year 1996 security costs would increase over the previous year.

The Committee's recommendation for this activity is $83,395,000, a reduction of $6,121,000 from the budget request of $89,516,000.

Current program activities should be reviewed and prioritized within available funding.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

This program includes those activities necessary for granting appropriate security clearances to agency and Government contractor personnel who must in the performance of their work have access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material, or who occupy a designated critical sensitive position.

This program continues to maintain huge uncosted balances each year. As a result, the Committee recommendation is $20,000,000, a reduction of $13,247,000 from the budget request of $33,247,000.

SECURITY EVALUATIONS

The Security Evaluations program provides oversight of the effectiveness of the Department of Energy's safeguards and security policies and programs by conducting inspections and assessments of these policies and programs, and reviewing their implementation in the field. The program also includes funds for the Radioactive Materials Packaging Certification program which certifies that radioactive material packages are in compliance with Federal safety regulations. The Committee recommendation is $14,707,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Office of Nuclear Safety provides safety oversight of DOE nuclear operations to ensure that the Department and its contractors provide the workers and the public the highest level of protection reasonably achievable from radiological hazards.

Many groups have noted the extensive duplication of oversight of the Department's nuclear facilities. The Committee is concerned about the multiple oversight efforts and notes that the Department has committed to reduce this duplication of reviews. The compliance and oversight review process is currently being modified by the Office of Environment, Safety and Health, and this should result in reduced costs and personnel resources devoted to this effort.

The Committee has recommended $15,050,000, a reduction from the budget request of $24,679,000. While this may appear to be a significant reduction, the recommendation includes the full budget request of $11,044,000 for program direction costs to support the current staffing levels. The recommendation does significantly reduce funding for support services contracts to perform compliance reviews which should be conducted by federal employees.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

In accordance with Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993 and as a result of a change in the work force at defense nuclear facilities, defense employees of the Department may be provided various options to minimize impacts of these work force structure changes. These options include retraining, early retirement incentives, preference in hiring, outplacement assistance, and relocation assistance. In addition, this program funds contrac-

tor employment reduction requirements for severance and separation payments.

The Committee continues to support the Department's efforts to transition the Pinellas Plant in Florida from a nuclear weapons production facility to a commercial production facility. Ownership of the Pinellas Plant has been transferred to the Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners which is in the process of finding commercial tenants to use the technologies and capabilities of the plant and personnel. The Committee urges the Department to assist the Technology Deployment Center which is successfully identifying the technologies and capabilities available at the Pinellas Plant which have the greatest chances for success in the commercial market.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation is $75,000,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request of $100,000,000. The Committee will be reviewing the costs of employee buyout proposals to ensure that they do not exceed acceptable standards. The Committee is concerned at the excessive costs of some previous buyout packages agreed to by the Department.

FISSILE MATERIALS CONTROL AND DISPOSITION

The Fissile Materials Control and Disposition program is responsible for the technical and management activities to assess, plan and direct efforts to provide for the safe, secure, environmentally sound long-term storage of all weapons-usable fissile materials and the disposition of fissile materials declared surplus to national defense needs. The Committee recommendation is $70,000,000, the same as the budget request.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

In an effort to streamline the Department of Energy's emergency-related organizations and eliminate redundancy, the Committee has proposed to consolidate funding for Emergency Management which has previously been included in the Weapons Activities program direction account and funding for the Department's separate Emergency Preparedness account which has been funded in the Department of the Interior and Other Related Agencies Appropriations Act in previous years. The fiscal year 1996 budget request for Emergency Management is $20,056,000, and $8,219,000 for Emergency Preparedness. The Committee has combined these two programs and provided a total of $23,321,000 for fiscal year 1996. This reduction in funding from the budget request will require consolidation of staff functions and should lead to efficiencies in centralizing the Department's emergency planning and oversight.

NAVAL REACTORS

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

surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $682,168,000, the same as the budget request.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $13,000,000 in prior year balances as proposed in the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1995	$129,430,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	198,400,000
Recommended, 1996	198,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+68,970,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 1994, the balance owed by the federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was $664,000,000 (including principal and interest). The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the federal government's contribution to the Nuclear Waste Fund. Through fiscal year 1995, a total of $361,930,000 has been paid into the Nuclear Waste Fund for atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommends the fiscal year 1996 budget request of $198,400,000.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1995	$407,312,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	439,444,000
Recommended, 1996	362,250,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−45,062,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−77,194,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1995	−$161,490,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−122,306,000
Recommended, 1996	−122,306,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+39,184,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

The funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy. The account funds a wide array of activities not directly associated with program execution such as: salaries, travel and other costs associated with the management and support of the Department; development and analysis of energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of programs; coordination of policies and programs for communicat-

ing with the news media and the general public; support for training and education programs; development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; performance of work for non-federal entities; and revenues from the sale of products and services and their related costs.

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation for administrative activities is $362,250,000, a decrease of $77,194,000 from the budget request of $439,444,000. Program activities in most areas of the Department are being reduced which should result in decreasing needs for administrative and support activities.

The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $22,826,000, the same as the budget request. This reflects the latest estimate of work to be performed for non-federal entities in fiscal year 1996. The Committee recognizes that funds received from reimbursable activities may be used to fund general purpose capital equipment which is used in support of those activities.

REVENUES

The revenue estimate for fiscal year 1996 is $122,306,000, the same as the budget request, but a reduction of $39,184,000 from the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1995.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1995	$26,465,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	30,998,000
Recommended, 1996	26,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−465,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−4,998,000

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

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation is $26,000,000, a reduction of $4,998,000 from the budget request of $30,998,000.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

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

Operation and Maintenance, Alaska Power Administration

Appropriation, 1995	$6,494,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	4,260,000
Recommended, 1996	4,260,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−2,234,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

The Administration's fiscal year 1996 budget assumes that the assets of the Alaska Power Administration will be sold; however, the budget assumes that no asset transfers will occur before the end of fiscal year 1996. The Committee recommendation is $4,260,000, the same as the budget request.

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 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of 14,800 circuit-miles of transmission line and 390 substations with an installed capacity of 22,279 MW.

Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load

growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, 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 1996, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $378,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs.

The Committee continues to support the concept of financing a portion of capital investments from revenues and alternatives such as the use of third-party financing to extend the availability of the current total borrowing authority. The Committee commends Bonneville's efforts to date to review current spending programs. With the severe budget constraints expected to continue in the future, appropriating additional funds to replenish Bonneville's borrowing authority will be very difficult.

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

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1996, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $762,400,000, of which $200,800,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Limitation on direct loans.—Language was requested permitting Bonneville to make direct loan obligations not to exceed $29,000,000. The Committee has not included this provision and recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1996.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1995	$22,431,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	19,843,000
Recommended, 1996	19,843,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−2,588,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 10 southeastern states. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,092 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through "wheeling" arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommendation of $19,843,000 is the same as the budget request. In addition to this appropriated amount, $10,059,000 of prior year unobligated funds are available for use in fiscal year 1996.

Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration

Appropriation, 1995	$21,316,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	29,778,000
Recommended, 1996	29,778,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+8,462,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1996 is $29,778,000, the same as the budget request.

Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance Western Area Power Administration

Appropriation, 1995	$222,285,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	306,352,000
Recommended, 1996	257,652,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+35,367,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−48,700,000

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.

