Calendar No. 156

104TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 104–120

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1996

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1995.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 1905]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Amount in new budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$18,682,457,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	20,681,648,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	20,162,093,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the budget estimate, 1996	−519,555,000
Under enacted bill, 1995	−130,906,000

CONTENTS

TITLE I

TITLE II

TITLE III

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1996 beginning October 1, 1995, and ending September 30, 1996, 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 1996 budget estimates for the bill total $20,681,648,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $20,162,093,000. This is $519,555,000 under the budget estimates and $130,906,000 under the enacted appropriation for the current fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET ALLOCATION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 602(b)(1) of the Budget Act totals $20,180,000,000 in budget authority and $20,216,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1996. The bill as recommended by the Committee is within the subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1996 in budget authority and outlays.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $11,428,981,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Stockpile stewardship	$1,696,580,000
Stockpile management	2,050,683,000
Verification and control technology	450,842,000
Other defense programs	988,270,000
Defense waste management and environmental restoration	5,989,750,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $2,798,324,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar and renewable energy	$283,560,000
Environmental restoration and waste management (nondefense)	627,606,000
Nuclear fission R&D	279,873,000
Magnetic fusion	225,144,000

Basic energy sciences	791,661,000
Biological and environmental R&D	428,591,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides a net appropriation of $971,000,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics, and nuclear physics. Major programs are:

High energy physics research	$657,000,000
Nuclear physics	304,500,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $919,531,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs include:

Appalachian Regional Commission	$182,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	131,290,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	474,300,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	110,339,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

General investigations	$137,557,000
Construction	1,382,317,000
Operations and maintenance	2,092,754,000
Corps of Engineers, regulatory activities	101,000,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $4,035,275,000 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.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN ENDANGERED SALMON

The Committee continues to support efforts to recover the threatened and endangered salmon runs in the Columbia River basin. Three of the Federal agencies under the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee's jurisdiction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration, are responsible for funding the majority of recovery measures currently being implemented.

The Committee notes that both the Northwest Power Planning Council's strategy for salmon and the Snake River salmon recovery plan call for a broad range of recovery measures that cover hydroelectric operations, habitat improvements, hatchery reform, changes in harvest allocations and methods, and a revised oversight structure. The administration's primary focus on recovery activities has been on the hydroelectric system, and significant changes in hydro operations are being made.

The Committee believes that salmon restoration will occur only if a broad-based strategy is implemented that addresses each aspect of the salmon life cycle, including the other critical recovery areas, including hatcheries, harvest, and habitat.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held five sessions in connection with the fiscal year 1996 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 1996, therefore, have been developed after careful consideration of available data.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote on July 25, 1995, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

By unanimous vote of 28 to 0 the Committee on July 27, 1995, 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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS' CIVIL WORKS MISSION

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

The most far reaching of these proposals involves the Corps of Engineers' role in protecting our citizens from the devastating effects of floods. Under the administration's proposal, the Corps would only participate in projects that meet the following three criteria: (1) more than one-half of the damaging flood water must come from outside the boundaries of the State where the damage is occurring; (2) the project must have a benefit-to-cost ratio of two or greater; and (3) the non-Federal sponsor must be willing and able to pay 75 percent of the first cost of the project. The practical effect of applying those three criteria against all proposed projects would be to terminate the Federal Government's role in flood control activities. The first criterion alone would eliminate the Corps' role in flood control throughout much of the country, including three of our largest States: California, Texas, and Florida.

The Committee concurs with the House action which strongly disagrees with the administration's proposal that the Federal Government end its historic role in protecting our citizens from the devastating effects of floods. The Committee is aware that every $1 invested in flood control projects has resulted in $6 of flood damages prevented. Terminating the Federal Government's role in flood control activities as a way to save money is clearly misguided.

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

Therefore, in making recommendations for fiscal year 1996, the Committee has recommended funding for projects without regard to these proposed new policies as the House did. The Committee ex-

pects the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to proceed with those projects, all of which are fully authorized. The Committee further directs the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to continue to process all decision documents, including the transmission of feasibility reports to the Congress for authorization, without regard to whether projects comply with the administration's proposed new policies.

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

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1995	$181,199,000
Budget estimate, 1996	155,625,000
House allowance	129,906,000
Committee recommendation	126,323,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	ALABAMA								
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE L&D, AL	2,406,000	168,000	238,000	---	238,000	---	238,000	---
	ALASKA								
(N)	ANIAK, AK	150,000	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	ARTIC COAST NAVIGATION, AK	350,000	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	600,000	310,000	208,000	---	208,000	---	208,000	---
(SPE)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	980,000	---	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	10,700,000	---	---	237,000	---	237,000	---	237,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	1,026,000	956,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	12,860,000	147,000	---	186,000	---	186,000	---	186,000
(N)	KUSKOKWIM RIVER, AK	1,125,000	---	175,000	---	---	---	175,000	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	1,080,000	---	200,000	---	---	---	280,000	---
(N)	NORTHERN SEA ROUTE, AK	1,500,000	572,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	500,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	150,000	---	---	---	---	---	75,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	50,000	---
(N)	WRANGELL, AK	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(RCP)	ALAMO LAKE, ARIZONA	1,030,000	518,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, N SCOTTSDALE DRAINAGE AREA,	1,750,000	300,000	400,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, GILLESPIE DAM TO YUMA, AZ	2,500,000	1,200,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, TORTOLITA DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,250,000	300,000	200,000	---	300,000	---	200,000	---
	RIO DE FLAG, AZ	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	RIO SALADO, SALT RIVER, AZ	1,875,000	850,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	1,750,000	1,570,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEE, PLUM BAYOU, AR	600,000	---	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR	---	---	---	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	740,000	30,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	500,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	577,000,000	11,061,000	---	3,000,000	---	3,000,000	---	2,500,000
	BOLINGAS LAGOON, CA	1,500,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJECT, CA	1,875,000	750,000	375,000	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
	CITY OF ARCADIA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RESTORATION, CA	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(SP)	CITY OF ENCINITAS, CA	1,000,000	231,000	169,000	---	169,000	---	169,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	500,000	250,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	900,000	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA	7,700,000	125,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000
	IMPERIAL COUNTY WATERSHED, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(HANSEN & LOPEZ DAMS), CA	1,270,000	400,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SPE)	LACDA WATER CONS & SUP(WHITTIER NARROWS & SANTA FE DAM	1,360,000	400,000	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---
(SP)	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA	875,000	518,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	1,122,000	888,000	234,000	---	234,000	150,000	234,000	150,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	875,000	316,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, C	1,250,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION, CA	1,500,000	620,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WINTERS & VICINITY, CA	1,250,000	510,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	1,570,000	1,284,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	67,400,000	10,413,000	---	787,000	---	787,000	---	787,000
	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	990,000	518,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	---	---	---	375,000	---	375,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA	19,990,000	3,271,000	---	559,000	---	559,000	---	559,000
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	10,120,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	---	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	PILLAR POINT HARBOR, CA	875,000	175,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA	1,250,000	600,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PORT OF LONG BEACH (DEEPENING), CA	35,000,000	---	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
	RUSSIAN RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	5,940,000	4,155,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, LITTLE HOLLAND TRACT,	1,250,000	210,000	290,000	---	300,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, PROSPECT ISLAND, CA	875,000	356,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, WESTERN DELTA TRACT	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	1,125,000	300,000	150,000	---	350,000	---	150,000	---
(SP)	SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CITIES OF OCEANSIDE AND CALSBAD, CA.	1,910,000	1,010,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY BAR CHANNEL, CA	1,250,000	---	240,000	---	---	---	---	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA	1,100,000	975,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,780,000	385,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	2,000,000	668,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),	3,195,000	2,020,000	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP,	2,944,000	2,773,000	171,000	---	171,000	---	171,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FIREBAUGH AND MENDOTA, CA	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, KAWEAH RIVER, CA	1,757,000	1,717,000	40,000	---	40,000	260,000	40,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STRMS	2,070,000	798,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	---	---	---	---	600,000	---	---	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TULE RIVER, CA	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	SAN JUAN AND ALISO CREEKS, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	9,033,000	900,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(FC)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA	19,100,000	1,860,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS, CA	2,799,000	1,968,000	81,000	---	81,000	---	81,000	---
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	4,670,000	500,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA	5,500,000	50,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
	SANTA MONICA WATER SUPPLY, CA	---	---	---	---	350,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA	1,168,000	903,000	265,000	---	265,000	---	265,000	---
(N)	SF BAY, LEONARD RANCH (DISPOSAL), CA	750,000	300,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA	800,000	---	---	---	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL, CA	1,250,000	---	240,000	---	---	---	---	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	2,580,000	2,066,000	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---
	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
	VENTURA AND SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	2,080,000	845,000	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(FDP)	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT	920,000	356,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
	DELAWARE								
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	2,615,000	2,528,000	57,000	---	57,000	---	57,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	3,406,000	2,056,000	880,000	---	880,000	---	880,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	2,845,000	2,082,000	145,000	---	145,000	---	145,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ, & PA	285,800,000	9,018,000	---	780,000	---	780,000	---	780,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
(FC)	WASHINGTON, DC & VICINITY	5,100,000	2,637,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	FLORIDA								
	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WW, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(SP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	684,000	577,000	107,000	---	107,000	---	107,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA STUDY, FL	12,320,000	3,879,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	650,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL	392,000	212,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL	3,800,000	150,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	1,308,000	446,000	414,000	---	414,000	---	414,000	---
	LIDO SARASOTA BEACH, FL	---	---	---	---	---	---	100,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL	71,346,000	4,585,000	---	415,000	---	415,000	---	415,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	14,797,000	2,315,000	---	285,000	---	285,000	---	285,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	941,000	574,000	233,000	---	233,000	---	233,000	---
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	1,100,000	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	GEORGIA								
(SPE)	ATLANTA WATERSHED STUDY, GA	1,600,000	---	350,000	---	---	---	350,000	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	2,477,000	1,846,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	665,000	640,000	25,000	---	25,000	---	25,000	---
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	9,000,000	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK & DAM, GA	320,000	---	130,000	---	---	---	---	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXTENSION, GA	2,425,000	93,000	332,000	---	332,000	---	332,000	---
	HAWAII								
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	1,075,000	394,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	5,775,000	526,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000
(N)	MAUI SECOND HARBOR, MAUI, HI	525,000	---	130,000	---	---	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI	1,016,000	502,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	1,247,000	753,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	143,000,000	1,428,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	1,825,000	1,463,000	362,000	---	362,000	---	362,000	---
(ROP)	FREEPORT, IL	940,000	340,000	108,000	---	108,000	---	108,000	---
(FC)	NUTWOOD DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT, IL	7,200,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000
(RCP)	SNY ISLAND, IL	1,250,000	252,000	248,000	---	248,000	---	248,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST CHICAGO, IL	1,185,000	178,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	43,400,000	23,223,000	6,205,000	---	6,205,000	---	6,205,000	---
(ROP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	250,000	90,000	25,000	---	25,000	---	25,000	---
	INDIANA								
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	---	---	---	2,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	1,461,000	1,406,000	55,000	---	55,000	200,000	55,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, CALUMET TOWNSHIP, IN	745,000	45,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, DYER, IN	700,000	220,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION (INDIANA SHORELINE), IN	1,175,000	400,000	275,000	---	---	---	275,000	---
	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY, IN	---	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, IN & IL (MIDDLE REAC	1,266,000	1,113,000	153,000	---	228,000	---	228,000	---
	IOWA								
(FDP)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	300,000	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, IA, IL & MO	885,000	270,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER, KS	---	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, KS	1,500,000	125,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS	850,000	10,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	968,000	10,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	1,720,000	1,609,000	111,000	---	111,000	---	111,000	---
(RCP)	WILSON LAKE, KS	400,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	9,375,000	1,230,000	---	670,000	---	---	---	---
	KENTUCKY								
	GREEN RIVER LOCK AND DAM NO. 6	---	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM ADDITION, KY	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2,500,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, KY & IN	299,700,000	7,873,000	---	1,487,000	---	---	---	2,387,000
	METROPOLITAN LEXINGTON, FAYETTE COUNTY, KY	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	1,310,000	960,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	12,207,000	930,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	1,350,000	500,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY,	1,000,000	100,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN/OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM STUDY, KY, IL & IN	10,740,000	5,605,000	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---	2,600,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW, LA	2,670,000	400,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	44,100,000	4,940,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	134,200,000	250,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	4,798,000	1,845,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	4,710,000	1,546,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	2,930,000	711,000	34,000	---	34,000	---	234,000	---
(N)	LAKE CHARLES SHIP CHAN, BY-PASS AND GEN ANCHORAGE AREA	1,660,000	553,000	47,000	---	587,000	---	587,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, LA	600,000	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION, LA	1,625,000	665,000	25,000	---	25,000	---	25,000	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	2,610,000	1,360,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	2,423,000	273,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA	104,000,000	500,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
	WEST SHORE - LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(FC)	ANACOSTIA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	28,200,000	700,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	3,145,000	1,645,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(SPE)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESS, MD &.	600,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES & CHANNELS, MD	11,800,000	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD	1,512,000	1,221,000	291,000	---	291,000	---	291,000	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES STUDY, MD	1,480,000	529,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY TIME VARIABLE MODEL, MD, VA, PA & DC	3,000,000	2,230,000	335,000	---	335,000	---	335,000	---
(RCP)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE - REALLOCATION, MD & VA	712,000	478,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	LOWER EASTERN SHORE, MD & DE	1,800,000	---	250,000	---	---	---	---	---
(N)	OCEAN CITY, MD AND VICINITY	3,239,000	878,000	850,000	---	850,000	---	850,000	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER WATER RESOURCES, MD	2,350,000	350,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	1,750,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	150,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(FDP)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	1,800,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	23,850,000	1,875,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000
	MICHIGAN								
	SAULT STE MARIE, MI	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN	995,000	808,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(SPE)	POMME DE TERRE RIVER - MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY, MN	720,000	---	75,000	---	---	---	---	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	HANCOCK, HARRISON AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MS	2,950,000	538,000	62,000	---	62,000	---	62,000	---
	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS	---	---	---	---	---	1,299,000	---	1,299,000
(N)	LOWNDES COUNTY PORT BARGE FLEETING AREA, MS	420,000	100,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	11,300,000	---	---	10,000	---	10,000	---	10,000
	FABIUS RIVER DRAINAGE DISTRICT, MO	---	---	---	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	ST LOUIS REGION, MO	1,700,000	850,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	585,000	90,000	144,000	---	144,000	---	144,000	---
	NEBRASKA								
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	688,000	464,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER & TRIBS, NE	1,875,000	134,000	441,000	---	441,000	---	441,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	6,040,000	538,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV	1,800,000	915,000	---	---	---	---	400,000	---

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	NEW JERSEY								
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ	---	---	---	---	550,000	---	200,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	1,717,000	1,400,000	115,000	---	115,000	---	115,000	---
(SP)	GREAT EGG INLET TO TOWNSEND INLET, NJ	1,400,000	210,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS - CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	1,300,000	756,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ	48,800,000	5,837,000	---	963,000	---	963,000	---	963,000
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400,000	210,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL	14,000,000	1,146,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY (CLIFFWOOD BEACH), NJ	1,120,000	268,000	52,000	---	52,000	---	52,000	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	3,189,000	1,147,000	620,000	---	620,000	---	620,000	---
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	186,000,000	18,373,000	---	3,600,000	---	3,600,000	---	3,600,000
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	1,700,000	475,000	25,000	---	300,000	---	25,000	---
(SPE)	STONY BROOK, PRINCETON TOWNSHIP, NJ	1,400,000	---	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	1,250,000	1,129,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
	NEW MEXICO								
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	815,000	697,000	118,000	---	118,000	---	118,000	---
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM	6,000,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(SPE)	RIO DE CHAMA, ABIQUIU DAM TO ESPANOLA, NM	1,000,000	168,000	232,000	---	232,000	---	232,000	---
(FDP)	ROCKY ARROYO/DARK CANYON, PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES,	1,320,000	445,000	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL - HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY	28,700,000	1,536,000	---	400,000	---	800,000	---	800,000
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK, NY	7,000,000	838,000	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	950,000	350,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	1,500,000	793,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	900,000	400,000	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---
(BE)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY	35,500,000	419,000	---	525,000	---	525,000	---	525,000
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	1,600,000	---	250,000	---	---	---	---	---
(SP)	MONTAUK POINT, NY	772,000	425,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	1,200,000	600,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	2,000,000	474,000	26,000	---	26,000	---	26,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	650,000	460,000	95,000	---	95,000	---	95,000	---
(N)	RARITAN BAY ANCHORAGES, NY AND NJ CHANNELS, NY & NJ	1,200,000	510,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	REYNOLD'S CHANNEL AND NEW YORK STATE BOAT CHANNEL, NY	1,250,000	480,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	2,000,000	470,000	30,000	---	330,000	---	330,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD	2,300,000	210,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(SP)	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY	2,000,000	168,000	332,000	---	332,000	---	332,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	38,300,000	2,011,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(N)	CAPE FEAR - NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC	2,870,000	2,025,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	2,097,000	963,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, CHANNEL WIDENING, NC	18,795,000	780,000	---	570,000	---	570,000	---	570,000
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	1,859,000	849,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	625,000	---
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND	1,560,000	972,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---
	OHIO								
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH, KY.	12,800,000	970,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
	OKLAHOMA								
(FDP)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBS, OK, NM, CO, & KS	1,470,000	---	350,000	---	---	---	350,000	---
(RCP)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	735,000	---	100,000	---	---	---	---	---
	OREGON								
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	4,228,000	2,198,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FDP)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	1,438,000	383,000	55,000	---	55,000	---	55,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR	1,384,000	514,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	1,450,000	25,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH SANTIAM FISHERY RESTORATION, OR	1,425,000	390,000	35,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---
(SPE)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	795,000	---	100,000	---	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	2,200,000	846,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(MP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	24,000,000	419,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK, PA	6,225,000	430,000	---	570,000	---	570,000	---	570,000
(COM)	CONEMAUGH RIVER BASIN, PA	978,000	602,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA	500,000	450,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	MILTON, PA	500,000	485,000	15,000	---	15,000	---	15,000	---
	MUSSERS DAM, MIDDLE CREEK, SNYDER CO, PA	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(RCP)	YOUGHIOGHENY LAKE - SEC 216	625,000	---	250,000	---	---	---	250,000	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,500,000	955,000	---	281,000	---	281,000	---	281,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	133,300,000	2,047,000	---	453,000	---	453,000	---	453,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING/WIDENING)	1,885,000	1,707,000	158,000	---	158,000	---	158,000	---
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	1,397,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS, SC	1,620,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	1,885,000	---	300,000	---	---	---	---	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	27,000,000	995,000	---	390,000	---	390,000	---	390,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD	498,000	274,000	10,000	---	10,000	---	10,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	10,830,000	71,000	---	20,000	---	20,000	---	20,000
	TENNESSEE								
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	---	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FDP)	METRO CENTER LEVEE, DAVIDSON CO, NASHVILLE, TN	1,150,000	335,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	TEXAS								
	ALPINE, TX	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	211,200,000	2,798,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(RDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES - ADDICKS & BARKER RESERVO	2,050,000	500,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, TX	---	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,143,000	443,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	136,800,000	1,745,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX	1,900,000	850,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	110,000,000	1,797,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	20,400,000	20,000	---	750,000	---	750,000	---	750,000
(RDP)	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX (SECTION 216)	2,140,000	420,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	1,220,000	---	150,000	---	---	---	---	---
(RDP)	GIWW-CC BAY TO PORT ISABEL, TX AA642	3,790,000	470,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	162,200,000	3,146,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	295,900,000	15,727,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER & TRIBS SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	39,920,000	1,662,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	1,000,000	700,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX	1,210,000	450,000	30,000	---	30,000	---	30,000	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	142,100,000	2,373,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	4,810,000	4,506,000	304,000	---	304,000	---	304,000	---
	UTAH								
	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	---	---	---	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	8,900,000	1,500,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	VIRGIN ISLANDS								
(RDP)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	170,000	---	150,000	---	---	---	150,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(N)	AIWW BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	22,790,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, POQUOSON, VA	---	---	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPE)	EASTERN SHORE, ACCOMACK AND NORTHAMPTON COUNTIES, VA	1,250,000	252,000	248,000	---	248,000	---	248,000	---
(RCP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	2,400,000	---	350,000	---	---	---	350,000	---
(SPE)	NANSEMOND RIVER BASIN, SUFFOLK, VA	1,450,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---
(BE)	SANDBRIDGE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	6,548,000	780,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000
	WASHINGTON								
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISE, WA	1,727,000	548,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(COM)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER, WA	1,700,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM (ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WA	2,225,000	1,425,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(RDP)	MOUNT ST HELENS ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WA	1,400,000	---	15,000	---	---	---	---	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	1,350,000	252,000	98,000	---	98,000	---	98,000	---
(COM)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	1,700,000	---	200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	CHEAT RIVER BASIN, WV	1,400,000	335,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	11,533,000	10,610,000	703,000	---	703,000	---	703,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV	163,000,000	5,181,000	---	5,319,000	---	5,319,000	---	5,319,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER WATERFRONT, WV	1,200,000	600,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTOR, WV &	1,800,000	475,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN, WV	---	---	---	---	800,000	---	---	---
	TYGART RIVER BASIN (BARBOUR COUNTY), WV	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
	WEST VIRGINIA PORT DEVELOPMENT, WV	---	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	WYOMING								
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	1,733,000	875,000	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
	MISCELLANEOUS								
	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	---	---	3,605,000	---	3,205,000	---	2,600,000	---
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	---	---	4,000,000	---	3,800,000	---	3,800,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	14,790,000	---	7,540,000	---	8,540,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	160,000	---	---	---	---	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS	---	---	615,000	---	---	---	---	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	---	---	500,000	---	---	---	---	---

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	FEDERAL COST	TOTAL ALLOCATED TO DATE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		HOUSE ALLOWANCE		SENATE ALLOWANCE	
				INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	15,000,000	---	7,600,000	---	9,600,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	770,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
	NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF WATER SUPPLY DEMAND AND AVAILAB	---	---	3,000,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---
	NATIONAL DREDGING NEEDS STUDY OF PORTS AND HARBORS	---	---	909,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
	NATIONAL SPATIAL DATA INFRASTRUCTURE	---	---	2,050,000	---	---	---	---	---
	OHIO RIVER BASIN STUDY	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATEHER SERVICE)	---	---	550,000	---	500,000	---	400,000	---
	PRESIDENT'S CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN	---	---	600,000	---	---	---	---	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	---	---	400,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	40,574,000	---	28,432,000	---	31,432,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	350,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	770,000	---	770,000	---	770,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	950,000	---	950,000	---	950,000	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-26,988,000	---	-27,288,000	---	-39,843,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			117,273,000	38,352,000	87,402,000	42,504,000	82,592,000	43,731,000

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

St. Paul Harbor, AK.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $50,000 for the Corps to initiate the feasibility phase of the St. Paul Harbor, AK, study.

Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, AR.—The Committee has included $280,000, the same as the House allowance, for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Arkansas River, Tucker Creek, AR, project.

Arkansas River levees, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $400,000 is recommended for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design for repair work to certain segments of the Corps' Arkansas River levees, including the Plum Bayou levee in Arkansas.

San Joaquin River basin, Kawaeh River, CA.—The Committee has provided $40,000 for the Corps to complete feasibility studies of the San Joaquin River basin, Kawaeh River, CA, project. This is the same as the budget request for fiscal year 1996.

Stockton metropolitan area, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study to determine the extent and nature of flood control needs for the Stockton, CA, area.

San Joaquin River basin, Caliente Creek stream group, California.—The Committee concurs with the House in providing $171,000 for the completion of the Caliente Creek, CA, feasibility study. This is the same as the budget request. The Committee directs that the Corps of Engineers take all steps necessary to ensure that this 12-year old study is completed in fiscal year 1996.

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

Indianapolis central waterfront, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with preconstruction engineering and design for the elements of the master plan of the central waterfront project in Indianapolis, IN.

McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $2,387,000 for the McAlpine lock and dam project in Indiana and Kentucky, an increase of $900,000 over the budget request. The additional funds will advance preconstruction engineering and design by 1 year and allow the project to be considered as a new start in 1997.

Lake George, Hobart, IN.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers will use previously appropriated funds to complete the general design memorandum and initiate plans and specifications for the Lake George, Hobart, IN, project.

Little Calumet River basin, Cady Marsh ditch, Indiana.—The Committee understands the Corps of Engineers will use previously appropriated funds in fiscal year 1996 to complete the general design memorandum for the Cady Marsh ditch, Indiana, project.

Coralville Lake, IA.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study to address the comprehensive reservoir regulation procedures, efficiency of the structure, and possible structural and nonstructural improvements at the Coralville Lake, IA.

Grand (Neosho) River, KS.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps to initiate a study of the backwater effects

of flood control operations along the Grand (Neosho) River in Kansas as far north as John Redmond Reservoir. Particular emphasis is to be given to the effect of flood pool levels on the extent and duration of flooding north of the Miami reach. To the greatest extent possible, the Corps should make use of already available U.S. Geologic Survey maps of the Neosho River basin. The Corps shall keep interested parties informed of its activities and progress on a regular basis.

*Frankfort, KY, Bellepoint floodwall.*The Corps of Engineers is directed to use $65,000 of available funds to complete the feasibility study of the Bellepoint floodwall, Frankfort, KY, project.

Amite River and tributaries, LA.—The Committee is aware of recent flooding in the Amite River basin which encompasses about 2,000 square miles in southeastern Louisiana and southwestern Mississippi. While the Corps continues to study some possible flood control solutions for this area, the Committee supports the examination of additional measures. Therefore, the Committee has included $200,000 to reevaluate the State of Louisiana's review of the previously suspended feasibility phase studies of Darlington Reservoir.

Lake Charles ship channel, bypass and general anchorage area, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation concurs with the House in providing an additional $540,000 for the Lake Charles ship channel, bypass and general anchorage area, Louisiana. The funds will be used to investigate the feasibility of developing a support service facility for the Calcasieu ship channel at Hackberry, LA, in the interest of improved navigability in the ship channel.

Lafayette Parish, LA.—The Committee has included an additional $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance phase and initiate the feasibility phase of the Lafayette Parish, LA, study.

Mississippi River ship channel, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 for the Corps to initiate a reconnaissance study of the long-term improvements needed for navigation on the Mississippi River and its outlets between Baton Rouge, LA, and the Gulf of Mexico.

West Shore-Lake Pontchartrain, LA.—The Committee has provided $500,000, the same as the House allowance, for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study of hurricane flooding problems west of Bonnet Carre spillway.

Lower Truckee River, NV.—The bill includes an additional $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study for the restoration of riparian areas of the lower Truckee River in Nevada.

Devils Lake, ND.—An additional $500,000 has been included for the Corps to accelerate work on the Devils Lake, ND, feasibility study. The Committee expects the study to address all aspects of the project set out in the study evaluation.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, NJ.—An appropriation of $200,000 is included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study of storm damage reduction measures for the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, NJ, project.

Colonias along the United States-Mexico border, Texas.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to

continue to provide technical and planning and design assistance to colonias along the United States-Mexico border.

Tolchester S–turn, Maryland.—The Committee concurs with the House in urging the Corps of Engineers to complete its ongoing studies and related design work pertaining to the dangerous S–turn in the Tolchester channel, and to complete its report addressing the economic, environmental, and safety concerns of this modification in time for consideration during the deliberations on the fiscal year 1997 budget.

Willamette River temperature control, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000, for the Corps to continue engineering, design, and preparation of detailed plans and specifications for water temperature control facilities at the Cougar project on the McKenzie River. Over the last 5 years, Congress has directed the Corps to expedite completion of the feasibility study and design for this important project. The Committee again directs the Corps to proceed without further delay to complete preconstruction design in 1996 and to request construction funding in 1997 and to provide a report to the Committee no later than February 1996 on its activities and progress.

