Calendar No. 496

104TH CONGRESS *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 104–320

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1997

JULY 16, 1996.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1959]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1997

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$20,648,952,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	20,735,645,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the budget estimate, 1997	86,693,000
Over enacted bill, 1996	799,991,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

TITLE II

TITLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1997 beginning October 1, 1996, and ending September 30, 1997, for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activities (except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions), including environmental restoration and waste management, and atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The fiscal year 1997 budget estimates for the bill total $20,648,952,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $20,735,645,000. This is $86,693,000 over the budget estimates and $799,991,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 602(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals $20,308,000 in budget authority and $20,202,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1997 in budget authority and outlays.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $11,582,645,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Stockpile stewardship	$1,659,267,000
Stockpile management	1,969,831,000
Verification and control technology	470,248,000
Other defense programs	1,136,585,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	5,615,210,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,749,043,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar and renewable energy	$246,641,000
Environmental restoration and waste management (nondefense)	595,895,000
Nuclear fission R&D	229,734,000
Magnetic fusion	240,000,000
Basic energy sciences and other research	863,438,000

Biological and environmental R&D	389,075,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $1,000,626,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$672,921,000
Nuclear physics	318,425,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $459,629,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$165,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	146,290,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	471,800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	113,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

General investigations	$172,662,000
Construction	1,478,316,000
Operations and maintenance	1,981,234,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities	101,000,000

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,308,411,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

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

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

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

Our waterways and harbors are an essential part of our national transportation system—providing clean, efficient, and economical transportation of fuels for energy generation and agricultural pro-

duction, and making possible residential and industrial development to provide homes and jobs for the American people.

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

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

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1997 appropriation bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction.

In addition, the subcommittee received numerous statements and letters from Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local officials and representatives, and hundreds of private citizens of all walks of life throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee. The recommendations for fiscal year 1997, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote on July 11, 1996, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

By unanimous vote of 28 to 0 the Committee on July 16, 1996, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1996	$121,767,000
Budget estimate, 1997	142,500,000
Committee recommendation	154,557,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	ALABAMA						
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	2,406,000	356,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	700,000	148,000	100,000		100,000	
	ALASKA						
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	550,000	37,000	113,000		113,000	
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	980,000	74,000	223,000		223,000	
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	10,770,000	176,000		61,000		61,000
	COSTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT					500,000	
(FC)	COOK INLET, AK	1,280,000			150,000		150,000
(N)	DUTCH HARBOR, AK	900,000	752,000	148,000		148,000	
(N)	KENAI RIVER, AK					200,000	
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	750,000	130,000	238,000		238,000	
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	670,000	208,000	160,000		160,000	
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	726,000	326,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	432,000	172,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY AK					90,000	
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	731,000	716,000	15,000		15,000	
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	8,800,000			150,000		150,000
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	700,000	130,000	200,000		200,000	
	ARIZONA						
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,030,000	580,000	257,000		257,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, N SCOTTSDALE DRAINAGE AREA,	1,750,000	710,000	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	825,000	385,000	290,000		290,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, TORTOLITA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,250,000	510,000	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	1,875,000	250,000	500,000		500,000	
(E)	RIO SALADO WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM, AZ	2,045,000	1,099,000	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	18,000,000			500,000		500,000

	ARKANSAS						
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	740,000	185,000	265,000		265,000	
(FDP)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR AND TX	2,570,000	334,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	RED RIVER NAVIGATION, SOUTHWEST AR REEVALUATION	3,000,000				600,000	
	CALIFORNIA						
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	518,000,000	14,965,000		3,500,000		3,500,000
(SPE)	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJECT, CA	1,900,000	900,000	363,000		363,000	
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	1,300,000	165,000		495,000		495,000
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	1,250,000	225,000	389,000		389,000	
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	29,500,000	50,000		600,000		1,000,000
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS AND SUP(HANSEN AND LOPEZ DAMS), CA	1,270,000	696,000	370,000		370,000	
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS AND SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS AND SANTA FE DAM	1,360,000	741,000	430,000		430,000	
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	950,000	539,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	1,250,000	520,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION, CA	1,500,000	625,000	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS AND VICINITY, CA	750,000			150,000		150,000
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS AND VICINITY, CA	781,000	751,000	30,000		30,000	
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,320,000	1,500,000	120,000		120,000	
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	70,800,000	12,050,000		700,000		700,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,125,000	148,000	377,000		377,000	
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	1,030,000	593,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	1,500,000	222,000	410,000		410,000	
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	10,240,000	689,000		810,000		810,000
(SP)	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	400,000	148,000	252,000		252,000	
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	910,000	395,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	990,000	772,000	200,000		200,000	
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	14,640,000	556,000		194,000		194,000
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	790,000	100,000	350,000		350,000	
(FDP)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	1,230,000	910,000	270,000		270,000	
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER, ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,125,000	74,000	386,000		386,000	
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940,000	4,054,000	600,000		600,000	
(E)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, LITTLE HOLLAND TRACT, CA	1,150,000	405,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA ISLANDS, C	1,850,000	798,000	400,000		400,000	
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	1,125,000	460,000	128,000		128,000	

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	1,915,000	865,000	500,000		500,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),	3,665,000	2,427,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	2,070,000	1,249,000	550,000		550,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	2,000,000	296,000	540,000		540,000	
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	1,469,000	869,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,250,000	225,000	365,000		365,000	
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	2,799,000	2,049,000	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA				250,000		250,000
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	1,168,000	1,108,000	60,000		60,000	
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	2,974,000	2,395,000	579,000		579,000	
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,815,000	415,000	450,000		450,000	
(SP)	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	400,000	148,000	252,000		252,000	
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	2,080,000	1,168,000	430,000		430,000	
	DELAWARE						
(N)	C&D CANAL—BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEP	2,615,000	2,570,000	45,000		45,000	
(N)	C&D CANAL—BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEP	76,100,000			1,210,000		1,210,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE AND NJ	3,406,000	2,708,000	557,000		557,000	
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,845,000	2,189,000	288,000		288,000	
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ AND PA	263,040,000	9,844,000		156,000		156,000
	FLORIDA						
(N)	BIG BEND CHANNEL				250,000		250,000
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL						500,000
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	1,680,000	222,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL				200,000		200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	150,000	111,000	39,000		39,000	
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,308,000	793,000	246,000		246,000	
(SP)	LIDO KEY SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	100,000	74,000	26,000		26,000	

(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	11,622,000	1,282,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	941,000	817,000	112,000	.....	112,000	.....
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES, FL	425,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	175,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	.....	296,000	.....	300,000	.....	300,000
	GEORGIA						
(E)	ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	1,600,000	275,000	325,000	.....	325,000	.....
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,477,000	2,106,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(FDP)	FLINT RIVER BASIN STUDY, GA	1,400,000	.....	260,000	.....	260,000	.....
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER, GA AND SC	2,265,000	200,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	2,425,000	296,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
	HAWAII						
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	1,243,000	523,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	6,197,000	576,000	.....	365,000	.....	365,000
(N)	MAUI SECOND HARBOR, MAUI, HI	541,000	96,000	120,000	.....	120,000	.....
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	1,016,000	584,000	230,000	.....	230,000	.....
	ILLINOIS						
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,247,000	855,000	175,000	.....	175,000	.....
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	113,000,000	.....	.....	350,000	.....	350,000
(RDP)	FREEPORT, IL	1,005,000	330,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	9,940,000	186,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	50,360,000	27,296,000	9,883,000	.....	11,000,000	.....
	INDIANA						
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	.....	50,000	.....	475,000	.....	475,000
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN (MIDDLE REACHES), IN AND IL	1,116,000	1,011,000	105,000	.....	105,000	.....
	IOWA						
(RCP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	1,100,000	65,000	235,000	.....	235,000	.....
	KANSAS						
(SPE)	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KS	500,000	371,000	129,000	.....	129,000	.....
(RCP)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	913,000	250,000	25,000	.....	25,000	.....
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460–471, KS	1,875,000	750,000	145,000	.....	145,000	.....
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	850,000	23,000	302,000	.....	302,000	.....
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	968,000	5,000	367,000	.....	367,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	22,000,000	.....	.....	25,000	.....	25,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	1,770,000	1,691,000	79,000	.....	79,000	.....
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	400,000	5,000	155,000	.....	155,000	.....
	KENTUCKY						
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	430,000	50,000	380,000	.....	380,000	.....
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK, KY	235,000,000	6,500,000	.....	3,000,000	.....	3,000,000
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	1,088,000	251,000	149,000	.....	149,000	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY	1,043,000	400,000	315,000	.....	315,000	.....
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	1,310,000	1,230,000	80,000	.....	80,000	.....
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	.....	.....	.....	150,000	.....	150,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	1,508,000	500,000	262,000	.....	262,000	.....
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	38,400,000	7,993,000	7,719,000	.....	7,719,000	.....
	PANTHER CREEK, KY	.....	.....	.....	.....	200,000	.....
	LOUISIANA						
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	200,000	.....	.....	.....	200,000	.....
(FDP)	BAYOU TIGRE, ERATH, LA	1,285,000	185,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(FDP)	BLACK BAYOU DIVERSION, LA	1,442,000	342,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	60,800,000	5,559,000	.....	200,000	.....	200,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	91,000,000	667,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	4,796,000	2,414,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	4,710,000	2,403,000	593,000	.....	593,000	.....
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	2,826,000	814,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	1,000,000	222,000	278,000	.....	278,000	.....
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	2,700,000	1,397,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	ST TAMMANY PARISH, LA	2,407,000	507,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FC)	WEST BANK—EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	66,650,000	1,629,000	.....	50,000	.....	50,000
(FDP)	WEST SHORE—LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	1,810,000	371,000	129,000	.....	129,000	.....

	MARYLAND						
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	3,145,000	1,979,000	700,000	.....	700,000	.....
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	600,000	148,000	442,000	.....	442,000	.....
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD	24,000,000	.....	.....	338,000	.....	338,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD	1,740,000	1,549,000	191,000	.....	191,000	.....
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	1,795,000	720,000	596,000	.....	596,000	.....
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA AND DC	3,000,000	2,478,000	522,000	.....	522,000	.....
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE—REALLOCATION, MD AND WV	1,900,000	.....	.....	37,000	.....	37,000
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE—REALLOCATION, MD AND WV	712,000	678,000	34,000	.....	34,000	.....
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	2,689,000	1,846,000	740,000	.....	740,000	250,000
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	2,350,000	650,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	1,750,000	150,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	MASSACHUSETTS						
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,600,000	100,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	20,400,000	2,010,000	.....	90,000	.....	90,000
	MICHIGAN						
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	.....	.....	.....	.....	250,000	.....
	MINNESOTA						
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	.....	.....	.....	190,000	.....	190,000
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	995,000	939,000	56,000	.....	56,000	.....
	MISSISSIPPI						
(FC)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	67,326,000	355,000	.....	2,790,000	.....	2,790,000
	MISSOURI						
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	8,550,000	7,000	.....	450,000	.....	450,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,307,000	307,000	285,000	.....	285,000	.....
(RCP)	FABIUS RIVER LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	1,000,000	82,000	318,000	.....	318,000	.....
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	906,000	306,000	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	1,256,000	306,000	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	585,000	234,000	55,000	.....	55,000	.....
(N)	ST. LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	650,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
	NEBRASKA						
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	838,000	531,000	175,000		175,000	
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	1,991,000	491,000	420,000		420,000	
	NEVADA						
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	1,300,000	350,000	210,000		210,000	
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PAIUTE, NV	1,355,000	933,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	790,000	327,000	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	NORTH LAS VEGAS, CHANNEL "A", NV	1,000,000		100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, RENO, NV	1,700,000	50,000	650,000		650,000	
(N)	TAHOE BASIN, NV AND CA	600,000				500,000	
	NEW JERSEY						
	BARNEGAT BAY ESTUARY AND WATERSHED, NJ					350,000	
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ					300,000	
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	1,717,000	1,485,000	160,000		160,000	
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS—CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	1,300,000	1,015,000	231,000		231,000	
	NEW JERSEY INTERCOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ					375,000	
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (CLIFFWOOD BEACH), NJ	1,120,000	295,000	25,000		25,000	
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	3,189,000	1,682,000	590,000		590,000	
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	186,000,000	21,219,000		2,781,000		2,781,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	2,800,000	697,000	400,000		400,000	
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	1,250,000	1,205,000	45,000		45,000	
	NEW MEXICO						
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM	4,600,000	193,000		207,000		207,000
(SPE)	RIO CHAMA, ABIQUIU DAM TO ESPANOLA, NM	1,000,000	400,000	150,000		150,000	

	NEW YORK						
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	1,380,000	230,000	75,000	.....	75,000	.....
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL—HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	28,700,000	2,296,000	.....	1,200,000	.....	1,200,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	7,000,000	1,806,000	1,400,000	.....	1,400,000	.....
	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN, NY	500,000	.....	.....	.....	200,000	.....
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	3,025,000	525,000	375,000	.....	375,000	.....
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	3,000,000	903,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	35,500,000	808,000	.....	742,000	.....	742,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	.....	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	760,000	535,000	120,000	.....	120,000	.....
	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	.....	.....	.....	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	2,500,000	591,000	209,000	.....	209,000	.....
(FDP)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	500,000	.....	.....	.....	400,000	.....
(SP)	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY	2,000,000	475,000	25,000	.....	25,000	.....
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	25,100,000	2,592,000	.....	500,000	.....	500,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR—NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	150,120,000	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,097,000	1,169,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR—NORTHEAST CAPE FEAR RIVER, NC	25,729,000	1,880,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	4,445,000	1,294,000	1,100,000	.....	1,100,000	.....
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	1,560,000	1,119,000	361,000	.....	361,000	.....
	OREGON						
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA	4,228,000	2,225,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(E)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	1,450,000	271,000	179,000	.....	179,000	.....
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	856,000	74,000	230,000	.....	230,000	.....
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,225,000	945,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	45,200,000	1,232,000	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	753,000	703,000	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA	2,500,000	500,000	600,000	.....	600,000	.....
(FDP)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, (GREEN RIDGE AND PLOT SECTIONS)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	600,000
	LOWER WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PA	540,000	.....	.....	.....	300,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	1,560,000	487,000	73,000		73,000	
(FDP)	SCHYULKILL RIVER BASIN, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN AREA, PA	630,000	200,000	175,000		175,000	
	TIOGA RIVER WATERSHED, PA					250,000	
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, STORAGE REALLOCATION, PA AND MD	600,000	200,000	175,000		175,000	
	PUERTO RICO						
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	23,400,000			600,000		600,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	11,175,000			329,000		329,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	43,000,000	3,223,000		150,000		150,000
	RHODE ISLAND						
	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST. AND STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, RI	400,000				300,000	
	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	500,000				225,000	
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING AND WIDENING)	72,800,000			225,000		225,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,397,000	205,000	207,000		207,000	
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	1,828,000	204,000	254,000		254,000	
	TENNESSEE						
	DUCK RIVER, TN					500,000	
(FDP)	EAST RIDGE, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	1,500,000					500,000
(FDP)	EMILY AVE AND TIMOTHY ST., KNOXVILLE, TN	100,000				100,000	
	MEMPHIS METROPOLITAN AREA, TN AND MS					1,200,000	
(FDP)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	990,000	660,000	330,000		330,000	
	TEXAS						
(FDP)	ALPINE, TX	1,150,000	222,000	178,000		178,000	
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	207,244,000	2,889,000		1,110,000		1,110,000

(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S.-MEXICO BORDER, TX AND AZ	614,000	294,000	320,000	.....	320,000	.....
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,171,000	436,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	104,874,000	1,722,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	1,951,000	1,007,000	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	25,000,000	2,150,000	.....	930,000	.....	930,000
(N)	GIWW—ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	20,300,000	718,000	.....	857,000	.....	857,000
(RDP)	GIWW—HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	3,720,000	602,000	1,200,000	.....	1,200,000	.....
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	3,700,000	.....	.....	50,000	.....	50,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	137,853,000	3,010,000	.....	860,000	.....	860,000
(N)	HOUSTON—GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	252,754,000	17,318,000	.....	1,900,000	.....	1,900,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	17,955,000	1,848,000	.....	520,000	.....	520,000
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	1,080,000	.....	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	888,000	661,000	140,000	.....	140,000	.....
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	773,000	473,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	151,300,000	3,410,000	.....	650,000	.....	650,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	8,235,000	4,578,000	1,230,000	.....	1,230,000	.....
	UTAH						
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	1,550,000	334,000	320,000	.....	320,000	.....
(E)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER RESTORATION, UT	600,000	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
	VIRGIN ISLANDS						
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....	100,000
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	22,800,000	1,656,000	.....	344,000	.....	344,000
(SP)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, POQUOSON, VA	925,000	74,000	301,000	.....	301,000	.....
(RCP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	2,400,000	185,000	620,000	.....	620,000	.....
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, SUFFOLK, VA	1,450,000	274,000	226,000	.....	226,000	.....
	NORFOLK VIRGNIA, VICINITY OF WILLOUGHBY SPIT, VA	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	375,000
(BE)	SANDBRIDGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	205,840,000	967,000	.....	283,000	.....	283,000
	WASHINGTON						
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	1,727,000	589,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	950,000	286,000	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	2,225,000	1,789,000	320,000	.....	320,000	.....
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	770,000	279,000	140,000	.....	140,000	.....

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
				Investigations	Planning	Investigations	Planning
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	1,350,000	411,000	330,000		330,000	
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	1,510,000	510,000	350,000		350,000	
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	1,080,000	69,000	331,000		331,000	
	WEST VIRGINIA						
(E)	CHEAT R B, N BRANCH, LICK RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	945,000	445,000	350,000		350,000	
(FDP)	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	550,000	50,000			500,000	
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	11,700,000	11,129,000	400,000		400,000	
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, WV	12,500,000			366,000		366,000
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	166,000,000	7,850,000		1,850,000		1,850,000
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RVR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV	1,875,000	703,000	550,000		550,000	
(E)	TYGART VALLEY R B, GRASSY RUN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATIO	1,087,000	587,000	350,000		350,000	
	WISCONSIN						
(RCP)	FOX RIVER, WI	1,496,000	1,309,000	187,000		187,000	
	WYOMING						
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	1,482,000	932,000	200,000		200,000	
	MISCELLANEOUS						
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			650,000		650,000	
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION			1,500,000		1,500,000	
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES			8,540,000		8,040,000	
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA			250,000		250,000	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES			10,000,000		9,350,000	
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)					500,000	
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES			500,000		500,000	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES			300,000		300,000	
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS			575,000		575,000	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE)			500,000		500,000	

REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			300,000		300,000	
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			27,000,000		28,600,000	
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS			150,000		150,000	
STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)			770,000		770,000	
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS			950,000		950,000	
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−16,064,000		−18,364,000	
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			103,760,000	38,740,000	112,367,000	42,190,000

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

Coastal studies of navigation improvements, Alaska.—An appropriation of $500,000 has been included for the Corps to initiate a regional reconnaissance study which will evaluate the navigation needs of Alaska's coastal communities. By combining several harbor and navigation studies into this one study, the Corps is expected to be able to continue significant work substantially below the cost to address each project separately.

Red River navigation, southwest Arkansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.—The Committee has included $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a cost-shared feasibility study to extend navigation on the Red River from Shreveport, LA, into southwest Arkansas. The Committee recognizes that this region is economically depressed and that extending commercial navigation upstream of Shreveport-Bossier City, LA, into southwest Arkansas holds the potential to provide benefits to the Nation due to lower transportation costs and economic activity in the area. The Committee understands that a non-Federal interest has offered to cost share the feasibility study on a 50–50 basis in order to expedite completion of the study. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to work closely with the local sponsor to control study costs, and plan and conduct an efficient expedited study.

Kawaeh River, CA.—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000, over the $600,000 budget request for the Kawaeh River, CA, study for the Corps to initiate geotechnical studies, hydraulic and sedimentation analyses in order to allow completion of the planning and engineering design in fiscal year 1998 if possible.

Port Everglades Harbor, FL.—The Committee has included $175,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a feasibility study on the Port Everglade Harbor, FL, project. The study will address geotechnical, environmental, economic, design, and ship simulation efforts.

Kaumalapau Harbor, HI.—In the past, this Committee appropriated over $900,000 toward the research and design of a new breakwater to replace the current breakwater which users regard as unsafe. The Committee is aware that Lanai's petroleum products supplier recently announced its intention to cancel all deliveries to the island due to the unsafe condition of the breakwater.

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

Upper Mississippi and Illinois navigation study, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The Committee has included $11,000,000 for the Upper Mississippi and Illinois navigation study. This is the full capability of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1997. The Committee directs the Corps to accelerate the exe-

cution of the feasibility study activities in accordance with the approved project study plan in such a manner that schedule recovery will be maximized and a final report will be completed as early as practicable. The Committee reaffirms the position taken on this project in the conference report on the Energy and Water Development Act for 1996.

Kentucky lock and dam, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided the full budget request of $3,000,000 for the Kentucky lock and dam to continue preconstruction engineering and design activities. If additional funding is needed during the year to keep work on schedule, the Committee urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to reprogram additional funds into the project.

Amite River and tributaries, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes an amount of $200,000 to reevaluate the benefit-cost analysis in connection with proposed flood control solutions in the Amite River basin and continued review of the previous studies of Darlington Reservoir.

Ocean City, MD, and vicinity, (Assateague Island).—In addition to the budget request of $740,000, the Committee has recommended $250,000 for the Corps to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of measures to mitigate damages to Assateague Island National Seashore and vicinity impacted by Federal projects constructed to stabilize inlet conditions for navigation and protection of shoreline erosion.

St. Louis Harbor, MO.—The Committee has included $650,000 for the St. Louis Harbor, MO, project, to continue the general reevaluation, including the collection of basic physical and economic data, identification of potential harbor sites, and formulation and evaluation of alternative plans.

Devils Lake, ND.—An appropriation of $1,100,000, the full budget request, has been included for the Corps to expedite work on the Devils Lake, ND, feasibility study for lake stabilization, including an inlet and outlet at the lake. The Committee urges the Corps to work cooperatively with the Bureau of Reclamation and the State of North Dakota in this effort. The Committee expects the study will address all aspects of the project set out in the study evaluation.

Barnegat Bay, NJ.—The Committee had included $350,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study to develop a comprehensive management plan for a variety of water resource problems in the Barnegat Bay area of New Jersey.

New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway [NJIWW], NJ.—The bill includes $375,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study to identify the ecosystem restoration opportunities along the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in New Jersey, including the emphasis of techniques for the beneficial use of dredged material.

Chemung River basin, Susquehanna River basin, New York and Pennsylvania.—An amount of $200,000 has been provided to undertake a reconnaissance study of the water resource improvements needs for streambank stabilization, flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and other allied purposes in the Chemung River basin in New York upstream of the confluence with the mainstem Susquehanna River.

Tahoe basin, Nevada and California.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Tahoe basin study in Nevada and California. The study will examine flood control, water quality, wetland habitat, and other environmental restoration opportunities. The study is critical for restoring the health of Lake Tahoe and the Lake Tahoe basin.

Willamette River temperature control, Oregon.—The Committee directs the Corps to remain on its present schedule for the Willamette River temperature control project at Cougar Lake in Oregon. In particular, the Committee directs the Corps to complete plans and specifications for the Cougar Lake project by December 1997.

Lackawanna River, Scranton, PA, (Green Ridge and Plot sections).—The Committee has provided $300,000 each for the Lackawanna River, Green Ridge and Plot sections for the Corps of Engineers to undertake the cost-shared planning and design phase of the projects.

Rhode Island, south coast, Rhode Island.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps to conduct a reconnaissance study of potential flood control and watershed improvements, frontal erosion prevention, coastal storm damage reduction, and habitat restoration along the Rhode Island south coast from Watch Hill to Narragansett, RI.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway [AIWW], SC.—The Committee has included $225,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study to develop a master plan for the maintenance and operation of the AIWW in South Carolina caused by significant changes along the waterway; including the development a long-range disposal plan, the feasibility of releasing excess easement areas, restoration of the environment, and development and protection of wildlife habitat in the existing easement areas consistent with disposal requirements.

Memphis metro area, Tennessee and Mississippi.—The bill includes $1,200,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study to evaluate the problems and opportunities for flood control, urban drainage, storm water management, water quality, environmental enhancement and protection, and other water resource problems in the Memphis metropolitan area in Tennessee.

Cheat River basin, West Virginia, environmental restoration.—The Committee is aware of and supports efforts of the Corps of Engineers to identify environmental restoration problems in the Cheat River basin in West Virginia. However, the Committee feels that prior to proceeding with the Lick Run project, more detailed analysis and investigations of potential higher priority sites in the Cheat River basin is warranted. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to use the $350,000 provided herein to further Cheat basin reconnaissance studies in an effort to identify the highest priority acid mine drainage projects in the basin. The Corps is to work closely with the State in this effort.

Greenbrier River basin, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps to resume feasibility studies in the Greenbrier River basin in West Virginia. The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to update hydrology and hydraulics in the basin to account for recent floods in the area. These studies will

allow the Corps to evaluate a wide range of alternatives and recommend a specific plan for implementation.

Research and development.—An appropriation of $28,600,000 is recommended for research and development activities of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark funding for university research institutions given the limited resources and severe budget constraints.

The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for zebra mussel research, which is the same as the fiscal year 1997 budget allocation. Given that this is a nationwide program and the limited funding available, the Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark the limited funds available. The Committee has been informed of the need to conduct activities in the Great Lakes region and Lake Champlain, VT. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to apply the funds to various regions geographically, and on varying technologies and applications in order to accomplish the highest-priority work.