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

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation for Western for fiscal year 1996 is $257,652,000, a decrease of $48,700,000 from the budget request of $306,352,000. This reduction is possible due to decreased purchase power requirements and construction costs.

The amount to be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund is $245,151,000, a reduction of $48,700,000 from the request of $293,851,000.

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 and 1995. This legislation also directed that the Fund be administered by the administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas. Funds for these costs were previously included in the appropriations of the Department of State.

The Committee recommendation is $1,000,000, 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

Appropriation, 1995	$166,173,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	136,567,000
Recommended, 1996	132,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−33,883,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−4,277,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1995	−$166,173,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−136,567,000
Recommended, 1996	−132,290,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+33,883,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+4,277,000

The Committee provides $132,290,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Committee notes that the workload of the Commission with respect to the regulation of oil and natural gas is declining dramatically as those industries become more competitive. The Admin-

istration's request for the natural gas and oil pipelines program, though reduced from fiscal year 1995, fails to match this decline in responsibility. The Committee recommendation provides for a ten percent reduction from fiscal year 1995 levels in staffing of the natural gas and oil pipelines program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Solar energy			
Solar building technology research	4,992	4,667	1,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	81,000	68,129	54,128
Solar thermal energy systems	32,700	22,943	27,943
Biofuels energy systems	83,112	80,360	48,000
Wind energy systems	48,000	48,020	20,000
International solar energy program	9,280	20,164	---
Solar technology transfer	16,000	17,756	---
National renewable energy laboratory	1,548	380	500
Construction			
General plant projects	1,685	120	---
86-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	---	5,800	---
86-E-105 South table mountain site infrastructure, Golden, CO	2,780	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	4,415	5,920	---
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	5,963	6,000	500
Resource assessment	4,195	4,665	2,000
Solar program support	6,407	7,548	---
Program direction	8,300	9,460	8,500
Subtotal, Solar Energy	288,814	331,311	184,072
Review of uncosted balances	---	-4,886	-4,886
Total, Solar Energy	288,814	326,423	149,186
Geothermal			
Geothermal technology development	36,277	36,130	26,434
Program direction	1,000	1,080	880
Capital equipment	900	387	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-885	-885
Total, Geothermal	37,177	36,972	26,729
Hydrogen research	10,000	7,334	18,000
Hydropower			
Small scale hydropower development	1,418	904	---
Program direction	86	90	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-14	---
Total, Hydropower	1,500	980	---
Electric energy systems and storage			
Electric energy systems			
Electric field effects research	14,000	9,924	9,924
Reliability research	6,200	6,195	---
System and materials research	19,000	24,712	19,000
Program direction	950	950	800
Review of uncosted balances	---	-615	-615
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	40,090	41,024	29,909
Energy storage systems			
Battery storage	5,700	5,666	---
Program direction	300	295	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-66	---
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	6,000	5,919	---
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	46,100	46,943	29,909
Policy and management	4,817	4,746	2,800
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	388,108	422,387	221,622
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D			
Light water reactor	55,000	49,740	46,000
Advanced reactor R&D	20,700	---	20,000
Space reactor power systems	1,800	---	---
Advanced radioisotope power system	81,083	49,237	49,237
Facilities	7,100	---	---
Nuclear technology R&D	---	37,300	18,000
Program direction	12,500	13,000	8,000
Policy and management	11,200	10,200	8,000
Test reactor area hot cells	1,448	1,400	---
Oak Ridge landlord	12,148	15,430	14,400
Construction			
89-E-188 General plant projects	2,255	3,255	---
Subtotal, Oak Ridge landlord	14,400	18,685	14,400

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Test reactor area landlord	1,900	1,370	2,000
Construction			
GP-N-102 General plant projects, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	730	730	---
96-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,700	1,800	1,900
Subtotal, Construction	2,900	2,530	1,900
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	4,800	4,000	3,900
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	3,800	2,303	2,303
University reactor fuel assistance and support	---	6,130	3,900
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	203,128	191,895	184,340
Termination costs	84,000	79,000	73,000
Construction			
GPN-102 General plant projects	2,800	1,000	---
96-E-207 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor - II sodium processing facility Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	1,500	1,700	1,700
92-E-200 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor-II fuel handling major maintenance, Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	2,500	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	6,500	2,700	1,700
Total, Terminations costs	70,500	81,700	74,700
Isotope support	19,600	25,358	24,858
Soviet designed reactor safety	---	78,754	---
Russian replacement power initiative	---	5,000	---
General reduction	---	---	-8,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	283,228	382,817	255,898
CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
Spent fuel storage R&D	593	589	---
Program direction	110	110	---
TOTAL, CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	703	699	---
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	128,740	148,578	114,933
Nuclear safety policy	17,180	17,180	13,500
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	145,920	166,759	128,433
ENERGY RESEARCH			
Biological and environmental research			
Biological and environmental research R&D	366,622	387,018	320,050
Construction			
GP-E-128 General plant projects	3,500	4,460	---
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL	4,700	2,500	2,500
94-E-338 Structural biology center, ANL	6,700	4,295	4,295
94-E-339 Human genome lab, LBL	15,800	5,700	6,700
91-EN-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	40,000	50,000	40,000
Subtotal, Construction	70,700	67,045	53,995
Subtotal, Biological & environ. research R&D	437,322	434,064	372,645
SBIR program direction	7,500	7,500	7,000
Total, Biological and environmental research	444,822	441,564	379,645
Fusion energy	370,563	311,948	229,144
Construction			
GPE-500 General plant projects, var. locations	2,000	1,000	---
96-E-310 Elise project	---	3,200	---
94-E-300 Tokamak physics experiment, Princeton plasma physics laboratory	---	49,900	---
Subtotal, Construction	2,000	54,100	---
Total, Fusion energy	372,563	366,048	229,144

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	275,731	340,287	288,400
Chemical sciences	165,919	181,888	186,400
Applied mathematical sciences	109,367	108,888	118,600
Engineering and geosciences	36,837	39,963	41,700
Advanced energy projects	11,088	12,026	12,300
Energy biosciences	28,887	28,534	30,300
Program direction	9,800	10,000	9,800
Capital equipment	41,837	56,973	---
Construction			
GPE-400 General plant projects	4,500	8,314	---
98-E-308 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	---	12,863	10,478
88-E-305 Accelerator improvement projects	7,500	---	---
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL	58,378	3,186	3,186
87-R-406 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	---	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	70,278	24,363	15,661
Total, Basic energy sciences	747,206	811,418	762,961
Other energy research			
Advanced neutron source	21,000	---	---
Energy research analyses	3,831	3,463	3,463
Laboratory technology transfer	57,813	58,776	---
Advisory and oversight	12,480	9,780	6,200
Policy and management	2,200	2,200	2,200
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities	6,362	6,382	---
Construction			
GPE-801 General plant projects	8,740	8,740	---
96-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, phase I (ANL)	1,307	2,500	2,500
95-E-302 Applied science center, phase I (BNL)	600	3,270	3,270
95-E-303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	240	1,500	1,500
95-E-310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	400	2,740	2,740
94-E-381 Fuel storage and transfer facility upgrade (BNL)	2,478	640	640
94-E-383 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	3,000	2,038	2,038
93-E-313 Electrical system upgrade, phase II (ANL)	2,043	---	---
93-E-325 Potable water system upgrade, phase I (BNL)	1,883	---	---
92-E-322 East canyon electrical safety project (LBL)	1,000	---	---
92-E-324 Safety compliance modifications 326 building (PNL)	1,800	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	23,572	21,228	12,488
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	29,954	27,610	12,488
Environment, safety and health	8,507	8,857	8,656
Construction			
96-E-330 Building electrical service upgrade Phase I, Argonne National Laboratory Argonne, Illinois	---	1,200	---
96-E-331 Sanitary sewer restoration, Phase I, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA	---	2,400	---
96-E-332 Building 801, renovations Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York	---	800	---
88-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	---	---	4,600
98-E-307 Fire Safety imp. III (ANL)	210	1,000	1,000
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	960	1,840	1,840
95-E-309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)	800	2,480	2,480
93-E-315 Roof replacement, phase I (BNL)	100	---	---
93-E-317 Life safety code compliance (PNL)	506	---	---
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)	1,800	2,411	2,411
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade phase I (LBL)	2,000	1,130	1,130