These temperature control facilities are intended to correct unfavorable water temperatures resulting from the operation of the Cougar and Blue River projects. With more favorable water temperatures, wild salmon will regain their capacity to reproduce. The project modifications will help restore wild spring chinook salmon runs in the Willamette River drainage.

The Committee supports installation of these fish facilities as project modifications which mitigate for the fish and wildlife of the Cougar Dam. The cost of the fish facilities would be repaid according to the allocations among the original project purposes.

Research and development.—An appropriation of $31,432,000 is recommended for research and development activities of the Corps of Engineers. This is the same as the House allowance. The Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark funding for university research institutions given the limited resources and severe budget constraints.

The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for zebra mussel research, which is the same as the current year; $2,000,000 for wetlands research; and $2,400,000 for evaluation of environmental investments. In recommending $1,000,000 for zebra mussel research, the Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to apply the funds to various regions geographically, and on varying technologies and applications in order to accomplish the highest-priority work..

The Midwestern flooding in 1993–94 has brought to light the possible need of the Corps of Engineers to develop and deploy updated comprehensive flood impact modeling capabilities. Using available funds, the Corps is to evaluate current operational capabilities and the need for enhanced on-line, predictive event modeling, including refinement of operational planning, intra-agency and interagency data base sharing, impacts and alternative proposals for flood control and water resource management, and optimum use of Corps flood control facilities to reduce damage and begin the effort if appropriate.

Coordination and studies with other agencies.—The Committee recommendation for coordination and studies with other agencies includes $380,000 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. These strategies will consider ecological, social, and economic principles to manage biological and physical systems in a manner that safeguards the long-term ecological sustainability, natural diversity, and productivity of the watershed and its landscapes. The strategies will include the evaluation, planning, design, and completion of restoration or demonstration projects and the development of coordinated directives for the management of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. In as much as possible, these strategies will complete or complement State and local watershed restoration efforts on public and private lands or in conjunction with American Indian tribes.

Nonproject specific program reductions.—Because of the severe budgetary situation, the Committee has been forced to delete or reduce the funds requested by the administration for a number of nonproject specific activities funded under the "General investigations" account. The Committee understands that this could adversely affect ongoing work and, therefore, expects the Corps to apply reductions in a way that limits the impacts to the extent possible and to bring an activity to a logical conclusion.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1995	$983,668,000
Budget estimate, 1996	785,125,000
House allowance	807,846,000
Committee recommendation	778,456,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	ALABAMA					
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	6,279,000	4,394,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	16,141,000	1,371,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	87,300,000	70,747,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
	ALASKA					
(N)	HOMER SPIT, REPAIR AND EXTENSION, AK	3,800,000	---	---	---	3,800,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK	15,454,000	12,454,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	9,900,000	8,833,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ	11,000,000	8,739,000	2,261,000	2,261,000	2,261,000
(FC)	NOGALES WASH, AZ	6,400,000	1,559,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(FC)	RILLITO RIVER, AZ	25,000,000	16,106,000	4,894,000	4,894,000	4,894,000
	ARKANSAS					
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700,000	5,091,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR AR RVR NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, AR	649,000,000	613,179,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	---	---	6,600,000	6,600,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA	41,850,000	19,210,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	63,300,000	30,250,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	283,000,000	10,450,000	11,367,000	11,367,000	11,367,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	100,700,000	4,630,000	100,000	425,000	---
	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	23,300,000	5,637,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	85,900,000	15,548,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,200,000	2,076,000	124,000	124,000	124,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	89,235,000	38,169,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	25,750,000	7,879,000	3,296,000	3,296,000	3,296,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	112,200,000	88,272,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA	24,900,000	7,717,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR)	76,375,000	76,275,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA	---	---	---	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	28,800,000	24,903,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000
	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY, CA	---	---	---	1,900,000	1,900,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	172,250,000	63,979,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	778,000,000	395,626,000	70,249,000	70,249,000	70,249,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	17,100,000	8,197,000	300,000	2,300,000	300,000
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	---	---	200,000	---
(N)	SONOMA BAYLANDS WETLAND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, CA	6,375,000	5,875,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET - NEWPORT BEACH, CA	34,240,000	16,368,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	15,200,000	2,347,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA	17,700,000	16,460,000	1,240,000	1,240,000	1,240,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA	7,170,000	6,450,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO	5,950,000	2,717,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
	FLORIDA					
	BROWARD COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	450,000	---
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	1,358,000,000	412,880,000	3,726,000	4,026,000	4,026,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL	170,400,000	51,728,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	---	---	---	148,000	---
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	6,770,000	4,180,000	2,590,000	2,590,000	2,590,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	30,600,000	---	600,000	600,000	600,000
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT)	8,200,000	2,324,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	18,684,000	3,105,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	25,600,000	1,150,000	3,202,000	3,202,000	3,202,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	51,066,000	14,651,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	---	---	---	3,000,000	---
(BE)	SARASOTA COUNTY, FL	55,200,000	7,505,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
	ST JOHNS COUNTY (ST AUGUSTINE BEACH), FL	---	---	---	350,000	---
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	17,700,000	---	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	575,000,000	569,200,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700,000	---	2,200,000	2,200,000	---
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	28,700,000	19,110,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(N)	FOUR LOCKS, ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (MAJOR REHAB)	27,200,000	23,946,000	3,254,000	3,254,000	3,254,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	23,100,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	21,400,000	4,028,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,100,000	10,311,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	738,500,000	718,323,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY	1,050,000,000	149,848,000	32,100,000	32,100,000	32,100,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL (DEF CORR)	5,300,000	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	246,899,000	110,714,000	19,455,000	19,455,000	19,455,000
	INDIANA					
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	15,800,000	1,347,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	33,865,000	4,884,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	104,000,000	39,091,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	OHIO RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION, IN	---	---	---	1,000,000	---
	IOWA					
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	20,900,000	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	69,900,000	23,760,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	128,417,000	93,548,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,640,000	949,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	40,600,000	8,233,000	168,000	168,000	168,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA	15,300,000	8,481,000	4,040,000	4,040,000	4,040,000
	KANSAS					
	WINFIELD, KS	---	---	---	670,000	670,000
	KENTUCKY					
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	157,299,000	146,499,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	19,600,000	600,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(FC)	FRANKFORT, SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY	8,630,000	6,007,000	2,623,000	2,623,000	2,623,000
	MCALPINE LOCK AND DAM, KY, IN	---	---	---	3,487,000	---
	SALYERSVILLE, KY	---	---	---	500,000	500,000
	LOUISIANA					
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORM WATER DISCHARGE, LA	---	---	---	---	850,000
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	7,078,000	2,249,000	2,379,000	2,379,000	2,379,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	515,000,000	316,149,000	7,848,000	11,848,000	11,848,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	79,100,000	67,903,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	584,000,000	101,696,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	166,000,000	134,620,000	3,360,000	3,360,000	3,360,000
	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA	12,500,000	8,300,000	---	---	2,300,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, LA, AR, TX	---	---	---	3,800,000	2,000,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,726,416,000	1,640,330,000	16,673,000	16,673,000	16,673,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	61,800,000	20,717,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	MARYLAND					
	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD	---	---	---	339,000	339,000
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500,000	421,000	230,000	230,000	230,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	MASSACHUSETTS					
	ROUGHANS PT, REVERE, MA	---	---	---	710,000	710,000
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	25,200,000	23,910,000	990,000	990,000	990,000
	MICHIGAN					
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	---	---	82,000	82,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	CHASKA, MN	29,600,000	24,061,000	3,740,000	3,740,000	3,740,000
	MISSISSIPPI					
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	35,170,000	9,248,000	2,812,000	2,812,000	2,812,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	35,745,000	30,924,000	4,686,000	4,686,000	4,686,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	185,000,000	77,422,000	9,600,000	9,600,000	9,600,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO	32,900,000	24,669,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	210,000,000	174,424,000	5,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	---	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000,000	1,957,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
	NEVADA					
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	169,900,000	15,651,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	NEW JERSEY					
(FC)	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK AT HALEDON, PROSPECT PARK AND PATERS	23,600,000	5,594,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	15,360,000	2,321,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND,NJ	8,315,000	2,015,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	6,826,000	3,250,000	3,576,000	3,576,000	3,576,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,104,900,000	56,107,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
	NEW MEXICO					
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM EMERGENCY GATES, NM	4,200,000	270,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	63,900,000	10,364,000	120,000	120,000	1,620,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	31,800,000	3,143,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	NEW YORK					
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	64,699,000	35,743,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	524,000,000	21,947,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &.	127,000,000	45,103,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE, NY (DEF CORR)	6,100,000	2,085,000	4,015,000	4,015,000	4,015,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	80,600,000	42,971,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	5,600,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	185,480,000	15,007,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(BE)	FORT FISHER, NC	4,170,000	2,076,000	2,094,000	2,094,000	2,094,000
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	8,230,000	290,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY)	18,000,000	11,417,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	6,280,000	4,418,000	853,000	853,000	853,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	31,800,000	21,199,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	OHIO					
	HOLES CREEK, WEST CARROLLTON, OH	---	---	---	190,000	190,000
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	83,250,000	25,005,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK	13,425,000	2,942,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK	76,500,000	58,433,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	31,800,000	870,000	530,000	530,000	530,000
	OREGON					
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	27,100,000	12,111,000	8,530,000	8,530,000	8,530,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	86,400,000	3,808,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU INDIAN FISHING SITES, OR & WA	11,972,000	10,200,000	---	---	1,720,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000,000	107,851,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	PENNSYLVANIA					
	BROAD TOP REGION, PA	---	---	---	4,100,000	2,000,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	35,500,000	---	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
	GLEN FOERD, PA	---	---	---	200,000	200,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA	10,900,000	1,892,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA	15,400,000	2,048,000	357,000	357,000	357,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 & 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	664,000,000	15,789,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	59,927,000	14,644,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA	22,401,000	20,437,000	1,964,000	1,964,000	1,964,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	100,000,000	12,778,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	415,700,000	342,163,000	12,451,000	12,451,000	12,451,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	62,400,000	3,634,000	250,000	250,000	250,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	305,500,000	15,671,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(BE)	MYRTLE BEACH, SC	160,551,000	5,191,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
	TENNESSEE					
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY)	13,800,000	12,896,000	904,000	904,000	904,000
	TEXAS					
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX	3,950,000	2,034,000	1,916,000	1,916,000	1,916,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	24,616,000	4,172,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	113,400,000	89,474,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX	78,800,000	13,590,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX	7,270,000	2,817,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	315,200,000	309,667,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY)	36,500,000	27,026,000	9,474,000	9,474,000	9,474,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	145,300,000	138,203,000	7,097,000	7,097,000	7,097,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	212,700,000	30,109,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX (DAM SAFETY)	9,950,000	200,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	---	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA	38,500,000	10,756,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,400,000	18,261,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	23,600,000	4,773,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA	---	---	---	1,100,000	1,100,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	8,561,000	6,251,000	925,000	925,000	925,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	WASHINGTON					
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS, WA.....	10,700,000	8,963,000	1,377,000	1,377,000	1,377,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID..	583,600,000	192,367,000	78,800,000	68,800,000	78,800,000
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY).....	1,947,000	360,000	1,587,000	1,587,000	1,587,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000,000	213,044,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,447,800,000	542,439,000	6,300,000	24,000,000	26,200,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV.....	16,800,000	5,947,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV.....	17,700,000	6,239,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH.....	384,000,000	309,960,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	377,000,000	180,248,000	11,840,000	11,840,000	11,840,000
	WISCONSIN					
	PORTAGE, WI.....	---	---	---	250,000	250,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM.....	---	---	---	---	5,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	---	---	3,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING (SECTION 208).....	---	---	500,000	300,000	300,000
	DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAM.....	---	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	---	---	10,000,000	10,000,000	6,000,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	---	---	18,984,000	18,984,000	18,984,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	---	---	22,000,000	22,000,000	15,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES.....	---	---	40,000	40,000	40,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES.....	---	---	185,000	185,000	185,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION (SECTION 111).....	---	---	500,000	500,000	1,100,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	---	5,000,000	2,500,000	6,500,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	---	24,280,000	12,000,000	10,850,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of Project	Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
	WETLAND AND AQUATIC HABITAT CREATION.....	---	---	15,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	---	---	-33,401,000	-33,401,000	-62,051,000
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....			785,125,000	807,846,000	778,456,000

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

Homer Spit, AK, repair and extension.—The Committee recommends $3,800,000 for emergency repairs and extension of the local cost sharing agreement for the Homer Spit storm damage reduction project at Homer, AK, as authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–640). The original project was to provide a long-term solution to erosion of the Homer Spit and consisted of 1,430 feet of rock revetments with periodic beach nourishment at approximately 10-year intervals for 50 years. The Committee recognizes that within 2 months after construction of the first phase of the project, an unusually severe storm caused considerable damage adjacent to the revetments and undermined the Spit Road. Utilities and access to the port facilities at the end of the spit are currently threatened, requiring emergency repairs and extension of the Federal project if the original project purpose is to be preserved.

McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system (Montgomery Point lock and dam), Arkansas.—The bill includes $6,000,000 for the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation project, the same as the budget request. The bill also directs the Corps of Engineers to use $4,900,000 for activities relating to Montgomery Point lock and dam. The Committee directs the Corps to use $2,000,000 to construct an access road and service facilities as authorized by law. The Committee notes that Montgomery Point was included in the original waterway design that predates the inland waterways trust fund. Given the large Federal investment in the waterway, the Committee believes that it is imperative that a decision be made regarding the financing of the Montgomery Point lock and dam. The Committee again points out that it will be impossible to sustain ongoing construction funding through completion without executive branch support.

Red River emergency bank protection, Arkansas.—An appropriation of $6,600,000 is included in the bill for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete construction of the Dickson revetment feature of the Red River emergency bank protection project in Arkansas. This is the same as the House allowance.

Sacramento River flood control project, (Glenn-Colusa irrigation district), California.—The Committee has provided $300,000, the same as the House allowance, for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the riffle restoration project and continue participation in, and, when necessary and appropriate, provide direct support to the State-Federal effort to develop a long-term solution to the fish passage problem at the Hamilton City pumping plant.

Los Angeles Harbor, CA.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000, the full budget request, for the Corps of Engineers complete engineering and design and to execute the project cooperation agreement for the Los Angeles Harbor project in California.

Klamath-Glen levee repairs, California.—The Committee believes that the question of the local contribution on the Klamath-Glen levee project in California should more appropriately be addressed by the authorizing committees of the Congress.

Santa Ana River mainstem, California.—The Committee does not concur with the House regarding the San Timoteo Creek feature of the Santa Ana River mainstem project in California. The Commit-

tee understands that the next usable increment, phase 3, has a current estimated cost of $20,000,000. Therefore, continuation of the San Timoteo Creek feature from within funds available for the Santa Ana mainstem project would have significant impact on the overall project schedule.

Kissimmee River restoration, Florida.—The Committee understands that carryover funds from prior years appropriations are sufficient to continue engineering and design on the Kissimmee River restoration project in Florida.

The Committee recognizes the continued Federal obligation to this important multiyear project and is committed to it's completion at the earliest possible date. In addition, it is the Committee's intent to continue to work with the State of Florida and the Corps of Engineers by providing support funding in future years as such funds may become obligated.

McCook and Thronton Reservoirs, IL.—While the budget request for the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, IL, project does not include a request for new funding, the Committee understands that $11,478,000 of previously appropriated funding is available and adequate to undertake scheduled activities in fiscal year 1996.

The Committee is concerned with the continued reliance by the Corps of Engineers on its 1986 design memorandum described in the Water Resources Act of 1988. This design memorandum does not take into proper consideration the impact on the McCook quarry or the impact on the surrounding community. The Committee, therefore, directs the Corps to continue their assessment of other options which would minimize the impact on this valuable limestone resource.

O'Hare Reservoir, IL.—The Committee concurs with the House in urging the Corps to reprogram additional funds, as needed, to complete the O'Hare Reservoir, IL, project as efficiently and quickly as possible.

Ohio River flood protection (Indiana shoreline), Indiana.—The Committee has provided $275,000, the full budget request, under general investigations for the Corps of Engineers to continue cost-shared feasibility studies related to the Ohio River flood protection (Indiana shoreline) project in Indiana.

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

McAlpine lock and dam, Kentucky and Indiana.—The Committee has transferred the McAlpine lock and dam project to the "General investigations" account and provided $2,387,000, an increase of $900,000 over the budget request, to complete planning, engineering, and design. This will advance project planning by 1 full year allowing the project to be considered as a new start in 1997.

Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity (hurricane protection), Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation concurs with the House allowance of $11,848,000 for the Lake Pontchartrain and vicinity (hurricane protection), Louisiana project. In addition, in light of recent devastating flooding, the Corps is directed to evaluate the feasibility of expediting the remaining features of the project in the vicinity of St. Charles Parish, and to provide the Committee with an accelerated construction schedule and funding profile through

project completion, along with the feasibility and impacts of incorporating four additional pumping stations, and other needed structures, in the New Orleans west unit, St. Charles Parish levee part of the project.

Lake Pontchartrain storm water discharge, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $850,000 to continue the development of this project. Further, the facility owners shall receive credit for design and construction, compatible with project requirements, accomplished by the facility owner prior to execution of the necessary agreements with the non-Federal sponsor.

Ouachita River levees, Louisiana.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the rehabilitation or replacement of deteriorated drainage structures in the Ouachita River levee system in Louisiana.

Baltimore Harbor and channels, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $339,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the limited reevaluation report for the Brewerton channel extension.

Red River below Denison Dam, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000, the full capability of the Corps of Engineers to undertake work on the Red River below Denison Dam project in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

Southeast Louisiana flooding, Louisiana.—The Committee concurs with the House regarding flooding in southeast Louisiana.

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

Committee directs the Corps to provide a report to the Committee, prior to the conference with the House on this bill, on a plan for having the private sector assist with or conduct this and other important Corps project study work.

Ste. Genevieve, MO.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers plans to use up to $3,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for construction of the Ste. Genevieve, MO, project in fiscal year 1996. Because of the urgent need to complete this project as soon as possible, the Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for construction in fiscal year 1996. The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to take all steps necessary to expedite construction of this project.

Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay channels, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee understands that $3,100,000 in previously appropriated funds will be available in fiscal year 1996 for the Corps of Engineers to continue engineering and design of phase II of the Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay channels, New York and New Jersey project.

Onondaga Lake, NY.—In fiscal years 1994–95, the Congress provided a total of $4,000,000 for design of the Onondaga Lake, NY combined sewer overflow project authorized by section 307 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. At that time, the scope of the project had not yet been finalized and, therefore, construction costs had not yet been determined. Since then, the local sponsor has better defined the project and determined that design and construction of the project can be fully funded using the $4,000,000 of Federal funds already appropriated. In addition, the Committee understands that the sponsor has agreed to finance any excess funding requirements over the Federal appropriation of $4,000,000. Accordingly, the Committee concurs with the House committee and has no objection to the Corps of Engineers utilizing the $4,000,000 in previously appropriated funds for construction of the Onondaga Lake project.

Acequias irrigation system, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $1,620,000 for the acequias irrigation system project in New Mexico. Those funds, combined with $1,900,000 in programmed carryover will provide a total of $3,520,000 for acequia rehabilitation projects in fiscal year 1996. The Committee remains concerned about the slow pace of work on this program and directs the Corps of Engineers to work more closely with acequia district members in order to accelerate the number of acequia projects undertaken. The Committee encourages the Corps to work with acequia district members to permit them to perform some of their own repairs, if appropriate.

Columbia River treaty fishing access sites, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,720,000 to continue activities associated with the Columbia River Treaty fishing access sites project authorized by Public Law 100–581, including $1,120,000 for construction of phase I sites and $600,000 for engineering and design of an additional six Bonneville pool sites planned under phase II.

In addition, the Committee understands that the Department of the Army, the Department of the Interior, and the Bonneville Power Administration have recently signed a memorandum of

agreement to capitalizes the long-term operation and maintenance costs of each site when that site is funded for construction and to provide these funds to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be held in trust for annual operation and maintenance expenses. The Committee has included language in the bill to carry out the agreement.

Broad Top region, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for wetlands restoration and the completion of acid mine drainage mitigation projects for the Broad Top region of Huntington and Bedford Counties in Pennsylvania.

Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The Committee has provided $78,800,000, the full budget request, for the Corps to continue activities and work on the Columbia River juvenile fish mitigation project in Oregon and Washington.

The Committee commends the Corps of Engineers for requesting funds to continue the Juvenile Fish Bypass Program. Significant progress is being made on improving fish survival at several of the Columbia and Snake River hydroelectric projects. The Committee urges the Corps to move forward as quickly as possible with planned modifications and other improvements to the projects, including the adult fishways. The Committee directs the Corps to aggressively improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the bypass systems, reduce predator mortality, and enhance passage conditions. Improvements to the fish bypass systems include: dispersed release sites, new flumes, PIT-tag facilities, spillway/stilling basin modifications and testing and installation of surface flow bypass systems.

The Committee remains committed to development of the most effective bypass system for the Dalles project, and its installation at the earliest possible date. There is growing evidence, however, that surface-oriented juvenile fish bypass systems may be more effective and cost less than screened bypass systems, particularly at the Dalles project. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to give priority continued testing of a prototype surface flow system at the Dalles. This should lead to an expeditious decision in 1996 on further bypass system development at the Dalles, independent of progress on surface bypass at the other projects.

To help broaden evaluations of fish survival in the Columbia River system, passive integrated transponder tag (PIT tag) detectors must be installed at John Day and Bonneville projects. Completion of these facilities must be of the highest priority to the Corps. The facilities should be completed as soon as possible by the following dates: John Day—spring 1997; Bonneville—spring 1998.

The Committee supports the development of a comprehensive monitoring program to ensure that spill is carefully monitored and its effects on dissolved gas levels and fish survival are fully evaluated. This program must be in place before the provision of additional spills. In addition, it is critical that dissolved gas abatement technologies such as slotted or baffled gates and flip lips be installed without further delay to reduce dissolved gas levels from both intentional and unintentional spill. Flip lips or flow deflectors shall be designed and installed at John Day and Ice Harbor projects by spring 1997. Another modification, identified by both

Federal and private engineers, is baffled or slotted spillway gates. Experience from non-Federal Columbia River dams indicates that slotted spillway gates could improve fish passage efficiency and reduce dissolved gas levels, as well as the cost of the spill program. The Committee directs the Corps to immediately test, evaluate, and construct spillway gate modifications on at least two projects by the spring of 1996. An additional two projects should be improved by 1997. The Corps is encouraged to use private sector engineering firms and any other available means to accelerate the work as necessary to assist in completing this effort at the earliest possible date. The Committee directs the Corps to reallocate funds within this program, if necessary, from studies, design, and even construction of extended length screens and related activities in order to provide adequate funds in fiscal year 1996 to meet this schedule on gas abatement technologies.

The Committee has included funding for advanced planning and design of a drawdown of John Day Reservoir to minimum operating pool. The Committee, however, is concerned about the costs and justification for the proposed John Day drawdown as an effective method for salmon recovery. The Committee is aware that studies conducted by the Corps, the Snake River Salmon Recovery Team, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and a consultant to the Northwest Power Planning Council have all drawn various conclusions about the potential effectiveness of this salmon recovery measure. Because of these divergent views, the power council, using an independent scientific panel, has initiated a review and reevaluation of the science underlying the John Day drawdown measure. In light of these studies and the current reevaluation of the scientific information available, the Committee urges the Corps to continue to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the power council on this drawdown measure and consult regularly with the council and other regional, State, and tribal interests. The Committee urges the administration to furnish the scientific justification for the John Day drawdown as an effective means of recovery, or abandon the proposal altogether.

The Committee is pleased that the Corps is evaluating options for improving the efficiency of hydroelectric units at its Snake and Columbia River powerhouses in order to improve juvenile salmon survival. The Committee urges the Corps to continue its efforts in concert with other interested agencies and organizations.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia.—The Committee has provided a total of $26,200,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. In addition to amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes $12,000,000 to continue phase III of the Harlan, KY, element of the project; $4,100,000 for the Williamsburg, KY, element of the project to continue floodproofing, complete real estate acquisition and perform levee/floodwall construction; and $1,600,000 for design work, the acquisition of real estate, and the continuation of floodproofing on the Middlesboro, KY, element of the project. In addition, the Corps is directed to continue construction of the Pike County, KY, element using funds previously appropriated.

The Committee has recommended and additional $2,000,000 over the House allowance for the Upper Mingo County element and $200,000 for the Hatfield Bottom nonstructural element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River (sec. 202) project.

Portage levee, Wisconsin.—The Committee includes $250,000 to begin construction work on the Portage levee in the State of Wisconsin. The Committee expects the levee to be constructed to an elevation necessary to meet the State of Wisconsin's floodplain criteria (100-year flood, plus 3 feet), as originally authorized.

Aquatic plant control program.—The Committee has included $5,000,000 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 1996. The appropriations are to undertake the highest priority activities.

Continuing authorities programs.—The Committee agrees with the House in rejecting the administration's proposal to terminate funding for the section 103, section 208, section 14, section 205, section 111, and section 107 continuing authorities programs beginning in fiscal year 1997. Furthermore, the Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has implemented a plan to cease work on projects which are not scheduled for construction approval by the end of fiscal year 1996. The programs, which require only modest amounts of budgetary resources, have proven to be of great value and are particularly important in providing much needed assistance to many small communities throughout the Nation. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to continue the planning, engineering, design and construction of projects under all sections of the continuing authorities program in fiscal year 1995–96 whether or not they will be approved for construction by the end of fiscal year 1996, initiate new projects under its normal procedures for the continuing authorities programs in fiscal year 1995–1996, and continue budgeting these programs in fiscal year 1997 and beyond.

Small flood control projects (sec. 205).—Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee recommendation for section 205 small flood control projects is $15,000,000. This is $1,600,000 below the amount provided for the current fiscal year.

The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to complete feasibility studies and initiate plans and specifications and construction of the Snoqualmie, WA, project; and $100,000 to initiate and complete a feasibility study for First Creek in Knoxville, Knox County, TN. The Committee recommendation concurs with the House on the Muscle Shoals, AL, projects.

Small navigation projects (sec. 107).—An appropriation of $6,500,000 is recommended for small navigation projects, section 107, projects, including $1,000,000 for Ouzinkie Harbor, AK; $1,000,000 for Larsen Bay Harbor, AK; $1,300,000 for Williamsport, AK; $250,000 for Tatitlik Harbor, AK; $200,000 for Valdez Harbor, AK; Tamgas, AK, $200,000; and Whittier Harbor, AK, $50,000.

Projects modifications for improvement of the environment (sec. 1135).—The Committee has provided a total of $10,850,000 for sec-

tion 1135, projects modifications for improvements of the environment. The recommendation includes $100,000 for the St. Paul Harbor, salt lagoon, Alaska project; and $750,000 for the Valdez Harbor, AK intertidal water retention project.

Wetland and aquatic habitat creation program.—Due to the severe budgetary constraints, the Committee has provided $2,500,000 for the wetland and aquatic habitat creation program. Given that this is a nationwide program and the limited funding available, the Committee believes it inappropriate to earmark the limited funds available.

The Committee recognizes the importance of the Poplar Island, MD, beneficial use of dredged material project to the Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts and the Port of Baltimore's dredging program. The Committee directs the Corps to expedite completion of the feasibility report on Poplar Island and, if the project is found to be feasible, to support construction of the project out of the finding provided for wetland and aquatic habitat creation (sec. 204 funds) and/or other appropriate accounts.

Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.—The Committee concurs with the House Committee regarding providing funding to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Committee believes that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should obtain the funds it needs to carry out its role in connection with this program through its own budget.