The Corps research and development program includes materials and structural engineering activities to provide improved techniques and technologies to significantly reduce construction costs and to improve structural durability, service life, and safety. As the Nation undertakes to rehabilitate its domestic infrastructure, it is becoming increasingly apparent that for reasons of both environmental protection and longevity, traditional construction methods and materials are not cost effective when compared to new designs and composite materials. In an effort to demonstrate the feasibility of advanced composite designs for application in a marine environment, the Committee has included $1,600,000 for cost-shared research and development and installation of composite pilings with the Greater New Orleans Expressway Commission at Lake Pontchartrain and the Waterways Experiment Station [WES] in Vicksburg.

Coordination and studies with other agencies.—The Committee recommendation for coordination and studies with other agencies includes $450,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to participate as a stake holder in the interagency ecosystem management task force's Pacific Northwest forest case study with responsibility to restore, sustain, and develop coordinated watershed ecosystem management strategies for species viability on all public lands. These strategies will consider ecological, social, and economic principles to manage biological and physical systems in a manner that safeguards the long-term ecological sustainability, natural diversity, and productivity of the watershed and its landscapes. The strategies will include the evaluation, planning, design, and completion of restoration or demonstration projects and the development of coordinated directives for the management of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. In as much as possible, these strategies will complete or complement State and local watershed restoration efforts on public and private lands or in conjunction with American Indian tribes.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1996	$804,573,000
Budget estimate, 1997	914,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,024,195,000

An appropriation of $1,024,195,000 is recommended for ongoing construction activities.

BUDGET CONSTRAINTS AND PROGRAM EXECUTION

The Committee has been faced with difficult choices in development of the budget for the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1997. Severe reductions in budgetary resources last year forced the Committee to ask the Corps to undertake more work than available funds could support. In addition, after several years of poor performance in utilizing the funding provided by the Congress, the Corps has responded by raising their execution rate from around 70 percent to over 95 percent. The Committee received testimony that during the first quarter of this year the actual utilization of construction funding was 104 percent of that planned. This has severely limited the Corps ability to respond to changing construction needs and eliminated the flexibility within the construction program to meet the demands of Congress to provide critical flood control protection, essential commercial navigation improvements, and other infrastructure needs in a timely manner.

The Committee expects the budgetary resources for non-Defense discretionary programs to continue to decline. In response to Committee questions, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works indicated that OMB budget planning allocations between now and the year 2000 for Corps of Engineers programs and activities are expected to decline by $600,000,000.

NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS

With continued reductions in budgetary resources, increased performance by the Corps of Engineers, severely limited program flexibility, and the uncertainty of future funding allocations, the Committee has decided not to commit to new construction projects, but to apply available resources on ongoing construction work. In addition, budgetary constraints and lack of program flexibility have limited the number of requests which could be accommodated by the Committee.

NEW PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Finally, the Committee is troubled with the prospects of another extended period of stalemate, dispute, and lack of cooperation in the area of water resource policy. A similar dispute occurred between 1970 and 1986, a period of 16 years, when the water resource infrastructure needs of the Nation were neglected. The ever increasing population of the United States will require larger and larger amounts of water, not only for human needs, but also to support industrial development in order to sustain employment and create new jobs. Therefore, it is vitally important to the Nation that the executive branch and the Congress work together to develop sound and realistic water resource policy.

The Committee received numerous requests to include project authorizations in the Energy and Water Development appropriations bill. However, in an effort to support congressional authorizing committees desires to enact comprehensive water resource authorizing legislation, and to underscore the importance of enacting authorizing legislation on a regular schedule, the Committee has not included new project authorizations.

The Committee has included minor provisions which increase the cost ceiling for ongoing projects in order to prevent construction delays and associated increased costs.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	ALABAMA				
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	6,184,000	5,061,000	1,123,000	1,123,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,123,000	1,565,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	87,300,000	83,019,000	4,281,000	4,281,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,400,000	.....	900,000	900,000
	ALASKA				
	DILLINGHAM, AK (SHORELINE EROSION)	4,123,000	500,000	.....	3,302,000
(FC)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION, AK	16,133,000	12,333,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	10,116,000	1,206,000	4,000,000	.....
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	11,500,000	11,296,000	204,000	204,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	25,000,000	20,594,000	4,406,000	4,406,000
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	4,666,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	632,500,000	599,465,000	1,414,000	1,714,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	200,000,000	18,614,000	5,886,000	5,886,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR &LA	137,975,000	100,262,000	.....	6,000,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	44,000,000	30,787,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	63,300,000	37,678,000	5,000,000	7,500,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	204,000,000	18,874,000	14,400,000	14,400,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	100,700,000	4,640,000	850,000	10,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,450,000	1,002,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,600,000	7,548,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	85,900,000	16,090,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	25,700,000	3,355,000	100,000	100,000

(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	56,025,000	51,719,000	4,306,000	4,306,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	24,350,000	9,116,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	159,100,000	92,523,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	2,893,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	172,250,000	65,417,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	9,030,000	844,000	200,000	.....
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	445,114,000	51,020,000	51,020,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	20,300,000	10,606,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE—SUNSET—NEWPORT BEACH, CA	43,200,000	16,460,000	5,604,000	5,604,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	2,890,000	1,150,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	15,700,000	4,347,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
	COLORADO				
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	5,950,000	2,607,000	100,000	100,000
	DELAWARE				
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	12,800,000	4,480,000	214,000	214,000
	FLORIDA				
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,366,000,000	415,172,000	17,237,000	17,237,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	170,400,000	49,851,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL	181,000,000	72,585,000	580,000	580,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	30,600,000	550,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	255,600,000	31,371,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	18,585,000	3,010,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	26,000,000	4,508,000	109,000	109,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	51,066,000	15,748,000	500,000	500,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	34,100,000	8,345,000	1,919,000	1,919,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	129,000,000	23,405,000	5,865,000	5,865,000
	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL (VENICE SEGMENT)	55,200,000	7,035,000	.....	900,000
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	1,284,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	586,650,000	583,700,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	2,018,000	4,900,000	4,900,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	HAWAII				
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HAWAII, HI	10,670,000	10,170,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	12,112,000	.....	345,000	345,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HAWAII, HI	6,178,000	3,940,000	2,238,000	2,238,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	8,810,000	1,745,000	517,000	517,000
	ILLINOIS				
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	8,100,000	1,015,000	1,300,000	.....
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,563,000	22,260,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	23,430,000	768,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	21,150,000	6,372,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	18,300,000	8,969,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	738,932,000	719,658,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	24,600,000	22,682,000	1,918,000	1,918,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL AND KY	1,020,000,000	165,224,000	70,352,000	70,352,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,880,000	275,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN	222,737,000	127,678,000	15,694,000	15,694,000
	INDIANA				
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	13,600,000	6,265,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	33,866,000	8,553,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	.....	.....	.....	2,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	109,000,000	40,018,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
	IOWA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,700,000	642,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	75,700,000	29,087,000	1,600,000	5,000,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	126,723,000	93,663,000	400,000	650,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,540,000	1,198,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	41,644,000	9,893,000	5,363,000	5,363,000

(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA	14,600,000	11,786,000	2,814,000	2,814,000
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	28,100,000	3,025,000	50,000	1,000,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	10,300,000	1,987,000	50,000	1,000,000
	KENTUCKY				
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	157,299,000	147,966,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	18,300,000	1,155,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAMS, KY AND IN	255,000,000	10,513,000	7,501,000	7,501,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	8,471,000	1,153,000	3,089,000	.....
	LOUISIANA				
(FC)	ALOHA—RIGOLETTE, LA	7,333,000	3,421,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	504,000,000	329,497,000	4,025,000	18,525,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA	.....	.....	.....	3,500,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	79,100,000	69,309,000	517,000	517,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER—GULF OUTLET, LA	599,000,000	103,519,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	161,000,000	20,420,000	752,000	752,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	166,000,000	136,791,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(FC)	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	12,500,000	10,500,000	.....	2,600,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA	134,975,000	100,262,000	.....	4,400,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,886,880,000	1,659,879,000	4,800,000	8,500,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	25,000,000	2,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,800,000	22,034,000	4,206,000	5,706,000
	MARYLAND				
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	632,000	206,000	206,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	287,000,000	1,561,000	22,000,000	500,000
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	17,100,000	.....	5,200,000	5,200,000
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	7,930,000	1,779,000	2,663,000	2,663,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	27,000,000	23,863,000	3,137,000	3,137,000
	MINNESOTA				
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	29,100,000	27,491,000	1,609,000	1,609,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,220,000	1,453,000	500,000	1,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	14,600,000	540,000	680,000	680,000
(FC)	ST. CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN	8,700,000	2,400,000	.....	1,000,000
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	194,000,000	81,301,000	8,300,000	12,300,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU—JACKSON, MO	33,300,000	24,482,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	16,267,000	7,301,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	214,000,000	180,434,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	900,000	460,000	460,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000,000	1,974,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	5,900,000	850,000	1,000,000	.....
	NEVADA				
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	170,000,000	19,319,000	10,260,000	10,260,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	89,400,000	11,734,000	1,965,000	1,965,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	343,000,000	27,514,000	380,000	380,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	23,500,000	5,260,000	8,150,000	8,150,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	9,025,000	2,079,000	250,000	250,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	2,196,000,000	61,894,000	24,118,000	24,118,000
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	4,200,000	470,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	63,900,000	11,740,000	300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	3,425,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	265,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	35,700,000	6,874,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	56,000,000	3,575,000	100,000	100,000

(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	3,020,000	220,000	250,000	250,000
	NEW YORK				
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	61,470,000	38,237,000	1,298,000	1,298,000
	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	.....	.....	.....	4,471,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	519,400,000	31,525,000	13,900,000	13,900,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ	326,200,000	195,038,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &	130,000,000	45,196,000	100,000	100,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(N)	AIWW—REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	77,100,000	47,482,000	6,400,000	6,400,000
(BE)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	177,580,000	17,831,000	6,533,000	6,533,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	36,100,000	.....	337,000	337,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	8,190,000	783,000	450,000	450,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	15,800,000	11,746,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,000,000	3,900,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	32,230,000	21,758,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	101,387,000	99,687,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	OHIO				
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,380,000	221,000	220,000	220,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,306,000	1,076,000	592,000	592,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	8,688,000	1,176,000	466,000	.....
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,400,000	19,592,000	11,400,000	11,400,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	13,650,000	4,501,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	72,000,000	57,568,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	32,800,000	1,356,000	690,000	690,000
	OREGON				
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	24,040,000	23,540,000	500,000	500,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	5,869,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR AND WA	678,714,000	678,114,000	600,000	600,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	74,400,000	9,572,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	8,352,000	3,307,000	4,900,000	4,900,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	108,552,000	500,000	500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(N)	GRAYS LANDING LOCK AND DAM, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	181,000,000	173,800,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500,000	1,128,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	10,900,000	2,112,000	610,000	610,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	15,400,000	2,375,000	358,000	358,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	645,000,000	28,260,000	17,100,000	18,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	63,035,000	15,094,000	485,000	485,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	7,050,000	2,034,000	500,000	.....
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	100,000,000	15,438,000	14,063,000	14,063,000
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	11,700,000	1,043,000	350,000	.....
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	416,500,000	352,059,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	62,400,000	4,006,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	89,050,000	2,679,000	2,540,000	.....
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	16,948,000	7,663,000	7,663,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,535,000	14,422,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	17,150,000	1,498,000	2,200,000	.....
	TEXAS				
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	4,436,000	3,040,000	1,396,000	1,396,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	22,500,000	6,529,000	9,550,000	9,550,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	68,800,000	16,098,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	113,400,000	89,226,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(N)	GIWW—SARGENT BEACH, TX	58,600,000	30,432,000	18,300,000	18,300,000

(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	7,580,000	2,916,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	317,450,000	314,446,000	3,004,000	3,004,000
	RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX AND OK	225,000,000	40,818,000	.....	4,500,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	36,914,000	35,714,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	147,410,000	145,810,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	203,600,000	35,484,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	10,100,000	380,000	300,000	300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	.....	.....	.....	5,000,000
	UTAH				
(FC)	LITTLE DELL LAKE, UT	.....	.....	.....	4,000,000
	VIRGINIA				
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA	34,500,000	16,242,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	18,226,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	RICHMOND FILTRATION PLANT, VA	.....	.....	.....	3,500,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,500,000	4,432,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	.....	.....	.....	6,000,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	7,461,000	6,974,000	487,000	487,000
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	1,382,217,000	294,113,000	107,000,000	107,000,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	1,760,000	360,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	220,810,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1–14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	86,000,000	.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA				
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,559,728,000	565,545,000	6,921,000	38,526,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV	18,000,000	8,939,000	6,385,000	6,385,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV	17,900,000	13,384,000	4,516,000	4,516,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV AND OH	373,000,000	319,832,000	12,158,000	12,158,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	225,600,000	168,530,000	30,900,000	30,900,000
	WISCONSIN				
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	6,620,000	2,148,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	.....	.....	2,500,000	4,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)			3,000,000	4,700,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)			4,000,000	4,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT			500,000	500,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM			2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)			7,500,000	8,500,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION			18,892,000	18,892,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)			24,500,000	32,650,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSES			40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSES			185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT			500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)			5,000,000	9,632,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME			15,000,000	17,280,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−46,716,000	−46,716,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL			914,000,000	1,024,195,000

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

Dillingham, AK, shoreline erosion.—The Committee has included $3,302,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Dillingham, AK, shoreline erosion control project in the vicinity of Snag Point. The Committee understands that serious erosion is endangering sewer lines, homes and businesses along a 1,500 foot section of shoreline near Snag Point.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system (Montgomery Point lock and dam), Arkansas.—The bill includes $5,886,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project, as proposed in the budget request.

Red River emergency bank protection, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $6,000,000 is included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete construction of the Dickson revetment feature of the Red River emergency bank protection project in Arkansas.

Los Angeles Harbor, CA.—An appropriation of $10,000,000 is recommended for the Los Angeles Harbor project in California. This is $9,150,000 over the budget for fiscal year 1997. This is a good example for the impact of current and future budget constraints have on providing for the infrastructure needs of the nation. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers could utilize nearly $30,000,000 to maintain efficient progress on this project which contributes billions of dollars to the national economy through export and import of goods, direct and indirect employment, and associated economic activity generated in the region. Yet, the Committee is unable to provided the full amount required for 1997, and budget profiles for the next several years project a continued decline in available resources to support projects such as the Los Angeles Harbor that contribute so much to the national economy.

Sacramento River flood control project, (Glenn-Colusa irrigation district), California.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000, the same as the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction on the riffle restoration project.

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

Lee County, FL, (Captiva Island).—An amount of $1,000,000 has been included in the Committee recommendation to reimburse the Federal share of costs for the renourishment of the beach at Captiva Island, FL.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL.—While the budget request for the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL, project does not include a request for new funding, the Committee understands that $6,655,000 of previously appropriated funding is available and adequate to undertake scheduled activities in fiscal year 1997.

Arkansas City, KS, and Winfield, KS.—The Committee is aware of the severe flooding problems in Arkansas City and Winfield, KS, and the urgent need to provide flood protection in those areas. Therefore, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for each of these projects to accelerate construction. The Secretary of the Army is directed to initiate construction on the first of two contracts for each project on an accelerated basis if the non-Federal sponsor is able

to acquire necessary lands by the second quarter of fiscal year 1997.

The Committee has recommended a provision in the bill to increase the cost ceiling for this project.

Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $3,500,000 to continue the development of the Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge project in Louisiana.

Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $14,300,000 for this project of which is to be used by the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of parallel protection along the Orleans Avenue and London Avenue Outfall canals.

Ouachita River levees, Louisiana.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to award and complete construction of levee raising from Bastrop to Monroe items 1 and 2 in Louisiana.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—An appropriation of $8,500,000 is recommended for the Red River Waterway, LA, project. The Committee recognizes the economic tourism development of the waterway region is critical to provide the full value to the Nation. Therefore, an additional $3,700,000 has been provided for the design and construction of the visitor center and interpretive displays and exhibits, and to subsequently initiate continuing contracts, not to be considered fully funded, for a regional visitor center at Shreveport, LA, as specified by Public Law 104–46, and an enhanced recreation site with appropriate project oriented exhibits and displays at Grand Ecore, near Nachitoches, LA, as specified in the Red River Waterway master plan for recreation.

Both center and site are to be constructed at full Federal expense. Engineering, design, and construction need not await completion of the recreation master plan supplement and project cooperation agreement for pools 3–5 recreation development. The center will provide educational information to the public on the Red River Waterway project, the Red River basin, and national and local water resources development by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Red River emergency bank protection, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation for the Red River emergency bank protection project in Louisiana includes $3,900,000 for the Corps to design and construct the Cat Island revetment, and $500,000 for the Corps to undertake a sediment transport study on the stretch of the Red River from Denison Dam to Index, AR. The sediment transport study is needed to determine if bank erosion sediment entering the river above Index, AR, is being transported into the navigation channel at Shreveport, thereby increasing the maintenance dredging costs associated with the Red River Waterway project.

Missouri River levee system, L–385, Missouri.—The Committee directs the Corps to proceed with completion of engineering and design on the L–385, Riverside/Quindaro Bend levee project.

St. Charles County flood control project, Missouri.—The Committee is aware of the severe flood damages suffered during the floods of 1993 and 1995 in the St. Charles County, MO, peninsual affect-

ing homes, businesses, critical infrastructure, and cropland. The Committee has added $250,000 to the Missouri River levee system, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri project to initiate detailed engineering and design including preparation of the general reevaluation report and related NEPA compliance documentation for the L–15 levee unit of the Missouri River levee system project.

North Jefferson City, MO.—The Committee understands that there have been delays on the L–142, North Jefferson City levee and encourage the Corps to proceed expeditiously to complete the economic analysis and feasibility study.

Poplar Island, MD, (sec. 204).—The Committee understands that use of the $22,000,000 budget request for the Poplar Island, MD, project is contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation which would resolve significant policy issues and provide an assured funding stream for the project. The Committee has reduced, without prejudice, the recommended funding to $500,000. The $500,000 has been provided under the authority of section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, in an effort to keep the project moving forward until authorizing legislation is in place. The Corps of Engineers is directed to use the funding to continue essential activities related to water quality certification requirements, coordinate with the non-Federal project sponsor and various interested parties, and to evaluate alternative construction sequences (phases versus nonphased) to determine associated impacts on project costs, financing, and construction activities.

Missouri River fish and wildlife mitigation, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Missouri River fish and wildlife mitigation project. The Corps is directed to use the additional funds to expedite those elements which are ready for construction funding.

Acequias irrigation system, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 for the acequias irrigation system in New Mexico in order to continue progress on this important project.

Red River basin chloride control, Texas.—The Committee believes that there is an urgent need to accelerate construction of the Red River basin chloride control project. Therefore, the Committee has provided $4,500,000 for the award and first year's execution of a contract for construction of the Crowell Brine Lake embankment, spillway, and access roads. In addition, the Committee is aware that the Army Corps of Engineers will carry over $5,400,000 into fiscal year 1997 which will be used to continue engineering and design and award construction contracts of the collection facilities at areas VII and IX.

Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee continues to support the Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation program and has provided the full budget request of $107,000,000 to continue the project in fiscal 1997. A significant portion of the funds will be used to investigate new technologies and approaches to improve juvenile fish survival at the Federal projects on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. In particular, the Committee supports the testing and installation of surface bypass facilities at several of the projects and understands that they may hold great promise for improving fish survival in the system.

The Corps is directed to continue its work on gas abatement measures, including the construction of spillway flip lips at Ice Harbor and John Day Dams. The Committee encourages efforts to continue improving monitoring of dissolved gas levels at the projects, and directs the Corps to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Northwest Power Planning Council, States, and tribes to further improve the current physical gas monitoring and reporting system.

In addition, the Committee supports the construction of passive integrated transponder [PIT] tag detectors at the John Day and Bonneville projects. The Committee understands that the Corps' cost estimate for the construction of the John Day PIT tag facility has been revised upward due to recently discovered problems at the construction site. The Committee considers this facility to be a high priority, and directs the Corps to allocate sufficient funds within the overall program to ensure that the facility is completed no later than October 1997.

The Committee strongly encourages the Corps to carry out all its activities associated with the program in a manner that is based upon the best available science, and fosters consensus among the affected States, Indian tribes, Federal agencies, and the council. The Corps should pursue procedures for reaching technical consensus, including dispute resolution procedures, that have been used to address other anadromous fish-related issues in the Columbia basin. In consultation with affected States, the council, Indian tribes, and Federal agencies, the Corps shall report to the Committee prior to the Committee's hearings on the fiscal year 1998 budget regarding these efforts. The report should take into consideration the views of all participants.

The Committee is aware that the Corps has generally had difficulty contracting with Indian tribes to carry out fish and wildlife actions, such as evaluation of water temperature conditions in the Snake River in relation to adult migration of salmon, or in the protection of tribal cultural resources. In the past, research proposals submitted by the tribes, fully peer reviewed, and accepted by the region for scientific merit have not been funded by the Corps apparently due to limitations in the Corps' authorities. The Committee directs the Corps to establish contract mechanisms under its existing authorities to carry out such work expeditiously with affected Indian tribes, or report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the changes in authority which are necessary to initiate the contracts.

In prior years, the Committee has encouraged the Corps to investigate the efficacy of underwater sound generating acoustic guidance systems and underwater strobe lighting guidance systems to help decrease fish mortality at the Columbia and Snake River projects. The Committee is not aware, however, of any significant tests or studies that the Corps has initiated at the projects themselves. Recent improvements have been made in both technologies, and the Committee directs the Corps to fully investigate the feasibility of both guidance technologies, with additional laboratory research, at one or more of its projects on the Columbia or Snake Rivers.

The Committee is concerned that the Corps continues to be unable to meet critical milestones for completion of important components of salmon recovery program. The Committee cannot over emphasize the importance and need for the Corps to meet deadlines on critical features and urges the Corps to take appropriate actions to ensure future critical milestones are met.

Finally, the Committee is very disappointed the Secretary of the Army and the Corps of Engineers has not responded to language contained in the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill which directed the development of a set of recommendations for improving the system by which fish passage improvements in the Columbia River power system are designed, tested, and implemented. Recent issues involving the installation of a prototype surface collectors at lower Granite Dam and the installation of the John Day juvenile fish sampling and monitoring facility have heightened the concerns of the Committee.

The Committee believes it appropriate to have an independent entity that has engineering experience and familiarity with current practices of the Army Corps of Engineers, the Bonneville Power Administration, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and other Federal agencies and the private sector to develop an objective independent report to identify specific recommendations that, if implemented, would shorten the time requirements, reduce the costs, and improve the biological success of fish passage projects. The report should include an evaluation of how projects are identified, moved through the Federal and regional review process, and ultimately selected for construction. The report shall include not only Corps, BPA, NMFS, and other Federal agencies, but also State and tribal elements that combine to result in the development and installation of fish facilities along the entire Columbia River power system. Further, the Committee believes that the involvement of a variety of interests is essential in developing this report and should consider the views of States, tribes, utilities, and environmental interests. The Committee expects all parties to work closely and collaboratively in this effort.

Elk Creek Dam, OR.—The Committee is aware that the Elk Creek Dam in southern Oregon was authorized as part of a three dam system for flood control in the Rogue River basin, and that two of the three dams have been completed and that Elk Creek Dam is over one-half completed. Despite completion of several NEPA documents on the Elk Creek project, construction was enjoined by a Federal district court in 1987. This injunction was upheld recently by the ninth circuit court of appeals which directed that another supplemental EIS be completed. The Committee is informed by the Corps of Engineers that significant funding and effort would be required to address issues raised by the court without certainty of success in future court decisions.

In light of this fact, the Committee had included language in the bill to enable the Corps to utilize $2,500,000 of funds previously appropriated for the Elk Creek project to undertake appropriate engineering, biological, and environmental studies of options to manage the project in its uncompleted state.

Little Dell Lake, UT.—The Committee has included an appropriation of $4,000,000 to complete construction of recreation facilities at the Little Dell Lake, UT, project, and reimbursement to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City consistent with supplement No. 3 to design memorandum No. 4 titled "Little Dell Lake-Recreation, Salt Lake City Streams, Utah" dated September 1995. The cost allocation and cost apportionment shall be consistent with Public Law 99–662 and the figures shown in supplement No. 3.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV-KY-VA.—The Committee has provided a total of $38,521,000 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 $10,000,000 to continue the Harlan, KY, element of the project; $4,700,000 for the Williamsburg, KY, element of the project; $3,000,000 for the Pike County (Tug Fork) element; and $4,00,000 for continuation of flood proofing on the Middlesboro, KY, element of the project. In addition, the Corps is directed to continue construction of the Pike County, KY, element using funds previously appropriated.

The Committee recommendation also includes $4,000,000 for the Upper Mingo County, WV, element; $4,200,000 for the Lower Mingo (Kermit), WV, element and $1,600,000 for the Hatfield Bottom, WV, nonstructural element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, (sec. 202) project, and $105,000 for the Lower Mingo, WV, tributaries supplement to the detail project report.

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

Small flood control projects, (sec. 205).—The Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects is $32,650,000.