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL)	1,862	1,288	1,288
Subtotal, Construction	7,836	14,249	14,249
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	14,245	22,906	30,906
Inactive and surplus facilities	500	500	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	44,788	51,018	33,382
Total, Other energy research	141,489	128,238	48,286
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	1,788,174	1,734,383	1,446,706
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
University and science education programs			
Laboratory cooperative science centers	35,848	30,038	---
University programs	17,377	17,377	---
University reactor fuel assistance	3,730	---	---
University research instrumentation	8,647	8,647	---
Program direction	2,844	2,388	---
Total, University and science education programs	88,844	85,418	---
Technical information management program	18,315	15,950	11,000
Construction	1,000	1,500	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	18,315	17,450	12,000
Technology partnership	---	8,163	---
In-house energy management	8,530	15,664	---
Construction			
IME - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt	24,700	13,135	---
Total, In-house energy management	31,380	28,798	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	113,108	104,810	12,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT. (NON-DEFENSE)			
Corrective activities	600	1,065	---
Construction			
92-E-601 Melton Valley liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	9,100	339	339
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	17,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	26,100	4,339	4,339
Total, Corrective activities	26,700	5,404	4,339
Environmental restoration	355,186	417,758	368,400
Waste management	215,288	198,127	178,696
Construction			
09-E-800 General plant projects	2,040	2,212	---
96-E-601 Radioactive waste handling facility, PPPL	1,937	---	---
94-E-601 Waste handling building, Fermilab	2,500	---	---
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL	7,000	300	300
93-E-832 Laboratory floor drain collection system upgrades, BNL	571	---	---
93-E-633 Upgrade sanitary sewer system, ORNL	4,000	---	---
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	4,510	4,048	4,048
91-E-306 Waste management facility project, BNL	5,180	---	---
91-E-900 Rehabilitation of waste management building 300, ANL	---	787	787
91-E-902 Hazardous, radioactive and mixed waste storage facility, ANL	3,900	---	---
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling facility, LBL	838	871	871
Subtotal, Construction	32,348	8,018	5,906
Total, Waste management	247,881	206,145	183,702
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	74,578	83,683	72,100
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	744,041	712,990	626,541
Subtotal, Energy supply, research and development	3,388,283	3,826,626	2,691,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimate	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Use of prior year balances	-35,583	-78,300	-78,300
General reduction, ESRAD	-23,280	---	-18,000
Productivity savings	-4,000	---	---
Procurement reform/SBA rent reduction	-12,772	---	---
Galvin task force reductions	---	-50,000	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,314,848	2,396,535	2,666,700
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			
Uranium program activities	78,883	93,600	80,700
Construction			
GP-H-501 General plant projects	250	---	---
96-U-200 UF6 cylinders refurbishment facility, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plants	---	5,800	5,800
93-U-200 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	2,482	3,400	3,400
91-U-200 Safeguards and security upgrading, Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plant	700	---	---
98-H-501 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	700	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	4,132	9,200	9,200
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	83,015	102,800	89,900
Revenues - Sales	-9,500	-34,903	-34,903
Use of prior year balances	-10,868	-25,705	-25,705
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	63,310	42,292	29,294
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	301,327	288,807	276,807
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH			
High energy physics			
Physics research	136,940	147,158	146,000
Facility operations	333,174	338,457	358,077
Construction			
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	12,148	13,845	---
96-G-301 Accelerator improvement projects, various locations	---	9,800	---
95-G-301 Accelerator improvement projects, VL	12,515	---	---
94-G-304 B-Factory, SLAC	44,000	52,000	52,000
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	43,000	52,000	52,000
Subtotal, Construction	111,661	127,645	104,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	444,835	467,102	462,077
High energy technology	86,180	87,370	88,823
Other capital equipment	5,026	3,028	---
Total, High energy physics	686,680	686,662	677,000
Nuclear physics	284,771	236,448	231,828
Construction			
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	3,900	4,765	---
96-G-302 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	---	4,875	2,575
95-G-302 Accelerator improvements & mods., VL	3,200	---	---
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	70,000	70,000	70,000
87-R-283 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	1,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	78,100	78,780	72,575
Other capital equipment	1,870	1,870	---
Total, Nuclear physics	364,741	321,878	304,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimate	Budget Request	Committee Bill
General science program direction	10,400	10,800	8,500
Subtotal, General science	982,031	1,017,336	981,000
General reduction	-5,000	---	---
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-3,000	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	964,031	1,017,336	981,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship	960,570	1,016,903	1,028,403
Construction			
97D-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,500	12,500	---
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	---	2,520	2,520
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	---	8,400	8,400
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology Laboratory, SNL	---	1,800	1,800
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	---	6,500	---
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	3,300	9,940	9,940
94-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization Phase V, various locations	19,000	12,200	12,200
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, NV	17,000	15,850	15,850
92-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, phase IV, various locations	21,810	---	---
90-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, Development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	4,900	6,200	6,200
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	20,980	17,998	17,998
Subtotal, Construction	88,490	93,805	74,708
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,050,060	1,109,708	1,103,108
Inertial fusion	178,473	203,267	213,267
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	---	37,400	---
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	178,473	240,667	213,267
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	215,794	228,408	28,000
Education	20,000	20,000	---
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	235,794	248,408	28,000
Marshall Island/Dose reconstruction	7,000	5,800	5,800
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,468,327	1,606,580	1,348,175
Stockpile management	1,848,848	1,788,488	1,808,488
Construction			
Stockpile support facilities			
97D-121 General plant projects, various loc	1,000	10,000	---
96-D-123 Replacement transportation safeguards division aviation facility, Albuquerque, NM	2,000	---	---
Subtotal, Stockpile support facilities	3,000	10,000	---
Production base			
96-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	14,820	8,660	8,660
96-D-126 Tritium loading line modifications, Savannah River Site, SC	---	---	12,200
Subtotal, Production base	14,820	8,660	20,860
Environmental, safety and health			
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	---	500	500
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant	---	3,100	3,100
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant	2,200	6,300	6,300
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	8,300	8,700	8,700