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

Appropriations, 1995	$328,138,000
Budget estimate, 1996	319,250,000
House allowance	307,885,000
Committee recommendation	307,885,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BENEFIT COST RATIO	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	CURRENT YEAR ALLOCATION	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS							
	SURVEYS:							
	GENERAL STUDIES:							
	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO		3,080,000	1,618,000	538,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS		9,582,000	6,632,000	2,840,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
	REELFOOT LAKE, TN		2,092,000	1,304,000	149,000	238,000	238,000	238,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA		---	---	---	325,000	325,000	325,000
	PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:							
	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY), AR	1.15	114,000,000	7,312,000	3,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR	2.10	55,400,000	3,131,000	371,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA		1,200,000	300,000	---	---	---	100,000
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					5,263,000	5,263,000	5,363,000
	CONSTRUCTION							
	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	33.30	3,570,000,000	2,351,996,000	64,945,000	63,090,000	60,000,000	61,000,000
	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	2.10	8,620,000	2,068,000	---	580,000	580,000	580,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	33.30	1,341,000,000	745,954,000	23,866,000	32,450,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	.97	381,000,000	334,461,000	8,684,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	1.80	169,430,000	82,089,000	4,802,000	11,294,000	11,294,000	11,294,000
	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR	5.20	3,340,000	1,358,000	646,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	33.30	164,000,000	35,328,000	5,383,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	33.30	1,660,000,000	759,754,000	26,842,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA	1.90	57,200,000	6,783,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	3.40	92,800,000	35,247,000	6,318,000	13,300,000	13,300,000	13,300,000
	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	27.70	2,400,000	2,233,000	286,000	148,000	148,000	148,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:		(1,438,497,000)	(517,367,000)	(53,908,000)	(47,928,000)	(47,928,000)	(47,928,000)
	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	1.50	101,694,000	74,938,000	8,421,000	8,920,000	8,920,000	8,920,000
	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	1.50	525,550,000	169,302,000	22,431,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
	F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS	1.50	7,245,000	6,195,000	630,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
	MAIN STEM, MS	1.50	207,400,000	34,472,000	22,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	1.50	32,408,000	21,527,000	3,463,000	2,810,000	2,810,000	2,810,000
	TRIBUTARIES, MS	1.50	249,309,000	104,154,000	3,855,000	2,948,000	2,948,000	2,948,000
	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	1.50	314,891,000	106,779,000	15,086,000	11,200,000	11,200,000	11,200,000
	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS	5.10	18,400,000	9,242,000	90,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	.71	128,000,000	46,713,000	1,235,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION					217,940,000	212,400,000	213,400,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BENEFIT COST RATIO	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	CURRENT YEAR ALLOCATION	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	MAINTENANCE							
	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	---	---	---	61,825,000	56,000,000	56,000,000
	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR	---	---	---	---	146,000	146,000	146,000
	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR	---	---	---	---	115,000	115,000	115,000
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	---	---	---	5,630,000	5,630,000	5,630,000
	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO	---	---	---	---	9,363,000	9,363,000	9,363,000
	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	---	---	---	2,628,000	2,628,000	2,628,000
	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	---	---	---	1,258,000	1,258,000	1,258,000
	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	---	---	---	206,000	206,000	206,000
	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	---	---	---	13,341,000	13,341,000	13,341,000
	BATON ROUGE HARBOR - DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	---	---	---	150,000	150,000	150,000
	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	---	---	---	87,000	87,000	87,000
	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	---	---	---	875,000	875,000	875,000
	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	---	---	---	77,000	77,000	77,000
	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA	---	---	---	---	415,000	415,000	415,000
	OLD RIVER, LA	---	---	---	---	4,821,000	4,821,000	4,821,000
	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	---	---	---	2,740,000	2,740,000	2,740,000
	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	---	---	---	258,000	258,000	258,000
	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	---	---	---	223,000	223,000	223,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	---	---	---	---	(22,638,000)	(22,638,000)	(22,638,000)
	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	---	---	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	---	---	---	2,012,000	2,012,000	2,012,000
	ENID LAKE, MS	---	---	---	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	GREENWOOD, MS	---	---	---	---	860,000	860,000	860,000
	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	---	---	---	4,329,000	4,329,000	4,329,000
	MAIN STEM, MS	---	---	---	---	1,390,000	1,390,000	1,390,000
	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	---	---	---	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000
	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	---	---	---	1,135,000	1,135,000	1,135,000
	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS	---	---	---	---	474,000	474,000	474,000
	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	---	---	---	529,000	529,000	529,000
	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	---	---	---	709,000	709,000	709,000
	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	---	---	---	3,601,000	3,601,000	3,601,000
	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN	---	---	---	---	1,415,000	1,415,000	1,415,000

[Amounts in dollars]

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BENEFIT COST RATIO	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	ALLOCATED TO DATE	CURRENT YEAR ALLOCATION	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE	SENATE ALLOWANCE
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS		---	---	---	1,368,000	1,368,000	1,368,000
	MAPPING		---	---	---	1,008,000	1,008,000	1,008,000
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE					134,188,000	128,363,000	128,363,000
	REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE		---	---	---	-38,141,000	-38,141,000	-39,241,000
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES					319,250,000	307,885,000	307,885,000

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

Louisiana State Penitentiary levee, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue preconstruction engineering and design on the Louisiana State Penitentiary levee project in Louisiana.

Arkabutla Reservoir, MS.—The Committee is aware of the roads at Arkabutla Reservoir in Mississippi caused by Corps of Engineer traffic to and from the reservoir in order to make necessary repairs. The Committee directs the Corps to use not to exceed $100,000 of available operation and maintenance funds to restore the roads to the dam that have been damaged, from Eudora to the project boundary on the north and from Arkabutla to the boundary on the south.

Mississippi River levees and channel improvement.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers no longer requires the use of lands in the Vidalia, LA, area previously used for casting and storage of articulated concrete mats used for construction of the Mississippi River and tributaries project. In the interest of public safety and environmental restoration, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Mississippi River Commission to use up to $900,000 of the funds provided herein to return the lands to acceptable environmental condition now that the casting operations have ceased.

Yalobusha River, MS, flooding.—The Committee is concerned that the Corps of Engineers has not conducted authorized operation and maintenance work on the Grenada Reservoir, MS, project which has resulted in considerable backwater flooding along the Yalobusha River. The Committee directs the Corps to undertake normal, authorized operation and maintenance work at Grenada Reservoir necessary to mitigate the backwater flooding problem.

Tallahatchie River, MS, bank erosion.—The Committee understands that damaging bank slide problems exist along the Tallahatchie River in Tallahatchie County, MS. The Corps is directed to use available funds to study the problem and to report to the Committee by February 1, 1996, if possible, on the extent of the problem and the cost to stabilize the river banks. The report should also address why the necessary repairs are not being undertaken under existing authority and within existing operation and maintenance funding.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1995	$1,646,535,000
Budget estimate, 1996	1,749,875,000
House allowance	1,712,123,000
Committee recommendation	1,696,998,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,668,000	5,668,000
BAYOU CODEN, AL	231,000	231,000
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	455,000	455,000
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	16,820,000	16,820,000
BON SECOUR RIVER, AL	551,000	551,000
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	252,000	252,000
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	505,000	505,000
FLY CREEK, AL	249,000	249,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	3,172,000	3,172,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	5,156,000	5,156,000
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,780,000	17,780,000
PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL, AL	350,000	350,000
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	3,688,000	3,688,000
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	21,090,000	21,090,000
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	6,434,000	6,434,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,380,000	1,380,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,649,000	1,649,000
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	599,000	599,000
HOMER HARBOR, AK	265,000	265,000
KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK	564,000	564,000
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	182,000	182,000
NOME HARBOR, AK	305,000	305,000
VALDEZ HARBOR, AK	---	275,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,167,000	1,167,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	3,736,000	3,736,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	112,000	112,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,983,000	3,983,000
BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR	4,640,000	4,640,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,153,000	1,153,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,575,000	4,575,000
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	6,385,000	6,385,000
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,189,000	4,189,000
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,096,000	1,096,000
DIERKS LAKE, AR	997,000	997,000
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,006,000	1,006,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,447,000	4,447,000
HELENA HARBOR, AR	500,000	500,000
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	25,248,000	25,248,000
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,789,000	1,789,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR	3,524,000	3,524,000
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,363,000	1,363,000
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,582,000	3,582,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	453,000	453,000
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	5,304,000	5,304,000
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,175,000	4,175,000
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,200,000	2,200,000
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	142,000	142,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,534,000	1,534,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	890,000	890,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA	2,410,000	2,410,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	3,172,000	3,172,000
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	158,000	158,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,705,000	1,705,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,670,000	4,670,000
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	702,000	702,000
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	160,000	160,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,413,000	3,413,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA	172,000	172,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	217,000	217,000
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,580,000	2,580,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	845,000	845,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,529,000	1,529,000
NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA	893,000	893,000
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	500,000
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	2,205,000	2,205,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,045,000	1,045,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	---	750,000
PETALUMA RIVER, CA	1,690,000	1,690,000
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,451,000	2,451,000
PORT HUENEME, CA	135,000	135,000
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	2,600,000	2,600,000
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	6,481,000	6,481,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	457,000	457,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	872,000	872,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	117,000	117,000
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA	1,085,000	1,085,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,000,000	2,000,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	150,000	150,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,195,000	2,195,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	1,825,000	1,825,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,659,000	1,659,000
SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA	1,080,000	1,080,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	2,889,000	2,889,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,038,000	1,038,000
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	2,358,000	2,358,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	665,000	665,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA	1,474,000	1,474,000
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,288,000	2,288,000
YUBA RIVER, CA	30,000	30,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	429,000	429,000
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,000,000	1,000,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	978,000	978,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,475,000	1,475,000
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	609,000	609,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	249,000	249,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	375,000	375,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	264,000	264,000
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	724,000	724,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	349,000	349,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	325,000	325,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	245,000	245,000
STONY CREEK, CT	412,000	412,000
THOMASTON DAM, CT	471,000	471,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	486,000	486,000
DELAWARE		
CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REP	14,000,000	14,000,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	16,090,000	16,090,000
MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	40,000	40,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	2,513,000	2,513,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	785,000	785,000
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	35,000	35,000
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA	75,000	75,000
APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	187,000	187,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	4,736,000	4,736,000
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	9,846,000	9,846,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL	3,275,000	3,275,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL, FL	886,000	886,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	1,623,000	1,623,000
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	712,000	712,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,	221,000	221,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,293,000	3,293,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	4,119,000	4,119,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,111,000	5,111,000
JOHNS PASS, PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	400,000	400,000
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	295,000	295,000
NEW PASS, SARASOTA, FL	1,086,000	1,086,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	3,933,000	3,933,000
OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	127,000	127,000
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	1,459,000	1,459,000
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	717,000	717,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	2,147,000	2,147,000
PORT ST JOE HARBOR, FL	72,000	72,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,700,000	3,700,000
ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL	4,000	804,000
ST LUCIE INLET, FL	85,000	85,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	3,744,000	3,744,000
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34,000	34,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	5,894,000	5,894,000
APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	4,321,000	4,321,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	1,916,000	1,916,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	3,411,000	3,411,000
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,377,000	7,377,000
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	5,218,000	5,218,000
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	10,364,000	10,364,000
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	9,480,000	9,480,000
RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA	7,307,000	7,307,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	8,377,000	8,377,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	2,475,000	2,475,000
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	5,114,000	5,114,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	143,000	143,000
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI	480,000	480,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	4,467,000	4,467,000
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	9,144,000	9,144,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,054,000	1,054,000
ILLINOIS		
ANDALUSIA HARBOR, IL	71,000	71,000
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	600,000	600,000
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	3,715,000	3,715,000
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,545,000	2,545,000
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	610,000	610,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	273,000	273,000
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	465,000	465,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL	1,440,000	1,440,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN	20,844,000	20,844,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,717,000	1,717,000
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	645,000	645,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	6,399,000	6,399,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	12,437,000	12,437,000
MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	73,347,000	73,347,000
REND LAKE, IL	3,434,000	3,434,000
ROCK ISLAND SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IL	123,000	123,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	970,000	970,000
INDIANA		
BEVERLY SHORES, IN	35,000	35,000
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	711,000	711,000
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,545,000	1,545,000
BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	95,000	95,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	625,000	625,000
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	762,000	762,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN	643,000	643,000
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	320,000	320,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	540,000	540,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,073,000	1,073,000
MONROE LAKE, IN	680,000	680,000
PATOKA LAKE, IN	790,000	790,000
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	807,000	807,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,654,000	2,654,000
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA.	61,000	61,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	6,068,000	6,068,000
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,028,000	2,028,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,539,000	3,539,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,956,000	4,956,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	2,014,000	2,014,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,038,000	1,038,000
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	498,000	498,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	765,000	765,000
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	892,000	892,000
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	1,128,000	1,128,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	2,238,000	2,238,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,493,000	1,493,000
MARION LAKE, KS	2,533,000	2,533,000
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,567,000	1,567,000
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,886,000	1,886,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	893,000	893,000
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,919,000	1,919,000
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,939,000	1,939,000
TORONTO LAKE, KS	330,000	330,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,202,000	2,202,000
WILSON LAKE, KS	1,307,000	1,307,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY	7,026,000	7,026,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,898,000	1,898,000
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,035,000	1,035,000
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,272,000	1,272,000
CARR FORK LAKE, KY	1,593,000	1,593,000
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	979,000	979,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,092,000	1,092,000
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	400,000	400,000
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,607,000	1,722,000
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	986,000	986,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,378,000	1,378,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,904,000	1,904,000
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,059,000	1,059,000
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	3,000,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,261,000	1,261,000
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	30,000	30,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	649,000	649,000
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	65,000	65,000
NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,956,000	1,956,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	53,568,000	53,568,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	6,025,000	6,025,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	940,000	940,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,780,000	1,780,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	963,000	963,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	6,488,000	6,488,000
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,033,000	1,033,000
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	12,786,000	12,786,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	921,000	921,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	504,000	504,000
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	10,000	10,000
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25,000	25,000
BAYOU TECHE, LA	727,000	727,000
CADDO LAKE, LA	159,000	159,000
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	4,095,000	4,095,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	1,659,000	1,659,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	16,110,000	16,110,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,897,000	3,897,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	292,000	292,000
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	37,000	37,000
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,081,000	2,081,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA.	51,837,000	51,837,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA	12,054,000	12,054,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	1,645,000	1,645,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,	9,714,000	10,714,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	1,865,000	1,865,000
TANGIPAHOA RIVER, LA	100,000	100,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	186,000	186,000
MAINE		
CRIEHAVEN HARBOR, ME	293,000	293,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD (50 FT)	13,425,000	13,425,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455,000	455,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	520,000	520,000
BROAD CREEK, MD	360,000	360,000
CHESTER RIVER, MD	660,000	660,000
CRISFIELD HARBOR, MD	65,000	65,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	104,000	104,000
FISHING BAY, MD	70,000	70,000
HERRING CREEK, TALL TIMBERS, MD	40,000	40,000
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,604,000	1,604,000
KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	782,000	782,000
NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	260,000	260,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	125,000	125,000
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	150,000	150,000
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	615,000	615,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	342,000	342,000
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	336,000	336,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	331,000	331,000
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,087,000	8,087,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	153,000	153,000
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	236,000	236,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	385,000	385,000
GREEN HARBOR, MA	364,000	364,000
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	339,000	339,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	355,000	355,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	326,000	326,000
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	241,000	241,000
NEWBURYPORT HARBOR, MA	646,000	646,000
SCITUATE HARBOR, MA	208,000	208,000
SESUIT HARBOR, MA	217,000	217,000
TULLY LAKE, MA	384,000	384,000
WELLFLEET HARBOR, MA	1,214,000	1,214,000
WEST HILL DAM, MA	479,000	479,000
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	369,000	369,000
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
BOLLES HARBOR, MI	29,000	29,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	245,000	245,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118,000	118,000
DETROIT RIVER, MI	4,729,000	4,729,000
EAGLE HARBOR, MI	60,000	60,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	372,000	372,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	817,000	817,000
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MI	218,000	218,000
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	123,000	123,000
GRELICKVILLE, MI	63,000	63,000
HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI	77,000	77,000
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	417,000	417,000
INLAND ROUTE, MI	31,000	31,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	1,641,000	1,641,000
LELAND HARBOR, MI	280,000	280,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	224,000	224,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	136,000	136,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	495,000	495,000
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	440,000	440,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	32,000	32,000
MONROE HARBOR, MI	772,000	772,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	805,000	805,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	455,000	455,000
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	799,000	799,000
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	301,000	301,000
PORT AUSTIN HARBOR, MI	188,000	188,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR, MI	260,000	260,000
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	103,000	103,000
ROUGE RIVER, MI	297,000	297,000
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,802,000	1,802,000
SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	918,000	918,000
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10,000	10,000
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	868,000	868,000
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,080,000	1,080,000
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	14,962,000	14,962,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	434,000	434,000
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	475,000	475,000
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	3,396,000	3,396,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	550,000	550,000
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	145,000	145,000
ORWELL LAKE, MN	4,077,000	4,077,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	302,000	302,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,515,000	3,515,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	461,000	461,000
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	153,000	153,000
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	203,000	203,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,876,000	2,876,000
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	113,000	113,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,773,000	1,773,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	2,998,000	2,998,000
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	280,000	280,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	410,000	410,000
YAZOO RIVER, MS	3,000	3,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,279,000	5,279,000
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,065,000	2,065,000
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,549,000	8,549,000
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	1,403,000	1,403,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	731,000	731,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
MISS RIVER BETWEEN OHIO AND MO RIVERS, MO & IL (REG WO	18,858,000	18,858,000
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	300,000	300,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,668,000	1,668,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,030,000	1,030,000
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	150,000	150,000
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,528,000	3,528,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,565,000	5,565,000
UNION LAKE, MO	16,000	16,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20,000	20,000
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	4,050,000	4,050,000
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	5,009,000	5,009,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,363,000	6,363,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	1,488,000	1,488,000
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE , SD	---	200,000
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	500,000	500,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	742,000	742,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	811,000	811,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	378,000	378,000
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	163,000	163,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	387,000	387,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	346,000	346,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	614,000	614,000
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	827,000	827,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	392,000	392,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	401,000	401,000
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,455,000	1,455,000
CHEESEQUAKE CREEK, NJ	2,590,000	2,590,000
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	485,000	485,000
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	850,000	850,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	18,157,000	18,157,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	1,255,000	1,255,000
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	3,729,000	3,729,000
SALEM RIVER, NJ	410,000	410,000
SHARK RIVER, NJ	1,190,000	1,190,000
TOMS RIVER, NJ	290,000	290,000
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,352,000	1,352,000
COCHITI LAKE, NM	2,040,000	2,040,000
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,134,000	1,134,000
GALISTEO DAM, NM	244,000	244,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	398,000	398,000
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	998,000	998,000
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	356,000	356,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	438,000	438,000
ARKPORT DAM, NY	226,000	226,000
BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	230,000	230,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	3,205,000	3,205,000
BROWNS CREEK, NY	500,000	500,000
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	455,000	455,000
BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	820,000	820,000
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	309,000	309,000
EAST RIVER, NY	195,000	195,000
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	930,000	930,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	483,000	483,000
FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY	1,668,000	1,668,000
GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	130,000	130,000
GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,380,000	1,380,000
HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,520,000	2,520,000
IRONDEQUOIT BAY HARBOR, NY	160,000	160,000
JAMAICA BAY, NY	220,000	220,000
JONES INLET, NY	3,880,000	3,880,000
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	1,930,000	1,930,000
LITTLE SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	1,560,000	1,560,000
MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	570,000	570,000
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,810,000	1,810,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	205,000	205,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,886,000	4,886,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740,000	740,000
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,020,000	6,020,000
OAK ORCHARD HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
OLCOTT HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	496,000	496,000
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	200,000	200,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	853,000	853,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	515,000	515,000
WILSON HARBOR, NY	10,000	10,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,097,000	5,097,000
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,237,000	1,237,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350,000	350,000
BELHAVEN HARBOR NC	415,000	415,000
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	655,000	655,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	1,200,000	1,200,000
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	852,000	852,000
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,070,000	1,070,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	857,000	857,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	6,506,000	6,506,000
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	4,650,000	4,650,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,108,000	3,108,000
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	1,595,000	1,595,000
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	840,000	840,000
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	125,000	125,000
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	125,000	125,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR, NC	200,000	200,000
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	2,848,000	2,848,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,048,000	6,048,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	222,000	222,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	9,154,000	9,154,000
HOMME LAKE, ND	149,000	149,000
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230,000	1,230,000
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	405,000	405,000
SOURIS RIVER, ND	101,000	101,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	861,000	861,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	1,088,000	1,088,000
BERLIN LAKE, OH	1,907,000	1,907,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,186,000	1,186,000
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	722,000	722,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	13,038,000	13,038,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	655,000	655,000
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	620,000	620,000
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	623,000	623,000
DILLON LAKE, OH	914,000	914,000
HURON HARBOR, OH	820,000	820,000
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	407,000	407,000
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25,000	25,000
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	922,000	922,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,026,000	1,026,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	8,287,000	8,287,000
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	213,000	213,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	521,000	521,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	75,000	75,000
ROCKY RIVER, OH	12,000	12,000
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30,000	30,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,030,000	1,030,000
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,502,000	3,502,000
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	430,000	430,000
VERMILION HARBOR, OH	10,000	10,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	609,000	609,000
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	850,000	850,000
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	292,000	292,000
BIRCH LAKE, OK	749,000	749,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	2,059,000	2,059,000
CANDY LAKE, OK	39,000	39,000
CANTON LAKE, OK	1,692,000	1,692,000
COPAN LAKE, OK	874,000	874,000
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	4,405,000	4,405,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,271,000	4,271,000
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	847,000	847,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	337,000	337,000
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	754,000	754,000
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,527,000	1,527,000
HULAH LAKE, OK	401,000	401,000
KAW LAKE, OK	1,702,000	1,702,000
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	3,819,000	3,819,000
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	1,373,000	1,373,000
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	511,000	511,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	5,000	5,000
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,168,000	1,168,000
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,862,000	4,862,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
SARDIS LAKE, OK	857,000	857,000
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	789,000	789,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,371,000	3,371,000
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,894,000	1,894,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,515,000	3,515,000
WISTER LAKE, OK	947,000	947,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	664,000	664,000
ASTORIA HARBOR, NORTH BREAKWATER, OR	---	275,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	442,000	442,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	18,788,000	18,788,000
CHETCO RIVER, OR	500,000	500,000
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	11,017,000	11,017,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	8,013,000	8,013,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	420,000	420,000
COOS BAY, OR	4,349,000	4,349,000
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	454,000	454,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	719,000	719,000
COUGAR LAKE, OR	1,282,000	1,282,000
DEPOE BAY, OR	3,000	3,000
DETROIT LAKE, OR	2,247,000	2,247,000
DORENA LAKE, OR	552,000	552,000
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	559,000	559,000
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	920,000	920,000
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	2,558,000	2,558,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	752,000	752,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	14,988,000	14,988,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	5,439,000	5,439,000
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,914,000	3,914,000
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	12,561,000	12,561,000
PORT ORFORD, OR	425,000	425,000
PORT OF TOLEDO, OR	---	500,000
ROGUE RIVER, OR	816,000	816,000
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	864,000	864,000
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	61,000	61,000
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	43,000	43,000
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,094,000	1,094,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	846,000	846,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	70,000	70,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	482,000	482,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	1,565,000	1,565,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	12,736,000	12,736,000
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	612,000	612,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	205,000	205,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	1,425,000	1,425,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,059,000	2,059,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	3,112,000	3,112,000
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	2,084,000	2,084,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,201,000	1,201,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	669,000	669,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	1,036,000	1,036,000
ERIE HARBOR, PA	468,000	468,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	683,000	683,000
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	675,000	675,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	331,000	331,000
JOHNSTOWN, PA	1,243,000	1,243,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,559,000	1,559,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,155,000	1,155,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,844,000	1,844,000
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	16,586,000	16,586,000
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	463,000	463,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	37,000	37,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,426,000	3,426,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	1,930,000	1,930,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,074,000	2,074,000
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	373,000	373,000
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,415,000	2,415,000
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,256,000	1,256,000
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	296,000	296,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	1,242,000	1,242,000
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	3,044,000	3,044,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA	1,833,000	1,833,000
PUERTO RICO		
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	10,000	10,000
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	2,420,000	2,420,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,426,000	6,626,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	2,469,000	2,469,000
FOLLY RIVER, SC	386,000	386,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	3,509,000	3,509,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	64,000	64,000
MURRELLS INLET, SC	65,000	65,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,192,000	1,192,000
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	428,000	428,000
TOWN CREEK, SC	491,000	491,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,079,000	6,079,000
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	190,000	190,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	184,000	184,000
FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,520,000	8,520,000
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	973,000	973,000
OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	9,363,000	9,363,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,251,000	5,251,000
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,895,000	5,895,000
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,192,000	4,192,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,082,000	4,082,000
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,410,000	4,410,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	7,281,000	7,281,000
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	13,637,000	13,637,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	650,000	650,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	623,000	623,000
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,139,000	1,139,000
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,210,000	1,210,000
BELTON LAKE, TX	2,249,000	2,249,000
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,610,000	1,610,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,038,000	1,038,000
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	3,649,000	3,649,000
CANYON LAKE, TX	1,657,000	1,657,000
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	1,510,000	1,510,000
COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX	874,000	874,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	2,190,000	2,190,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,033,000	6,033,000
ESTELLINE SPRINGS, TX	12,000	12,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX	2,130,000	2,130,000
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	2,870,000	2,870,000
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	136,000	136,000
GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	1,595,000	1,595,000
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,459,000	1,459,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	1,956,000	1,956,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	17,805,000	17,805,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,007,000	1,007,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,823,000	5,823,000
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	810,000	810,000
LAKE KEMP, TX	218,000	218,000
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,303,000	2,303,000
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,798,000	2,798,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,145,000	5,145,000
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	1,780,000	1,780,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,388,000	1,388,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,540,000	1,540,000
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,120,000	1,120,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	873,000	873,000
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,528,000	1,528,000
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	783,000	783,000
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	11,946,000	11,946,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,217,000	4,217,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,282,000	2,282,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,519,000	1,519,000
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,525,000	1,525,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	1,502,000	1,502,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX	1,270,000	1,270,000
WACO LAKE, TX	2,014,000	2,014,000
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	473,000	473,000
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	3,659,000	3,659,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,326,000	2,326,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	548,000	548,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	645,000	645,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	398,000	398,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	483,000	483,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	506,000	506,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	363,000	363,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	3,169,000	3,169,000
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	590,000	590,000
CHINCOTEAGUE BAY CHANNEL, VA	42,000	42,000
CHINCOTEAGUE HARBOR OF REFUGE, VA	36,000	36,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	888,000	888,000
CRANES CREEK, VA	321,000	321,000
DEEP CREEK, VA	597,000	597,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	2,169,000	2,169,000
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	647,000	647,000
HOSKINS CREEK, VA	395,000	395,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	1,616,000	1,616,000
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,770,000	8,770,000
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,551,000	1,551,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	200,000	200,000
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,131,000	5,131,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	351,000	351,000
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,266,000	2,266,000
QUEENS CREEK, MATHEWS COUNTY, VA	337,000	337,000
RUDEE INLET, VA	570,000	570,000
STARLINGS CREEK, VA	389,000	389,000
TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	467,000	467,000
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	1,355,000	1,355,000
TYLERS BEACH, VA	34,000	34,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,268,000	1,268,000
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	12,038,000	12,038,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	26,000	26,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	7,000	7,000
COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, ID, MT & O	559,000	559,000
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	870,000	870,000
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	10,655,000	10,655,000
HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA	1,373,000	1,373,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	14,884,000	14,884,000
KENMORE NAVIGATION CHANNEL, WA	202,000	202,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,877,000	6,877,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,978,000	4,978,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	10,618,000	10,618,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,318,000	5,318,000
MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA	731,000	731,000
MT ST HELENS, WA	432,000	432,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	1,922,000	1,922,000
OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	12,000	12,000
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,155,000	1,155,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	2,250,000	2,250,000
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	678,000	678,000
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	174,000	174,000
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	56,000	56,000
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	12,270,000	12,270,000
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	431,000	431,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	956,000	956,000
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,741,000	1,741,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,187,000	1,187,000
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,296,000	1,296,000
ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV	3,000	3,000
ELKINS, WV	10,000	10,000
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	11,376,000	11,376,000
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,632,000	1,632,000
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	957,000	957,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,310,000	1,310,000
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,753,000	1,753,000
TYGART LAKE, WV	1,615,000	1,615,000
WISCONSIN		
ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	117,000	117,000
CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI	107,000	107,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	560,000	560,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Budget estimate	Senate allowance
FOX RIVER, WI	2,215,000	2,215,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,029,000	1,029,000
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	130,000	130,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	300,000	300,000
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	43,000	43,000
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	257,000	257,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	3,123,000	3,123,000
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	883,000	883,000
STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	2,831,000	2,831,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	760,000	760,000
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	979,000	979,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
CIVIL WORKS ENERGY DATA SYSTEM	60,000	---
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	4,000,000	2,000,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	480,000	480,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	3,000,000	---
DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT PROGRAM (DOTS)	3,350,000	1,675,000
EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	1,250,000	800,000
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS (ERGO)	2,000,000	---
HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE RESTORATION	3,000,000	---
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	7,818,000	6,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN MAINSTEM MODEL DEVELOPMENT	1,000,000	500,000
MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	2,100,000	1,900,000
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	20,000	20,000
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	7,000,000	5,000,000
NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION	4,000,000	2,000,000
NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY (NRI)	500,000	---
NATURAL RESOURCES TECHNICAL SUPPORT (NRTS)	1,800,000	---
PEER REVIEW PROGRAM	400,000	---
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS FOR O&M	3,500,000	---
POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	4,000,000	---
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	11,498,000	7,000,000
PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50,000	50,000
REAL TIME WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM (WCRP)	1,000,000	---
REINVESTED USER FEES FOR RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS	5,000,000	---
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675,000	500,000
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	1,000,000	500,000
REPAIR EVALUATION MAINTENANCE RESEARCH (REMR II)	6,000,000	2,000,000
RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH	1,150,000	---
SCANNING HYDROGRAPHIC OPERATIONAL AIRBORNE LIDAR SURVE	1,750,000	1,750,000
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	3,058,000	3,000,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	4,108,000	3,000,000
WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	1,600,000	---
WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,200,000	3,200,000
WETLANDS ACTION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION	500,000	---
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-55,770,000	-67,770,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,749,875,000	1,696,998,000

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 situation, the Corps has had to defer or delay scheduled maintenance activities. If the trend in deferred maintenance continues, Corps-managed facilities nationwide will continue to experience deterioration until failure occurs.