The Committee recommendation includes $3,900,000 to complete construction of the Muscle Shoals, AL, project; $150,000 each for the Elba and Geneva, AL, levee rehabilitation projects; $2,950,000 for the Corps to initiate construction of the St. Peters, MO, Old Town levee project; $100,000 to initiate and complete a feasibility study of nonstructural solutions to flooding in Lincoln County, MT; an additional $3,100,000 over the $270,000 included in the budget for the Cedar River, Renton, WA, project to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction; and $500,000 each for the Corps to plan and install early flood warning systems for the Cheat River and Greenbrier River basins in West Virginia which the Committee understands will be done at full Federal expense. Further, the Corps is directed to use $25,000 of funds provided to perform a combined reconnaissance/feasibility study to further assess the flood control problems along the Mahoning River in the vicinity of Struthers, OH.

Small navigation projects, (sec. 107).—An appropriation of $9,632,000 is recommended for small navigation projects, section

107, projects. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for construction of Ouzinkie Harbor, AK; $2,000,000 for construction of Larsen Bay Harbor, AK; $120,000 for initiation of plans and specification for the King Cove Harbor, AK, project; $212,000 to complete the feasibility report and initiate plans and specification on the Whittier Harbor, AK, project; $124,000 to complete the feasibility study on the Tatitlik Harbor, AK, project; and $176,000 to complete the feasibility report and initiate plans and specifications for the Tamgas Harbor, AK, project.

Emergency streambank and shoreline protection, (sec. 14).—The Committee recommendation for section 14, emergency streambank and shoreline protection projects is $8,500,000. The recommendation includes the full budget request of $278,000 for the Wash-on-the-Brazos, TX, project; $310,000 for the Manitou Beach Drive and Murden Cove Road bulkhead repair in Bainbridge Island, WA; and $400,000 to initiate and complete the Emmonak, AK project.

Beach erosion control, (sec. 103).—An appropriation of $4,700,000 is recommended for beach erosion control, section 103 projects for fiscal year 1997. The Committee has included $1,700,000 to complete the Lummi Shore Road, Lumi Indian Reservation, WA, project.

Projects modifications for improvement of the environment, (sec. 1135).—The Committee has provided a total of $17,280,000 for section 1135, projects modifications for improvements of the environment. The recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Valdez Harbor, AK, intertidal water retention project; $1,700,000 for the Amazon Creek restoration project in Oregon; $100,000 for the Numana Dam fish passage project in Nevada; and $180,000 for the Bernado Waterfowl Management Area in New Mexico.

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

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

Appropriations, 1996	$307,885,000
Budget estimate, 1997	292,500,000
Committee recommendation	312,513,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Benefit cost ratio	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS						
	SURVEYS:						
	GENERAL STUDIES:						
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	.....	4,805,000	1,718,000	500,000	965,000	965,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS	.....	7,377,000	7,039,000	990,000	338,000	338,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN	.....	2,092,000	1,305,000	221,000	350,000	350,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	.....	2,130,000	475,000	.....	130,000	130,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	.....	.....	.....	.....	335,000	335,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:						
(FC)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	1.15	204,750,000	9,212,000	2,104,000	788,000	788,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,906,000	2,906,000
	CONSTRUCTION						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	33.30	3,570,000,000	2,398,957,000	48,136,000	50,800,000	50,800,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	2.30	8,570,000	2,262,000	198,000	841,000	841,000
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	2.00	7,700,000	2,025,000	.....	150,000	.....
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	33.30	1,452,000,000	775,385,000	30,741,000	24,369,000	26,669,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR AND MO	1.20	381,000,000	343,435,000	8,300,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	6.90	3,300,000	869,000	325,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	33.30	172,000,000	47,629,000	4,701,000	5,020,000	5,020,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	33.30	1,650,000,000	781,790,000	21,948,000	18,600,000	18,600,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	1.70	59,000,000	6,933,000	500,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	5.30	93,700,000	44,393,000	11,296,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2.00	167,428,000	88,597,000	9,355,000	11,393,000	11,393,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	.....	(1,320,271,000)	(608,867,000)	(43,670,000)	(33,164,000)	(33,164,000)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	1.30	214,115,000	59,071,000	.....	20,000	20,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	1.30	100,215,000	76,584,000	6,063,000	6,807,000	11,000,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	1.30	206,701,000	194,001,000	21,169,000	12,700,000	20,000,000

(FC)	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	1.30	7,304,000	5,803,000	232,000	480,000	480,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	1.30	203,200,000	34,494,000	22,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	1.30	32,408,000	20,540,000	1,323,000	3,459,000	3,459,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	1.30	244,228,000	106,800,000	2,867,000	904,000	904,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	1.30	312,100,000	111,574,000	11,994,000	8,769,000	14,000,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS	4.80	18,400,000	9,893,000	662,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	80	131,000,000	47,558,000	1,120,000	3,024,000	3,024,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION					173,861,000	192,735,000
	MAINTENANCE						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN					65,101,000	65,101,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR					475,000	475,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER—NORTH BANK, AR					156,000	156,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER—SOUTH BANK, AR					121,000	121,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN					5,458,000	5,458,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR AND MO					9,815,000	9,815,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA					2,631,000	2,631,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR					1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL					50,000	50,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY					28,000	28,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA					150,000	150,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA					12,223,000	12,223,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR—DEVIL SWAMP, LA					172,000	172,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA					92,000	92,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA					1,228,000	1,228,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA					415,000	415,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER—SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA					56,000	56,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA					261,000	261,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA					5,025,000	5,025,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA					2,849,000	2,849,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS					239,000	239,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS					195,000	195,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS					122,000	122,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:					(18,658,000)	(18,658,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS					2,838,000	2,838,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Benefit cost ratio	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Current year allocation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	668,000	1,700,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,821,000	2,821,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	751,000	751,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,783,000	3,783,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	936,000	936,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,946,000	3,946,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	485,000	485,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	393,000	500,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	.....	.....	.....	.....	750,000	750,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	223,000	223,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,545,000	3,545,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	129,000	129,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MAPPING	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,064,000	1,064,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	133,481,000	134,620,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	.....	−17,748,000	−17,748,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	.....	.....	.....	.....	292,500,000	312,513,000

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

Big Black River, MS.—The Committee is informed that recurring flooding of the Big Black River south of Vaiden, MS, has resulted in decreased economic opportunities for residents of that region. The Corps shall provide the Committee with a report not later than January 31, 1997, which provides details on the nature of the problem, options to solve the flooding problem and associated costs for each option, and statutory authority for the Corps to do the work necessary to resolve the problem.

Mississippi River levees, MR&T.—The Committee has included an additional $2,300,000 for the Corps to undertake additional work in Mississippi including Wilson Point-Lookout Point item 489R, State line-Wilson Point item 506R, and item 501L.

Yazoo basin projects, Mississippi.—The Committee notes the reduction in funding for many Yazoo basin projects from last year's planned levels and is concerned that these reductions could result in schedule slippages, thus increasing the risks of flood damages in this region. Accordingly, the Committee requests a report from the Corps of Engineers not later than January 31, 1997, which provides information on the effects of reduced funding for the Mississippi River levee enlargement projects and all Yazoo basin construction and operations and maintenance projects. This report shall include, but not be limited to, the effect of the reduced funding on project schedules.

Demonstration erosion control, MR&T.—The Committee is very concerned by the significant decrease in funding for the demonstration erosion control project, and does not endorse plans by the Corps of Engineers to eliminate this funding entirely in fiscal year 1998. Accordingly, the Committee has added an additional $7,300,000 for the Demonstration Erosion Control Program, and directs that from the funds provided the Corps immediately initiate maintenance procedures to alleviate the backwater flooding on the Yalobusha River in Calhoun County, MS.

Yazoo basin, MS, Big Sunflower River, including Steele Bayou.—The Committee has included an additional $4,193,000 for the Corps to undertake additional work including, Steele Bayou item 66A/B phase III, Robert Shaw ditch, and main canal item 2 channel.

Yazoo basin, Upper Yazoo projects, MS.—The bill includes $14,000,000 for the Upper Yazoo projects to continue items 3A–2 and item 3B in Yazoo River, Alligator-Catfish Bayou water control structure and other related work.

The Committee has included language in the bill to direct that the variable cost recovery rate be used to establish the rates charged for the Mississippi River Commission aircraft in accordance with OMB Circular A–126, appendix A. The Committee understands that use of the variable cost recovery rate in accordance with OMB Circular A–126 will result in more use of the aircraft by other agencies and offices of the Corps when operations costs are less than the cost of commercial travel, therefore, providing net saving in the cost of Government travel.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1996	$1,703,697,000
Budget estimate, 1997	1,663,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,700,358,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA—COOSA RIVER, AL	5,839,000	5,839,000
BAYOU CODEN, AL	5,000	5,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	5,000	5,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,693,000	16,693,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	550,000	550,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,054,000	3,054,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	35,000	35,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM—WILLIAM ''BILL'' DANNELLY LAKE	6,647,000	6,647,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,918,000	17,918,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	899,000	899,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	392,000	392,000
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	4,491,000	4,491,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	90,000	90,000
TENNESSEE—TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	19,192,000	19,192,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	5,972,000	5,972,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,200,000	1,200,000
BETHEL HARBOR, AK	325,000	325,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,726,000	1,726,000
CRESCENT BAY HARBOR, SITKA, AK	70,000	70,000
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	551,000	551,000
DOUGLAS HARBOR, AK	396,000	396,000
DRY PASS, AK	345,000	345,000
HOMER HARBOR, AK	233,000	233,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	24,000	24,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	181,000	181,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	260,000	260,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	565,000	565,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,069,000	1,069,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	72,000	72,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,136,000	1,136,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	70,000	70,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	112,000	112,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,961,000	3,961,000
BLAKELY MT DAM—LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,595,000	4,595,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,088,000	1,088,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,416,000	4,416,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,793,000	5,793,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,088,000	4,088,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,051,000	1,051,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,034,000	1,034,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	995,000	995,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,264,000	4,264,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	455,000	455,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	209,000	209,000
MCCLELLAN—KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	24,155,000	24,155,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,743,000	1,743,000
NARROWS DAM—LAKE GREESON, AR	3,614,000	3,614,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,295,000	1,295,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,505,000	3,505,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	426,000	426,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	5,763,000	5,763,000
OZARK—JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	3,986,000	3,986,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	5,000	5,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,257,000	2,257,000
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	113,000	113,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,576,000	1,576,000
BUCHANAN DAM—H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,376,000	1,376,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,432,000	2,432,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,177,000	3,177,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	192,000	192,000
HIDDEN DAM—HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,446,000	1,446,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,155,000	3,155,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,224,000	1,224,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,125,000	1,125,000
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
LOS ANGELES—LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	100,000	100,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,729,000	3,729,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	291,000	291,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	222,000	222,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	1,130,000	1,130,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	2,056,000	2,056,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,651,000	1,651,000
NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	910,000	910,000
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40,000	40,000
NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR, CA	736,000	736,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,625,000	2,625,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	680,000	680,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,721,000	2,721,000
PORT HUENEME, CA	399,000	399,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,415,000	1,415,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	3,025,000	3,025,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,099,000	2,099,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	897,000	897,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	105,000	105,000
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	175,000	175,000
SAN DIEGO RIVER—MISSION BAY, CA	35,000	35,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY—DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,030,000	2,030,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	100,000	100,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,290,000	2,290,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,365,000	2,365,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,960,000	1,960,000
SAN LEANDRO MARINA (JACK D MALTESTER CHANNEL), CA	1,450,000	1,450,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,410,000	1,410,000
SAN RAFAEL CREEK, CA	2,515,000	2,515,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,739,000	2,739,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,265,000	1,265,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	739,000	739,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,610,000	1,610,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	745,000	745,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,569,000	1,569,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,300,000	2,300,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	48,000	48,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	423,000	423,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	793,000	793,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	1,084,000	1,084,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	63,000	63,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,415,000	1,415,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	330,000	330,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	632,000	632,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	396,000	396,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	419,000	419,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	469,000	469,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	868,000	868,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	3,000	3,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	470,000	470,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	415,000	415,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	1,210,000	1,210,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	402,000	402,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	477,000	477,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	426,000	426,000
DELAWARE		
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL—ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	100,000	100,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE	11,602,000	11,602,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, DE	42,000	42,000
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	265,000	265,000
WATERWAY INDIAN RIVER INLET TO REHOBOTH BAY, DE	315,000	315,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	4,810,000	4,810,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	7,000	7,000
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	829,000	829,000
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	62,000	62,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	30,000	30,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	34,000	34,000
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC AND VA	1,436,000	1,436,000
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	150,000	150,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,545,000	3,545,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,513,000	9,513,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	35,000	4,830,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	886,000	886,000
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	136,000	136,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,848,000	1,848,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	696,000	696,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	50,000	50,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	209,000	209,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,538,000	3,538,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	2,965,000	7,000,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	5,040,000	5,040,000
JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	40,000	40,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	80,000	80,000
LONG BOAT PASS, FL	40,000	40,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	343,000	343,000
NEW PASS, SARASOTA, FL	30,000	30,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,276,000	4,276,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	155,000	155,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,233,000	2,233,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	35,000	35,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	120,000	120,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	113,000	113,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	55,000	55,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	500,000	500,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,980,000	3,980,000
ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	10,000	10,000
ST LUCIE INLET, FL	68,000	68,000
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	13,000	13,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	4,068,000	4,068,000
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	41,000	41,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,514,000	4,514,000
APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,109,000	4,109,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,710,000	1,710,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,883,000	2,883,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,649,000	6,649,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,324,000	4,324,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	9,441,000	9,441,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	40,000	40,000
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	10,378,000	10,378,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	6,357,000	6,357,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	14,714,000	14,714,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	277,000	1,777,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	4,911,000	4,911,000
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	150,000	150,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	200,000	200,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	275,000	275,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,535,000	4,535,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	7,939,000	7,939,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	114,000	114,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,151,000	1,151,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	272,000	272,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	45,000	45,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	1,258,000	1,258,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,497,000	4,497,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	3,528,000	3,528,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	507,000	507,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	257,000	257,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	881,000	881,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL AND IN	23,726,000	23,726,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	712,000	712,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,556,000	1,556,000
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	498,000	498,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,763,000	5,763,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	13,081,000	13,081,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	79,423,000	79,423,000
NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	150,000	150,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	105,000	105,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,568,000	3,568,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	191,000	191,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,167,000	1,167,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	815,000	815,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,193,000	1,193,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	5,000	5,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	661,000	661,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	739,000	739,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	733,000	733,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	458,000	458,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	117,000	117,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	62,000	62,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	993,000	993,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	749,000	749,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	605,000	605,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	26,000	26,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	799,000	799,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	110,000	110,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,726,000	2,726,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	874,000	874,000
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	64,000	64,000
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	6,210,000	6,210,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IA	61,000	61,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	1,884,000	1,884,000
RED ROCK DAM—LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,518,000	3,518,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,635,000	3,635,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,473,000	1,473,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,032,000	1,032,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	489,000	489,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	723,000	723,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	737,000	737,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	807,000	807,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	78,000	78,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	4,054,000	4,054,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,395,000	1,395,000
MARION LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,038,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,580,000	1,580,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,759,000	1,759,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	798,000	798,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,798,000	1,798,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,720,000	1,720,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	56,000	56,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	357,000	357,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,031,000	2,031,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,715,000	1,715,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	8,429,000	8,429,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,968,000	1,968,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,080,000	1,080,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,232,000	1,232,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,397,000	1,397,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	964,000	964,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,330,000	1,330,000
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	420,000	420,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,944,000	1,944,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,249,000	1,249,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,835,000	1,835,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,791,000	1,791,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	153,000	153,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,148,000	1,148,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,235,000	1,235,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	23,000	23,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	692,000	692,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	83,000	83,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,725,000	1,725,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	52,146,000	52,146,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	6,533,000	6,533,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,041,000	1,041,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	5,000	5,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,790,000	1,790,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,015,000	1,015,000
WOLF CREEK DAM—LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,996,000	5,996,000
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,067,000	1,067,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, LA	8,281,000	8,281,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	497,000	497,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	520,000	520,000
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	119,000	119,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	138,000	138,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	4,535,000	4,535,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,947,000	1,947,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA AND TX	16,603,000	16,603,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	2,321,000	2,321,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	418,000	418,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	321,000	321,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	38,000	38,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER—BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA	46,155,000	46,155,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MISSISSIPPI RIVER—GULF OUTLET, LA	12,828,000	12,828,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,190,000	2,190,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	144,000	144,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	9,853,000	10,853,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,890,000	1,890,000
TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	150,000	150,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	165,000	165,000
WATERWAY—EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	115,000	115,000
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	225,000	225,000
MAINE		
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,131,000	1,131,000
SCARBOROUGH RIVER, ME	1,167,000	1,167,000
YORK HARBOR, ME	714,000	714,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	10,711,000	10,711,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	420,000	420,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	550,000	550,000
CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	478,000	478,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	108,000	108,000
FISHING BAY, MD	695,000	695,000
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	65,000	65,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	32,000	32,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,600,000	1,600,000
NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	117,000	117,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	582,000	582,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	300,000	300,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	119,000	119,000
TILGHMAN ISLAND HARBOR, MD	50,000	50,000
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	744,000	744,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	70,000	70,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
ANDREWS RIVER, MA	165,000	165,000
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	324,000	324,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	451,000	451,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	348,000	348,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,191,000	8,191,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	378,000	378,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	168,000	168,000
CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	101,000	101,000
DUXBURY HARBOR, MA	1,882,000	1,882,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	294,000	294,000
GREEN HARBOR, MA	262,000	262,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	339,000	339,000
HYANNIS HARBOR, MA	358,000	358,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	112,000	112,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	371,000	371,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	338,000	338,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	595,000	595,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	971,000	971,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MA	16,000	16,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	376,000	376,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	521,000	521,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	387,000	387,000
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	254,000	254,000
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	293,000	293,000
AU SABLE HARBOR, MI	22,000	22,000
BLACK RIVER (PORT HURON), MI	23,000	23,000
CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	124,000	124,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	125,000	125,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	80,000	80,000
CHEBOYGAN HARBOR, MI	105,000	105,000
CLINTON RIVER, MI	113,000	113,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,466,000	3,466,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	38,000	38,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,278,000	1,278,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	112,000	112,000
HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	368,000	368,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	614,000	614,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	23,000	23,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	302,000	302,000
LAC LA BELLE, MI	82,000	82,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	306,000	306,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	225,000	225,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	94,000	94,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	166,000	166,000
MACKINAW CITY HARBOR MI	22,000	22,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	323,000	323,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	484,000	484,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	717,000	717,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	126,000	126,000
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	25,000	25,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	496,000	496,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,719,000	1,719,000
PETOSKEY HARBOR, MI	163,000	163,000
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	298,000	298,000
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	163,000	163,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	255,000	255,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	82,000	82,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	169,000	169,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	502,000	502,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,729,000	1,729,000
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	1,926,000	1,926,000
SEBEWAING RIVER, MI	538,000	538,000
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	35,000	35,000
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	767,000	767,000
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	671,000	671,000
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	16,557,000	16,557,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,301,000	2,301,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,688,000	1,688,000
WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	22,000	22,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	179,000	179,000
DULUTH—SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	2,665,000	2,665,000
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	22,000	22,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	9,000	9,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	835,000	835,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	145,000	145,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	2,909,000	2,909,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	59,000	59,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	87,000	87,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,397,000	2,397,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	231,000	231,000
TWO HARBORS, MN	157,000	157,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	800,000	800,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	3,000	3,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	200,000	200,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,999,000	2,999,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	78,000	78,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,693,000	1,693,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,001,000	3,001,000
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	1,983,000	1,983,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	5,000	5,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	348,000	348,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	315,000	315,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,197,000	5,197,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,025,000	2,025,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,418,000	8,418,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	203,000	203,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	878,000	878,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	747,000	747,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	14,299,000	14,299,000
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	265,000	265,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,845,000	1,845,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,046,000	1,046,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	101,000	101,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,391,000	3,391,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,501,000	5,501,000
UNION LAKE, MO	16,000	16,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,684,000	3,684,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	16,000	16,000
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	8,127,000	8,127,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	47,000	47,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	14,000	14,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	6,193,000	6,193,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,382,000	1,382,000
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECEATIONAL RIVER, NE, SD	.....	200,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	500,000	500,000
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	736,000	736,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	928,000	928,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	442,000	442,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	483,000	483,000
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	164,000	164,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	415,000	415,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	468,000	468,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	731,000	731,000
HOPKINTON—EVERETT LAKES, NH	1,887,000	1,887,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	489,000	489,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	355,000	355,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	532,000	532,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,275,000	1,275,000
CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	430,000	430,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	500,000	500,000
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	20,000	20,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	15,195,000	15,195,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,445,000	1,445,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	293,000	293,000
KEYPORT HARBOR, NJ	50,000	50,000
MANASQUAN RIVER, NJ	2,300,000	2,300,000
MATAWAN CREEK, NJ	50,000	50,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,079,000	2,079,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	1,190,000	1,190,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	354,000	354,000
SHARK RIVER, NJ	420,000	420,000
SHOAL HARBOR AND COMPTON CREEK, NJ	375,000	375,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,340,000	1,340,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,987,000	1,987,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,105,000	1,105,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	356,000	356,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	109,000	109,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	425,000	425,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	966,000	966,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	66,000	66,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	455,000	455,000
UPPER RIO GRANDE, WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	210,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	525,000	525,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	259,000	259,000
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	465,000	465,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,906,000	3,906,000
BRONX RIVER, NY	365,000	365,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,476,000	1,476,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	263,000	263,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	90,000	90,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	466,000	466,000
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	625,000	625,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	120,000	120,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	900,000	900,000
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	380,000	380,000
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	925,000	925,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,215,000	2,215,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	540,000	540,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,300,000	1,300,000
JONES INLET, NY	1,005,000	1,005,000
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	85,000	85,000
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	100,000	100,000
MORICHES INLET, NY	80,000	80,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	2,361,000	2,361,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	1,750,000	1,750,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	4,273,000	4,273,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	730,000	730,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	5,798,000	9,298,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	285,000	285,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	109,000	109,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	918,000	918,000
RONDOUT HARBOR, NY	740,000	740,000
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	500,000	500,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	900,000	900,000
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15,000	15,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	527,000	527,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	510,000	510,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC BEACH CHANNELS, NC	20,000	20,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,328,000	5,328,000
AVON HARBOR, NC	20,000	20,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,128,000	1,128,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	20,000	20,000
BELHAVEN HARBOR, NC	90,000	90,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	655,000	655,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	686,000	686,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	852,000	852,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT, NC	20,000	20,000
DRUM INLET, NC	2,000,000	2,000,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,043,000	1,043,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	857,000	857,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,171,000	7,552,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	890,000	890,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	2,748,000	2,748,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,595,000	1,595,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	840,000	840,000
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	125,000	125,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	125,000	125,000
ROLLINSON CHANNEL, NC	20,000	20,000
STUMPY POINT BAY, NC	20,000	20,000
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,904,000	1,904,000
WATERWAY CONNECTING PAMLICO SOUND AND BEAUFORT HARBOR,	20,000	20,000
WATERWAY CONNECTING SWANQUARTER BAY AND DEEP BAY, NC	20,000	20,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,757,000	5,757,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN—HALEY LAKE, ND	229,000	229,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	8,445,000	8,445,000
HOMME LAKE, ND	150,000	150,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	104,000	104,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	933,000	933,000
MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN FT. PECK DAM, MT AND GAVINS PT. DAM, SD AND NE, BTID (SEC. 33)	.....	750,000
LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND (MOSQUITO CONTROL)	.....	50,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	418,000	418,000
SOURIS RIVER, ND	261,000	261,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	33,000	33,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	693,000	693,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	718,000	718,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,429,000	1,429,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,142,000	1,142,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	808,000	808,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	17,938,000	17,938,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	628,000	628,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	671,000	671,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	503,000	503,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	866,000	866,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	1,030,000	1,030,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	335,000	335,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	445,000	445,000
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	887,000	887,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	899,000	899,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	5,793,000	5,793,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	312,000	312,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	1,664,000	1,664,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	15,000	15,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	26,000	26,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,013,000	1,013,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	283,000	283,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,340,000	3,340,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	367,000	367,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	558,000	558,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	802,000	802,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	295,000	295,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	812,000	812,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,691,000	1,691,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,848,000	1,848,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	916,000	916,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	3,522,000	3,522,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,269,000	3,269,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	802,000	802,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	330,000	330,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	764,000	764,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,619,000	1,619,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	424,000	424,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	84,000	84,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,781,000	1,781,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,545,000	3,545,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,326,000	1,326,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	247,000	247,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR—LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	10,000	10,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,182,000	1,182,000
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,546,000	3,546,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	932,000	932,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	474,000	474,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	922,000	922,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,554,000	3,554,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,521,000	1,521,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	2,902,000	2,902,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	856,000	856,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	699,000	699,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	273,000	273,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR	17,109,000	17,109,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	530,000	530,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	11,739,000	14,139,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	8,021,000	8,021,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, OR	344,000	344,000
COOS BAY, OR	4,433,000	4,433,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	559,000	559,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	756,000	756,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,466,000	1,466,000
DEPOE BAY, OR	3,000	3,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,217,000	2,217,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	597,000	597,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	551,000	551,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	964,000	964,000
GREEN PETER—FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,549,000	2,549,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	764,000	764,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	184,000	184,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	14,558,000	14,558,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	4,138,000	4,138,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	4,021,000	4,021,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	11,242,000	11,242,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	396,000	396,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	154,000	154,000
ROGUE RIVER, OR	1,153,000	1,153,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	102,000	102,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	753,000	753,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	17,000	17,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	56,000	56,000
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	13,000	13,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,228,000	1,228,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	1,201,000	1,201,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	60,000	60,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	603,000	603,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,192,000	2,192,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	7,586,000	7,586,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	635,000	635,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	219,000	219,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	830,000	830,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,194,000	2,194,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	2,252,000	2,252,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,076,000	2,076,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,301,000	1,301,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	754,000	754,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,071,000	1,071,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	25,000	25,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	744,000	744,000
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	818,000	818,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	587,000	587,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	181,000	181,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	222,000	222,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,399,000	1,399,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,138,000	1,138,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,317,000	1,317,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	16,940,000	16,940,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	1,228,000	1,228,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	586,000	586,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	12,000	12,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,690,000	3,690,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	60,000	60,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	350,000	350,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,418,000	2,418,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	345,000	345,000
TIOGA—HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,577,000	2,577,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,231,000	1,231,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	297,000	297,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	919,000	919,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	1,297,000	1,297,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	2,154,000	2,154,000
RHODE ISLAND		
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	444,000	444,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,589,000	3,189,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,609,000	4,859,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,287,000	4,112,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	392,000	604,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,088,000	3,088,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	27,000	27,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC AND NC	40,000	40,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	42,000	42,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	81,000	151,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	23,000	23,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	395,000	545,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	488,000	588,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM—LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,457,000	6,457,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	201,000	201,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	186,000	186,000
FT RANDALL DAM—LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,041,000	8,041,000
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	430,000	430,000
OAHE DAM—LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	9,911,000	9,911,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	311,000	311,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	4,938,000	4,938,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,559,000	5,559,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,694,000	4,694,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,908,000	3,908,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	130,000	130,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,039,000	4,039,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,833,000	6,833,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	7,000	7,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,612,000	13,612,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	650,000	650,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	627,000	627,000
ARKANSAS—RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,162,000	1,162,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,344,000	1,344,000
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,325,000	2,325,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,572,000	1,572,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	3,328,000	3,328,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,413,000	3,413,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,001,000	2,001,000
CEDAR BAYOU, TX	600,000	600,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	160,000	160,000
COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	951,000	951,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,360,000	4,360,000
DENISON DAM—LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,275,000	5,275,000
DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	510,000	510,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS, TX	12,000	12,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM—LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,182,000	2,182,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	3,140,000	3,140,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	3,693,000	3,693,000
GIWW—CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	620,000	620,000
GIWW—CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	300,000	300,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,416,000	1,416,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,968,000	1,968,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	19,138,000	19,138,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,004,000	1,004,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,323,000	4,323,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	590,000	590,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	774,000	774,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	235,000	235,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,180,000	2,180,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,589,000	2,589,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,490,000	1,490,000
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,165,000	1,165,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,380,000	1,380,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,539,000	1,539,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	792,000	792,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	796,000	796,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,543,000	1,543,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	60,000	60,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	711,000	711,000
SABINE—NECHES WATERWAY, TX	10,050,000	10,050,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	3,462,000	3,462,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	77,000	77,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,385,000	2,385,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,567,000	1,567,000
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,250,000	1,250,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM—B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,571,000	1,571,000
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	35,000	35,000
WACO LAKE, TX	1,901,000	1,901,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	449,000	449,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,326,000	3,326,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,295,000	2,295,000
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	41,000	41,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	159,000	159,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	854,000	854,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	133,000	133,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	46,000	46,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	555,000	555,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	668,000	668,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	592,000	592,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	392,000	392,000
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	5,000	5,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,290,000	2,290,000
BROAD CREEK, VA	1,000	1,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	50,000	50,000
CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	125,000	125,000
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	144,000	144,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	887,000	887,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,481,000	1,481,000
HAMPTON CREEK, VA	210,000	210,000
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	700,000	700,000
HORN HARBOR, VA	125,000	125,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	84,000	84,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	2,567,000	2,567,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	6,652,000	6,652,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,498,000	1,498,000
LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA	712,000	712,000
NEABSCO CREEK, VA	137,000	137,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), VA	232,000	232,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,000,000	5,000,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	337,000	337,000
PARKER CREEK, VA	113,000	113,000
PARROTTS CREEK, VA	234,000	234,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,203,000	2,203,000
POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	41,000	41,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	711,000	711,000
RUDEE INLET, VA	608,000	608,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	152,000	152,000
TYLERS BEACH, VA	170,000	170,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,246,000	1,246,000
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,830,000	12,830,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR	44,000	44,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	38,000	38,000
EDIZ HOOK, WA	746,000	746,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	853,000	853,000
FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	52,000	52,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	7,479,000	8,009,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,198,000	1,198,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,689,000	7,689,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	116,000	116,000
LAKE CROCKETT (KEYSTONE HARBOR), WA	34,000	34,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,833,000	6,833,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,187,000	5,187,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	7,541,000	7,541,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,876,000	5,876,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA	737,000	737,000
MT ST HELENS, WA	414,000	414,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,860,000	1,860,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	9,000	9,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	282,000	282,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,100,000	1,100,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	769,000	769,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	421,000	421,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	265,000	265,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	.....	185,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	87,000	87,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	365,000	365,000
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	66,000	66,000
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	10,820,000	10,820,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	1,002,000	1,002,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,069,000	1,069,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,647,000	1,647,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,427,000	1,427,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,520,000	1,520,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	3,000	3,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	73,000	73,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,759,000	8,759,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,504,000	1,504,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	940,000	940,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,512,000	1,512,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,481,000	1,481,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	780,000	780,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	276,000	276,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	585,000	585,000
FOX RIVER, WI	2,602,000	2,902,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,018,000	1,018,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,793,000	3,793,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	46,000	46,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	465,000	465,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	329,000	329,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	120,000	120,000
LA POINTE HARBOR, WI	22,000	22,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	187,000	187,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	2,673,000	2,673,000
OCONTO HARBOR, WI	58,000	58,000
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	40,000	40,000
PORT WING HARBOR, WI	109,000	109,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	78,000	78,000
SAXON HARBOR, WI	188,000	188,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	560,000	560,000
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	299,000	299,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	424,000	424,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	29,000	29,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,041,000	1,041,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	36,000	36,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	2,000,000	2,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000,000	2,000,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	480,000	480,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	1,000,000	3,000,000
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	700,000	700,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAINSTEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	500,000	500,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	1,900,000	1,900,000
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	5,500,000	5,500,000
OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,650,000	2,650,000
PEER REVIEW PROGRAM	200,000	200,000
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	500,000	500,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	500,000
REPAIR EVALUATION MAINTENANCE RESEARCH (REMR II)	2,000,000	2,000,000
RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH	500,000	500,000
UNFORSEEN CRITICAL MAINTENANCE DREDGING	.....	12,500,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,000,000	4,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−32,216,000	−32,216,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,663,000,000	1,700,358,000

