106TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { 106–253

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

JULY 23, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2605]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United States Government, 2000. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 1999, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2000.

	1999	2000 estimate	2000 recommendation	2000 recommendation compared with—	
				1999 appropriation	2000 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,097,233,000	3,905,800,000	4,188,389,000	91,156,000	282,589,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	824,596,000	895,979,000	821,871,000	(2,725,000)	(74,108,000)
Title III—Department of Energy	17,060,796,000	17,077,197,000	15,553,535,000	(1,507,261,000)	(1,523,662,000)
Title IV—Independent Agencies	175,700,000	117,050,000	84,100,000	(91,600,000)	(32,950,000)
Subtotal	22,158,325,000	21,996,026,000	20,647,895,000	(1,510,430,000)	(1,348,131,000)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(1,088,690,000)	(438,300,000)	(458,000,000)	630,690,000	(19,700,000)
Grand Total of bill	21,069,635,000	21,557,726,000	20,189,895,000	(879,740,000)	(1,367,831,000)

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000 reaffirms the congressional commitment to reducing the size, scope and cost of the Federal government. At $20.2 billion, the total level of spending in this bill is $880 million below the fiscal year 1999 level and $1.4 billion below the Administration's budget request. Although the savings effected by this bill are real and profound, the Committee has managed to preserve cost-effective investments in high-value programs with demonstrable benefits for the U.S. taxpayer.

Over the past five years, the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill has helped turn the concept of deficit reduction into a reality. Comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 bill illustrate the point. The total level of spending in the fiscal year 2000 bill represents a reduction of more than $300 million below the fiscal year 1995 level. The comparable reduction in non-defense discretionary spending amounts to $1.3 billion, or 12.8%. Adjusted for inflation, this decrease in domestic discretionary spending totals 21.4%. Cumulative five-year savings realized by this reduction total $8.4 billion in 1995 dollars.

By limiting the amount of taxpayer largesse available to Federal agencies and by instituting substantial managerial reforms, programs throughout the Energy and Water Subcommittee's jurisdiction are leaner and more efficiently executed than they were just five years ago. The benefits of Committee action are tangible and quantifiable.

Because the Committee transferred the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program from the Department of Energy to the Corps of Engineers, residents of communities that contributed to the development of our atomic capability are seeing contaminated soils removed from their towns at less cost and on a more expeditious schedule. Because of provisions included in recent Energy and Water Bills, contracts for operation of Department of Energy laboratories—massive contracts that have not been competed in a generation—are now subject to open and competitive bidding. By adjusting expenditures in solar and renewable energy, the Committee has assured that a greater share of scarce taxpayer resources is invested in the basic science associated with the development of renewable energy technologies and that a lesser share goes to support the activities of trade associations. By reducing the Federal appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority from $143 million in fiscal year 1995 to $0 in fiscal year 2000, the Committee has significantly reduced taxpayer subsidies flowing to that New Deal-era regional electric utility.

The Energy and Water Bill for fiscal year 2000 continues this recent tradition of programmatic reform and taxpayer savings, beginning with reductions in contractor travel. In fiscal year 1998, Department of Energy contractors spent almost $250,000,000 for travel expenses. One contractor reported over 4,500 trips to Washington, D.C., or almost 87 trips each week. The Committee has cut contractor travel in half in fiscal year 2000, saving $125,000,000. The number of contractor employees who are assigned to Wash-

ington will also be reduced by fifty percent, saving almost $25,000,000.

Additionally, in response to recent security reviews critical of the Department's Headquarters and field structure, the Committee is recommending a ten percent reduction in the size of the field operations. Finally, the Committee continues to insist that contracts be competed in an open and fair manner to get the best prices possible—not extended for decades with no competition.

Title I of the Energy and Water Bill includes funding for the civil works program of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Committee has been able to maintain a relatively vigorous civil works program within severe budgetary constraints. By concentrating limited resources on those traditional missions yielding the greatest economic benefits for the nation (viz., flood control and navigation), the Committee has acted to ensure the highest possible yield on taxpayer investment. At the same time, the Committee has acted to check mission creep within the Corps. Spending on new environmental programs, local water supply, recreation, waterfront development and sewer infrastructure can only be accomplished at the expense of traditional missions with national benefits. The Committee respects the importance of these other needs but acknowledges that they are, as a general proposition, more appropriately the responsibility of state and local government.

The Bureau of Reclamation is funded through title II of the Energy and Water Bill. The continued existence of the Bureau, long after its principal mission of reclaiming the American West has been accomplished, proves that, like diamonds, bureaucracy is forever. Rather than serve as an enabler in the Bureau's continued efforts to perpetuate itself through new missions and reinvention, the Committee has directed targeted programmatic reductions to better reflect the Bureau's relevance in the post-settlement era of the seventeen Reclamation states. At the same time, the Committee has provided generously for the operation and maintenance of existing Reclamation facilities in an effort to protect the considerable Federal investment in western water infrastructure.

Revivification of the national debate over the future of the Bureau is long overdue. The Committee expects that its action will help ignite that discussion. In the meantime, the Committee will actively examine options for the consolidation or reorganization of the national water bureaucracy.