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.

Program reductions.—Severe budgetary constraints have forced the Committee to make difficult choices and limit the amount of work that can be accomplished in fiscal year 1996. Accordingly, the Committee has reduce or deleted funding for several miscellaneous programs which do not have an immediate impact on the structural integrity of the water resource infrastructure. The Committee is aware that curtailment of funding for these items could prematurely terminate achievement of efficiencies, beneficial efforts, and products that serve to support project operation and maintenance. Therefore, the Committee does not intend to preclude the limited reprogramming of funds to bring these endeavors to a logical completion or reduced level of effort, provided that the Committee is consulted and informed prior to the reallocation of funding, and with assurance that sufficient funds are available to properly operate and maintain projects.

Dredge Essayons.—The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers mobilized the Federal dredge *Essayons* from the Pacific Northwest to the gulf coast due to emergency shoaling problems in the Mississippi River. The Committee directs the Corps to provide a clear plan to return the *Essayons* to the Pacific Northwest as soon as possible. Given the volume of dreding work on the west coast, the Committee expects the *Essayons* to return to her regular assigned region at the earliest practical time so that all regularly scheduled west coast work can be completed as planned.

Seward Harbor, AL.—Within available funds, the Corps is directed to use $100,000 to conduct bioassay analysis of contaminated dredge materials at Seward Harbor, AL, in order to comply with disposal permit processing.

Valdez Harbor, AL.—The Committee has provided $275,000 for the Corps of Engineers to dredge Valdez Harbor, AL, to authorized project depths.

Newport Bay Harbor, CA.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate repair the jetties at Newport Bay Harbor, CA.

St. Augustine Harbor, FL.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000, the same as the House allowance, for the St. Au-

gustine Harbor, FL, project for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging and utilize the material to nourish the beaches at St. Augustine Beach.

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

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

Fort Peck Reservoir, MT.—The Committee is aware of the need for a breakwater to protect Fort Peck Marina in Montana from damage due to high winds and ensuing severe wave action. Lack of an effective breakwater is a major limiting factor in the State and local area not being able to realize the full potential of the recreational opportunities at the marina and Fort Peck Reservoir. The Committee is also aware of the difficulty non-Federal interests are having in satisfying the cost-sharing requirements necessary to proceed with construction of the breakwater.

In light of the potential for severe damage, the Secretary of the Army is directed to review and report to the Committee no later than February 15, 1996, on the project with the objective of reducing the non-Federal cost as much as possible. The analysis should include consideration of possible innovative alternative solutions, use of in-kind contributions, and an appropriate explanation of the recommended cost-sharing requirements. The Committee expects the Secretary and the Corps of Engineers to work in a positive and cooperative spirit to resolve this longstanding problem.

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

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

Port of Toledo, OR.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Corps to undertake channel maintenance at the Port of Toledo, OR.

Astoria east boat basin, Oregon.—The Committee understands that severe erosion has occurred to the north breakwater at Astoria east boat basin in Oregon which is threatening nearby public facilities. An appropriation of $275,000 has been included in the bill to allow the Corps to continue and complete an evaluation report of measures needed to rehabilitate the north breakwater.

Columbia River navigation channel, Oregon and Washington.—The Committee is aware that the authorized 40-foot Columbia River channel is subject to shoaling at a number of locations in the river, causing restrictions in channel draft. The Committee directs that, within available project funds, the Corps of Engineers shall conduct necessary advance maintenance dredging to assure that project depth of 40 feet is maintained.

Erie Harbor, PA.—In fiscal year 1993, the Corps of Engineers was provided $1,000,000 to dredge an access channel and berthing area for the vessel *Niagara* at Erie Harbor, PA. The Committee has been advised that additional funds may be required to complete the work. The Committee expects the Corps to continue work with the city and directs the Corps to use available funds to complete the dredging work.

Charleston Harbor, Clouter Creek disposal area, South Carolina.—The Committee has included an additional $1,200,000 for the Corps to accomplish ditching, clearing and site preparation for diking of the south and middle cells, and commencement of initial diking of the south cell of the Clouter Creek disposal area. The Committee understands that this restoration work is needed in order to ready to disposal site for reuse.

Columbia River, Columbia Park, Kennewick, WA.—The Committee is aware of local community support for the development and construction of recreational opportunities at Columbia Park in Kennewick, WA. Further, the Committee understands that the Corps owns the land and that the city of Kennewick has provided operation and maintenance of the area. The Committee urges the Corps to work cooperatively and in an expeditious manner to assist the local community in developing a recreation plan for the area, and to develop a plan for the purchase of the property by the city.

Port Chinook Harbor, WA.—The Committee directs the Corps to use available funds to complete maintenance dredging at Port Chinook Harbor, WA, that commenced in January and February, but was not completed.

Green Bay Harbor, WI.—Upon resolution of the status of the section 401 permit, the Corps may use $250,000 of available funds to resume design work on the proposed expansion of the Renard Isle confined disposal facility.

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: additional maintenance dredging of shoals and anchorages at Charleston Harbor, SC; maintenance dredging at Foley River and Port Royal Harbor, SC, and maintenance dredging at York Harbor and Scarborough River, ME.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995	$101,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	112,000,000
House allowance	101,000,000
Committee recommendation	101,000,000

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

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

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

The Committee understands that a certain municipal solid waste landfill project in Pierce County, WA, has an Army Corps of Engineers application No. OBY–4–013996 that must be completed immediately in order for the county to begin construction of a new landfill and avoid the need to long haul waste at a prohibitive cost. The Committee urges the Corps to use all possible speed to expedite the required permitting process.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1995	$14,979,000
Budget estimate, 1996	20,000,000
House allowance	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

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

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

OILSPILL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1995	$900,000
Budget estimate, 1996	850,000
House allowance	850,000
Committee recommendation	850,000

An appropriation of $850,000 is recommended for oilspill research for fiscal year 1996, which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

Section 7001 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Oil Pollution Research to develop a plan for, and coordinate the implementation of, an oil pollution research, development, and demonstration program. Title VII of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 also authorizes use of the oilspill liability trust fund to perform oil pollution research.

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

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$152,500,000
Budget estimate, 1996	164,725,000
House allowance	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	153,000,000

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $153,000,000 which is $11,725,000 below the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISION

Corps hopper dredges, (sec. 101).—For the past 3 fiscal years, Congress has made available to the private dredge fleet 7.5 million cubic yards of work which had been accomplished in earlier years by the Federal hopper dredge fleet. The Committee recommendation continues the 7.5 million cubic yard set-aside in fiscal year 1996. During the period in which any of the Federal hopper dredges is out of service for lengthy repair or rehabilitation, reallocating this entire 7.5 million cubic yards among the three remaining Federal dredges would require further reduction in their days of service, thus making their operation more costly and less competitive. If any of the four Federal dredges is removed from service for repair or rehabilitation and is prevented from accomplishing the level of work it has carried out during the past 3 fiscal years, the Committee directs the Corps to reduce the 7.5 million cubic yards amount contained in subsection (a) by the share allocated to that dredge over the past 3 fiscal years which has been put out for bid for the private industry.

The Committee recommendation would prohibit the Corps from undertaking improvements and major repairs to the dredge *McFarland* except normal maintenance and repair necessary to keep the vessel in it's current operational condition.

Corps of Engineers headquarters building, South East Federal Center, (sec. 103).—The Committee is aware of the GSA plans to construct a building to house the Corps of Engineers in the South East Federal Center. However, during this time of downsizing of the Federal work force and the continual restructuring and reducing of the Corps' headquarters, the Committee believes that such a move in premature and ill advised. Therefore, the Committee has included language in the bill under section 103 which prohibits the Corps from participating in any way in the construction of this project. The Committee urges GSA to reflect on the building moratorium mandated by the Congress and to postpone award of any additional contracts until it has assessed the results of the

downsizing of the Federal work force in the Washington, DC, area with the hope that additional construction will not be necessary.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1995	$40,163,000
Budget estimate, 1996	44,139,000
House allowance	44,139,000
Committee recommendation	44,139,000

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1996 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act is $44,139,000, the same as the budget request and House allowance.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1995	$14,190,000
Budget estimate, 1996	13,602,000
House allowance	13,114,000
Committee recommendation	11,234,000

An appropriation of $11,234,000 is recommended by the Committee for general investigations of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
ARIZONA					
TUCSON/PHOENIX WATER CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE STUDY..	830,000	780,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
VERDE RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	500,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
CALIFORNIA					
DEL NORTE CNTY/CRESCENT CITY WASTEWATER RECLAMATION ST	---	---	---	500,000	---
FORT BRAGG WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	---	---	---	750,000	---
IMPERIAL VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE STUDY.....	500,000	75,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
LOWER OWENS RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY.....	300,000	---	100,000	---	---
MALIBU CREEK FISHERY ENHANCEMENT STUDY.....	250,000	---	50,000	---	---
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	---	---	---	100,000	---
SAN FRANCISCO AREA WATER RECLAMATION STUDY.....	4,790,000	790,000	700,000	1,500,000	700,000
SO CALIF COASTAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	750,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
SO CALIF COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY & RECLAMATION STUD	3,000,000	731,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	163,377	113,377	50,000	50,000	50,000
SOUTHWEST COLORADO RURAL WATER SUPPLY.....	275,000	---	75,000	---	---
YAMPA RIVER WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	250,000	200,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
IDAHO					
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	959,000	659,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
UPPER SALMON RIVER WATER OPTIMIZATION.....	500,000	100,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
KANSAS					
KANSAS COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION.....	275,000	---	100,000	---	100,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
MONTANA					
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY	699,000	349,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
YELLOWSTONE RIVER BASIN STUDY	320,000	---	140,000	---	140,000
NEBRASKA					
NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT	300,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
NEW MEXICO					
RIO GRANDE/LOW FLOW CONVEYANCE CHANNEL	480,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
SAN JUAN RIVER GALLUP - NAVAJO WATER SUPPLY, NM	---	---	---	---	100,000
OKLAHOMA					
OKLAHOMA WATER SUPPLY STUDY	375,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
OREGON					
CARLTON LAKE RESTORATION	352,000	302,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
CENTRAL OREGON IRRIG SYS CONSERVATION PROJ FEASIBILITY	900,000	75,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES PROJECT	1,120,000	1,070,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
GRANDE RONDE RIVER BASIN	684,000	484,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY	824,000	374,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY	816,000	466,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING	892,000	492,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
OWYHEE STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY	453,000	403,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
SOUTHERN OREGON COASTAL RIVER BASINS	800,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY	462,170	312,170	150,000	150,000	150,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TEXAS					
EDWARDS AQUIFER REGIONAL WATER RESOURCES & MGMT STUDY.	851,000	421,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
RINCON BAYOU-NUECES MARSH WETLANDS RESTOR/ENHANCE PROJ	604,174	454,174	150,000	150,000	150,000
RIO GRANDE/RIO BRAVO INTERNATIONAL BASIN ASSESSMENT...	600,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
RIO GRANDE CONVEYANCE CANAL/PIPELINE.....	---	---	---	200,000	---
UTAH					
ASHLEY/BRUSH CREEKS OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	475,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
WEBER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	459,807	359,807	100,000	100,000	100,000
WASHINGTON					
WASHINGTON RIVER BASIN PLANNING.....	500,000	---	75,000	---	75,000
VARIOUS					
BEAR RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	337,342	237,342	100,000	100,000	100,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	61,880,082	56,483,314	375,000	375,000	375,000
DROUGHT INVESTIGATIONS.....	533,000	493,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	---	---	1,877,000	1,300,000	1,000,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT..	200,750	25,750	50,000	---	---
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	---	---	2,435,000	2,035,000	1,635,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	---	---	540,000	432,000	432,000
LOWER COLORADO INDIAN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	375,000	---	75,000	---	---
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	---	---	150,000	120,000	150,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN TRIBES IN NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA.	1,250,000	391,000	250,000	250,000	250,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
PALLID STURGEON RECOVERY DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	490,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	---	---	1,665,000	1,332,000	1,332,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	1,209,000	959,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY..	932,000	432,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....			13,602,000	13,114,000	11,234,000

Walker River Basin, Nevada.—The Committee directs the Department of the Interior, in cooperation with the University of Nevada, to undertake a 1-year appraisal study of the potential for water banking within the Walker River Basin of Nevada and California. Specifically, the study is to assess the extent to which voluntary water transfers involving private water rights holders and the Walker River Indian Reservation might be employed to assist in the stabilization and banking. Not more than $200,000, from funds appropriated herein for the Bureau of Reclamation, to be matched by contributions from State and local government entities or interested parties, shall be available for this purpose.

San Juan River Gallup, Navajo water supply project, New Mexico.—The Committee has included $100,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue activities related to the San Juan River Gallup, Navajo water supply project, New Mexico.

Chiloquin Dam, OR.—The Committee is aware that fish passage through the existing fish ladders at Sprague River Dam (Chiloquin Dam) in Oregon has been questioned as insufficient. Within available funds, the Bureau of Reclamation may provide technical or other assistance, as appropriate, to mitigate the fish passage problem.

Funding adjustment to various programs.—Due to the severe budget constraints and limited resources in future years, the Committee has not been able to include funding for some of the new studies proposed in the budget and included in the House-passed bill. In addition, the Committee has found it necessary to reduce several nonproject specific programs in order to stay within the budget targets for fiscal year 1996. The Committee is aware that curtailment or reduced funding levels could prematurely terminate ongoing work. Therefore, the Committee expects that the Bureau of Reclamation to reprogram funds on a limited basis to insure activities are brought to a logical and efficient conclusion.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995	$432,727,000
Budget estimate, 1996	375,943,000
House allowance	417,301,000
Committee recommendation	390,461,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $390,461,000 for construction programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM					
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT	2,384,342,000	356,668,966	1,357,000	1,357,000	1,357,000
DELTA DIVISION	359,386,000	172,973,905	6,500,000	6,580,000	6,500,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	495,206,000	347,764,980	11,869,000	16,469,000	11,869,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	499,902,000	352,301,505	875,000	7,590,000	875,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	350,778,000	304,186,616	664,000	664,000	664,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,570,372,000	565,931,664	800,000	800,000	800,000
SHASTA DIVISION	307,829,000	214,566,886	749,000	19,749,000	19,749,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM	329,743,000	306,395,396	5,067,000	5,067,000	5,067,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECT	68,120,000	13,500,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	7,300,000
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	---	---	---	600,000	---
BRACKISH WATER RECLAMATION DEMONSTRATION FACILITY	---	---	---	2,000,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	172,590,000	2,500,000	2,340,000	2,340,000	2,340,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	38,090,000	10,000,000	9,750,000	9,750,000	5,000,000
SAN JOSE WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE-TITLE 16	112,000,000	1,715,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	257,570,000	145,523,310	5,799,000	5,799,000	5,799,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	251,852,000	24,014,424	1,231,000	1,231,000	1,231,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP	66,339,157	66,039,157	300,000	300,000	300,000
IDAHO					
MINIDOKA NORTH SIDE DRAINWATER PROJECT	1,830,000	---	60,000	60,000	60,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	1,483,255,000	547,126,198	24,900,000	24,900,000	24,900,000
OREGON					
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT	51,089,000	38,186,675	6,700,000	6,700,000	6,875,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP	62,351,000	50,815,694	3,802,000	3,802,000	3,802,000
MID-DAKOTA PROJECT	113,456,000	5,161,902	2,500,000	12,500,000	10,500,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT	250,341,000	32,017,531	10,500,000	22,300,000	22,300,000
TEXAS					
NORTHWEST WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	---	---	1,500,000	---
WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	1,776,176,944	1,700,756,098	1,698,000	2,573,000	2,573,000
YAKIMA BASIN ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	---	---	---	1,500,000	1,500,000
VARIOUS					
COLUMBIA/SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY	61,226,000	7,599,613	15,000,000	10,000,000	15,000,000
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	---	---	3,255,000	---	1,500,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG., UC R	---	5,198,000	6,373,000	6,373,000	6,373,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION/RECOVERY PROJ., LC REG	10,936,000	1,454,000	2,170,000	2,170,000	2,170,000
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROG., PN R	---	---	170,000	170,000	170,000
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	---	4,235,209	4,357,000	4,357,000	4,357,000
TITLE I DIVISION, CRBSCP	458,835,000	399,669,936	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
TITLE II, NEW FORMAT, CRBSCP	---	---	6,000,000	---	1,000,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
WATER CONSERVATION CHALLENGE PARTNERSHIPS	45,000,000	---	9,000,000	---	---
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION			157,136,000	192,551,000	175,981,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
BOISE PROJECT, ID	45,746,490	34,507,829	510,000	510,000	510,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NM	199,302,869	144,021,989	650,000	650,000	650,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM, AZ - CA	183,158,000	86,206,623	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OR - CA	59,745,000	51,435,579	2,818,000	2,818,000	2,818,000
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL, NM - TX	2,790,000	1,399,477	100,000	570,000	100,000
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY, CO	21,249,635	18,469,635	600,000	600,000	600,000
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT, OK	120,149,342	120,022,342	125,000	125,000	125,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OK	45,311,259	44,411,259	700,000	700,000	700,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, CA - NV	53,197,000	15,253,652	7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TX	109,344,394	108,994,394	105,000	105,000	105,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TX	74,092,994	74,067,994	25,000	25,000	25,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP, NE	363,708,853	351,354,161	900,000	900,000	900,000
OAHE UNIT, P-SMBP, SD	490,000,000	44,697,192	80,000	80,000	80,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT-TITLE 28, VARI	28,126,776	8,463,776	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, AZ	1,500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT, NM	---	---	---	---	2,000,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS	29,117,267	13,440,628	2,330,000	5,930,000	2,330,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA	47,737,000	46,157,726	1,210,000	1,210,000	1,210,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			23,203,000	27,273,000	25,203,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAM:					
CROOKED RIVER, OCHOCO DAM, OR	10,525,000	3,625,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	14,682,620	8,612,620	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000
INITIATE SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION	374,158,090	56,814,090	38,175,000	35,175,000	28,175,000
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES	55,796,488	40,796,488	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, AZ	37,699,000	25,885,385	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, AZ	24,464,000	22,545,073	1,103,000	1,103,000	1,103,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, AZ	46,743,000	45,547,692	974,000	974,000	974,000
UMATILLA PROJECT, COLD SPRINGS DAM, OR	12,372,000	6,776,480	5,250,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
YAKIMA, BUMPING LAKE DAM, WA	5,086,000	2,621,000	1,825,000	1,825,000	1,825,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS			65,182,000	62,182,000	55,182,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UT	11,868,460	10,893,460	975,000	975,000	975,000
SHOSHONE, WY	7,500,000	4,741,164	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UT	19,564,000	13,301,822	2,474,000	2,474,000	2,474,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT			4,749,000	4,749,000	4,749,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:					
ENERGY/WATER PRODUCT EFFICIENCY STANDARDS	900,000	---	450,000	---	---
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	24,628,100	22,957,000	771,000	771,000	1,271,000
IMPROVED RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT CONTROL	1,200,000	---	300,000	---	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	2,270,000	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
WATERSHED MODELING SYSTEMS INITIATIVE	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	800,000	800,000
WATER TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY	14,556,197	5,536,197	1,700,000	1,360,000	1,360,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	119,106,508	35,029,684	3,800,000	3,000,000	2,800,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY			8,321,000	6,231,000	6,531,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			258,591,000	292,986,000	267,646,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT	427,073,500	53,075,011	4,879,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
DOLORES PARTICIPATING PROJECT	552,158,000	527,051,690	3,470,000	3,470,000	3,470,000
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT	1,230,066,867	1,201,451,319	13,579,000	13,579,000	13,579,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES, AZ, CO, NM, UT, WY	---	6,226,000	1,920,000	1,920,000	1,920,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			23,848,000	28,969,000	28,969,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)	4,130,337,350	3,281,794,728	92,725,000	94,225,000	92,725,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS	139,992,000	103,474,333	29,411,000	29,411,000	29,411,000
CENTAL ARIZONA PROJECT, GILA RIVER INDIAN COMMUNITY	---	---	---	1,842,000	1,842,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT			122,136,000	125,478,000	123,978,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ASSOCIATED ITEMS					
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-28,632,000	-30,132,000	-30,132,000
TOTAL, CONTRUCTION PROGRAM.....			375,943,000	417,301,000	390,461,000

Construction program budget request.—The Committee is disappointed and dismayed with the continued disregard of the funding needs for various ongoing projects in the construction program. On several projects, where construction contracts have been awarded and work is underway, the actual funding needs are two to four times greater than the amount requested in the budget. In some cases, the budget request is hardly sufficient to cover the costs which would be incurred if the project were terminated. Further, unrealistic assumptions regarding the level of non-Federal contributions have also created significant shortfalls.

These factors and severe budgetary constraints, have forced the Committee to eliminate or substantially reduce new initiatives proposed for 1996, and reduce proposed increases in other programs to the current year level or lower in order to stay within the budgetary allocations for discretionary programs.

Boulder Canyon project, Hoover Dam Visitors Center.—As the result of tremendous cost overruns for the Hoover Dam Visitors Center and so that ratepayers are not asked to absorb the excessive cost of these overruns, the Committee directs that the Bureau of Reclamation, within available funds, produce a study that will look at various options to reduce the burden on the ratepayers, and report back to the Committee within 6 months.

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

Central Valley project.—Because of severe budgetary constraints and the need to augment the shortfall in funding for the higher priority Shasta temperature control device, the Committee has not been able to fund many of the Central Valley project activities at higher levels. The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the Department of the Interior, and all parties, in establishing the Central Valley Project Improvement Act roundtable. The Department is encouraged to strengthen this process so that the most critical and essential activities are identified and proposed for funding. This process will be essential in future years with smaller and smaller discretionary budgetary resources.

The Secretary is directed to prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, by February 1996, a report which displays priorities and activities for a 5-year period beginning with fiscal year 1997, associated with the restoration requirements and goals of the CVPIA. The information shall be updated annually and made part of the CVPIA justification material which is prepared for the Committee. In preparation of such report the Secretary is encouraged to work closely with the Restoration Fund Roundtable, the State of California, and other stakeholders.

Little Holland tract.—The Committee has not included funds for the Bureau to purchase the Little Holland tract in California due to significant regulatory and legal issues. The Committee further believes that if the purchase of the property can be justified for inclusion in the Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge, funding for that purpose should be provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and not by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Central Valley project, Shasta division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $19,000,000 for continuing construction of the Shasta Dam temperature control device.

The need for the Committee to add these funds has been brought about by the failure of the State of California to thus far provide the States cost-sharing obligations under the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, which requires that the State contribute 25 percent of the cost of the temperature control device. The Committee has added these funds only because of contractual commitments for ongoing construction work and the fact that continued operation of Shasta Dam without the temperature control device in place can cost the taxpayers as much as $11,000,000 a year to replace power lost when water is bypassed away from the turbines. The Committee has had to find offsetting reductions in order to maintain the work at Shasta which the Committee understands is the highest priority.

San Diego area water reclamation project, California.—The Committee has provided $2,340,000 for the San Diego area water reclamation project in California, including $1,000,000 for the Escondido water reclamation program, and $1,340,000 for the San Diego water reclamation program.

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

Umatilla basin project, Oregon.—An additional $175,000 has been provided for the Umatilla basin project in Oregon. The additional funding is for a hydrology study of the basin that is needed for boundary expansion EIS.

Lake Meredith salinity control.—The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use up to an additional $470,000 of available funds to accelerate Federal involvement in the Lake Meredith, TX salinity control project.

Safety of dams, initiate corrective action.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $28,175,000 for initial safety of dams corrective activities which include special studies, preparation of authorization reports, preconstruction activities, and accomplishment of modifications not exceeding $750,000.

Congress appropriated $18,389,000 for these activities for the current year, but plans call for allocation of approximately $10,000,000. Further, the fiscal year 1996 budget request is $38,175,000, $28,000,000 more than the current program level and $20,000,000 more than the appropriation for 1995.

The Committee is sensitive to the funding needs and the critical nature of the work performed within the initiate corrective action line item. The Committee believes that the funding level rec-

ommended is adequate to cover critical program needs. The level recommended is just slightly under the highest appropriation since the program started, $28,443,000. It is also $15,000,000 more than the 8-year average of $13,300,000 and $10,000,000 more than the appropriation for fiscal year 1995.

The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to manage the resources to insure that funds are available for the most critical work. If additional funds are required to cover unforeseen needs in fiscal year 1996, the Committee expects the Secretary to exercise his emergency authority to make funds available.

Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program.—The Committee recommendation for the Ground Water Recharge Demonstration Program includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue the Equus beds recharge project in Kansas. The Committee understands that the project is being cost shared on a 50–50 basis.

The Committee does not concur with the House Committee in allowing the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with new ground water recharge demonstration projects. The Committee is concerned that future domestic discretionary resources will not be sufficient to sustain major commitments of this type through completion.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1995	$284,300,000
Budget estimate, 1996	288,759,000
House allowance	278,759,000
Committee recommendation	267,393,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $267,393,000. This is $11,366,000 below the House allowance and $21,366,000 below the budget request. This reduction is necessary because of the severe budgetary limitations for non-Defense discretionary programs and the shortfall of funding in other parts of the Bureau's program.

