Calendar No. 401

105TH CONGRESS, *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 105–206

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1999

JUNE 5, 1998.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2138]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 2138) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1999

Budget estimates considered by Senate	$21,725,462,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	21,371,266,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Below the budget estimate, 1999	−354,196,000
Over enacted bill, 1998	109,359,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

TITLE II

TITLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1999 beginning October 1, 1998, and ending September 30, 1999, 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 1999 budget estimates for the bill total $21,725,462,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $21,371,266,000. This is $354,196,000 below the budget estimates and $109,359,000 over the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 302(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals $21,077,000,000 in budget authority and $20,720,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1999 in budget authority and outlays.

The Committee allocation for nondefense discretionary funding for fiscal year 1999 is essentially a freeze, $9,047,000,000 in budget authority, but is $57,000,000 below the budget request in outlays. This constrained budget situation combined with the administration's totally irresponsible action in under funding ongoing projects of the Corps of Engineers by $1,300,000,000 below the efficient rate to keep projects proceeding without significant delay, has placed extreme demands on the available nondefense discretionary resources available to the Committee. The Corps testified that the budget presented by the administration would conservatively result in a estimated $376,300,000 in increased costs to the Federal Government and $3,900,000,000 in forgone benefits.

The defense discretionary allocation of $12,030,000,000 in budget authority is $268,000,000 below the budget request for the subcommittee, and $55,000,000 below the budget request for outlays.

Again, in order to meet the outlay target, the subcommittee has to reduce defense activities and programs from the request by $350,000,000.

Faced with severely constrained budget resources and the totally unacceptable reductions in the Corp of Engineers' water resource development program, the Committee has not been able to include new construction starts, and has applied available resources to ongoing projects. The Committee has also had to severely limit the numbers of new studies recommended for inclusion in the bill.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

In accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act, the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission submitted performance plans to the Committee in February 1998.

The Department of Energy's performance plan is improved over the previous years. Unfortunately, there is considerable inconsistency among the quality of information provided by program offices. Energy research accounts are prone to subjective and vague goals such as: increasing activities to remove barriers to U.S. companies in energy efficiency, renewables, oil and gas recovery and clean coal technology markets; or reducing the country's vulnerability to imported oil. Those goals provide no basis for the evaluation of performance and, as a result, in no way assist in the purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act.

Other programs do much better. For example, environmental management sets specific goals regarding the amount of material that will be processed at waste treatment facilities and when contracts will be awarded. Those sorts of measures should serve as a model for other program offices.

It is the Committee's observation that program offices with vague and subjective goals in the Department's performance plan lack management focus. Those programs are frequently characterized by stove pipes within internal organizations, poor technology review capability, and an inability to evaluate the merits of their own programs.

The Committee again commends the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC] on its performance plan. Interestingly, the General Accounting Office [GAO] review of the NRC performance plan found a shortcoming the Committee attributes to the NRC as a whole, later in this report. The GAO found that the NRC performance plan includes over 110 output measures for seven strategic goals. By including such a large number of output measures, NRC risks creating an excess of data that will obscure rather that clarify performance issues. The Committee joins the GAO in recommending that the NRC rank its performance goals.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $11,872,360,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Stockpile stewardship	$2,163,375,000
Stockpile management	2,076,825,000
Nonproliferation and national security	696,300,000
Other defense programs	1,658,160,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	4,293,403,000
Defense facilities closure projects	1,048,240,000
Defense environmental privatization	241,857,000

ENERGY SUPPLY

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $669,836,000 for energy research programs including:

Solar and renewable energy	$345,479,000
Nuclear fission R&D	280,662,000

NONDEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An appropriation of $456,700,000 is recommended for nondefense environmental management activities of the Department of Energy.

SCIENCE

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $2,669,560,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$691,000,000
Nuclear physics	332,600,000
Basic energy sciences	836,100,000
Biological and environmental R&D	407,600,000
Magnetic fusion	232,000,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $705,898,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$67,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	168,898,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	466,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	70,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Corps of Engineers:	
General investigations	$165,390,000
Construction	1,248,068,000
Flood control Mississippi River and tributaries	313,234,000
Operations and maintenance	1,667,572,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities	106,000,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	65,000,000
Central Valley project restoration fund	39,500,000
Water and related resource	672,119,000
Central Utah project completion	44,948,000

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,670,256,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the

area of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

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

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

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

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

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

When projects are completed, they make enormous contributions to America. The benefits derived from completed projects, in many instances, vastly exceed those contemplated during project development. In 1997, flood control projects prevented $45,500,000,000 in damages, and U.S. ports and harbors annually handle about $600,000,000,000 in international cargo generating over $150,000,000,000 in tax revenues, nearly $520,000,000,000 in personal income, contributing $783,000,000,000 to the Nation's gross domestic product, and $1,600,000,000,000 in business sales.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held three sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1999 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 1999, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

By unanimous vote of 27 to 0 the Committee on June 4, 1998, 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, 1998	$156,804,000
Budget estimate, 1999	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	165,390,000

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	1,300,000				200,000	
(SPE)	BIRMINGHAM WATERSHEDS, VILLAGE CREEK, AL	1,100,000	426,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL	5,100,000	100,000	500,000		500,000	
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	1,100,000	426,000	50,000		50,000	
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	768,000	534,000	100,000		100,000	
	ALASKA						
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	320,000	180,000	140,000		140,000	
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	637,000	304,000	200,000		200,000	
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	200,000	100,000			100,000	
	BREVIG MISSION, AK	500,000	100,000			200,000	
(FDP)	CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100,000				100,000	
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	670,000	452,000	150,000		150,000	
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	1,800,000	742,000	300,000		300,000	
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	500,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	300,000		250,000		250,000	
(N)	KENAI RIVER NAVIGATION, AK	601,000	178,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	900,000	100,000	110,000		110,000	
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	1,100,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
	NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED	100,000				100,000	
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK				209,000		225,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	791,000	781,000	10,000		10,000	
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	400,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	13,500,000	8,000		217,000		217,000
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	13,500,000			150,000		225,000
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	500,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(N)	SITKA LIGHTERING FACILITY, AK	450,000	173,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	THOMAS BASIN HARBOR, AK	100,000				100,000	

(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	471,000	100,000	118,000		218,000	
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	8,700,000			60,000		60,000
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	598,000	531,000	67,000		67,000	
	ARIZONA						
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTH SCOTTSDALE, AZ	1,975,000	1,111,000	272,000		272,000	
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	1,375,000	968,000	407,000		407,000	
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	1,930,000	1,015,000	460,000		460,000	
(E)	RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, AZ	64,100,000	50,000		938,000		938,000
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	1,985,000	940,000	610,000		610,000	
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	18,000,000	703,000		329,000		329,000
	ARKANSAS						
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	765,000	196,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	30,000,000	326,000		400,000		400,000
	CALIFORNIA						
(E)	ALISO CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	897,000	355,000	290,000		290,000	
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	28,510,000	15,773,000		50,000		50,000
(FDP)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	4,465,000	4,265,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,100,000	713,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	1,050,000	100,000	500,000		500,000	
(E)	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED STUDY, CA	1,300,000	620,000	265,000		265,000	
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	22,320,000	1,835,000		1,165,000		1,165,000
(FDP)	KERN RIVER VALLEY, ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,100,000		100,000		100,000	
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, RUSSIAN RIVER, CA	1,100,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	600,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
	MARE ISLAND STRAIT DREDGING EXPANSION, CA	100,000				100,000	
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	1,825,000	1,144,000	520,000		520,000	
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	1,300,000	350,000	300,000		300,000	
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	600,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(SPE)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	600,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	500,000	200,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, FAIRFIELD STREAMS AND CORDELIA MARSH, CA	1,400,000	250,000	300,000		300,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	1,970,000	820,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	1,070,000	750,000	200,000		200,000	
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, VACAVILLE, DIXON AND VICINITY, CA	850,000	252,000	300,000		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
(FC)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	13,997,000	50,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	70,800,000	14,256,000	.....	744,000	.....	744,000
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	1,125,000	650,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHEAD MANAGEMENT, CA	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	1,155,000	1,013,000	142,000	.....	142,000	.....
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	60,000,000	.....	.....	300,000	.....	300,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	8,840,000	1,837,000	.....	433,000	.....	433,000
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	944,000	654,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	1,100,000	70,000	30,000	.....	30,000	.....
(E)	PRADO BASIN WATER SUPPLY, CA	968,000	635,000	333,000	.....	333,000	.....
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	1,600,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	1,179,000	646,000	285,000	.....	285,000	.....
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940,000	4,894,000	555,000	.....	555,000	.....
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	12,750,000	3,293,000	3,500,000	.....	3,500,000	.....
(BE)	SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	5,900,000	198,000	.....	50,000	.....	50,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	730,000	396,000	260,000	.....	260,000	.....
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	700,000	100,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	1,100,000	640,000	460,000	.....	460,000	.....
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	1,100,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	1,525,000	1,260,000	265,000	.....	265,000	.....
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	1,165,000	349,000	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES AND MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	1,100,000	82,000	18,000	.....	18,000	.....
(FC)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREA	34,500,000	375,000	.....	900,000	.....	900,000
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	1,825,000	996,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	1,278,000	1,175,000	103,000	.....	103,000	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	1,100,000	60,000	40,000	.....	40,000	.....
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	600,000	196,000	100,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	1,470,000	609,000	535,000	.....	535,000	.....

(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	1,100,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	2,788,000	2,659,000	129,000		129,000	
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	1,600,000	345,000	400,000		800,000	
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA AND NV	1,200,000	400,000	400,000		400,000	
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	1,100,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
	TUOLUMNE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	1,000,000				200,000	
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	60,000,000	373,000		575,000		575,000
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	1,845,000	402,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	1,000,000	200,000	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	2,080,000	1,770,000	310,000		310,000	
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER, POSO AND DEER CREEKS, CA	100,000				100,000	
	COLORADO						
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO	932,000	82,000	158,000		158,000	
	CONNECTICUT						
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	700,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
	DELAWARE						
(BE)	BETHANY, SOUTH BETHANY, DE	500,000					100,000
(N)	C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE AND MD (DEEPE	69,800,000	2,550,000		600,000		600,000
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE AND NJ	3,406,000	3,355,000	51,000		51,000	
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,845,000	2,616,000	150,000		150,000	
	REHOBOTH AND DEWEY BEACHES, DE	450,000	245,000				150,000
	FLORIDA						
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	3,270,000	1,159,000	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	8,900,000	357,000		242,000		242,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	850,000	304,000	270,000		270,000	
	FT. PIERCE SHORE PROTECT, FL						300,000
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	2,200,000	338,000		262,000		262,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	4,027,000	73,000		270,000		270,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	112,500,000	82,000		600,000		600,000
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL		82,000		297,000		297,000
	LIDO KEY BEACH, FL	350,000	82,000			300,000	
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL	13,300,000	1,671,000		86,000		86,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	4,511,000	143,000		370,000		370,000
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	6,500,000			262,000		262,000

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
	ST. AUGUSTINE BEACH, FL	.....	.....	.....	.....	300,000	.....
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	18,600,000	826,000	.....	205,000	.....	205,000
	GEORGIA						
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA	800,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	29,890,000	881,000	.....	250,000	.....	250,000
(FDP)	CHATHAM COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL, GA	350,000	152,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
(FDP)	CITY OF SAVANNAH FLOOD CONTROL, GA	460,000	152,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	1,100,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	2,300,000	856,000	550,000	.....	550,000	.....
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA AND SC	840,000	100,000	350,000	.....	350,000	.....
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	55,900,000	639,000	.....	250,000	.....	250,000
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA AND SC	2,600,000	245,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	HAWAII						
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	1,350,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	1,243,000	1,107,000	136,000	.....	136,000	.....
(N)	HILO HARBOR, HI	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	982,000	82,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	6,471,000	1,129,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	1,292,000	974,000	318,000	.....	318,000	.....
(FC)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	20,800,000	.....	.....	40,000	.....	40,000
	ILLINOIS						
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,352,000	1,174,000	178,000	.....	178,000	.....
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	100,000,000	326,000	.....	300,000	.....	300,000
(RCP)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	2,245,000	82,000	479,000	.....	479,000	.....
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL AND IN	1,650,000	345,000	940,000	.....	940,000	.....
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT QUINCY, IL	1,055,000	294,000	195,000	.....	195,000	.....

(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	10,500,000	489,000	.....	325,000	.....	325,000
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	930,000	252,000	377,000	.....	377,000	.....
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	11,000,000	1,949,000	1,331,000	.....	1,331,000	.....
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	53,440,000	44,713,000	5,700,000	.....	5,700,000	.....
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	245,000	172,000	73,000	.....	73,000	.....
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, MADISON COUNTY	2,069,000	80,000	.....	175,000	.....	175,000
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	600,000	100,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
	INDIANA						
(FC)	MIDDLE WABASH, GREENFIELD BAYOU ENVIRON RESTORATION, I	3,000,000	.....	.....	200,000	.....	200,000
(E)	TIPPECANOE RIVER, IN	700,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
	IOWA						
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	700,000	82,000	218,000	.....	218,000	.....
(FDP)	INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
	KANSAS						
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	918,000	506,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS AND MO	28,600,000	159,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
	KENTUCKY						
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, KY	700,000	100,000	318,000	.....	318,000	.....
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION STUDY,	830,000	530,000	255,000	.....	255,000	.....
(FDP)	GREENUP, KY	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER TRIBUTARIES, FRANKFORT, KY	700,000	100,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FDP)	LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	1,109,000	500,000	228,000	.....	228,000	.....
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	600,000	100,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, FALMOUTH, KY	850,000	100,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	6,876,000	294,000	.....	356,000	.....	356,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	850,000	245,000	295,000	.....	295,000	.....
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	38,400,000	22,175,000	10,150,000	.....	10,150,000	.....
(FDP)	OLIVE HILL, KY	600,000	100,000	218,000	.....	218,000	.....
(FDP)	PANTHER CREEK, KY	600,000	100,000	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
(FDP)	PADUCAH, KY	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
	LOUISIANA						
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER, DARLINGTON RESERVOIR, LA	2,405,000	705,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	74,763,000	6,300,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000

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)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	71,500,000	1,705,000	.....	395,000	.....	395,000
(N)	EAST FORK CALCASIEU PASS, LA (SEC. 509)	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	4,880,000	3,789,000	550,000	.....	650,000	.....
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	3,044,000	2,616,000	428,000	.....	428,000	.....
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	2,857,000	1,822,000	550,000	.....	550,000	.....
(SP)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, LA	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS, LA	4,000,000	858,000	415,000	.....	415,000	.....
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	2,700,000	2,126,000	574,000	.....	574,000	.....
(FDP)	WALLACE LAKE AREA, LA	1,100,000	100,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	1,875,000	750,000	388,000	.....	388,000	.....
	MARYLAND						
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	3,000,000	1,153,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, NORTHWEST BRANCH, MD AND DC	2,605,000	2,497,000	108,000	.....	108,000	.....
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD AND DC	590,000	150,000	231,000	.....	231,000	.....
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD AND VA	20,200,000	468,000	.....	207,000	.....	207,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD	559,000	524,000	35,000	.....	35,000	.....
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD	7,345,000	.....	.....	50,000	.....	50,000
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	1,232,000	994,000	199,000	.....	199,000	.....
	CHESAPEAKE BAY INTEGRATED ECOSYSTEM AND ATLANTIC COAST SHELF MODEL, MD	1,100,000	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.....
(SP)	EASTERN SHORE, MD	500,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	HAVRE DE GRACE, MD	1,000,000	100,000	110,000	.....	110,000	.....
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	900,000	263,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, WICOMICO AND ST MARY'	650,000	137,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER, GEORGES CREEK, MD	540,000	230,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MD	575,000	153,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	1,650,000	1,195,000	360,000	.....	360,000	.....
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	1,100,000	613,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....

	MASSACHUSETTS						
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA AND RI	1,600,000	616,000	393,000		393,000	
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	700,000		100,000		100,000	
	MICHIGAN						
	SAULT STE. MARIE	15,300,000	816,000				500,000
	MINNESOTA						
(FC)	CROOKSTON, MN	6,100,000	495,000		255,000		255,000
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND—EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	92,000,000	3,055,000		945,000		945,000
	MISSISSIPPI						
(E)	BAYOU PIERRE, MS	1,100,000		100,000		100,000	
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, BAYOU CASOTTE EXTENSION, MS	250,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	85,056,000	82,000		400,000		400,000
	MISSOURI						
(FDP)	BALLWIN, ST LOUIS COUNTY, MO	450,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	12,000,000	877,000		457,000		457,000
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	1,079,000	746,000	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	563,000	502,000	61,000		61,000	
(FC)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	3,695,000			153,000		153,000
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO AND KS	2,010,000	277,000	245,000		545,000	
(FC)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	3,250,000			64,000		64,000
(FDP)	LOWER RIVER DES PERES, MO	408,000	378,000	30,000		30,000	
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 AND R460–471, MO	1,945,000	1,095,000	311,000		311,000	
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	800,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO AND IL	15,074,000	2,495,000		314,000		314,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	709,000	513,000	196,000		196,000	
	NEBRASKA						
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	2,800,000			74,000		74,000
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	838,000	678,000	160,000		160,000	
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	2,060,000	871,000	310,000		310,000	
	NEVADA						
(FDP)	CARSON RIVER, NV	100,000				100,000	
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	1,300,000	763,000	300,000		300,000	
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	1,223,000	993,000	230,000		230,000	

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)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, WASHOE COUNTY, NV	515,000	315,000	50,000		50,000	
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	11,250,000	4,388,000		500,000		1,700,000
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	1,050,000	400,000	150,000		400,000	
	NEW JERSEY						
	ARTHUR KILL, PERTH AMBOY CHANNEL, NJ	100,000				100,000	
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	2,400,000	467,000	400,000		400,000	
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	1,540,000	467,000	400,000		400,000	
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	415,000	150,000	100,000		100,000	
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	1,775,000	959,000	325,000		325,000	
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	2,800,000	1,470,000	382,000		382,000	
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	800,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	800,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
	NEW MEXICO						
(E)	RIO GRANDE WATER MANAGEMENT, NM, CO AND TX	1,100,000		210,000		210,000	
(E)	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	1,100,000		210,000		210,000	
	NEW YORK						
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	1,105,000	305,000	92,000		92,000	
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	45,400,000	3,938,000		845,000		845,000
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	800,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER BASIN AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	800,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY AND PA	1,500,000	431,000	400,000		400,000	
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	1,175,000	82,000	250,000		250,000	
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	2,399,000	1,063,000	250,000		250,000	
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY	1,000,000		100,000		100,000	
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	1,850,000	1,384,000	300,000		300,000	
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY	800,000	100,000	100,000		100,000	
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY AND NJ	9,100,000	1,198,000	7,902,000		7,902,000	

(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	1,200,000	574,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	1,750,000	716,000	210,000	.....	210,000	.....
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	1,020,000	747,000	125,000	.....	125,000	.....
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,100,000	222,000	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	2,100,000	755,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA AND MD	1,450,000	1,040,000	320,000	.....	320,000	.....
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	1,300,000	468,000	351,000	.....	351,000	.....
(E)	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN ENVIRON RESTORATION, NY	1,200,000	263,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	NORTH CAROLINA						
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	.....	3,363,000	.....	658,000	.....	658,000
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,097,000	1,755,000	342,000	.....	342,000	.....
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, EASTERN BAND CHEROKEE NATIO	700,000	50,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC	455,000	50,000	305,000	.....	305,000	.....
	NORTH DAKOTA						
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	4,445,000	2,373,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
	OHIO						
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	1,600,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	GREAT MIAMI RIVER, OXBOW AREA, OH	900,000	100,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	750,000	75,000	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	650,000	50,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	800,000	82,000	223,000	.....	223,000	.....
	OKLAHOMA						
(FDP)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM AND CO	1,470,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
	OREGON						
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA	4,228,000	3,522,000	335,000	.....	335,000	.....
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR AND WA	52,500,000	.....	.....	300,000	.....	300,000
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	970,000	543,000	275,000	.....	275,000	.....
(E)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR AND WA	1,600,000	.....	100,000	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	1,100,000	82,000	168,000	.....	168,000	.....
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR AND WA	1,146,000	405,000	240,000	.....	240,000	.....
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,284,000	1,643,000	440,000	.....	440,000	.....
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	1,465,000	82,000	278,000	.....	278,000	.....
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	62,000,000	3,100,000	.....	29,000	.....	29,000

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
	PENNSYLVANIA						
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	800,000	100,000	210,000		210,000	
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	1,875,000	73,000		227,000		227,000
(E)	LOWER WEST BR, SUS RIVER, ENV RESTORATION, BUFFALO CRE	1,000,000	500,000	120,000		120,000	
(FDP)	LOWER WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, LYCOMING CREEK, P	900,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, BRUSH CREEK ENV RESTORATION, PA	450,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, LYONS RUN ENV RESTORATION, PA	450,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	450,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE, PA	625,000	477,000	148,000		148,000	
	PUERTO RICO						
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	21,200,000	709,000		600,000		600,000
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	8,900,000	368,000		306,000		306,000
	RHODE ISLAND						
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST AND SRTM DMG REDU	700,000	250,000	350,000		350,000	
	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	200,000				200,000	
	SOUTH CAROLINA						
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,100,000	508,000	500,000		500,000	
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	1,600,000	100,000	175,000		175,000	
(SP)	PAWLEY'S ISLAND, SC	800,000	100,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	3,119,000	764,000	150,000		150,000	
(E)	YADKIN-PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC AND NC	1,615,000	345,000	150,000		150,000	
	SOUTH DAKOTA						
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER, SD AND ND	900,000		90,000		90,000	
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	10,790,000	153,000		380,000		380,000
	TENNESSEE						
(FDP)	DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	100,000				100,000	

(E)	DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	900,000	100,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FC)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	4,000,000	122,000	.....	250,000	.....	250,000
(FDP)	NOLICKUCKY WATERSHED, TN	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.....
(E)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	650,000	100,000	250,000	.....	250,000	.....
	TEXAS						
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	2,150,000	150,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,740,000	1,089,000	280,000	.....	280,000	.....
(E)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	2,145,000	1,189,000	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	53,200,000	4,707,000	.....	1,330,000	.....	1,330,000
(FC)	FORT WORTH SUMPS 14 AND 15, UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN,	11,050,000	57,000	.....	490,000	.....	490,000
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	3,900,000	269,000	935,000	.....	935,000	.....
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	4,600,000	2,672,000	1,100,000	.....	1,100,000	.....
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	3,800,000	239,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
(FC)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN)	6,100,000	86,000	.....	64,000	.....	64,000
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	163,166,000	4,431,000	.....	600,000	.....	600,000
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	82,235,000	500,000	.....	500,000	.....	500,000
(FC)	JOHNSON CREEK, UPPER TRINITY BASIN, ARLINGTON, TX	.....	.....	.....	600,000	.....	600,000
(FDP)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	1,510,000	416,000	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	40,050,000	2,758,000	.....	1,050,000	.....	1,050,000
	NORTH PACKERY FLOOD PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL ESTORATION, TX	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	1,500,000	.....
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	950,000	206,000	180,000	.....	180,000	.....
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	3,300,000	.....	.....	350,000	.....	350,000
(E)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	832,000	613,000	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	72,502,000	436,000	.....	400,000	.....	400,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	3,100,000	82,000	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	137,455,000	5,094,000	.....	600,000	.....	600,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	8,235,000	6,520,000	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....
	UTAH						
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	1,495,000	695,000	150,000	.....	150,000	.....
	VIRGIN ISLANDS						
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	3,260,000	.....	.....	130,000	.....	130,000
	VIRGINIA						
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	1,168,000	100,000	425,000	.....	425,000	.....

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
(SPE)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	1,451,000	300,000	450,000		450,000	
(N)	JAMES RIVER, VA	720,000	100,000	190,000		190,000	
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	800,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
(FDP)	POQUOSON, VA	625,000	375,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	1,075,000	300,000	400,000		400,000	
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	950,000	100,000	250,000		250,000	
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	825,000	100,000	200,000		200,000	
	WASHINGTON						
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	3,341,000			176,000		
(N)	BLAIR WATERWAY, TACOMA HARBOR, WA	427,000	378,000	49,000			
	CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	250,000				250,000	
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	1,117,000	689,000	428,000		428,000	
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	11,250,000	200,000		600,000		600,000
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	799,000	398,000	100,000		100,000	
	OCEAN SHORES, WA	100,000				100,000	
	TRICITIES AREA, WA	550,000				550,000	
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	2,124,000	919,000	665,000		665,000	
(FDP)	RODEO LAKE, OTHELLO, WA	100,000				100,000	
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	2,548,000	1,094,000	678,000		678,000	
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	955,000	540,000	156,000		156,000	
	WEST VIRGINIA						
(E)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, BEAVER CREEK ENVIRON RESTORATION, W	877,000	392,000	215,000		215,000	
(E)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, SOVERN RUN ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV	800,000	563,000	137,000		137,000	
	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	700,000				500,000	
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	13,000,000	11,671,000	800,000		800,000	
	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	500,000				500,000	
(FDP)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	800,000	100,000	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	7,800,000			240,000		240,000

(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	1,375,000	1,306,000	69,000		69,000	
(E)	TYGART THREE-WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FORDS RU	445,000	175,000	100,000		100,000	
(E)	TYGART THREE-WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MAPLE RU	650,000	363,000	287,000		287,000	
(FC)	WEST VIRGINIA STATEWIDE FLOOD PROTECTION PLAN	2,000,000	400,000			624,000	
	WYOMING						
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	1,482,000	1,280,000	202,000		202,000	
	MISCELLANEOUS						
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION			1,500,000		1,500,000	
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES			100,000		100,000	
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA			500,000		500,000	
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES			9,400,000		9,400,000	
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES			600,000		600,000	
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES			1,900,000		1,900,000	
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS			8,400,000		8,400,000	
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES			5,300,000		7,500,000	
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)			450,000		450,000	
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT			400,000		400,000	
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT			30,000,000		30,000,000	
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS			100,000		100,000	
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)			900,000		900,000	
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS			850,000		850,000	
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER			650,000		650,000	
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE			−25,777,000		−24,377,000	
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	123,151,000	26,849,000	136,376,000	29,014,000		

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

Alabama River below Claiborne lock and dam, Alabama.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $200,000 for the Corps to undertake feasibility studies for measures to improve the reliability of the navigation channel in the Alabama River below the Claiborne Dam. This study is essential if the lower Alabama River area is to realize the full economic potential of the Alabama River navigation project.

Anchorage Harbor deepening, Alaska.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to complete the reconnaissance study for deepening Anchorage Harbor, AK.

Brevig Mission, AK.—An amount of $200,000 is provided for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility studies for harbor improvements at Brevig Mission, AK.

Chandalar River watershed, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of the hydrology and water resource management problems in the Chandalar River watershed in Alaska.

Naknek River watershed, Alaska.—An appropriation of $100,000 is included for a reconnaissance study of the hydrology and other conditions affecting fisheries Naknek River watershed downstream of King Salmon and Kvichak Bay in Alaska.

Nome Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided an additional $16,000 over the budget request for the Nome Harbor project in Alaska for the Corps to expedite completion of the preconstruction engineering design at the harbor.

Seward Harbor, AK.—An appropriation of $225,000, an increase of $75,000, is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering design on the Seward, AK, harbor project.

Thomas Basin Harbor improvements, Alaska.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study of possible navigation and harbor improvements at Thomas basin in Alaska.