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

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

Much of the backlog is essential maintenance dredging needed to keep the Nation's ports, harbors, and waterways open and able to efficiently handle international trade activities. Yet the Committee is aware that out-year budget planning guidance for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers projects that the current appropriation for their critical operation and maintenance activities will decline from $1,703,000,000 in 1996 to around $1,400,000,000 in the year 2000. If additional resources are not available, the Committee will be forced to begin terminating or closing many activities and projects.

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

Charlotte Harbor, FL.—The Committee understands that shoaling has severely restricted operations at Charlotte Harbor, FL. An additional $4,795,000 has been added for the Corps to advertise and award a dredging contract to address this unforeseen maintenance problem.

Jacksonville Harbor, FL.—An additional $4,035,000 has been added over the budget request for the Corps to award a second training wall contract and undertake additional maintenance dredging.

Savannah River below Augusta, GA (New Savannah Bluff Lock and Dam).—The Committee is aware of a decision by the Corps of Engineers to close the New Savannah Bluff lock and dam because of structural problems and that this action has severely impacted water travel from Augusta, GA, to the Atlantic Ocean. The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps to dewater and accomplish the necessary repairs to the lock and dam.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee is aware that very high rates of sedimentation have occurred in oxbow lakes formed by realignment of the navigation channel primarily as a result of flooding. The Committee notes that project documents projected that the environmental values of the oxbow lakes would be maintained over the life of the navigation project in order to attain the project's annual benefits. Therefore, the Committee has included an additional $1,000,000 over the budget request for the Corps to conduct maintenance dredging and other related work for recreation and environmental purposes.

Upper Rio Grande water operation model, New Mexico.—The Committee has provide $210,000 for scheduling reservoir operations for the Corps to continue joint activities with other Federal agencies related to the need for an Upper Rio Grande water operations model to help water managers in flood control operations, water accounting, and evaluation of water operations alternatives.

New York Harbor, NY-NJ.—An additional $3,500,000 over the budget request of $5,798,000 has been included for the Corps to perform the remaining dredge material management plan study activities, and to implement short-term disposal alternatives which have been determined to be feasibility and quickly implementable, and to investigate methods to reduce sediment contamination within the harbor.

Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Corps is directed to use $50,000 of available resources to continue mosquito control measures at Lake Sakakawea, ND, in fiscal year 1996.

Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, WA, and Portland, OR.—The Committee is informed that for several years the Columbia River pilots and the lower Columbia River ports have been reviewing navigation concerns in the Brookfield/Pillar Rock stretch of the Columbia River. In view of these concerns, the Committee has included an additional $400,000 for the Corps to undertake a simulation study to address the problem and determine the most appropriate solution. The Committee has also provided $2,000,000 for the Corps to correct the situation when the appropriate solution in determined.

The Committee is aware that the authorized 40-foot Columbia River channel is subject to shoaling at a number of locations in the river, causing restrictions in channel draft. The Committee directs the Corps to use its existing authorities to dredge a 5-foot overdraft; and, when appropriate, to conduct advanced maintenance dredging to assure that project depth of 40 feet is maintained to the maximum extent possible.

Pipestem Dam and Lake, SD-ND.—The Committee understands that serious flooding in 1993, 1995, and 1996 indicates that there may be significant impacts in South Dakota, including channel capacity that is less than the minimum flood control release. The Committee recommendation includes $52,000, the same amount included in the budget, for the Corps to evaluate the South Dakota impacts along the James River in South Dakota, including the evaluation of the water control plan.

Jamaica, VT.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers will reach a final plan in the near future on how to protect against accidental sediment releases from Ball Mountain Lake

Dam. To the extent feasible, the Corps should expedite the process of selecting a final plan and move toward implementation. Once a final decision is approved, the Corps should use available funds to undertake the plan which will ensure long-term protection of water quality and habitat downstream of the dam.

Grays Harbor, Chehalis River, WA.—Funding in the amount of $530,000 has been included in the bill for the Corps to complete studies to determine the most appropriate long-term solution to the erosion problems with the Federal navigation project at Grays Harbor, and to initiate final design and environmental documentation for the selected measures.

Fox River (Appleton Dam), WI.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 for the Corps to finalize plans and proceed with construction of a seepage barrier Appleton Dam, Fox River, WI.

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

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1996	$101,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	112,000,000
Committee recommendation	101,000,000

An appropriation of $101,000,000 is recommended for regulatory programs of the Corps of Engineers.

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

The Committee is aware of the Corps desire to undertake an administrative appeal process related to their permit decisions and jurisdiction determinations which allows the public to challenge permit decisions without costly and lengthy court actions. The Committee urges the Corps to explore ways to implement this appeals process within the recommended program resources.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1996	$10,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies. This is $5,000,000 below the budget request.

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

OILSPILL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1996	$850,000
Budget estimate, 1997	850,000
Committee recommendation	850,000

An appropriation of $850,000 is recommended for oilspill research for fiscal year 1997, which is the same as the budget request and the funding level for the current fiscal year.

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 oilspill liability trust fund to perform oil pollution research.

As a member of the Interagency Coordinating Committee, the Corps of Engineers participates 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 oilspill situation.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1996	$151,500,000
Budget estimate, 1997	153,000,000
Committee recommendation	153,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $153,000,000 which is the same as the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISION

Corps hopper dredges, (sec. 107).—For the past 4 fiscal years, Congress has made available to the private dredge fleet 7.5 million cubic yards of work which had been accomplished in earlier years by the Federal hopper dredge fleet. The Committee recommendation continues the 7.5 million cubic yard set-aside in fiscal year 1997. During the period in which any of the Federal hopper dredges is out of service for lengthy repair or rehabilitation, reallocating this entire 7.5 million cubic yards among the three remaining Federal dredges would require further reduction in their days of service, thus making their operation more costly and less competitive. If any of the four Federal dredges is removed from service for repair or rehabilitation and is prevented from accomplishing the level of work it has carried out during the past 3 fiscal years, the Committee directs the Corps to reduce the 7.5 million cubic yards amount contained in subsection (a) by the share allocated to that dredge over the past 3 fiscal years which has been put out for bid for the private industry.

Authority to reprogram, obligate, and expend funds on ongoing construction projects.—The Committee has included a provision in the bill which will prevent the unintentional slowing or shutting

down of contract work at specifically funded ongoing construction projects because of insufficient funding.

The language in the bill, similar to that contained in Public Law 103–50, the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993, and Public Law 103–126, the Energy and Water Development Act of 1994, permits the Corps of Engineers to continue work, within established reprogramming authority, until additional funding is provided, and if appropriate, remedial bill language is enacted. The Committee expects this authority to be used sparingly and only after other measures allowed by statute or regulation have been exhausted.

When exercising this authority, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works will notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate as to the circumstances by which it becomes necessary to use the authority and explain what corrective actions have, will, or should be taken to preclude recurrence.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1996	$44,139,000
Budget estimate, 1997	43,627,000
Committee recommendation	43,627,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act is $43,627,000, the same as the budget request.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1996	$12,684,000
Budget estimate, 1997	15,095,000
Committee recommendation	18,105,000

An appropriation of $18,105,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The recommended amounts provided under this account for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ARIZONA				
HOPI WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	900,000	.....	80,000	80,000
NAVAJO WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	900,000	.....	100,000	100,000
SOUTHERN ARIZONA REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	.....	150,000	150,000
WEST SALT RIVER VALLEY WATER RESOURCES MGMT STUDY	.....	.....	.....	100,000
CALIFORNIA				
DELTA MODEL DEVELOPMENT GROUP	490,000	.....	90,000	90,000
FRIANT UPPER BASIN OPTIMIZATION AND REUSE STUDY	100,000	.....	75,000	75,000
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	500,000	250,000	175,000	175,000
LOWER OWENS RIVER STUDY	300,000	.....	100,000	100,000
MYSTIC LAKE WATERSHED MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATION	550,000	.....	100,000	100,000
NEW MELONES TEMPERTURE CONTROL EVALUATION	90,000	.....	90,000	90,000
SAN FRANCISCO AREA RECLAMATION STUDY	3,790,000	1,915,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	750,000	50,000	250,000	250,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY	3,097,000	1,578,000	750,000	750,000
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY	500,000	250,000	125,000	125,000
COLORADO				
DOLORES RIVER BASIN RUNOFF MODEL	225,000	.....	75,000	75,000
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER NEEDS ASSESSMENT	200,000	.....	100,000	100,000
IDAHO				
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	1,900,000	750,000	250,000	250,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY	1,552,000	652,000	300,000	300,000
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	504,000	254,000	150,000	150,000
KANSAS				
CHENEY RESERVOIR WATER QUALITY INVESTIGATION	900,000	.....	100,000	100,000

MONTANA				
COLD CLIMATE WASTEWATER TREATMENT	875,000	.....	35,000	35,000
FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION	.....	.....	.....	210,000
JEFFERSON RIVER BASIN RETURN FLOW STUDY	400,000	.....	80,000	80,000
MONTANA RIVER SYSTEMS STUDY	1,275,000	.....	150,000	150,000
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	729,000	579,000	150,000	150,000
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY	320,000	120,000	100,000	100,000
NEBRASKA				
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT	300,000	75,000	100,000	100,000
NEVADA				
CARSON RIVER BASIN	.....	.....	.....	200,000
WALKER RIVER BASIN	.....	.....	.....	250,000
NEW MEXICO				
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE WATER CONVEYANCE PLAN	200,000	.....	100,000	100,000
RIO GRANDE/LOW FLOW CONVEYANCE CHANNEL STUDY	480,000	75,000	200,000	200,000
SAN JUAN GALLUP-NAVAJO PIPELINE	.....	.....	.....	150,000
OKLAHOMA				
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	375,000	75,000	125,000	125,000
OREGON				
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIGATION SYSTEM CONSERVATION FEASIBIL	900,000	275,000	250,000	250,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	996,000	696,000	150,000	150,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY	878,000	678,000	200,000	200,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY	944,000	644,000	150,000	150,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING	887,000	687,000	100,000	100,000
OREGON WATER CONSERVATION PROJECTS	.....	.....	.....	2,000,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS	800,000	100,000	200,000	200,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III	275,000	.....	100,000	200,000
SOUTH DAKOTA				
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	725,000	442,000	75,000	75,000
TEXAS				
EDWARDS AQUIFER REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES AND MANAGEMEN	896,000	706,000	190,000	190,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARCH WETLANDS RESTORATION/ENHANCE	875,000	604,000	100,000	100,000
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMENT	600,000	150,000	200,000	200,000
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE	.....	.....	.....	200,000
UTAH				
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEK OPTIMIZATION STUDY	475,000	75,000	200,000	200,000
CARBON/EMERY COUNTY WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	500,000	.....	100,000	100,000
OGDEN RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT INVESTIGATI	450,000	.....	50,000	50,000
WASHINGTON				
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING	500,000	75,000	125,000	125,000
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	58,914,000	56,694,000	360,000	360,000
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	.....	.....	1,745,000	1,745,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES	.....	.....	1,985,000	1,785,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS	.....	.....	705,000	705,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED PROJECTS	.....	.....	145,000	145,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES IN ND/SD WATER RESOURCES M	1,250,000	610,000	250,000	250,000
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM	350,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	.....	.....	1,925,000	1,925,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION	1,164,000	1,114,000	50,000	50,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	15,095,000	18,105,000

West Salt River Valley, AZ.—Funding in the amount of $100,000 has been provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate phase I appraisal level studies of alternatives for water resource management of the different water sources, infrastructure development, and economic and environmental issues in the west Phoenix metropolitan area.

San Juan River Gallup, Navajo water supply project, New Mexico.—The Committee has included $150,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue activities related to the San Juan River Gallup, Navajo water supply project, New Mexico.

Oregon water conservation projects, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake formal feasibility studies for water conservation projects in the Deschutes, Rogue, Umpqua, and Malheur River basins in Oregon. The Committee understands that the Bureau has not completed necessary assessments required for project authorization. The proposed projects would address water conservation measures to improve irrigation efficiencies, streamflow enhancements, and improvements to fish and wildlife habitat.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1996	$411,046,000
Budget estimate, 1997	392,524,000
Committee recommendation	410,499,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $410,499,000 for construction programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS				
ARIZONA				
CRBSCP, TITLE I DIVISION	459,038,000	402,316,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	35,795,000	.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
CALIFORNIA				
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	161,961,000	141,961,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,394,762,000	358,025,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA DIVISION	394,940,000	177,656,000	8,850,000	8,850,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	543,459,000	235,937,000	14,200,000	14,200,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	550,765,000	361,299,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	220,561,000	41,821,000	4,737,000	4,737,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,509,164,000	566,252,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
SHASTA DIVISION	343,310,000	249,395,000	500,000	500,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	326,407,000	309,728,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROGRAM	69,970,000	24,285,000	14,300,000	14,300,000
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	172,590,000	5,567,000	9,340,000	9,340,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT, WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	38,090,000	16,403,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	109,959,000	3,164,000	2,760,000	2,760,000
IDAHO				
MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	60,000	180,000	180,000
NORTH DAKOTA				
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P–SMBP	1,483,255,000	571,622,000	21,600,000	25,000,000
OREGON				
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	57,362,000	45,062,000	4,900,000	6,100,000

SOUTH DAKOTA				
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P–SMBP	62,076,000	55,173,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER SYSTEM	119,417,000	16,001,000	2,500,000	7,500,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	250,341,000	53,157,000	28,350,000	28,350,000
TEXAS				
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	2,000,000
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, IRRIGATION FACILITIES	1,768,993,000	1,702,403,000	2,590,000	2,590,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	150,327,000	1,886,000	4,475,000	4,475,000
VARIOUS				
COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	108,504,000	22,387,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
CRBSCP, TITLE II DIVISION	331,878,000	151,652,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	.....	.....	.....	2,500,000
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	.....	.....	4,350,000	4,350,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	89,744,000	15,639,000	14,511,000	14,511,000
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	64,769,000	18,317,000	6,759,000	6,759,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	.....	1,500,000	2,500,000	5,000,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION	.....	.....	53,620,000	58,620,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:				
BOISE PROJECT, ID	35,196,000	34,996,000	200,000	200,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	198,703,000	144,622,000	700,000	700,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM, AZ, CA,	183,158,000	88,309,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
CRSP, DALLAS CREEK PROJECT, CO	121,631,000	121,331,000	300,000	300,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR, CA	62,925,000	54,254,000	2,245,000	2,245,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, NM, TX	3,500,000	2,919,000	100,000	100,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT, CO	21,195,000	18,595,000	650,000	650,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	45,459,000	43,759,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, CA, NV	73,143,000	22,214,000	6,550,000	6,550,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:				
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, NE	361,179,000	349,851,000	900,000	900,000
OAHE UNIT, SD	490,000,000	44,774,000	85,000	85,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT—TITLE 28, VARI	31,425,000	10,391,000	3,515,000	3,515,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT, NM, TX	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SAN LUIS VALLEY, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION, CO	95,249,000	94,849,000	400,000	400,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, AZ	6,025,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH, NM	30,550,000	14,035,000	2,000,000	3,200,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	51,483,840	16,224,000	3,938,000	3,938,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	47,351,000	46,981,000	370,000	370,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION	.....	.....	27,253,000	28,453,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAM:				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OCHOCO DAM, OR	14,605,000	13,705,000	900,000	900,000
CVP, FOLSOM DAM (MORMON ISLAND), CA	29,930,000	22,913,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM, VARIOUS	16,151,000	10,151,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	483,335,000	75,773,000	25,050,000	25,050,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	57,699,000	47,870,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ	35,167,000	31,870,000	3,097,000	3,097,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ	22,773,000	22,148,000	403,000	403,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TX	60,000,000	14,817,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION PROJECT, COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	48,203,000	47,981,000	221,000	221,000
SCOFIELD PROJECT, SCOFIELD DAM, UT	2,500,000	2,000,000	500,000	500,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, BUMPING LAKE DAM, WA	5,086,000	4,446,000	640,000	640,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFEY OF DAMS PROGRAM	.....	.....	59,261,000	59,261,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:				
SHOSHONE PROJECT, WY	7,500,000	6,040,000	1,459,000	1,459,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	19,639,000	14,201,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT	.....	.....	3,159,000	3,159,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	25,081,000	24,249,000	540,000	1,415,000
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL SYSTEM (PHAS	1,200,000	.....	400,000	400,000
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,002,000	282,000	400,000	400,000

WATERSHED RIVER SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	4,000,000	1,897,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY	17,176,000	7,166,000	2,000,000	1,300,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	134,962,000	37,712,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY			8,140,000	8,315,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			319,515,000	337,490,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT				
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS				
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PARTICIIPATING PROJECT	437,744,000	629,980,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
DOLORES PARTICIPATING PROJECT	549,262,000	530,820,000	6,115,000	6,115,000
UTAH				
CENTRAL UTAH PARTICIPATING PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,231,301,000	1,218,744,000	7,495,000	7,495,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	80,694,000	18,624,000	2,440,000	2,440,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			25,550,000	25,550,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT				
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT				
ARIZONA				
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	4,190,701,000	3,235,672,000	71,728,000	71,728,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS	138,487,000	130,205,000	4,918,000	4,918,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			76,646,000	76,646,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS				
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS			−29,187,000	−29,187,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			392,524,000	410,499,000

Animas-La Plata [ALP] project, Colorado.—It is the desire of this Committee that the Secretary comply with the directive issued by Congress last year and proceed without delay to construct those portions of the Animas-La Plata project (stage A) which were approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. section 1531 et seq. In the event that the funding provided to the Bureau is inadequate for the tasks to be accomplished this year, the Committee expects the Bureau to reprogram any available funds to the project for construction. When it passed the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, Congress endorsed the project as the vehicle for settlement of the water rights of the two Colorado Ute Indian Tribes. Congress intended that by the year 2000, the project would provide the tribes with substantial quantities of water for their future use. The need for environmental compliance does not mean that the terms of that agreement may be rewritten.

As a result of the section 7 process, the final configuration of the project remains uncertain. The Committee understands that the Bureau of Reclamation has done a superb job in describing the various stages through which the project may progress, the impacts and required mitigation for each stage, and the utility associated with each stage. In addition, the State of Colorado has always supported this project and has committed $42,600,000 (plus interest) to the project. For purpose of initiating construction of stage A, the existing repayment obligations of the parties contracting for water, along with the commitments of the States of Colorado and New Mexico, provide adequate assurances that the United States will be repaid in connection with the construction of those facilities.

The Committee is aware that the San Juan River and its tributaries do not consistently meet New Mexico's newly adopted water quality standards for selenium and that there is concern over the potential effect of the operations of the ALP facilities in Colorado on this existing problem. The Secretary should take reasonable steps to assist Colorado and New Mexico in improving the quality of surface flows by addressing the problems caused by nonpoint sources.