The appropriation recommended under this hearing provides for the operation and maintenance of a total of 36 projects, project areas, or divisions of projects. These projects are operated and maintained for power production, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, flood control, and other benefits. Provision is also made for administration of 13 associated programs. These programs seek to maximize benefits from existing projects. Project benefits and operations will be enhanced through water conservation measures, examination of existing structures, environmental considerations, improvement of recreation opportunities, and water quality improvement.

The Committee recommendation includes $1,293,000 for joint use facilities of the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project. In addition, the Committee has provided an appropriation of $6,692,000 for the Central Valley Improvement Act, which is the same as the funding level for fiscal year 1995.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriations, 1995	$9,600,000
Budget estimate, 1996	16,668,000
House allowance	11,668,000
Committee recommendation	11,668,000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending an appropriation of $11,668,000 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.

New loan program activity.—Due to budgetary constraints, the Committee recommendation concurs with the House in deleting the $5,000,000 requested by the administration for the proposed new loan program.

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title	Total Federal cost	Allocated to date	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
LOAN PROGRAM					
ARIZONA					
TOHONO O'ODHAM NATION - SCHUK TOAK DISTRICT	5,307,000	1,000,000	3,043,000	3,043,000	3,043,000
CALIFORNIA					
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	16,036,000	1,064,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT	9,984,000	900,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 3	13,395,000	9,932,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY	10,212,000	900,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT-ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATE	8,001,000	350,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
COLORADO					
UTE MOUNTAIN UTE	3,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
OREGON					
DOUGLAS COUNTY - MILLTOWN HILL	17,274,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
VARIOUS					
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	---	600,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
NEW LOAN PROGRAM ACTIVITY	---	---	5,000,000	---	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM			16,668,000	11,668,000	11,668,000

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriations, 1995	$45,385,000
Budget estimate, 1996	43,579,000
House allowance	43,579,000
Committee recommendation	43,579,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $43,579,000, the same as the budget request.

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

The Committee has provided $11,281,000, the full budget request, for the Shasta temperature control device.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1995	$54,034,000
Budget estimate, 1996	50,327,000
House allowance	48,150,000
Committee recommendation	48,150,000

The Committee recommendation for general adminsitrative expenses is $48,150,000. This is the same as the House allowance.

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

Funds recommended in title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: energy supply, research and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund; general science and research activities; the nuclear waste disposal fund; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; the Office of Inspector General; Power Marketing Administrations; and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

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

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

DEPARTMENTAL RESTRUCTURING

The Committee is aware of the Secretary of Energy's efforts to restructure operations enabling the Department to deliver its core critical missions to the Nation at a lower cost to the taxpayer. Reducing Federal costs through downsizing and management will help the Department maintain its essential defense, research, energy security, and environmental cleanup activities vital to the Nation's security. The Department has announced a comprehensive plan to achieve $14,000,000,000 in savings over the next 5 years.

Of this amount, $1,700,000,000 is expected to be derived from: reengineering of the Department's field and headquarters operations to achieve a 27-percent reduction in Federal employees, elimination of 3,788 positions; more focused management of support service contractors; improved management of information technology; reforms in employee and contractor travel; sales of surplus inventory assets; and reforms in environmental policy procedures. The Committee is pleased that the Department is taking these steps to downsize and increase the efficiency of its operations. The Committee emphasizes, however, that the very survival of the Department may depend upon the success of its efforts. The Committee urges the Department to attain its goals in this regard, and to continue to seek ways to further streamline its operations.

LABORATORY MANAGEMENT

The Committee concurs with the insights of the Galvin task force regarding the management of Department laboratories, and expresses its frustration with the Department's lack of progress in either implementing the far-reaching solutions proposed by the Galvin report or proposing alternative solutions to the inefficient and oppressive oversight and regulation endured by the laboratories. The Department's inability to make meaningful reforms in these areas has resulted in increased cost and reduced productivity at the national laboratories that, if allowed to continue, could jeopardize the laboratories' ability to fulfill their missions.

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

SUPPORT SERVICE CONTRACTORS

The Committee shares the House's concern regarding the extensive use of support service contractors by the Department of Energy at headquarters and the field offices. As Federal staffing declines in response to streamlining initiatives, budget reductions, and redirections there will be increasing pressure to substitute support service contractors for Federal employees. This must be resisted, and support service contract costs must be reduced significantly. Certain services such as custodial services, physical security, mail room operations, and facility and grounds maintenance, are usually performed cost effectively by the private sector. However, there are other support service contractors who perform services which appear to be inherently governmental in nature or noncritical. The Department is directed to review its support service contracts rigorously and eliminate those which are of low priority or which are inappropriate.

The Committee realizes that there is a need for the Department to contract with the private sector in order to obtain unbiased technical expertise, unavailable within the Department. Technical services contracts provide the Federal Government with the necessary flexibility in acquiring the appropriate labor quantity and skills mix to meet changing program requirements. This approach is clearly cost effective, as needed expertise can be used for a limited period of time until program needs or tasks are completed. It would

be much more difficult and expensive to maintain a Federal labor force given the diversity of technical expertise needed. In addition, contracting for technical services is consistent with the Government's long-standing policy of contracting out work for which there is an available private sector capability, as long as the Government refrains from contracting out inherently governmental functions or personal services.

The Committee is aware that the Department is implementing a plan which would force support service contractor cost savings of $450,000,000 over 5 years (fiscal years 1996 through 2000). While this is encouraging, the Committee believes that higher savings are possible. The Department should, at a minimum, require demonstrable savings of not less than $90,000,000 in fiscal year 1996. Further, future budget requests for support services must be free of all contracts which cannot be justified on the basis of a cost-benefit analysis or as a short-term requirement for expertise in a technical specialty area. The Department should report annually on its progress in reducing these expenditures.

OPERATING AND CAPITAL FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

The Committee agrees with the House action to merge capital equipment, general plant projects, and most accelerator improvements project funds with operating funds to expedite the allocation of resources for operations and infrastructure activities and to ensure the operation of the Department's laboratories and facilities in the most efficient and cost-effective manner. The Committee hopes this will help alleviate instances of excessive administrative and procedural oversight.

Construction activity in the atomic energy defense activities areas exceeding the general plant project threshold of $2,000,000 will continue to require specific authorization and appropriation by Congress. Any construction activity that does not exceed the $2,000,000 threshold will be included in the "Operation and maintenance" account.

In implementing this change, the Committee directs the Department to continue to reflect the capital equipment, general plant projects, and accelerator improvement projects in the financial and accounting reports.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1995	$3,314,548,000
Budget estimate, 1996	3,396,535,000
House allowance	2,575,700,000
Committee recommendation	2,798,324,000

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1996 supports to the extent possible the role of Federal participation in basic research and development programs in energy supply activities. Due to budget constraints, significant reductions in certain of the De-

partment's programs are necessary. To provide more flexibility in program execution in a time of declining budgetary resources, the recommended funding levels have merged operating, capital equipment and general plant project funding. Funding for programs which have accelerator improvement projects costing less than $2,000,000 has also been merged to provide flexibility.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Appropriations, 1995	$388,108,000
Budget estimate, 1996	423,397,000
House allowance	266,394,000
Committee recommendation	283,560,000

Solar energy.—Funding for fiscal year 1996 is $283,560,000, and will support both basic and applied research, and technology development. In addition, the Committee supports the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's work in association with other national laboratories in renewable energy technology development. While current budget constraints prevent the Committee from funding the solar programs at higher levels, the Committee believes that the resources provided will be sufficient to maintain the program at a level which will result in continuing advances in solar technologies.

Within the total funding provided for solar energy, the Committee has included $2,988,000, the same as the budget request, for the renewable energy production incentive program. The Committee urges the Department to fully fund both tier 1 and tier 2 projects as outlined in its recently published regulations.

The Committee believes there is significant potential in the proposed collaboration between the National Renewable Energy Laboratory and efforts to design and implement energy efficient technologies, using cost effective, locally sourced materials, including waste-based ones, in the cold regions of the country, where energy demands are high and transportation costs substantial. The Committee has included $750,000 for continued research, development and specific site demonstration of these technologies.

Photovoltaics.—From within the available photovoltaic funds, an addition of $1,000,000 shall be made available to support the ongoing research in photovoltaics being conducted by the Southeast and Southwest Regional Photovoltaic Experiment Station.

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

Solar thermal.—Within the funds available, the Committee has included $3,100,000 for the operations and testing of the solar II central receiver facility.

Biomass.—Within the funds provided, the Committee recommendation includes the full budget request to test the gasifier/hot-gas cleanup system in Hawaii and the wood-burning gasifier in Vermont.

The Committee has provided $3,940,000 for the regional biomass program. This funding level is the same as the budget request. The Committee has provided no funds for an ethanol production plant in the city of Gridley, CA.

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

Wind.—The Committee is aware of the efforts at Kotzebue, AK, to displace a portion of its high-cost diesel power with a wind-energy system. The project will provide important data on the operation of a wind-energy system in a cold climate. The Committee directs the Department to provide technical assistance and other appropriate support for this project.

Solar international.—The Committee has provided $6,500,000 for solar international programs. The Committee expects funding to be divided between activities associated with the Committee on Renewable Energy Commerce and Trade [CORECT] and joint implementation projects.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $29,892,000, an increase of $4,163,000 over the House. Requested funding to maintain the Energy Technology Engineering Center has not been included.

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

During the past year, industry cost sharing has significantly expanded within this program. The program's past years' results are illustrated by the $4,000,000,000 in overseas goethermal plant construction contracts recently won by American companies, as described in the testimony. The Committee notes that the geothermal industry pays over $30,000,000 per year to the Federal Government in royalties and leases.

The Committee recommendation provides funds for the cost-shared project to inject treated waste water effluent from Lake County, CA, into the geothermal heat reservoir at the geysers field. No funds, however, are provided to study the feasibility of piping treated effluent from Santa Rosa to the geysers.

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

Hydrogen research.—The Committee proposes to fund hydrogen research at $7,500,000, an increase of $166,000 over the budget request.

Hydropower.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000, an increase of $2,020,000 over the budget request. The additional funds are provided to support the cost-shared program to develop an advanced energy-efficient turbine which reduces environmental impacts on fish species.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The Committee recommendation for electric energy systems and storage is $32,309,000. The Committee recommends $4,000,000 for the energy storage systems program.

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

Ocean energy systems.—Within available funds, the Committee has included $300,000 to continue the ocean thermal energy conversion and ocean energy systems as provided in past fiscal years. The Committee understands that this will be the final year of Federal funding for this program.

Policy and management.—The Committee recommendation for policy and management is $13,775,000. The Committee has consolidated all program direction funds for the solar and renewable programs in this single account.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1995	$293,228,000
Budget estimate, 1996	382,817,000
House allowance	235,698,000
Committee recommendation	274,873,000

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

To ensure that the advanced light water reactor program goes forward within current budget constraints, the Committee directs that the Department provide sufficient resources to attain final design approval of the midsize passively safe pressurized water reactor by December 31, 1996. The Committee further directs that the Department give priority to supporting the completion of design certification of authorized large water reactors.

The National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Electrometallurgical Techniques for DOE Spent Fuel Treatment concluded that electrometallurgical techniques being developed at the Argonne National Laboratory could represent a sufficiently promising technology for treating a variety of DOE spent fuels and warrants continued research and development.

However, due to budget constraints, the Committee recommends no funding for the nuclear technology research and development program in this account. Funding for research on the electrometallurgical treatment of spent nuclear fuels has been provided under technology development in the "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" account, consistent with the authorizing committee's recommendation.

The Committee has included an appropriation of $12,500,000 which shall be used by the Department of Energy for continuation of the development of the gas turbine-modular helium reactor [GT–MHR], a new and unique power reactor concept that combines the passively safe gas-cooled reactor with a state-of-the-art high-efficiency gas turbine. This represents an increase in funding of $5,000,000 over the closeout funding requested by the DOE. Notwithstanding the above, no more than $5,000,000 shall be made available to the program until an evaluation of the technical feasibility and economic potential of the GT–MHR for power generation shall be completed by the National Research Council and the results reported to the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress.

The Committee understands that the GT–MHR has the capability to destroy 90 percent of the plutonium 239 in weapons grade plutonium when used alone and over 99 percent of the plutonium 239 when used in combination with an accelerator driven reactor, without the need of reprocessing or recycle of the material. The evaluation shall also include, therefore, a review of the technical capability of the reactor to accomplish the near total destruction of weapons grade plutonium alone or in combination with an accelerator without reprocessing and recycle. The study shall be supported by funds within this account and shall be completed no later than 90 days following the signing of this bill into law. If the results reported are positive the balance of the funding shall be released to continue the development of the GT–MHR and if negative the balance of the funding shall be applied to program closeout.

The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000 for the Soviet-designed reactor safety program. The House provided no funds for this initiative. While the Committee realizes that this program competes with important domestic programs for scarce budgetary resources, the Committee believes that the long-term benefits of improving the safety of these foreign nuclear facilities far outweigh the costs.

The Committee has provided no funds for the Russian replacement power initiative. Unlike the Soviet-designed reactor safety program, the replacement power initiative does not require the unique technical expertise possessed by the Department of Energy, and would be more appropriately funded under a foreign assistance or national security program.

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

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation is $25,358,000, the same as the budget request and $700,000 over the House. The Committee agrees with the House that in order to consolidate related isotope activities, the funding for test reactor hot cells, $1,400,000, is transferred from nuclear energy research and development to the isotope support program, and is included within available funding. The Committee also has provided $1,700,000 for program direction.

The Committee understands that the Department of Energy and the Idaho Brain Tumor Center [IBTC] signed a lease agreement that may lead the way for the IBTC to prepare the Power Burst Facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory to perform brain cancer therapy. The IBTC will assume responsibility for the surveillance and maintenance of the facility when the necessary NRC permits have been approved and other lease conditions have been met. The Committee supports this arrangement, and expects to be informed of any developments that would preclude the use of the Power Burst Facility in boron neutron capture therapy treatment.

CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Due to funding contraints, the Committee concurs with the House recommendation and has not provided the budget request of $699,000 for this program in fiscal year 1996.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

Appropriations, 1995	$143,920,000
Budget estimate, 1996	166,759,000
House allowance	128,433,000
Committee recommendation	128,433,000

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

Much criticism has been heard regarding excessive compliance reviews and audits of field facilities and laboratories. With the reduction in funding resources, the Committee expects the Department to make every effort to coordinate reviews and eliminate excessive oversight by headquarters and field organizations, and to reduce the use of support service contract employees to perform Federal functions.

Radiation Effects Research Foundation.—Over the last few months, the Department has made a number of proposals to alter the institutional arrangements for following up on the health of survivors of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombing. Since 1946, the U.S. Government has relied on the National Academy of Sciences to serve as the neutral intermediary for the provision of support and oversight of scientific research on the consequences of the acute radiation exposures suffered by the population of these two cities.

Most of our information on radiation effects to human health comes from this research, and results of such research over the next decade—as individuals who were exposed to radiation as children enter the later years of their life—promises to provide important information on long-term effects of radiation exposure.

The Committee understands that the Department would like to change the current institutional arrangement to provide for more training of radiation epidemiologists, but sees no rationale for altering the current organizational and management relationship with the National Academy.

Accordingly, the Secretary shall keep this relationship intact. This judgment should not be seen as signaling disinterest by the Committee in the training of the next generation of radiation scientists, but as a reflection of the Committee's judgment that the current program of the Radiation Effects Research Foundation Program is sound and not in need of institutional alteration.

ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

Appropriations, 1995	$444,822,000
Budget estimate, 1996	431,664,000
House allowance	379,645,000
Committee recommendation	428,591,000

This program has two main objectives: (1) to develop the knowledge base necessary to identify, understand, and anticipate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy use

and development; and (2) to utilize the Department's unique scientific and technological capabilities to solve major scientific problems in medicine and biology.

Within funds available, the Committee has included $9,461,000, the same as the budget request, for the boron neutron capture therapy program.

The Committee encourages the Department to support research in the development and shared use of high MR instruments for the study of brain function in centers where these research efforts can lead to improved diagnosis and treatment of the mentally ill.

The Committee has provided $7,000,000 to the Biomedical Research Foundation of northwest Louisiana to create the Center for Biomedical Technology Innovation. The center will serve as a focal point for the ongoing biomedical research and development that is ongoing at many of the national laboratories and for the clinical testing of products that result from that research. It will focus specifically on the development of instrumentation for minimally invasive procedures (including advanced imaging technologies), technologies for individual self care, telemedicine and medical robotics. Priority will be given to those technologies which are most likely to reduce the cost of care. The center will be housed within the Foundation's Biomedical Research Institute, and managed by a consortium organized and led by the Biomedical Research Foundation.

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

The Committee is aware of the serious environmental threats facing the Arctic and Bering Sea ecosystem that supports the fishery resources of great importance to the Nation. Accordingly, the Committee strongly supports the atmospheric radiation measurement [ARM] program and the establishment of the third ARM site on the North Slope of Alaska. Within the funds available, the Committee has included $1,000,000 for this activity which will enhance the monitoring of the Arctic's atmospheric processes.

The Committee has included $8,500,000 for the continued development of a statewide, high-speed information, education, and data gathering network managed by the Oregon Health Sciences University. Of this amount, $5,000,000 will be dedicated to enhancing network infrastructure and capabilities at OHSU, with the additional $3,500,000 for a collaborative effort with the Oregon Graduate Institute to develop and test new delivery technologies that can improve access to critical data and expand multimedia applications in the field.

The Human Genome Program represents one of the most important and ambitious biological research efforts being pursued by the Department of Energy. The human genome contains about 3 billion DNA bases and some 80,000 genes, of which approximately 5,000 genes have already been mapped. Considering the long-term benefits of this research project on human health and the development of new medical applications, the Committee continues its strong support of this program, and has provided the full budget request in its recommendation.

The Committee supports the important work conducted at the Inhalation Toxicology Research Institute, and has included within the funds provided the full budget request for this facility.

The Committee recommendation includes $50,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Environmental and Molecular Sciences Laboratory.

FUSION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1995	$372,563,000
Budget estimate, 1996	366,045,000
House allowance	229,144,000
Committee recommendation	225,144,000

Due to severe budgetary constraints, the Committee is forced to propose significant reductions in funding for the fusion energy program. The Committee's recommendation of $225,144,000 is a reduction of $140,901,000 from the budget request.

Consistent with the direction provided in the conference report to the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995 (H. Rept. 103–672), the President's Advisory Council on Science and Technology [PCAST] initiated a review and evaluation of the fusion energy program. In that review, which the Committee understands was completed last month, the PCAST panel recommended a stable level of funding of approximately $320,000,000 per year. A program funded at that level would provide for a core research program, operation of the Tokamak fusion test reactor [TFTR], and continued participation in the ITER project. While the Committee appreciates the efforts of the PCAST panel, the resources to fund such a program are not available.

The Committee provides funding to support a domestic core physics research and development program following the recommendation of the PCAST panel, and to continue the U.S. participation in the engineering design activities phase of the international thermonuclear experimental reactor [ITER] project, to which the United States is committed through fiscal year 1998.

The Committee has been advised that the administration will develop a strategy for restructuring the fusion program at a reduced level of funding using the PCAST panel report as the framework. Pending receipt of the restructured recommendations next year, the funds made available are to provide for the domestic core program in plasma science and fusion technology of about $180,000,000 per year which includes the continued operation within the core program of the DIII–D device and the Alcator C–MOD device. Funds are also included to continue the EDA phase of ITER. The heavy ion fusion research effort previously under this program is to be continued under the inertial confinement fusion subprogram. In addition, the Committee recommends that the computer work included in this budget be transferred to other programs in the Department during this transition. Termination, severance and separation costs should also be covered under other activities within the Department.

The Committee believes that, because of the stringent budget realities facing this Nation, the promise of fusion energy can only be realized through international collaboration. The high cost of fusion development points to the increasing importance of international

cooperation as a means of designing, building, and financing magnetic fusion facilities in the future. Because the United States has committed to such an approach, it is crucial that a restructuring of the fusion program not undermine our credibility as a reliable international partner.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

Appropriations, 1995	$747,296,000
Budget estimate, 1996	811,419,000
House allowance	791,661,000
Committee recommendation	791,661,000

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

A recommendation of $7,000,000, the same as the House, is included to continue the Department's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research [EPSCoR] Program at the fiscal year 1995 level.

The Committee continues its strong support for the Department's participation in the domestic natural gas and oil initiative through the advanced computational initiative.

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

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

Materials Sciences Program.—The Committee supports an appropriation for $8,000,000 for research and development and conceptual design activities for a new spallation neutron source. The Committee recognizes that the expertise to develop a new spallation neutron source, including high-power accelerators, neutron targets, materials and instrumentation, resides primarily at Argonne and Los Alamos National Laboratories, based on operation and use of their spallation neutron research facilities over the past 15 years. However, Brookhaven and Oak Ridge National Laboratories are also potential sites due to their neutron expertise developed from their extensive reactor experience. Accordingly, the Committee rejects the House's endorsement of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory as the preferred site for the new spallation neutron source.

The Committee directs the Department of Energy to establish and pursue a competitive site selection process for this proposed facility. The Department is directed to seek formal input from the scientists involved in neutron science to establish a long-range plan which will ensure the revitalization of this discipline over the next decade. Consideration should be given to the most cost-effective improvements of the existing neutron beam facilities at Argonne, Brookhaven, Los Alamos, and Oak Ridge Laboratories, as well as the possibilities for a next-generation accelerator-based source. The Committee directs the Department to report to the Committees on Appropriations no later than December 1, 1995, on its plans to establish a competitive site selection process for the new spallation neutron source.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1995	$141,493,000
Budget estimate, 1996	125,235,000
House allowance	45,256,000
Committee recommendation	70,256,000

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

Due to funding constraints, the Committee's recommendation for the laboratory technology transfer program is $25,000,000. The Committee recommends that the Department determine which cooperative research and development agreements [CRADA's] are the most promising, and complete the most promising CRADA's during fiscal year 1996.

Indian Energy Resource Program.—From within funds available in the "Energy supply, research, and development" appropriation, the Committee allowance includes $15,000,000 to fund and implement Indian energy resource programs authorized under section 2603 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. Within this amount, the Committee directs that $6,600,000, the same as the current year, be provided for continued preconstruction activities for the Navajo transmission project, and $3,000,000 be provided for the Haida Alaska Native Village Corp.'s Reynolds Creek hydroelectric project.

The Committee supports the budget request for the construction projects in the multiprogram energy laboratories program. The capital equipment and general plant projects accounts are merged with the energy research program that is supported by the specific capital items.

To the extent that nonprogram specific general plant projects and general plant equipment are required for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory/Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, they are to be funded within the Biological and Environmental Research Program.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1995	$113,109,000
Budget estimate, 1996	104,810,000
House allowance	12,000,000
Committee recommendation	42,000,000

Due to severe budgetary constraints, the Committee recommends a funding level of $30,000,000 for the university and science education programs. The Committee has reviewed the Department's efforts in science education and remains strongly committed to the Department's continued participation in science, primarily at the national laboratories. Funding is provided with the understanding that resources will be provided to those laboratories that are the most outstanding performers.

The Committee does not, however, believe that the Department's science education programs are being managed in a holistic manner. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary to centralize all the science education programs within the Office of Energy Research where they were located from 1977 to 1993. In that way, the programs will be closely coupled with the Department's research programs.

The Committee directs the Department to make every effort to continue support for innovative partnerships which have been developed with the departmental laboratories and the Nation's historically black colleges and universities and other minority institutions at last year's levels. These partnerships were designed to redress the real and documented need to improve the representation of minorities in our Nation's science and engineering work force. Important steps have been made, but much remains to be done and partnerships such as the Science and Engineering Alliance developed by the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory with four HBCU's and the PREP awards which have helped many minority institutions improve undergraduate science curricula should be continued and improved.

Also, $500,000 is provided to continue support for the partnership with Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories and institutions of higher education to support the Louisiana systemic initiative which addresses the need to increase representation of minorities and women in science, math technology, engineering, and related disciplines.

Funds should also be made available to continue the important environmental education initiatives and to extend these efforts such as the BATmobile and environmental education program developed by PNL-Hanford to the Lower Mississippi Delta area.

Within available funds, the Committee has provided $700,000 for the Einstein Fellowship Program as authorized by Public Law 103–382.

Since 1981, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, the Ana G. Mendez University System, and Jackson State University have enjoyed a productive relationship intended to promote minority participation in the sciences and enhance computer science and scientific research at all three institutions. The Committee is encouraged by the success of this effort and directs the Department to maintain and support this program at the fiscal year 1995 level.

In support of its science education mission and activities, the Committee urges the Department to disseminate information in a linguistically and culturally appropriate manner and undertake outreach activities to reach all minority populations that are affected by its operations. For example, the Committee recognizes that Hispanic Americans are the fastest growing minority popu-

lation in the United States, and there are large Hispanic communities adjacent to the Department's major environmental remediation sites at Hanford and Rocky Flats. Currently, however, Hispanics are underrepresented as scientists and technicians both in the Department of Energy and relative to the general population, and currently account for less than 2 percent of all Ph.D graduates in scientific fields critical to the mission of the Department of Energy.

Because the Department operates significant programs adjacent to large Hispanic populations, and employs laborers drawn from Hispanic migrant populations, the Committee urges the Department to undertake a national strategic outreach effort that will encourage U.S. Hispanic citizens to pursue educational and career opportunities in the sciences and new technologies. The Committee emphasizes that such a program must be communicated in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner. The Committee directs the Department to report on its efforts to establish such an outreach strategy no later than June 1, 1996.

The Committee recognizes and supports the efforts to promote work force and economic development through the close cooperation of Government, tribes, the private sector, professional societies, Federal laboratories, and the academic community. It is recognized in particular that quality education and work force development will be key to social and economic advancement of our native American citizens. The Committee, therefore, supports the partnership for environmental technology education [PETE] tribal college initiative for addressing the long-tern needs of native American students, and expects the Department to give priority to implementing such a program.

Within available funds, the Committee has provided $500,000 to support the Nebraska math and science initiative's effort to partner with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory to support, through the use of electronic technology, rural youth programs to utilize data, and expertise to solve community problems related to energy and environment and investigate career options.

Due to the significant reduction in funding for technology transfer activities throughout the Department, the Committee concurs with the House recommendation and does not include funds for a separate technology partnership organization.

The In-house Energy Management Program has been in existence over 20 years. It appears that energy efficiency is an integral part of the operating philosophy of the Department's facilities; therefore, the Committee agrees with the House and does not see the need for a separate funding source for these alternatives.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(NONDEFENSE)

Appropriations, 1995	$744,041,000
Budget estimate, 1996	712,990,000
House allowance	626,541,000
Committee recommendation	627,606,000

The Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program funds activities necessary to meet milestones and legal re-

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

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

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

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Department proposed to use $79,300,000 of prior year balances to offset current year funding requirements and $50,000,000 to be achieved by implementing savings recommended by the Galvin task force. The Committee recommendation includes $73,800,000 of prior year balances, but not the undistributed general reduction. Specific program reductions have been taken which will reflect savings from implementing recommendations of the Galvin task force.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

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

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1995	$63,310,000
Budget estimate, 1996	42,292,000
House allowance	29,294,000
Committee recommendation	29,294,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1995	−$9,900,000
Budget estimate, 1996	−34,903,000
House allowance	−34,903,000
Committee recommendation	−34,903,000

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

The budget request for fiscal year 1996 includes $102,898,000 for operation, maintenance, and construction activities, and is offset by the receipt of $34,903,000 in revenues and the use of $25,703,000 from unobligated balances carried over from prior years' funding, resulting in a net budget request of $42,292,000. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee agrees with the House by recommending a reduction of $12,998,000 from the budget request.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriations, 1995	$301,327,000
Budget estimate, 1996	288,807,000
House allowance	278,807,000
Committee recommendation	278,807,000

The uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning [D&D] fund supports D&D, remedial actions, waste management, and surveillance and maintenance associated with preexisting conditions at sites leased and operated by the USEC, as well as Department of Energy facilities at these and other uranium enrichment sites. The sites covered by this D&D fund include the operating uranium enrichment facilities at Portsmouth, OH, and Paducah, KY, and the inactive K–25 site in Tennessee, formerly called the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Environmental restoration efforts at these three sites are supported from the D&D fund established by a tax on domestic utilities and by congressional appropriations.