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
84-D-126 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	1,000	5,500	3,500
84-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	1,000	2,000	2,000
84-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	1,000	4,000	4,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	5,000	7,200	7,200
Subtotal, Environmental, safety and health	18,800	37,400	37,400
Safeguards and security 88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	15,000	13,400	13,400
Nuclear weapons incident response 88-D-125 Washington management operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD	---	900	---
Reconfiguration 93-D-150 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	88,000	41,065	41,065
Subtotal, Construction	107,320	111,425	112,725
Total, Stockpile management	1,754,166	1,906,863	1,818,163
Program direction	158,852	138,088	118,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,383,345	3,681,619	3,364,358
Use of prior year balances	-143,276	-86,344	-88,344
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-11,000	---	---
Streamline DOE contractors (undistributed)	---	-25,000	-25,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,229,069	3,540,175	3,273,014
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Corrective activities			
Construction 92-D-103 Tank upgrades project, LLNL	512	---	---
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	---	3,406	3,406
Total, Corrective activities	512	3,406	3,406
Environmental restoration	1,518,548	1,675,975	1,675,975
Productivity savings initiative	-133,900	---	---
Total, Environmental restoration	1,384,648	1,675,975	1,675,975
Waste management	2,474,864	2,260,286	2,168,084
Construction GP-D-171 General plant projects,various locations	18,832	30,728	---
96-D-400 Replace industrial waste piping, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	---	200	---
96-D-401 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan immobilization of miscellaneous wastes, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,400	---
96-D-402 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan building 374/774 sludge immobilization Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,800	---
96-D-403 Tank farm service upgrades, Savannah River, SC	---	3,315	---
96-D-406 T-Plant secondary containment & leak detection upgrades, Richland, WA	---	2,100	---
96-D-408 N-Basin operations program, Richland, WA	---	28,000	28,000
96-D-407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	---	---	2,900
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	---	---	5,815
95-D-401 Radiological support facilities Richland, WA	1,585	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Waste management	2,474,856	2,288,266	2,168,994
Construction			
GP-D-171 General plant projects,various locations	15,632	30,728	---
96-D-400 Replace industrial waste piping, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	---	200	---
96-D-401 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan immobilization of miscellaneous wastes, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,400	---
96-D-402 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan building 374/774 sludge immobilization Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,500	---
96-D-403 Tank farm service upgrades, Savannah River, SC	---	3,315	---
96-D-405 T-Plant secondary containment & leak detection upgrades, Richland, WA	---	2,100	---
96-D-406 K-Basin operations program, Richland, WA	---	26,000	26,000
96-D-407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	---	---	2,900
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	---	---	5,615
95-D-401 Radiological support facilities Richland, WA	1,585	---	---
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	700	4,314	4,314
95-D-403 Hazardous waste storage facility, AL	597	---	---
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge,TN	1,000	4,600	4,600
95-D-406 Road 5-01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	2,338	1,023	1,023
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	2,000	---	---
95-D-408 Phase II liquid effluent treatment and disposal, RL	7,100	---	---
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	1,000	4,445	4,445
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	3,282	282	282
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	21,373	11,000	11,000
94-D-406 Low-level waste disposal facilities, K-25	6,000	---	---
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,700	9,400	9,400
94-D-408 Office facilities - 200 East, Richland, WA	4,000	---	---
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex Richland, WA	42,200	5,500	5,500
94-D-416 Solvent storage tanks installation, Savannah River, SC	1,700	---	---
94-D-417 Intermediate-level and low-activity waste vaults, Savannah River, SC	300	2,704	2,704
93-D-174 Plant drain waste water treatment upgrades, Y-12	1,400	---	---
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,300	3,900	3,900
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line replacement, Richland, WA	3,300	---	---
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	14,810	19,795	19,795
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation facility, Richland, WA	88,605	31,000	31,000
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	26,525	19,700	19,700
93-D-188 New sanitary landfill, Savannah River,SC	---	---	---
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	---	1,105	1,105
92-D-177 Tank 101-AZ waste retrieval system, Richland, WA	8,000	---	---
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	2,845	1,100	1,100
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA	3,985	---	---
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	3,819	2,000	2,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID	1,747	1,428	1,428
90-D-178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID	7,594	2,606	2,606
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	300	800	800
88-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	18,000	11,500	11,500
96-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,900	8,885	8,885
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	6,000	1,000	1,000
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	45,068	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	387,918	213,330	182,602
Subtotal, Waste management	2,842,772	2,601,596	2,351,596
Productivity savings initiative	-180,800	---	---
Total, Waste management	2,661,972	2,601,596	2,351,596
Technology development	411,759	390,510	390,510
Construction			
96-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	7,000	---	---
Total, Technology development	418,759	390,510	390,510
Transportation management	20,664	18,158	10,158
Program direction	84,948	---	---
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	685,831	1,467,384	1,427,108
Construction			
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	15,211	34,724	---
96-D-458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	885	885
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	1,539	1,539
96-D-462 Health physics instrument laboratory, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	1,126	---
96-D-463 Central facilities area (CFA) craft shop Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	724	---
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	4,952	---
96-D-466 200 Area sanitary sewer system, Richland, WA	---	1,800	---
96-D-470 Environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	3,500	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	1,500	1,500
96-D-472 Plant engineering & Design, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	4,000	---
96-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	2,000	---
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	2,900	2,900
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River,SC	---	6,000	6,000
95-D-454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA	1,500	3,500	3,500
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	965	8,382	8,382
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,500	5,000	5,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,219	5,074	5,074
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	7,800	1,000	1,000
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, INEL, ID	4,920	3,601	3,601
94-D-461 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	10,500	2,940	2,940
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	7,130	7,130