Valdez Harbor, AK.—An additional amount of $100,000 over the budget request has been included for the Corps to expedite the feasibility phase of expanding the harbor at Valdez, AK.

Mare Island Strait dredging expansion, California.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to determine the feasibility of Federal participation in dredging and maintaining channels on the eastern shore of Mare Island Strait in California.

Napa Valley watershed management, California.—Funding of $100,000 is recommended for the Napa Valley Watershed Management study in California. This reconnaissance study is needed to identify solutions to water management issues on the Napa River and tributaries upstream of the city of Napa, CA.

Santa Margarita River and tributaries (Murrieta Creek), CA.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $400,000 over the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to complete feasibility studies for flood control on Murrieta Creek.

Tuolumne River and tributaries, California.—An amount of $200,000 is recommended for the Tuolumnue River and tributaries study in California for the Corps to complete the reconnaissance phase and continue into the feasibility phase. The study will enable

the Corps to investigate the feasibility of identified options for increased flood control protection and other benefits.

White River, Poso, and Deer Creeks, CA.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study of the need for providing flood protection along the White River, Poso and Deer Creeks in the area of Earlimart, CA, in Tulare and Kern Counties.

Rehoboth and Dewey Beaches, DE.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to advance preconstruction engineering design of the Rehoboth and Dewey Beaches portion of the Delaware coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, DE, project.

Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach, DE.—Funding of $100,000 is recommended for the Corps to undertake preconstruction engineering and design on the Bethany Beach to South Bethany Beach portion of the Delaware coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, DE, project.

Fort Pierce shore protection, St. Lucie County, FL.—An amount of $300,000 has been provided for the Corps to complete a general reevaluation report for extending the authorized Fort Pierce, FL, shore protection project.

Lido Key, Sarasota County, FL.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the Corps to complete the feasibility study for the Lido Key, Sarasota County, FL, project.

St. Augustine Beach, FL.—Funding of $300,000 has been included for the Corps to complete the general reevaluation report for the St. Augustine Beach project in Florida.

Savannah River Basin comprehensive water resources study, Georgia and South Carolina.—An amount of $300,000, the full budget request, is recommended for the Corps to continue the comprehensive study to address the current and future needs for flood damage prevention and reduction, water supply, and other related water resource needs in the Savannah River basin in Georgia and South Carolina. The study is to be limited to an analysis of water resource issues that fall within the traditional civil works mission of the Corps.

Hilo Harbor, HI.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to initiate an expedited reconnaissance study of improvements at Hilo Harbor, HI. The study will include identification of possible modifications, determination of Federal interest, and preparation of a project study plan.

Kahului Harbor, HI.—An amount of $100,000 is provided for the Corps of Engineers to initiate an expedited reconnaissance study which would determine whether there is Federal interest in modifying the Kahului Deep Draft Harbor, HI, to increase cargo transportation efficiency and to prepare a plan of study.

Indian Creek, Council Bluffs, IA.—An appropriation of $100,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete the reconnaissance phase of the Indian Creek, Council Bluffs, IA, study. The study will determine the flood hazard associated with Indian Creek and develop alternative to mitigate this hazards.

Upper Mississippi River navigation study, Illinois and Iowa.—The Committee has provided the full budget request of $5,700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Upper Mississippi River

navigation study. Given the importance of this study, the Corps should take appropriate steps to maintain the current completion schedule.

Greenup, KY, flood damage reduction.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study to determine the feasibility of flood damage reduction measures along the Ohio River at Greenup, KY.

Paducah, KY.—The Committee has included $100,000 for a reconnaissance study, including a full condition analysis and identification of costs and priorities for updating, replacing or modifying major project features in the vicinity of Paducah, KY.

Calcasieu Lock, LA.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to conduct a reconnaissance study to determine the feasibility and advisability of modifying the Calcasieu lock, Louisiana, to reduce navigation traffic congestion.

Chesapeake Bay integrated ecosystem and Atlantic coast shelf model, Maryland.—An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended for the Chesapeake Bay integrated ecosystem and Atlantic coast shelf model study to allow the Corps of Engineers to support the development and integration of this regional model of comprehensive hydrodynamic and water quality simulation in the near-coastal Atlantic and the Chesapeake Bay.

Eastern Shore, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study of the water resources problems in watersheds of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The Committee understands that the area is experiencing a variety of problems with its water resources including the outbreak of Pfiesteria which has resulted in the closure of several rivers recently. Given its expertise in watershed management, the Committee believes the Corps of Engineers can provide invaluable assistance in assessing coastal and riparian changes and processes, and evaluating needed improvements to address this problem.

Ocean City and vicinity, Assateague Island, MD.—The Committee directs the Corps to use available funds to complete the preconstruction engineering and design of the Assateague Island mitigation project in an effort to keep the project moving forward until construction funding is available.

Sault Ste. Marie, replacement lock, Michigan.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to begin preparation of the general design memorandum for a replacement lock at Sault Ste. Marie, MI.

Kansas City, MO.—The Committee has included $545,000 for the Kansas City, MO, reconnaissance study which is comprised of seven separable levee units, encompasses two States and two major rivers, and has multiple sponsors. Due to the large study area, the complexities, and the large number of interest, the Committee directs that the study not be limited to the 1 year constraint for a reconnaissance study and that the study be schedules for completion by the end of fiscal year 1999.

Truckee meadows, Nevada.—The recommendation includes $1,700,000 for the Truckee meadows, Nevada study, an increase of $1,200,000 over the budget request. The additional funding is provided for the Corps to expedite completion of the preconstruction engineering and design of this much needed flood control project.

Walker River basin, NV.—A total of $400,000 has been included for the Corps to accelerate completion of the feasibility study of the Walker River basin, Nevada study which is addressing flood control and other issues in the Walker River basin.

Devils Lake, ND.—An appropriation of $300,000 the full budget request, has been included for the Corps to expedite work on the Devils Lake, ND, feasibility study for lake stabilization. The Committee urges the Corps to work cooperatively with the Bureau of Reclamation, the State of North Dakota, other interested parties, and Canada in this effort. The Committee expects the study will address all aspects of the project set out in the study evaluation.

Rhode Island ecosystem restoration study, Rhode Island.—The Committee has recommended $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct reconnaissance level studies of the opportunities to restore degraded salt marshes, restore anadromous fisheries, restore degraded freshwater wetlands, and improve overall fish and wildlife habitats in the Pawcatuck River and Pawcatuck River watershed; and the Mohassuck River, Ten Mile River, and the Woonasquatucket River watersheds.

Davidson County, TN.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps to conduct a reconnaissance study of the flooding problems in the Nashville area of Davidson County, TN.

Nolichucky watershed, Tennessee.—An amount of $100,000 has been provided for the Corps to initiate the feasibility study for flood control and environmental restoration in the Nolichucky watershed in the east Tennessee counties of Greene, Washington, and Unicoi.

Blair Waterway, Tacoma Harbor, WA.—The Committee understands that the scope of this Blair Waterway, Tacoma Harbor, WA, study has been significantly reduced and that the current project falls within the scope of the Corps' section 107, continuing authorities program. Therefore, the funding requested under the "General investigation" account has not been provided, and the project is addressed in the construction, general program.

Rodeo Lake, Othello, WA.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps to undertake a reconnaissance study of flooding from Rodeo Lake at Othello, WA. The study will address alternatives to alleviate flooding and to stabilize water levels at the lake.

Tri Cities area, Washington.—An appropriation not to exceed $550,000 is recommended for the NEPA and CERCLA costs associated with land conveyance pursuant to section 501(i) of Public Law 104–303, the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

West Virginia statewide flood protection plan.—The Committee recommendation includes $624,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete ongoing feasibility studies to identify flood prone areas, formulate potential flood protection measures, address project implementation requirements, and prioritize needed studies, programs, and projects into a long-term strategy for addressing flood protection in the State of West Virginia.

Flood plain management services.—The Committee is aware of advanced technologies which may provide significant advantages over traditional methods of gathering and updating data on floods and flood damage potential. These technologies, including laser and microwave radiometry, offer highly detailed models of flood plains with the potential of being invaluable to planning and implementa-

tion of flood prevention and floodproofing measures, and mitigating flood hazards through better use of land within the flood plain. In addition, these technologies, coupled with soil moisture maps derived utilizing microwave rediometers, will give all agencies involved with flood prevention and control, data analysis tools superior to currently used methods.

The Committee recommends the Corps work closely with the Federal Emergency Management Agency in an effort to utilize the same technologies to product data sets, thus enabling the two agencies to better coordinate their work and provide a superior product for use by decisionmakers.

Planning assistance to States.—The Committee has provided $7,500,000 for the Corps of Engineers' planning assistance to States program. The increase over the budget request is recommended to reduce the backlog of work and to address the growing demand for technical assistance and guidance by the from the Corps. The Committee recommendation includes $175,000 for various studies in Alaska, including completion of the Kivilina relocation, erosion and flooding studies with the Alaska Department of Community and Regional Affairs, economic studies with the Alaska Department of Transportation related to harbor development, and studies with Alaska rural villages. Funding of $500,000 is also included for the Corps to provide geographic information system assistance to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the purpose of watershed modeling and management. An amount of $100,000 is included for the Corps to review the Lake Champlain basin pollution prevention, control and restoration plan to determine what actions may be taken by the Corps to support the plan. This work shall be undertaken in cooperation with the Lake Champlain Basin Program, the States of Vermont and New York, and participating Federal agencies.

Other coordination programs.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000, the full budget request, for the Corps of Engineers to continue to participate as a stakeholder 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.

Also included in the Committee recommendation is the full budget request for the Corps to support the International Joint Commission's study of ways to reduce flood damages along the Red River. The Committee understands that the United States and Canada have agreed to a cooperative effort to determine ways to prevent future flooding.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1998	$1,473,373,000
Budget estimate, 1999	784,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,248,068,000

An appropriation of $1,248,068,000 is recommended for ongoing construction activities.

BUDGET IMPACTS AND PROGRAM EXECUTION

The Committee is convinced that the administration's budget request of $784,000,000 for the fiscal year 1999 construction program, over $1,000,000,000 below the efficient rate of funding, was formulated without consideration of the administration's own priorities, policies, or budget objectives and worse, cannot be executed without significant contract terminations. In fact, if the President's budget were enacted, the additional financial burden on the American taxpayers would be a staggering $400,000,000 in increased costs and over $3,900,000,000 in benefits foregone. Further, the constraints that the administration has imposed, both through the ill-advised fiscal year 1998 apportionment restrictions on contracting and forced contract terminations, have delayed execution of the fiscal year 1998 program and cost taxpayers and non-Federal local sponsors additional financial burdens. This budget was truly dead on arrival and the Committee has spent inordinate amounts of time restructuring a budget that is implementable and will keep the commitments to local sponsors who are also paying for these projects.

This Committee has traditionally supported the cost-sharing initiatives that the administration has proposed to allow the program to continue. However, the President's budget fails to recognize that once a project cooperation agreement, which this administration so eagerly and publicly enters into, has been signed, the administration has a commitment to complete the project in the most efficient and least costly manner. It is inconceivable to leave such a financial hardship on the Government's partner in water resource construction as would have been imposed by the President's request. In addition, the administration's proposed construction budget fails to recognize the importance of investments in the water resources infrastructure as an investment in the future of the Nation. Many ongoing projects that are crucial to the Nation's economic security and competitiveness in the world economy had completion dated postponed as much as 10 years.

The Committee has provided for a construction program that will allow contractors to move forward with the expectation of being paid for their completed work. However, the Committee has had to reduce the budgeted amounts for some projects and has not included any new construction starts for fiscal year 1999. Therefore, the Committee repeats its longstanding management policy for moving available resources from projects that are experiencing delays to those projects most in need of funding and directs the Corps to manage the construction program on a nationwide basis, moving available resources from projects that are experiencing delays to those projects most in need of funding. The Committee believes that good management, and cooperation of Corps district offices and non-Federal sponsors will be essential in limiting the impacts of insufficient funding.

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

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)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,102,000	2,116,000	500,000	500,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL AND GA (MAJOR REH	37,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL AND GA (MAJOR REHAB)	28,000,000	2,353,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	ALASKA				
(N)	ALASKA ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT	.....	5,000,000	.....	5,000,000
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR	5,500,000	4,672,000	.....	748,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	9,500,000	3,500,000	.....	6,000,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	10,959,000	4,894,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(N)	ST. PAUL HARBOR	13,200,000	1,500,000	.....	6,000,000
	ARIZONA				
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	16,000,000	14,200,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
	ARKANSAS				
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	12,934,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	632,500,000	603,989,000	550,000	550,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000,000	40,735,000	19,000,000	50,000,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK RESTORATION, AR	112,861,000	102,000,000	.....	4,500,000
	CALIFORNIA				
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	47,600,000	7,971,000	1,000,000	9,000,000
	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHEAD (NATOMAS)	28,500,000	5,500,000	.....	5,000,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	43,800,000	22,897,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	43,300,000	32,635,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	78,500,000	62,619,000	4,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	12,300,000	6,395,000	3,600,000	5,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	180,000,000	49,056,000	11,000,000	40,000,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	116,200,000	43,415,000	12,000,000	45,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	3,910,000	2,958,000	952,000	3,200,000

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)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	29,400,000	28,654,000	746,000	5,746,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800,000	17,421,000	500,000	900,000
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	13,250,000	10,535,000	1,700,000	2,000,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	5,580,000	1,200,000	.....	4,000,000
	PORT OF LONG BEACH, CA	17,000,000	6,385,000	.....	4,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900,000	101,958,000	7,080,000	7,080,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN–COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	10,650,000	4,276,000	700,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	13,150,000	3,515,000	2,800,000	3,500,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	885,900,000	570,299,000	20,035,000	35,000,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	22,100,000	14,029,000	2,700,000	4,000,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,800,000	4,224,000	400,000	1,000,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	16,300,000	13,700,000	2,500,000	7,500,000
	CONNECTICUT				
	FAULKNER ISLAND, CT	4,500,000	1,500,000	.....	2,600,000
	DELAWARE				
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	12,100,000	4,904,000	233,000	233,000
	FLORIDA				
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL	6,600,000	5,026,000	640,000	1,000,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,444,100,000	462,042,000	40,800,000	25,000,000
	DADE COUNTY, FL	163,300,000	61,818,000	.....	2,500,000
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000,000	9,392,000	20,000,000	10,000,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL AND GA (MAJOR R	35,600,000	7,010,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	247,400,000	34,188,000	27,300,000	10,000,000
	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	47,300,000	21,000,000	.....	8,000,000
	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	22,900,000	9,781,000	.....	5,000,000
	GEORGIA				
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	28,300,000	845,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	20,800,000	14,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	599,085,000	596,015,000	1,685,000	1,685,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA AND SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	11,649,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
	HAWAII				
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	14,381,000	584,000	270,000	270,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	9,920,000	2,894,000	230,000	400,000
	ILLINOIS				
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	22,270,000	.....	700,000	.....
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	144,000,000	16,345,000	5,050,000	6,000,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	29,460,000	26,326,000	500,000	500,000
	EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY (INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL)	1,050,000	530,000	.....	375,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 1, MISS RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	24,990,000	7,920,000	7,100,000	7,700,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24 PART 2, MISS RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	38,370,000	.....	2,400,000	.....
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL AND MO (MAJOR REH	22,394,000	13,034,000	4,900,000	5,500,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,900,000	11,746,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	491,000,000	22,374,000	900,000	2,500,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL AND MO	739,562,000	726,584,000	1,330,000	1,330,000
	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL	30,000,000	28,900,000	.....	1,000,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL AND KY	1,020,000,000	332,970,000	54,500,000	54,500,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	242,862,000	161,711,000	18,355,000	18,355,000
	INDIANA				
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	37,239,000	23,218,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	119,000,000	56,470,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	39,975,000	20,753,000	.....	4,000,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,200,000	.....	3,600,000	.....
	WABASH RIVER, NEW HARMONY, IN	2,610,000	600,000	.....	2,000,000
	IOWA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	21,000,000	12,378,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	79,100,000	36,089,000	1,391,000	8,000,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS AND MO	136,769,000	96,521,000	824,000	1,024,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,760,000	3,182,000	290,000	1,500,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	42,186,000	21,278,000	1,367,000	5,700,000
(FC)	RED ROCK, LAKE RED ROCK, IA	44,500,000	5,600,000	.....	225,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	KANSAS				
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	26,200,000	4,808,000	300,000	4,000,000
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	8,100,000	3,779,000	2,330,000	2,330,000
	KENTUCKY				
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	157,599,000	150,788,000	300,000	1,000,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	13,700,000	2,436,000	900,000	900,000
	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, KY	266,500,000	12,983,000	.....	7,500,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, KY AND IN	268,000,000	20,076,000	1,000,000	4,500,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	12,083,000	2,617,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	LOUISIANA				
(FC)	ALOHA—RIGOLETTE, LA	7,078,000	5,753,000	320,000	1,100,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	506,000,000	369,442,000	5,676,000	10,000,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA	22,500,000	10,596,000	.....	6,000,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,000,000	70,401,000	250,000	1,500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	622,000,000	106,822,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	169,000,000	141,609,000	500,000	1,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,886,847,000	1,686,969,000	5,392,000	9,900,000
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	330,000,000	60,210,000	15,279,000	22,200,000
(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	183,000,000	40,801,000	3,936,000	7,100,000
	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD AND DC	12,000,000	5,916,000	36,000	2,000,000
(BE)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	16,900,000	.....	4,000,000	.....
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	270,300,000	34,231,000	100,000	100,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND PROTECTION PROGRAM, MD	10,000,000	1,000,000	.....	500,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	1,469,000	23,000	543,000
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000,000	29,151,000	157,000	7,000,000

	MASSACHUSETTS				
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	19,500,000	8,259,000	40,000	6,800,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	18,400,000	9,900,000	5,443,000	5,443,000
(FC)	ROUGHANS POINT, REVERE, MA	8,000,000	5,320,000	2,680,000	2,680,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	30,000,000	28,600,000	20,000	600,000
	MINNESOTA				
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	12,400,000	750,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,350,000	2,302,000	40,000	1,700,000
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	9,610,000	1,903,000	1,487,000	1,487,000
	STILLWATER, MN	8,700,000	3,652,000	.....	1,500,000
	MISSISSIPPI				
	JACKSON COUNTY, MS	10,000,000	3,000,000	.....	4,500,000
(E)	NATCHEZ BLUFF, MS	19,549,000	8,500,000	.....	5,000,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	18,588,000	958,000	.....	10,000,000
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	196,000,000	108,683,000	9,600,000	12,600,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	35,187,000	27,698,000	400,000	1,500,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	17,926,000	9,334,000	1,980,000	3,200,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	272,000,000	187,537,000	1,200,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ST GENEVIEVE, MO	33,858,000	8,569,000	4,617,000	5,700,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO AND AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200,000	2,431,000	2,650,000	2,650,000
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE AND SD	21,000,000	2,249,000	125,000	125,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	9,969,000	1,850,000	69,000	2,300,000
	NEVADA				
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	178,500,000	47,811,000	12,295,000	23,295,000
	NEW JERSEY				
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	83,800,000	16,988,000	60,000	1,900,000
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	367,000,000	32,351,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	20,600,000	16,430,000	4,170,000	4,170,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	16,975,000	2,940,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	14,800,000	3,787,000	200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	9,300,000	4,574,000	75,000	1,500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	RARITAIN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUBBASIN, NJ	243,000,000	26,900,000	.....	7,200,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,026,000,000	93,278,000	3,300,000	13,300,000
	NEW MEXICO				
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	6,200,000	2,631,000	3,569,000	3,569,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000,000	12,325,000	150,000	600,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	34,800,000	4,676,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM (DAM SAFETY)	8,300,000	3,699,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600,000	980,000	150,000	3,000,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800,000	8,907,000	510,000	510,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	59,500,000	4,183,000	300,000	1,000,000
	NEW YORK				
	ALTANTIC COAST OF LONG ISLAND, LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	50,000,000	2,000,000	.....	1,000,000
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	92,500,000	13,741,000	300,000	1,500,000
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	62,000,000	39,028,000	300,000	2,000,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	329,330,000	30,021,000	200,000	1,000,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	542,000,000	46,804,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY AND NJ	847,000,000	200,659,000	10,000,000	19,000,000
	ORCHARD BEACH, NY	5,200,000	621,000	.....	1,000,000
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	75,630,000	55,231,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	242,600,000	6,350,000	5,300,000	8,000,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	40,030,000	2,869,000	2,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	29,000,000	10,000,000	16,000,000	8,000,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	37,142,000	859,000	274,000	274,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,900,000	1,211,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	14,700,000	14,201,000	499,000	499,000

(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,800,000	5,619,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	28,000,000	23,122,000	400,000	400,000
	OHIO				
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,400,000	571,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	3,896,000	2,765,000	1,131,000	1,131,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	12,574,000	2,348,000	669,000	669,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000,000	99,712,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	82,758,000	48,897,000	1,800,000	7,500,000
	OKLAHOMA				
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	75,400,000	69,072,000	6,328,000	6,328,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	9,500,000	.....	500,000	500,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	37,100,000	1,962,000	25,000	4,500,000
	OREGON				
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR AND WA (MAJOR REHAB)	89,100,000	22,899,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR AND WA	75,100,000	18,666,000	1,700,000	3,800,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	114,911,000	300,000	800,000
	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,664,000	8,907,000	4,450,000	4,450,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	9,800,000	3,039,000	50,000	50,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	51,850,000	8,924,000	100,000	100,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000,000	54,154,000	4,500,000	23,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	58,835,000	16,253,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575,000	2,678,000	400,000	1,200,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,300,000	37,718,000	3,250,000	7,500,000
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	422,617,000	373,346,000	6,082,000	7,200,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	63,300,000	4,915,000	426,000	3,000,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	322,100,000	41,018,000	7,052,000	9,800,000
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	34,400,000	4,323,000	500,000	3,300,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
	CHARLESTON HARBOR DEEPENING	98,539,000	2,318,000	.....	17,000,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	207,791,000	204,177,000	500,000	500,000
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	140,535,000	30,710,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	27,800,000	1,518,000	2,200,000	.....
	TEXAS				
	BRAYS BAYOU, TX	268,000,000	6,000,000	.....	3,000,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	24,430,000	12,582,000	1,560,000	1,560,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	75,323,000	21,597,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	114,800,000	97,991,000	400,000	3,000,000
(N)	HOUSTON-GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	321,641,000	39,043,000	5,220,000	38,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	11,050,000	9,536,000	1,514,000	1,514,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	152,600,000	150,852,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	209,820,000	61,946,000	9,450,000	10,800,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	6,260,000	2,326,000	500,000	1,500,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	66,300,000	.....	.....	8,000,000
	UTAH				
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	9,660,000	2,276,000	200,000	1,500,000
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	23,100,000	3,394,000	393,000	3,000,000
	LYNCHBURG COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	20,000,000	939,000	.....	1,000,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,496,000	22,521,000	420,000	420,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,900,000	5,164,000	200,000	1,000,000
	RICHMOND COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW, VA	20,000,000	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	247,300,000	29,000,000	.....	20,000,000
	WASHINGTON				
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR AND ID	1,376,217,000	468,633,000	117,000,000	95,000,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	228,205,000	650,000	650,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1–14), WA AND OR (MAJOR REH	94,000,000	5,580,000	900,000	3,050,000

	WEST VIRGINIA				
	GREENBRIER RIVER BASIN, WV	12,000,000	1,409,000	.....	1,000,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,759,337,000	665,799,000	3,000,000	41,800,000
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	20,200,000	1,214,000	1,700,000	.....
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	286,700,000	11,569,000	1,500,000	4,000,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV AND OH	363,474,000	334,396,000	7,000,000	8,700,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	8,200,000	1,849,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV	221,600,000	212,348,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
	WISCONSIN				
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	17,000,000	764,000	.....	1,000,000
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI	7,590,000	4,391,000	3,199,000	3,199,000
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	.....	.....	2,000,000	4,000,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	.....	.....	2,000,000	6,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	.....	.....	2,600,000	2,600,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	.....	.....	200,000	200,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	.....	.....	100,000	100,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	.....	.....	2,000,000	7,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	.....	.....	15,000,000	15,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	.....	.....	18,289,000	18,289,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	.....	.....	26,500,000	32,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—BOARD EXPENSE	.....	.....	45,000	45,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD—CORPS EXPENSE	.....	.....	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	.....	.....	100,000	100,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	.....	.....	2,700,000	8,000,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	.....	.....	5,300,000	15,000,000
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA	.....	.....	25,000,000	.....
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	−32,388,000	−35,238,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	.....	.....	784,000,000	1,248,068,000

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

Cook Inlet, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000 for the Cook Inlet project in Alaska. The funding will allow the Corps of Engineers to complete the project. The Committee is aware that the current cost estimate for the project exceeds the authorized level and that the project cannot proceed without an increase in the project cost ceiling. In a effort to reduce delay and because the project can be completed in a single construction season, the Committee has recommended a provision in the bill to provide the required cost ceiling increase.

Environmental infrastructure, Alaska.—The Committee has included $5,000,000, the same amount as provided for the current year, to continue the cost shared environmental infrastructure program in Alaska. In addition to allowing the Corps of Engineers to address serious water, wastewater, and other infrastructure issues, attention of the Corps is directed to the need to help with many other rural issues including bulk fuel storage, rural power, erosion control, and comprehensive utility planning.

St. Paul Harbor, AK.—An appropriation of $6,000,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the St. Paul Harbor, AK, project in fiscal year 1999. The Committee directs the Corps to use the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1998 and the appropriations provided herein to award a continuing contract and proceed expeditiously to complete the project.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system (Montgomery Point lock and dam), Arkansas.—The bill includes $50,000,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project. This is $31,000,000 over the amount requested in the budget for fiscal year 1999 will allow the Corps to proceed with construction on a more efficient schedule.

Red River emergency bank protection, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $4,500,000 is included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to fully fund construction of Canale Dikes, and Black Lake revetment along the Red River, AR. The Committee supports efforts to develop new methods to meet emergency streambank protection needs along the Red River.

Los Angeles County drainage area, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000 for the Los Angeles County drainage area flood control project in California. The budget request of $11,000,000 for the project is completely insufficient to maintain the construction schedule and would result in as much as a 5-year delay in project completion. Such a delay would result in $200,000,000 loss in potential flood control benefits and an additional $130,000,000 in increased flood insurance premiums for the area.

Los Angeles Harbor, CA.—An appropriation of $45,000,000 is recommended for the Los Angeles Harbor project in California. This is $33,000,000 over the budget for fiscal year 1998. The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers could utilize $69,000,000 to maintain optimum 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. However, because of the Administration's totally inadequate budget request, the Committee is unable to provide the full amount required for 1999. The rec-

ommendation includes reimbursement to the local sponsor as appropriate.

Marysville/Yuba City, CA.—An amount of $5,746,000 has been included by the Committee to continue work on flood control levee work in the Marysville and Yuba City area of California. The Committee understands that a levee break during the January 1997 flood caused loss of life and substantial property damage in the area. The Committee believes that the totally inadequate funding request for fiscal year 1999 leaves the area in jeopardy to flooding and has, therefore, provided additional funding for fiscal year 1999.

Faulkner Island, CT.—Funding in the amount of $2,600,000 is provided for the Corps to complete the construction of the Faulkner Island Lighthouse shoreline protection project in Connecticut.