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

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

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1995	$984,031,000
Budget estimate, 1996	1,017,530,000
House allowance	991,000,000
Committee recommendation	971,000,000

The general science and research activities programs are concerned with understanding the nature of matter and energy and the fundamental forces and particles of nature. The knowledge acquired in this basic research is an essential part of the intellectual foundation of other scientific disciplines and technical permits. Deeper understanding correspondingly contributes to all of the scientific disciplines and to our Nation's technological base. The gen-

eral science and research activities programs are organized into two interrelated scientific programs, high-energy physics, and nuclear physics. While these programs are not directly associated with energy technology in the near or midterm, they support basic research whose aim is to provide new knowledge which is expected to have long-term scientific and technological impacts on energy development and utilization and on other aspects of our society.

The Committee's funding recommendation for general science and research activities reflects the continued role of the Federal Government in fundamental scientific research where research is not market driven and is difficult for the private sector to conduct. The Committee strongly supports the budget request for the scientific facilities utilization initiative to enhance and increase the use of fundamental science and user facilities, but due to severe funding constraints, has found it necessary to reduce the overall budget request. It is the Committee's hope that congressional actions such as merging operating and capital funding along with a lessening of departmental internal regulations and oversight reviews will compensate in part for this reduction.

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

Due to budget constraints, the Committee recommendation for high-energy physics is 657,000,000, a $20,000,000 reduction from the House. The recommendation for nuclear energy physics is $304,500,000, the same as the House. Funding for program direction has been reduced to $9,500,000 from the request of $10,900,000. This is identical to the House recommendation.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Appropriations, 1995	$392,800,000
Budget estimate, 1996	.....
House allowance	226,599,000
Committee recommendation	151,600,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1992 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 authorize a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities. These laws establish the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste. The Committee recommends $151,600,000 to be derived from the fund in fiscal year 1996. Combined with the appropriation to the "Defense nuclear waste disposal" account, a total of $400,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 1996. This is $24,599,000 below the House's total recommendation.

The Committee shares the House's frustration with the administration's lack of enthusiasm for resolving the Nation's civilian high-level radioactive waste storage problem. Last year, the Department informed the Committee that the nuclear waste repository would not be operational before 2010, and then only if the planned program were revised substantially and annual appropriations for the program were increased significantly. The Committee endorsed the Department's revised program and increased funding accordingly in fiscal year 1995. Spending limitations for fiscal year 1996, however, now make it impossible for the Committee to appropriate sufficient funds to continue the program on its present course.

The Committee recognizes that failure to fund the program adequately will delay completion of the repository indefinitely. The Committee also recognizes that the Department now has no alternative program for managing nuclear waste pending completion of the repository. Nuclear waste is currently scattered among over 113 nuclear reactors across the country. At least 26 of these reactors will run out of storage space by 1998 and 80 more by 2010. Plainly, steps must be taken to provide alternative storage capacity pending completion of the permanent repository.

Accordingly, the Committee directs the Department to provide for the interim storage of spent nuclear fuel beginning on January 31, 1998, or as soon thereafter as practicable, notwithstanding any restrictions on the siting or construction of a interim storage facility in section 145 or 148 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. Of the combined amount appropriated to the Department from the Nuclear Waste Fund and for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, $85,000,000 shall be available for interim storage activities.

In addition, the Committee directs the Department to refocus the repository program on completing core scientific activities at Yucca Mountain. The Department should complete excavation of the exploratory tunnel and the scientific tests needed to assess the performance of the repository. It should defer preparation and filing of a license for the repository with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission until a later date. The Department's goal should be to collect the scientific information needed to determine the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site and to complete a conceptual design for the repository and waste package for later submission to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Of the combined amount appropriated to the Department from the Nuclear Waste Fund and for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, $250,000,000 shall be available for these activities.

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

and submitted for review and approval of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses prior to payment by the Department of Energy.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

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

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1995	$3,229,069,000
Budget estimate, 1996	[1] 3,489,367,000
House allowance	3,273,014,000
Committee recommendation	3,751,719,000

[1] Reflects budget amendment contained in H.Doc. 104–100 not considered by House.

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

The Committee's recommendation for weapons activities is $3,751,719,000, an increase of $211,544,000 over the budget request. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

An appropriation of $1,696,580,000 is recommended for the stockpile stewardship activities of the Department of Energy.

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

Core stockpile stewardship.—The 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 $1,209,708,000 for core stockpile stewardship programs. This is

$106,600,000 more than the House and $100,000,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the funding level proposed for fiscal year 1996 may not be sufficient to address the concerns expressed by some about the aging stockpile. The Committee believes that preservation of core intellectual and technical competencies and the continued ability of the weapons laboratories to respond to changing world situations is critically important.

The Committee is pleased with the progress made in the past year in focussing plans for stockpile stewardship activities. An increase of $40,000,000 is included for the accelerated strategic computing initiative [ASCI], including additional research on high end hardware development. ASCI, along with other initiatives such as the Los Alamos neutron scattering facility will enhance the core capabilities needed to ensure confidence in the scientific and engineering information base that will support the enduring stockpile over the long term.

The Committee is also supportive of other new initiatives for stewardship of the aging stockpile, including enhanced surveillance and dual revalidation. New surveillance technologies, coupled with advanced predictive capability, are needed to understand the effects of aging on component and weapon performance. The Committee directs that $40,000,000 of the increase be applied to an enhanced surveillance program which will address current and expanded activities in both the stewardship and management programs to transition surveillance from a reactive to predictive mode. In addition, funding of $20,000,000 is provided for a dual revalidation program which should be initiated to establish baseline assessments of each weapon type in the stockpile.

The Committee recommendation also provides an additional $10,000,000 over the budget request, the same as the House, for operation of the Los Alamos neutron scattering facility, for total funding of $35,000,000.

Project 96–D–105, contained firing facility addition, LLNL.—The Committee recommendation includes $6,600,000 for the contained firing facility addition at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. The Committee believes that this facility is critical to the national defense needs of the Nation. In addition, the proposed project provides much needed environmental protection.

Inertial confinement fusion [ICF].—An appropriation of $240,667,000 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 deterent 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 is pleased to recognize the achievements of the Naval Research Laboratory [NRL] which has recently completed the Nike laser, and the University of Rochester which has completed the Omega laser. The recommendation provides the full budget request for these programs. The Committee has consistently supported these facilities and expects both to contribute to the research and technology development efforts in the Inertial Confine-

ment Fusion Program in fiscal year 1996 and future years. The Committee continues to support the very useful work performed by the NRL and provides the full budget request of $8,000,000 for Nike activities at NRL.

Project 96–D–111, national ignition facility.—The Committee has restored funding for the national ignition facility [NIF] deferred by the House Committee. The NIF is a key facility in maintaining the nuclear weapons science expertise required for the stockpile stewardship program and supporting the weapons effects testing. An appropriation of $37,400,000 is recommended for the NIF project, which is the same as the budget request. The Committee understands that first-year funding for the project does not initiate physical construction, but allows orderly progress to proceed to meet key decision 1 milestones, including title I engineering and design, refinement of costs, preparation of NEPA documentation and safety analysis, and activities with commercial vendors. This is the minimum level of support needed to avoid stretch out of project schedules and associated increase in project costs.

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $239,405,000 for these activities for fiscal year 1996. This is $10,000,000 below the budget request. The amount recommended includes $229,405,000 for a redirected technology transfer program.

The Committee believes that there have been benefits to the national security programs through collaborations with industrial partners and have been supportive of efforts to assure strong dual benefits to the weapons core missions. However, in light of the concerns in this area, the Committee urges the Department to transition and refocus the current technology transfer activities into other areas, particularly advanced manufacturing and advanced computing to develop the capability to support future manufacturing and technological needs which directly support the weapons programs through weapon support agreements. The Committee recommendation, therefore, includes $50,000,000 to complete the highest priorities cooperative research and development agreements which remain. The remaining resources are to be allocated to carry out a redirected program. The Committee supports laboratory industrial partnerships and expects the Department to leverage this funding, when appropriate, to meet stockpile stewardship and management missions. The Committee recommendation includes the full-budget request for the advanced computational technology initiative.

The Committee has also provided $10,000,000 to support science education activities ranging from high school, graduate, and postgraduate levels through its national laboratories and Nevada operations office. These activities help ensure a highly trained, diverse, and scientific work force is available to fill defense programs needs.

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

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,050,683,000 for stockpile management activities. The stockpile management mission is to provide for maintenance, evaluation, dismantlement, transportation, and disposal of nuclear weapons in accordance with quality, quantity, and schedule requirements approved by the President in the nuclear weapons stockpile plan.

The Committee has provided an additional $141,600,000 over the budget request for enhanced stockpile surveillance, advanced manufacturing, and core stockpile management activities. The Committee recognizes the concerns of the authorization committee about the Department's national security infrastructure. However, the Committee believes it is premature to initiate long-term capital improvements in advance of the outcome of the stockpile stewardship/management programmatic environmental impact statement process currently underway. The Committee is supportive of more fundamental initiatives in advanced manufacturing, especially activities in partnership with private industry. Additional emphasis and attention should be given to advanced computerized manufacturing and dual revalidation techniques.

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

New tritium source.—Funding of $50,000,000, as requested in the budget, is provided to initiate a new tritium source project. The Committee directs the Department to conduct a fair and impartial assessment of alternatives for providing tritium including various types of reactors and the accelerator concept. Establishing an assured supply of tritium for national security needs is the critical objective of this program. The Committee expects the Department to assure that the new tritium source will not in any way jeopardize the schedule for providing tritium in the necessary timeframe and that the operational regime does not compromise the ability of the Department of Energy to meet the tritium requirements of the Department of Defense.

The Committee considers it prudent to pursue a backup source in case of a national emergency or substantial delay of a new tritium production source coming on-line. Therefore, the Committee recommendation includes funding to initiate light water tritium target contingency work requested in the budget request. The Committee directs these activities be strictly limited to evaluation of the emergency, contingency capability of the light water reactor. Funds are provided only for out of reactor testing, examination, and target development work.

The Committee has included the total cost of $12,200,000 for project D–126, tritium loading line modifications at the Savannah River site in South Carolina. This project, which was identified after the budget was submitted to Congress, will provide the capability to load a new tritium reservoir for existing weapons systems.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

An appropriation of $128,000,000 is recommended for program direction activities. The amount recommended is $10,000,000 more

than the House allowance and $31,852,000 below the appropriation for the current year. The Committee recommendation provides the full request for the community assistance program, and also continues support for the liquefied gaseous fuels spill test facility and the facility's modeling support center.

The Committee expects the Department to address the support service contracts level in accordance with the guidance provided elsewhere in the Committee report.

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

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriations, 1995	$4,892,691,000
Budget estimate, 1996	6,008,002,000
House allowance	5,265,478,000
Committee recommendation	5,989,750,000

The Department's environmental management program is responsible for identifying and reducing risks and managing waste at sites where the Department carried out nuclear energy or weapons research and production activities which resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination. The number of sites and facilities continues to grow as the Department shifts its focus from production efforts to environmental management activities. Environmental management is budgeted under three appropriation accounts: defense environmental restoration and waste management; energy supply, research, and development; and the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund.

The "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" account includes waste management functions, environmental restoration activities, technology development efforts, nuclear materials and facilities stabilization functions, and a variety of crosscutting and program support initiatives.

The recommended funding for defense environmental restoration and waste management is $5,989,750,000, an increase of $724,272,000 over the House allowance.

The Committee believes that the environmental management program of the Department of Energy is at a critical juncture. While a sizable increase is requested for fiscal year 1996, the rate at which the budget is increasing has been slowed. Budget constraints will continue to check future increases and require additional efficiencies. However, even with these constraints, tremendous progress has been made both in tangible, on-the-ground results and in the business practices within the program. The Committee expects the Department to continue to seek every opportunity to bring about more efficiencies and tough business-like approaches to program execution.

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. For ex-

ample, the Committee is concerned both about the growing landlord costs of maintaining buildings and facilities that are ready for demolition, and the high costs associated with temporarily storing and monitoring wastes that are ready for permanent disposal. In order to reduce these costs in the future, it is important that the Department expedite demolition work, waste shipments, and permanent storage whenever possible. Therefore, in prioritizing spending for environmental management work, the Secretary should give special attention to those sites or portions of sites where increased near-term funding for actual physical remediation work and permanent waste disposal can save substantial future dollars. In the Department's fiscal year 1997 budget request, the Secretary shall report on the Department's efforts to lower costs in this manner.

As noted in the introduction to title III of this report, the Committee is concerned with the level of support service contracts at the Department. The Committee expects the Department to apply those directions to the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program.

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

The Committee recommendation includes funding to maintain State studies in South Carolina, Tennessee, and Colorado involving birth defects at the $7,300,000 level in fiscal year 1996.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

An appropriation of $1,635,973,000 is recommended for environmental restoration programs. The purpose of this program is to reduce or eliminate risks to human health and the environment through assessment, remediation, and decontamination of contaminated Department of Energy sites. These sites include contaminated surface water, ground water, soil, and structures.

The Committee has provided an additional $60,000,000 for the Department to undertake accelerate efforts to reduce growing landlord costs as discussed earlier in this report. The Committee concurs with the House regarding the cleanup of the Fernald site.

The Committee urges the Department of Energy to consider adopting modeling techniques deployed by Lawrence Livermore Laboratory for ground water remediation at contaminated sites. The software used in the modeling techniques allows users to develop an optimum cleanup plan by analyzing a number of environmental parameters. Initial testing at Department of Defense environmental restoration sites has demonstrated the opportunity for significant savings.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,470,868,000 for the Waste Management Program, including the full budget request for operation and maintenance of $2,288,266,000. The Waste

Management Program seeks to protect the public and workers by seeking to minimize, treat, store, and dispose of radioactive and hazardous waste.

The Committee is concerned about the reduction recommended by the House. This program manages some of the highest risks in the world today. The fiscal year 1996 budget was carefully structured to address urgent risks and high overhead costs. The Committee feels that reductions proposed by the House are neither fiscally nor environmentally prudent. Therefore, the Committee has restored much of those reductions.

The Committee recommends that the Department in making budget decisions consider risk and life cycle costs in establishing program priorities. Risk should focus on public health and safety impact as well as environmental impact.

The Committee action concurs with the House in merging operating, capital, and general plant project funding to provide additional program flexibility, and consolidating five separate construction project requests into two consolidated projects, project 96–D–407, mixed waste low-level waste treatment projects at the Rocky Flats site, and project 96–D–408, waste management upgrades at various locations.

The Committee is concerned with the constantly fluctuating and reallocation of budgetary resources due to rescoping orders. This has resulted in an inability for managers to plan with any certainty or to enter into meaningful agreements with regulators. The Committee expects the Department to address this situation and take steps to insure funding levels remain as stable as possible.

In addition to the budget request for TMI waste storage, the Committee has provided an additional $7,000,000 to design, engineer, or construct additional capacity for dry storage of spent nuclear fuel at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. The Committee recommendation also includes $5,000,000 for design and preliminary construction of an advanced mixed waste treatment facility at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory.

Startup of the defense waste processing facility [DWPF], which will vitrify the high-level waste at the Savannah River site in South Carolina, is critical to the credibility and success of the Department's Waste Management Program. The Committee expects the Department to maintain the current schedule for startup and operation of the DWPF.

Nuclear fuels canister storage building and stabilization facility, 96–D–406.—The Committee recognizes the urgency of the plans to move spent nuclear fuel from inadequate storage in the K-Basin at Hanford to a new facility proposed in the fiscal year 1996 budget request. The new spent nuclear fuels canister storage building and stabilization facility project, 96–D–406 (formerly called K-Basin Operations Program), will take advantage of previous design and construction efforts at Hanford, and new long-term, dry storage and fuel stabilization technologies to meet an accelerated removal schedule for K-Basin spent nuclear fuel. The Department is directed to proceed expeditiously with scope, design and construction of the facility to store and stabilize spent nuclear fuel from the K-Basin.

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for technology development activities is $490,510,000. The funding level recommended by the Committee is in line with the action recommended by the authorizing committee.

The mission of the Office of Technology Development is to develop new technologies or improve existing technologies that will assist in managing DOE-generated wastes faster, safer, and more economically.

The Committee continues to believe that advanced technology development is key to a successful restoration and waste management program, and to significantly reducing costs. In recommending this increase over the budget request, the Committee restates the goal of a technology development program, which is 10 percent of the total environmental restoration budget.

The Committee recommendation supports the development of the electrometallurgical technology, a promising technology for treating a variety of DOE waste forms, at $40,000,000. The Committee has also provided up to $1,000,000 for the Department to undertake an initial evaluation of using Pentaborane for environmental remediation or other uses.

The Committee believes that the application of new technologies and/or commercial waste remediation technologies offers significant long-term cost savings and is essential for the Department of Energy to make real progress on environmental remediation problems and reduce the overall costs of the Federal Government's cleanup efforts. Technology development provides the opportunity to demonstrate new or commercial technology applications at Department of Energy sites. The Committee directs that the Department include in its budget justification materials for fiscal year 1997 that is presented for congressional review, a description of specific activities funded by moneys appropriated for the Technology Development Program.

There is continued concern that the Department's efforts to develop appropriate and effective technologies to facilitate the cleanup of its facilities are meeting with limited success. The Committee is seriously concerned that the Department may not be providing sufficient attention and resources for basic science research. The Committee believes that the Office of Environmental Management should seek out and expand the use of existing basic research infrastructure within the Office of Energy Research [OER]. The capabilities of OER could easily be used to address the mid- and long-term needs of environmental management. The Committee believes that strengthened ties between the Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Energy Research can only enhance the ability to the Department to succeed in its complex cleanup effort.

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT

The full budget request of $16,158,000 is recommended for transportation management programs, which is $6,000,000 over the House allowance.

Transportation management is responsible for assuring the safe, secure and economical transportation of materials, including radioactive and other hazardous materials.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND FACILITIES STABILIZATION

The Committee recommendation is $1,532,802,000, a reduction of $63,226,000 from the budget request and $30,000,000 more than the House allowance. The purpose of the Nuclear Materials and Facilities Stabilization Program is to coordinate and oversee the orderly transition of contaminated installation and facilities from other program offices to environmental management.

Funding reductions are primarily directed toward program support and integration activities at headquarters and the field offices. Program support and integration funding includes support service contracts to provide technical support and contract expertise to assist the Federal staff with its line management and oversight functions. Support service contract reductions should be made as directed earlier in this report.

The Committee recommendation supports the Hanford environmental dose reconstruction project and health information network at the budget request level. The Committee also has included $1,700,000 for the Hanford thyroid study, the same as the current fiscal year.

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

COMPLIANCE AND PROGRAM COORDINATION

The Committee recommendation of $56,251,000 is a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request of $81,251,000, and is $25,000,000 more than the House allowance. This program is responsible for providing policy guidance, oversight and assessment, and technical support and assistance.

The Committee concurs with the Galvin task force assessment that the Department is mired in layers of management and oversight which hinder efficient program operations. Many functions proposed in this program area should be performed by the line program managers in the environmental management organization or by separate headquarters organizations such as environment, safety, and health. In a time of severely constrained resources, use of existing resources for direct cleanup activities must have first priority.

ANALYSIS, EDUCATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation for analysis, education, and risk management is $97,022,000, a $20,000,000 increase over the House allowance. Funding in this account provides for Federal salaries, support service contracts, education and training, risk management assessments, and public accountability and outreach activities.

The Department proposes to increase public accountability efforts from less than $4,000,000 in fiscal year 1995 to more than $32,000,000. The Committee believes that, while this program can help develop appropriate consensus, increases of the amount proposed for fiscal year 1996 divert needed resources away from critical cleanup work. An appropriation of $20,000,000 is recommended for public accountability activities. The Committee directs that none of these funds be used for reimbursement of travel expenses of individuals traveling to Washington, DC.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $276,240,000 of prior-year balances and the use of $37,000,000 from the Savannah River pension fund.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1995	$1,849,657,000
Budget estimate, 1996	1,432,159,000
House allowance	1,323,841,000
Committee recommendation	1,439,112,000

An appropriation of $1,439,112,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $6,953,000 over the budget request and $115,271,000 over the House allowance.

This account includes the following programs: verification and control technology, nuclear safeguards and security, security investigations, security evaluations, the Office of Nuclear Safety, Worker, and Community Transition Assistance, fissile materials control and disposition, emergency management, and naval reactors. In prior years this account funded the materials support program conducted at the Savannah River site in South Carolina. This program has been transferred to the "Defense environmental restoration and waste management" appropriation in fiscal year 1996. Descriptions of each of the remaining accounts are provided below.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Verification and Control Technology Program includes activities related to nonproliferation and verification research and development, arms control, and intelligence. The Department is engaged in an active nuclear nonproliferation program through research and development activities performed at the national laboratories, by providing technical and analytical support to treaty development and implementation, and by providing intelligence support to these

efforts. The Committee recommendation of $450,842,000 is the same as the budget request.

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology includes $30,000,000 for Department of Energy efforts related to Soviet designed reactor safety work. It should be pointed out that production of nuclear material for weapons and nuclear energy for civilian use in the former Soviet Union was and is more highly integrated than in other countries. Facilities often fulfill dual functions or are highly interdependent. The Committee believes this program is important to the national security interest of the United States and has, therefore, provided funding under verification and control technology to continue these important activities.

Research and development.—The objective of the Research and Development Program is to conduct applied research, development tests, and evaluations of systems and technologies in support of nonproliferation and treaty verification requirements.

The Committee continues to strongly support these activities and has restored the House reduction of $62,642,000. The Department has long been actively involved in preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons technology and protecting nuclear material and facilities. Moreover, in the post-cold war era, the Department and its system of national laboratories have conducted a vigorous program of nonproliferation research and development and provide unique capabilities to respond to a broad range of domestic and international situations.

The Committee believes that the House reduction creates an unacceptable risk to the core competencies and poses substantial national security concerns.

Arms control.—The arms control program supports the development and implementation of U.S. and international policies aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It also promotes effective international safeguards and physical protection of nuclear materials and control of the export of nuclear-related equipment, technologies, and materials.

The Committee recommendation of $162,364,000 for arms control activities is the same as the budget request. The recommendation supports the Industrial Partnering Program at $10,000,000 and provides $5,000,000 to support spent fuel activities in North Korea. The Committee strongly supports the Industrial Partnership Program and would support the Department applying additional funding of not to exceed $10,000,000, if warranted.

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

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

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

The Committee concurs with the House recommending an appropriation of $83,395,000, a reduction of $6,121,000 below the budget request of $89,516,000. Current program activities should be reviewed and prioritized within available funding.

Declassification initiative.—In streamlining the Department's ongoing declassification process, as part of the "National Performance Review," the Committee directs the Department to take the necessary action to meet the requirements of the new declassification policies established by the Congress or the executive branch. The declassification productivity initiative will develop technical and analytical services in knowledge engineering, linguistics, cognitive modeling, systems engineering, and computer automation designed to improve the document declassification review process. The Committee recommends that $3,000,000 be made available to continue this important initiative.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

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

An appropriation of $20,000,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is a reduction of $13,247,000 from the budget request of $33,247,000 and reflects continuing large uncosted balances in this account.

SECURITY EVALUATIONS

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

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR SAFETY

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

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $17,679,000, a reduction of $7,000,000 from the budget request of $24,679,000. The Committee has included $2,000,000 within the recommendation to support nuclear safety activities.

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 $90,000,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $100,000,000. The Committee has restored $15,000,000 of the House reduction for this activity. The increased funding will assist in limiting the impacts from additional personnel reductions planned in fiscal year 1996, and to reduce the need to fund transition costs from program budgets. The Committee will be reviewing the costs of employee buyout proposals to ensure that they do not exceed acceptable standards. The Committee is concerned that the buyout packages may exceed acceptable standards and urges the Department to review established guidelines to insure they are in line with those in the private sector.

FISSILE MATERIALS CONTROL AND DISPOSITION

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

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Committee concurs with the House in consolidating funding for emergency management activities. Its effort is to streamline the Department of Energy's emergency effort to streamline the Department of Energy's emergency-related organizations and eliminate redundancy consolidating. Funding for these activities had previously been included in the "Weapons activities program direction" account and "Emergency preparedness" account which has been

funded in the Department of the Interior and Other Related Agencies Appropriations Act in previous years. The fiscal year 1996 budget request for emergency management is $20,056,000, and $8,219,000 for emergency preparedness. The Committee has combined these two programs and provided a total of $23,321,000 for fiscal year 1996, the same as the House allowance. The Committee believes that efficiencies and savings realized from this consolidation will allow the Department to carry out essential planning and oversight activities.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors Program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores having long fuel life, high reliability, improved performances, and simplified operating and maintenance requirements. The nuclear propulsion plants and cores cover a wide range of configurations and power ratings suitable for installation in naval combatants varying in size from small submarines to large surface ships. The Committee recommendation is $682,168,000, the same as the budget request and House allowance.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

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

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriations, 1995	$129,430,000
Budget estimate, 1996	198,400,000
House allowance	198,400,000
Committee recommendation	248,400,000

The Committee recommends $248,400,000 for defense nuclear waste disposal.

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

The Committee recommendation increases the Federal Government's share by $50,000,000 and brings the deficit between the balance owed and that paid into the fund to $54,070,000.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

NET APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1995	$245,822,000
Budget estimate, 1996	317,138,000
House allowance	239,944,000
Committee recommendation	239,820,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1995	$161,490,000
Budget estimate, 1996	−122,306,000
House allowance	−122,306,000
Committee recommendation	−137,306,000

The funding recommended for Departmental Administration provides for general management and program support functions benefiting all elements of the Department of Energy. The account funds a wide array of activities not directly associated with program execution such as: salaries, travel and other costs associated with the management and support of the Department; development and analysis of energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of programs; coordination of policies and programs for communicating with the news media and the general public; support for training and education programs; development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; performance of work for non-Federal entities; and revenues from the sale of products and services and their related costs.

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation for administrative activities is $377,126,000, a decrease of $62,318,000 from the budget request of $439,444,000. Program activities in most areas of the Department are being reduced which should result in decreasing needs for administrative and support activities.

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

REVENUES

The revenue estimate for fiscal year 1996 is $137,306,000, a $15,000,000 increase over the budget request, but a reduction of $24,184,000 from the revenues estimated for fiscal year 1995.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriations, 1995	$26,465,000
Budget estimate, 1996	30,998,000
House allowance	26,000,000
Committee recommendation	25,000,000

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

Due to severe budget constraints and the proposed downsizing of the Department of Energy, the Committee recommendation is $25,000,000. This is a reduction of $5,998,000 from the budget request of $30,998,000.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

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

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1995	$6,494,000
Budget estimate, 1996	4,260,000
House allowance	4,260,000
Committee recommendation	4,260,000

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

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

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The Bonneville Power Administration is the Federal electric power marketing agency in the Pacific Northwest, a 300,000-square-mile service area that encompasses Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and small portions of adjacent Western States in the Columbia River drainage basin. Bonneville markets hydroelectric power from 30 Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation projects, as well as thermal energy from non-Federal generating facilities in the region. Bonneville also markets and exchanges surplus electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie with California, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

Bonneville constructs, operates and maintains the Nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of 14,800 circuit-miles of transmission line and 390 substations with an installed capacity of 22,279 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 1996, the Committee recommends an additional increment of $378,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, system replacement, energy resources, fish and wildlife, and capital equipment programs.