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
93-D-172 Idaho national engineering laboratory electrical upgrade, INEL, ID	7,800	124	---
93-D-184 325 facility compliance/renovation, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA	1,000	---	---
93-D-185 200 Area unsecured core area fabrication shop, Richland, WA	4,000	---	---
92-D-123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	9,560	9,560
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,100	-7,000	7,000
92-D-181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID	6,000	8,883	8,883
92-D-182 Idaho national engineering laboratory sewer systems upgrade, INEL, ID	1,900	---	---
92-D-186 Steam system rehabilitation, phase II Richland, WA	5,600	---	---
91-D-127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replacmnt, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	---	2,800	2,800
Subtotal, Construction	77,136	128,544	75,894
Subtotal, Nuclear materials and fac. stabilization	772,967	1,596,028	1,602,802
Productivity savings initiative	-5,000	---	---
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization	767,967	1,596,028	1,602,802
Compliance and program coordination	---	66,251	16,251
Construction 95-E-900 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	---	15,000	15,000
Total, Compliance and program coordination	---	81,251	31,251
Analysis, education and risk management	---	157,022	77,022
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,359,491	6,321,944	5,932,718
Savannah river pension refund	---	-37,000	-37,000
Use of prior year balances	-249,300	-276,942	-630,240
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-17,800	---	---
FY 1995 rescission (P.L. 104-6)	-200,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,892,691	6,008,002	5,265,478
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Materials support	781,305	---	---
Construction			
Environment, safety and health			
95-D-158 Disassembly basin upgrades-K, L, P, Savannah River, SC	13,000	---	---
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade Phase I & II, Savannah River, SC	11,300	---	---
93-D-148 Replace high-level drain lines, Savannah River, SC	2,700	---	---
93-D-152 Environmental modification for production facilities, Savannah River, SC	2,900	---	---
92-D-143 Health protection instrument calibration facility, Savannah River, SC	3,000	---	---
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC	5,000	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	37,900	---	---
Programmatic projects			
GPD-146 General plant projects, various locations	15,000	---	---
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC	750	---	---
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River, SC	2,100	---	---
95-D-157 D-area powerhouse life extension, Savannah River, SC	4,000	---	---
92-D-150 Operations support facilities, Savannah River, SC	2,000	---	---
92-D-153 Engineering support facility, Savannah River Site, SC	3,200	---	---
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	27,050	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	64,950	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
Program direction	56,000	---	---
Total, Materials support	902,285	---	---
Other national security programs			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	228,900	226,142	163,800
Arms control	75,924	162,364	147,364
Intelligence	43,131	42,336	42,336
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	348,555	430,842	353,200
Nuclear safeguards and security	85,816	89,516	83,385
Security investigations	33,827	33,247	20,000
Security evaluations	14,780	14,707	14,707
Nuclear safety	21,678	24,678	15,050
Worker and community transition	118,000	100,000	75,000
Fissile materials control and disposition	50,000	70,000	70,000
Emergency management	---	---	23,321
Total, Other national security programs	668,657	762,991	654,673
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development	673,651	682,568	682,568
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,200	6,500	6,600
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	2,400	11,300	11,300
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	700	4,800	4,800
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	7,900	3,900	3,900
92-D-200 Laboratories facilities upgrades, various locations	2,800	---	---
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	---	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Construction	20,000	29,800	29,800
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	693,651	682,168	682,168
Enrichment materials	32,000	---	---
Total, Naval reactors	725,651	682,168	682,168
Subtotal, Other defense activities	2,297,563	1,445,159	1,336,841
Savannah river pension refund	-40,000	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-401,406	-13,000	-13,000
Contractor pay freeze	---	---	---
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-6,500	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,849,657	1,432,159	1,323,841
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	129,430	198,400	198,400
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	10,100,847	11,178,738	10,060,733
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	3,418	3,569	2,800
General management - personnel compensation and benefits	202,886	215,129	173,553
General management - other expenses	183,578	189,774	167,000
Program support			
Minority economic impact	3,428	3,415	2,900
Policy analysis and system studies	4,500	5,864	2,900
Consumer affairs	46	46	40
Public affairs	54	92	50
Environmental policy studies	8,070	8,000	1,000
Scientific and technical training	2,283	2,248	1,000
Subtotal, Program support	18,381	19,665	7,890
Total, Administrative operations	418,361	428,137	350,943
Cost of work for others	24,356	22,826	22,826
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	440,717	450,963	373,769
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments	-30,707	-11,519	-11,519
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-2,698	---	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	407,312	439,444	362,250
Miscellaneous revenues	-161,490	-122,306	-122,306
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	245,822	317,138	239,944

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	Current Year Estimates	Budget Request	Committee Bill
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	33,425	32,913	27,915
Use of prior year balances	-6,960	-1,915	-1,915
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	26,465	30,998	26,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance	5,484	4,280	4,280
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	3,292	3,472	3,472
Purchase power and wheeling	27,249	26,430	26,430
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,541	29,902	29,902
Use of prior year balances	-8,110	-10,059	-10,059
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	22,431	19,843	19,843
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	19,538	20,897	20,897
Purchase power and wheeling	1,503	1,464	1,464
Construction	9,514	7,931	7,931
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,556	30,292	30,292
Use of prior year balances	-9,240	-514	-514
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	21,316	29,778	29,778
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	92,883	70,125	51,125
System operation and maintenance	127,972	125,255	125,255
Purchase power and wheeling	101,908	113,709	93,708
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,135	5,285	5,285
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	327,496	314,372	275,372
Use of prior year balances	-105,044	-6,020	-17,720
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-187	---	---
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(7,472)	(4,556)	(4,556)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	222,285	308,352	257,652
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	---	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	272,516	361,233	312,533
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	166,173	151,567	147,290
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	---	-15,000	-15,000
FERC revenues	-166,173	-136,567	-132,290
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	392,800	---	226,600

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1995	$282,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	183,000,000
Recommended, 1996	142,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−140,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−41,000,000

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

The Committee recommends $142,000,000 for fiscal year 1996. Reductions to the budget request are to be applied as follows: −$20,000,000 from the request for "Business Development" activities; −$12,000,000 from the request for "Human Development" activities; and −$9,000,000 from the Highway Development Program.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$17,933,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	18,500,000
Recommended, 1996	17,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−933,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−1,500,000

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

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation is $17,000,000, a reduction of $1,500,000 from the budget request of $18,500,000.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$343,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	353,000
Recommended, 1996	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−343,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−353,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints and in the advancement of congressional efforts to streamline government, the Committee recommends termination of Federal participation in the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of the compact States to continue their cooperative efforts to develop water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries without Federal assistance.

The Committee recognizes the vital role of this Commission, and supports the continuation of its work. The Committee will assist the Delaware River Basin Commission in the transition as the compact States assume full responsibility for the funding of its function.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1995	$478,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	551,000
Recommended, 1996	
Comparison:	
Apropriation, 1995	−478,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−551,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints and in the advancement of congressional efforts to streamline government, the Committee recommends termination of Federal participation in the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of the compact States to continue their cooperative efforts to develop water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries without Federal assistance.

The Committee recognizes the vital role of this Commission, and supports the continuation of its work. The Committee will assist the Delaware River Basin Commission in the transition as the compact States assume full responsibility for the funding of its function.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriation, 1995	$511,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	524,000
Recommended, 1996	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−511,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−524,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints and in the advancement of congressional efforts to streamline government, the Committee recommends termination of Federal participation in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of the Potomac River Basin States to continue their cooperative efforts without further Federal assistance.

The Committee recognizes the vital role of this Commission, and supports the continuation of its work. The Committee will assist the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin in the transition as the compact States assume full responsibility for the funding of its function.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Gross Appropriation:	
Appropriation, 1995	$520,501,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	520,300,000
Recommended, 1996	468,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−52,201,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−52,000,000
Revenues:	
Appropriation, 1995	−498,501,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−498,300,000
Recommended, 1996	−457,300,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+41,201,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+41,000,000
Net Appropriation:	
Appropriation, 1995	22,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	22,000,000
Recommended, 1996	11,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−11,000,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−11,000,000

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $468,300,000 for fiscal year 1996, a reduction from both the Administration's budget request and the fiscal year 1995 level.

The fiscal year 1996 budget request proposes that $22,000,000 of the agency's total appropriation be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. These funds are requested for agency activities related to implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and in support of the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. Consistent with the Committee's direction to the Department of Energy to suspend, downgrade or terminate site characterization activities at Yucca Mountain, the NRC appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund is reduced by $11,000,000. The Commission is directed to target funds appropriated from the Nuclear Waste Fund to activities consistent with the expeditious development and execution of a national interim storage program.

In recommending a reduction for fiscal year 1996, the Committee notes that licensee safety performance indicators demonstrate a

pronounced trend toward improved industry performance. The Committee also notes that agency staffing appears to be unreasonably high, especially given: the maturation of the industry; the lack of nuclear power plants under construction; and a decreased need for research and rulemaking services. Also, the Committee observes that the Commission must reduce its unacceptably high levels of unobligated balances and undelivered orders.

The Committee understands that the Commission plans to reduce its staffing in future years. In light of severe budgetary constraints and consistent with congressional efforts to downsize and streamline government, the Commission is directed to accelerate those plans.