Central and southern Florida.—The Committee has provide $25,000,000 for the central and southern Florida project. The Upper St. John's portion of the project has not been reduced from that proposed in the President's budget.

Dade County, FL.—The Committee has included $2,500,000 to continue the Dade County, FL, beach erosion control project, including project modifications at Sunny Isles and other activities related to advancing the project.

Miami Harbor Channel, FL.—An appropriation of $8,000,000 is provided for the Miami Harbor Channel, Florida project to initiate a general reevaluation report to determine the feasibility of additional channel deepening, and to provide reimbursement to local sponsors as appropriate.

Panama City Beaches, FL.—Funding in the amount of $5,000,000 has been included for the Panama City Beaches project in Florida. The funds will be used to reimburse the local sponsor for the Federal share of construction costs. The Committee understands that the State and local officials believe that the restoration of hurricane protection for the area is essential and are proceeding to construct the project under authorities which allow reimbursement.

Chicago Shoreline, IL.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request, for the Chicago Shoreline project in Illinois. The recommended funding will be used to complete construction of reach 5, and to continue construction and design in reaches 2 and 4. If additional funding is needed in fiscal year 1999 the Corps is urged to consider reprogramming actions as appropriate.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,500,000 for the Corps to continue construction of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL, project. The budget request for fiscal year 1999 provided only $900,000 and resulted in an extended completion schedule. The funding recommended by the Committee will allow construction of this important project to proceed on a more efficient schedule.

O'Hare Reservoir, IL.—An amount of $1,000,000 has been provided for the O'Hare Reservoir project in Illinois. The funding is provided to complete project construction, including payment of settled contractor claims as appropriate.

Indianapolis central waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the Corps to continue construction of the Indianapolis central waterfront project in Indiana.

Wabash River, New Harmony, IN.—An appropriation of $2,000,000 is recommended for the Wabash River, New Harmony flood control project in Indiana. The funding provided herein will be used to complete construction of this project which will provide critical flood protection to New Harmony, IN. Congress appropriated funding to begin construction in fiscal year 1998, but OMB refused to allow the Corps to award a contract for construction. This has resulted in extended delay in construction completion and in the area benefiting from this much needed flood protection.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife mitigation, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri.—The Committee recommendation for the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation project provides $8,000,000 to continue critical fish and wildlife mitigation activities along the Missouri River. The budget request severely underfunded the project and the Committee recommendation will significantly advance the project completion schedule.

Arkansas City, KS.—The Committee recognized the importance of the Arkansas City flood control project in Kansas and has provided $4,000,000 to continue construction of this critical project in fiscal year 1999.

Kentucky lock and dam, Kentucky.—An appropriation of $7,500,000 is recommended for the Kentucky lock and dams replacement project. The Corps of Engineers budget request did not include continued funding which would result in unacceptable delays in the completion schedule for the project. The funding provided by the Committee will be used to continue design, relocation activities, and other essential work to accelerate the construction schedule.

Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $6,000,000 to continue the construction and water quality monitoring activities of the Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge project in Louisiana.

Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $10,000,000 for this project which is to be used by the Corps of Engineers to continue critical construction of parallel protection along Orleans and London Avenue Canals and other authorized fronting, drainage, and flood proofing features. It should be pointed out that the budget request was substantially below the amount needed by the Corps to keep the project on schedule. The amount recommended by the Committee will help mitigate the delays proposed in the budget.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, LA.—The Committee recognizes the need to refine the Red River Waterway navigation channel in order to ensure that it is reliable and safe, and to reduce maintenance dredging costs. Therefore, the Committee has recommended additional funding for fiscal year 1999 to undertake reinforcements, dikes, and capouts, and to continue design and construct measures necessary to provide for a safe, reliable, and efficient navigation channel.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program, Maryland.—Funding of $500,000 has been provided under the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection Program for the Corps of Engineers to provide design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure and

resource protection and development projects affecting the Chesapeake Bay estuary. Budget constraint have limited the Committee's ability to recommend additional funding for this project in fiscal year 1999.

Ocean City and vicinity, Assateague Island, MD.—The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to repair storm damage to the north end of Assateague Island and recognizes the importance of protecting this section of the island from the effects of storms until the mitigation project authorized in section 534 of Public Law 104–303 can be initiated. The Committee urges the Corps to carryout the work in a manner which compliments the mitigation project and will not interfere with the piping plover nesting season.

Poplar Island, MD.—The Committee recommendation includes $7,000,000 for the Poplar Island project in Maryland. The budget request proposed only $157,000 to continue this project in fiscal year 1999. The Committee understands that issues which have delayed progress on this project have now been resolved and construction can proceed. The Committee expects the Corps to move to return the project to an orderly schedule and to make sufficient funding available to accomplish this task.

Missouri River levee system, L–385, Missouri.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for the Corps to proceed with completion of engineering and design for the L–385 project and to begin construction of that portion of the project.

Natchez Bluffs, MS.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of measures to prevent destruction of property and to reduce the threat of loss of life from bluff failures at Natchez Bluffs, MS. The funding included in the bill will be used to complete design and continue construction activities.

Pascagoula Harbor, MS.—An appropriation of $10,000,000 is recommended for the Pascagoula Harbor, MS, project authorized by the Water Resources Development Act of 1986. No funding was requested in the Corps' fiscal year 1999 budget, therefore, additional funding is needed to avoid significant delays and increased project costs.

North Fork Border Monitoring Station, Montana.—The Corps is directed to use $40,000 of available funds to complete the reestablishment and of an operational monitoring station on the North Fork of the Flathead River in Montana for which funding was provided in last years bill.

Acequias irrigation system, New Mexico.—The Committee is concerned with the progress being made on the Acequias irrigation system rehabilitation project in New Mexico. In an effort to resolve issues related to the project, the Committee expects the Corps to undertake efforts to strengthen its communication and coordination efforts with state and local interests; to explore ways to reduce or eliminate breaks in agreements; and to streamline its environmental and other documentation, where possible, so that work can be accomplished without disruption. The Committee has provided $600,000 to continue the project in fiscal year 1999.

Wilmington Harbor channel widening, North Carolina.—The Committee has included $8,000,000, $2,700,000 over the budget request, to continue construction of the modified Wilmington Harbor

project in fiscal year 1999. The recommended funding will be used to award a contract for mitigation and disposal areas, continue design of other project features, accomplish test blasting, and undertake environmental monitoring and documentation of structures for preblast conditions.

Buford-Trenton irrigation district, North Dakota.—An appropriation of $5,000,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers for the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District project in North Dakota to complete the last of the land appraisals and continue acquisition of easements from willing sellers.

Devils Lake, ND.—The Committee is aware that the city of Devils Lake faces a chronic flood emergency as a result of the dramatic rise of Devils Lake over the past 5 years. In response to this emergency, the Committee has provided $5,000,000 in additional funds for construction by the Corps of an emergency outlet. The Committee is prepared to approve a transfer of funds or to provide further funding in a supplemental appropriation if circumstances warrant more accelerated construction of the outlet. It is expected that such circumstances would also be such that granting of a waiver under the emergency provision of the National Environmental Policy Act would be appropriate and that the provision of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty would be met.

Orchard Beach, NY.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Corps to continue engineering and design, including borrow area investigations surveys, and NEPA analysis and coordination on the Orchard Beach project in New York. No funding was included in the Corps' budget for fiscal year 1999, therefore, follow-on funding is provided in order to mitigate completion schedule delays and cost increases.

West Columbus, OH.—The budget request for fiscal year 1999 for the West Columbus, OH, flood control project was $1,800,000, significantly below the amount needed by the Corps of Engineers to maintain anticipated schedules without extended delays. The Committee recommendation provides $7,500,000 for fiscal year 1999 in order to mitigate schedule delays and cost increases. The recommended funding will be used to complete construction of levee and floodwalls upstream of Town Street, initiate construction below Town Street, and undertake other related construction activities.

Willamette temperature control device, Oregon.—The Army Corps of Engineers shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress by January 15, 1999, on the reasons the projected construction costs for the Willamette temperature control device, Oregon project, authorized under section 101(a)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303), have risen from $38,000,000 to over $77,000,000. The Corps will also outline the steps it is taking to control construction costs on the project, and whether—in light of these significant cost increases—it is looking at lower cost alternatives for achieving the temperature control goals at these reservoirs.

Locks and dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, PA.—The budget request for the locks and dams 2, 3, and 4 project on the Monongahela River in Pennsylvania included only $5,000,000, $25,000,000 short of the $30,000,000 needed by the Corps to maintain an optimum construction schedule. The Committee under-

stands that the locks are in an advanced state of deterioration and that the proposed budget request for fiscal year would severely impact the Corps' efforts to proceed with the project. Budget constraints have not allowed the Committee to recommend the full amount needed by the Corps. However, $23,000,000 is provided to continue ongoing activities, and to perform municipal relocations, complete the construction contract for abutment and lock riverwall adjustments, and to award the contract for the new lock 2, if possible.

Schuykill River Park, PA.—The Committee directs the Corps to complete by December 1, 1998, the report referred to in subsection 564(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 regarding work to be performed by the Corps on the Schuykill River Park project.

Brays Bayou, Houston, TX.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor a portion of the Federal share of the costs for completed construction of discreet segments of work for the Brays Bayou, TX, project which the Secretary of the Army has approved for reimbursement.

North Padre Island flood protection and environmental restoration project, Texas.—The Committee understands that the North Padre Island flood protection and environmental restoration project will provide flood protection to thousands of residents of Nueces County, TX, as well as important economic and resource conservation benefits to the region. The Committee directs the Corps to continue and complete all studies necessary to evaluate the feasibility of this project, and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design activities.

Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee continues to support the Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation program and has provided $95,000,000, the same funding level that was provided for the current fiscal year, to continue the project in fiscal year 1999. The reduction below the budget request for fiscal year 1999 is made without prejudice and reflects overall budget constraints.

The Committee is aware of a recent GAO audit which indicates that a significant portion of the Corps' fish mitigation work has experienced delays and cost overruns. The Committee believes this is unacceptable and directs the Corps to report to the Committee on actions the Corps will implement to correct the problems outlined by GAO.

Last year, the conference committee requested the Northwest Power Planning Council's Independent Scientific Advisory Board [SAB] to conduct a review of the major fish mitigation capital construction activities proposed for implementation in the Columbia River Federal Power System. The first phase of the review is scheduled for completion by June 30. The Committee directs the Corps to not advertise or award any new construction contracts relating to the first phase of the ISAB's review prior to its completion. Pending Committee consideration of the review, the Committee may wish to revisit this issue during conference.

The Committee recommendation supports the full amount requested for the Corps to undertake phase I only of the John Day

Reservoir drawdown study as outlined in the Corps' scoping document and report dated February 11, 1998.

Snake River Dam modifications, Washington.—The Committee is concerned about recent techniques employed by the Corps in attempting to determine the impacts of Snake River Dam removal on recreational river users. The use of financial incentives in surveying river users and the practice of misleading recipients of the survey are questionable. The Committee expects the Corps to work objectively in assessing the true impacts of any dam removal on the entire region.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, WV-KY-VA.—The Committee has provided a total of $41,800,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,500,000 to continue the Harlan, KY, element of the project; $1,500,000 for the Williamsburg, KY, element of the project; $4,900,000 for the Pike County (Tug Fork) element; and $5,000,000 for continuation of flood proofing on the Middlesboro, KY, element of the project; $2,000,000 for the Cumberland City/Harland County, KY, detailed project report; and $4,600,000 for the Martin County, KY, element.

The Committee recommendation also includes $1,600,000 for the Upper Mingo County, including Mingo County tributaries, West Virginia, element; $3,600,000 for the Kermit, Lower Mingo County (Kermit), WV, element; $1,800,000 for the Wayne County, WV, element; $300,000 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 $5,000,000 for the McDowell County, WV, element.

Finally, $1,000,000 is provided for the Grundy, VA, element.

Marmet lock, Kanawha River, WV.—An appropriation of $4,000,000 is provided for the Marmet lock, West Virginia project. The recommended funding will be used to continue acquisition of hardship real estate tracts, and other construction activities, including geology and foundation-related work, and the lock design memorandum.

LaFarge Lake, WI.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Corps to undertake environmental compliance and remediation work, complete NEPA documents, undertake sampling and remediation of identified contamination sites, and carryout site safety activities related to project water control structures at the LaFarge Lake project in Wisconsin.

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. The Committee recognizes that there is a shortage of funding to harvest nuisance aquatic plants, while there are other programs to aid aquatic plant control research. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps to place a higher priority on actual plant control through funding provided in this account.

Emergency streambank and shoreline protection, (sec. 14).—The Committee recommendation for section 14, emergency streambank and shoreline protection projects is $15,000,000. The recommendation includes $850,000 for the Corps to the Whittier Creek, AK, project; $250,000 for the Grants, Cibola County, NM, project; and funding to continue the Lake St. Croix Beach, MN, and Mankato, TH 169, MN projects; $250,000 for design and construction of Tioga County, PA, streambank protection and stabilization projects.

Beach erosion control (sec. 103).—An appropriation of $2,600,000 is recommended for beach erosion control, section 103 projects for fiscal year 1997.

Small navigation projects (sec. 107).—An appropriation of $8,000,000 is recommended for small navigation projects, section 107, projects.

The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Tatitlik Harbor, AK, project; $100,000 to initiate plans and specifications on the Tamgas Harbor, AK, project; $100,000 each for the Corps to initiate the feasibility study for the Haines Harbor and Ketchikan Harbor, AK, projects; $3,000,000 to complete construction of King Cove, AK project; and $100,000 to initiate the reconnaissance study for the Thorne Bay, AK, project. Funding in the amount of $1,416,000 is included for the Blair Waterway channel deepening project in Washington; $130,000 for Yellow Bend Port, AR, project to allow the Corps to conduct feasibility studies and prepare the report to investigate the extension of the harbor; and $90,000 each for the New Madrid County Harbor, MO, and Pemiscot County Harbor, Caruthersville, MO, projects.

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

The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study and begin plans and specifications for the Prattville, AL, project; $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study for the Tanana River, AK, project; Henderson Bayou, Ascension Parish, LA, $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study; $100,000 for the Stephensville, St. Martin Parish, LA, project to initiate and complete a feasibility study; $130,000 for feasibility study of the Blackwater River, Salisbury, MA, project; $1,000,000 for construction of the Fort Fairfield, ME, project; $55,000 for the Chippewa River, Montevido, MN, project to continue the feasibility study; Minnesota River, Granite Falls, MN, $82,000 to continue the feasibility study; $100,000 to initiate plans and specifications for the Wild Rice, Marsh River, MN, project; $300,000 to initiate and complete the reconnaissance study and begin the feasibility study of the Mecklenburg County streams, North Carolina project; $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study for Repaupo Creek, NJ; Fallon, NV, flood control project, $200,000 to complete the detailed planning report; $300,000 to complete construction of the Reno, NV, flood warning system; $1,000,000 for the Battle Mountain, NV, project to complete construction; $500,000 to prepare plans and specification and award a construction contract for construction of the Loyalsock Creek, Borough of Dushore, Sullivan County, PA, project; $150,000 to complete the detailed project

report for the Doe River, Carter County, TN, project and initiate plans and specifications; $200,000 for the feasibility study for the Douglas Springs Branch, Rutherford, TN, project; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Rossville, TN, project; $1,750,000 for construction of the Cedar River, WA, flood damage reduction project; $225,000 to initiate the feasibility study for the Snoqualmie River, WA, project; and $200,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility study for the Stillaquaminsh River Valley, WA, project.

Aquatic ecosystem restoration (sec. 206).—An appropriation of $6,000,000 is recommended for the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Program. Included in the Committee recommendation is $100,000 for the Badger Slough, AK, project to complete the feasibility study; $100,000 for the Snake River, AK, project for the Corps to complete the feasibility study; $2,000,000 for the Corps to continue construction of the Penn Mine, California, project; $100,000 to complete a reconnaissance study of the Green River/Tradewater watersheds project in west central Kentucky; $800,000 for the Lake Tahoe regional wetland development project in Nevada; $375,000 to continue the Drake Creek, Old Hickory Lake, TN, project; $750,000 to complete the environmental restoration report, and initiate plans and specifications for the Upper Jordan River restoration, Utah project; and $100,000 to complete the environmental restoration report of the Copperas Brook, South Strafford, VT, project.

Projects modifications for improvement of the environment (sec. 1135).—The Committee has provided a total of $15,000,000 for section 1135, projects modifications for improvements of the environment.

The recommendation includes $900,000 to initiate and complete construction of Talkeetna, AK, project; $100,000 to complete the feasibility study for the Gold Creek, AK, project; $200,000 complete plans and specification, and initiate construction of the Port Canaveral, Manatee protection, Florida project; $100,000 to complete a reconnaissance study from the tailwaters of the Green River Lake to the Lock and Dam No. 6 in Kentucky; $200,000 to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility phase for an urban habitat restoration project in the greater St. Louis, MO, area and surrounding communities; $1,400,000 to complete the Mecklenburg County, NC, Little Sugar Creek project; $1,125,000 for the Numana Dam fish passage project in Nevada; $1,000,000 for the Lower Bear Creek, WA, restoration project; Chittenden locks, Smolt passage project, Washington, $185,000 to complete feasibility level design and cost of various restoration measures and alternatives; and $2,258,000 for the Corps to complete plans and specification, and initiate and complete construction of the Lower Hamm Creek, WA, restoration project.

Shoreline protection policy.—The Committee continues to be troubled by the administration's policy regarding 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 again strongly urges the OMB and executive branch to recognizes the importance and contribution these types of projects

make to the economic well-being of the country, and to place a higher priority on shore protection and small navigation projects in future budgets.

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

Appropriations, 1998	$296,212,000
Budget estimate, 1999	280,000,000
Committee recommendation	313,234,000

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:						
	DONALDSONVILLE TO GULF OF MEXICO	.....	100,000	.....	.....	.....	100,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL AND SCOTT	.....	100,000	.....	.....	100,000	100,000
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	.....	1,600,000	100,000	100,000	500,000	500,000
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	.....	5,023,000	4,268,000	898,000	755,000	755,000
(FDP)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN AND MS	.....	2,925,000	850,000	450,000	800,000	800,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN AND KY	.....	1,982,000	1,916,000	315,000	66,000	66,000
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS STUDY, ARKANSAS	.....	4,000,000	470,000	.....	.....	500,000
(FDP)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	.....	1,329,000	1,139,000	437,000	190,000	190,000
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	.....	125,000,000	300,000	300,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN AND KY	.....	19,500,000	.....	.....	450,000	450,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	.....	.....	.....	.....	360,000	360,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,721,000	5,821,000
	CONSTRUCTION						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	39.30	3,620,000,000	2,483,509,000	31,536,000	44,599,000	44,599,000
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	2.30	9,020,000	3,087,000	763,000	581,000	581,000
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	.....	229,800,000	12,350,000	1,900,000	11,500,000	.....
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	1.90	8,193,000	2,825,000	658,000	910,000	910,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN	39.30	1,486,000,000	830,074,000	28,143,000	23,750,000	30,750,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR AND MO	1.30	381,000,000	357,595,000	5,191,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	5.50	3,300,000	2,626,000	1,039,000	674,000	674,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	39.30	185,000,000	62,598,000	4,702,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	39.30	1,730,000,000	822,998,000	19,036,000	21,023,000	21,023,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY, LA	.....	25,100,000	1,316,000	892,000	400,000	5,400,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA AND MS	1.70	64,500,000	7,865,000	282,000	250,000	250,000

(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	7.10	98,500,000	64,298,000	14,891,000	14,000,000	16,000,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2.10	169,342,000	105,925,000	7,886,000	10,100,000	10,100,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS		(1,157,209,000)	(614,846,000)	(31,586,000)	(18,665,000)	(18,665,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS		106,175,000	86,961,000	3,881,000	3,450,000	4,950,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS		229,126,000	225,226,000	13,252,000	3,900,000	13,500,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS		208,500,000	34,562,000	24,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS		32,408,000	25,620,000	1,880,000	1,840,000	1,840,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS		243,000,000	107,433,000	−312,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS		338,000,000	135,044,000	12,861,000	9,250,000	10,750,000
	YAZOO BACKWATER PUMP		95,200,000	10,688,000			500,000
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO		56,300,000	7,470,000	2,820,000	250,000	6,250,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN AND MS	6.20	17,925,000	10,359,000	210,000	122,000	122,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	.77	143,000,000	51,700,000	671,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION					162,974,000	184,574,000
	MAINTENANCE						
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN					53,329,000	53,329,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR					293,000	293,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR					457,000	457,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR					112,000	112,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR					124,000	124,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO AND TN					6,271,000	6,800,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR AND MO					7,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR AND LA					2,374,000	2,374,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR					1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL					47,000	47,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY					26,000	26,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA					613,000	613,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA					9,425,000	11,425,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA					146,000	146,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA					90,000	90,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA					975,000	2,200,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA					368,000	368,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA					1,773,000	1,773,000

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)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA					402,000	402,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA					4,100,000	4,100,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA					2,820,000	2,820,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS					361,000	361,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS					195,000	195,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS					247,000	247,000
	YAZOO BASIC, MS					(20,966,000)	(20,966,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS					3,193,000	3,993,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS					242,000	3,242,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS					3,273,000	3,273,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS					837,000	837,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS					4,330,000	4,330,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS					1,631,000	1,631,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS					4,320,000	6,300,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS					1,238,000	1,238,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS					498,000	498,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS					621,000	621,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS					783,000	783,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO					210,000	210,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO					6,833,000	6,833,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN					118,000	118,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN					1,400,000	1,400,000

(FC)	MAPPING	.....	.....	.....	.....	998,000	998,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	.....	.....	.....	.....	− 12,768,000	− 13,268,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	.....	.....	.....	.....	111,305,000	124,339,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	.....	.....	.....	.....	280,000,000	314,734,000

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

The Committee is again concerned by the continued, severe reductions for the Mississippi River and tributaries [MR&T] project. The Committee feels this is unacceptable when only a few short years ago the Mississippi was experiencing devastating flooding. The Mississippi River has the third largest drainage basin in the world, exceeded in size only by the Amazon and Congo River watersheds. It drains a total of 1,245,00 square miles, covering all or part of 31 States and two Canadian Provinces. Water from as far east as New York and as far west as Wyoming contribute to floods in the lower Mississippi River Valley, flowing through the basin roughly resembling a funnel which has its spout at the Gulf of Mexico.

Therefore, flood control and protection along the Mississippi River and its tributaries is not an option, it is mandatory. The floods of 1993 demonstrated this importance by averting $8,100,000,000 in damages. Over the years, the MR&T project has saved and estimated $150,000,000,000 in flood damages based on a Federal investment of $8,121,000,000. Another outcome of the recent floods is the need to raise and strengthen numerous section of levees. The proposed $65,000,000 reduction below the appropriation for 1998 severely impacts this effort and increases the likelihood of higher disaster payments as the result of major flooding.

In action of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1998, Congress directed no fully allocated funding policy be applied to projects funded in the current year. Given the detrimental and adverse impacts to the Nation and the Mississippi River and tributaries area, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers to continue ongoing construction and expedite award of contracts, using continuing contracts, in fiscal year 1999 to alleviate continued flooding and suffering affected areas.

Southeast Arkansas, including Boeuf-Tensas area, study, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $500,000 is recommended for the southeast Arkansas study, including the Boeuf-Tensas area. The funding will allow the Corps to continue feasibility studies to address flooding, water supply, and environmental needs in the southeastern portion of Arkansas.

Bonnet Carre' spillway, maintenance, Louisiana.—Funding of $2,200,000 is provided for the Bonnet Carre' spillway, Louisiana. project to perform operation and maintenance activities, and to replace two cranes at the facility.

Donaldsonville to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a reconnaissance study of rainfall, tidal, and hurricane flooding between Bayou Lafourche and Donaldsonville, LA, and the Gulf of Mexico.

Mississippi Delta region, Davis Pond, LA.—An additional $2,000,000 is recommended for the Mississippi Delta region, Davis Pond, LA project to expedite construction due to anticipated increases in contractor earning and, where possible, to initiate work to mitigate negative impacts caused by the freshwater diversion.

Yazoo basin backwater project, MR&T.—The Committee is aware of the frequent flooding being experienced in the Yazoo backwater portion of the Mississippi Delta located just north of Vicksburg,

MS. Work on this project was initiated in March 1986, but was delayed for reformulation of the project to consider alternatives. The Committee understands that the project reformulation is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1999 and has provided $500,000 to initiate design of the reformulated project.

Yazoo basin, Big Sunflower River, MR&T.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps to expedite various features of the Big Sunflower River, MS, project.

Yazoo basin, demonstration erosion control, MR&T.—An additional $9,600,000 is recommended for the demonstration erosion control project, to continue a joint effort by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Yazoo basin of the Mississippi. The funds provided will permit the Corps to undertake additional flood water retarding structures, pipe and culvert grade control structures, channel improvements, and bank stabilization items in various watersheds. Design of future work, acquisition of real estate and monitoring of results will be accomplished for all watersheds in order to facilitate work in fiscal year 1999 and for all future work as required for completion of the total program. The Committee expects the administration to continue to request funds for this important project.