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

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

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

Limitation on direct loans.—Language was requested permitting Bonneville to make direct loan obligations not to exceed

$29,000,000. The Committee has not included this provision and recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 1996.

Regional technical forum on conservation program evaluation and verification.—Bonneville's reinvention of conservation is intended to allow utilities to develop and implement conservation strategies that are better tailored to their local situations. As a consequence, the Northwest can anticipate a more diversified approach to conservation acquisition. With this diversification comes the need to develop regionally consistent evaluation standards and protocols for assessing the energy savings produced by these more varied programs, and ensuring that the region continues to meet the Northwest Power Planning Council's targets for securing cost-effective conservation. In order to facilitate development of such standards and protocols, Bonneville and the Northwest Power Planning Council should promptly convene a regional technical forum on conservation program evaluation and verification. The forum's membership should include individuals with technical expertise and experience in conservation program planning, implementation, and evaluation. Its services should be available to all Northwest utilities, and its immediate priority should be to develop consistent standards and protocols for verification and evaluation of energy savings, in consultation with all interested parties. By developing standards and protocols of generalized applicability, the forum should help utilities improve program quality and reduce program costs.

Renewable energy.—The Committee has been interested in Bonneville's efforts to support the development of renewable energy in the Pacific Northwest. Given Bonneville's mission, it is important for Bonneville to play a leadership role in assuring that renewable energy is included in the mix of the region's resources. The Committee understands that Bonneville is developing a green power product to market the power from renewable resources. The Committee expects that Bonneville will be aggressive in these marketing efforts. The Committee understands that Bonneville is reevaluating its current portfolio of renewable resources and urges Bonneville to support renewable resource development. The Committee supports the efforts of Bonneville and the project developers to reduce the costs of the proposed projects.

Residential exchange.—The Committee is concerned that in the recently proposed rate case for the Bonneville Power Administration, there is a proposal to reduce rates for public power and direct service industries but substantially increase the cost of power exchanged with some residential customers of investor owned and publicly owned utilities. The Committee has been told that this increase in residential rates results from the implementation of a provision of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act. It has been suggested by some that the provision has been applied inequitably, while others argue that it has been done properly. The Committee would be gravely concerned if the provision has been applied unfairly or inappropriately. Bonneville is directed to provide the Committee with an explanation and justification of its proposal at the earliest possible date.

BPA competitiveness.—The Committee understands BPA is operating in a very competitive electric utility environment. The Com-

mittee understands that recently, three of BPA's longstanding customers announced that they were removing a total of 200 megawatts of load off the BPA system in addition to the 275 megawatts of load which BPA customers removed from the BPA system earlier in the year. The Committee further understands that these customers have signed contracts for purchased power below BPA's existing rate for 1 to 5 years. Utility deregulation has fostered a strong independent wholesale electric power production industry nationwide, and in the Northwest BPA customers now have alternatives. The Committee is aware that the cost of new power sources has dropped sharply in recent years, causing the gap between BPA's historical low costs and the higher cost of alternative power sources to narrow dramatically and now be effectively closed. The Committee is very concerned about these customer losses and the real possibility of future additional losses due to increased electric supplier competition and/or cost pressures, including the increasing cost of salmon recovery. The Committee is informed that, in order to stay competitive, BPA has taken aggressive steps to control costs which are within its control and to improve customer service. The Committee commends BPA's efforts to be competitive now and in the future.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1995	$22,431,000
Budget estimate, 1996	19,843,000
House allowance	19,843,000
Committee recommendation	19,843,000

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

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

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1995	$21,316,000
Budget estimate, 1996	29,778,000
House allowance	29,778,000
Commmittee recommendation	29,778,000

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, Arkan-

sas, and Louisiana with a total installed capacity of 2,158 megawatts. It operates and maintains some 1,380 miles of transmission lines, 24 generating projects, and 24 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

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

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1995	$222,285,000
Budget estimate, 1996	306,352,000
House allowance	257,652,000
Committee recommendation	257,652,000

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 1,300,000-square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of 16,727 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 257 substations. Western distributes power generated by 55 plants with a maximum operating capacity of 10,576 megawatts.

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1994–95. 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 Sec-

tion of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas. Funds for these costs were previously included in the appropriations of the Department of State.

The Committee recommendation is $1,000,000, the same as the budget request.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARIES

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

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$166,173,000
Budget estimate, 1996	136,567,000
House allowance	132,290,000
Committee recommendation	131,290,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1995	−$166,173,000
Budget estimate, 1996	−136,567,000
House allowance	−132,290,000
Committee recommendation	131,290,000

The Committee provides $131,290,000 for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Committee concurs with the House's observation that the workload of the Commission with respect to the regulation of oil and natural gas is declining dramatically as those industries become more competitive. The budget request for the natural gas and oil pipelines program, though reduced from fiscal year 1995, fails to match this decline in responsibility.

Because the FERC has largely deregulated the natural gas pipeline industry, a 20-percent reduction in the natural gas and oil pipeline staffing is recommended for fiscal year 1996. This is consistent with the House action to reduce staff by 10 percent. This action will reduce fee charges being assessed on the natural gas industry and reduce unnecessary regulatory oversight.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY				
Solar energy				
Solar building technology research	4,692	4,657	1,000	3,500
Photovoltaic energy systems	91,000	88,129	54,129	69,429
Solar thermal energy systems	32,700	33,943	22,943	27,943
Biofuels energy systems	62,112	80,380	48,000	54,300
Wind energy systems	49,000	49,820	20,000	32,000
International solar energy program	9,250	29,154	---	6,500
Solar technology transfer	16,090	17,758	44,772	4,300
National renewable energy laboratory	1,548	380	500	500
Construction				
General plant projects	1,665	120	---	---
96-E-100 FTLB renovation and expansion, Golden, CO	---	5,500	---	1,500

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
95-E-103 South table mountain site infrastructure, Golden, CO	2,750	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	4,415	5,620	---	1,500
Subtotal, National renewable energy laboratory	5,963	6,000	500	2,000
Resource assessment	4,100	4,665	2,000	2,000
Solar program support	5,407	7,345	---	---
Program direction	8,200	9,460	5,500	---
Subtotal, Solar Energy	288,514	331,311	198,844	201,972
Review of uncosted balances	---	-4,888	-4,888	-4,888
Total, Solar Energy	288,514	326,423	193,956	197,084
Geothermal				
Geothermal technology development	35,277	36,130	25,434	30,447
Program direction	1,000	1,000	850	---
Capital equipment	900	397	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Review of uncosted balances	---	-555	-555	-555
Total, Geothermal	37,177	36,972	25,729	29,892
Hydrogen research	10,000	7,334	15,000	7,500
Hydropower				
Small scale hydropower development	1,410	904	---	3,000
Program direction	90	90	---	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-14	---	---
Total, Hydropower	1,500	980	---	3,000
Electric energy systems and storage				
Electric energy systems				
Electric field effects research	14,000	9,924	9,924	9,924
Reliability research	6,200	6,153	---	---
System and materials research	19,000	24,712	19,000	19,000
Program direction	850	850	600	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-615	-615	-615
Subtotal, Electric energy systems	40,050	41,024	28,909	28,309

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Energy storage systems				
Battery storage	5,700	5,656	---	4,000
Program direction	350	350	---	---
Review of uncosted balances	---	-88	---	---
Subtotal, Energy storage sytems	6,050	5,918	---	4,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	46,100	46,942	28,909	32,309
Policy and management	4,817	4,746	2,800	13,775
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY	388,108	423,397	266,394	283,560
NUCLEAR ENERGY				
Nuclear energy R&D				
Light water reactor	65,000	49,740	40,000	40,000
Advanced reactor R&D	20,700	---	---	12,500
Space reactor power systems	1,500	---	---	---
Advanced radioisotope power system	61,083	49,237	49,237	48,512
Facilities	7,100	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Nuclear technology R&D	---	37,300	18,000	---
Program direction	12,500	13,000	8,000	8,800
Policy and management	11,900	10,200	5,000	7,400
Test reactor area hot cells	1,445	1,400	---	---
Oak Ridge landlord	12,145	15,430	14,400	14,400
Construction				
GPN-103 General plant projects	2,255	3,255	---	---
Subtotal, Oak Ridge landlord	14,400	18,685	14,400	14,400
Test reactor area landlord	1,500	1,370	2,000	2,000
Construction				
GP-N-102 General plant projects, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	750	730	---	---
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,750	1,900	1,900	1,900
Subtotal, Construction	2,500	2,630	1,900	1,900
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	4,000	4,000	3,900	3,900

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Advanced test reactor fusion irradiation	3,500	2,303	2,303	2,303
University reactor fuel assistance and support	---	6,130	3,500	3,500
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	203,128	191,995	144,340	141,315
Termination costs	64,000	79,000	73,000	71,500
Construction				
GPN-102 General plant projects	2,500	1,000	---	---
95-E-207 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor - II sodium processing facility Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	1,500	1,700	1,700	1,700
92-E-200 Modifications to reactors, experimental breeder reactor-II fuel handling major maintenance, Argonne National Laboratory-West, ID	2,500	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	6,500	2,700	1,700	1,700
Total, Terminations costs	70,500	81,700	74,700	73,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Isotope support	19,600	25,358	24,658	25,358
Soviet designed reactor safety	---	78,764	---	40,000
Russian replacement power initiative	---	5,000	---	---
General reduction	---	---	-8,000	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	293,228	382,817	235,698	279,873
CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
Spent fuel storage R&D	593	589	---	---
Program direction	110	110	---	---
TOTAL, CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	703	699	---	---
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH				
Environment, safety and health	126,740	149,579	114,933	114,933
Nuclear safety policy	17,180	17,180	13,500	13,500
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	143,920	166,759	128,433	128,433

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ENERGY RESEARCH				
Biological and environmental research				
Biological and environmental research R&D.....	366,622	357,019	320,050	358,996
Construction				
GP-E-120 General plant projects.....	3,500	4,450	---	---
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL.....	4,700	2,600	2,600	2,600
94-E-338 Structural biology center, ANL.....	6,700	4,295	4,295	4,295
94-E-339 Human genome lab, LBL.....	15,800	5,700	5,700	5,700
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA.....	40,000	50,000	40,000	50,000
Subtotal, Construction.....	70,700	67,045	52,595	62,595
Subtotal, Biological & environ. research R&D....	437,322	424,064	372,645	421,591

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
BER program direction	7,500	7,600	7,000	7,000
Total, Biological and environmental research	444,822	431,664	379,645	428,591
Fusion energy	370,563	311,945	229,144	225,144
Construction				
GPE-900 General plant projects, var. locations	2,000	1,000	---	---
96-E-310 Elise project	---	3,200	---	---
94-E-200 Tokamak physics experiment, Princeton plasma physics laboratory	---	49,900	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	2,000	54,100	---	---
Total, Fusion energy	372,563	366,045	229,144	225,144
Basic energy sciences				
Materials sciences	275,721	348,297	367,400	367,400
Chemical sciences	163,513	181,565	198,400	198,400
Applied mathematical sciences	109,367	108,688	116,500	116,500
Engineering and geosciences	36,837	39,953	41,700	41,700

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Advanced energy projects	11,085	12,026	12,300	12,300
Energy biosciences	28,957	29,534	30,200	30,200
Program direction	9,900	10,000	9,500	9,500
Capital equipment	41,537	56,973	---	---
Construction				
GPE-400 General plant projects	4,500	6,314	---	---
96-E-305 Accelerator and reactor improvements and modifications, various locations	---	12,883	10,475	10,475
95-E-305 Accelerator improvement projects	7,500	---	---	---
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL	58,379	3,186	3,186	3,186
87-R-405 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	---	2,000	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	70,379	24,383	15,661	15,661
Total, Basic energy sciences	747,296	811,419	791,661	791,661
Other energy research				
Advanced neutron source	21,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Energy research analyses	3,531	3,463	3,463	3,463
Laboratory technology transfer	57,513	58,776	---	25,000
Advisory and oversight	12,450	9,780	6,200	6,200
Policy and management	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support				
Multiprogram general purpose facilities	6,382	6,382	---	---
Construction				
GPE-801 General plant projects	8,740	8,740	---	---
95-E-301 Central heating plant rehabilitation, phase I (ANL)	1,307	2,500	2,500	2,500
95-E-302 Applied science center, phase I (BNL)	600	3,270	3,270	3,270
95-E-303 Electrical safety rehab (PNL)	240	1,500	1,500	1,500
95-E-310 Multiprogram laboratory rehabilitation, phase I (PNL)	400	2,740	2,740	2,740
94-E-351 Fuel storage and transfer facility upgrade (BNL)	2,479	440	440	440
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	3,000	2,038	2,038	2,038

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
93-E-313 Electrical system upgrade, phase II (ANL)	2,043	---	---	---
93-E-325 Potable water system upgrade, phase I (BNL)	1,863	---	---	---
92-E-322 East canyon electrical safety project (LBL)	1,000	---	---	---
92-E-324 Safety compliance modifications 326 building (PNL)	1,900	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	23,572	21,228	12,488	12,488
Subtotal, Multiprogram gen. purpose facilities	29,954	27,610	12,488	12,488
Environment, safety and health	6,507	8,657	6,656	6,656
Construction				
96-E-330 Building electrical service upgrade Phase I, Argonne National Laboratory Argonne, Illinois	---	1,200	---	---
96-E-331 Sanitary sewer restoration, Phase I, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, CA	---	2,400	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
96-E-332 Building 801, renovations Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York.....	---	800	---	---
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations.....	---	---	4,400	4,400
95-E-307 Fire Safety imp. III (ANL).....	210	1,000	1,000	1,000
95-E-308 Sanitary system mods. II (BNL).....	960	1,540	1,540	1,540
95-E-309 Loss prevention upgrades (BNL).....	600	2,480	2,480	2,480
93-E-315 Roof replacement, phase I (BNL).....	100	---	---	---
93-E-317 Life safety code compliance (PNL)....	506	---	---	---
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase II (ANL).....	1,500	2,411	2,411	2,411
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade phase I (LBL).....	2,000	1,130	1,130	1,130

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase I (LBL)	1,962	1,288	1,288	1,288
Subtotal, Construction	7,838	14,249	14,249	14,249
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	14,345	22,906	20,905	20,905
Inactive and surplus facilities	500	500	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	44,799	51,016	33,393	33,393
Total, Other energy research	141,493	125,235	45,256	70,256
TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH	1,706,174	1,734,363	1,445,706	1,515,652
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES				
University and science education programs				
Laboratory cooperative science centers	35,846	30,035	---	20,000
University programs	17,377	17,377	---	10,000
University reactor fuel assistance	3,730	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
University research instrumentation	5,647	5,647	---	---
Program direction	2,944	2,359	---	---
Total, University and science education programs	65,544	55,418	---	30,000
Technical information management program	15,315	15,950	11,000	11,000
Construction	1,000	1,500	1,000	1,000
Total, Technical information management program	16,315	17,450	12,000	12,000
Technology partnership	---	3,153	---	---
In-house energy management	6,550	15,664	---	---
Construction				
IHE - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt	24,700	13,125	---	---
Total, In-house energy management	31,250	28,789	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	113,109	104,810	12,000	42,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MGMT. (NON-DEFENSE)				
Corrective activities	600	1,065	---	1,065
Construction				
92-E-601 Melton Valley liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	9,100	339	339	339
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer system upgrade, ORNL	17,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	26,100	4,339	4,339	4,339
Total, Corrective activities	26,700	5,404	4,339	5,404
Environmental restoration	395,165	417,758	366,400	366,400
Waste management	215,258	198,127	176,896	176,896
Construction				
GP-E-600 General plant projects	2,040	2,212	---	---
95-E-601 Radioactive waste handling facility, PPPL	1,937	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
94-E-601 Waste handling building, Fermilab.....	2,500	---	---	---
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL.....	7,000	300	300	300
93-E-632 Laboratory floor drain collection system upgrades, BNL.....	571	---	---	---
93-E-633 Upgrade sanitary sewer system, ORNL.....	4,000	---	---	---
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL....	4,910	4,048	4,048	4,048
91-E-305 Waste management facility project, BNL...	5,160	---	---	---
91-E-600 Rehabilitation of waste management building 306, ANL.....	---	787	787	787
91-E-602 Hazardous, radioactive and mixed waste storage facility, ANL.....	3,600	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
88-R-812 Hazardous waste handling facility, LBL...	625	671	671	671
Subtotal, Construction.....	32,343	8,018	5,806	5,806
Total, Waste management.....	247,601	206,145	182,702	182,702
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization.....	74,575	83,683	73,100	73,100
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT...	744,041	712,990	626,541	627,606
Subtotal, Energy supply, research and development.	3,389,283	3,525,835	2,714,772	2,877,124
Use of prior year balances.....	-35,683	-79,300	-79,300	-78,800
General reduction, ESR&D.....	-22,280	---	-59,772	---
Productivity savings.....	-4,000	---	---	---
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction.....	-12,772	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Galvin task force reductions	---	-50,000	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,314,548	3,396,535	2,575,700	2,798,324
URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES				
Uranium program activities	79,993	93,698	80,700	80,700
Construction				
GP-N-501 General plant projects	250	---	---	---
96-U-200 UF6 cylinders refurbishment facility, Paducah, Kentucky gaseous diffusion plants	---	5,800	5,800	5,800
93-U-200 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	2,452	3,400	3,400	3,400
91-U-208 Safeguards and security upgrading, Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plant	700	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
89-N-501 UF6 cylinders and storage yards, Paducah, KY and Portsmouth, OH gaseous diffusion plants	700	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	4,102	9,200	9,200	9,200
Subtotal, Uranium supply & enrichment activities	84,095	102,898	89,900	89,900
Revenues - Sales	-9,900	-34,903	-34,903	-34,903
Use of prior year balances	-10,885	-25,703	-25,703	-25,703
TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES	63,310	42,292	29,294	29,294
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND				
Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	301,327	288,807	278,807	278,807

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
High energy physics				
Physics research	139,940	147,155	146,000	136,000
Facility operations	333,174	339,457	358,077	348,077
Construction				
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations	12,146	13,845	---	---
96-G-301 Accelerator improvement projects, various locations	---	9,800	---	---
95-G-301 Accelerator improvement projects, VL	12,515	---	---	---
94-G-304 B-Factory, SLAC	44,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
92-G-302 Fermilab main injector, Fermilab	43,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
Subtotal, Construction	111,661	127,645	104,000	104,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	444,835	467,102	462,077	452,077
High energy technology	58,190	67,370	68,923	68,923

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Other capital equipment	3,925	3,925	---	---
Total, High energy physics	646,890	685,552	677,000	657,000
Nuclear physics	254,771	239,448	231,925	236,925
Construction				
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations	3,900	4,785	---	---
96-G-302 Accelerator improvements and modifications, various locations	---	4,975	2,575	2,575
95-G-302 Accelerator improvements & mods., VL	3,200	---	---	---
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL	70,000	70,000	70,000	65,000
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA	1,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	78,100	79,760	72,575	67,575

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Other capital equipment	1,870	1,870	---	---
Total, Nuclear physics	334,741	321,078	304,500	304,500
General science program direction	10,400	10,900	9,500	9,500
Subtotal, General science	992,031	1,017,530	991,000	971,000
General reduction	-5,000	---	---	---
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-3,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	984,031	1,017,530	991,000	971,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES				
Stockpile stewardship				
Core stockpile stewardship	960,570	1,015,903	1,028,403	1,128,403

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction				
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations	8,500	12,500	---	---
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	---	2,520	2,520	2,520
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National laboratory	---	8,400	8,400	8,400
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	---	1,800	1,800	1,800
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	---	6,600	---	6,600
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	3,300	9,940	9,940	9,940
94-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, development and testing facilities revitialization Phase V, various locations	13,000	12,200	12,200	12,200
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, NV	17,000	15,650	15,650	15,650

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
92-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, phase IV, various locations	21,810	---	---	---
90-D-102 Nuclear Weapons Research, Development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase III, various locations	4,900	6,200	6,200	6,200
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase II, various locations	20,980	17,995	17,995	17,995
Subtotal, Construction	89,490	93,805	74,705	81,305
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,050,060	1,109,708	1,103,108	1,209,708
Inertial fusion	176,473	203,267	213,267	203,267
Construction				
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	---	37,400	---	37,400
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	176,473	240,667	213,267	240,667
Technology transfer/education				
Technology transfer	215,794	229,405	25,000	229,405

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Education	20,000	20,000	---	10,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	235,794	249,405	25,000	239,405
Marshall Island/Dose reconstruction	7,000	6,800	6,800	6,800
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,469,327	1,606,580	1,348,175	1,696,580
Stockpile management	1,646,846	1,795,458	1,805,458	1,937,058
Construction				
Stockpile support facilities				
GPD-121 General plant projects, various loc	1,000	10,000	---	---
95-D-123 Replacement transportation safeguards division aviation facility, Albuquerque, NM	2,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Stockpile support facilities	3,000	10,000	---	---
Production base				
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	14,820	8,660	8,660	8,660

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
96-D-126 Tritium loading line modifications, Savannah River Site, SC	---	---	12,200	12,200
Subtotal, Production base	14,820	8,660	20,860	20,860
Environmental, safety and health				
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU) Pantex plant	---	600	600	600
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for Ozone protection Y-12 plant	---	3,100	3,100	3,100
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant	2,200	6,300	6,300	6,300
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	6,300	8,700	8,700	8,700
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	1,000	5,500	5,500	5,500
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
94-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	1,000	4,000	4,000	4,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant.....	5,000	7,200	7,200	7,200
Subtotal, Environmental, safety and health....	16,500	37,400	37,400	37,400
Safeguards and security				
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant.....	15,000	13,400	13,400	13,400
Nuclear weapons incident response				
96-D-125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, MD.....	---	900	---	900
Reconfiguration				
93-D-123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, various locations.....	58,000	41,065	41,065	41,065
Subtotal, Construction.....	107,320	111,425	112,725	113,625
Total, Stockpile management.....	1,754,166	1,906,883	1,918,183	2,050,683
Program direction.....	159,852	138,056	118,000	128,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities.....	3,383,345	3,651,519	3,384,358	3,875,263

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Use of prior year balances	-143,276	-86,344	-86,344	-86,344
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-11,000	---	---	---
Streamline DOE contractors (undistributed)	---	-75,808	-25,000	-37,200
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	3,229,069	3,489,367	3,273,014	3,751,719
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.				
Corrective activities				
Construction				
92-D-403 Tank upgrades project, LLNL	512	---	---	---
90-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	---	3,406	3,406	3,406
Total, Corrective activities	512	3,406	3,406	3,406
Environmental restoration	1,518,549	1,575,973	1,575,973	1,635,973
Productivity savings initiative	-133,900	---	---	---
Total, Environmental restoration	1,384,649	1,575,973	1,575,973	1,635,973

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Waste management	2,474,856	2,288,266	2,168,994	2,288,266
Construction				
GP-D-171 General plant projects,various locations	16,832	30,728	---	---
96-D-400 Replace industrial waste piping, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	---	200	---	---
96-D-401 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan immobilization of miscellaneous wastes, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,400	---	---
96-D-402 Comprehensive Treatment & Management Plan building 374/774 sludge immobilization Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	---	1,500	---	---
96-D-403 Tank farm service upgrades, Savannah River, SC	---	3,315	---	---
96-D-405 T-Plant secondary containment & leak detection upgrades, Richland, WA	---	2,100	---	---
96-D-406 K-Basin operations program, Richland, WA	---	26,000	26,000	26,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
96-D-407 Mixed waste low level waste treatment project, Rocky Flats	---	---	2,900	2,900
96-D-408 Waste mgmt upgrades, various locations	---	---	5,615	5,615
95-D-401 Radiological support facilities Richland, WA	1,585	---	---	---
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service WIPP, AL	700	4,314	4,314	4,314
95-D-403 Hazardous waste storage facility, AL	597	---	---	---
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge,TN	1,000	4,600	4,600	4,600
95-D-406 Road 5-01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	2,338	1,023	1,023	1,023
95-D-407 219-S Secondary containment upgrade, Richland, WA	2,000	---	---	---
95-D-408 Phase II liquid effluent treatment and disposal, RL	7,100	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	1,000	4,445	4,445	4,445
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	3,292	282	282	282
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	21,373	11,000	11,000	11,000
94-D-406 Low-level waste disposal facilities, K-25	6,000	---	---	---
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,700	9,400	9,400	9,400
94-D-408 Office facilities - 200 East, Richland, WA	4,000	---	---	---
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex Richland, WA	42,200	5,500	5,500	5,500
94-D-416 Solvent storage tanks installation, Savannah River, SC	1,700	---	---	---
94-D-417 Intermediate-level and low-activity waste vaults, Savannah River, SC	300	2,704	2,704	2,704

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
93-D-174 Plant drain waste water treatment upgrades, Y-12	1,400	---	---	---
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,300	3,900	3,900	3,900
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line replacement, Richland, WA	3,300	---	---	---
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	14,810	19,795	19,795	19,795
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation facility, Richland, WA	88,605	31,000	31,000	31,000
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	26,525	19,700	19,700	19,700
93-D-188 New sanitary landfill, Savannah River,SC	---	---	---	---
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	---	1,105	1,105	1,105
92-D-177 Tank 101-AZ waste retrieval system, Richland, WA	5,000	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	2,846	1,100	1,100	1,100
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA	3,995	---	---	---
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	3,819	2,000	2,000	2,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID	1,747	1,428	1,428	1,428
90-D-178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID	7,594	2,606	2,606	2,606
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	300	800	800	800
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	18,000	11,500	11,500	11,500
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,900	8,885	8,885	8,885
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC	6,000	1,000	1,000	1,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, SC	45,058	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	367,916	213,330	182,602	182,602
Subtotal, Waste management	2,842,772	2,501,596	2,351,596	2,470,868
Productivity savings initiative	-160,800	---	---	---
Total, Waste management	2,681,972	2,501,596	2,351,596	2,470,868
Technology development	411,759	390,510	380,510	490,510
Construction				
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	7,000	---	---	---
Total, Technology development	418,759	390,510	380,510	490,510
Transportation management	20,684	16,158	10,158	16,158
Program direction	84,948	---	---	---
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization	695,831	1,467,384	1,427,108	1,457,108

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction				
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	15,211	34,724	---	---
96-D-458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	---	885	885	885
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	1,539	1,539	1,539
96-D-462 Health physics instrument laboratory, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	1,126	---	---
96-D-463 Central facilities area (CFA) craft shop Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	724	---	---
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	---	4,952	---	---
96-D-465 200 Area sanitary sewer system, Richand, WA	---	1,800	---	---
96-D-470 Environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	3,500	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	1,500	1,500	1,500
96-D-472 Plant engineering & Design, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	---	4,000	---	---
96-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	2,000	---	---
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	2,900	2,900	2,900
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River,SC	---	6,000	6,000	6,000
95-D-454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA	1,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	986	8,382	8,382	8,382
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,500	5,000	5,000	5,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,219	5,074	5,074	5,074

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	7,800	1,000	1,000	1,000
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, INEL, ID	4,920	3,601	3,601	3,601
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	10,600	2,940	2,940	2,940
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	---	7,130	7,130	7,130
93-D-172 Idaho national engineering laboratory electrical upgrade, INEL, ID	7,800	124	---	---
93-D-184 325 facility compliance/renovation, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, WA	1,000	---	---	---
93-D-186 200 Area unsecured core area fabrication shop, Richland, WA	4,000	---	---	---
92-D-123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	---	9,560	9,560	9,560