Office of Inspector General

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1995	$5,080,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	5,500,000
Recommended, 1996	5,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−80,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−500,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1995	−5,080,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−5,500,000
Recommended, 1996	−5,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	+80,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	+500,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1996. This recommendation, a reduction from both the Administration request and the fiscal year 1995 level, is consistent with reductions to the Commission and congressional efforts to downsize and streamline the Federal government.

Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board

Appropriation, 1995	$2,664,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	2,970,000
Recommended, 1996	2,531,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−133,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−439,000

The Committee recommendation provides continued funding 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.

The Committee recommendation of $2,531,000 represents a five-percent reduction in funding from the current fiscal year and a fif-

teen-percent reduction from the Administration's budget request. In making this recommendation, the Committee observes that the budget request assumes that the Board will operate with a full complement of eleven Board members as authorized by law. The Board, however, has never in its history had eleven members. In fact, current Board membership is six, and the terms of these members will expire in April 1996. The Committee hopes the Administration will act expeditiously to fill Board vacancies but anticipates that savings will be realized through reductions in compensation, benefits, and travel related to a continued shortage of Board members. The Committee also observes that the budget request funds an apparently excessive ratio of clerical staff to professional staff. The Committee also notes that the Board continues to carry over unreasonably large unobligated balances from prior fiscal years.

The Committee has included a general provision to permit Board members whose terms have expired to continue serving on the Board until their successors have taken office. This authority, which exists for other Federal boards and commissions, will enable the Board to operate with a quorum if, as expected, the President fails to appoint an adequate number of Board candidates prior to the expiration of six members' terms in 1996.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$318,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	332,000
Recommended, 1996	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−318,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−332,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints and in the advancement of congressional efforts to streamline government, the Committee recommends termination of Federal participation in the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of the compact States to continue their cooperative efforts to develop water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries without Federal assistance.

The Committee recognizes the vital role of this Commission, and supports the continuation of its work. The Committee will assist the Susquehanna River Basin Commission in the transition as the compact States assume full responsibility for the funding of its function.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1995	$288,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	360,000
Recommended, 1996	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−288,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−360,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints and in the advancement of congressional efforts to streamline government, the Committee

recommends termination of Federal participation in the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of the compact States to continue their cooperative efforts to develop water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries without Federal assistance.

The Committee recognizes the vital role of this Commission, and supports the continuation of its work. The Committee will assist the Susquehanna River Basin Commission in the transition as the compact States assume full responsibility for the funding of its function.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1995	$142,873,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	140,473,000
Recommended, 1996	103,339,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1995	−39,534,000
Budget Estimate, 1996	−37,134,000

The Committee recommends $103,339,000 for the appropriated programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Reductions from the budget request are to be applied as follows: −$32,282,000 from the Environmental Research Center; −$3,000,000 from Land Between the Lakes; and −$1,852,000 from Economic Development. The Committee directs that the funds appropriated to Land Between the Lakes be strictly targeted to necessary operation and maintenance activities.

The Committee is aware of serious silt and debris problems at the Sinking Creek embayment on Fort Patrick Henry Reservoir in Sullivan County, Tennessee. The Committee urges TVA to take expeditious action to correct these conditions, using available funds.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee has included a provision repealing Sec. 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. This provision prohibited the use of funds to conduct studies relating to changes in pricing of hydroelectric power by the six Federal public power authorities.

The Committee has also repealed Sec. 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986, which prohibited the use of funds by the executive branch to solicit proposals, prepare studies, or draft proposals to transfer out of Federal ownership the Federal power marketing administrations located within the contiguous 48 States.

Section 501 repeals all existing statutory limitations on using appropriated funds to study options for transferring the power marketing administrations to non-Federal ownership or to study possible changes in the current ratemaking practices of the power marketing administrations.

The Committee has included a provision repealing Sec. 510 of Public Law 101–514, the Fiscal Year 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. This provision prohibited the use of funds by the executive branch to change the employment levels determined by the administrators of the Federal power marketing administrations to be necessary to carry out their responsibilities.

The Committee has included a provision permitting a member of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board whose term has expired to continue to serve as a member of the Board until that member's successor has taken office.

The Committee has included as a general provision language emphasizing the importance of Federal agency personnel adhering to provisions of law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, and unfunded mandates. This provision does not establish any new law in these areas. It is intended as a statement of Congressional expectations regarding program administration once applicable Federal law is enacted.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the House of Representatives requires that each committee report on a bill or resolution shall contain a statement as to whether enactment of such bill or resolution may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

Titles I and II of the bill contain $4.1 billion for planning, construction and maintenance of water resource development projects. Water is an important input for many industries as well as for private residences. The Committee believes that public works projects will provide for stable supplies of water at lower costs than would be incurred under alternative institutional arrangements. Similarly, many projects will provide for increased supplies of hydroelectric power at costs below every other electric power production alternative.

Public works projects also provide for improved and lower cost water transportation which can reduce the prices of goods by lowering the input costs of industrial production and encouraging large-scale cost industrial production. Lower transportation costs also allow more producers to enter more markets, thereby giving consumers the benefits of increased competition and lower prices.

Titles III and IV of the bill contain approximately $3.9 billion in new budget authority for various energy programs. Every citizen of the United States is well aware of the economic and inflationary impact of the rapid increase in the price of imported oil. The conflict in the Persian gulf underscored this Nation's vulnerability to price increases in oil due to instability in the Middle East region. These price increases prompt major increases in the price of all domestic petroleum fuels and significantly increase aggregate inflation. These programs and activities will contribute directly to increasing the supply and availability of more abundant, less costly domestic sources of energy.

Environmental restoration and waste management activities to prevent near-term adverse health and environmental impacts are funded at approximately $6.2 billion in this bill. This program will reduce health and safety risks, and the technology development should ultimately reduce the costs of cleanup of sites and facilities. In addition, the bill contains approximately $4.8 billion for atomic energy defense research and support activities. These activities help develop defense technology which meets the national security requirements of the United States and or allies at significantly lower costs.

The Committee concludes that this will result in less inflationary impact.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

[In millions of dollars]

	602(b) Allocation		This Bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	$18,850	$19,738	$18,704	$19,466
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....

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

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

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

	Millions
Budget authority	$18,704
Outlays:	
1996	11,146
1997	5,843
1998	1,626
1999	58
2000 and beyond	32

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

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

	Millions
Budget authority	$149
Fiscal year 1996 outlays resulting therefrom	16

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

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

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program:

> * * * of which $27,049,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund authorized by section 5 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 602d), and

$94,225,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund authorized by section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1968 (43 U.S.C. 1543), and such amounts as may be necessary shall be considered as though advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund for the Boulder Canyon Project as authorized by the Act of December 21, 1928, as amended: *Provided,* That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities which can be financed by the reclamation fund shall be derived from the fund: *Provided further,* That transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund may be increased or decreased by transfers within the overall appropriation under this heading * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Special Funds:

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

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

* * * of which $245,151,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided,* That of the amount herein appropriated, $5,283,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer from the Colorado River Dam Fund to the Western Area Power Administration $4,556,000 to carry out the power marketing and transmission activities of the Boulder Canyon project as provided in section 104(a)(4) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984, to remain available until expended.

Under Title IV, Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

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

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

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

and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: * * *

Under Title IV, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board:

* * * as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $2,531,000, to be transferred from the Nuclear Waste Fund and to remain available until expended.

CHANGES IN APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

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

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

Language is included under Corps of Engineers, Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

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

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

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

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

Language is also included under Operation and Maintenance, Corps of Engineers, limiting the funds available for national emergency preparedness programs.