The Committee is also aware that the ESA has the potential to limit water development in the San Juan basin, including the completion of ALP and the Navajo Indian irrigation project. The Committee remains confident that the San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program will achieve its stated objectives of: (1) recovering the endangered fish and (2) permitting water development to proceed. Although the precise level of development that will ultimately be allowed cannot be determined at this time, the immediate construction of stage A is required if the United States is to meet the terms of the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988. The present documentation is fully informative of these issues and construction of the first stage of the project may proceed without adversely affecting any other water users on the San Juan system.

The Committee notes that the section 404(b)(1) analysis required by 33 U.S.C. 1344(r) has been received by the Congress.

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.—The recommendation for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation includes $2,500,000

for a wetland restoration project to be carried out jointly between the foundation, Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Agriculture National Conservation Service, and non-Federal interest along the Williamson River, in Klamath County, OR.

The Committee understands that the legislation authorizing appropriations to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation requires that non-Federal sources match one for one each Federal fish and wildlife dollar. The Committee supports this level of matching funding as a minimum. But in this time of serious budget constraints, the Committee feels that more can and should be provided through non-Federal sources, who in many cases benefit just as much or more than Federal reclamation activities. Therefore, it is the Committee's expectation that, while not required by law, the foundation will make every effort to secure a two or three to one non-Federal contribution on projects and activities undertaken through these appropriations. Further, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to submit to the Committee as soon as practical after the end of the fiscal year a status report on how the funding for the previous year has been allocated by project, the level and source of funding both Federal and non-Federal, a completion schedule for each project, and an analysis of the unobligated and unexpended balances related to these appropriations.

Garrison diversion project, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation for the Garrison diversion project is $25,000,000, an increase of $3,400,000 over the budget request for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue development of rural and municipal water systems, Indian water systems, wetland mitigation, and wildlife enhancement activities.

Umatilla basin project, Oregon.—An additional $1,200,000 has been provided for the Umatilla basin project in Oregon for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete phases I and II of the project. The Committee has also included language in the bill increasing the project cost ceiling so the project can proceed through completion without having to terminate ongoing contract work.

Central Utah project, Utah.—The Committee is aware that beginning in fiscal 1996, the repayment credit provisions of section 206 of the Energy and Water Development Act for 1996 (Public Law 99–591) became effective. The Bureau of Reclamation has incorrectly interpreted the substantially complete declaration provision of section 206 to be applicable only to its own activities and not to the Bonneville unit. The Committee directs the Bureau to apply the provisions of section 206 of Public Law 99–591 until such time as the Bonneville unit is declared to be substantially complete, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, but in no case beyond fiscal year 2000.

Endangered species recovery implementation.—The Committee has provided funding for reclamation's participation in the development and implementation of the multi-State basinwide Platte River Recovery Implementation Program. It is the Committee's intent that these funds may be used for program development and implementation, including habitat conservation, water conservation, and program administration.

Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program includes $875,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Equus beds recharge project in Kansas. The Committee understands that the project is being cost shared on a 50–50 basis.

In situ copper mining research.—The in situ copper mining research project has been transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation from the Bureau of Mines. It is the understanding of the Committee that sufficient funds were transferred with the project to support the Bureau of Reclamation's in-house research and oversight responsibility through the conclusion of the program. Sufficient fiscal year 1997 funds should also be available for the field test. Any funds transferred from the in-house oversight amount to cover field test shortfalls must be cost shared by the private sector partner as stipulated in project contracts. The Bureau of Reclamation should also examine the research data to explore the application of the technology to other Bureau programs.

Drought emergency assistance.—The Committee is aware of the severe drought condition in New Mexico and several other Western States and that authority for appropriations under the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, Public Law 102–250, expires at the end of fiscal year 1996. In response to the current emergency conditions, the Committee has recommended a provision in the bill to extend the authority to make appropriations through 1997, and has included $2,500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake emergency measures as provide under Public Law 102–250.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1996	$273,076,000
Budget estimate, 1997	292,876,000
Committee recommendation	280,876,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $280,876,000. This is $12,000,000 below the budget request. This reduction is necessary because of the severe budgetary limitations for non-Defense discretionary programs.

The appropriation recommended under this heading provides for the maintenance, reliability, and operational readiness of 348 storage reservoirs and 254 diversion dams, thousands of miles of canals, water distribution systems, and drains; more than 260 pumping plants; 58 powerplants; and recreation facilities so that protection of the Federal investment is maintained. The operation and maintenance program also provides for the management and protection of the waters, lands, and other natural resources associated with reclamation developments.

The Committee recommendation includes $450,000 for the upper Rio Grande water operation model study in New Mexico. The additional funding over the budgeted amount will allow acceleration of the model to be responsive to current drought conditions and other current water resource management issues.

The Committee is concerned that the scope of the long-term monitoring and research program authorized in section 1805 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act is being expanded beyond the param-

eters established in the act and intended by Congress. The Committee believes the purpose of the monitoring and research program is to ensure that Glen Canyon Dam is operated in a manner consistent with that of section 1802 and is meeting the objectives established in the Glen Canyon environmental impact statement. It is not intended to be a basic science research program or to permit studies on issues not directly related to the operation of the dam. To prevent the unauthorized expansion of the monitoring and research program and overspending, the Committee directs the Secretary to include in the annual budget justification for the Bureau of Reclamation, a detailed work program and budget information that includes staffing, overhead, tasks, and an explanation of the role the Glen Canyon Environmental Studies Program will play in the monitoring and research program. That budget justification shall also include a projection for the monitoring and research program costs for the following 5 out-years. The Secretary shall submit this information to this Committee, to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and to the House Appropriation and Resources Committes.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1996	$11,668,000
Budget estimate, 1997	12,715,000
Committee recommendation	12,715,000

The Committee concurs with the House in recommending an appropriation of $12,715,000, the same as the budget request, for the small reclamation program of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

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

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

LOAN PROGRAM

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ARIZONA				
Tohono O'Odham Nation—Schuk Toak District	$5,353,000	$3,543,000	$1,810,000	$1,810,000
CALIFORNIA				
Castroville irrigation water supply project	13,813,000	2,564,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Chino basin desalination project, Santa Ana Watershed	8,200,000	2,000,000	1,650,000	1,650,000
Eastern Municipal Water District No. 3	13,650,000	12,620,000	1,030,000	1,030,000
Salinas Valley water reclamation facility for crop irrigation	8,973,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Temescal Valley project, Elsinore Valley municipal water	5,268,000	1,050,000	1,650,000	1,650,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
OREGON				
Milltown Hill project, Douglas County	16,899,000	100,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
VARIOUS				
Loan administration			425,000	425,000
Total, loan program			12,715,000	12,715,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 1996	$43,579,000
Budget estimate, 1997	38,000,000
Committee recommendation	38,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $38,000,000, the same as the budget request.

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

The Committee recommendation includes funding to undertake the Rock Slough fish screen project.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$48,150,000
Budget estimate, 1997	48,971,000
Committee recommendation	48,971,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $48,971,000. This is the same as the budget request.

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, Denver, CO, and five regional offices. The Denver office and regional offices charge individual projects or activities for direct beneficial services and related administrative and technical costs. These charges are covered under other appropriations.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to support the final activities of the Western Water Policy Review Commission.

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

As was the case with the Committee's recommendation for fiscal year 1996, funding recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 1997 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 1997 budget request in many areas. Because this trend can be expected to continue, the Department should not delay efforts to reduce the scope of certain programs and the number of Federal employees at headquarters and in the field. Any delay, as occurred in fiscal year 1996, will simply increase reductions that will have to be made at a later date.

Reductions in Federal employees are necessary for programmatic as well as budgetary reasons. The Department's administration has become too cumbersome and, partially as a result of its size, the Department has lost its programmatic focus. Management has devoted its attention to process issues such as the openness initiative, strategic alignment initiative, and contract reform, instead of on defining and achieving programmatic goals.

The Department's missions in energy supply and research, the environment, and national security are compelling and justify a significant Federal commitment. Unfortunately, the Department's system of administration has increased costs and reduced output. If this trend is not reversed it will seriously jeopardize the future of the Department and may lead to its replacement with an organization better suited to the management of the Department's resources. The Committee has modified the Department's budget request to address these and other issues.

For guidance on implementing the reductions proposed by the Committee, the Committee recommends its fiscal year 1996 report and particularly the references to the findings of the Galvin Commission.

LABORATORY MANAGEMENT

The Committee concurs with the insights of the Galvin task force regarding the management of Department laboratories. The Committee is frustrated by the Department's lack of progress in either implementing the far-reaching solutions proposed by the Galvin report or proposing alternative solutions to the inefficient and oppres-

sive oversight and regulation endured by the laboratories. The Department's inability to make meaningful reforms in these areas has resulted in increased cost and reduced productivity at the national laboratories that, if allowed to continue, could jeopardize the laboratories' ability to fulfill their missions.

The Committee is encouraged by DOE's ongoing consideration of moving to outside regulation of the laboratories and strongly endorses any approach that removes the duplication of oversight that currently exists between DOE and outside regulators.

CONTROL OF FUNDS

The Committee is aware that the Department imposes strict reporting and cost control requirements on funds allocated to contractors. Such requirements are sometimes necessary. However, in cases involving experienced contractors with demonstrated accounting systems, these requirements may result in a greater cost than benefit to Federal and contractor managers. The Committee encourages the Department to identify experienced contractors with demonstrated accounting systems with which the Department will devise less burdensome reporting and control requirements.

AGING FACILITIES

The time and expense required for the Department to design and construct nonnuclear and nonscientific facilities is substantially greater than that for non-Federal entities. The Committee recommends the Department implement facilities procurement guidelines that match best business practices and provide contractors increased flexibility in the procurement of nonnuclear and nonscientific facilities. In particular, the Committee recommends that the Department and its contractors design and construct nonnuclear facilities to State and local building codes.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1996	$2,727,407,000
Budget estimate, 1997	3,020,497,000
Committee recommendation	2,749,043,000

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 1997 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 are necessary.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 1996	$275,213,000
Budget estimate, 1997	363,245,000
Committee recommendation	246,641,000

Solar energy.—Funding for fiscal year 1997 is $159,800,000 and will support both basic and applied research and technology development. The Committee supports the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's work in association with other national laboratories in renewable energy technology development. While current budget constraints prevent the Committee from funding the solar programs at higher levels, the Committee believes that the resources provided will be sufficient to maintain the program at a level which will result in continuing advances in solar technologies.

Photovoltaics.—The Committee has provided $65,000,000, the same as the amount provided in fiscal year 1996, for photovoltaic energy systems. From within such available funds, $2,000,000 shall be made available to support the ongoing research in photovoltaics being conducted by the Southeast and Southwest Regional Photovoltaic Experiment Station.

The Committee is concerned that the Utility Photovoltaic Group [UPVG] provides funding for cost-shared projects in which the total cost per watt is many times the cost at which photovoltaic technologies will ever be commercially competitive. The Committee urges the Department to review UPVG projects to determine if projects that exceed $10 per watt should be funded.

The Committee supports the development of integrated roofing materials and other technologies which blend photovoltaic systems and architectural components. The Committee encourages the Department to continue its support for such technologies.

Biofuels.—The Committee recommendation includes $55,300,000 for biofuels energy systems, an amount equal to the amount provided in fiscal year 1996. An amount of $27,650,000 is allocated for the category of biochemical conversion, of which $3,000,000 is for the Federal share of a 50/50 cost-shared biomass ethanol production plant in Gridley, CA, and $24,650,000 is for biochemical conversion research converting biomass to ethanol. Within the remaining funds, the Committee has provided the amount of the budget request to complete technology development of a hot-gas filtration system, with demonstration on the Hawaii gasifier. This funding will complete the project. Also, funding has been included for the wood burning gasifier in Burlington, VT. Within the remaining funds, the Committee has provided funds for feedstock development at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and has provided $3,000,000 for the regional biomass program.

The Committee urges the Department to continue funding for high-quality, peer-reviewed, university-based research with practical applications in the Biofuels Program.

Wind.—Advances in wind energy technologies have reduced the price of newly installed wind generated electricity from 35 cents/kWh in 1980 to 4 cents/kWh today. While the Department's goal to reduce that cost to 2.5 cents/kWh by the year 2000 is laudable, the technology is now sufficiently competitive in select markets that the private sector should substantially replace the Federal Government as a funding source for additional technology development. For that reason, and due to significant budget constraints, the Committee recommends $15,000,000 for wind energy systems, a reduction of $17,500,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 1996.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $30,500,000, a $608,000 increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1996.

The Geothermal Energy Program addresses the use of heat from the Earth for electricity generation, direct heating of facilities, and for geothermal heat pumps. State-of-the-art, properly designed geothermal installations need relatively little surface area, do not contaminate ground water supplies, and are benign to the atmosphere. The purpose of the geothermal program is to reduce economic and technological barriers to expanded use of this technology through Government-industry cost-shared efforts involving research, development, and demonstration.

The Committee recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request to implement the Lake County, CA, project to inject treated wastewater effluent into the Geysers steamfield and to complete the feasibility study for piping effluents from Santa Rosa to the Geysers steamfield.

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

Hydrogen research.—The Committee proposes to fund hydrogen research at $9,000,000. The reduction from the requested amount of $11,012,000 is necessitated by budget pressures.

Hydropower.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000, equal to the amount provided in fiscal year 1996, to continue the cost-shared, fish friendly turbine program.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation for electric energy systems and storage is $32,000,000, an increase of $1,691,000 over the amount provided in fiscal year 1996.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000, the requested amount, for the final year of the electric and magnetic fields research and development program.

The Committee is aware of the success of the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency in the development of aluminum continuous fiber reinforced metal matrix composites which are economically affordable. These composites appear to have substantial potential for improving the efficiency of electric power transmission through the substitution of metal matrix composites for the steel cores now included in electric transmission wire. Improvements of over 60 percent to 180 percent have been projected.

The Committee encourages the Department to budget funds for fiscal year 1998 to evaluate the application of metal matrix composites for this purpose and would expeditiously review an appropriate reprogramming of fiscal year 1997 funds to begin evaluation of this project immediately. The Department is directed to report to the Committee on plans for this evaluation not later than March 15, 1997.

Renewable energy production incentive.—Within funds otherwise available for solar and renewable energy utility sector, $1,000,000 is provided to continue the renewable energy production incentive program, and the Committee recommends the Department give priority to funding applications for the Short Mountain and Coffin Butte landfill methane projects.

Renewable energy utilization.—The Committee is concerned that current economic considerations are not favorable for the widespread utilization of renewable energy technologies if the electricity generation and distribution markets are restructured. Therefore, the Committee agrees that the Department may use funds, not to exceed $3,000,000, from within amounts otherwise made available for solar and renewable energy utility sector programs and activities, to conduct research involving electric industry restructuring and its impacts on renewable energy utilization. These funds shall not be used for support services contractors or for policy advocacy, but rather shall be used for objective research of use to State and Federal decisionmakers.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable program direction is $13,841,000, a 20-percent reduction from the amount requested.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1996	$230,973,000
Budget estimate, 1997	248,054,000
Committee recommendation	229,734,000

Due to budget pressures, the Committee recommends a number of changes to the Department's request for nuclear energy programs.

Advanced light water reactor programs.—These programs include a broad range of activities designed to ensure the availability of a viable nuclear powerplant option to serve the electric energy requirements in the next century. Program activities are concentrated on achieving Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC] certification of evolutionary and advanced light water reactor [ALWR] plant designs, promoting commercial standardization of plant equipment and systems, and supporting the continued operation of existing nuclear powerplants for as long as they are safe, reliable, and economical.

The Committee recommends $22,000,000 for the advanced light water reactor program, a reduction of $18,000,000. No funds are provided under this program for the first-of-a-kind engineering program. Completing design certification for evolutionary and passive nuclear powerplants requires satisfying the new NRC design and certification process provided under 10 CFR Part 52 as amended by the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Funds provided are the minimum necessary to meet the Department's obligation to the cost-shared program with utilities and industry and to bring the activities to an orderly completion.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—Radioisotope thermoelectric generators [RTG's] provide electrical power for National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] spacecraft and to power important national security systems. Work is continuing to design, fabricate, and assemble RTG's and radioisotope heat generators for delivery to NASA for use on the Cassini mission in late 1997. The Committee recommends $38,810,000 for fiscal year 1997, a reduction of $1,190,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 1996.

Nuclear technology research and development.—This program supports research and development of technologies on high-priority

electrometallurgical treatment of spent nuclear fuel for safe storage and ultimate disposition. Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommends $20,000,000 for this program and defers without prejudice the establishment and operation of an international nuclear safety center as proposed until better budget allocations permit the Committee to provide sufficient funds.

Other nuclear energy programs.—The Committee has reluctantly reduced funds available for university reactor fuel assistance and support, landlord activities at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and test reactor area landlord costs.

Termination costs.—The Committee has provided $97,100,000 for termination costs within the nuclear energy program. This includes final closeout costs for the first-of-a-kind engineering program which the Committee directs be terminated ahead of schedule.

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation for isotope support is $17,704,000 which includes $5,000,000 to implement the Department's record of decision on the production of moly–99.

Program direction.—The Committee has provided $14,800,000 for nuclear energy program direction, a 20-percent reduction from the amount requested.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 1996	$128,433,000
Budget estimate, 1997	112,206,000
Committee recommendation	94,437,000

The Environmental, Safety, and Health Program [ES&H] was established to assure protection of the environment, safety, and health of DOE workers, the public, and DOE property. The ES&H Program implements these goals by defining DOE policy, providing guidance and technical assistance, performing safety-related research of a generic nature, and performing independent overview and assessment.

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.

Radiation Effects Research Foundation.—The Committee is aware of and pleased with the findings of the blue ribbon panel appointed by the Secretary to review the Radiation Effects Research Foundation. The panel's findings are a strong endorsement of the National Academy of Sciences as manager of the foundation.

In light of the Department's recent commitment to a revised 5-year funding agreement for the Radiation Effects Research Foundation and to maintain the current role of the National Academy of Sciences, the Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request for the Radiation Effects Research Foundation.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for environment, safety, and health program direction is $31,237,000, a 20-percent reduction from the amount requested.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1996	$419,486,000
Budget estimate, 1997	379,075,000
Committee recommendation	389,075,000

This program has two main objectives: (1) to develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

The Committee is aware of the serious environmental threats facing the Arctic and Bering Sea ecosystem that supports the fishery resources of great importance to the Nation. Accordingly, the Committee strongly supports the atmospheric radiation measurement [ARM] program and the establishment of the third ARM site on the North Slope of Alaska. The Committee recommendation includes the amount of the budget request, $54,267,000, for climate and hydrology to ensure the timely completion of the ARM site on the North Slope of Alaska.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 for the final phase of the Biomedical Information Communication Center at the Oregon Health Sciences University. The data base resulting from the project will be used to track the efficacy and effect of medical treatments, and assist in research efforts associated with the long-term effects of low-level exposure to potential environmental hazards such as radiation or electromagnetic fields.

The Human Genome Program represents one of the most important and ambitious biological research efforts being pursued by the Department of Energy. The human genome contains about 3 billion DNA bases and some 80,000 genes, of which approximately 2 million DNA bases have already been sequenced. Considering the long-term benefits of this research project on human health and the development of new medical applications, the Committee continues its strong support of this program, and has provided the full budget request in the Committee's recommendation.

The Committee fully supports the important work conducted at the Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute and the efforts by the Department to privatize the Institute in a manner that preserves its important capability, reduces costs to the Government, and enhances the Institute's long-term availability to meet Federal and non-Federal research needs. The Committee encourages the Department to complete the privatization in fiscal year 1997.

The Committee recommendation includes the amount requested, $35,113,000, to complete the Environmental and Molecular Sciences Laboratory at the Pacific Northwest Laboratory.

The Committee recommendation includes the amount requested for the Ocean Margins and the Ocean Carbon Dioxide Survey, $4,728,000 and $1,811,000, respectively, and directs that these funds be used only for these programs.

The Committee notes that the Albert Einstein Medical Center in Philadelphia, PA, is establishing a new Women's Cancer Center as a focal point of care for its own patients and those of community

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

FUSION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1996	$244,144,000
Budget estimate, 1997	255,600,000
Committee recommendation	240,000,000

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

The Committee is impressed by the balanced plan developed with the assistance of the Fusion Energy Advisory Committee and is pleased that the Department has incorporated the recommendations of the plan into the program. As a result, the Committee has provided $240,000,000, as close to level funding as possible given budget constraints, for the fusion energy program. Such amount includes $6,720,000 for program direction, a 20-percent reduction of the $8,400,000 the Department proposed to fund for fusion energy-related program direction in other energy research program direction and $8,000,000 for fusion energy-related computing the Department had proposed to fund in other energy research computational and technology research. The recommendation includes the amount requested to continue the U.S. participation in the engineering design activities phase of the international thermonuclear experimental reactor [ITER] project, to which the United States is committed through fiscal year 1998.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1996	$791,661,000
Budget estimate, 1997	653,675,000
Committee recommendation	649,675,000

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 labora-

tories 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 $9,000,000 to continue the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] Program. Also, the Midwest superconductivity consortium is continued at the current level.

Energy bioscience program.—There exists a substantial need to discover and develop the appropriate technology to aid in environmental restoration initiatives. The Committee believes that more basic research must be conducted if the United States is to successfully surmount the numerous environmental cleanup and waste treatment challenges the Nation currently faces. The Committee notes the success the Division of Energy Biosciences has had in support of other energy-related fields, such as energy production, and is encouraged by current research initiatives involving bioremediation. Accordingly, the Committee has included the budget request for this program.

Scientific users facility initiative.—The Committee commends the Department for its support of the scientific users facilities initiative which has substantially increased operating hours and funded state-of-the-art instrumentation at the Department's user facilities. The Committee has included the full amount of the request, $277,636,000, for the initiative.

Spallation neutron source.—In the conference report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Act, the conferees provided funds for research and development and conceptual design activities for a new spallation neutron source. The Committee also directed the Department to evaluate opportunities to upgrade existing reactors and spallation sources as cost-effective means of providing neutrons in the near term for the scientific community while the next generation source is developed.

After reviewing the interim report of the Basic Energy Sciences Advisory Committee on this matter, which strongly recommended that the upgrades and construction projects under consideration not come at the expense of other research activities of the Office of Basic Energy Science, the Committee is concerned that upgrades may be the only affordable option for the foreseeable future. However, because of the investment already made in conceptual design, environmental impact studies, and preconstruction research and development, and because the Committee intends that a final decision on the next generation spallation source be made on the basis of complete information, the Committee has included $8,000,000, the same as the request, for those activities in fiscal year 1997. The results of those activities, and any recommendations concerning upgrades, should be included in the Department's fiscal year 1998 budget request.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1996	$63,256,000
Budget estimate, 1997	231,182,000
Committee recommendation	213,763,000

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

Technology transfer.—The Committee strongly supports technology transfer which facilitates technologies and capabilities developed at public expense to enter the marketplace to benefit the Nation. The Committee is willing to concur with the Department's request that technology transfer not be provided a separate appropriation with the understanding that the Department's commitment to technology transfer will continue and that programmatic funding will continue to support technology transfer at the current level, as was intended by the original legislation authorizing the Department's participation in technology transfer activities.

Indian energy resource program.—The Committee recognizes the unique challenge of providing power to rural Alaska; many parts of which are not accessible by road and characterized by severe climate, poverty, and dispersed populations. The Committee is willing to undertake a significant effort to address these issues.

The Committee recommendation for energy supply research and development includes $5,000,000 to fund and implement Indian energy resource programs authorized under section 2603 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Within this amount, the Committee directs that $1,000,000 be provided for the Haida Alaska Native Village Corp.'s Reynolds Creek hydroelectric project; $3,000,000 be provided for the Eyak Native Corp. Power Creek hydroelectric project in Cordova, AK; and $1,000,000 be provided for the Klawock-Thorne Bay-Kasaan electrical intertie on Prince of Wales Island, AK.

Energy and environmental technologies.—The Committee recommendation for other energy research includes $10,000,000 for the establishment of the energy and environmental technologies applications project at the University of Southwestern Louisiana. The project will enhance fundamental automation research in areas designed to improve the Nation's global competitiveness and energy efficiency. The project includes automation for energy and environmental responsibility, computer integrated manufacturing, intelligent material handling systems, advanced computer and communications technology and data dissemination systems. These funds will augment cost-sharing commitments from non-Federal sources, the State of Louisiana, and the University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Computational chemistry.—The Committee recommendation includes $760,000 for computational chemistry and molecular modeling. The Committee supports the broad application of the capabilities at the computational chemistry center in combustion and energy technologies.

Program direction.—The Committee has included $27,003,000 for other energy research program direction which is 20 percent below the request once the request is reduced by $8,400,000. The $8,400,000 reduction results from the Committee's action to include funding for fusion energy-related program direction in the fusion energy account.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1996	$32,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	174,223,000
Committee recommendation	138,000,000

University and science education.—Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends the amount of $15,000,000 for the university and science education programs. To increase flexibility, the Committee has merged funding for the laboratory cooperative science centers and for university programs.

The Committee recommendation for university and science education includes $3,000,000 to support one Hispanic collaborative for research and education in science and technology consortium effort, with a Hispanic institution serving as the lead institution.

Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mended University system, and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to promote minority participation in the sciences and have enhanced computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort and directs the Department to continue the collaboration at the current year level.