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO.....	2,100	7,000	7,000	7,000
92-D-181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID.....	6,000	6,883	6,883	6,883
92-D-182 Idaho national engineering laboratory sewer systems upgrade, INEL, ID.....	1,900	---	---	---
92-D-186 Steam system rehabilitation, phase II Richland, WA.....	5,600	---	---	---
91-D-127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replaemnt, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO..	---	2,800	2,800	2,800
Subtotal, Construction.....	77,136	128,644	75,694	75,694
Subtotal, Nuclear materials and fac. stabilization	772,967	1,596,028	1,502,802	1,532,802
Productivity savings initiative.....	-5,000	---	---	---
Total, Nuclear materials & fac. stabilization.....	767,967	1,596,028	1,502,802	1,532,802

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Compliance and program coordination	---	66,251	16,251	41,251
Construction				
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	---	15,000	15,000	15,000
Total, Compliance and program coordination	---	81,251	31,251	56,251
Analysis, education and risk management	---	157,022	77,022	97,022
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,359,491	6,321,944	5,932,718	6,302,990
Savannah river pension refund	---	-37,000	-37,000	-37,000
Use of prior year balances	-249,300	-276,942	-630,240	-276,240
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-17,500	---	---	---
FY 1995 rescission (P.L. 104-6)	-200,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,892,691	6,008,002	5,265,478	5,989,750
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
Materials support	781,305	---	---	---

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Construction				
Environment, safety and health				
95-D-158 Disassembly basin upgrades-K, L, P, Savannah River, SC	13,000	---	---	---
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade Phase I & II, Savannah River, SC	11,300	---	---	---
93-D-148 Replace high-level drain lines, Savannah River, SC	2,700	---	---	---
93-D-152 Environmental modification for production facilities, Savannah River, SC	2,900	---	---	---
92-D-143 Health protection instrument calibration facility, Savannah River, SC	3,000	---	---	---
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC	5,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Environment, safety and health	37,900	---	---	---
Programmatic projects				
GPD-146 General plant projects, various locations	15,000	---	---	

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, SC	750	---	---	---
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River, SC	2,100	---	---	---
95-D-157 D-area powerhouse life extension, Savannah River, SC	4,000	---	---	---
92-D-150 Operations support facilities, Savannah River, SC	2,000	---	---	---
92-D-153 Engineering support facility, Savannah River Site, SC	3,200	---	---	---
Subtotal, Programmatic projects	27,050	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	64,950	---	---	---
Program direction	56,000	---	---	---
Total, Materials support	902,255	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Other national security programs				
Verification and control technology				
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	228,500	226,142	163,500	246,142
Arms control	76,924	162,364	147,364	162,364
Intelligence	43,131	42,336	42,336	42,336
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	348,555	430,842	353,200	450,842
Nuclear safeguards and security	85,816	89,516	83,395	83,395
Security investigations	33,827	33,247	20,000	20,000
Security evaluations	14,780	14,707	14,707	14,707
Nuclear safety	21,679	24,679	15,050	17,679
Worker and community transition	115,000	100,000	75,000	90,000
Fissile materials control and disposition	50,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Emergency management	---	---	23,321	23,321
Total, Other national security programs	669,657	762,991	654,673	769,944
Naval reactors				
Naval reactors development	673,651	652,568	652,568	652,568
Construction				
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,200	6,600	6,600	6,600

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	2,400	11,300	11,300	11,300
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	700	4,800	4,800	4,800
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	7,900	3,900	3,900	3,900
92-D-200 Laboratories facilities upgrades, various locations	2,800	---	---	---
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	---	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Construction	20,000	29,600	29,600	29,600
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	693,651	682,168	682,168	682,168

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Enrichment materials	32,000	---	---	---
Total, Naval reactors	725,651	682,168	682,168	682,168
Subtotal, Other defense activities	2,297,563	1,445,159	1,336,841	1,452,112
Savannah river pension refund	-40,000	---	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-401,406	-13,000	-13,000	-13,000
Contractor pay freeze	---	---	---	---
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-6,500	---	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,849,657	1,432,159	1,323,841	1,439,112
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL				
Defense nuclear waste disposal	129,430	198,400	198,400	248,400
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	10,100,847	11,127,928	10,060,733	11,428,981

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
Administrative operations				
Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses	3,416	3,569	2,500	3,000
General management - personnel compensation and benefits	202,886	215,129	173,553	200,398
General management - other expenses	193,678	189,774	167,000	146,531
Program support				
Minority economic impact	3,426	3,415	2,900	2,900
Policy analysis and system studies	4,500	5,864	2,900	4,900
Consumer affairs	46	46	40	40
Public affairs	54	92	50	50
Environmental policy studies	6,070	8,000	1,000	7,000
Scientific and technical training	2,285	2,248	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Program support	16,381	19,665	7,890	15,890
Total, Administrative operations	416,361	428,137	350,943	385,819
Cost of work for others	24,356	22,826	22,826	22,826
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	440,717	450,963	373,769	388,645

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments.....	-30,707	-11,519	-11,519	-11,519
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction.....	-2,698	---	---	---
Total, Departmental administration (gross).....	407,312	439,444	362,250	377,126
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-161,490	-122,306	-122,306	-137,306
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net).....	245,822	317,138	239,944	239,820
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL				
Office of Inspector General.....	32,425	32,913	27,915	26,915
Use of prior year balances.....	-5,960	-1,915	-1,915	-1,915
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.....	26,465	30,998	26,000	25,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS				
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance.....	6,494	4,260	4,260	4,260

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance				
Operating expenses	3,292	3,472	3,472	3,472
Purchase power and wheeling	27,249	26,430	26,430	26,430
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,541	29,902	29,902	29,902
Use of prior year balances	-8,110	-10,059	-10,059	-10,059
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	22,431	19,843	19,843	19,843
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance				
Operating expenses	19,539	20,897	20,897	20,897
Purchase power and wheeling	1,503	1,464	1,464	1,464
Construction	9,514	7,931	7,931	7,931
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	30,556	30,292	30,292	30,292
Use of prior year balances	-9,240	-514	-514	-514
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	21,316	29,778	29,778	29,778

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance				
Construction and rehabilitation	92,883	70,125	51,125	51,125
System operation and maintenance	127,972	125,255	125,255	125,255
Purchase power and wheeling	101,506	113,709	93,709	93,709
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,135	5,283	5,283	5,283
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	327,496	314,372	275,372	275,372
Use of prior year balances	-105,044	-8,020	-17,720	-17,720
Procurement reform/GSA rent reduction	-167	---	---	---
Transfer of authority from Department of Interior	(7,472)	(4,556)	(4,556)	(4,556)
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	222,285	306,352	257,652	257,652
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND				
Operation and maintenance	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	272,526	361,233	312,533	312,533

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION				
Federal energy regulatory commission	166,173	151,567	147,290	146,290
Use of prior year balances (FERC)	---	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000
FERC revenues	-166,173	-136,567	-132,290	-131,290
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND				
Discretionary funding	392,800	---	226,599	151,600
ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS				
Energy Supply, Research and Development	3,314,548	3,396,535	2,575,700	2,798,324
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	73,210	77,195	64,197	64,197
Revenues	-9,900	-34,903	-34,903	-34,903
Total, Uranium supply and enrichment	63,310	42,292	29,294	29,294
Uranium enrichment D&D fund	301,327	288,807	278,807	278,807
General Science and Research Activities	984,031	1,017,530	991,000	971,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	392,800	---	226,599	151,600
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management				
Defense function	(4,892,691)	(6,008,002)	(5,265,478)	(5,989,750)
Non-defense function	(1,045,368)	(1,001,797)	(905,348)	(906,413)
Total, Environmental Restoration and Waste Mgmt	(5,938,059)	(7,009,799)	(6,170,826)	(6,896,163)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities				
Weapons Activies	3,229,069	3,489,367	3,273,014	3,751,719
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Mgmt	4,892,691	6,008,002	5,265,478	5,989,750
Other Defense Activities	1,849,657	1,432,159	1,323,841	1,439,112
Defense nuclear waste disposal	129,430	198,400	198,400	248,400
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,100,847	11,127,928	10,060,733	11,428,981
Departmental Administration	407,312	439,444	362,250	377,126
Revenues	-161,490	-122,306	-122,306	-137,306
Total, Departmental administration	245,822	317,138	239,944	239,820
Office of the Inspector General	26,465	30,998	26,000	25,000
Power Marketing Administrations				
Alaska Power Administration	6,494	4,260	4,260	4,260

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY--Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Project title	Current year enacted	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
Southeastern Power Administration	22,431	19,843	19,843	19,843
Southwestern Power Administration	21,316	29,778	29,778	29,778
Western Area Power Administration	222,285	306,352	257,652	257,652
Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	272,526	361,233	312,533	312,533
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	---	---	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS	15,701,676	16,582,461	14,740,610	16,235,359

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1995	$282,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	183,000,000
House allowance	142,000,000
Committee recommendation	182,000,000

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 has restored $40,000,000 of the House reduction and directs that these funds be applied to ARC corridor construction.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$17,933,000
Budget estimate, 1996	18,500,000
House allowance	17,000,000
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

An appropriation of $17,000,000 is recommended for fiscal 1996. This is $1,500,000 below 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.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee finds it necessary to recommend the $17,000,000 reduction.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$343,000
Budget estimate, 1996	353,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	343,000

The recommendation provides $343,000 requested for salaries and expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission.

The Delaware River Basin Commission was created by compact under Public Law 87–328 among the States of Delaware, New

York, New Jersey, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government. The compact enables the Commission to participate jointly in the development of water and related resources of the region drained by the Delaware River and its tributaries.

The amount recommended is for the expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and associated staff. The action holds the salaries and expenses at the current level because of the severe budget constraints.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1995	$478,000
Budget estimate, 1996	551,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	478,000

An appropriation of $478,000 is recommended by the Committee for fiscal year 1996. This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

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

INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1995	$511,000
Budget estimate, 1996	524,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	511,000

In light of the severe budgetary constraints, the Committee recommendation includes $511,000 for the contribution to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. This is the same as the current fiscal year and $13,000 below the budget request.

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

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1995	$520,501,000
Budget estimate, 1996	520,300,000
House allowance	468,300,000
Committee recommendation	474,300,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1995	−$498,501,000
Budget estimate, 1996	−498,300,000
House allowance	−457,300,000
Committee recommendation	−457,300,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1995	$22,000,000
Budget estimate, 1996	22,000,000
House allowance	11,000,000
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the nuclear waste fund, by assessing licenses and annual fees. The Committee recommends an appropriation of $474,300,000 for fiscal year 1996, a reduction from both the administration's budget request and the fiscal year 1995 level.

The fiscal year 1996 budget request proposes that $22,000,000 of the agency's total appropriation be derived from the nuclear waste fund. These funds are requested for agency activities related to implementation of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and in support of the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. Consistent with the Committee's support for the development of a national interim storage program for the Nation's high level civilian radioactive waste, and the direction for the Department of Energy to continue site characterization activities at Yucca Mountain at a reduced level of effort, the Committee has restored $6,000,000 of the House reduction for the NRC's salaries and expenses appropriation. Considering that the NRC must review significant health and safety aspects of a potential interim storage program and the transportation program as well as maintain sufficient technical capability to assess geologic repository issues, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $17,000,000 to be derived from the nuclear waste fund, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request.

The Committee concurs with the House in directing the NRC to accelerate plans to downsize and streamline staff and organization.

The Committee is encouraged by progress in the licensing for the General Electric advanced boiling water reactor and the ABB-combustion engineering system 80+ as shown by the issuance for public comment of the first two proposed design certification rules, and urges the Commission to act expeditiously to resolve public comments received, and to proceed to a final version of these rules. The Committee further urges the Commission to follow up these rules with detailed guidance on how the new licensing process will interface with existing practices, such as inspection and enforcement activities, so that future licensees, NRC staff, and the public will have a clear understanding of the regulatory framework in which these plants will be built and operated.

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

The Committee continues to be concerned about overly burdensome NRC review fees charged to ALWR design certification applicants. The Committee expects the timely completion of final design

approval for the two small, passive reactors: the Westinghouse AP–600 and the General Electric simplified boiling water reactor.

The Committee commends the NRC for expeditious actions to modify the license renewal rule for current operating licensees. The amended rule offers a stable, predictable regulatory process that utilities will use to demonstrate continued safe operation of one of the Nation's sources of electricity—nuclear power.

The Committee is encouraged by the recent efforts to reduce most fees and to revise the method of calculating hourly rates to allocate the costs associated with the reactor program and with the waste and materials programs separately, and more equitably. The Committee is also pleased that the rates for each class of applicants and licensees have been reduced. The Committee supports the effort to streamline the fee program and improve the predictability of fees by eliminating the materials flat inspection fees and including these costs in annual licensing fees.

However, the Committee continues to be concerned about issues of equity and fairness resulting from fees that are charged to licensees for which they receive no direct benefit, including international cooperative safety programs, and international safeguards activities, agreement State oversight, low-level waste disposal generic activities, and site decommissioning management plan activities. As an example, one area where the Committee expects an immediate change, by the close of this fiscal year, is the current policy of assessing fees to licensees for NRC licensing reviews and inspections for Federal agencies. The Committee sees no reason why the private sector should be required to pay for these activities.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1995	$5,080,000
Budget estimate, 1996	5,500,000
House allowance	5,000,000
Committee recommendation	5,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriations, 1995	−$5,080,000
Budget estimate, 1996	−5,500,000
House allowance	−5,000,000
Committee recommendation	−5,000,000

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

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

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriations, 1995	$2,664,000
Budget estimate, 1996	2,970,000
House allowance	2,531,000
Committee recommendation	2,664,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,664,000 for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. This is the same as provided for the current fiscal year.

The Committee recommendation provides continued funding for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987 directed the Board to evaluate the technical and scientific validity of the activities of the Department of Energy's nuclear waste disposal program. The Board must report its findings not less than two times a year to the Congress and the Secretary of Energy.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1995	$318,000
Budget estimate, 1996	332,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	318,000

In light of severe budgetary constraints, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $318,000 for salaries and expenses for the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

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

CONTRIBUTION TO SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1995	$288,000
Budget estimate, 1996	360,000
House allowance	.....
Committee recommendation	288,000

An appropriation of $288,000 is recommended by the Committee for its contribution to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for fiscal year 1996. The Committee finds it necessary to recommend a freeze at the 1995 level due the severe budgetary constraints.

This appropriation provides the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1995	$142,873,000
Budget estimate, 1996	140,473,000
House allowance	103,339,000
Committee recommendation	110,339,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $110,339,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is $30,134,000 below the

budget request for fiscal year 1996. The Committee recommendation begins to phase down the programs and activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Committee recommendation provides $72,303,000 for stewardship, land and water, $6,170,000 for land between the lakes [LBL], $6,866,000 for economic development, and $25,000,000 for TVA's Environmental Research Center.

Environmental Research Center.—The Committee directs TVA to begin the process of transitioning its Environmental Research Center and accelerate the transition to funding to other than appropriated funds. TVA will immediately focus the research of the Center in those areas of greatest need for the country and areas that will leverage and attract funding from outside sources. It should also be pointed out that several years will be necessary for TVA to complete a multimillion-dollar Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA] program currently underway at the Center. The Committee believes that an orderly transition in the financing of its activities is warranted in order to protect the previous research investment and to allow the development of a solid customer base.

Land between the lakes.—The Committee understands that TVA is currently in the process of preparing a public use plan, a major step in shaping the future of LBL, and establishing a firm foundation for future development and cost recovery initiatives. The public use plan will be completed by October 1, 1996. The Committee expects TVA to begin immediately to prepare for the phase down of appropriated funding and the shift to other sources of program financing once the public use plan is completed.

Finally, budget constraints and limitations have forced the Committee to make funding adjustments to the Stewardship and Economic Development programs of TVA.

The Committee is aware of and commends TVA for its efforts to reduce cost and limit its borrowing. TVA is encouraged to continue efforts in this regard. However, the Committee understands that TVA is considering further construction of power generation facilities which will require additional borrowing. In meeting those needs, TVA is encouraged to consider power generation facilities with the private sector which focus on technologies that have a proven record of performance. These ventures could help reduce TVA's borrowing requirement while providing electric power needs for its customers. Furthermore, the Committee commends to the attention of TVA a recent study by the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association which recommends that any new power generation should be located in the west end of the system to aid in reducing losses and supporting the transmission system.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions included in the House-passed bill.

Section 509, *Bonneville Power Administration, fish and wildlife activities.*—In addition, the Committee has recommended a general provision, section 509, which establishes a long-term budget for the Bonneville Power Administration's fish and wildlife activities.

The Committee is very concerned about the continuing decline in salmon populations in the Columbia River Basin. Many recent reports have indicated that reversing this decline will require a substantial long-term financial commitment. Much of the funding for this effort is expected to come from the Bonneville Power Administration [BPA].

Yet, the Committee is very concerned about the impact of the increasingly competitive wholesale electric power market on BPA. In the last 6 months BPA has lost over 500 megawatts of its 8,000 megawatts of load to alternative power suppliers. The continued loss of customers poses a very serious risk to BPA's ability to maintain a high probability of making Treasury payments. While this Committee strongly supports Bonneville and its public agency mission, the Committee believes that not making full Treasury payments is a prescription for significant change in the structure of Bonneville (such as privatization). Such change would likely not benefit the public policy objectives which Bonneville implements including fish and wildlife efforts. Providing a stable long-term source of fish and wildlife funding requires a stable source of revenue. The Committee believes it is very important that actions be taken which increase customer confidence in Bonneville.

A variety of factors are creating financial pressure on Bonneville, all of which must be addressed if its long-term competitive position in the market is to be stabilized. The Committee is aware that Bonneville has taken aggressive actions to cut its costs and increase its revenues, and believes these efforts must continue. The Committee also realizes that some past decisions, such as the ill-fated decision to proceed with construction of the Washington Public Power Supply System's nuclear plants, also have weakened Bonneville's financial position. A particular area of customer concern are the recent large increases in the Bonneville fish and wildlife budget. This bill includes language which would establish a long-term budget for Bonneville's fish and wildlife activities. The level of the budget is not established in this bill. The Committee urges interested regional parties to come together to establish a budget which improves efficiency, provides Bonneville greater predictability and stability and will lead to increasing fish and wildlife resources in the region. The Committee believes this should be done in a manner which does not increase costs for other beneficiaries of the Columbia River Basin hydrosystem. Should no consensus

emerge, however, prior to the conference on this legislation, the Committee fully intends to act to achieve the goals outlined above.

The Committee recognizes the economic, historical, and cultural importance of anadromous fish resources in the Columbia/Snake River basin. In addition, the Committee is committed to supporting appropriate steps to achieve fishery restoration and healthy fish populations in the basin. Such steps are necessary to meet requirements of the Northwest Powering Planning and Conservation Act; sustain commercial fisheries dependent on the basin; to meet U.S. treaty obligations under the Stevens Treaties of 1855; and to ensure a continued high quality of life in the Pacific Northwest.

Nothing in this provision is intended to diminish, modify, affect, or abrogate any treaty obligation of the United States to Indian tribes.

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 1996, has not passed the Senate.

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

In title IV, independent agencies, the recommended appropriation for the Appalachian Regional Commission is $182,000,000.

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

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

Yeas	Nays
Chairman Hatfield	
Mr. Stevens	
Mr. Cochran	
Mr. Specter	
Mr. Domenici	
Mr. Gramm	
Mr. Bond	

Mr. Gorton
Mr. McConnell
Mr. Mack
Mr. Burns
Mr. Shelby
Mr. Jeffords
Mr. Gregg
Mr. Bennett
Mr. Byrd
Mr. Inouye
Mr. Hollings
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Bumpers
Mr. Lautenberg
Mr. Harkin
Ms. Mikulski
Mr. Reid
Mr. Kerrey
Mr. Kohl
Mrs. Murray

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

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

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

No change in existing statutes has been proposed.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

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

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount of bill	Committee allocation	Amount of bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with Committee allocations to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1996: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development:				
Defense discretionary	11,447	11,446	10,944	[1] 10,907
Nondefense discretionary	8,723	8,716	9,272	9,271
Violent crime reduction fund	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....
Projections of outlays associated with the recommendation:				
1996	.....	.....	.....	[2] 11,968
1997	.....	.....	.....	6,310
1998	.....	.....	.....	1,788
1999	.....	.....	.....	66
2000 and future year	.....	.....	.....	41
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1996 in bill	NA	188	NA	18

[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 1995 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	181,199,000	155,625,000	129,906,000	126,323,000	-54,876,000	-29,302,000	-3,583,000
Construction, general	983,668,000	785,125,000	807,846,000	778,456,000	-205,212,000	-6,669,000	-29,390,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	328,138,000	319,250,000	307,885,000	307,885,000	-20,253,000	-11,365,000	---
Operation and maintenance, general	1,646,535,000	1,749,875,000	1,712,123,000	1,696,998,000	+50,463,000	-52,877,000	-15,125,000
Regulatory program	101,000,000	112,000,000	101,000,000	101,000,000	---	-11,000,000	---
Flood control and coastal emergencies	14,979,000	20,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-4,979,000	-10,000,000	---
General expenses	152,500,000	164,725,000	150,000,000	153,000,000	+500,000	-11,725,000	+3,000,000
Oil spill research	900,000	850,000	850,000	850,000	-50,000	---	---
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	3,408,919,000	3,307,450,000	3,219,610,000	3,174,512,000	-234,407,000	-132,938,000	-45,098,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Central Utah Project Completion Account							
Central Utah project construction	22,839,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	18,905,000	-3,934,000	---	---
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	11,133,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	18,503,000	+7,370,000	---	---
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	5,485,000	+485,000	---	---
Program oversight and administration	1,191,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	1,246,000	+55,000	---	---
Total, Central Utah project completion account	40,163,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	44,139,000	+3,976,000	---	---
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	14,190,000	13,602,000	13,114,000	11,234,000	-2,956,000	-2,368,000	-1,880,000
Construction program	432,727,000	375,943,000	417,301,000	390,461,000	-42,266,000	+14,518,000	-26,840,000
Operation and maintenance	284,300,000	288,759,000	278,759,000	267,393,000	-16,907,000	-21,366,000	-11,366,000
Loan program	9,600,000	16,668,000	11,668,000	11,668,000	+2,068,000	-5,000,000	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(23,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(37,000,000)	(+14,000,000)	---	---
General administrative expenses	54,034,000	50,327,000	48,150,000	48,150,000	-5,884,000	-2,177,000	---

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Emergency fund	1,000,000	---	---	---	-1,000,000	---	---
Colorado River Dam fund (by transfer, permanent authority)	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)	---	---
Central Valley project restoration fund	45,385,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	43,579,000	-1,806,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	841,236,000	788,878,000	812,571,000	772,485,000	-68,751,000	-16,393,000	-40,086,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	881,399,000	833,017,000	856,710,000	816,624,000	-64,775,000	-16,393,000	-40,086,000
(By transfer)	(-7,472,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(-4,556,000)	(+2,916,000)	---	---
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities	3,314,548,000	3,396,535,000	2,575,700,000	2,798,324,000	-516,224,000	-598,211,000	+222,624,000
Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities	73,210,000	77,195,000	64,197,000	64,197,000	-9,013,000	-12,998,000	---
Gross revenues	-9,900,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-34,903,000	-25,003,000	---	---
Net appropriation	63,310,000	42,292,000	29,294,000	29,294,000	-34,016,000	-12,998,000	---
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	301,327,000	288,807,000	278,807,000	278,807,000	-22,520,000	-10,000,000	---
General Science and Research Activities	984,031,000	1,017,530,000	991,000,000	971,000,000	-13,031,000	-46,530,000	-20,000,000
Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	392,800,000	---	226,599,000	151,600,000	-241,200,000	+151,600,000	-74,999,000
Environmental Restoration and Waste Management:							
Defense function	(4,892,691,000)	(6,008,002,000)	(5,265,478,000)	(5,265,478,000)	(+372,787,000)	(-742,524,000)	---
Non-defense function	(1,045,368,000)	(1,001,797,000)	(905,348,000)	(905,348,000)	(-140,020,000)	(-96,449,000)	---
Total	(5,938,059,000)	(7,009,799,000)	(6,170,826,000)	(6,170,826,000)	(+232,767,000)	(-838,973,000)	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activities							
Weapons Activities	3,229,069,000	3,489,367,000	3,273,014,000	3,751,719,000	+522,650,000	+262,352,000	+478,705,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,892,691,000	6,008,002,000	5,265,478,000	5,989,750,000	+1,097,059,000	-18,252,000	+724,272,000
Other Defense Activities	1,849,657,000	1,432,159,000	1,323,841,000	1,439,112,000	-410,545,000	+6,953,000	+115,271,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	129,430,000	198,400,000	198,400,000	248,400,000	+118,970,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	10,100,847,000	11,127,928,000	10,060,733,000	11,428,981,000	+1,328,134,000	+301,053,000	+1,368,248,000

Departmental Administration	407,312,000	439,444,000	362,250,000	377,126,000	-30,186,000	-62,318,000	+14,876,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-161,490,000	-122,306,000	-122,306,000	-137,306,000	+24,184,000	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Net appropriation	245,822,000	317,138,000	239,944,000	239,820,000	-6,002,000	-77,318,000	-124,000
Office of the Inspector General	26,465,000	30,998,000	26,000,000	25,000,000	-1,465,000	-5,998,000	-1,000,000
Power Marketing Administrations							
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration	6,494,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	4,260,000	-2,234,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	22,431,000	19,843,000	19,843,000	19,843,000	-2,588,000	---	---
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	21,316,000	29,778,000	29,778,000	29,778,000	+8,462,000	---	---
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	222,285,000	306,352,000	257,652,000	257,652,000	+35,367,000	-48,700,000	---
(By transfer, permanent authority)	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)	---	---
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	---	---
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	272,526,000	361,233,000	312,533,000	312,533,000	+40,007,000	-48,700,000	---
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission							
Salaries and expenses	166,173,000	136,567,000	132,290,000	131,290,000	-34,883,000	-5,277,000	-1,000,000
Revenues Applied	-166,173,000	-136,567,000	-132,290,000	-131,290,000	+34,883,000	+5,277,000	+1,000,000
Total, title III, Department of Energy	15,701,676,000	16,582,461,000	14,740,610,000	16,235,359,000	+533,683,000	-347,102,000	+1,494,749,000
(By transfer)	(7,472,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(4,556,000)	(-2,916,000)	---	---
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission	282,000,000	183,000,000	142,000,000	182,000,000	-100,000,000	-1,000,000	+40,000,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,933,000	18,500,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	-933,000	-1,500,000	---
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	343,000	353,000	---	343,000	---	-10,000	+343,000
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	478,000	551,000	---	478,000	---	-73,000	+478,000
Total	821,000	904,000	---	821,000	---	-83,000	+821,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	511,000	524,000	---	511,000	---	-13,000	+511,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	520,501,000	520,300,000	468,300,000	474,300,000	-46,201,000	-46,000,000	+6,000,000
Revenues	-498,501,000	-498,300,000	-457,300,000	-457,300,000	+41,201,000	+41,000,000	---
Subtotal	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	17,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+6,000,000

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

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1995 appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
Office of Inspector General	5,080,000	5,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-80,000	-500,000	---
Revenues	-5,080,000	-5,500,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+80,000	+500,000	---
Subtotal	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Total	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	17,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+6,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	318,000	332,000	---	318,000	---	-14,000	+318,000
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	288,000	360,000	---	288,000	---	-72,000	+288,000
Total	606,000	692,000	---	606,000	---	-86,000	+606,000
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	142,873,000	140,473,000	103,339,000	110,339,000	-32,534,000	-30,134,000	+7,000,000
					---	-306,000	+133,000
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,664,000	2,970,000	2,531,000	2,664,000	---	---	---
Office of the Nuclear Waste Negotiator	1,000,000	---	---	---	-1,000,000	---	---
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	470,408,000	369,063,000	275,870,000	330,941,000	-139,467,000	-38,122,000	+55,071,000
Grand total:							
New budget (obligational) authority	20,462,402,000	21,091,991,000	19,092,800,000	20,557,436,000	+95,034,000	-534,555,000	+1,464,636,000
(By transfer)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---