Under Operation and Maintenance, General, the bill includes language authorizing the Secretary of the Army to transfer not to exceed 300 acres of land at the Cooper Lake, Texas, project from mitigation or low-density recreation to high-density recreation and to take whatever steps are necessary to accomplish that transfer.

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

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

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

Under General Expenses, the bill includes language directing the Secretary of the Army to develop and submit to the Congress a

plan that reduces the number of Corps of Engineers division offices and that further directs the Secretary of the Army to implement the plan prior to October 1, 1997.

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

Under General Provisions, Corps of Engineers—Civil, the bill includes language that directs the Secretary of the Army to advertise for competitive bid at least 7,500,000 of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992 and that permits the Secretary to utilize the Corps of Engineers' dredge fleet under certain conditions. The language also provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act or otherwise available to the Corps of Engineers, including funds in the Revolving Fund, may be used for improvements or major repair of the dredge McFARLAND or for any use of the McFARLAND other than to perform emergency work.

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

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

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

Language is included under Bureau of Reclamation, Construction Program which permits funds transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Funds.

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

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

For Operation and Maintenance, language is included providing that funds may be derived from the reclamation fund and the special fee account established pursuant to the Act of December 22, 1967.

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

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

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

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

Language is included under General Administrative Expenses making a portion of the funds appropriated available until expended. Language is also included relating to the source of funds

for General Administrative Expenses and prohibiting the use of other appropriations for general administrative functions.

Language is included under Special Funds identifying the special funds authorized by law from which funds are made available to the Bureau of Reclamation as authorized and making it explicit that such unexpended balances of such funds are to be returned to sources from which derived.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Language is included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation, and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration providing $5,283,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992.

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

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

Language is included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission allowing transfer of appropriations to other agencies for certain necessary activities and waives 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts. Language is also in-

cluded, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, to permit NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations.

Language is included which appropriates funds to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the Nuclear Waste Fund.

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

Language is included under the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board which transfers funds to the Board from the Nuclear Waste Fund.

Title V—Language is included repealing section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, which prohibited the use of funds to conduct studies relating to changes in pricing hydroelectric power by the six Federal public power authorities, and Sec. 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986, which prohibited the use of funds by the executive branch to solicit proposals, prepare studies, or draft proposals to transfer out of Federal ownership the Federal power marketing administrations located within the contiguous 48 States.

Language is included repealing section 510 of Public Law 101–514, the Fiscal Year 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, which prohibited the use of funds by the executive branch to change the employment levels determined by the administrators of the Federal power marketing administrations to be necessary to carry out their responsibilities.

Language is included that provides that without fiscal year limitation and notwithstanding section 502(b)(5) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, or any other provision of law, a member of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board whose term has expired may continue to serve as a member of the Board until such member's successor has taken office.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

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

Bureau of Reclamation—Central Valley Project, Trinity River Restoration Program, California

Department of Energy:

- Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities
- Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities
- General Science and Research Activities
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund
- Weapons Activities
- Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
- Other Defense Activities
- Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal
- Departmental Administration
- Office of Inspector General
- Power Marketing Administrations

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Appalachian Regional Commission

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspector General

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

COMPLIANCE WITH HOUSE RULE XIII, CLAUSE 3 (RAMSEYER)

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

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

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

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

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

The accompanying bill would repeal section 510 of Public Law 101–514, the Fiscal Year 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

[SEC. 510. Without fiscal year limitation and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or made avail-

able under this or any other Act now or hereafter shall be used by the executive branch to change the employment levels determined by the Administrators of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations to be necessary to carry out their responsibilities under the Department of Energy, Organization Act and related laws, or to change the employment levels of other Department of Energy programs to compensate for employment levels of the Federal Power Marketing Administrations.]

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1996

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1995 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1996 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1995 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1996 (6)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	181,199,000	155,625,000	129,906,000	-51,293,000	-25,719,000
Construction, general	983,668,000	785,125,000	807,846,000	-175,822,000	+22,721,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	328,138,000	319,250,000	307,885,000	-20,253,000	-11,365,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,646,535,000	1,749,875,000	1,712,123,000	+65,588,000	-37,752,000
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	.....	-11,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	14,979,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	-4,979,000	-10,000,000
General expenses	152,500,000	164,725,000	150,000,000	-2,500,000	-14,725,000
Oil spill research	900,000	850,000	850,000	-50,000	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,408,919,000	3,307,450,000	3,219,610,000	-189,309,000	-87,840,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	22,839,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	-3,934,000	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,133,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	+7,370,000	.....

Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	+485,000	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,191,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	+55,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	40,163,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	+3,976,000	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	14,190,000	13,602,000	13,114,000	-1,076,000	-488,000
Construction program	432,727,000	375,943,000	417,301,000	-15,426,000	+41,358,000
Operation and maintenance	284,300,000	288,759,000	278,759,000	-5,541,000	-10,000,000
Loan program	9,600,000	16,668,000	11,668,000	+2,068,000	-5,000,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(23,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(+14,000,000)	.....
General administrative expenses	54,034,000	50,327,000	48,630,000	-5,404,000	-1,697,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	.....	.....	-1,000,000	.....
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	45,385,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	-1,806,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	841,236,000	788,878,000	813,051,000	-28,185,000	+24,173,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	881,399,000	833,017,000	857,190,000	-24,209,000	+24,173,000
(By transfer)	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)	.....
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	3,314,548,000	3,396,535,000	2,596,700,000	-717,848,000	-799,835,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	73,210,000	77,195,000	64,197,000	-9,013,000	-12,998,000
Gross revenues	-9,900,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-25,003,000	.....
Net appropriation	63,310,000	42,292,000	29,294,000	-34,016,000	-12,998,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1996—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1995 (enacted to date)	Budget estimates, 1996	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with appropriated, 1995	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1996
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	301,327,000	288,807,000	278,807,000	-22,520,000	-10,000,000
General Science and Research Activities	984,031,000	1,017,530,000	991,000,000	+6,969,000	-26,530,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	392,800,000	.....	226,600,000	-166,200,000	+226,600,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:					
Defense function	(4,892,691,000)	(6,008,002,000)	(5,265,478,000)	(+372,787,000)	(-742,524,000)
Non-defense function	(1,045,368,000)	(1,001,797,000)	(905,348,000)	(-140,020,000)	(-96,449,000)
Total	(5,938,059,000)	(7,009,799,000)	(6,184,230,000)	(+246,171,000)	(-825,569,000)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons Activities	3,229,069,000	3,540,175,000	3,273,014,000	+43,945,000	-267,161,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,892,691,000	6,008,002,000	5,265,478,000	+372,787,000	-742,524,000
Other Defense Activities	1,849,657,000	1,432,159,000	1,323,841,000	-525,816,000	-108,318,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	129,430,000	198,400,000	198,400,000	+68,970,000	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,100,847,000	11,178,736,000	10,060,733,000	-40,114,000	-1,118,003,000
Departmental Administration	407,312,000	439,444,000	362,250,000	-45,062,000	-77,194,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-161,490,000	-122,306,000	-122,306,000	+39,184,000	.....
Net appropriation	245,822,000	317,138,000	239,944,000	-5,878,000	-77,194,000
Office of the Inspector General	26,465,000	30,998,000	26,000,000	-465,000	-4,998,000

Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	6,494,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	-2,234,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	22,431,000	19,843,000	19,843,000	-2,588,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	21,316,000	29,778,000	29,778,000	+8,462,000	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	222,285,000	306,352,000	257,652,000	+35,367,000	-48,700,000
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	272,526,000	361,233,000	312,533,000	+40,007,000	-48,700,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	166,173,000	136,567,000	132,290,000	-33,883,000	-4,277,000
Revenues Applied	-166,173,000	-136,567,000	-132,290,000	+33,883,000	+4,277,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,701,676,000	16,633,269,000	14,761,611,000	-940,065,000	-1,871,658,000
(By transfer)	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)	.....
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	282,000,000	183,000,000	142,000,000	-140,000,000	-41,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,933,000	18,500,000	17,000,000	-933,000	-1,500,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	343,000	353,000	.....	-343,000	-353,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	478,000	551,000	.....	-478,000	-551,000
Total	821,000	904,000	.....	-821,000	-904,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1996—Continued

Agency and item (1)	Appropriated, 1995 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates, 1996 (3)	Recommended in bill (4)	Bill compared with appropriated, 1995 (5)	Bill compared with budget estimates, 1996 (6)
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	511,000	524,000	.....	-511,000	-524,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	520,501,000	520,300,000	468,300,000	-52,201,000	-52,000,000
Revenues	-498,501,000	-498,300,000	-457,300,000	+41,201,000	+41,000,000
Subtotal	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Office of Inspector General	5,080,000	5,500,000	5,000,000	-80,000	-500,000
Revenues	-5,080,000	-5,500,000	-5,000,000	+80,000	+500,000
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	318,000	332,000	.....	-318,000	-332,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	288,000	360,000	.....	-288,000	-360,000
Total	606,000	692,000	.....	-606,000	-692,000

Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	142,873,000	140,473,000	103,339,000	-39,534,000	-37,134,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,664,000	2,970,000	2,531,000	-133,000	-439,000
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	1,000,000	.....	.....	-1,000,000	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	470,408,000	369,063,000	275,870,000	-194,538,000	-93,193,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	20,462,402,000	21,142,799,000	19,114,281,000	-1,348,121,000	-2,028,518,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. DAVID R. OBEY

CORPORATE WELFARE FOR THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

When the full Appropriations Committee considered the FY 1996 Energy, and Water Appropriations Bill on June 20, 1995, I offered two amendments cutting spending. These amendments were defeated. It is my intention to offer these two amendments and an additional amendment when the bill is considered on the House floor.

Gas turbine modular helium reactor

The bill includes $20 million for the Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor (GT–MHR). I intended to offer an amendment to cut this funding. This program funding is a prime example of the continuation of corporate welfare for the nuclear industry for a program with questionable technology. No funds have been requested by the President for this program for three years in a row.

The only commercial version of a GT–MHR reactor ever built was Colorado's Fort St. Vrain reactor, which had the worst operating record of any nuclear facility. Completed in 1974, it was shut down in 1990 after having operated for years at 14% capacity.

Despite the claims of the proponents of the GT–MHR program about a new design, the technology is still not proven. Even if it were proven, I again point out that providing these funds amounts to corporate welfare to a mature industry in the private sector. The amount of $900 million has been spent for this program, and what has been accomplished? The companies have determined that a new design is required and if only Congress will just keep coming up with a subsidy, then $5.3 billion later a prototype gas cooled reactor just might be built. Clearly this funding should be cut from the bill.

Nuclear technology research and development program

The bill contains $18,000,000 for the Nuclear Technology research and development program. I intend to offer an amendment to cut this funding. Last year Congress voted decisively to kill the Advanced Liquid Metal Reactor Program. The program was ultimately judged too costly (at $3.3 billion) and the technology too questionable to continue the program.

The Department of Energy sought and received approval from the Committee to reprogram $21 million to terminate this program. After receiving approval the Department reneged on its commitment, terminated only a few people through buyouts, and sought an additional $37 million in FY 1996 to continue the funding of these positions while they searched for a new mission for the Argonne Lab.

The Department claims this program is necessary because nuclear reprocessing technology may be a potential treatment for spent fuel. Internal documents from the Department show that there is no consensus within the Department on this technology, and in fact the Department's waste managers have developed plans for spent fuel which do not involve reprocessing.

The Department of Energy is singled out for elimination in the House passed Budget Resolution. This is one minor program within the Department of Energy for which there is no current purpose. The $18 million provided in this bill does exactly what many in the majority party have been promising they would not do, that is continue funding for a federal program for which there is no current purpose. If the Congress can't eliminate one small program whose usefulness has ended, how can anyone take seriously the claims that the Department of Energy will be eliminated?

Advanced light water reactor

The bill contains $40,000,000 for the Advanced Light Water Reactor program. I will offer an amendment to cut this funding. Here we go again with another example of corporate welfare for the nuclear industry. The bill contains $40 million to help large corporations obtain design certification from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This amounts to the government funding a portion of the licensing costs of large corporations to comply with its own regulations. The Committee heard volumes of testimony this year from organizations saying, "let the marketplace determinate what is commercially viable. The government shouldn't be in the business of picking winners and losers", they said repeatedly. These remarks apparently fell on deaf ears, or alternatively the Committee has determined that these concepts do not apply to the nuclear industry.

DAVID R. OBEY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. NANCY PELOSI

The Committee has indicated that it intends to eliminate funding of the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative, authorized in section 3601(c)(1) of the 1992 Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA; P.L. 102–575). Specifically, the Committee Report "directs that the $1,000,000 requested for the San Joaquin River Basin Resource Management Initiative not be expended for that purpose."

As I noted in my views on HR 1158, this program was included in the CVPIA to address fish, wildlife and habitat concerns on the San Joaquin River. They study was authorized so that steps could be determined to restore fish to the San Joaquin River, where irrigation water deliveries have destroyed several stocks of commercially valuable anadromous fish.

Elimination of this study will deny the public important information about the destruction of fishery resources in the San Joaquin River. The study is opposed by a small group of CVP beneficiaries who receive subsidized water supplies at the expense of California's commercial and sport fish resources. The study has been authorized Congress and is being conducted properly by the Bureau of Reclamation. It should be allowed to proceed without interference by special interests.

Committee report language also "directs that the Bureau of Reclamation take no action to collect costs associated with the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program or the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program until drainage service negotiations are complete, drainage service is provided, or the authorizing Committee has acted on this issue." This Committee has already approved years of delays in the initiation of repayment at the request of project beneficiaries while a detailed repayment study was underway by the Department. Now, that study is completed and recommendations have been made with respect to the proper apportionment of repayment. Yet no effort has been made to modify existing repayment law to confirm to the study's recommendations.

This language, if it is heeded by the Bureau of Reclamation, would indefinitely delay the repayment of these costs, providing a further subsidy to the CVP water users who have contaminated the Central Valley and the Sacramento-Bay and Delta for years with their toxic irrigation drainage. The Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation quite properly advised Congress earlier this year that he had no choice under current law but to insist that the more than $70 million spent on these programs be repaid. These costs are reimbursable under the law, and this Committee should not attempt to intrude on the Bureau of Reclamation's responsibility to initiate repayment. While I endorse the proposal to allow the authorizing Committee to consider various alternatives for repayment

of Kesterson cleanup and drainage study costs, I do not believe that further repayment delays are appropriate.

NANCY PELOSI.

○