The Energy and Water Development Act for Fiscal Year 1996 provided $500,000 to support the Nebraska math and science initiative in cooperation with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory as authorized by Public Law 104–46. The Committee is concerned that the Department did not follow the recommendation of the Committee in this regard. The Committee has again included $500,000 for this purpose.

In-house energy management.—The Committee is strongly committed to reducing the Department's energy consumption. Those savings can and should be accomplished at no cost to the Department; energy service companies which contract to install energy saving devices in non-Federal buildings have demonstrated a willingness to make such installations and receive payment exclusively from the resultant energy cost savings.

Despite the Committee's elimination of funding for in-house energy management in the Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Act, the Department has continued some in-house energy management activities in fiscal year 1996. The Department justifies its continued activities on the grounds that the Department does not have the ability to procure energy savings devices and services like those provided to non-Federal entities by energy services companies. The Committee recognizes this problem. As a result, the Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to establish an in-house, centralized energy efficiency procurement and contracting expertise to assist the Department's procurement and contracting officers

The Committee further recommends that, to the extent the Department has not already done so, the Department conform its procurement regulations to the procurement authorities provided by subsections (a) and (c) of section 546 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8256). These steps will enable the Department to become a leader within the Federal Government in

the procurement of energy saving devices and services. The Committee strongly supports this needed reform.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 1996	$621,541,000
Budget estimate, 1997	651,414,000
Committee recommendation	595,895,000

The Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program funds activities necessary to meet milestones and legal requirements included in compliance agreements, consent orders, and Federal and State statutes and regulations, and provides for implementation of all DOE orders and highest priority discretionary activities including those relating to reducing risk to the environment, safety, and health. The budget request is submitted under two appropriation accounts—"Energy supply, research, and development" and the "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" accounts.

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation for nondefense environmental restoration and waste management is $595,895,000, a reduction of $25,646,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 1996. Within that amount, the Committee has increased funding for waste management to $186,224,000, a $4,183,000 increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1996, to emphasize the Committee's commitment to reducing future environmental restoration costs.

The recommendation includes funding to expedite the cleanup of the Wayne, NJ, interim storage site under the formerly utilized sites remedial action program [FUSRAP].

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 a limited competitive market and the extensive use by the Department of Defense, the Committee directs that the Department's national low-level radioactive waste management program shall conduct a study of the costs of operating a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility such as the commercial low-level radioactive waste disposal facility at Barnwell, SC. This study is to ensure that the Department of Defense, the Veteran's Administration, and any other waste generators are paying equitable disposal fees.

The Committee is aware that in 1975, a consortium formed by the Atomic Energy Commission and consisting of investor-owned utilities, General Electric, and the West German Government transferred ownership of the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor [SEFOR] to the University of Arkansas. The university is now concerned by the significant cost it may face for the eventual decontamination and decommissioning of SEFOR. The Senate is considering legislation that would establish a decommissioning pilot program to decommission and decontaminate the SEFOR at the Department's expense. The Committee understands the project could cost from tens of millions of dollars to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Because of the substantial cost that may be involved, the Committee strongly recommends the Department evaluate any legal obligation the Department may maintain regarding SEFOR and identify and evaluate any obligations that may exist from similar reactors or nuclear facilities which have transferred to non-Federal ownership. The Committee directs the Department to report its findings to the Committee within 180 days of enactment of this act.

Formally utilized sites remedial action program.—The Committee realizes that St. Louis City and St. Louis County bear a substantial radioactive waste burden from cold war uranium refining operations in the 1940's and 1950's and also from the Manhattan project uranium operations. The waste continues to be moved and spread and there are more than 100 properties contaminated above DOE's cleanup standards. In St. Louis there are more offsite contaminated properties above DOE's standards than at Rocky Flats, INEL, Los Alamos, and Sandia combined. The owners of the contaminated properties were not AEC or DOE contractors and did not cause the contamination.

The Committee directs the DOE to cooperate with the citizens of St. Louis City and County in moving forward with a cost-effective cleanup of these sites. The Department is directed to report to the Committee on the proposed course of action the Department is pursuing no later than 90 days after enactment of this act.

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

Appropriations, 1996	$89,900,000
Budget estimate, 1997	87,266,000
Committee recommendation	59,466,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1996	$60,606,000
Budget estimate, 1997	59,466,000
Committee recommendation	59,466,000

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 Corp. [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 1997 includes a gross appropriation of $87,266,000. Once reductions are taken for revenues and use of prior-year balances, the Department requested a net appropriation of $27,800,000. Due to severe budget constraints, the

Committee has provided a gross appropriation of $59,466,000 and a net appropriation of zero.

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

Appropriations, 1996	$278,807,000
Budget estimate, 1997	240,200,000
Committee recommendation	220,200,000

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

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request of $240,200,000. The Committee recommends the entire reduction be taken from activities under title IX of Public Law 102–486.

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1996	$981,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	1,009,150,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,626,000

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. These programs support basic research which is aimed 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 Department's general science and research support some of the most important research conducted by the Federal Government. As a result, the Committee has sought to minimize any reductions in these programs.

High-energy physics.—The Committee recommendation for high-energy physics is $672,921,000, a $5,921,000 reduction from the amount provided in fiscal year 1996 and a $6,204,000 reduction from the amount requested.

The Committee encourages the Department to participate in international collaborations to increase access of U.S. researchers to world class research facilities. However, the Committee strongly

cautions the Department that, due to budget constraints, it should anticipate, at best, current level funding for the high-energy physics program for the foreseeable future. Any funds committed to the LHC must be derived from the base high-energy physics budget.

Nuclear physics.—The recommendation for nuclear energy physics is $318,425,000, a $13,925,000 increase over the amount provided in fiscal year 1996 and equal to the amount requested.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act requires the Department to determine whether Yucca Mountain, NV, is a suitable site for the Nation's nuclear waste repository, and, if it is, to build the repository there. The repository is needed to dispose of 84,000 metric tons of nuclear waste that is being produced at the Nation's 110 nuclear powerplants and thousands of additional tons of nuclear wastes produced by the Nation's national security programs. Since the Nuclear Waste Policy Act was passed in 1982, the Department has collected nearly $8,000,000,000 from the utilities and their ratepayers and has spent about $5,000,000,000 for this purpose.

Funding for the nuclear waste program was cut sharply in fiscal year 1996. The program received only one-half the funds requested by the President and 40 percent less that in fiscal year 1995. The Department was directed to refocus its efforts on completing the core scientific activities needed to determine whether the Yucca Mountain site is suitable and to complete a conceptual design for the repository waste package.

The Committee recommends $400,028,000 for the program in fiscal year 1997. Of this amount, $200,028,000 is to be derived from the nuclear waste fund collected from the ratepayers, and $200,000,000 from the defense account. These funds are to be used to continue the existing scientific work at Yucca Mountain in order to determine the ultimate feasibility and licensibility of the permanent repository at Yucca Mountain. This work should proceed in accordance with the Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Draft Program plan issued by the Department in May 1996. No later than June 30, 1998, the Secretary shall provide to the President and to the Congress a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain site. The viability assessment shall include: the preliminary design concept for the critical elements for the repository and waste package; a total system performance assessment, based upon the design concept and the scientific data and analysis available by June 30, 1998, describing the probable behavior of the repository in the Yucca Mountain geological setting relative to the overall system performance standards; a plan and cost estimate for the remaining work required to complete a license application; and an estimate of the costs to construct and operate the repository in accordance with the design.

The Environmental Protection Agency is now developing radiation protection standards that will determine whether the Yucca

Mountain repository can be licensed to receive nuclear waste. While those standards should provide adequate protection of the health and safety of the public, they should not set dose limits or compliance periods at arbitrary and unrealistic levels that require a degree of proof that science is unable to provide. The standards should reflect the scientific uncertainty inherent in human and geophysical behavior thousands of years in the future. The standards should be used to determine whether deep geologic disposal at Yucca Mountain provides adequate protection of the public compared to other management options. They should not be designed to defeat the Nation's considered policy of deep geologic disposal by requiring a degree of proof that science cannot provide.

Any radiation protection standard proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency for the Yucca Mountain repository should consider specific alternatives to deep geologic disposal at Yucca Mountain and should include an analysis of the comparative risk to the public from each alternative. The alternatives considered should include the permanent storage of nuclear waste at the sites where it is now stored and one or more centralized storage sites recommended by the administration for the above-ground, managed storage. The Agency should evaluate each of these alternatives against the standards proposed for deep geologic disposal at Yucca Mountain.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1996	$3,460,314,000
Budget estimate, 1997	3,710,002,000
Committee recommendation	3,978,602,000

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

The mission of defense programs is to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, utilizing a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship and management in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. The future weapons complex will rely on scientific understanding and

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

The Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program is a single, highly integrated technical program for maintaining the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile in an era without underground nuclear testing and without new nuclear weapons development and production. Traditionally, the activities of the three weapons laboratories and the Nevada test site have been regarded separately from those of the weapons production plants. However, although there remain separate budget items within defense programs, all stockpile stewardship and management activities have achieved a new, closer linkage to each other.

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

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

The Committee's recommendation for weapons activities is $3,976,102,000, an increase of $266,100,000 over the budget request. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

An appropriation of $1,659,267,000 is recommended for the stockpile stewardship activities of the Department of Energy.

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in weapons stockpile safety and reliability without underground nuclear testing through a technically challenging science-based stockpile stewardship program utilizing upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities.

Core stockpile stewardship.—The Core Stockpile Stewardship Program provides the physical, technical, and intellectual infra-

structure necessary to support a reliable, safe, and secure nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee has recommended a total of $1,230,907,000 for core stockpile stewardship programs. This is $80,000,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the funding level proposed for fiscal year 1997 and future budget planning projections of the Department of Energy may not be sufficient to address the critical needs of an aging stockpile. The Committee believes that preservation of core intellectual, scientific, and technical competencies and the continued ability of the weapons complex to respond to changing world situations is critically important. The Department is to be commended on the progress made over the past year in continuing to focus on stockpile stewardship activities.

An additional $20,000,000 is recommended for enhanced surveillance. Enhanced surveillance is an integrated program among the nuclear weapons laboratories and the production plants to develop modern technologies for detecting and predicting defects in nuclear weapons and their components that will arise from the longer lifetimes required of the enduring stockpile. The additional funding will provide for research and development in chemistry and materials; engineering and design assessment for aged or replaced weapons; characterization of device components; and modeling and simulation of aging-induced changes among other activities.

An increase of $40,000,000 is included for the accelerated strategic computing initiative [ASCI], including additional high end hardware development. The additional funding will allow increased cooperative activities with universities on new theory and computer models for key weapon physics, additional simulation code development, and common programming environment. An increase of $10,000,000 is provided for simulation and computer models to better understand primary and secondary sequences such as implosion or boost.

The Committee has included an additional $10,000,000 for advanced manufacturing and infrastructure activities to develop and evaluate technologies and processes to meet present and future stockpile needs. Funding provided in this area allows DOE to explore such things as agile manufacturing and enterprise integration for optimization of the complex's responsiveness; and advanced laser cutting, drilling, and machining techniques for materials and production processes that lead to cleaner, cheaper, and higher quality component manufacturing.

Los Alamos Neutron Science Center [LANSCE].—The Committee has provided $34,160,000 for the Los Alamos Neutron Science Center [LANSCE]. The LANSCE facility provides a new source of critical data in the detection of small defects which might serve as indicators of weapons component aging and the prediction of material performance. It is, therefore, an essential element in the Department's science-based stockpile stewardship program.

Testing capabilities and readiness.—An appropriation of $162,525,000 is recommended for testing capabilities and readiness activities. Current Presidential direction is to maintain a readiness capability to conduct an underground nuclear test at the Nevada test site. Therefore, infrastructure and other measures are to be maintained to support this requirement. Presidential direction also

indicates that resources should be included that are necessary to conduct experimental activities planned by the nuclear weapons design laboratories and appropriate to the national nuclear testing policy.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $88,337,000 is recommended for construction projects under core stockpile stewardship activities for fiscal year 1997. This is the same as the budget request.

Inertial confinement fusion [ICF].—An appropriation of $366,460,000 is recommended for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program. The ICF Program continues to be a major contributor to the science and technology base supporting the nuclear deterrent through improved understanding of the underlying physics of nuclear weapons and computational modeling that will provide the future basis for ensuring safety, reliability, and performance on nuclear components.

The Committee recommendation supports the cooperative agreement between DOE and the University of Rochester's Laboratory of Laser Energetics.

Project 96–D–111, national ignition facility [NIF].—The NIF is a key facility in maintaining nuclear weapons science expertise required for the stockpile stewardship program, and to supporting weapons effects testing. An appropriation of $131,900,000 is recommended for the NIF project, which is the same as the budget request. The funding will enable DOE to undertake title II final detailed design and preconstruction, site specific preparation activities.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $61,900,000 for these activities for fiscal year 1997 to support existing cooperative research and development agreements and education activities.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,969,831,000 for stockpile management activities.

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

The Committee has provided an additional $15,000,000 over the budget request for integrated enhanced surveillance activities at the four production plants to assess the reliability and safety of the weapons stockpile.

An additional $100,000,000 is recommended for the manufacturing and infrastructure needs of the weapon production plants. It is critical that the evaluation, surveillance, maintenance, repair, and dismantlement capabilities in the production complex be maintained; along with improving the manufacturing technologies needed to support the stockpile. In addition, these funds are intended to address aging processing equipment, information system upgrades, and funding deficits for ongoing production activities. The Committee expects that the additional funding will be allocated equitably across the productions plants and with recognition that the weapons laboratories must be involved in this effort.

The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 in operating funds for the Department to undertake upgrades to the existing tritium recycling facility.

Tritium source.—An appropriation of $150,000,000 is recommended for activities related to providing a new tritium source. Tritium is a key element used in nuclear weapons which must be replaced periodically in order for the weapon to operate as designed. Currently, there is no capability to produce tritium and, therefore, it is essential that activities related to providing a new source of tritium proceed as quickly as possible and requirements dictate. The Committee continues to support the dual-track program being developed by the Department.

The Committee understands that the Department has identified additional requirements, above those included in the fiscal year 1997 budget request, based on a review by the Tritium Executive Committee. Therefore, the Committee has recommended an additional $40,000,000 for accelerator production technology and $10,000,000 for light water reactor-related activities. The Committee directs that the activities related to the light water reactor be strictly limited to out-of-reactor work. The Committee expects the Department to assure that the new tritium source will not in any way jeopardize the schedule for providing tritium in the necessary timeframe, and that the operational regime does not compromise the ability of the Department of Energy to meet the tritium requirements of the Department of Defense.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $94,361000 is recommended for line item construction projects under core stockpile management for fiscal year 1997. This is the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of $349,504,000 is recommended for program direction activities. The Committee recommendation provides $22,600,000 for the community assistance program at Los Alamos.

The Committee is aware that the Depart of Energy, pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act of 1996, has recommended that the historically paid annual assistance to the incorporated county of Los Alamos should not continue indefinitely and that termination of financial assistance to the county could best be accomplished by a final settlement, the transfer to the county of installations and functions owned and operated by the Federal Government and the transfer to the county of certain undeveloped land. The Committee further understands that DOE does not believe

that any extension of authorities under the Community Act are required to implement the proposed recommendation.

Therefore, the Committee has included $22,600,000 for DOE to carry out the recommendations for final settlement payment, and directs the Department to carry out the recommendations as set forth in the report to Congress concerning assistance payments for the incorporated county of Los Alamos, NM, dated June 1996.

The Committee notes that the fiscal year 1997 assistance payments to the School Board of Los Alamos, NM, under its existing contract with the Department shall be the last such payment under the Atomic Energy Communities Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2391); and beginning in fiscal year 1998, the School Board of Los Alamos is eligible for payments in lieu of taxes under section 168 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2088) and other assistance as necessary under existing authority of the Department.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1996	$5,557,532,000
Budget estimate, 1997	5,409,310,000
Committee recommendation	5,615,210,000

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing health and safety risks, and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The environmental management program goals are to eliminate and manage the urgent risk in the system; emphasize health and safety for workers and the public; establish a system that increases managerial and financial control; and establish a stronger partnership between DOE and its stakeholders. Environmental management activities of the Department of Energy are budgeted under three appropriation accounts: defense environmental restoration and waste management; energy supply, research, and development; and the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

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

The recommended funding for defense environmental restoration and waste management is $5,615,210,000, an increase of $205,900,000 over the budget request.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is at a critical juncture. The trend of large budget increases has been reversed, and for the first time in several years the budget request for fiscal year 1997 is below the enacted amount for 1996. However, the Committee feels

that additional funding is warranted and that it is critical to future program success to have a stable and predictable stream of funding. Large swings in appropriations can cause waste and inefficiencies if too high; and conversely if too low, result in unacceptable response to critical problems and requirements. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 1997 is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

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

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where relative small amounts of additional funding invested in the near-term offer the potential for significant reductions in long-term budgetary requirements. The Committee continues to be concerned with growing landlord costs required to maintaining buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible. Therefore, in prioritizing spending for environmental management work, the Secretary should continue to give special attention to those sites or portions of sites where increased near-term funding for actual physical remediation work and permanent waste disposal can save substantial future dollars.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

An appropriation of $1,777,194,000 is recommended for environmental restoration programs, an increase of $15,000,000 over the budget request for fiscal year 1997. The Environmental Restoration Program conducts cleanup activities to stabilize radioactive waste, carries out remediation efforts, and performs decommissioning and decontamination work at contaminated DOE sites. Other activities include performing assessments and characterizations to determine potential radioactive and hazardous waste releases and to reduce and remove the potential risks to the environment, human health, and safety resulting from past defense-related Department activities.

The Committee has provided an additional $15,000,000 for the Department to undertake accelerate efforts to reduce growing landlord costs as discussed earlier in this report, and to address high priority removal and remedial actions. The Committee directs that increased funding be applied to those sites where remediation oc-

curs. The Committee recommendation would provide resources to sites such as Savannah River, Hanford, Rocky Flats, and Oak Ridge where additional resources can be used to significantly reduce life cycle costs.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,675,053,000 for the Waste Management Program. This is $138,400,000 over the budget request. The Waste Management Program seeks to protect the public and workers by seeking to minimize, treat, store, and dispose of radioactive, hazardous, mixed, and sanitary waste generated by past and ongoing operations at DOE facilities.

The Committee is concerned with the approach taken by DOE in development of the fiscal year 1997 budget request for waste management activities, specifically the reductions required in ongoing program activities such as reducing large mortgages, safety and compliance monitoring, cleanup of surface contamination, and tank monitoring upgrades and maintenance at Hanford tank farms, in order to undertake DOE's new environmental management privatization initiative.

The Committee recommendation provides significant additional resources to continue critical ongoing activities in an effort to mitigate the impact of proposed budget reductions for fiscal year 1997. Stable and predictable funding levels for ongoing cleanup work are essential in order to sustain the excellent progress being made. The Committee action seeks to support the privatization initiative while adding significant resources to mitigate the impact on waste management activities.

The Department is directed to accelerate defense waste processing facility [DWPF] operations and associated high-level waste treatment. The Committee understands that the facility was only recently activated and that additional operating funding may be warranted. The DWPF is critical to the credibility and success of DOE's Waste Management Program.

Review and comment by State of Oregon at Hanford.—The Committee understands that language was included by the Senate in the Department of Defense authorization bill (S. 1745, title XXXI, subtitle D, secs. 3161–3162) which gives the State of Oregon an opportunity to review and comment on certain remedial actions at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in the State of Washington. While the amendment would enhance the information available to the State of Oregon in the decisionmaking process at Hanford, it will not slow cleanup of the site and will not give Oregon the right to participate in Tri-Party Agreement negotiations. Because of Hanford's location on the Columbia River and the effects of past radiation releases on the State of Oregon, the Committee recognizes the State's desire to participate in future decisions made about cleanup at the site. The Department of Energy is encouraged to fully comply with the direction contained in the Defense authorization bill.

Construction projects.—An amount of $88,327,000 is provided for waste management construction activities for fiscal year 1997. This is the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION

The Committee recommendation for nuclear material and facility stabilization is $1,333,290,000, an increase of $429,469,000 over the budget request. The Nuclear Material and Facility Stabilization Program reflects the change in the Department's mission from production of nuclear weapons to the cleanup of the former production complex. The activities of this program reduce the level of potential risk to people and the environment and drive down the cost of maintaining surplus facilities. Nuclear material and facility stabilization activities that reduce risk include stabilizing nuclear materials and deactivating surplus production facilities. As stabilization and deactivation work is completed, the cost of implementing other environmental management activities should decrease.

The recommendation includes an increase of $100,000,000 for nuclear material and facility stabilization activities, such as acceleration of Hanford deactivation and mortgage reduction activities associated with Hanford's plutonium finishing plant, B plant, and the 300 area fuel supply shut down nuclear materials stabilization and site operations at Savannah River F and H Canyons; augmented facility decontamination and stabilization activities; and increased emphasis in support of spent nuclear fuels movements and efforts to resolve spent nuclear fuel vulnerabilities.

The Committee is aware that the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory has been designated the lead lab under DOE's National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program and that the Department has acknowledged that increased funding will be needed to carry out the additional responsibilities. The Committee recommendation is consistent with the Senate authorizing committee action for this activity.

Site operations office.—The Committee has not adopted the proposal included in the budget request to create a new office of site operations as a separate budget function. The Committee is concerned that the Department is unnecessarily reducing its management flexibility by creating this new budget category. Committee action moves all funding and construction projects back under nuclear material and facility stabilization as in past years. The budget request totaling $324,969,000 has also been transferred back into that account.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development activities is $303,771,000, the same as the budget request.

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

There is continued concern that the Department's efforts to develop appropriate and effective technologies to facilitate the cleanup are meeting with limited success. The Committee is seriously concerned with the Department's reluctance to fully integrate Of-

fice of Energy Research expertise and capabilities into the technology development effort to address mid- and long-term environmental management needs. The Secretary is urged to address this problem and take appropriate action to ensure energy research capabilities are more fully utilized. The Committee believes that strengthened ties between environmental management and the Office of Energy Research can only enhance the ability to the Department to succeed in its complex cleanup effort.

The Committee understands that chemical decontamination technology could have the potential to accelerate waste cleanup work at nuclear production facilities and to reduce the costs and risks to the environment. The Committee encourages the Department to explore and demonstrate this new technology if appropriate.

The Department has a large stockpile (550M kg) of depleted uranium, a byproduct of the uranium enrichment process. The Committee is advised that using innovative technology, depleted uranium can be recycled into environmentally stable uranium compounds and commercial products: anhydrous hydrogen fluoride [HF], which is used in uranium processing and in the manufacture of nonchlorofluorcarbon refrigerants; and depleted uranium oxides (UO_2) and metals, which can be used to fashion radiation shielding, waste containers, counterweights, flywheels, and other devices requiring dense materials.

The Committee understands the Department is interested in producing a stable uranium oxide that could be reused. It has identified a potential use for UO_2 in the manufacturing of ducrete, a concrete-like material that could serve as a multipurpose cask to store and transport radioactive waste. Ducrete is a highly efficient shield with the capacity of steel and the relatively inexpensive construction cost of poured concrete. Although high quality UO_2 has been manufactured from depleted uranium, the process needs refinement to recycle applications such as shielding and containers. Upon the Department's approval, funds appropriated herein may be used for this purpose.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides an appropriation of $33,155,000 for policy and management activities. The reduction recommended reflects Committee concern that many activities funded under this account are duplicative of activities elsewhere in the Department and the need to concentrate available funding on cleanup work.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE PROGRAM

A total of $62,136,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request, is provided for the Environmental Science Program. The goal of this program is to strengthen the Department's environmental management basic science activities through a competitive process between DOE's national laboratories, academic, and industrial organizations. This program was initiated by Congress in fiscal year 1996 in response to the Galvin Commission report.

As stated under technology development, the Committee is concerned about the Department's efforts to integrate basic science research of the Office of Energy Research and the activities of the Of-

fice of Technology Development. The Committee strongly urges the Secretary of Energy to ensure that the Office of Energy Research have full management responsibility over the funding provided herein.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

An appropriation of $150,000,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee action is taken without prejudice. The Committee supports Department's efforts to explore innovative options to reduce environmental management costs, but is concerned that response to DOE's recent bid solicitation raises serious questions regarding the Department's current approach to privatization. The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committee no later than December 31, 1996, on the impact recent interest in DOE's privatization proposal will have on projected cost savings, the extent of commercial competition and participation in the initiative, and recommendations on any changes, or new approaches which would make this initiative more effective.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $439,011,000. Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy.

FIXED ASSET ACQUISITION

The Committee has included $182,000,000, the full amount requested in the budget, for the Department of Energy to establish a new asset acquisition and privatization program. The Committee understands that program seeks to bring commercial practices and expertise into the DOE cleanup process. The Committee endorses this initiative and the activities proposed in the request, including the advanced mixed waste treatment facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. This facility demonstrates the Federal commitment to prepare waste for final disposition.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1996	$1,388,212,000
Budget estimate, 1997	1,547,700,000
Committee recommendation	1,606,833,000

An appropriation of $1,606,833,000 is recommended by the Committee for other defense activities.

This account includes the following programs: verification and control technology, nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, security evaluations, the Office of Nuclear Safety, Worker, and Community Transition Assistance, fissile materials control and disposition, emergency management, international nuclear

safety and security activities, and naval reactors. Descriptions of each account are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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 Committee recommendation totals $470,248,000.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology research and development includes an increase of $10,000,000 for DOE to undertake a cooperative technology effort on the verifiable dismantlement and conversion of plutonium from former Soviet Union weapons. This effort will use new ARIES technology to verifiably transform weapons grade plutonium removed from Russian weapons into plutonium oxide or hydride which is unsuitable for weapons use.