Yazoo basin maintenance.—The Committee has been informed of inadequate maintenance of road surfaces and slides on Mississippi levees in the Yazoo basin. Additional levee maintenance funding has been provided for the Corps to address this problem. In addition, head-cutting and severe erosion control problems in the Yazoo basin continue to threaten structures. The Corps is directed to use the funds provided for operation and maintenance to begin addressing these growing problems and other priority maintenance needs, and to coordinate its efforts with local sponsors.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1998	$1,740,025,000
Budget estimate, 1999	1,603,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,667,572,000

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	4,900,000	4,900,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,800,000	1,800,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,000,000	20,000,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	7,726,000	7,726,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	30,000	30,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM ''BILL'' DANNELLY LA	4,000,000	5,000,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	21,000,000	25,000,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300,000	300,000
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,900,000	3,900,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	20,000	20,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL AND MS	17,000,000	18,200,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL AND GA	6,400,000	6,400,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,600,000	1,600,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,591,000	1,591,000
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	592,000	592,000
HOMER HARBOR, AK	243,000	243,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	20,000	20,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	200,000	200,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	265,000	265,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	489,000	489,000
ST. PAUL HARBOR AK	.....	500,000
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	.....	600,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,114,000	1,114,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	73,000	73,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,079,000	1,079,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	25,000	25,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	192,000	192,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,585,000	3,585,000
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,464,000	5,464,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	998,000	998,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,652,000	4,652,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,861,000	5,861,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	3,988,000	3,988,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	965,000	965,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	954,000	954,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	896,000	896,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,148,000	4,148,000
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	278,000	278,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	253,000	253,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	22,093,000	23,693,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,571,000	1,571,000
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,834,000	3,834,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,397,000	1,397,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,471,000	3,471,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	383,000	383,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR AND LA	6,332,000	6,332,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,185,000	4,185,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AR	4,000	4,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,747,000	2,747,000
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	119,000	119,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,782,000	1,782,000
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,820,000	1,820,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,246,000	3,246,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,121,000	3,121,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,060,000	4,060,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	374,000	374,000
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,843,000	1,843,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	3,910,000	3,910,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	973,000	973,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,401,000	1,401,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165,000	165,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,613,000	3,613,000
MARINA DEL RAY, CA	.....	3,000,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	288,000	288,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	237,000	237,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	.....	1,000,000
MOSS CREEK LANDING, CA	.....	1,300,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,732,000	1,732,000
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,101,000	1,101,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	3,424,000	3,424,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	622,000	622,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,197,000	2,197,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,100,000	1,100,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,384,000	5,384,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,182,000	2,182,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA	1,069,000	1,069,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	133,000	133,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,211,000	2,211,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,392,000	2,392,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,339,000	2,339,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	3,004,000	3,004,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,500,000	1,500,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,023,000	3,023,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,541,000	1,541,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,081,000	1,081,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,890,000	1,890,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	1,044,000	1,044,000
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,570,000	1,570,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,705,000	2,705,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	35,000	35,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	460,000	460,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	648,000	648,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	965,000	965,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	101,000	101,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,771,000	1,771,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	398,000	398,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	767,000	767,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	440,000	440,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	516,000	516,000
FIVE MILE RIVER, CT	.....	700,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	216,000	216,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	867,000	867,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CT	33,000	33,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	418,000	418,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	319,000	319,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CT	971,000	971,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	295,000	295,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	672,000	672,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	496,000	496,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
DELAWARE		
CEDAR CREEK, DE	250,000	250,000
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL—ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE	280,000	280,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	12,816,000	12,816,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	43,000	43,000
MISPILLION RIVER, DE	225,000	225,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DE	50,000	50,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	5,590,000	5,590,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, DC	5,000	5,000
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	880,000	880,000
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	183,000	183,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, DC	32,000	32,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &	30,000	30,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	3,367,000	3,367,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	8,598,000	8,598,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	40,000	3,000,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,615,000	1,615,000
FT MYERS BEACH, FL	.....	1,000,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	441,000	441,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	75,000	75,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	88,000	88,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,153,000	3,153,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,625,000	7,625,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL AND GA	5,400,000	5,400,000
LA GRANGE BAYOU, FL	.....	250,000
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	20,000	20,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	200,000	200,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,159,000	3,159,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	5,000	5,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,190,000	2,190,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	20,000	20,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	30,000	4,000,000
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	50,000	50,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	425,000	425,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	2,700,000	2,700,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	34,000	34,000
ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	60,000	60,000
ST LUCIE INLET, FL	60,000	60,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	5,201,000	5,201,000
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,900,000	4,900,000
APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	4,700,000	4,700,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,162,000	2,162,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	9,728,000	9,728,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	6,400,000	6,400,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	4,600,000	4,600,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA AND SC	8,588,000	8,588,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41,000	41,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA AND SC	8,200,000	8,200,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA AND SC	6,380,000	6,380,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,161,000	12,161,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	200,000	200,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA AND AL	4,800,000	4,800,000
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	916,000	916,000
HONOLULU HARBOR, HI	1,580,000	1,580,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	262,000	262,000
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	910,000	910,000
NAWILIWILI HARBOR, HI	962,000	962,000
PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	292,000	292,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	416,000	416,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	1,432,000	1,432,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	3,743,000	3,743,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	89,000	89,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	975,000	975,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	190,000	190,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	62,000	62,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL AND IN	1,444,000	1,444,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	6,337,000	6,337,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	4,889,000	4,889,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362,000	362,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	135,000	135,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL AND IN	22,934,000	22,934,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	657,000	657,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	2,273,000	2,273,000
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	537,000	537,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	4,219,000	4,219,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &	96,985,000	96,985,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	72,000	72,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,868,000	3,868,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	96,000	96,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	995,000	995,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	776,000	776,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	925,000	925,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	797,000	797,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	924,000	924,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	564,000	564,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	80,000	80,000
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	733,000	733,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	57,000	57,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	851,000	851,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	806,000	806,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	836,000	836,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	67,000	67,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	768,000	768,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	62,000	62,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,615,000	2,615,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	170,000	170,000
MISSOURI RIVER—KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	154,000	154,000
MISSOURI RIVER—SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS AND MO	6,280,000	6,280,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,156,000	2,156,000
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,365,000	3,365,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,170,000	4,170,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,389,000	2,389,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	956,000	956,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	461,000	461,000
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	585,000	585,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,092,000	1,092,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	949,000	949,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	267,000	267,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	913,000	913,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,352,000	1,352,000
MARION LAKE, KS	1,206,000	1,206,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,683,000	1,683,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,699,000	1,699,000
PEARSON—SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	787,000	787,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,850,000	1,850,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,632,000	1,632,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	333,000	333,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	440,000	440,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,977,000	1,977,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,655,000	1,655,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY AND TN	8,005,000	8,005,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,077,000	2,077,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,170,000	1,170,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,317,000	1,317,000
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,406,000	1,406,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	808,000	808,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,431,000	1,431,000
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	325,000	325,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,450,000	1,450,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,048,000	1,048,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,601,000	1,601,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,672,000	1,672,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	105,000	105,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	4,488,000	4,488,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,266,000	1,266,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	17,000	17,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	686,000	686,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	52,000	52,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,764,000	1,764,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	59,814,000	59,814,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA AND WV	5,447,000	5,447,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	920,000	920,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, KY	4,000	4,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,531,000	1,531,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,056,000	1,056,000
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	3,927,000	3,927,000
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,090,000	1,090,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	7,681,000	7,681,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	1,450,000	1,450,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	481,000	481,000
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5,000	5,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	50,000	50,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	140,000	3,140,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	114,000	114,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	6,980,000	6,980,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	2,960,000	2,960,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA AND TX	19,561,000	22,561,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	841,000	841,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	423,000	423,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	368,000	368,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	43,000	43,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,808,000	2,808,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,095,000	1,095,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	46,220,000	46,220,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	11,580,000	14,080,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80,000	80,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	8,337,000	9,837,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,960,000	1,960,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	184,000	184,000
WATERWAY FROM EMPIRE TO THE GULF, LA	5,000	5,000
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	165,000	165,000
MAINE		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ME	15,000	15,000
KENNEBEC RIVER, ME	301,000	301,000
PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	400,000	6,000,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,596,000	1,596,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17,000	17,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	440,000	440,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	570,000	570,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	14,558,000	14,558,000
CHESTER RIVER, MD	335,000	335,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	105,000	105,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	32,000	32,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD AND WV	1,492,000	1,492,000
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	70,000	70,000
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	75,000	75,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	330,000	330,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	306,000	306,000
ROCK HALL HARBOR, MD	260,000	260,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	83,000	83,000
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	575,000	575,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	305,000	305,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	409,000	409,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	695,000	695,000
BOSTON HARBOR, MA	7,000,000	7,000,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	367,000	367,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,416,000	8,416,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	232,000	232,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	133,000	133,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	273,000	273,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	349,000	349,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	72,000	72,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	381,000	381,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	526,000	526,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	329,000	329,000
NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	594,000	594,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	873,000	873,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	401,000	401,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	633,000	633,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	333,000	333,000
MICHIGAN		
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	110,000	110,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	194,000	194,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,392,000	2,392,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	49,000	49,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	704,000	704,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	497,000	497,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205,000	205,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	286,000	286,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	154,000	154,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	259,000	259,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	1,641,000	1,641,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	421,000	421,000
MARQUETTE HARBOR, MI	247,000	247,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI AND WI	4,000	4,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	622,000	622,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	881,000	881,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	724,000	724,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	.....	1,900,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	367,000	367,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	416,000	416,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,275,000	1,275,000
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,003,000	2,003,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	571,000	571,000
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,422,000	1,422,000
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	20,720,000	20,720,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,192,000	3,192,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,874,000	1,874,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN AND SD	566,000	566,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN AND WI	4,085,000	4,085,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	97,000	97,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	490,000	490,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	155,000	155,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	797,000	797,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	17,000	17,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	444,000	444,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,699,000	3,699,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	31,000	31,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	10,000	10,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	8,000	8,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	120,000	120,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,200,000	2,200,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	114,000	114,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	101,000	101,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,700,000	1,700,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,900,000	2,900,000
PEARL RIVER, MS AND LA	263,000	263,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MS	4,000	4,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	415,000	415,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	15,000	15,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	159,000	159,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	4,445,000	4,445,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,067,000	2,067,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,444,000	7,444,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	377,000	377,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	777,000	777,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	814,000	814,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,908,000	13,908,000
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	206,000	206,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,789,000	1,789,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	5,000	5,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MO	50,000	50,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,049,000	1,049,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	280,000	280,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,560,000	3,560,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,051,000	5,051,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,671,000	4,671,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	23,000	23,000
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	1,570,000	1,570,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	67,000	67,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE AND SD	7,138,000	7,138,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,679,000	1,679,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	170,000	170,000
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	1,900,000	1,900,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	200,000	200,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE	.....	400,000
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	597,000	597,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	786,000	786,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	113,000	113,000
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	36,000	36,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV AND CA	588,000	588,000
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	284,000	284,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	410,000	410,000
COCHECHO RIVER, NH	.....	1,000,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	522,000	522,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	591,000	591,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES, NH	964,000	964,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NH	10,000	10,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	493,000	493,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NH	126,000	126,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	485,000	485,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,050,000	1,050,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	390,000	390,000
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	305,000	305,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA AND DE	16,650,000	18,150,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,000,000	1,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NJ	429,000	429,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,195,000	2,195,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	590,000	590,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NJ	805,000	805,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,287,000	1,287,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,944,000	1,944,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,293,000	1,293,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	277,000	277,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	83,000	83,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	339,000	339,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	969,000	969,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	124,000	124,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	337,000	337,000
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL	.....	850,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	449,000	449,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	227,000	227,000
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	75,000	75,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	4,057,000	4,057,000
BRONX RIVER, NY	700,000	700,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,027,000	1,027,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	730,000	730,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	434,000	434,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,000,000	2,000,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	384,000	384,000
EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	900,000	900,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	1,650,000	1,650,000
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	75,000	75,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,380,000	2,380,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	543,000	543,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,000,000	1,000,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,340,000	1,340,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	760,000	760,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY AND NJ	4,930,000	4,930,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	740,000	740,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	3,310,000	3,310,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	345,000	345,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,710,000	1,710,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	680,000	680,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	715,000	715,000
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15,000	15,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	538,000	538,000
WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	700,000	700,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	517,000	517,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,454,000	5,454,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,119,000	1,119,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350,000	350,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	490,000	490,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	667,000	667,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	700,000	700,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	842,000	842,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22,000	22,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	503,000	503,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,865,000	4,865,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,885,000	3,885,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	800,000	800,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	575,000	575,000
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	75,000	75,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59,000	59,000
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	75,000	75,000
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,472,000	1,472,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	5,700,000	5,700,000
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN-HALEY LAKE, ND	179,000	179,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,471,000	9,571,000
HOMME LAKE, ND	177,000	177,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	105,000	105,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,206,000	1,206,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	409,000	409,000
SOURIS RIVER, ND	276,000	276,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ND	31,000	31,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	628,000	628,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,420,000	1,420,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,189,000	3,189,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,060,000	1,060,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	724,000	724,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	6,456,000	6,456,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	325,000	325,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	720,000	720,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	680,000	680,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	768,000	768,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	385,000	385,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	1,000,000	1,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	217,000	217,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	530,000	530,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,032,000	1,032,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,234,000	1,234,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	6,186,000	6,186,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	319,000	319,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	595,000	595,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	75,000	75,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	935,000	935,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	166,000	166,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,385,000	3,385,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	251,000	251,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	543,000	543,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	818,000	818,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	347,000	347,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	635,000	635,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,350,000	1,350,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	18,000	18,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,509,000	1,509,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	618,000	618,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	4,074,000	4,074,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	3,647,000	3,647,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	696,000	696,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	240,000	240,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	651,000	651,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,285,000	1,285,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	433,000	433,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	75,000	75,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,446,000	1,446,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,367,000	3,367,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,915,000	1,915,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	54,000	54,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	36,000	36,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,112,000	1,112,000
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	3,695,000	3,695,000
SARDIS LAKE, OK	908,000	908,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	344,000	344,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	869,000	869,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,296,000	3,296,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,393,000	1,393,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,795,000	3,795,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	1,201,000	1,201,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	740,000	740,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	233,000	233,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	5,111,000	5,111,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	383,000	383,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLA	12,122,000	12,122,000
COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WA AND PORTLAND, ASTORIA BOAT BASIN NORTH BREAKWATER	.....	4,800,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR AND WA	6,960,000	6,960,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	391,000	391,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
COOS BAY, OR	4,601,000	4,601,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	421,000	421,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	751,000	751,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	855,000	855,000
DEPOE BAY, OR	9,000	9,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	951,000	951,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	399,000	399,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	523,000	523,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	905,000	905,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,245,000	1,245,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	422,000	422,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	180,000	180,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	3,936,000	3,936,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,941,000	1,941,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,889,000	2,889,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR AND WA	3,304,000	3,304,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	502,000	502,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	135,000	135,000
ROGUE RIVER, OR	1,056,000	1,056,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	120,000	120,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	878,000	878,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	175,000	175,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7,000	7,000
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	13,000	13,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,294,000	1,294,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	497,000	497,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	499,000	499,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	590,000	590,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	2,891,000	3,991,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,791,000	6,791,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	659,000	659,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	223,000	223,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	916,000	916,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,236,000	2,236,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,149,000	1,149,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,512,000	1,512,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,648,000	1,648,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	672,000	672,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	916,000	916,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	15,000	15,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	723,000	723,000
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	688,000	688,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	271,000	271,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	215,000	215,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	288,000	288,000
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,423,000	1,423,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,121,000	1,121,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,930,000	1,930,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,438,000	14,438,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	15,000	15,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	408,000	408,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	14,000	14,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,084,000	3,084,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, PA	56,000	56,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	50,000	50,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,167,000	2,167,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	333,000	333,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	66,000	66,000
TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,917,000	1,917,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,437,000	1,437,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	284,000	284,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	798,000	798,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	566,000	566,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA AND MD	1,795,000	1,795,000
RHODE ISLAND		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, RI	5,000	5,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, RI	527,000	527,000
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	1,143,000	1,143,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,325,000	3,525,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	4,716,000	5,616,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,211,000	3,211,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	230,000	490,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	2,414,000	2,414,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	24,000	24,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC AND NC		40,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC		42,000
PORT ROYAL, SC		100,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	40,000	40,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	270,000	270,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	340,000	340,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,476,000	6,676,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	204,000	204,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184,000	184,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	7,417,000	7,717,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	14,000	14,000
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD AND MN	1,440,000	1,440,000
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	3,000,000	3,000,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD AND ND	8,467,000	9,217,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	70,000	70,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,635,000	5,635,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	4,826,000	4,826,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,554,000	4,554,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	3,810,000	3,810,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	18,000	18,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,571,000	3,571,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,925,000	5,925,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TN	5,000	5,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	12,886,000	12,886,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	285,000	285,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	585,000	585,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL—AREA VI	1,090,000	1,090,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	909,000	909,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,465,000	1,465,000
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,170,000	1,170,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,835,000	2,835,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	2,080,000	2,080,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,400,000	1,400,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,175,000	2,175,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,516,000	2,516,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	1,790,000	1,790,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,845,000	6,845,000
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,895,000	5,895,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14,000	14,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,584,000	2,584,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,050,000	4,050,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	1,755,000	1,755,000
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,160,000	1,160,000
GIWW, CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX	100,000	100,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,578,000	1,578,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,388,000	2,388,000
GREENS BAYOU CHANNEL, TX	660,000	660,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	18,381,000	18,381,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,378,000	1,378,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	7,930,000	7,930,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	355,000	355,000
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	3,302,000	3,302,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	863,000	863,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	208,000	208,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	3,851,000	3,851,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,170,000	3,170,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	110,000	110,000
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,770,000	1,770,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,554,000	1,554,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,817,000	1,817,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	893,000	893,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	928,000	928,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,711,000	1,711,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50,000	50,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	777,000	777,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY, TX	7,200,000	7,200,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,346,000	4,346,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	222,000	222,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	3,033,000	3,033,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,888,000	1,888,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,612,000	1,612,000
WACO LAKE, TX	2,299,000	2,299,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	780,000	780,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,815,000	3,815,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,605,000	2,605,000
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	55,000	55,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	496,000	496,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	731,000	731,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	.....	875,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VT	28,000	28,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT AND NY	536,000	536,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	586,000	586,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	680,000	680,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	547,000	547,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	602,000	602,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,300,000	2,300,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	45,000	45,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	800,000	800,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,602,000	1,602,000
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK AND NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	912,000	912,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	84,000	84,000
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,333,000	3,333,000
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA AND NC	7,950,000	7,950,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,246,000	1,246,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	280,000	280,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,483,000	6,483,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	333,000	333,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,027,000	2,027,000
POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	180,000	180,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	723,000	723,000
RUDEE INLET, VA	794,000	794,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	159,000	159,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,115,000	1,115,000
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	1,019,000	1,019,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA AND OR	3,000	3,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6,000	6,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,212,000	1,212,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	6,900,000	6,900,000
GRAYS HARBOR (SOUTH JETTY EXTEN.), CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	.....	4,000,000
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,421,000	1,421,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,269,000	2,269,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	175,000	175,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	7,608,000	7,608,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,069,000	1,069,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,389,000	2,389,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,169,000	1,169,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	1,722,000	1,722,000
MT ST HELENS, WA	404,000	404,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,188,000	2,188,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	302,000	302,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,013,000	1,013,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,213,000	1,213,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	400,000	400,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	780,000	780,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	180,000	180,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	58,000	58,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA	457,000	457,000
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	68,000	68,000
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA AND OR	1,929,000	1,929,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	75,000	3,000,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	.....	1,400,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	976,000	976,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,021,000	1,121,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,294,000	1,294,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,513,000	1,513,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	385,000	385,000
ELKINS, WV	11,000	11,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	103,000	103,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	8,130,000	8,130,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,484,000	1,484,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	914,000	914,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,298,000	1,298,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,470,000	1,470,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	2,235,000	2,235,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	171,000	171,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	674,000	674,000
FOX RIVER, WI	2,360,000	2,360,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,212,000	1,212,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL)	3,603,000	3,603,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WI	42,000	42,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	325,000	325,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	51,000	51,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	274,000	274,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	1,629,000	1,629,000
PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI	201,000	201,000
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	8,000	8,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	619,000	619,000
STURGEON BAY, WI	475,000	475,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	27,000	27,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,506,000	1,506,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	340,000	340,000
MISCELLANEOUS.		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	4,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000,000	2,000,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,075,000	1,075,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000,000	8,000,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,000,000	2,000,000
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	2,000,000	2,000,000
GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT	.....	500,000
HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575,000	575,000
MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	600,000	600,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAIN STEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	2,000,000	2,000,000
MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000,000	2,000,000
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40,000	40,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000,000	6,000,000
NATIONAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT (NRMS) PROGRAM	1,850,000	1,850,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	515,000	515,000
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	675,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500,000	500,000
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	850,000	850,000
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,400,000	4,400,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	−22,918,000	−29,268,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,603,000,000	1,667,572,000

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.

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

The Committee is aware of the Corps' efforts to stretch the limited resources to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of means. As more and more projects enter the inventory and budgetary constraints continue, it is clear that the Corps will need to find 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.

St. Paul Harbor, AK.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps to accomplish breakwater repairs at St. Paul Harbor, AK.

Wrangell Narrows, AK.—The Committee understands that rock pinnacles pose a safety hazard in the Wrangell Narrows, AK, navigation channel. Funding of $600,000 has been included for the Corps to remove these rock impediments.

Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, AL.—An amount of $20,000,000 is recommended for maintenance of the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers navigation system in Alabama. The increase over the budget request will allow the Corps to perform rock dredging, purchase land and contract dredge material disposal areas, and carry out other essential operation and maintenance activities.

Mobile Harbor, AL.—An additional $4,000,000 has been recommended for the Mobile Harbor, AL, navigation project for the Corps to undertake additional maintenance dredging. The amount recommended includes $600,000 for the Corps to perform environmental clearance activities for maintenance at Arlington Channel.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, AL-MS.—The Committee recommendation for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project includes an increase of $1,200,000 for the Corps to perform additional dredging in critical reaches of the waterway.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an increase of $1,600,000 for the Corps to continue to install additional tow haulage equipment at locks on the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system.

La Grange Bayou, FL.—An additional $250,000 has been provided for the La Grange Bayou, FL, project for the Corps to perform environmental studies and water quality certification work prior to maintenance dredging.

Ponce DeLeon Inlet, FL.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Ponce DeLeon Inlet project in Florida. The increased funding over the budget request is provided for construction of a north jetty extension to relieve erosion pressures on the jetty.

Kaskaskia River navigation, Illinois.—The Committee recommendation includes $490,000 for the Corps to examine the feasibility of operating remotely the low volume Kaskaskia lock and dam from a high volume lock and dam located elsewhere within the St. Louis district.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, LA.—An additional amount of $3,000,000 over the budget request is provided for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway project in Louisiana for additional dredging, lock repairs and equipment purchases.

Portland Harbor, ME.—Sufficient funding over the budget request is provided for the Portland Harbor project in Maine for the Corps to complete plans and specifications and to award a construction contract for maintenance dredging of the harbor.

Pentwater Harbor, MI.—The Committee has included $1,900,000 the Corps to advertise and award a construction contract to initiate phase two of the repair to the north and south piers at Pentwater Harbor, MI.

Water control management regionalization.—The Committee has become aware of a plan for regionalization of water control management activities for projects operated by the Corps of Engineers. The Committee requests a report outlining the plan and any impacts on current Corps of Engineer districts and division operations and resources prior to adoption of the plan.

Missouri River between Garrison Dam and Lake Oahe, ND.—The Corps is directed to use $750,000 of available funds to undertake bank stabilization for the most serious erosion sites along 174 miles of riverbank identified in a 1997 report by the North Dakota State Water Commission.

Missouri River between Fort Peck and Culbertson, MT.—The Corps is urged to use nontraditional means of combating river bank erosion along the Missouri River between Fort Peck and Culbertson, MT.

Cochecho River, NH.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Cochecho River, NH, project for the Corps to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction of an upland disposal site.

Conchas Dam and Lake, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware of Corps efforts to be of assistance in resolving recreation facility problems at Conchas Lake in New Mexico. The Corps is to be commended for their efforts and is strongly encouraged to continue to provide assistance to the greatest extent possible.

Upper Rio Grande water operation model, New Mexico.—The Committee has provide $850,000 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. The Corps is to provide a report to the Committee on progress and plans to complete this activity. The Committee expects the Corps to coordinate and consult with the Bureau of Reclamation in preparing this report.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, ND.—The Committee recommendation for the Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea project in North Dakota includes $100,000 for the Corps to continue mosquito control activities.

Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea (Pea Patch Island), New Jersey and Delaware.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,500,000 for the Corps to begin the process of addressing the erosion of the shoreline in the vicinity of Pea Patch Island located in the Delaware River east of Delaware City, DE. The additional funds will allow the Corps to review State-prepared design documents for the restoration, perform soil sample testing, coordinate with the State historic society, prepare NEPA documents, and modify plans and specification in preparation for project implementation.

Columbia River navigation channel, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 40-foot Columbia River navigation 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 advance maintenance dredging to assure that project depth of 40 feet is maintained to the maximum extent possible.

Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, below Vancouver, WA, and Portland, OR.—The Committee is aware of the severely deteriorated condition of the north breakwater at Astoria east boat basin in Oregon. The Committee recommendation includes $4,800,000 for the Corps to proceed to initiate and complete rehabilitation of the eastern 400 feet of the north breakwater.

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, North Marina breakwater, Oregon.—The Committee has increased the funding for the Yaquina Bay and Harbor, OR project by $1,100,000 to allow the Corps to initiate the first phase of work to reconstruct the deteriorated North Marina breakwater.

Charleston Harbor, SC.—The Committee has included an additional $900,000 for the Corps to undertake dike repair, ditching

and dewatering the south cell of Clouter Creek disposal area in South Carolina.

Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, SC.—An additional $200,000 is provided for the Corps to dredge the McClellan branch of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in South Carolina.

Big Bend Dam, Lake Sharpe, SD.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 for the Corps to continue repairs to facilities damages in flooding at the Big Bend Dam, Lake Sharpe, SD, project.

Fort Randall Dam, Lake Francis Case, SD.—The recommendation of $7,717,000 for the Fort Randall Dam, Lake Francis Case project in South Dakota includes $300,000 for the Corps to continue repairs to facilities damaged in flooding.

Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe, SD.—The Committee recommendation for Oahe Dam, Lake Oahe project in South Dakota is $9,217,000 and includes $600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to identify ways to alleviate sediment buildup near Pierre and Fort Pierre, SD, and $150,000 to repair facilities damaged by flooding.

Connecticut River basin (master plan), Vermont.—The Corps of Engineers should, in the development of the Connecticut River basin master plan, coordinate their work with other environmental assessments which are also underway.

Kennewick Man skeletal remains.—The Committee continues to be concerned that the Corps of Engineers is not acting in an impartial manner concerning the disposition of the Kennewick Man remains and notes recent actions by the Corps that resulted in the loss of a potential piece of the skeleton. The Committee continues to believe the Corps should work cooperatively with all affected interest groups in determining the treatment and disposition of the Kennewick Man skeleton. The Committee expects the Corps to act objectively in all areas concerning these remains and in resolving all questions surrounding access to and the study and disposition of the remains.

Willapa River and Harbor, WA.—The Committee has been informed about the ongoing serious erosion problem at the Willapa River and Harbor, WA, navigation project. Congress provided an additional $2,425,000 in appropriations for the current fiscal year to help address the situation, but erosion continues to threaten public facilities. The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps to finalize a plan to resolve this ongoing problem. In the interim, the Corps strongly urged to use available emergency funds, as appropriate, to protect threatened public facilities. Funding is also provided to determine whether the navigation channel can be maintained cost effectively.

Bluestone Lake, WV.—The Committee has provided an additional $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reevaluation study of a possible hydroelectric plant addition to the Bluestone Dam in West Virginia.

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: the need for aquatic weed control in the Mobile-Tensaw Delta of Alabama.

The Committee has been informed of the use by the Mississippi Valley Division of a new technology, passive microwave radiometry,

to measure the soil moisture content along the Mississippi River levee system to locate areas of levee saturation and underseepage. The Committee supports the application of this type of new technology and encourages the Corps to expand its use, if appropriate. The Corps is requested to provide the Committee with a report on the effectiveness and cost comparison of microwave radiometry in levee monitoring and other relevant applications, including advisability of expanding the use of the technology.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1998	$106,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	117,000,000
Committee recommendation	106,000,000

An appropriation of $106,000,000 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 concerned that the Corps has not proceeded to fully implement the administrative appeals process for which funding was provided last year. The Committee recommendation, while holding the Regulatory Program at the 1998 level of funding, supports the implementation of the administrative appeals process, including appeals related to jurisdictional determinations. The Corps is to report to the Committee on its progress in implementing the program at the hearing on the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $320,000 for the Corps to initiate and complete the Yellowstone River special area management plan, Gardiner to Springdale, MT, study which will assess the long-term effects of streambank stabilization. Information provided by the study should help in making timely decisions based on a watershed approach, and possibly result in a general permit for the area. The Committee expects that this effort will be coordinated with the Yellowstone River task force.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1998	$4,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	.....
Committee recommendation	.....

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.

The Committee understands that, based on the average yearly funding requirement, additional appropriations are not required for fiscal year 1999.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1998	$140,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	140,000,000
Committee recommendation	140,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,000,000 to continue activities related to the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] in fiscal year 1999. This is the same as the amount requested.

The responsibility for the cleanup of contaminated sites under the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP] was transferred to the Army Corps of Engineers in the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Public Law 105–62. The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy and the Corps of Engineers have not been able to enter into an agreement on the functions of the program assumed by the Corps and, therefore, finds it necessary to include clarifying language in this year's bill.

The FUSRAP Program is not specifically defined by statute. The program was established in 1974 under the broad authority of the Atomic Energy Act and, until fiscal year 1998, funds for the cleanup of contaminated sites have been appropriated to the Department of Energy through existing appropriation accounts. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy.

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

The Committee directs DOE and the Corps of Engineers to enter into a memorandum of understanding [MOU] to remedy any misunderstanding that may exist between the two agencies as to the roles and responsibilities related to the cleanup program. Such an MOU is essential to improving the exchange of information and resolution of future issues.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1998	$148,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	148,000,000
Committee recommendation	148,000,000

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 $148,000,000.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1998	$41,153,000
Budget estimate, 1999	40,948,000
Committee recommendation	44,948,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1999 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act is $44,948,000. An appropriation of $28,189,000 has been provided for Central Utah project construction and $10,476,000 for commission activities.

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

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriations, 1998	$694,348,000
Budget estimate, 1999	640,124,000
Committee recommendation	672,119,000

An appropriation of $672,119,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Water and related resources incorporates activities previously funded under general investigations, construction program, and operation and maintenance.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES						
ARIZONA						
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	7,080,000	.....	7,080,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	4,279,783,350	3,346,237,350	49,908,000	.....	46,218,000	.....
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	448,076,000	406,728,936	2,407,000	6,966,000	2,407,000	6,966,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	102,373,078	92,942,165	2,950,000	.....	2,950,000	.....
NORTHERN AZ WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	650,000	.....	650,000	.....
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	16,767,000	3,000,000	.....	1,500,000	.....	1,500,000
SOUTH/CENTRAL AZ WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	1,050,000	.....	1,050,000	.....
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT	58,039,000	11,342,999	3,000,000	.....	3,000,000	.....
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	5,935,000	2,800,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	.....	22,213,000	.....	22,213,000
CALIFORNIA						
CACHUMA PROJECT	28,306,000	22,689,000	531,000	6,160,000	531,000	6,160,000
CALIFORNIA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	1,863,000	.....	1,863,000	.....
CALLEGUAS MUINICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	20,000,000	.....	1,300,000	.....	.....	.....
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:						
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	2,719,575,904	528,115,189	9,722,000	9,558,000	9,276,000	9,558,000
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT	.....	.....	1,222,000	.....	1,222,000	.....
DELTA DIVISION	362,186,018	211,134,320	13,216,000	4,791,000	16,216,000	4,791,000
EAST SIDE DIVISION	.....	.....	413,000	3,543,000	413,000	3,543,000
FRIANT DIVISION	421,000	75,000	2,602,000	2,196,000	2,602,000	2,196,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	604,160,000	313,532,670	15,846,000	2,754,000	17,846,000	2,754,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	528,187,677	373,542,691	11,926,000	735,000	12,426,000	735,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	354,993,000	307,949,201	692,000	.....	692,000	.....

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	215,692,000	57,105,000	7,900,000	.....	7,900,000	.....
SHASTA DIVISION	302,434,067	275,300,372	4,457,000	8,965,000	4,457,000	8,965,000
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	319,094,409	316,959,409	3,653,000	6,759,000	3,653,000	6,759,000
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	.....	.....	1,014,000	5,063,000	1,014,000	5,063,000
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	1,457,608,570	571,321,359	5,331,000	6,993,000	5,331,000	6,993,000
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	.....	.....	2,000,000	.....	2,000,000	.....
LONG BEACH/LA COUNTY WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	15,100,000	.....	1,300,000	.....	.....	.....
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	69,970,000	50,330,000	10,000,000	.....	10,000,000	.....
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	20,000,000	.....	1,300,000	.....	.....	.....
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	20,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....
ORLAND PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	685,000	.....	685,000
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	10,000,000	900,000	400,000	.....	400,000	.....
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	172,590,000	28,788,000	13,000,000	.....	13,000,000	.....
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	38,090,000	22,792,000	2,500,000	.....	2,500,000	.....
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	109,959,000	10,033,679	3,000,000	.....	3,000,000	.....
SOLANO PROJECT	.....	.....	906,000	975,000	906,000	975,000
SO. CALIF. COMPREHENSIVE WATER RECLAMATION STUDY	3,491,999	3,291,999	200,000	.....	200,000	.....
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	680,000	.....	680,000	.....
COLORADO						
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 AND 8	512,870,700	76,080,623	3,000,000	.....	3,000,000	.....
COLLBRAN PROJECT	.....	.....	1,206,000	1,039,000	1,206,000	1,039,000
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	.....	.....	104,000	7,158,000	104,000	7,158,000
COLORADO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	733,000	.....	733,000	.....
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	.....	.....	50,000	12,000	50,000	12,000
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	.....	.....	160,000	4,447,000	160,000	4,447,000
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	506,000	150,000	506,000	150,000

LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	.....	.....	722,000	908,000	722,000	908,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	500,000	.....	500,000	.....
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	318,000	.....	318,000
MANCOS PROJECT	.....	.....	55,000	18,000	55,000	18,000
PARADOX UNIT, CRBSCP	.....	.....	.....	2,474,000	.....	2,474,000
PINE RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	76,000	46,000	76,000	46,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS	.....	.....	234,000	3,152,000	234,000	3,152,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	.....	.....	79,000	18,000	79,000	18,000
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN SELENIUM STUDY	540,000	.....	440,000	.....	440,000	.....
HAWAII						
HAWAII WATER MANAGEMENT APPRAISAL STUDY	300,000	.....	.....	.....	200,000	.....
IDAHO						
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	2,837,000	2,340,000	2,837,000	2,340,000
COLUMBIA-SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	111,086,000	41,035,305	13,116,000	.....	13,116,000	.....
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	850,000	.....	50,000	.....	50,000	.....
IDAHO WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	715,000	.....	715,000	.....
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	.....	.....	3,639,000	1,832,000	3,639,000	1,832,000
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	536,374	300,000	.....	300,000	.....
MACCALL AREA WASTEWATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	6,100,000	.....	.....	.....	3,600,000	.....
KANSAS						
EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	3,200,000	2,000,000	.....	.....	200,000	.....
KANSAS WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	613,000	.....	613,000	.....
WICHITA PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	188,000	.....	188,000
MONTANA						
FORT PECK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	5,800,000	300,000	.....	.....	3,000,000	.....
FORT PECK RESERVATION, MR&I WATER SYSTEM	600,000	240,000	.....	.....	360,000	.....
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	.....	.....	.....	770,000	.....	770,000
MILK RIVER PROJECT	.....	.....	250,000	479,000	250,000	479,000
MONTANA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM	.....	.....	863,000	.....	863,000	.....
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WTR RIGHTS SETTLEMENT STUDY	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	1,000,000	.....
NEBRASKA						
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	.....	.....	44,000	22,000	44,000	22,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
NEBRASKA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			337,000		337,000	
NEVADA						
CARSON RIVER BASIN GROUNDWATER STUDY, NV	300,000				150,000	
LAKE TAHOE REGIONAL WETLANDS DEVEL., NV	800,000				600,000	
LAS VEGAS SHALLOW AQUIFER DESALINATION, NV	20,000,000				3,250,000	
NEWLANDS PROJECT			5,360,000	344,000	5,360,000	344,000
SOUTHERN NEVADA/UTAH WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			125,000		125,000	
SPARKS WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	250,000				250,000	
WALKER RIVER BASIN	1,300,000	700,000			300,000	
WASHOE PROJECT			1,021,000	590,000	1,021,000	590,000
NEW MEXICO						
CARLSBAD PROJECT			845,000	490,000	845,000	490,000
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	1,402,992	963,992	2,015,000	8,929,000	2,015,000	8,929,000
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT				178,000		178,000
RIO GRANDE PROJECT			685,000	2,972,000	685,000	2,972,000
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			171,000		171,000	
SAN JUAN GALLUP-NAVAJO WATER SUPPLY	938,000	788,000			150,000	
SAN JUAN RIVER GALLUP. MT. TAYLOR MINE	500,000				200,000	
SOUTHERN NM/WEST TX WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			225,000		225,000	
UPPER RIO GRANDE BSN WATER MGMT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			356,000		2,356,000	
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	29,463,870	18,008,870	3,995,000		3,995,000	

NORTH DAKOTA						
DAKOTA TRIBES WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			165,000		165,000	
DAKOTA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			362,000		487,000	
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P–SMBP	1,524,499,440	617,139,251	20,402,000	3,712,000	26,402,000	3,712,000
OKLAHOMA						
ARBUCKLE PROJECT				140,000		140,000
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT				493,000		493,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT				193,000		193,000
NORMAN PROJECT				126,000		126,000
OKLAHOMA WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			367,000		367,000	
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT				599,000		599,000
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT				223,000		223,000
OREGON						
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG. SYS. CONSERVATION FEASIBILITY	760,324	635,324	125,000		125,000	
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT			116,000	318,000	116,000	318,000
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT			1,000,000			
DESCHUTES PROJECT			105,000	115,000	105,000	115,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	1,075,541	925,541	50,000		50,000	
KLAMATH PROJECT			5,429,000	354,000	5,429,000	354,000
OREGON WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			910,000		910,000	
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION			93,000	1,105,000	93,000	1,105,000
TUALATIN PROJECT			13,000	96,000	13,000	96,000
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	899,345	299,345	200,000		200,000	
UMATILLA PROJECT			331,000	1,815,000	331,000	1,815,000
SOUTH DAKOTA						
LAKE ANDES-WAGNER, SD	150,000				150,000	
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	131,865,000	41,512,081	10,000,000		20,000,000	
MNI WICONI PROJECT	302,215,000	113,380,121	26,717,000	4,627,000	29,317,000	4,627,000
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY	225,000	75,000	100,000		100,000	
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT				16,000		16,000
TEXAS						
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT				92,000		92,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT				324,000		324,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
EL PASO-LAS CRUCES REGIONAL SUSTAINABLE WATER PROJ	1,550,000	750,000			400,000	
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	5,500,000	4,500,000			1,000,000	
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT				504,000		504,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT				2,017,000		2,017,000
TEXAS WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			325,000		325,000	
UTAH						
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE	1,313,514,980	1,306,801,980	800,000	451,000	800,000	451,000
HYRUM PROJECT			38,000	23,000	38,000	23,000
MOON LAKE PROJECT			11,000	19,000	11,000	19,000
NAVAJO SANDSTON AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	875,000				200,000	
NEWTON PROJECT			33,000	9,000	33,000	9,000
NORTHERN UTAH WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			278,000		278,000	
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT			47,000	12,000	47,000	12,000
PROVO RIVER PROJECT			265,000	197,000	265,000	197,000
SCOFIELD PROJECT			40,000	3,000	40,000	3,000
SOUTHERN UTAH WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			403,000		403,000	
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT			84,000	3,000	84,000	3,000
TOOELE WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND REUSE PROJECT	2,300,000	500,000	800,000		3,000,000	
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	19,639,000	15,929,723	1,445,000	3,525,000	1,445,000	3,525,000
WEBER RIVER PROJECT			210,000	7,000	210,000	7,000
WASHINGTON						
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT			3,865,000	6,749,000	3,865,000	6,749,000
WASHINGTON WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			395,000		395,000	
YAKIMA PROJECT			204,000	9,764,000	204,000	9,764,000

YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WTR ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	177,541,000	14,716,257	8,980,000		8,980,000	
WYOMING						
KENDRICK PROJECT			4,000	2,660,000	4,000	2,660,000
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT			84,000	1,126,000	84,000	1,126,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT			34,000	845,000	34,000	845,000
WYOMING WATER MANAGEMENT AND TECH ASST PROGRAM			300,000		300,000	
VARIOUS						
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, T. II BASINWIDE	75,000,000	13,045,187	12,300,000		12,300,000	
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SEC. 5			1,931,000	902,000	1,931,000	902,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECT. 8, REC, FISH AND WILDLIFE	85,851,692	49,844,956	3,682,000		3,682,000	
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	70,465,000	47,622,099	75,000		75,000	
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM			3,505,000		3,505,000	
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM			5,250,000		5,250,000	
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION	137,855,000	44,056,362	15,007,000		15,548,000	
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION			1,993,000		1,993,000	
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES				3,898,000		3,898,000
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM				281,000		281,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES			2,247,000		2,247,000	
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT			6,129,000		6,129,000	
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM			6,603,000		6,603,000	
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS			24,000	950,000	24,000	950,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION			1,500,000		1,500,000	
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS			8,905,000		8,905,000	
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING			884,000		884,000	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT			85,000	464,000	85,000	464,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN—OTHER PROJECTS			2,668,000	23,678,000	2,668,000	23,678,000
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES			1,023,000	550,000	1,023,000	550,000
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM			371,000	9,000	371,000	9,000
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION			4,873,000		4,873,000	
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT—TITLE 28			4,440,000		7,145,000	
RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE PROG. ADMININISTRATION			1,891,000		1,891,000	
SAFETY OF DAMS:						
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM				1,500,000		1,500,000
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION AND MODIFICATION				56,550,000		56,550,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:						
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	153,479,445	55,021,985	6,140,000		6,140,000	
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	17,711,187	11,211,187	1,300,000		3,300,000	
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE	24,785,854	24,485,854	250,000		250,000	
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTR. PROTECTION AND ENHANCE	3,500,000		700,000		700,000	
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,324,656	824,656	300,000		300,000	
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT	10,418,951	2,918,951	1,500,000		1,500,000	
SITE SECURITY				5,000,000		5,000,000
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION			144,000		144,000	
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY			2,100,000		2,100,000	
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES			100,000		100,000	
UNSCHEDULED MAINTENANCE				1,500,000		1,500,000
WATER MANAGEMENT CONSERVATION PROGRAM			7,551,000		7,551,000	
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT			7,296,000		7,296,000	
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS				−30,093,000		−35,743,000
WORKING CAPITAL FUND TRANSFER			−25,800,000		−25,800,000	
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES			396,863,000	243,261,000	434,508,000	237,611,000

Central Arizona project, Arizona.—The Committee has recommended an appropriation of $46,218,000 for the central Arizona project. The Committee understands that the budget request for fiscal year 1999 included $560,000 for the Tucson Reliability Division of the central Arizona project for use on feasibility investigations and facilities planning for CAP reliability options; and that affected stakeholders had differing desires on the level of funding for these studies. Discussion among the parties resulted in agreement on a budget of $370,000 for the Tucson reliability work for fiscal year 1999, resulting in a $190,000 reduction in the amount of funding that is needed. Field reviews are to be kept to a minimum as well as land, design, and fish and wildlife activities.

The Committee has also recommended a reduction of $3,500,000 in project fish and wildlife coordination, mitigation, and native species activities.

Central Valley project, American River Division, California.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $5,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to make the site selection and initiate construction of a permanent replacement pumping facility for the Placer County Water Agency. No funding is included for the Folsom Dam temperature control device due to lack of construction authorization.

Central Valley project, Delta Division, California.—The Committee has provided $3,250,000 for the construction of the fish screen at Contra Costa pumping plant intake on Rock Slough in California.

Central Valley project, miscellaneous project programs, California.—An appropriation of $20,600,000 is provided for Central Valley project, miscellaneous project programs in California. Included in this amount is $5,500,000 for design and construction of facilities to upgrade the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District's facilities needed to deliver refuge water supplies to the west Sacramento complex of refuges.

Central Valley project, Sacramento River Division, California.—The Committee recommendation for the Sacramento River Division of the Central Valley project in California includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.

Hawaii water management and technical assistance studies.—The Committee has included $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake appraisal level activities related to developing plans to increase the delivery efficiency of existing water systems developed to serve sugarcane plantations and surrounding communities in the State of Hawaii.

Fort Hall Indian Reservation, ID.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $200,000 of available funds to begin a feasibility study to address the serious dangers of ground water contamination at the Fort Hall Indian Reservation in Idaho.

Garrison diversion project, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation for the Garrison diversion project is $30,114,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request. The Bureau of Reclamation to continue development of municipal, rural, and industrial water programs for the Oaks test area and for Indian water systems. The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000, for

continued development of Indian municipal, rural, and irrigation facilities.

San Juan River Gallup, Mount Taylor pipeline, NM.—The Committee is pleased with the cooperation and signing of the memorandum of agreement regarding conducting a feasibility study of a pipeline to provide water from Mount Taylor mine in New Mexico. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to move expeditiously on activities necessary to confirm the quantity and quality of the water available at the mine. An amount of $200,000 has been provided to insure there are no delays due to funding constraints.

San Juan Gallup-Navajo water supply study, New Mexico.—The Committee has recommended $150,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the feasibility report and initiate NEPA compliance activities for the San Juan Gallup-Navajo water supply study in New Mexico.

Upper Rio Grande water operations model study, New Mexico.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use available funds to continue the Upper Rio Grande water operations model study at the current year level of funding of $400,000.

Upper Rio Grande Basin Water Management and Technical Assistance Program, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided an increase of $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to initiate and complete a confirmatory well drilling program which is part of a preliminary Taos Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement. The Committee expects the Bureau to expedite this work and to keep the Committee informed of its progress.

Laughlin Lagoon, NV.—The Committee recommendation includes sufficient funding for the Bureau of Reclamation to clean up and dredge the Laughlin Lagoon along the Colorado River in Nevada. The Committee has been informed that the Bureau of Reclamation has acknowledged its obligation to maintain and correct deficiencies caused by work previously undertaken by the Bureau. The Committee expects the Bureau to move expeditiously to accomplish the planned cleanup and dredging activities.

Klamath project, Oregon.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested in the budget for the Klamath project in Oregon and supports the program as described in the Bureau of Reclamation's budget justification.

Dakota water management and technical assistance, South Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes a total of $250,000, an increase of $125,000, for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Black Hill, SD, water management study.

Lake Andes-Wagner project, South Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake an environmental impact statement [EIS] for the Lake Andes-Wagner project in South Dakota. The EIS is needed to determine the feasibility of possible future project construction.

Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Program.—In reviewing the out-year costs for the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, the Committee is concerned with the potential expansion of the program and program costs. It appears that the scope of work is expanding beyond that authorized by the Grand Canyon Protection Act and prescribed by the environmental impact state-

ment and record of decision. The Committee directs the Department to remain at budget levels for fiscal years 1998–99 for the Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center.

Endangered species recovery implementation.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000, an increase of $541,000, for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake additional endangered species implementation activities in the San Juan River basin.

Reclamation recreation management—title XXVIII.—An additional $2,700,000 is included to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in a meaningful way in a cost-shared program with the State of New Mexico in recreation facility improvements under title XXVIII of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustments Act, Public Law 102–575. The Committee is informed that the State has been financing these projects unilaterally and that an imbalance has existed in the allocation of funding through this program. The recommended funding will help correct this situation.

Competing water demands evaluation.—The Committee is informed by the authorizing committee that the Bureau of Reclamation plans to complete evaluations of current practices on at least one project in each of its 26 area offices, with the goal of finding ways to more effectively manage competing demands for water and of their concerns in this regard. Therefore, the Committee directs that none of the funds provided herein or made available in prior years be used for such evaluation until specifically authorized by Congress.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriations, 1998	$85,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	143,300,000
Committee recommendation	65,000,000

An appropriation of $65,000,000 is recommended for the California Bay-Delta Ecosystem Restoration [CALFED] Program.

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

The fiscal year budget proposes funding of $143,300,000, an increase of $58,300,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1998. While the Committee is unable to provide the full budget request due to severe budget constraints, much progress has been made over the past year to establish a strong project selection process. While CALFED is an important initiative, it must compete with other important programs during a time of reduced budget allocations and constraints. The Committee believes that the long-term success of the program is not dependent so much upon the level of funding as it does on the quality of the projects selected, and performance and ecosystem health monitoring measures to gauge the effectiveness of completed activities and projects. As stated last year, it will take time for the program to mature. The allocation of the current year appropriation was completed only recently, and construction or implementation work on most projects

is just beginning. Further, financial and accounting systems essential to proper funds management are not fully in place.

The Committee, therefore, believes that a substantial expansion of the program at this time could adversely impact the program's overall success and the proper use of the resources committed to the program.

In providing this funding, the Committee understands and anticipates that the ecosystem roundtable's revised priority setting and coordinated funding allocation process will be in place and underway as part of the timely allocation and distribution process. The Committee also expects to see significant steps toward improved program coordination and integration reflected in each quarterly report to congress, including, but not limited to key elements of the CALFED and CVPIA program.

The Committee continues to be concerned that the CALFED, CVPIA, and related activities under the Central Valley project work in water and related resources duplicate and overlap each other. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior are to explore ways to consolidate this work into a single program in order to more clearly and simple display to total effort on ecosystem restoration activities.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1998	$10,425,000
Budget estimate, 1999	12,425,000
Committee recommendation	12,425,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $12,425,000, the same as the budget request, for the small reclamation program of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

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

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate		Committee recommendation	
			Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation	Resource management and development	Facility operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation
CALIFORNIA						
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER	15,379,000	6,666,356	2,600,000		2,600,000	
CHINO BASIN RESALINATION	10,300,000	8,018,000	2,114,000		2,114,000	
SALINAS VALLEY	9,876,000	4,800,000	1,700,000		1,700,000	
SAN SEVAINE PROJECT	28,100,000	976,000	781,000		781,000	
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	6,541,000	3,351,000	801,000		801,000	
OREGON						
MILLTOWN HILL, DOUGLAS COUNTY	18,624,000	3,355,000	4,004,000		4,004,000	
VARIOUS						
LOAN ADMINISTRATION			425,000		425,000	
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM			12,425,000		12,425,000	

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 1998	$33,130,000
Budget estimate, 1999	49,500,000
Committee recommendation	39,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $39,500,000 for the Central Valley project restoration fund. Budget constraints have required the Committee to limit the activities to be funded through the Central Valley project restoration funds for fiscal year 1999. However, the amount recommended represents an increase of $6,000,000 over the current year level.

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.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1998	$47,558,000
Budget estimate, 1999	48,000,000
Committee recommendation	48,000,000

The Committee recommendation for general administrative expenses is $48,000,000. 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.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

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

In the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, the Congress reorganized the Department of Energy's nondefense energy and science research programs to delineate the two areas of research. For fiscal year 1999, the Committee recommends two adjustments to the structure enacted last year. First, the magnetic fusion energy program is moved from energy research to science. Second, the Committee proposes a general provision to rename the Office of Energy Research; which, contrary to the implications of its name, does not manage the Department's energy research but rather its science programs, to the Office of Science Research. Consequently, the title of the Office's director becomes the Director of Science Research.

INAPPROPRIATE USE OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee has learned that funds made available to the Department of Energy by previous appropriations acts have been used to, among other things: pay for members of industry associations and associated entities to attend national and international conferences, publish magazines, purchase association membership information, conduct surveys of association membership, place op-ed style articles in publications, write talking points in support of the Department's programs, and underwrite industry conferences.

The Committee has not included a statutory prohibition on these activities because the activities themselves are not at issue; there may be legitimate reasons for employees of the Department of Energy or its management and operating contractors to undertake the activities listed above. However, a distinction needs to be drawn between employees of the Department of Energy or its management and operating contractors who act on behalf of the Government and other contractors whose predominant responsibility is not to the Government. The Department and its management and operating contractors should not contract with any other entity for the performance of these or similar responsibilities, and, as a general rule, appropriated funds should not be used, directly or indirectly, to underwrite the expenses of industry associations or associated entities.

ENERGY SUPPLY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1998	$906,807,000
Budget estimate, 1999	1,129,042,000
Committee recommendation	699,836,000

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 1998	$346,266,000
Budget estimate, 1999	437,156,000
Committee recommendation	345,479,000

This is the first Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act considered by the Committee following the signing of the Kyoto Global Climate Change Accord.

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

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

When considered in those terms, the commitments made in Kyoto will have a negligible effect on the concentration of CO_2 and other pollutants in the atmosphere. If prudence merits the development of new energy production technologies, it also requires a recognition that existing technology does not provide a means to meet increasing global energy requirements while stabilizing the production of atmospheric pollutants and certainly does not provide a means to reduce atmospheric pollution concentrations.

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

The Committee is aware that State and local governments as well as private companies interested in pursuing grants through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, have been hampered by a lack of comprehensive grant information, and the Department's inability to fund projects which involve multiple renewable or energy efficiency technologies. These limitations are preventing worthy projects from receiving Federal assistance. To address this problem, the Committee urges DOE, in preparing its fiscal year 2000 budget, to consider and propose ways of integrat-

ing energy efficiency and renewable programs to facilitate assistance for cross-sector technologies and practices.

Solar building technology research.—The Committee recommends $3,600,000 for solar building technology research. For space conditioning and water heating, the Committee provides $100,000 instead of the requested $500,000 and directs that the funds provided be used to improve computer models that predict the reliability of solar systems made of new materials. The Committee recommendation does not provide funds for precompetitive field validation.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee recommends $57,110,000 for photovoltaic energy systems which includes $2,000,000 to support the ongoing research in photovoltaics conducted by the Southeast and Southwest regional photovoltaic experiment stations. Within that amount, the Committee has provided $4,921,000 for basic research/university programs. Within advanced materials and devices, the Committee recommendation includes $15,289,000 for thin-film partnerships. Within collector research and systems development, the Committee recommendation includes $9,000,000 for manufacturing research and development.

Solar thermal energy systems.—The Committee recommendation includes $17,100,000 for solar thermal energy systems. Within this amount, $1,000,000 is provided for the dish/engine field verification initiative, $1,000,000 is provided for the solmat initiative, and no funds are provided for systems and markets/industrial assistance.

Biofuels.—The Committee recommendation includes $59,013,000 for biofuels energy systems. The Committee recommends that the funds provided be allocated in the following manner: within the "Biopower systems" account: $1,500,000 for thermochemical conversion, $10,000,000 for rural development, $2,300,000 for biomass/coal cofiring field validation, $4,000,000 for modular systems development, $1,000,000 for black-liquor gasification demonstration, and $2,500,000 for biomass for energy; within the "Transportation biofuels" account: $2,000,000 for advanced fermentation research and development, $2,500,000 for advanced cellulose research and development, $2,808,000 for pretreatment research and development, $1,000,000 for the plant biotechnology consortium, $8,690,000 for integrated process development, $9,065,000 for production facilities development, $550,000 for biodiesel production, $4,600,000 for feedstock production, and $2,500,000 for the regional biomass program.

The Vermont Department of Public Service in cooperation with the Vermont Department of Agriculture and Agency for Natural Resources has proposed to initiate an energy demonstration project designed to demonstrate to the agricultural community both the physical and economic feasibility of capturing and utilizing methane from agricultural waste products for combined heat and power production on the farm. The Committee recommendation for biopower systems includes $695,000 for the Vermont methane energy production proposal.

The Committee recommendation includes $250,000 to evaluate the amount, distribution, and best method of extraction and utilization of methane gas from the Sunrise Mountain Landfill in Nevada.

The Committee is also aware of proposals to use switchgrass that is beneficial to control soil erosion as a fuel for electric generation,

is supportive and recommends that the Department enter into cost-sharing partnerships to demonstrate these technologies if the non-Federal partners provide the required cost sharing.

The Committee is aware of a biopower initiative at the Energy and Environmental Research Center [EERC]. The Committee recognizes the unique capabilities of the EERC to conduct laboratory and pilot plant research to evaluate and adapt existing technologies for cofiring, as well as to develop advanced technologies for combustion, gasification, and hot-gas cleaning, and encourages the Department to evaluate the biopower initiative and conduct cooperative work in this area with the EERC.