In addition, the Committee has provided $17,000,000 to the Department to undertake a research and development program to address the technical means for detecting the presence, transportation, production, and use of materials to make biological and chemical weapons. The national laboratories have long been involved in the detection of potential nuclear threats, and this program will focus the capabilities which exists in the national laboratories on the chemical and biological threat.

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 includes $214,144,000 for arms control activities. The recommendation provides an additional $30,000,000, consistent with Senate action on the Defense authorization bill, for material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities, including assistance to secure from theft or unauthorized diversion special nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union; and additional funding to support cooperation under laboratory-to-laboratory agreements along with government-to-government activities with the former Soviet Union to improve security of highly enriched uranium used for propulsion of Russian naval vessels. The Committee is aware that highly enriched uranium intended for naval propulsion can be used in nuclear weapons. To date, MPC&A efforts have focused on the nuclear weapons materials problem. Funding is included to expand DOE activities to secure nuclear materials used in naval propulsion.

A total of $7,900,000 is included for the Department of Energy to complete the canning of spent fuel rods in North Korea, pursu-

ant to the agreed framework, and to initiate postcanning technology activities.

Intelligence.—The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analyses on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the Department and other U.S. Government agencies. The focus of the Department's intelligence analysis and reporting is on emerging proliferant nations, nuclear technology transfers, foreign nuclear materials production, and proliferation implications of the breakup of the former Soviet Union. The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by GAO, the Senate Intelligence Committee, and senior DOE officials of the increased threat posed by foreign visitors visiting U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories. Increased openness at the weapons laboratories creates an inviting target for foreign countries seeking to obtain nuclear weapons-related information. Based on these concerns, the Committee recommends an additional $5,000,000 to expand counterintelligence activities at the nuclear weapons laboratories and other high-risk facilities. The Committee recommendation also supports expanded analysis of the Russian and Chinese nuclear weapons programs.

Emergency management.—The Committee has provided the full budget request of $16,794,000 for emergency management activities, which includes a $1,600,000 hazardous material spill facility. The Office of Emergency Management serves as the single point of contact and control for all DOE emergency and threat assessment-related activities, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting the departmental operations and activities or requiring departmental assistance.

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 are expected to decrease Departmentwide. The Committee concurs with the budget request of $47,208,000.

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

An appropriation of $20,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request and reflects continuing large uncosted balances in this account.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety, and Health is the departmental resource that provides oversight in the areas of environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security performance. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $63,800,000, which is the same as the budget request for fiscal year 1997. Included in the Committee recommendation is $6,800,000 to continue the Marshall Island studies, funding to support commitments under State health agreements, continued epidemiologic studies conducted under the

memorandum of understanding with the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Hanford thyroid study.

The Committee urges the Department to continue the biological diversity inventory and analysis at the Hanford site and to provide adequate funds to undertake the work anticipated to be accomplished in fiscal year 1997. Also, the Committee understands that the delivery of public occupational health services is an important function at Hanford. The Committee urges the Department to seek such services from contractors that have experience and expertise providing onsite medical surveillance services.

The Committee recommends the Department continue the long-term health study of plutonium workers exposed in 1944–45. Eight of the original 26 participants in the study are still alive and are due for a 5-year examination in 1996 or 1997. The ongoing study has produced the longest record of dosimetry data of plutonium exposed workers and should be considered a high priority.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

In accordance with section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1993 and as a result of a change in the work force at defense nuclear facilities, defense employees of the Department may be provided various options to minimize impacts of these work force structure changes. These options include retraining, early retirement incentives, preference in hiring, outplacement assistance, and relocation assistance. In addition, this program funds contractor employment reduction requirements for severance and separation payments. The Committee recommendation is $67,000,000, the same as the budget request.

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 $93,796,000, the same as the budget request. This includes $17,000,000 for project 97–D–140, the Consolidated Special Nuclear Materials Storage Plant.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SAFETY (DEFENSE)

An appropriation of $72,200,000 is recommended by the Committee for international nuclear safety and nuclear security programs of DOE.

The collapse of the former Soviet Union left many Russian nuclear reactors without the technical and financial support necessary to operate safely. Since 1992, the Department of Energy has undertaken efforts to develop a nuclear safety infrastructure and establish a safety culture at powerplants in the former Soviet Union and other central and Eastern European countries. The immediate effort is to support the conversion of the current reactor cores to non-weapons-grade plutonium producing cores. Other activities are de-

signed to alleviate proliferation concerns related to the use of nuclear reactors by nations of the former Soviet Union.

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 $663,932,000, 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.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 1996	$248,400,000
Budget estimate, 1997	200,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

The Committee recommends $200,000,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the nuclear waste fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 1994, the balance owed by the Federal Government to the nuclear waste fund was $1,098,000,000 (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.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

NET APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1996	$244,391,000
Budget estimate, 1997	119,475,000
Committee recommendation	92,629,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1996	$122,306,000
Budget estimate, 1997	125,388,000
Committee recommendation	125,388,000

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 communicating with the news media and the general public; support for train-

ing 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.

As stated earlier in the report, the Committee is concerned that the Department is failing to define and accomplish strategic objectives and has instead devoted its attention to process issues. This is a general shortcoming of the Department's administration which has become cumbersome and lost its focus.

As a result, the Committee recommendation includes a gross appropriation for departmental administration of $218,017,000, a $26,846,000 or 11-percent reduction from the request. That gross appropriation is offset by $125,388,000 in miscellaneous revenues resulting in a net appropriation of $92,629,000.

The Committee has generally reduced accounts within departmental administration by 16 percent from the amount requested. The exceptions are general management which was reduced only 10 percent and provides funding for rent, telephone service, copiers, contract audits, and other essential overhead costs; policy analysis and systems studies which was reduced 40 percent because of the Committee's concern that the maintenance of a policy structure separate from the programmatic offices contributes to the lack of integrated strategic planning; consumer affairs and public affairs which together total only $90,000; and environmental policy studies which was reduced 50 percent and appears to overlap significantly with policy analysis and system studies.

The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 which is available only for severance, termination, and related costs resulting from the reduction in personnel in departmental administration.

REVENUES

The revenue estimate for fiscal year 1997 is $125,388,000, an amount equal to the budget request, an increase of $3,082,000 from the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1996.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1996	$25,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	29,605,000
Committee recommendation	23,103,000

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 func-

tion 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 $23,103,000. This is a reduction of $1,897,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 1996 and $6,502,000 below the budget request.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1996	$4,260,000
Budget estimate, 1997	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,000,000

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

Public Law 104–58 authorizes the sale of the Alaska Power Administration assets. The Snettisham project will be sold to the State of Alaska and Eklutna project to the three current power customers, Municipal Light & Power, Chugach Electric Association, Inc., and Matanuska Electric Association, Inc. While the Department and the APA expect to complete sale of the Eklutna project by early 1997 and continue to pursue the financing arrangements for completion of the sale of the Snettisham project to the State of Alaska, continued operation and maintenance are required for a portion of fiscal year 1997. As such, the Committee recommendation is $4,000,000, the same as the budget. If the sales occur before the end of fiscal year 1997, any unobligated appropriations will be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

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 megawatts.

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

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000 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 $287,000,000 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.

Eastern Canadian Intertie.—The Committee has not included language for the eastern Canadian Intertie. While the Committee believes it may be necessary to include such language to ensure that the Untied States will be able to construct the transmission facilities necessary to return the Canadian entitlement in 2003, the

Committee has deferred action to allow some additional time for consultations about the line with interested parties.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1997, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $835,000,000, of which $278,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Fish and wildlife agreement.—Last fall Bonneville agreed to a 6-year fixed budget for its fish and wildlife expenditures that will provide $252,000,000 per year in program funding, plus $90,000,000 to $280,000,000 per year for hydro system operating costs. The budget is comprised of several categories including direct expenditures on fish and wildlife projects, reimbursement to other Federal agencies and the Federal Treasury, the cost of purchase replacement power, and foregone hydro systems revenues. In fiscal year 1997, the direct expenditure portion of the budget is expected to be $127,000,000. In fiscal year 1997, and each subsequent fiscal year, the Administrator shall use the funding available under the direct program portion of the fish and wildlife budget first to fund those measures, including reasonable and prudent alternatives, that are identified as mandatory Bonneville responsibilities for that fiscal year pursuant to the biological opinions issued under the Endangered Species Act. The remainder of the funding available under the direct program portion shall be used in a manner consistent with the Northwest Power Planning Council Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.

Renewable resource development.—The Committee understands that the BPA, in keeping with the goals of the 1980 Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act, is involved in four renewable resource demonstration projects in the region. The Committee supports BPA's efforts to confirm and expand the supply of renewable resources in the Northwest, and expects BPA to complete the two wind and two geothermal projects it has underway. Completing these projects will lay the foundation for building a renewable marketplace in the region, and will benefit both the environment and the local economy. The Committee understands that BPA may spend up to $40,000,000 each year on these projects once they are all in service, and encourages BPA to move forward expeditiously on their completion. The Committee directs BPA to prepare a report on the progress of this program by March 1, 1997.

Renewable and conservation resources.—The Committee continues to strongly support conservation and renewable energy resources. These resources remain the foundation for a sustainable energy future in the Pacific Northwest as the region approaches the new century. The Committee strongly encourages the Bonneville Power Administration, the Northwest Power Planning Council, and other participants in the regional review being conducted by the Governors of the four Northwest States, to explore all innovative measures to assure achievement of pace-setting energy conservation and renewable resource targets in the coming decade. The Committee urges that new mechanisms be defined to assure adequate funding to sustain and substantially expand energy conservation and renewable resources as the electric power industry transitions to a more deregulated energy marketplace. While the Committee recognizes the BPA's need to remain competitive and assure its payments to the U.S. Treasury, BPA should make every

effort to fulfill the commitments it has made to renewable energy and energy conservation resources.

Energy services businesses.—The Committee understands that there are concerns regarding whether BPA should engage in energy service business activities and the financial magnitude of the activities. The Committee also understands that BPA has committed to present the energy services business to the comprehensive review initiated by the four Governors for the their consideration. The Committee believes it is important that the region make recommendations as to whether BPA should expand its activities into energy services and that BPA limit its activities until those recommendations are forthcoming. The Committee directs that BPA limit any new energy service business contracts to $7,000,000 between now and January 1, 1997, in order to allow adequate time for the regional review to consider the appropriate role for BPA in these activities. Such contracts should also assure that cost recovery will not be borne by other BPA customers.

Direct loans for energy conservation.—The Committee has included bill language relating to new direct loans for energy conservation under Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.

Voluntary separation incentives.—The Committee rejects the House provision repealing BPA's ratepayer funded voluntary separation incentives [VSI's] program. Permanent authority for VSI's were provided by Congress in the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. The BPA Administrator recently announced new staff reduction targets of approximately 500 BPA employees and approximately 400 contractors by 1999. The Committee recognizes that continued BPA acccss to ratepayer funded VSI's: (1) is an important component of the agency's overall strategy to maintain a high probability of making its annual Treasury payment; and (2) will be critical to the success of this 3-year effort by which Bonneville expects to save about $70,000,000 annually.

Mid-Columbia hydroelectric plants.—The Committee is aware that there are significant costs for the mid-Columbia hydroelectric projects associated with fish and wildlife mitigation. In particular, there are costs being incurred as a result of water releases from upstream Federal facilities which the mid-Columbia projects cannot control because they have limited storage capability. The Committee is also aware that the Bonneville Power Administration has incurred significant costs for fish and wildlife mitigation and has worked hard to remain in a position where its power is competitively priced. The Committee believes, however, that the Bonneville system has more flexibility than the mid-Columbias, including greater system capacity and refined marketing authority, to operate in a manner consistent with regionwide fish and wildlife needs. The Committee, therefore, urges Bonneville to enter into equitable energy exchange agreements with the mid-Columbia project owners. Such agreement should benefit mid-Columbia project owners while not increasing costs for Bonneville Power Administration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1996	$19,843,000
Budget estimate, 1997	20,900,000
Committee recommendation	13,859,000

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

The Committee recommendation of $13,859,000 is $7,041,000 below the budget request. The reduction from the amount is possible because $13,586,000 of prior-year balances are available for use in fiscal year 1997.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1996	$29,778,000
Budget estimate, 1997	26,900,000
Committee recommendation	25,210,000

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1997 is $25,210,000, a reduction of $1,690,000 from the amount of the request.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1996	$257,652,000
Budget estimate, 1997	217,891,000
Committee recommendation	201,582,000

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.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommendation for Western for fiscal year 1997 is $201,582,000, a decrease of $16,309,000 from the budget request of $217,891,000.

The amount to be derived from the Department of the Interior reclamation fund is $3,774,000, the same amount as the request.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

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

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

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1996	$131,290,000
Budget estimate, 1997	159,397,000
Committee recommendation	146,290,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1996	−$131,290,000
Budget estimate, 1997	−159,397,000
Committee recommendation	−146,290,000

The Committee provides $146,290,000 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.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY:			
Solar energy:			
Solar building technology research	2,000	5,000	3,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	65,000	86,994	65,000
Solar thermal energy systems	25,000	23,750	21,500
Biofuels energy systems	55,300	80,890	55,300
Wind energy systems	32,500	49,650	15,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	.....	3,489	.....
International solar energy program	4,000	.....	.....
Solar technology transfer	4,300	.....	.....
National renewable energy laboratory	500	2,200	.....
Construction:			
96–E–100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	1,500	2,800	.....
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	2,000	5,000	.....
Resource assessment	2,000	.....	.....
Solar and renewable energy deployment	.....	8,509	.....
Subtotal, Solar Energy	192,100	263,282	159,800
Use of prior year balances	−4,888	.....	.....
Total, Solar Energy	187,212	263,282	159,800
Geothermal:	.....		
Geothermal technology development	30,447	35,600	30,500
Use of prior year balances	−555	.....	.....
Total, Geothermal	29,892	35,600	30,500

Hydrogen research	14,500	11,012	9,000
Hydropower:			
Small scale hydropower development	1,500	.....	1,500
Electric energy systems and storage:			
Electric energy systems:			
Electric field effects research	9,924	.....	.....
System and materials research	19,000	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	−615	.....	.....
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	28,309	.....	.....
Energy storage systems:	.....		
Battery storage	2,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	2,000	.....	.....
Electric and magnetic fields R&D	.....	8,000	8,000
High temperature superconducting R&D	.....	23,050	20,000
Energy storage systems	.....	4,000	4,000
Climate challenge	.....	1,000	.....
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	30,309	36,050	32,000
Program direction	11,800	17,301	13,841
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	275,213	363,245	246,641
NUCLEAR ENERGY:			
Nuclear energy R&D:			
Light water reactor	40,000	40,000	22,000
Advanced radioisotope power system	48,512	40,000	38,810
Nuclear technology R&D	.....	30,000	20,000
Program direction	8,000	.....	.....
Policy and management	5,000	.....	.....
Oak Ridge landlord	14,400	16,000	11,520
Test reactor area landlord	2,000	3,000	2,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Construction:			
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,900	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	3,900	4,000	3,000
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	2,303	800	800
University reactor fuel assistance and support	3,500	6,950	4,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	125,615	137,750	100,130
Termination costs	79,000	76,900	94,900
Construction:			
97–E–200 Modifications to reactors, sodium system drain and closure, Argonne National Lab—West, ID	.....	1,200	1,200
97–E–201 Modifications to reactors, hot fuel examination facility equipment upgrades, ANL–W	.....	1,000	1,000
95–E–207 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor—II sodium processing facility Argonne National Laboratory—West, ID	1,700	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	1,700	2,200	2,200
Total, Termination costs	80,700	79,100	97,100
Isotope support	24,658	12,704	17,704
Program direction	.....	18,500	14,800
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	230,973	248,054	229,734
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH:			
Environment, safety and health	114,933	73,160	63,200
Nuclear safety policy	13,500	.....	.....

Program direction	.....	39,046	31,237
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	128,433	112,206	94,437
ENERGY RESEARCH:			
Biological and environmental research:			
Biological and environmental research R&D	349,891	342,962	352,962
Construction:			
94–E–337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL	2,600	.....	.....
94–E–338 Structural biology center, ANL	4,295	.....	.....
94–E–339 Human genome lab, LBL	5,700	1,000	1,000
91–EM–100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	50,000	35,113	35,113
Subtotal, Construction	62,595	36,113	36,113
Subtotal, Biological & environ. research R&D	412,486	379,075	389,075
BER program direction	7,000	.....	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research	419,486	379,075	389,075
Fusion energy	244,144	255,600	240,000
Basic energy sciences:			
Materials sciences	367,400	334,560	332,060
Chemical sciences	198,400	173,370	171,870
Applied mathematical sciences	116,500	.....	.....
Engineering and geosciences	41,700	41,250	41,250
Advanced energy projects	12,300	.....	.....
Energy biosciences	30,200	28,185	28,185
Program direction	9,500	.....	.....
Capital equipment	.....	45,695	45,695
Construction:			
GPE–400 General plant projects	.....	9,275	9,275
97–E–305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	.....	2,500	2,500
96–E–305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	10,475	.....	.....
95–E–305 Accelerator improvement projects	.....	9,840	9,840

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
89–R–402 6–7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL	3,186	.....	.....
96–E–300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	2,000	9,000	9,000
Subtotal, Construction	15,661	30,615	30,615
Total, Basic energy sciences	791,661	653,675	649,675
Other energy research:			
Computational and technology research	.....	158,143	158,500
Energy research analyses	3,463	2,000	2,000
Laboratory technology transfer	18,000	.....	.....
Advisory and oversight	6,200	.....	.....
Policy and management	2,200	.....	.....
Program direction	.....	42,154	27,003
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities	.....	7,625	5,000
Construction:			
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	.....	21,260	.....
95–E–301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	2,500	.....	2,500
95–E–302 Applied science center, phase I (BNL)	3,270	.....	.....
95–E–303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	1,500	.....	1,500
95–E–310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	2,740	.....	2,960
94–E–351 Fuel storage and transfer facility upgrade (BNL)	440	.....	.....
94–E–363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	2,038	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	12,488	21,260	6,960
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	12,488	28,885	11,960
Environment, safety and health	6,656	.....	.....

Construction:			
96–E–333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	4,400	.....	7,424
95–E–307 Fire Safety imp. III (ANL)	1,000	.....	1,000
95–E–308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	1,540	.....	1,032
95–E–309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)	2,480	.....	4,620
93–E–320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)	2,411	.....	224
93–E–323 Fire and safety systems upgrade phase I (LBL)	1,130	.....	.....
93–E–324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL)	1,288	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	14,249	.....	14,300
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	20,905	.....	14,300
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. suppor	33,393	28,885	26,260
Total, Other energy research	63,256	231,182	213,763
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	1,518,547	1,519,532	1,492,513
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES:			
University and science education programs	20,000	19,900	15,000
Technical information management program	11,000	2,300	2,300
Program direction	.....	8,700	8,700
Construction	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	12,000	12,000	12,000
Field offices and management	.....	121,723	110,000
Information systems investment	.....	14,900	.....
In-house energy management	.....	3,941	1,000
Construction:			
IHE—500 Modifications for energy mgmt	.....	1,759	.....
Total, In-house energy management	.....	5,700	1,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	32,000	174,223	138,000
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT. (NON-DEFENSE):			
Environmental restoration	366,400	358,239	330,000
Waste management	171,896	192,799	180,000
Construction:			
GP–E–600 ANL waste handling facility, INEL	.....	360	360
94–E–602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL	300	1,106	1,106
93–E–900 Long-term storage of TMI–2 fuel, INEL	4,048	.....	.....
92–E–601 Melton Valley liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	339	.....	.....
91–E–600 Rehabilitation of waste management building 306, ANL	787	2,066	2,066
88–R–812 Hazardous waste handling facility, LBL	671	.....	.....
88–R–830 Liquid low-level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	4,000	2,692	2,692
Subtotal, Construction	10,145	6,224	6,224
Total, Waste management	182,041	199,023	186,224
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	73,100	84,782	73,100
Construction:			
93–E–900 Long-term storage of TMI–2 fuel, INEL	.....	6,571	6,571
Total, Nuclear materials and fac stabilization	73,100	91,353	79,671
Site operations	.....	2,799	.....
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	621,541	651,414	595,895

Subtotal, Energy supply, research and development	2,806,707	3,068,674	2,801,220
Use of prior year balances	−79,300	.....	−48,177
General reduction, ESR&D	.....	−48,177	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,727,407	3,020,497	2,749,043
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			
Uranium program activities	83,500	77,594	52,466
Program direction	.....	5,672	4,000
Construction:			
96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plant	3,000	4,000	3,000
93–U–200 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	3,400	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	6,400	4,000	3,000
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	89,900	87,266	59,466
Revenues—Sales	−34,903	−42,200	−42,200
Use of prior year balances	−25,703	−17,266	−17,266
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	29,294	27,800	.....
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	278,807	240,200	220,200
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH			
High energy physics:			
Physics research	141,000	141,290	141,000
Facility operations	353,077	362,955	359,998
Construction:			
97–G–303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC	.....	3,000	3,000
94–G–304 B–Factory, SLAC	52,000	45,000	45,000
92–G–302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	52,000	52,000	52,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Construction	104,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	457,077	462,955	459,998
High energy technology	68,923	74,880	71,923
Total, High energy physics	667,000	679,125	672,921
Nuclear physics	236,925	253,425	253,425
Construction:			
96–G–302 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	2,575	.....	.....
91–G–300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	65,000	65,000	65,000
Subtotal, Construction	67,575	65,000	65,000
Total, Nuclear physics	304,500	318,425	318,425
General science program direction	9,500	11,600	9,280
Subtotal, General science	981,000	1,009,150	1,000,626
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	981,000	1,009,150	1,000,626
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations:			
Office of the Secretary—salaries and expenses	2,500	2,850	2,280
General management—personnel compensation and benefits	185,000	119,647	100,695
Severance, termination and related cost	.....	.....	6,000
General management—other expenses	157,000	83,604	74,900
Program support:			
Minority economic impact	2,900	2,900	2,320

Policy analysis and system studies	2,900	3,493	2,096
Consumer affairs	40	40	40
Public affairs	50	65	50
Environmental policy studies	4,000	4,928	2,500
Scientific and technical training	1,000	1,000	800
Subtotal, Program support	10,890	12,426	7,806
General reduction	.....	.....	.....
Total, Administrative operations	355,390	218,527	191,681
Cost of work for others	22,826	26,336	26,336
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	378,216	244,863	218,017
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments	−11,519	.....	.....
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	366,697	244,863	218,017
Miscellaneous revenues	−122,306	−125,388	−125,388
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	244,391	119,475	92,629
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	26,915	30,502	24,000
Use of prior year balances	−1,915	−897	−897
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	25,000	29,605	23,103
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES:			
Stockpile stewardship:			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,078,403	1,062,570	1,142,570
Construction:			
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	2,520	19,250	19,250
96–D–103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	8,400	15,100	15,100
96–D–104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	1,800	14,100	14,100
96–D–105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	6,600	17,100	17,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	9,940	15,000	15,000
94–D–102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	12,200	7,787	7,787
93–D–102 Nevada support facility, NV	15,650	.....	.....
90–D–102 Nuclear Weapons Research, Development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	6,200	.....	.....
88–D–106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	17,995	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	81,305	88,337	88,337
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,159,708	1,150,907	1,230,907
Inertial fusion	203,267	234,560	234,560
Construction:			
96–D–111 National ignition facility, TBD	37,400	131,900	131,900
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	240,667	366,460	366,460
Technology transfer/education:			
Technology transfer	150,000	49,400	51,900
Education	10,000	10,000	10,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	160,000	59,400	61,900
Marshall Island/Dose reconstruction	6,800	.....	.....
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,567,175	1,576,767	1,659,267
Stockpile management	1,911,458	1,704,470	1,875,470
Construction:			
Production base:			
88–D–122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	8,660	21,940	21,940

96–D–126 Tritium loading line modifications, Savannah River Site, SC	12,200	.....	.....
Subtotal, Production base	20,860	21,940	21,940
Environmental, safety and health:			
97–D–121 Consolidated pit packaging system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	.....	870	870
97–D–122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	.....	4,000	4,000
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	.....	1,400	1,400
97–D–124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	.....	600	600
96–D–122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	600	100	100
96–D–123 Retrofit HVAX and chillers, for Ozone protection Y–12 plant	3,100	7,000	7,000
95–D–122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y–12 plant	6,300	10,900	10,900
94–D–124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y–12 plant	8,700	4,900	4,900
94–D–125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	5,500	5,200	5,200
94–D–127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	2,000	2,200	2,200
94–D–128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	4,000	.....	.....
93–D–122 Life safety upgrades, Y–12 plant	7,200	7,200	7,200
Subtotal, Environmental, safety and health	37,400	44,370	44,370
Safeguards and security:			
88–D–123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	13,400	9,739	9,739
Nuclear weapons incident response:			
96–D–125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD	900	3,825	3,825
Reconfiguration:			
93–D–123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	41,065	14,487	14,487
Subtotal, Construction	113,625	94,361	94,361
Total, Stockpile management	2,025,083	1,798,831	1,969,831
Program direction	115,000	334,404	349,504
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,707,258	3,710,002	3,978,602
Use of prior year balances	−209,744	.....	.....
Streamline DOE contractors (undistributed)	−37,200	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,460,314	3,710,002	3,978,602
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT:			
Corrective activities:			
Construction:			
90–D–103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	3,406	.....	.....
Environmental restoration	1,635,973	1,385,546	1,400,546
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	.....	376,648	376,648
Total, Environmental restoration	1,635,973	1,762,194	1,777,194
Waste management	2,295,994	1,448,326	1,586,726
Construction:			
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	.....	7,584	7,584
96–D–406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	42,000	.....	.....
96–D–407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	2,900	.....	.....
96–D–408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	5,615	11,246	11,246
95–D–402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	4,314	752	752
95–D–405 Industrial landfill V and construction/demolition landfill VII, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,600	200	200
95–D–406 Road 5–01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	1,023	.....	.....
95–D–407 219–S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000	.....	.....
94–D–400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	4,445	.....	.....
94–D–402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	282	.....	.....
94–D–404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	11,000	6,345	6,345
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	12,000	12,600	12,600
94–D–411 Solid waste operation complex Richland, WA	6,606	.....	.....
93–D–178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,900	.....	.....
93–D–181 Radioactive liquid waste line replacement, Richland, WA	5,000	.....	.....

93–D–182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	19,795	8,100	8,100
93–D–187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	19,700	20,000	20,000
92–D–171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	1,105	.....	.....
92–D–188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	1,100	.....	.....
90–D–172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	2,000	.....	.....
90–D–177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID	1,428	.....	.....
90–D–178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID	2,606	.....	.....
89–D–173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	800	.....	.....
89–D–174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,500	11,500	11,500
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,885	10,000	10,000
83–D–148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	1,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	174,604	88,327	88,327
Total, Waste management	2,470,598	1,536,653	1,675,053
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	1,447,108	818,664	1,215,718
Construction:			
97–D–450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	.....	7,900	7,900
97–D–451 B–Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	.....	1,500	1,500
96–D–406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	.....	60,672	60,672
96–D–457 Thermal treatment system, Richland, WA	1,000	.....	.....
96–D–458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	885	.....	.....
96–D–461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,539	.....	6,790
96–D–464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,952	10,440	10,440
96–D–468 Residue elimination project, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Co	33,100	.....	.....
97–D–470 Environment monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	.....	.....	2,500
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	1,500	.....	8,541
97–D–473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	.....	.....	2,000
95–E–600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, WA	.....	.....	7,900
95–D–155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,900	.....	4,137
95–D–156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River, SC	6,000	.....	.....
95–D–454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA	3,500	.....	.....
95–D–456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	8,382	4,645	4,645
94–D–122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	5,000	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
94–D–401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,074		547
94–D–412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000		
94–D–415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, INEL, ID	3,601		
94–D–451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,940		
93–D–147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,130		
92–D–123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	9,560		
92–D–125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	7,000		
92–D–181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID	6,883		
91–D–127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	2,800		
Subtotal, Construction	114,746	85,157	117,572
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization	1,561,854	903,821	1,333,290
Compliance and program coordination	31,251		
Construction:			
95–E–600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	15,000		
Total, Compliance and program coordination	46,251		
Site operations		297,054	
Construction:			
96–D–461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID		6,790	
97–D–470 Environment monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, SC		2,500	
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC		8,541	
97–D–473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, Aiken, SC		2,000	
95–E–600 Hazardous materials management and emergency response training center, Richland, WA		7,900	
95–D–155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC		4,137	

94–D–401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	.....	547	.....
Total, Site operations	.....	329,469	.....
Technology development	440,510	303,771	303,771
Transportation management	13,158	.....	.....
Analysis, education and risk management	90,022	.....	.....
Policy and management	.....	48,155	33,155
Environmental science program	.....	52,136	62,136
Environmental management privatization	.....	185,000	150,000
Program direction	.....	446,511	439,011
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	6,261,772	5,567,710	5,773,610
Savannah river pension refund	−37,000	−8,000	−8,000
Use of prior year balances	−667,240	−150,400	−150,400
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	5,557,532	5,409,310	5,615,210
FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621):			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management Privatization initiative, various locations	.....	182,000	182,000
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES:			
Other national security programs:			
Nonproliferation and national security:			
Verification and control technology:			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	246,142	194,919	221,919
Arms control	160,964	181,244	214,144
Intelligence	42,336	29,185	34,185
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	449,442	405,348	470,248
Emergency management	23,321	16,794	16,794
Nuclear safeguards and security	83,395	47,208	47,208
Security investigations	20,000	22,000	20,000
Program direction—NN	.....	95,622	95,622
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	576,158	586,972	649,872

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	.....	53,094	53,094
Security evaluations	14,707	.....	.....
Nuclear safety	17,679	.....	.....
Program direction—EH	.....	10,706	10,706
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	32,386	63,800	63,800
Worker and community transition	82,500	62,659	62,659
Program direction—WT	.....	4,341	4,341
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	82,500	67,000	67,000
Fissile materials disposition	70,000	73,163	73,163
Program direction—MD	.....	3,633	3,633
Construction:			
97–D–140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	.....	17,000	17,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials control/disposition	70,000	93,796	93,796
Nuclear energy (Defense):			
International nuclear safety	.....	66,200	66,200
Nuclear security	.....	6,000	6,000
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	.....	72,200	72,200
Total, Other national security programs	761,044	883,768	946,668
Naval reactors:			
Naval reactors development	652,568	623,130	623,130
Construction:			
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations	6,600	8,200	8,200
97–D–201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID	.....	400	400
95–D–200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	11,300	4,800	4,800

95–D–201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,800	500	500
93–D–200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	3,900	.....	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,000	8,000	8,000
Subtotal, Construction	29,600	21,900	21,900
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	682,168	645,030	645,030
Program direction	.....	18,902	18,902
Total, Naval reactors	682,168	663,932	663,932
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,443,212	1,547,700	1,610,600
Use of prior year balances	−70,000	.....	−3,767
Fiscal year 1996 supplemental appropriations (Public Law 104–134)	15,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,388,212	1,547,700	1,606,833
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL:			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	248,400	200,000	200,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	10,654,458	11,049,012	11,582,645
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION:			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,260	4,000	4,000
Fiscal year 1996 Supplemental (by transfer) (Public Law 104–134)	(5,500)	.....	.....
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	3,472	3,989	3,989
Purchase power and wheeling	26,430	23,456	23,456
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,902	27,445	27,445
Use of prior year balances	−10,059	−6,545	−13,586

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	19,843	20,900	13,859
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION:			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses	20,897	2,793	2,793
Purchase power and wheeling	1,464	1,095	1,095
Program direction	.....	17,862	17,862
Construction	7,931	6,054	6,054
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,292	27,804	27,804
Use of prior year balances	−514	−904	−2,594
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	29,778	26,900	25,210
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION:			
Operation and maintenance:			
Construction and rehabilitation	51,125	29,764	29,764
System operation and maintenance	125,255	33,453	33,453
Purchase power and wheeling	93,709	74,235	74,235
Program direction	.....	105,807	105,807
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,283	5,432	5,432
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	275,372	248,691	248,691
Use of prior year balances	−17,720	−30,800	−47,109
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(4,556)	(3,774)	(3,774)
Fiscal year 1996 Supplemental (transfer out) (Public Law 104–134)	(−5,500)	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	257,652	217,891	201,582

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND:			
Operation and maintenance	1,000	970	970
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	312,533	270,661	245,621
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	146,290	159,397	152,290
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	−15,000	.....	−6,000
FERC revenues	−131,290	−159,397	−146,290
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	.....	.....	.....
FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621)			
Energy Supply, Research and Development:			
Basic sciences:			
96–E–300, Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	.....	13,000	.....
General Science and Research Activities:			
High energy physics:			
94–G–304, B–factory, SLAC	.....	35,100	.....
92–G–302, Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	.....	36,750	.....
Nuclear physics:			
91–G–300, Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	.....	131,216	.....
Subtotal, General Science and Research Activities	.....	203,066	.....
TOTAL, FIXED ASSET ACQUISITIONS (SEC. 621)	.....	216,066	.....
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	151,600	200,028	200,028

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1996	$170,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	170,000,000
Committee recommendation	165,000,000

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

The Committee recommendation for the Appalachian Regional Commission totals $165,000,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request of fiscal year 1997. An appropriation of $104,000,000 is recommended for ARC highways.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1996	$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	17,000,000
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

An appropriation of $17,000,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1997. This is the same as the budget request.

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

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1996	$343,000
Budget estimate, 1997	342,000
Committee recommendation	

Consistent with action taken last year on the Energy and Water Development Act, the Committee recommends termination of the Office of the U.S. Commissioner of the Delaware River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of compact States to work cooperatively to develop water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries without the Office of the Federal Cochairman.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1996	$428,000
Budget estimate, 1997	534,000
Committee recommendation	500,000

An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended by the Committee for the fiscal year 1997 contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission. This appropriation provides the Federal contribution to the annual expenses of the Commission.

Due to the severe budgetary limitations, the Committee has recommended that the contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission be held at the current year's level.

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1996	$511,000
Budget estimate, 1997	508,000
Committee recommendation	508,000

The Committee recommendation includes $508,000 for the contribution to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. This is the same as the budget request.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created by compact among the States in the basin: Maryland, West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination, and assistance.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1996	$468,300,000
Budget estimate, 1997	475,300,000
Committee recommendation	471,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1996	$457,300,000
Budget estimate, 1997	457,800,000
Committee recommendation	457,300,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1996	$11,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	17,500,000
Committee recommendation	14,500,000

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the nuclear waste fund, by assessing licenses and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $471,800,000 for fiscal year 1997, a reduction from both the administration's budget request and the fiscal year 1996 level.

The reduction recommended by the Committee for activities of the NRC reflect the ongoing budgetary constraints and the need to restrain the growth in Government.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1996	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1996	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1997	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

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 1997.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 1996	$2,531,000
Budget estimate, 1997	3,214,000
Committee recommendation	2,531,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,531,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. This is the same as provided for the current fiscal year.

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.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1996	$318,000
Budget estimate, 1997	322,000
Committee recommendation	

Consistent with action taken last year on the Energy and Water Development Act, the Committee recommends termination of the Office of the U.S. Commissioner of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. The Committee expresses its confidence in the ability of compact States to work cooperatively to develop water and relat-

ed resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries without the Office of the Federal Cochairman.

The Susquehanna River Basin Commission was created by compact under Public Law 91–575 among the States of Maryland, New York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission members to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Susquehanna River and its tributaries.

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1996	$250,000
Budget estimate, 1997	380,000
Committee recommendation	300,000

An appropriation of $300,000 is recommended by the Committee for the Federal contribution to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for fiscal year 1997. This appropriation provides the Federal contribution of the annual expenses of the Commission.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1996	$109,169,000
Budget estimate, 1997	120,000,000
Committee recommendation	113,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $113,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is $7,000,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1997.

The Committee recommendation provides $72,000,000 for stewardship, land and water, $8,000,000 for land between the lakes [LBL], $9,000,000 for economic development, and $20,000,000 for TVA's Environmental Research Center.

The Committee is aware of efforts by the city of Sardis, MS, to implement phase III of its master plan for economic development of the area around Sardis Lake, a reservoir constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to provide flood control and recreational benefits for the region. The Committee is also aware of the city's efforts to obtain appropriate grant program assistance from the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Committee is satisfied that grant funds provided to the city to implement phase III of its master plan would fit within the TVA's definition of economic development for such purposes, and it urges TVA to give strong consideration to the city's application.

The Committee approves of the decision by TVA to diversify its power generation base by entering into a contract to purchase power from a lignite fuel power generating plant in Mississippi. Such diversification will help TVA meet its power generating needs for the future.

Environmental Research Center.—The Committee directs TVA to continue the transition of funding to other than appropriations. TVA will immediately focus the research of the Center in those areas of greatest need for the country and areas that will leverage and attract funding from outside sources. The Committee believes that an orderly transition in the financing of its activities is warranted in order to protect the previous research investment and to allow the development of a solid customer base.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions carried in previous appropriations bills.

The Committee has included language in the act clarifying that funds made available by this act to the Department of Energy shall be used only for the purposes for which they have been provided and only in accordance with the Committee recommendations included in this report.

In addition, the Committee has included a new general provision which extends current construction repayment and water service contracts for the Bostwick District in Kansas and Nebraska; and the Frenchman-Cambridge District in Nebraska. The Committee understands that the three 40-year contracts will expire on December 31, 1996, and, if not extended, will cause unacceptable impacts on the districts involved. The Committee has reluctantly included this provision with the understanding and expectation that comprehensive authorizing legislation will be enacted to address this issue. The Committee will not carry this provision on an annual basis if the authorizing committees cannot complete action to extend or renew construction repayment and water service contracts for these and other contracts which will expire in the near future.

In addition, the Committee has included a new general provision regarding scientific review of the Bonneville Power Administration's fish and wildlife programs. The Committee believes that successful implementation of the Northwest Power Planning Council's fish and wildlife program would be benefited by the advice of independent scientists with expertise on the enhancement of Columbia River fish and wildlife. The Committee believes that the National Academy of Sciences is best suited to recommend such individuals to the council for its appointment, and that scientists should have expertise in Columbia River basin issues.

The Bonneville Power Administration's [BPA] annual fish and wildlife budget for the council's program totals well over $100,000,000. Its purpose is to protect, mitigate, and enhance fish and wildlife populations along the Columbia an Snake River system. The Committee recognizes that the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority [CBFWA] is presently responsible for prioritizing council program measures and making recommendations to the council on projects to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget. CBFWA's advice is important. CBFWA members, however, are also the Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies and the tribes that financially benefit from the program. The Committee believes that independent scientific review would remove any suggestion of conflict of interest in prioritizing programs, and add an important element of scientific review to the council decisionmaking process.

The bill language seeks to ensure that Northwest ratepayer dollars are being well spent in a cost-effective and objective manner. The bill language requires that the panel review projects to ensure that projects are funded that benefit fish and wildlife in the region; have a clearly defined objective and outcome; are based on sound science principles; and employ cost-effective measures. The Committee intends that the panel will take the recommendations of CBFWA and carefully review those recommendations based upon these criteria. The panel shall, in turn, make its own recommendations to the council on whether or not specific projects should be funded. If the council does not follow the advice of the panel, it is to explain in writing the basis for its decision. The Committee understands that ocean conditions are a contributing factor to the health of fish and wildlife populations in the region, and has directed the council to consider the impacts of ocean conditions in making its recommendations to BPA to fund projects. The bill language expressly state the council, after review of CBFWA and panel recommendations, has the authority to make final recommendations to BPA on project(s) to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget.

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

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

The recommended appropriations in title III, Department of Energy, generally are subject to annual authorization. However, the Congress has not enacted an annual Department of Energy authorization bill for several years, with the exception of the programs funded within the atomic energy defense activities which are authorized in annual defense authorization acts. The authorization for the atomic energy defense activities, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1997, has passed the Senate.

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

In title IV, independent agencies, the recommended appropriation for the Appalachian Regional Commission is $165,000,000.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the accompanying bill was ordered reported from the Committee, subject to amendment and subject to the subcommittee allocation, by recorded vote of 28–0.

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Hatfield	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Mack	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Jeffords	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Johnston	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Bumpers	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kerrey	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	

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

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

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

Section 101 amends section 401(a) of Public Law 99–662 as follows:

TITLE IV—FLOOD CONTROL

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION.—The following works of improvement for the control of destructive flood-

waters are adopted and authorized to be prosecuted by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended in the respective reports designated in this subsection, except as otherwise provided in this subsection:

* * * * * * *

ARKANSAS CITY, KANSAS

The project for flood control, Arkansas City, Kansas: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated September 9, 1985, at a total cost of **[**$14,500,000**]** *$38,500,000*, with an estimated first Federal cost of **[**$10,880,000**]** *$19,250,000*, and an estimated first non-Federal cost of **[**$3,620,000**]** *$19,250,000.*

Section 103 amends section 101(a)(25) of Public Law 101–640 as follows:

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) PROJECTS WITH REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.—Except as provided in this subsection, the following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, recommended in the respective reports designated in this subsection:

* * * * * * *

(25) MOOREFIELD, WEST VIRGINIA.—The project for flood control, Moorefield, West Virginia: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated July 23, 1990, at a total cost of **[**$16,260,000**]** *$26,200,000*, with an estimated first Federal cost of **[**$11,675,000**]** *$20,300,000* and an estimated first non-Federal cost of **[**$4,585,000**]** *$5,900,000*.

Section 104 amends section 301(a)(25) of Public Law 99–662 as follows:

TITLE III—INLAND WATERWAY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF PROJECTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION.— The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation are authorized to be prosecuted by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended in the respective reports designated in this subsection, except as otherwise provided in this subsection:

* * * * * * *

LOCK AND DAM 7 REPLACEMENT, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA

The project for navigation, lock and dam 7 replacement, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania: Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated September 24, 1984, with such modifications (including acquisition of lands for fish and wildlife mitigation) as the Secretary determines are advisable, at a total cost of [$123,000,000] *$181,000,000*, with a first Federal cost of [$123,000,000] *$181,000,000.*

The proviso under "Construction Program" of title II, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation amends section 301 of Public Law 102–250 as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

Section 504 of title V amends the Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act, Public Law 96-501, by adding the following:

"(4)(g)(4) INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL.—(i) The Northwest Power Planning Council (Council) shall appoint an Independent Scientific Review Panel (Panel), which shall be comprised of five members, to review projects proposed to be funded through that portion of the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) annual fish and wildlife budget that implements the Council's annual fish and wildlife program. Members shall be appointed from a list submitted by the National Academy of Sciences, provided that Pacific Northwest scientists with expertise in Columbia river anadramous and nonanadramous fish and wildlife and ocean experts shall be represented on the Panel. The Council shall appoint members to the Panel that do not have a financial interest in the projects to be reviewed, other than any compensation that may be provided for performing its functions on the Panel. Panel employees may be compensated and shall be considered as special government employees subject to 45 CFR 684.10 through 684.22.

"(ii) The Panel shall review projects proposed to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget and make recommendations on matters related to each project to the Council. Project recommendations shall be based on a determination that each project: is based on sound science principles; benefits fish and wildlife; has a clearly defined objective and outcome with provisions for monitoring and evaluation of results; and employs cost-effective measures to achieve its objective. The Panel shall review, on an annual basis, prior year expenditures based upon

these criteria and submit its findings to the Council for its review.

"(iii) The Council shall fully consider the findings of the Panel when making its final recommendations for projects to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget, and if the Council does not incorporate a recommendation of the Panel, the Council shall explain in writing its reasons for not accepting the Panel's recommendations. The Council shall also take into consideration the impact of ocean conditions on fish and wildlife populations in making its recommendations to the BPA. The Council, after consideration of the recommendations of the Panel and other entities, shall be responsible for making the final recommendations of projects to be funded through BPA's annual fish and wildlife budget.".

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

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

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1997: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Defense discretionary	11,600	11,600	11,233	[1] 10,928
Nondefense discretionary	8,708	8,708	8,969	8,956
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1997	.....	.....	.....	[2] 13,051
1998	.....	.....	.....	5,929
1999	.....	.....	.....	861
2000	.....	.....	.....	74
2001 and future year	.....	.....	.....	51
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1997 in bill	NA	160	NA	7

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

NA: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Item	1996 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1996 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	$121,767,000	$142,500,000	$154,557,000	+$32,790,000	+$12,057,000
Construction, general	804,573,000	914,000,000	1,024,195,000	+219,622,000	+110,195,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	307,885,000	292,500,000	312,513,000	+4,628,000	+20,013,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,703,697,000	1,663,000,000	1,700,358,000	−1,339,000	+37,358,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 104–134)	30,000,000	.....	.....	−30,000,000	.....
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	.....	−11,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	10,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	.....	−5,000,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 104–134)	135,000,000	.....	.....	−135,000,000	.....
General expenses	151,500,000	153,000,000	153,000,000	+1,500,000	.....
Oil spill research	850,000	850,000	.....	−850,000	−850,000
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	3,366,272,000	3,292,850,000	3,455,623,000	+89,351,000	+162,773,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	18,905,000	25,827,000	25,827,000	+6,922,000	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	18,503,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	−6,803,000	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,485,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	−485,000	.....
Program oversight and administration	1,246,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	−146,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	44,139,000	43,627,000	43,627,000	−512,000	.....

Bureau of Reclamation					
General investigations	12,684,000	15,095,000	18,105,000	+5,421,000	+3,010,000
Construction program	411,046,000	392,524,000	410,494,000	−552,000	+17,970,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 104–134)	9,000,000	.....	.....	−9,000,000	.....
Operation and maintenance	273,076,000	292,876,000	280,876,000	+7,800,000	−12,000,000
Loan program	11,668,000	12,715,000	12,715,000	+1,047,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	.....	.....
General administrative expenses	48,150,000	48,971,000	48,971,000	+821,000	.....
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(−4,556,000)	(−3,774,000)	(−3,774,000)	(+782,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	43,579,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	−5,579,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	809,203,000	800,181,000	809,161,000	−42,000	+8,980,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	853,342,000	843,808,000	852,788,000	−554,000	+8,980,000
(By transfer)	(−4,556,000)	(−3,774,000)	(−3,774,000)	(+782,000)	.....
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	2,727,407,000	3,020,497,000	2,749,043,000	+21,636,000	−271,454,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	64,197,000	70,000,000	42,200,000	−21,997,000	−27,800,000
Gross revenues	−34,903,000	−42,200,000	−42,200,000	−7,297,000	.....
Net appropriation	29,294,000	27,800,000	.....	−29,294,000	−27,800,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	278,807,000	240,200,000	220,200,000	−58,607,000	−20,000,000
General Science and Research Activities	981,000,000	1,009,150,000	1,000,626,000	+19,626,000	−8,524,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	151,600,000	200,028,000	200,028,000	+48,428,000	.....
Departmental Administration	366,697,000	244,863,000	218,017,000	−148,680,000	−26,846,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−122,306,000	−125,388,000	−125,388,000	−3,082,000	.....
Net appropriation	244,391,000	119,475,000	92,629,000	−151,762,000	−26,846,000
Office of the Inspector General	25,000,000	29,605,000	23,103,000	−1,897,000	−6,502,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:					
Defense function	(5,557,532,000)	(5,591,310,000)	(5,543,810,000)	(−13,722,000)	(−47,500,000)
Non-defense function	(900,348,000)	(891,614,000)	(822,346,000)	(−78,002,000)	(−69,268,000)
Total	(6,457,880,000)	(6,482,924,000)	(6,366,156,000)	(−91,724,000)	(−116,768,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—Continued

Item	1996 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1996 appropriation	Budget estimate
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons Activities	3,460,314,000	3,710,002,000	3,978,602,000	+518,288,000	+268,600,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	5,557,532,000	5,409,310,000	5,615,210,000	+57,678,000	+205,900,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)	.....	182,000,000	182,000,000	+182,000,000	.....
Other Defense Activities	1,388,212,000	1,547,700,000	1,606,833,000	+218,621,000	+59,133,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	248,400,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	−48,400,000	.....
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,654,458,000	11,049,012,000	11,582,645,000	+928,187,000	+533,633,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	4,260,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	−260,000	.....
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	.....	.....	(−5,500,000)	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	19,843,000	20,900,000	13,859,000	−5,984,000	−7,041,000
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	29,778,000	26,900,000	25,210,000	−4,568,000	−1,690,000
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	257,652,000	217,891,000	201,582,000	−56,070,000	−16,309,000
(Transfer out)	(−5,500,000)	.....	.....	(+5,500,000)	.....
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(4,556,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(−782,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,000,000	970,000	970,000	−30,000	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	312,533,000	270,661,000	245,621,000	−66,912,000	−25,040,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	131,290,000	159,397,000	146,290,000	+15,000,000	−13,107,000
Revenues applied	−131,290,000	−159,397,000	−146,290,000	−15,000,000	+13,107,000
Fixed asset acquisitions (sec. 621)	.....	216,066,000	.....	.....	−216,066,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,404,490,000	16,182,494,000	16,113,895,000	+709,405,000	−68,599,000

(By transfer)	(10,056,000)	(3,774,000)	(3,774,000)	(−6,282,000)	.....
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	170,000,000	165,000,000	−5,000,000	−5,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	.....	.....
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	343,000	342,000	.....	−343,000	−342,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	428,000	534,000	500,000	+72,000	−34,000
Total	771,000	876,000	500,000	−271,000	−376,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:					
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	511,000	508,000	508,000	−3,000	.....
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	468,300,000	475,300,000	471,800,000	+3,500,000	−3,500,000
Revenues	−457,300,000	−457,800,000	−457,300,000	.....	+500,000
Subtotal	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	−3,000,000
Office of Inspector General	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....
Revenues	−5,000,000	−5,000,000	−5,000,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	11,000,000	17,500,000	14,500,000	+3,500,000	−3,000,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,531,000	3,214,000	2,531,000	.....	−683,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	318,000	322,000	.....	−318,000	−322,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	250,000	380,000	300,000	+50,000	−80,000
Total	568,000	702,000	300,000	−268,000	−402,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—Continued

Item	1996 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1996 appropriation	Budget estimate
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	109,169,000	120,000,000	113,000,000	+3,831,000	−7,000,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	311,550,000	329,800,000	313,339,000	+1,789,000	−16,461,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	19,935,654,000	20,648,952,000	20,735,645,000	+799,991,000	+86,693,000
(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	.....	.....	(−5,500,000)	.....