Wind.—The Committee recommendation includes $33,200,000 for wind energy systems. Within turbine research, $2,000,000 is provided for near-term research and testing, $5,000,000 for the next generation turbine project, $1,000,0000 for the small wind project, and $4,000,000 for supporting research, testing, and management. Within cooperative research and testing, a total of $3,000,000 is provided for industry support and utility analysis. The full amount of the request is provided for certification and standards development.

Renewable energy production incentive program.—The Committee recommendation provides $3,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentives program.

Solar program support.—The Committee strongly endorses the Department's efforts to provide technical analysis and assistance to Federal and State policymakers considering the role of renewable energy technologies in a deregulated electricity market. The Committee has provided the full amount of the request, $4,000,000, for that effort. The Committee supports aspects of the proposed 5-year open competition solicitation for renewable energy technologies in particular the proposed evaluation criteria; carbon and other pollution reduction, verification, and validation of technologies, replicability, and export potential. However, due to budget pressure, the Committee is unable to provide the requested $10,000,000 for this proposed new initiative.

International solar energy.—The Committee supports the U.S. industry joint implementation agreement which received the totality of funds provided within international solar energy programs in the current year. The Committee supports the increased budget request of $3,400,000 for USIJI and provides the full amount of the request.

The Committee has not provided funds for two proposed new initiatives; CORECT and the America's 21st century program.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommends a total of $18,000,000 for geothermal technology development. Within that amount, $9,000,000 is recommended for exploration and production technology, $8,000,000 for drilling technology, and $1,000,000 for geothermal heat pump deployment.

Hydrogen research.—The Committee recommendation includes $29,000,000 for the hydrogen research program, a $12,750,000 increase over the current year. The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 for the Hydrogen Fuel Cell Power and Refueling Station project in Nevada, and $250,000 for the gasification of switchgrass and its use in fuel cells.

The Committee understands that Billings, MT, stands in a rich resource area for the materials necessary for solid waste fuel cells. The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, MT, to complete a resource assessment and feasibility study on construction of a solid waste hydrogen fuel cell manufacturing facility in the community.

Renewable Indian energy resources.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000, the same amount as provided in the current year, for the renewable Indian energy resources program.

Transmission reliability.—The Committee is concerned that the transition to a deregulated, competitive electricity market not be accompanied by a decrease in transmission system reliability. To that end, the Committee recommends $5,000,000 to support a national laboratory-utility industry partnership to coordinate and integrate research and technology development to address critical concerns related to the reliability of the emerging electricity market.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee strongly supports the goals of the electric energy systems and storage program. Due to budget pressures, the Committee recommends a $1,000,000 reduction from the $32,000,000 requested for high temperature superconducting research and development.

Remote power.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 for the remote power initiative to continue the demonstration of fuel cell technology and other clean power alternatives in remote, cold weather climates, and directs the Department utilize criteria for cost effectiveness of energy savings over a 25-year life cycle.

Carbon sequestration.—A variety of programs within the Department of Energy investigate the potential of carbon sequestration to reduce the release of carbon and other pollutants into the atmosphere. There is some concern, especially regarding deep ocean sequestration, that such a program would substitute one environmental problem for another. As the Department continues its work in this regard, special attention should be given to the concerns of coastal and island communities that are economically dependent upon the oceans.

Accelerated technology demonstration.—The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable energy includes $3,000,000 for the accelerated demonstration of federally sponsored research for renewable energy production and environmental remediation project at the Michigan Biotechnology Institute.

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation includes $15,651,000, the same amount as provided in the current year, for solar and renewable energy program direction.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1998	$243,060,000
Budget estimate, 1999	325,750,000
Committee recommendation	280,662,000

Nuclear fission currently provides 20 percent of domestic electricity production and emits no atmospheric pollutants. The United States has not yet determined how it will dispose of spent nuclear

fuel, and the Committee does not underestimate the technical and social challenges entailed in the disposal of spent nuclear fuel. However, unlike the emissions of coal, gas, and fuel oil plants, the byproducts of fission can be contained. Until even more advanced, base-load energy technologies are developed, nuclear fission provides the best credible means of reducing the concentration of atmospheric pollutants in the foreseeable future. For that reason, the Committee strongly supports the nuclear technology research and development program, the nuclear energy research initiative, and the nuclear energy plant optimization program.

Fast flux test facility.—The Committee is aware of the potential uses of the fast flux test facility [FFTF]. Without prejudice, the Committee has provided funding to keep the FFTF in hot standby until a decision is made on tritium production from within the "Nondefense environmental restoration" account from which the FFTF was funded until the decision was made to delay its decommissioning.

Isotopes.—The Committee recommends that the Department establish an advisory committee to review the need for, capability to, and proposals regarding the production of isotopes for medical, research, and other purposes. The Committee is aware of a number of broad analyses of these issues by organizations such as the Institute of Medicine and specific proposals involving Department as well as university-owned reactors. Given the breadth of interest in the production of isotopes, the Committee recommends that the advisory committee include representatives of industry, universities, and other Federal agencies.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY, AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 1998	$66,050,000
Budget estimate, 1999	76,000,000
Committee recommendation	56,000,000

The Committee recommends the full amount of the request for environment, safety, and health program direction. However, the Committee recommends that of the amount requested, an additional $20,000,000 be borne within the defense function.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1998	$105,100,000
Budget estimate, 1999	126,881,000
Committee recommendation	115,600,000

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation for the technical information management program is $1,600,000, the same amount as provided in the current year. The Committee recommends $6,500,000 for program management within this account.

Field offices and management.—The Committee recommendation for field offices and management is $95,000,000, the same as the current year.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 1998	$497,059,000
Budget estimate, 1999	462,000,000
Committee recommendation	456,700,000

Fast flux test facility.—The Committee recommendation provides $32,100,000 within the "Nondefense environmental management" account to provide for the continued hot standby of the fast flux test facility [FFTF]. The Department will decide whether to restart or decommission and decontaminate the FFTF in the coming year.

No matter what direction the Department determines for the facility, the Committee fully expects the Department to request additional funds from Congress to support that decision to minimize job layoffs.

Science and technology.—All funds provided for environmental management technology development are provided within defense environmental management.

Uranium Mill Tailings Remediation Act.—The Department is nearing the completion of its uranium mill tailings work managed by the Grand Junction Project Office. It has been brought to the attention of the Committee that the Department's current plans do not call for the remediation of the project office site itself. Within 120 days of enactment of this act, the Department should report to the Committees on Appropriations of the requirements, both legal and environmental, to remediate the project office site.

Brookhaven National Laboratory.—The Committee considers the remediation of soil and water contamination at the Brookhaven National Laboratory to be of the highest priority. Consequently, $30,000,000, an increase of $5,700,000 over the amount of the request, is provided to accelerate that work.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program [FUSRAP].—The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy has not reached agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the transfer of cleanup responsibilities under FUSRAP and, therefore, has included clarifying language in the bill. The Committee directs the Department to fulfill its responsibilities at FUSRAP sites exclusive of the remedial actions which is to be performed by the Corps of Engineers. The Department will use funds appropriated under this account and the departmental administration accounts in fulfilling such responsibilities.

Prior-year balances.—The Committee recommends the use of $10,000,000 of prior-year balances derived from funds previously provided for nondefense environmental restoration and nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 1998	$220,200,000
Budget estimate, 1999	277,000,000
Committee recommendation	200,000,000

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 pro-

vided 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 budget constraints, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $77,000,000 from the budget request of $277,000,000.

The Committee is aware that the Secretary of Energy has failed to implement section 511 of the energy and water appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1998 regarding restoration of the arming and arrest authority at the Paducah and Portsmouth gaseous diffusion plants. In accordance with testimony by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Committee agrees that the Secretary of Energy is responsible for implementation of these guidelines affecting arming and arrest authority under section 161k of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201k). The Committee also expects that the Secretary will define adequate security guards carrying sidearms as all security guards employed at both Paducah and Portsmouth plants. The Committee concurs with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and directs the Secretary to implement section 511 immediately.

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

Appropriations, 1998	$160,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	190,000,000
Committee recommendation	190,000,000

The Committee has provided $4,875,000 for the State of Nevada and $5,540,000 for affected local governments in accordance with statutory restrictions contained in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

Data repository.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the University of Nevada Las Vegas to manage data from scientific studies of Yucca Mountain.

Cannister aging and corrosion.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management to study cannister aging and corrosion to further the understanding of the interaction of nuclear waste with cannisters and the effects of aging and corrosion on waste sequestration.

SCIENCE

Appropriations, 1998	$2,235,708,000
Budget estimate, 1999	2,482,460,000
Committee recommendation	2,669,560,000

The Committee has completed its consolidation of the Department's science accounts by moving fusion energy sciences from the "Energy supply" account to the "Science" account.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1998	$680,035,000
Budget estimate, 1999	691,000,000
Committee recommendation	691,000,000

The Committee has provided the full amount of the request for high energy physics.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

Appropriations, 1998	$320,925,000
Budget estimate, 1999	332,600,000
Committee recommendation	332,600,000

The Committee has provided the full amount of the request for nuclear physics.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1998	$406,710,000
Budget estimate, 1999	392,600,000
Committee recommendation	407,600,000

Low Dose Effects Program.—The Committee has provided $20,000,000 for the Low Dose Effects Program. The Department is to develop a program with the goal to determine the biological effects of exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation by 2008. Within 120 days of enactment of this act, the Department is to submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate a plan and proposed budget for the next 5 years of this effort.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to begin planning for the marine mammal research and education center to be located at the Natural Energy Laboratory on the Island of Hawaii. The Committee is aware of the State of Hawaii's intent to contribute $1,900,000 for this project.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1998	$668,240,000
Budget estimate, 1999	836,100,000
Committee recommendation	836,100,000

Spallation neutron source.—Despite significant budget pressures, the Committee recommends the full amount of the request for construction of the spallation neutron source. The Department of Energy's construction and operation of scientific user facilities sets it apart from any other Federal agency. The Committee encourages the Department's continued success in this regard, and will make every effort to provide the optimum annual funding to complete construction on schedule.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to continue the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] Program.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1998	$173,667,000
Budget estimate, 1999	182,900,000
Committee recommendation	172,260,000

Computational and technology research.—Due to budget pressure, the Committee recommends $150,000,000 for computational and technology research, a reduction of $10,640,000 from the request.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1998	$232,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	228,160,000
Committee recommendation	232,000,000

The Committee has previously complemented the review and coordination provided to the magnetic fusion program by the Fusion Energy Sciences Advisory Board and its predecessor; the Fusion Energy Advisory Board. The Committee is aware of efforts within the domestic and international fusion community to redirect the program in light of the demise of the proposed $11,000,000,000 international thermonuclear experimental reactor [ITER]; an inevitable decision given current and anticipated budgets. Three options are under consideration: a single machine strategy based on a more affordable ITER concept; a multiple machine strategy that would pursue parallel, phased, or sequential steps; and the possibility of deferring any decision about the next magnetic fusion facilities.

The Committee recommends that the Department, prior to committing to any future magnetic fusion program or facilities, conduct a broader review to determine which fusion technology or technologies the United States should pursue to achieve ignition and/or a fusion energy device.

The Department currently funds four fusion related technologies; pulsed-power, lasers, ion drivers, and magnetic fusion. The Department has been reluctant or unable to review those technologies as a group because they have different near-term objectives and are managed by different program offices. Regardless of these near-term and management differences, the Committee is aware that scientists within each program have an eye toward ignition and energy applications.

The Committee is well aware of the challenges entailed by a review of multiple programs with multiple and possibly competing technologies. However, the Department should conduct an encompassing review of all four technologies prior to making decisions about next steps toward fusion energy, specifically to consider non-magnetic alternatives. At the very least, the review should develop a roadmap that justifies the continued development of each technology.

The Committee is aware of a number of proposals for the decontamination and decommissioning of the Tokamak fusion test reactor [TFTR], the most expeditious of which could save the Department 3 years and $25,000,000. In the Committee's view, this represents a clear opportunity for the Department to prove its ability to decontaminate and decommission a facility in a timely and efficient manner. The Department should report to the Committee within 180 days on the schedule and budget for the decommissioning and decontamination of the TFTR.

UNIVERSITY AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

The Committee recognizes the Department's unique ability to contribute to the preparation of the Nation's next generation of scientists and engineers. The Committee regrets that budget constraints preclude providing the $15,000,000 requested for university and science education. The Committee endorses the Department's ongoing education initiatives funded through program accounts. While a line-item appropriation is not provided, the Committee encourages the Department to seek opportunities to continue to support work such as that performed by the Science and Technology Alliance.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(GROSS)

Appropriations, 1998	$224,155,000
Budget estimate, 1999	245,788,000
Committee recommendation	238,539,000

(MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES)

Appropriations, 1998	$136,738,000
Budget estimate, 1999	136,530,000
Committee recommendation	136,530,000

INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1998	$27,500,000
Budget estimate, 1999	29,500,000
Committee recommendation	27,500,000

The Committee has provided $27,500,000, $2,000,000 less than the request, for the Office of the Inspector General.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1998	$4,146,692,000
Budget estimate, 1999	4,500,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,445,700,000

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 certify weapon safety, performance, and reliability without underground nuclear testing. Weapons will be maintained, modified, or retired and dismantled as needed to meet arms control objectives or remediate potential safety and reliability issues. As new tools are developed and validated, they will be incorporated into a smaller, more flexible and agile weapons complex 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 policy framework which guides the Department of Energy's stockpile stewardship and management activities is the "Nuclear Posture Review" which is approved by the President. The requirements for DOE stated in terms of infrastructure to support U.S. nuclear forces are: (1) maintain nuclear weapons capability (without underground nuclear testing); (2) demonstrate the capability to design, fabricate, and certify weapon types in the enduring stockpile; (3) maintain the capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads; and (4) ensure tritium availability. In addition, the President has also requested a new annual certification process to certify that the stockpile is safe and reliable in the absence of underground nuclear testing, and to produce a statement about the future confidence in the safety and reliability of the stockpile.

The Committee has serious concerns that projected budget profiles for Defense missions of the Nation are insufficient to sustain the important stockpile stewardship and management initiatives of DOE. The Committee believes that the issue of sufficient resources for the Department of Energy to ensure the certification of the weapons stockpile safety and reliability is of such importance it requires the ongoing attention of the Department of Defense and the

Department of Energy. With programs constrained by budget ceilings, aggressive management at all levels is mandatory. The Committee is aware of instances at DOE laboratories where projects have not been well defined and there has been a lack of management attention. This situation has resulted in scope creep, extended project completion schedules, and cost growth far in excess of what is acceptable. If the capability of the national laboratories to provide the certification, required by the President, is to be maintained under a severely restricted budget environment, it is mandatory that DOE and the national laboratories take whatever steps are necessary to assure the proper focus. It is essential that critical, centerpiece missions not be impacted because of poor management attention.

The Committee's recommendation for weapons activities is $4,445,700,000, an decrease of $54,300,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1999. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

An appropriation of $2,163,375,000 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.

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.

Core stockpile stewardship.—The Core Stockpile Stewardship Program provides the physical, technical, and intellectual infrastructure necessary to support a reliable, safe, and secure nuclear weapons stockpile. The Committee has recommended a total of $1,596,375,000 for core stockpile stewardship programs. This is $25,000,000 less than the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the funding level proposed for fiscal year 1999 and future budget planning projections of the Department of Energy are not 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. Further, the Committee is not convinced that engineering and surveillance approaches of yesterday will be adequate to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of underground testing.

A decrease of $25,000,000 is recommended for the accelerated strategic computing initiative [ASCI]. The ASCI program will provide the computing software, computer platforms and an operating environment to allow the national laboratories to make critical decisions about the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapon stock-

pile without underground nuclear testing. The Committee is concerned with the rate of growth of the ASCI program when considered in the context of constrained DOE defense programs budgets. The Department has embarked on a high-risk, aggressive program to significantly upgrade the computing capabilities of the weapons labs. This computing capability is the glue or common element which ties the entire stockpile stewardship and management effort together, thereby enable certification of the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. However, the ASCI program cannot grow at a rate that adversely impacts other essential programs and activities, including basic core capabilities. The Committee urges the Department to adjust the rate of growth of this program to reflect budget realities and the utilization history.

In carrying out its Nevada test site stockpile stewardship archiving mission, the Department is encouraged to evaluate and utilize, if appropriate, the capabilities of the Nevada Test Site Historical Foundation.

Testing capabilities and readiness.—An appropriation of $183,900,000 is recommended for testing capabilities and readiness activities. This is the same as the budget request. 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.

While supporting the full amount requested in the budget for testing capability and readiness, the Committee is concerned that this level of funding may not be sufficient to continue some activities undertaken in fiscal year 1998 at an effective rate. The Department is urged to limit the impact to ongoing activities to the extent practicable.

The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 from within stockpile stewardship for the continued development and procurement of a dual-stage gas gun to be located at the Nevada test site.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $115,543,000 is recommended for construction projects under core stockpile stewardship activities for fiscal year 1999. The Committee recommendation is the same as the budget request.

Inertial confinement fusion [ICF].—An appropriation of $213,800,000 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 continues to be impressed with the significant scientific advancements being made in pulsed power technology at Sandia National Laboratory's Z accelerator. Major increases in energy and temperature production enhance prospects that pulsed power may contribute in a significant way to both weapons and en-

ergy applications technology at Sandia National Laboratory's Z accelerator. Funds are included to support continued work in pulsed power experiments at the Z accelerator and to fund initial design studies for a larger facility. The Committee understands that this work should help DOE and its laboratories reach a conclusion on the technical and fiscal feasibility of building a larger scale pulsed power facility.

Stockpile stewardship university alliance.—Within the funding available for stockpile stewardship, the Committee directs that up to $5,000,000 be used to support stockpile stewardship research requirements in accordance with the memorandum of agreement executed by the Department and the university and community college system of Nevada.

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 in supporting weapons effects testing. An appropriation of $284,200,000, the full amount needed in fiscal year 1999 to keep this important project on schedule, is recommended for the NIF project. Fiscal year 1999 is the peak year for construction funding, with physical construction being over 60 percent complete. The project remains on schedule and within the projected construction cost of $1,046,000,000. The Committee is pleased with the management and oversight attention provided by LLNL on the project.

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 $69,000,000 for these activities for fiscal year 1999 to support ongoing cooperative research and development agreements, including AMTEX; and education activities.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,980,803,000 for stockpile management activities. This is $45,000,000 over the budget request.

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.

Of the funds recommended for stockpile management, the Committee has provided an increase of $25,000,000 for the weapons production plants, including, $5,000,000 to support infrastructure and maintenance needs at the Savannah River site, $10,000,000 to support advanced manufacturing and other capital investment needs at the Kansas City plant, and $10,000,000 for the Pantex

Plant to support scheduled workload requirements, and other technology and infrastructure requirements.

Tritium source.—An appropriation of $177,000,000 is recommended for activities related to providing a new tritium source. This is $20,000,000 over the amount included in the Department's budget request for fiscal year 1999. 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 as requirements dictate. The Committee continues to support the dual-track program being developed by the Department.

The Committee is concerned that the proposed budget for a new tritium source is insufficient to support the Department's dual track tritium strategy for the accelerator as a back-up option if the light-water reactor option is selected as the preferred option. Therefore, the Committee has recommended an additional $20,000,000 for the APT option for continued design activities which will be necessary whether APT is selected as the primary option or back-up source.

Construction projects.—An appropriation of $96,022,000 is recommended for line item construction projects under core stockpile management for fiscal year 1999. The Committee recommendation is $19,300,000 below the budget request.

Budget constraints preclude the Committee's ability to recommend the initiation of certain construction projects and reduce funding for others. As such, no funding is included for project 99–D–123, replace mechanical utility systems project at the Y–12 plant at Oak Ridge, and project 99–D–125, replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant.

In addition, the Committee recommendation includes a $5,400,000 reduction for project 97–D–172, nuclear materials safeguards and security upgrades at Los Alamos; and an $11,000,000 reduction for project 95–D–102, chemistry and metallurgy research facility upgrades project at Los Alamos. Both projects have experienced significant schedule delays, changed requirements and cost increases, and the Committee is concerned that the lab has not given serious attention to design requirements, project management and cost control issues. The reductions will allow the DOE and the lab to resolve and firmly establish cost and schedule baselines so the projects can proceed without further significant delays. In the case of the nuclear materials safeguards facility, the Department is to move expeditiously to reevaluate the mission needs in light of the design deficiencies and to inform the appropriate congressional committees promptly once it's decision is final.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of $255,500,000 is recommended for program direction activities. This is a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request. The reduction reflects the belief that further savings can be achieved through efficiencies from realignment efforts proposed in the Institute for Defense Analysis report on the Department's management structure of weapon activities. The Com-

mittee supports the action taken by the Senate authorizing committee in making atomic energy weapons activities funding available for payment by the Secretary of Energy to the educational foundation chartered to enhance educational activities in the vicinity of Los Alamos National Laboratory, NM.

The Committee recommendation includes $8,000,000 for the Los Alamos schools and $3,000,000 for the Los Alamos Educational Foundation.

Use of prior year balances.—A $50,000,000 reduction in prior year carryover balances is recommended by the Committee. The Committee notes that there are differences between the Department and GAO regarding the level of available balances, but believes that a reduction is warranted and can be made without adverse impacts on critical weapon activity requirements.

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, 1998	$4,379,438,000
Budget estimate, 1999	4,259,903,000
Committee recommendation	4,293,403,000

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. The "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" appropriation is organized into two program accounts, site/project completion and post-2006 completion to reflect the emphasis on project completion and site closures.

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

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is beginning to turn the corner in the cleanup effort. Leadership within the Department has put in place initiatives which have produced greater efficiencies, reduced cost growth on many projects, and resulted in moving the program from the study phase to the cleanup of facilities. The Committee believes that the program recommended for fiscal year 1999

is within the acceptable range and will meet all legal requirements and other agreements.

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

While it is imperative that the Department's cleanup costs be brought down, there are instances where 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 maintain buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible.

SITE AND PROJECT COMPLETION

An appropriation of $1,047,253,000 is recommended for site/project completion activities. This is the same as the budget request.

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

POST-2006 COMPLETION

The Committee recommendation for post-2006 completion activities is $2,726,451,000, which includes $2,247,107,000 in operating expenses.

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

Of the amounts recommended, the Committee has included an increase of $5,000,000 for the National Spent Fuel Program to ad-

dress regulatory and repository issues associated with Department of Energy owned spent nuclear fuel, and an additional $10,000,000 for research and treatment of high level waste consistent with the authorized level in the Senate. An additional $20,000,000 is recommended to support increased operations at the defense waste processing facility's and unforeseen requirements related to the in-tank precipitation process, and to support infrastructure needs, all consistent with authorizing Committee action. The Committee recommendation continues support of the HBCU's at the current year level and provides the full budget request for F- and H-canyon materials processing.

The Committee is aware that the State of New Mexico is to complete WIPP roads ahead of schedule in anticipation of waste shipment to the facility. The Committee recommendation, therefore, includes $8,000,000 for reimbursement of expenses incurred by the State.

The Committee has included an $10,000,000 for DOE-funded studies or other activities associated with the health effects of radiation and other hazardous substances on DOE workers and communities. The Committee directs that these studies be managed by the Office of Environmental, Safety, and Health. Additionally, the Committee urges support for the ongoing efforts of the Hanford Health Information Network.

The Committee recommendation includes $5,500,000 from funds otherwise available for the Hanford site for the Volpentest hazardous materials management and emergency response training facility.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT—POST 2006 COMPLETION SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

The Committee recognizes that universities in South Carolina and Georgia have provided valuable technological support which has assured environmental, worker and public safety at the DOE's Savannah River site [SRS]. The Department has named the South Carolina Universities Research and Education Foundation [SCUREF], in conjunction with the SRS, as the pilot center for waste management and environmental restoration. Likewise, the Education Research and Development Association [ERDA], a consortium of Georgia universities, has worked with SRS in support of health and safety initiatives. The Committee recognizes the contributions of SCUREF and ERDA and recommends that the Secretary and the SRS continue utilizing these institutions for technological support.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

An appropriation of $222,500,000 is recommended for science and technology activities related to the environmental waste cleanup program.

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

environmental restoration and cleanup costs by an estimated $12,000,000,000 to $27,000,000,000.

The Congress has expressed its concerns with the rate at which new technology is used in actual cleanup projects. The Committee commends the Department's efforts to focus the program on completing cleanup and significantly reducing costs. However, the Committee is concerned that the existing culture and instructional system penalizes the application of innovative methods and technologies due to the higher risk. The Committee believes that the Department should weigh carefully the use of new technologies and approaches where potential cost reduction benefits are significant.

The Committee recommendation transfers to defense environmental restoration and waste management those activities proposed for funding under the Non-Defense Environmental Management Program. Funding for these activities—Technology Validation and Verification Center and Western Environmental Technology Office, had been included in the "Defense science and technology" account for fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 1998.

The Committee finds that the independent review provided through the consortium for risk evaluation and stakeholder participation to be important in providing balance and credibility to work performed for the Department and has provided funding to support the program at $5,000,000.

The Committee recognizes the work carried out by the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory [DIAL] at Mississippi State University for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program. This work has led to the development of instrumentation and technology of value to the Department's cleanup effort. This includes instrumentation to verify the content of plutonium in waste forms, and to ensure that waste drums can be handled safely. DIAL has also demonstrated technologies to characterize and optimize high temperature processes, which has also impacted the commercial sector. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the DIAL.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction totals $346,199,000, which is the same as the budget request. This funding level is essentially the same as the current fiscal year and nearly $65,000,000 less than fiscal year 1997.

Program direction provides the overall direction and administrative support for the environmental management programs of the Department of Energy. After undergoing significant and disruptive downsizing over the last 2 years, the Committee believes that stability is now essential if DOE is to provide effective oversight and management of the cleanup program.

Asset management.—The Department is encouraged to sell, for commercial purposes, its excess amounts of heavy water located at its Savannah River facility. Due to continuing budget constraints, and to the costs associated with the necessary removal of certain substances from the heavy water to increase its commercial value, the Department is directed to make use of such methods of sale as would allow it, directly or indirectly, to use the proceeds of the sale,

that will be received in the out-years, to offset future costs associated with the contract operation of the Savannah River site.

Funding adjustments.—The Committee has recommended funding adjustments totaling $49,000,000 for the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program, including an undistributed reduction of $20,000,000 to be offset by the availability of uncosted, unobligated prior year funds; and a general reduction of $29,000,000.

SITE CLOSURE

Appropriations, 1998	$890,800,000
Budget estimate, 1999	1,006,240,000
Committee recommendation	1,048,240,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,048,240,000 for the site closure program. This is an increase of $42,000,000 over the budget request.

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

The Committee continues to believe that a closure fund, which targets funding at specific facilities whose accelerated closure in the near-term results in significantly reduced out-year costs, is important in freeing up budgetary resources in the longer term. The Committee has included and additional $32,000,000 to mitigate the funding shortfall proposed in the budget for the Rocky Flats site. The Committee understands that early closure of the Rocky Flats site could result in over $1,000,000,000 in saving.

The Committee recommendation also includes $10,000,000 for cleanup activities related to TA–21 at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The Committee believes that this work is more appropriately included under site closure projects than under the post-2006 account.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriations, 1998	$200,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	516,857,000
Committee recommendation	241,857,000

An appropriation of $241,857,000 is recommended for the environmental management privatization initiative. The Committee action is taken without prejudice.

The Department of Energy continues to rely upon the private sector to accomplish it's mission of environmental cleanup. Privatization is just one tool used by DOE to implement alternative business strategies for the procurement of goods and services required to fulfill their cleanup responsibilities. The term "privatization" as used by DOE refers to a method of financing, contracting and risk-sharing between the Department and firms in the private sector for good or services, and involves the use of fixed price contracts under which contractors use private funding to design, construct, operate, and deactivate equipment and facilities required in the cleanup

mission. The vendor then receives payment for producing products that meet DOE performance specifications. Budget authority is set aside to cover future contractual obligations, as well as to provide an incentive for private sector investment.

The Committee recommends a reduction of $275,000,000 in the amount of additional budget authority to be held in reserve for privatization projects. Consistent with the Senate authorizing committee, the Committee recommends the following allocation of funding: $113,500,000 for the tank waste remediation system [TWRS] project, phase I; $20,000,000 for the spent nuclear fuel dry storage project; $87,300,000 for the advanced mixed waste treatment project; $19,600,000 for remote handled transuranic waste transportation (Carlsbad); and $33,500,000 for environmental/waste management disposal at Oak Ridge.

While recommending reductions in the TWRS project, the Committee recommendation continues to support the cleanup effort, and believes that adequately treating and disposing of the high-level waste at Hanford in an essential priority. The Committee feels that the funding proposed should be sufficient for TWRS to proceed in fiscal year 1999.

The Committee directs that available fiscal year 1997 funds of $25,000,000 from canceled projects—the broad spectrum, 97–PV–3, Oak Ridge project, $15,000,000; and the wastewater and sanitary treatment, 97–PVT–4, Rocky Flats project, $10,000,000, within defense environmental management privatization be made available to finance the fiscal year 1999 program. In addition, the Committee makes $7,000,000 of prior year balances available to cover the costs of the program in 1999.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1998	$1,666,008,000
Budget estimate, 1999	1,667,160,000
Committee recommendation	1,661,160,000

An appropriation of $1,661,160,000 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/arms control.—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 develop-

ment 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 $510,500,000. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee continues to strongly support these important national security programs.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology research and development, and arms control totals $466,900,000. The funding level recommended by the Committee provides significant increases over the current year level for DOE to continue important activities related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons; and increased initiatives to reduce the danger of nuclear smuggling and the associated potential of nuclear terrorism.

The recommendation provides $152,263,000, the same as the budget request, for material protection, control, and accounting [MPC&A] activities. The Committee continues to consider these activities important to reducing the threat created by the breakup of the former Soviet Union.

The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 for the continued development of Raman spectroscopy technology for the detection of chemical and biological agents.

In light of recent underground nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, the Committee directs the Department to reevaluate the adequacy of its treaty verification responsibilities and activities, and to provide the Committee a report on any recommended changes or other needs prior to the Committee's hearings on the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the development and demonstration of dielectric wall accelerator technology for remote detonation, radiography, and fusion applications.

Intelligence.—The Committee recommendation totals $43,600,000.

The Office of Intelligence provides information and technical analysis on international arms proliferation, foreign nuclear programs, and other energy-related matters to policymakers in the 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 has provided an additional $10,000,000 for the Department to continue its focus and expand counterintelligence programs at the national laboratories and other high-risk facilities related to openness issues.

The Department of Energy is encouraged to review the need for, and to allocate sufficient funding from the Nonproliferation and National Security Program, for assistance to the Russian nuclear weapons dismantlement program to develop an effective emergency response capability. The Committee recognizes that as dismantlement increases under START II, the possibility of accident increases proportionately and an inadequate response by the Russian Government to the accident may place the disarmament treaty at risk. The Committee further recognizes the Nevada test site as the

unique environment for such training without risking compromise of classified weapons design information.

Emergency management.—The Committee has provided $23,700,000 for emergency management activities. 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 departmental operations and activities or requiring departmental assistance.

Nuclear safeguards and security.—The Nuclear Safeguards and Security 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 Department-wide. The Committee concurs with the budget request of $53,200,000.

The Committee recommendation supports the requirement to replace security locks that meet Federal specifications for containers that hold classified material. The Department should initiate a retrofit program that ensures that all containers holding sensitive, classified material are protected with security locks meeting Federal specifications.

Security investigations.—The Security Investigations 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 $30,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee understands that the cost of security clearances is to be offset by program organizations in the amount of $20,000,000.

Funding adjustment.—The Committee has recommended a reduction of $10,000,000 to nonproliferation and national security to reflect the level of prior year balances in the program.

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 $89,000,000, a $15,000,000 increase over the budget request.

The Committee recommendation continues funding to support commitments under State health agreements, and studies conducted under a memorandum with the Department of Health and Human Services under defense activities as in past years. The recommendation also supports the program to monitor former DOE workers with significant occupational exposures at an increased level.

The Department's budget request proposed moving $20,000,000 of program direction, salaries and benefits to the nondefense portion of the bill. The Committee recommendation continues to fund

these activities, as it has in past years, under other defense activities.

Health studies.—The Committee is concerned with the large number, scope and wide variety of epidemiologic and other health-related studies undertaken by DOE and other agencies addressing the potential effects of DOE operations. These studies cover a broad range of issues—from workplace violence and smoking to radiation exposure on workers and communities. Studies on worker and community health are funded in environment, safety, and health [EH] through a memorandum of understanding [MOU] between DOE and the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS]. These studies are independently peer reviewed and administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Additional studies are funded separately by the Office of Environmental Management [EM] and administered by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry [ATSDR] under its statutory authority under CERCLA. Finally, still other studies and medical monitoring programs are funded directly by both EH and EM.

The Committee is concerned that the current arrangement for oversight provides insufficient focus within the Department and has resulted in duplication, overlap and increased costs in the studies undertaken. Further, there appears to a lack of a coherent, prioritized approach to selecting and conducting these studies. The Committee is aware, however, that DOE, with the cooperation of other agencies, has begun a process to consolidate and put in place a coherent plan to include a public health agenda for each DOE site. This should result in clearly defined study goals, objectives and priorities for ongoing and future studies. The Committee expects that all major, new programs will be specifically identified in its budget request.

Further, the Committee directs that all DOE funded studies or other activities associated with the effects of radiation or other hazardous substances on DOE workers or communities be managed through the Office of Environment, Safety and Health, and that all funding for all HHS managed health activities, either through CDC or ATSDR, be incorporated into a single MOU with HHS. Prior to public release, all DOE-funded health studies shall be peer reviewed. Sufficient funding has been provided to complete the Hanford thyroid study in December 1998 as scheduled. The Committee has also included $10,000,000 under defense environmental restoration and waste management for DOE-funded studies or other activities associated with the health effects of radiation and other hazardous substances on DOE workers and communities.

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 $40,000,000 for this program. The recommendation supports the Department's commitment to the State of Idaho at the amount contained in 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 $168,960,000 the same as the budget request.

Excess weapons grade plutonium in Russia is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States because of the possibility that it will fall into the hands of non-Russian entities and provide Russia with the ability to rebuild its nuclear arsenal at a rate the United States may be unable to equal.

For that reason, the Committee considers the Department's material disposition program of equal importance to weapons activities; both are integral components of our national effort to reduce any threat posed to the United States and to deter the threat that remains.

The Committee also strongly endorses the Department's decision to burn excess weapons plutonium in mixed-oxide fuel; the only disposition alternative that makes later recovery of remaining weapons grade material sufficiently difficult that the Committee considers the threat posed by that material to be acceptably low.

The current United States disposition program originated in a domestic effort to reduce United States inventories of excess weapons grade plutonium without adequate consideration given to the threat posed by stockpiles of similar Russian material. While some efforts have been made to link the United States program to progress on plutonium disposition in Russia, those linkages are not sufficient. Current linkages are consultative in nature, lack explicitness, and are significantly imbalanced. While both countries have declared 50 tons of plutonium to be excess, both have substantially more than 50 tons in excess and Russia has multiples of the amount excess in the United States. Despite that, the current plans are for the United States to dispose of plutonium at an initial rate of 3 tons per year while Russia proceeds with an uncertain program for which financing is not yet available to dispose of only 1.3 tons per year. At a minimum, the two countries disposition programs should be conducted under a bilateral accord that sets specific schedules for materials disposition in both countries and Russian material must be converted to nonweapons forms at no less than the rate of United States material—anything else would amount to an unequal and irresponsible disarmament.

In fact, the current U.S. policy is akin to a unilateral reduction in U.S. nuclear weapons capabilities with the hope that our traditional nuclear adversary will follow suit; a premise the Committee cannot accept.

The Committee has two interests in this matter; to show support for the Department's decision to endorse the eventual use of mixed-oxide fuel for the disposition of excess weapons plutonium, and also

ensure that the United States does not unwisely proceed with a program that does not ensure that an equal amount of plutonium will be converted to nonweapons forms by the Russian Federation.

For that reason, the Committee has provided the full amount of the request, but has also included a statutory proviso that funds for the design, licensing, or construction of a mixed-oxide fuel fabrication facility in the United States, shall be available only after the United States and the Russian Federation agree on a bilateral schedule for the conversion to nonweapons forms of excess weapons plutonium in accordance with which the conversion rate in the United States does not exceed the conversion rate in the Russian Federation.

The Committee wants to see as much excess weapons plutonium in Russia and the United States disposed of as fast as possible, and regrets that the Committee's action will result in some initial delay. However, the current program is imbalanced and could pose a long-term threat to the national security of the United States unless the issues identified by the Committee are addressed.

The Committee recommends that in negotiating the recommended bilateral agreement, the administration give serious consideration to utilizing mixed-oxide fuel fabrication facilities outside the United States and Russia and also to identify as many reactors as possible that might burn such fuel.

The Committee recognizes that Russian plans to dispose of excess weapons plutonium are in part limited by the Russian Federation's limited requirement for mixed-oxide fuel. The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to support the joint United States-Russian program to develop an advanced reactor to consume large quantities of excess weapons plutonium.

NUCLEAR ENERGY (DEFENSE)

An appropriation of $35,000,000 is recommended by the Committee for international nuclear safety and nuclear security programs of DOE. This is the same as the budget request.

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 program has four major elements that are critical to achieving lasting improvements in nuclear safety culture and infrastructure development. They are improvement of the capabilities of the plant operators; improvement of the physical condition of the plants; provide professionals in design, operation and regulation needed to conduct safety analyses; and assistance in the development of domestic liability legislation necessary to establish a strong, independent regulatory authority.

The Committee is aware that RedZone Robotics has worked successfully with an international consortium to remove nuclear waste from Chornobyl and has the ability to remove nuclear waste from storage tanks in Russia and the New Independent States. The Committee encourages the Department to review RedZone's pro-

posal in this regard to determine whether it meets the objectives of the international nuclear safety program.

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 $665,500,000.

While the Committee is unable to provide additional funding to optimize the program to shutdown prototype reactors and conduct remediation work, the Committee supports this effort and urges the Department to review the need for additional funding and to take appropriate action to request additional resources as may be needed in future budgets.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 1998	$190,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	190,000,000
Committee recommendation	185,000,000

The Committee recommends $185,000,000 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 1997, the balance owed by the Federal Government to the nuclear waste fund was $1,039,000,000 (including principal and interest). The "Defense nuclear waste disposal" appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal Government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 1998, a total of $987,800,000 has been appropriated to support nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommendation includes $15,000,000 to assess the application of advanced accelerator technology to the transmutation of high-level defense waste. The Committee is funding significant research in high power linear accelerator design for defense and nondefense purposes. The Committee is also aware of recent advances in accelerator target design employing pyrochemistry and liquid lead-bismuth eutectic technology for both the target and cooling that, coupled with a high power accelerator, may provide an opportunity to significantly reduce the radioactivity and radiotoxicity of certain isotopes. The Committee directs that this work be coordinated with work being done in other program offices on the development of high power accelerator technology.

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, 1998	$13,500,000
Budget estimate, 1999	.....
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

The Alaska Power Administration [APA] is responsible for operation, maintenance, and marketing of power for the 78-megawatt Snettisham project near Juneau.

Public Law 104–58 authorizes the sale of the APA assets. The Snettisham project will be sold to the State of Alaska. The Department and the APA expect to complete sale of the project by August 1998.

The Committee is aware that oil is leaking from one of the APA's submerged cables used to transmit power from the Snettisham hydroelectric facility to Juneau. Unfortunately, because the APA staff has been reduced from 31 to 8 over the previous year in anticipation of the APA's sale, the staff no longer has the engineering or procurement expertise to conduct the major technical procurement necessary to replace the cable.

In order to address this problem, the Committee has provided $5,000,000, in addition to the $2,500,000 provided in the current year, to assist in the cost to replace the cable. It is the Committee's hope that, prior to final disposition of this act, an agreement could be reached between the APA and the State of Alaska by which the APA would make a contribution to the State to cover the cost of replacing a single cable or, at the discretion of the State, the funds could be used to partially fund the replacement of all four cables.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 29 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal gen-

erating 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 400 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 megawatts.

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

Borrowing authority.—A total of $3,750,000,000 has been made available to Bonneville as permanent borrowing authority. Each year the Committee reviews the budgeted amounts Bonneville plans to use of this total and reports a recommendation on these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 1998, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $258,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capitol equipment programs.

Repayment.—During fiscal year 1998, Bonneville will pay the Treasury $614,000,000, of which $164,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Limitation on direct loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1998.

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.

The Committee recognizes that last year the Members of the northwest congressional delegation wrote to the administration, urging that a new agreement on funding for mitigation of the fish and wildlife financial impacts of the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS] be executed by April 30, 1998. The Committee commends the administration for its effort to develop a new agreement for these costs, but at this time one has not been completed. Therefore, unless the Bonneville Power Administration and other applicable Federal agencies have executed a definitive agreement setting specific dollar cost limitations with regard to funding for mitigation of the fish and wildlife impacts of the Federal Columbia River Power System for fiscal years 2002–06 by September 1, 1998, it is the Committee's sense that current levels of funding for mitigation of these fish and wildlife impacts should extend until October 1, 2006.

Last March Bonneville and the Northwest Power Planning Council completed the cost review of the Federal Columbia River Power System [FCRPS] and submitted the final recommendations to the

Committee. The review covered planned costs of the FCRPS, including transmission, with a focus on projected costs for Bonneville's next rate period, fiscal years 2002–06. The recommendations identified approximately $146,000,000 in reductions to planned power expenses during this period. Although the Committee understands that some of the recommendations require legislation, it believes that Bonneville should begin preparing now to implement the recommendations no later than October 1, 2001.

The Committee is particularly interested in the recommendations pertaining to the need for an integrated capital asset management strategy involving Bonneville, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Cost Review Management Committee estimated that such a strategy would produce about $48,000,000 per year in savings during the 5-year period.

The Committee directs Bonneville to work with the Corps and the Bureau in developing an integrated capital asset management strategy directed at maximizing value, including both financial returns and public benefits. The strategy should encompass the operation and maintenance of the FCRPS, including transmission, physical assets, a coordinated investment plan, and the creation of integrated performance measures. Bonneville shall submit a draft integrated capital asset management strategy to the Committee no later than March 1, 1999.

Administrative provisions.—In order to facilitate administrative cost savings of the Bonneville Power Administration and promote sales of Federal power both in the forthcoming subscription process and in the future, the Committee has included bill language clarifying the authority of the Administrator to sell Federal power to an entity formed by existing regional public body and cooperative customers of Bonneville. This entity is an organization called a joint operating entity which must be composed solely of public bodies and cooperatives of the Pacific Northwest region that are qualified to purchase requirements firm electric power service from Bonneville. Other Federal power marketing agencies currently make aggregated power sales to such entities for public bodies and cooperatives. BPA does the same for transmission contracts, nonfirm, and surplus power sales, but not requirements firm power sales.

The language does not expand any such customer's rights to purchase requirements firm power from Bonneville and does not allow resale by the joint operating entity of such power to customers that are not its members or participants. No joint operating entity, or combination of them, could purchase from Bonneville more requirements firm power from the sum of the purchases that its public body and cooperative members or participants could make if acting individually. Public body and cooperative customers participating in such joint operating entities do not waive existing rights.

The sole purpose of this provision is administrative in nature to assure that the Bonneville Power Administration takes advantage of its authority to sell requirements firm power to regional public body and cooperative customers who form and choose to aggregate their purchases of requirements Bonneville power through such joint operating entities.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1998	$12,222,000
Budget estimate, 1999	8,500,000
Committee recommendation	8,500,000

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.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1998	$25,210,000
Budget estimate, 1999	26,000,000
Committee recommendation	26,000,000

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.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1998	$189,043,000
Budget estimate, 1999	215,435,000
Committee recommendation	215,435,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission which operate hydropower generating plants in 15 Central and Western States encompassing a 1.3-million-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of 16,727 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 257 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

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

River Basin power marketing fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River storage facilities, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

The amount to be deposited in the "Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation" account is $5,036,000, 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.

The Committee recommendation is $1,010,000, 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, 1998	$162,141,000
Budget estimate, 1999	168,898,000
Committee recommendation	168,898,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriations, 1998	$162,141,000
Budget estimate, 1999	196,958,000
Committee recommendation	168,898,000

The Committee recommendation provides $168,898,000 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.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The Committee recommendation includes two Department of Energy general provisions not included in the current year Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Waste isolation pilot plant waste acceptance criteria.—The Committee recommends a prohibition on decreasing the concentration of radioactive contamination in waste so that such waste complies with the waste acceptance criteria for the waste isolation pilot plant.

Office of Science Research.—In the fiscal year 1998 Energy and Water Development Act, the Congress substantially reorganized the "Energy supply research and development" account of the Department of Energy to create two separate accounts; Energy re-

search, and science. The Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) mandates the establishment of an Office of Energy Research within the Department of Energy headed by a Director of Energy Research. In accordance with the Committee's reorganization of the "Energy supply research and development" account, the Department's science programs have been consolidated within the Office of Energy Research, and energy research programs are managed by other program offices; largely the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy. Consistent with the reorganization imposed by the Congress, the Committee recommends an amendment to the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7139) to rename the Office of Energy Research the Office of Science Research headed by a Director of Science Research.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
ENERGY SUPPLY			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES			
Solar energy:			
Solar building technology research	2,720	5,000	3,600
Photovoltaic energy systems	66,511	78,800	57,110
Photovoltaic energy research	2,274	2,883	2,883
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	68,785	81,683	59,993
Solar thermal energy systems	16,775	22,500	17,100
Biomass/biofuels energy systems:			
Power systems	28,600	42,900	22,800
Transportation	31,150	46,891	36,213
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	59,750	89,791	59,013
Biomass/biofuels energy research	38,635	27,199	27,199
Subtotal, Biomass	98,385	116,990	86,212
Wind energy systems	33,030	43,500	33,200
Wind energy research	295	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	33,325	43,783	33,483
Renewable energy production incentive program	3,000	4,000	3,000
Solar program support	.....	14,000	4,000
International solar energy program	1,375	8,800	3,400
Solar technology transfer	.....	1,360	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
National renewable energy laboratory	1,000	5,000	1,000
Construction: 96–E–100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	2,200	.....	.....
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	3,200	5,000	1,000
Solar photoconversion (ER)	.....	14,532	14,532
Total, Solar Energy	227,565	317,648	226,320
Geothermal: Geothermal technology development	29,500	33,000	18,000
Hydrogen research	16,250	24,000	29,000
Hydrogen energy research	3,100	3,008	3,008
Total, Hydrogen	19,350	27,008	32,008
Hydropower	750	4,000	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	4,000	.....	4,000
Electric energy systems and storage:			
Transmission reliability	.....	.....	5,000
Electric and magnetic fields R&D	8,000	.....	.....
High temperature superconducting R&D	32,500	32,000	31,000
Energy storage systems	3,950	6,000	6,000
Climate challenge	.....	500	500
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	44,450	38,500	42,500
Federal building/Remote power initiative	5,000	.....	3,000

Program direction	15,651	17,000	15,651
Prior year projects	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES	346,266	437,156	345,479
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D:			
Light water reactor	.....	.....	.....
Advanced radioisotope power system	40,500	40,500	40,500
Nuclear technology R&D	.....	25,000	25,000
Oak Ridge landlord	9,500	.....	.....
Test reactor area landlord	3,000	4,634	4,634
Construction:			
99–E–200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	.....	341	341
95–E–201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,425	2,425	2,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	7,425	7,400	7,400
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	.....	.....	.....
University reactor fuel assistance and support	7,000	10,000	10,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	.....	24,000	24,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	64,425	106,900	106,900
Facilities	.....	96,150	64,950
Termination costs	77,035	.....	.....
Construction:			
97–E–200 Modifications to reactors, sodium system drain and closure, Argonne National Lab—West, ID	.....	.....	.....
97–E–201 Modifications to reactors, hot fuel examination facility equipment upgrades, ANL–W	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	.....	.....	.....
Total, Termination costs	77,035	.....	.....
Uranium programs	61,600	66,700	55,362

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Construction:			
98–U–200 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	400	.....	.....
96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, KY	2,600	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	3,000	.....	.....
Total, Uranium programs	64,600	66,700	55,362
Isotope support	16,000	16,450	16,450
Construction: 99–E–201 Isotope production facility, LANL	.....	6,000	6,000
Total, Isotope support	16,000	22,450	22,450
Nuclear energy plant optimization	.....	10,000	10,000
Program direction	21,000	23,550	21,000
Prior year projects	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	243,060	325,750	280,662
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	42,500	37,602	37,602
Program direction	23,550	38,398	18,398
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	66,050	76,000	56,000
ENERGY RESEARCH			
Fusion energy sciences program	232,000	228,160	.....
Prior year projects	.....	.....	.....

TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	232,000	228,160	.....
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	2,340	1,600
Program direction	7,500	7,500	6,500
Construction	1,000	.....	.....
Total, Technical information management program	10,100	9,840	8,100
Field offices and management	95,000	104,541	95,000
Oak Ridge Landlord	.....	12,500	12,500
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	105,100	126,881	115,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	992,476	1,193,947	797,741
Renewable energy research program	−44,304	−47,905	−47,905
Use of prior year balances	−31,535	−17,000	−50,000
General reduction for contractor training	−9,830	.....	.....
Prior year projects	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	906,807	1,129,042	699,836
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			
Uranium program activities	.....	.....	.....
Program direction	.....	.....	.....
Construction:			
96–U–201 depleted UF6 cylinder storage yards, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plant	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	.....	.....	.....
Revenues—Sales	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	.....	.....	.....
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	269,911	254,344	254,344
Site/project completion	113,950	97,248	97,248
Post 2006 completion	82,294	83,908	83,908
Science and technology	.....	26,500	.....
Fast flux test facility standby/shutdown	30,904	.....	31,200
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	− 10,000
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	497,059	462,000	456,700
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	180,200	242,000	170,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	40,000	35,000	30,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	220,200	277,000	200,000
SCIENCE			
High energy physics:			
Research and technology	210,240	213,365	213,365
Facility operations	418,945	456,635	456,635
Construction:			
99–G–306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	.....	6,700	6,700
98–G–304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	5,500	14,300	14,300
98–G–305 C-Zero area experimental hall, Fermilab	5,000	.....	.....
97–G–303 Master substation upgrade, SLAC	9,400	.....	.....
94–G–304 B-Factory, SLAC	.....	.....	.....

92–G–302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	30,950	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	50,850	21,000	21,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	469,795	477,635	477,635
Total, High energy physics	680,035	691,000	691,000
Nuclear physics	261,525	315,980	315,980
Construction: 91–G–300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	59,400	16,620	16,620
Total, Nuclear physics	320,925	332,600	332,600
Biological and environmental research	406,710	392,600	407,600
Construction:			
94–E–339 Human genome lab, LBL	.....	.....	.....
91–EM–100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	.....	.....	.....
Total, Biological and environmental research	406,710	392,600	407,600
Basic energy sciences:			
Materials sciences	392,475	417,216	417,216
Chemical sciences	199,933	209,582	209,582
Applied mathematical sciences	.....	.....	.....
Engineering and geosciences	41,371	44,413	44,413
Energy biosciences	27,461	32,489	32,489
Capital equipment	.....	.....	.....
Construction:			
99–E–334 Spallation Neutron Source, ORNL	.....	128,400	128,400
GPE–400 General plant projects	.....	.....	.....
97–E–305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	.....	.....	.....
95–E–305 Accelerator improvement projects	.....	.....	.....
96–E–300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	7,000	4,000	4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Construction	7,000	132,400	132,400
Total, Basic energy sciences	668,240	836,100	836,100
Other energy research:			
Computational and technology research	150,907	160,640	150,000
Energy research analyses	1,500	1,000	1,000
Program direction			
Multiprogram energy labs—facility support:			
Multiprogram general purpose facilities:			
Infrastructure support		1,160	1,160
Construction:			
MEL–001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	7,259	14,924	14,924
95–E–301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, Phase I (ANL)	3,442		
95–E–303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)			
95–E–310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)			
94–E–363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	4,000	4,908	4,908
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	14,701	19,832	19,832
Environment, safety and health:			
Construction:			
96–E–333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	5,273	268	268
95–E–307 Fire safety imp. III (ANL)	718		
95–E–308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL)	568		
95–E–309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL)			
93–E–320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL)			

Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	6,559	268	268
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs—fac. support	21,260	21,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research	173,667	182,900	172,260
Fusion energy sciences program	.....	.....	232,000
University science education programs: Laboratory cooperative science centers	.....	15,000	.....
Program direction	37,600	39,860	37,600
Subtotal, Science	2,287,177	2,490,060	2,709,160
Use of prior year SSC balances	−35,000	−7,600	−7,600
Use of other prior year balances	−13,800	.....	−12,000
General reduction for contractor training	−2,669	.....	.....
Use of prior year project balances	.....	.....	−20,000
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,235,708	2,482,460	2,669,560
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Office of the Secretary	2,500	4,251	4,251
Board of contract appeals	.....	.....	722
Chief financial officer	.....	.....	22,200
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	.....	.....	5,111
Economic impact and diversity	.....	.....	4,819
Field management	.....	.....	7,926
General counsel	.....	.....	19,500
Human resources and administration	.....	.....	97,000
Policy office	.....	.....	15,449
Public affairs	.....	.....	3,812
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	2,500	4,251	180,790
General management—personnel compensation and benefits	101,695	106,210	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Severance, termination and related cost			
General management—other expenses	73,000	77,578	
Program support:			
Minority economic impact	1,650	1,880	1,880
Policy analysis and system studies	500	500	500
Consumer affairs	40	19	19
Public affairs	50	38	38
Environmental policy studies	1,750	2,500	2,500
Scientific and technical training	500	500	500
Information management	6,000	8,000	8,000
Subtotal, Program support	10,490	13,437	13,437
Total, Administrative operations	187,685	201,476	194,227
Cost of work for others	37,470	44,312	44,312
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	225,155	245,788	238,539
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	−1,000		
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	224,155	245,788	238,539
Miscellaneous revenues	−136,738	−136,530	−136,530
Transfer from other defense activities			
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	87,417	109,258	102,009
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	27,500	29,500	27,500
Use of prior year balances			

Transfer from other defense activities	.....	.....	.....
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	27,500	29,500	27,500
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship:			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,288,290	1,505,832	1,480,832
Construction:			
99–D–102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	.....	6,500	6,500
99–D–103 Isotope sciences facility, LLNL Livermore, CA	.....	4,000	4,000
99–D–104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction, Phase II), LLNL, Livermore CA	.....	7,300	7,300
99–D–105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos,NM	.....	3,900	3,900
99–D–106 Model validation and system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	.....	1,600	1,600
99–D–107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, JCEL, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	.....	1,800	1,800
99–D–108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	.....	2,000	2,000
97–D–102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	46,300	36,000	36,000
96–D–102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	19,810	20,423	20,423
96–D–103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	13,400	6,400	6,400
96–D–104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	.....	18,920	18,920
96–D–105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	19,300	6,700	6,700
94–D–102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	98,810	115,543	115,543
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,387,100	1,621,375	1,596,375
Inertial fusion	217,000	213,800	213,800
Construction: 96–D–111 National ignition facility, TBD	197,800	284,200	284,200
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	414,800	498,000	498,000
Technology transfer/education:			
Technology transfer	56,250	60,000	60,000
Education	9,000	9,000	9,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	65,250	69,000	69,000
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,867,150	2,188,375	2,163,375
Stockpile management	1,891,265	1,935,803	1,980,803
Construction:			
99–D–122 Rapid reactivation,various locations		11,200	11,200
99–D–123 Replace mechanical utility systems, Y–12, Oak Ridge, TN		1,900	
99–D–125 Replace boilers & controls Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO		1,000	
99–D–127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO		13,700	13,700
99–D–128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX		1,108	1,108
99–D–132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM		9,700	9,700
98–D–123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring init Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	11,000	27,500	27,500
98–D–124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Y–12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	6,450	10,700	10,700
98–D–125 Tritium extraction facility, SC	9,650		
98–D–126 Acceleration prod. of tritium, VL	67,865		
97–D–121 Consolidated pit packaging system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX			
97–D–122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	9,200	9,164	3,764
97–D–123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS		6,400	6,400
97–D–124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility, upgrade, Y–12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,900		
96–D–122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	6,900	3,700	3,700
96–D–123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y–12 plant	2,700		
96–D–125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD			
95–D–102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	5,000	16,000	5,000
95–D–122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y–12 plant	12,600		
94–D–124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y–12 plant	1,400		
94–D–125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	2,000		
94–D–127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant			

93–D–122 Life safety upgrades, Y–12 plant	2,100	3,250	3,250
93–D–123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations	.....	.....	.....
92–D–126 replace emergency notification system, VL	3,200	.....	.....
88–D–122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	18,920	.....	.....
88–D–123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	160,885	115,322	96,022
Total, Stockpile management	2,052,150	2,051,125	2,076,825
Program direction	250,000	260,500	255,500
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,169,300	4,500,000	4,495,700
Use of prior year balances	−2,608	.....	−50,000
General reduction	−20,000	.....	.....
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,146,692	4,500,000	4,445,700
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion:			
Operation and maintenance	863,792	848,090	848,090
Construction:			
99–D–402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	.....	2,745	2,745
99–D–404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, Id	.....	950	950
98–D–401 H–tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	1,000	3,120	3,120
98–D–453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	8,136	26,814	26,814
98–D–700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID	500	7,710	7,710
97–D–450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	18,000	79,184	79,184
97–D–451 B–Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	2,000	.....	.....
97–D–470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay lab, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	5,600	7,000	7,000
96–D–406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	16,744	38,680	38,680
96–D–408 Waste management upgrades, Kansas City Plant and SR	8,200	4,512	4,512
96–D–461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	2,927	.....	.....

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
96–D–464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	14,985	11,544	11,544
96–D–471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	8,500	8,000	8,000
95–D–155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,713	.....	.....
95–D–456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID	602	485	485
94–D–401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	.....	.....	.....
92–D–140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades Savannah River, SC	.....	3,667	3,667
92–D–172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant	5,000	.....	.....
86–D–103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	11,250	4,752	4,752
Subtotal, Construction	106,157	199,163	199,163
Total, Site/project completion	969,949	1,047,253	1,047,253
Post 2006 completion:			
Operation and maintenance	2,297,764	2,194,107	2,247,107
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	388,000	398,088	398,088
Construction:			
99–D–403 Privatization phase I infrastrucure support, Richland, WA	.....	14,800	14,800
97–D–402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	13,961	22,723	22,723
96–D–408 Waste management upgrades, Richland, WA	.....	171	171
95–D–402 Install permanent electrical service, WIPP, AL	176	.....	.....
95–D–405 Industrial landfill V and construction/demolition landfill VII, Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	3,800	.....	.....
95–D–407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	2,500	.....	.....
95–E–600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, WA	.....	.....	.....
94–D–404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	1,219	.....	.....
94–D–407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	15,100	32,860	32,860
93–D–182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	.....	.....	.....
93–D–187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	17,520	10,702	10,702

89–D–174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	1,042	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	55,318	81,256	81,256
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,741,082	2,673,451	2,726,451
Site closures	105,085	.....	.....
Science and technology	274,322	193,000	222,500
Program direction	345,000	346,199	346,199
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,435,438	4,259,903	4,342,403
Savannah river pension refund	.....	.....	.....
Use of prior year balances	−6,000	.....	−20,000
General reduction	−50,000	.....	−29,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,379,438	4,259,903	4,293,403
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Closure projects	890,800	1,006,240	1,048,240
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	200,000	516,857	241,857
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	5,470,238	5,783,000	5,583,500
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs:			
Nonproliferation and national security:			
Verification and control technology:			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	210,000	210,000	210,000
Arms control	234,600	256,900	256,900
Intelligence	33,600	33,600	43,600
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	478,200	500,500	510,500
Emergency management	20,000	23,700	23,700

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
Nuclear safeguards and security	47,200	53,200	53,200
Security investigations	30,000	30,000	30,000
Program direction—NN	82,900	88,900	88,900
Use of prior year balances	.....	.....	− 10,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	658,300	696,300	696,300
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	74,000	69,231	64,231
Program direction—EH	20,000	4,769	24,769
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	94,000	74,000	89,000
Worker and community transition	57,659	41,000	36,000
Program direction—WT	3,500	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	61,159	45,000	40,000
Fissile materials disposition	99,451	111,372	111,372
Program direction—MD	4,345	4,588	4,588
Construction:			
99–D–141 Pit disassembly and conversion Facility, Various locations	.....	25,000	25,000
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Various locations	.....	28,000	28,000
97–D–140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Construction	.....	53,000	53,000
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	103,796	168,960	168,960
Nuclear energy (Defense):			
Nuclear technology research and development: Electrometallurgical program	12,000	.....	.....
International nuclear safety: Soviet designed reactors	35,000	35,000	35,000
Russian plutonium reactor core conversion	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Nuclear energy (Defense)	47,000	35,000	35,000

Adminstrative support for defense activities	.....	.....	.....
Office of Hearings and Appeals	2,300	2,400	2,400
Total, Other national security programs	966,555	1,021,660	1,031,660
Independent assessment of DOE projects	35,000	.....	.....
Naval reactors:			
Naval reactors development	635,920	623,600	623,600
Construction:			
GPN–101 General plant projects, various locations	.....	9,000	9,000
98–D–200 Site laboratory facility upgrade, various locations	5,700	7,000	7,000
97–D–201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID	4,600	.....	.....
95–D–200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	1,100	.....	.....
95–D–201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	.....	.....	.....
90–N–102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	3,100	5,800	5,800
Subtotal, Construction	14,500	12,800	12,800
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	650,420	645,400	645,400
Program direction	20,080	20,100	20,100
Total, Naval reactors	670,500	665,500	665,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,672,055	1,687,160	1,697,160
Use of prior year balances	−6,047	.....	−19,000
Offset to user organizations	.....	−20,000	−20,000
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,666,008	1,667,160	1,658,160
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	190,000	190,000	185,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,472,938	12,140,160	11,872,360
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	3,500	.....	.....
Capital assets acquisition	10,000	.....	5,000
TOTAL, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	13,500	.....	5,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,313	4,370	4,370
Purchase power and wheeling	11,909	6,130	6,130
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	16,222	10,500	10,500
Use of prior year balances	−4,000	−2,000	−2,000
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	12,222	8,500	8,500
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Operating expenses	2,382	2,722	2,722
Purchase power and wheeling	57	59	59
Program direction	17,309	16,402	16,402
Construction	6,752	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	26,500	26,000	26,000
Use of prior year balances	−1,290	.....	.....

TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	25,210	26,000	26,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance:			
Construction and rehabilitation	24,243	20,802	20,802
System operation and maintenance	39,246	36,469	36,469
Purchase power and wheeling	54,886	53,886	53,886
Program direction	106,157	107,383	107,383
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,432	5,036	5,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	229,964	223,576	223,576
Use of prior year balances	−40,921	−8,141	−8,141
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(5,592)	.....	.....
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	189,043	215,435	215,435
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	970	1,010	1,010
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	240,945	250,945	255,945
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	162,141	168,898	168,898
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	.....	.....	.....
FERC revenues	−162,141	−196,958	−168,898
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	.....	−28,060	.....

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND			
Discretionary funding	160,000	129,511	129,511
Program direction	.....	60,489	60,489
Total, Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	160,000	190,000	190,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	15,848,574	17,042,305	16,473,910

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1998	$170,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	67,000,000
Committee recommendation	67,000,000

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 $67,000,000, which is the same as the current fiscal year.

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

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1998	.....
Budget estimate, 1999	.....
Committee recommendation	$20,000,000

In title VI, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000,000 for the Denali Commission. Historically, the United States has promoted economic development in regions with requirements that now only exist in Alaska. The recommendation includes language authorizing the creation of the Denali Commission to address special infrastructure, utilities, and economic development problems, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts to promote economic self-sufficiency.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1998	$17,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	17,500,000
Committee recommendation	17,500,000

An appropriation of $17,500,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1999. 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.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1998	$468,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	483,340,000
Committee recommendation	466,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1998	$450,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	152,341,000
Committee recommendation	416,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1998	$18,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	330,999,000
Committee recommendation	50,000,000

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has been subject to six major reviews since 1979; the Kemeny report in 1979, the Rogovin report in 1980, regulatory impact surveys in 1981 and 1989, the National Academy of Sciences in 1992, and the regulatory review task force in 1994. The reviews contain common criticisms, among them; the NRC's approach to regulation is punitive rather than performance based, licensees are forced to expend considerable resources on regulations that are not related to safety, the NRC is unnecessarily prescriptive, licensees fear retribution for criticism, there are no specific criteria for important NRC actions such as placing a reactor on the watch list, and the NRC focus on paper compliance is not related to and can distract from safety activities. The Committee is concerned that the NRC has done little to respond to these reviews and believes that a major review should be undertaken to improve the efficiency of the NRC and the manner in which it oversees public health and safety.

In recent years, the safety performance of U.S. nuclear powerplants has significantly improved. Since 1991, the number of significant events has decreased in excess of 70 percent, safety systems unavailability has decreased in excess of 60 percent, scrams while critical have decreased 50 percent, and collective radiation exposure has decreased 35 percent. Despite these improvements, in the last 3 years, the NRC has dramatically increased its imposition of civil fines (25 in 1995, 50 in 1996, and 71 in 1997) and level four (the least severe) violations (567 in 1995, 905 in 1996, and 1427 in 1997).

The Committee believes that the increased issuance of fines and violations is not a reflection on the safety of the nuclear utility industry; it is the result of a change in regulatory culture at the NRC that defies the achieved improvement in safety that is quantified by the reduced number of significant events, safety system unavail-

ability, scrams while critical, and collective radiation exposure doses among other metrics.

The result is an amplification of the criticisms identified in previous reviews. The NRC has launched a review of nuclear plant design baselines which requires exhaustive review of design calculations, electrical separation, 50.59 safety evaluations, accident analysis documentation, historical plant operating records, and steps taken to implement NRC generic letters. Tremendous costs have been imposed upon reactor operators, and significant deficiencies have been found at only a few reactors. More important, the NRC's new interpretation of what constitutes design base information is creating uncertainty as to what the NRC expects of reactor operators.

The NRC frequently imposes regulatory requirements using informal approaches that circumvent legal requirements for imposing regulatory requirements, including the Administrative Procedures Act. Those informal practices include: implementation of the systematic assessment of licensee performance process, determining which plants should be added to the watch list, generic communications that reactor operators feel obligated to follow, the use of diagnostic evaluation teams, and the practice of NRC staff providing guidance to reactor operators on what should be included in an operator's confirmatory action letters.

The Committee believes these informal practices have gained in influence in recent years as a result of two phenomena; the continuing inconsistency of regional offices, and the increasing willingness of the NRC to regulate the management as well as safety of plants; even going so far as to require NRC approval of certain personnel changes at plants.

NRC regulations are suppose to be developed through formal rulemaking processes conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act and should be consistent with the backfit rule. The backfit rule requires that new interpretations of existing regulations or the imposition of new regulations first be subject to review under 10 CFR 50.109 to determine if the new interpretation or new regulation is necessary to preserve adequate protection or to bring a plant into compliance with regulations. If the NRC cannot demonstrate that a backfit is necessary to meet either of those requirements, under NRC regulations, backfits should not be imposed unless a cost-benefit backfit analysis demonstrates that such an action will result in substantial increase in safety to the public and be cost beneficial. Concerns have been raised to the Committee that informal practices outlined above fail to meet these backfit requirements.

The Committee is aware of concerns that the NRC may have inappropriately expanded the scope of its reviews. Specifically, it has been suggested that the NRC's regulation of the below-ground aspects of uranium recovery operations that utilize in situ (that is, solution mining) extraction techniques unnecessarily duplicate adequate regulation by other Federal and State authorities. It has also been suggested that the NRC is inappropriately interpreting the Atomic Energy Act and Uranium Mill Tailings Remediation Act to limit the use of existing mill tailings impoundments for the deposition of materials that are chemically, physically, and radiologically

indistinguishable from uranium mill tailings. The Committee will work with the relevant congressional authorizing committee's to ensure that appropriations are not provided to the NRC to incorrectly implement those acts.

The Committee is aware that the NRC imposes an economic feasibility requirement on some applicants to the Commission. Within 180 days of enactment of this act, the NRC should provide to the Appropriations and relevant authorizing committees of the House and Senate a summary of the cases in which the NRC considered the economic feasibility of applicants' proposals, the length of time required by the NRC to dispose of those cases, and the final disposition of each of those cases.

The Committee supports the move to risk-informed, performance-based regulation. Risk informed requires the recognition that all activities entail risk; it can be limited but not eliminated, and that the reasonableness notion incorporated in the as low as reasonably achievable concept can be quantified and should not be exceeded by regulatory requirements. The Committee supports efforts to define frequently used terms such as "safety-significant" and "important to safety." Current nuclear powerplants may have 10,000 to 20,000 components classified as safety related or important to safety, but reviews indicate that up to 80 percent of these items have low safety significance. The Committee supports a graded safety value scale that enables reactor operators to better apply resources and procedures to components of greatest safety significance.

Numerous reviews, including those cited above, recommend the NRC review existing regulations to reform those that are outdated, paperwork oriented, or that consume resources needed to comply with regulations but that do not add to safety or that obscure actual safety issues. In 1985, the NRC's Regulations Marginal to Safety Program offered promise in this regard. Unfortunately, that review, which identified in excess of 20 regulations as marginal to safety, resulted in changes to only one major regulation. The Committee supports the resumption of that effort.

The Committee is concerned that an inappropriately large portion of the funds appropriated to the NRC are used to support an interminable adjudicatory process imposed by the atomic safety and licensing boards. Even though the majority of the NRC's budget is reimbursed to the Federal Treasury through fees imposed upon licensees, the Committee has an obligation to ensure that appropriated funds are spent wisely. The Committee supports previous efforts by the Commission to streamline its adjudicatory process, in particular the abolition of the appeals panel in 1991.

The Committee welcomes efforts by the relevant congressional authorizing committees to review the exorbitant and unpredictable time required to consider applications (even simply to write decisions once they are made), the broad discretion provided to judges to give standing, and the effort required to resolve issues no matter how trivial and unrelated to safety; such as personnel and economic viability issues addressed above. Within 180 days of enactment of this act, the NRC should provide a report to the Appropriations and relevant authorizing committees of the House and Senate on the amount of appropriated funds in fiscal years 1990–98 expended by and in support of atomic licensing and safety boards.

The Committee recommendation includes authority for the NRC to collect annual charges not to exceed a total of $416,000,000 from licensees in fiscal year 1999. The Committee recommends $17,000,000 be made available to the NRC from the nuclear waste fund. An additional $33,000,000, that will not be reimbursed through user fees, is provided for: agreement State oversight, international activities, generic decommissioning and reclamation activities, the site decommissioning management program, regulatory support to agreement States, the small entities program, support to nonprofit educational institutions, and other Federal agency programs.

The Committee directs the NRC to provide a monthly report on the status of its licensing and regulatory duties. The Committee recommends the NRC use the same format used in the so-called Bevill reports previously provided to the Committee.

The Committee recommendation includes a single year extension of the NRC's user fee collection authority. The Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the nuclear waste fund, by assessing licenses and annual fees. That authority expires in fiscal year 1998, and unless additional fee collection authority is enacted prior or concurrent to enactment of this act, the NRC's authority to collect user fees would be limited to 33 percent of its budget. The Committee is aware that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee recently reported legislation (S. 2090) to extend this authority for 5 years and intends that the 1-year extension included in this measure serve as a safeguard should that measure not be enacted by September 1, 1998.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1998	$4,800,000
Budget estimate, 1999	5,300,000
Committee recommendation	4,800,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1998	$4,800,000
Budget estimate, 1999	1,749,000
Committee recommendation	4,800,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,800,000 for fiscal year 1998.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 1998	$2,600,000
Budget estimate, 1999	2,950,000
Committee recommendation	2,600,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,600,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department

of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1998	$70,000,000
Budget estimate, 1999	76,800,000
Committee recommendation	70,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $70,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In the budget for fiscal year 1998 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the administration contemplated the elimination of Federal funding for the agency's appropriated programs in fiscal year 1999. It was felt that such action would allow TVA to focus more on generating low-cost, dependable electricity.

Although the conference on the Energy and Water Development Act for 1998 proposed that nonpower programs would be funded from other sources beginning in fiscal year 1999 as the administration requested, several issues including equity remain unresolved. Therefore, the Committee has recommended an appropriation of $70,000,000, the same as the amount appropriated for the current year, be provided for fiscal year 1999.

No funding is provided for construction of the new replacement Chickamauga Lock. The Committee understands that studies have indicated measures may be available which could delay the need to provide a replacement facility. TVA is directed to use $6,900,000 of unobligated carryover balances to continue to operate and maintain Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area in fiscal year 1999.

The Committee is concerned about the failure of the Tennessee Valley Authority to comply with provisions contained in the statement of managers accompanying the Fiscal Year 1998 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act which directed TVA to relocate power lines and assist with the environmental impact statements associated with the construction of the lake in Union County, MS. The Committee expects TVA to comply with these provisions and to report to the Committee 45 days after enactment of this legislation on the status of its work.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

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 1998, is currently being considered by the Senate.

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

In title IV, independent agencies, the recommended appropriation for the Appalachian Regional Commission is $67,000,000.

TITLE VI—DENALI COMMISSION

In title VI, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000,000 for the Denali Commission.

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

Pursuant to paragraph 7(c) of rule XXVI, the Committee ordered reported en bloc, S. 2138, an original Energy and Water Development appropriations bill, 1999, S. 2132, an original DOD appropriations bill, 1999, and S. 2137, an original Legislative Branch appropriations bill, 1999, each subject to amendment and each subject to its budget allocations, by a recorded vote of 27–0, a quorum being present. The vote was as follows:

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Bond	
Mr. Gorton	
Mr. McConnell	
Mr. Burns	
Mr. Shelby	
Mr. Gregg	
Mr. Bennett	
Mr. Campbell	
Mr. Craig	
Mr. Faircloth	
Mrs. Hutchison	
Mr. Byrd	
Mr. Inouye	
Mr. Hollings	
Mr. Leahy	
Mr. Bumpers	
Mr. Lautenberg	
Mr. Harkin	
Ms. Mikulski	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Kohl	
Mrs. Murray	
Mr. Dorgan	
Mrs. Boxer	

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

Paragraph 12 of rule XXVI requires that Committee reports on a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part of any statute include "(a) the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and (b) a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by

stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions which would be made by the bill or joint resolution if enacted in the form recommended by the committee."

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

UNITED STATES ENRICHMENT CORPORATION ACT (42 U.S.C. 2297H–5(H))

§ 3107 Maintenance of security at the gaseous diffusion plants.

(h) MAINTENANCE OF SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Kentucky, and the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Ohio, the guidelines relating to the authority of the Department of Energy's contractors (including any Federal agency, or private entity operating a gaseous diffusion plant under a contract or lease with the Department of Energy) and any subcontractor (at any tier) to carry firearms and make arrests in providing security at Federal installations, issued under section 161k. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2201k.) shall require, at a minimum, the presence of [an adequate number of] *all* security guards carrying sidearms at all times to ensure maintenance of security at the gaseous diffusion plants (whether a gaseous diffusion plant is operated directly by a Federal agency or by a private entity under a contract or lease with a Federal agency).

(2) FUNDING.—The Secretary of Energy shall reimburse a contractor or subcontractor for the costs of providing security to a gaseous diffusion plant as required to comply with the guidelines referred to in paragraph (1).

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 for 1999: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Defense discretionary	12,030	12,030	11,820	[1] 18,818
Nondefense discretionary	9,047	8,912	8,900	8,900
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1999	.....	.....	.....	[2] 13,607
2000	.....	.....	.....	6,503
2001	.....	.....	.....	1,184
2002	.....	.....	.....	83
2003 and future year	.....	.....	.....	132
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1999 in bill	NA	.....	NA	16

[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 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers—Civil					
General investigations	$156,804,000	$150,000,000	$165,390,000	+$8,586,000	+$15,390,000
Construction, general	1,473,373,000	784,000,000	1,248,068,000	−225,305,000	+464,068,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	296,212,000	280,000,000	313,234,000	+17,022,000	+33,234,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,740,025,000	1,603,000,000	1,667,572,000	−72,453,000	+64,572,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–174)	105,185,000	.....	.....	−105,185,000	.....
Regulatory program	106,000,000	117,000,000	106,000,000	.....	−11,000,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	4,000,000	.....	.....	−4,000,000	.....
Formerly utilized sites remedial action program	140,000,000	.....	.....	−140,000,000	.....
Defense function	.....	140,000,000	140,000,000	+140,000,000	.....
General expenses	148,000,000	148,000,000	148,000,000	.....	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense—Civil	4,169,599,000	3,222,000,000	3,788,264,000	−381,335,000	+566,264,000
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	23,743,000	22,189,000	28,189,000	+4,446,000	+6,000,000
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,610,000	12,476,000	10,476,000	−1,134,000	−2,000,000
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....
Program oversight and administration	800,000	1,283,000	1,283,000	+483,000	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	41,153,000	40,948,000	44,948,000	+3,795,000	+4,000,000

Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	694,348,000	640,124,000	672,119,000	−22,229,000	+31,995,000
Emergency appropriations (Public Law 105–174)	4,520,000			−4,520,000	
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	85,000,000	143,300,000	65,000,000	−20,000,000	−78,300,000
Loan program	10,425,000	12,425,000	12,425,000	+2,000,000	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(31,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(+7,000,000)	
Policy and administration	47,558,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	+442,000	
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(−5,592,000)			(+5,592,000)	
Central Valley project restoration fund	33,130,000	49,500,000	39,500,000	+6,370,000	−10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	874,981,000	893,349,000	837,044,000	−37,937,000	−56,305,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	916,134,000	934,297,000	881,992,000	−34,142,000	−52,305,000
(By transfer)	(−5,592,000)			(+5,592,000)	
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	906,807,000	1,129,042,000	699,836,000	−206,971,000	−429,206,000
Non-defense environmental management	497,059,000	462,000,000	456,700,000	−40,359,000	−5,300,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	220,200,000	277,000,000	200,000,000	−20,200,000	−77,000,000
Science	2,235,708,000	2,482,460,000	2,669,560,000	+433,852,000	+187,100,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	160,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+30,000,000	
Departmental administration	224,155,000	245,788,000	238,539,000	+14,384,000	−7,249,000
Miscellaneous revenues	−136,738,000	−136,530,000	−136,530,000	+208,000	
Net appropriation	87,417,000	109,258,000	102,009,000	+14,592,000	−7,249,000
Office of the Inspector General	27,500,000	29,500,000	27,500,000		−2,000,000
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(5,520,238,000)			(−5,520,238,000)	
Non-defense function	(717,259,000)			(−717,259,000)	
Total	(6,237,497,000)			(−6,237,497,000)	

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

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities	4,146,692,000	4,500,000,000	4,445,700,000	+299,008,000	−54,300,000
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,429,438,000	4,259,903,000	4,293,403,000	−136,035,000	+33,500,000
Defense facilities closure projects	890,800,000	1,006,240,000	1,048,240,000	+157,440,000	+42,000,000
Defense environmental management privatization	200,000,000	516,857,000	241,857,000	+41,857,000	−275,000,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,520,238,000	5,783,000,000	5,583,500,000	+63,262,000	−199,500,000
Other defense activities	1,666,008,000	1,667,160,000	1,658,160,000	−7,848,000	−9,000,000
Defense nuclear waste disposal	190,000,000	190,000,000	185,000,000	−5,000,000	−5,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,522,938,000	12,140,160,000	11,872,360,000	+349,422,000	−267,800,000
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	3,500,000	.....	.....	−3,500,000	.....
Capital assets acquisition	10,000,000	.....	5,000,000	−5,000,000	+5,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	12,222,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	−3,722,000	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	25,210,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+790,000	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	189,043,000	215,435,000	215,435,000	+26,392,000	.....
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(5,592,000)	.....	.....	(−5,592,000)	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	970,000	1,010,000	1,010,000	+40,000	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	240,945,000	250,945,000	255,945,000	+15,000,000	+5,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	162,141,000	168,898,000	168,898,000	+6,757,000	.....

Revenues applied	−162,141,000	−168,898,000	−168,898,000	−6,757,000	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,898,574,000	17,070,365,000	16,473,910,000	+575,336,000	−596,455,000
(By transfer)	(5,592,000)	.....	.....	(−5,592,000)	.....
TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	170,000,000	67,000,000	67,000,000	−103,000,000	.....
Denali Commission	.....	.....	20,000,000	+20,000,000	+20,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	+500,000	.....
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	468,000,000	483,340,000	466,000,000	−2,000,000	−17,340,000
Revenues	−450,000,000	−152,341,000	−416,000,000	+34,000,000	−263,659,000
Subtotal	18,000,000	330,999,000	50,000,000	+32,000,000	−280,999,000
Office of Inspector General	4,800,000	5,300,000	4,800,000	.....	−500,000
Revenues	−4,800,000	−1,749,000	−4,800,000	.....	−3,051,000
Subtotal	.....	3,551,000	.....	.....	−3,551,000
Total	18,000,000	334,550,000	50,000,000	+32,000,000	−284,550,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,600,000	2,950,000	2,600,000	.....	−350,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	70,000,000	76,800,000	70,000,000	.....	−6,800,000
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	277,600,000	498,800,000	227,100,000	−50,500,000	−271,700,000

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

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	21,261,907,000	21,725,462,000	21,371,266,000	+109,359,000	−354,196,000
Appropriations	(21,152,202,000)	(21,725,462,000)	(21,371,266,000)	(+219,064,000)	(−354,196,000)
Emergency appropriations	(109,705,000)	.....	.....	(−109,705,000)	.....
(By transfer)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

○