All atomic energy defense activities and most civilian programs of the Department of Energy (DOE) are funded through title III of the Energy and Water Appropriations Bill. The most substantial funding reductions for fiscal year 2000 are to be found in this title of the bill. Because of its size, inefficiency, and cloudy mission (as well as the questionable value of its outputs), DOE is in a position to absorb the sizable reductions required in energy and water programs pursuant to the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997.

Reductions in the Department of Energy, however, reflect more than budgetary constraints. They also reflect the Committee's frustrations with an unmanageable bureaucracy whose very existence is insufficiently justified. Created in direct response to the oil crisis of the early 1970s, the DOE has grown into a sprawling complex of loosely related "business lines." The current hodgepodge of DOE

activities and tasks has little to do with the mission of energy security around which the Department was originally created.

If the programs within the Department's portfolio were well managed and efficiently executed, it is conceivable that the Committee would be somewhat distracted from the larger questions surrounding the need for, and viability of, a U.S. Department of Energy. Sadly, though, DOE programs are models of mismanagement and waste. Long before the American public learned that DOE's national laboratories constituted a sieve through which our nuclear secrets poured, the Committee decried the lack of accountability for program management within Department. The Committee is aggrieved that it has taken a national security crisis of devastating proportions to bring the endemic mismanagement of DOE to the attention of the American public.

The Committee is proud of its accomplishments in instituting specific managerial reforms at DOE. Nevertheless, the Committee acknowledges that these improvements, while important, have occurred at the margins of a fundamentally flawed and irreparable government agency. The Committee shares the judgment of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which recently concluded that: "The Department of Energy is a dysfunctional bureaucracy that has proven it is incapable of reforming itself."

Title IV of the Energy and Water Bill contains funding for independent agencies. In fiscal year 1995, Congress appropriated $470 million in new budget authority for these agencies. The comparable figure for fiscal year 2000 is $84 million, a reduction of 82%. The accomplishments of the Committee in reducing or eliminating funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and independent river basin commissions, among other agencies, visibly and quantifiably exemplifies the success of Congress in delivering on its promise to reduce the size, scope and cost of Federal government.

Authorization for projects and agencies funded by the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill is in various stages of the legislative process. The Committee has worked closely with jurisdictional committees to establish the funding levels recommended in the bill. Funding has been provided for certain programs in anticipation and advance of authorization in order to avoid unnecessary disruptions in the provision of vital government services.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee is concerned about the amount of time and effort it takes the Army to review and approve project decision documents and agreements. These are very important to the civil works program because they determine the feasibility, scope, costs, and local responsibilities associated with water projects. The Committee recognizes that some form of a review and approval process is necessary to ensure that projects are properly planned and constructed to meet the water resources needs of the nation. The Committee, however, is not convinced that the process is being conducted in the best and most efficient manner.

The Committee believes that reduced levels of review, limited Washington level involvement and streamlined decision-making are imperatives to the improvement of this process. The review and approval of a decision document or agreement should, in the Committee's judgment, follow a basic path. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works should provide broad policy guidance to the Corps Headquarters. Headquarters, in turn, should implement specific policies and guidelines to govern the content and preparation of reports, agreements and other documents. Headquarters should further establish a process by which such agreements and approvals are reviewed at the lowest practical level.

The Committee is aware that the process is not working this way. The Headquarters and the Assistant Secretary's office have an excessive amount of involvement in the review and approval process. The Army leadership is not fully utilizing the capabilities of the division offices and districts to accomplish these activities. In the best interests of all involved, those closest to project implementation should be empowered to perform as much of the review and approval process as possible.

Specifically, the Committee requests consideration of changes to the process for review and approval of decision documents and agreements. These changes should address all reports and agreements throughout the project development process and across all programs, including the continuing authorities programs. This approach should emphasize delegation and decentralization to the lowest level and simplification of actions, activities, products, and agreements. In examining procedural requirements, the Corps is to focus on the value of these requirements in comparison to the time and costs of procedural compliance. The Chief of Engineers is di-

rected to provide a report to the Committee by February 1, 2000 outlining plans for improved and streamlined project decision, review, and agreement processes.

It has recently come to the attention of the Committee that the position of Director of Civil Works, a position whose occupants have served the country proudly and effectively for over fifty-four years, was summarily eliminated without consultation of the Congress. The Committee is concerned about this reorganization, as it is with other organizational changes for which the need remains obscure and unexplained. The Committee notes that the Corps of Engineers is relatively effective in fulfilling its missions to the nation and that any internal changes that might compromise its effectiveness would cause great concern. Further, the Committee would view with the greatest alarm any attempt to impose more military control over the civil works program at the expense of civilian authority. Civilian control of the military is a basic tenet of our democratic government, and this principle is especially appropriate for application to the civil works program.

The Committee notes that the Corps of Engineers has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in pursuit of opportunities to promote the conservation of fish, wildlife, and plants, in accordance with applicable law. The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) is a private, non-profit, 501(c)(3) organization, established by Congress in 1984. The Committee looks favorably upon future cooperative efforts of the Corps and NFWF.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1999	$161,747,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	135,000,000
Recommended, 2000	158,993,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−2,754,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+23,993,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	100	---	100	---
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	100	---	100	---
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL	170	---	170	---
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	100	---	100	---
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	350	---	350	---
	LUBBUB CREEK, REFORM, AL	---	---	100	---
	PERDIDO KEY BEACHES, AL	---	---	100	---
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	---	75	---	75
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR DEEPENING, AK	150	---	---	---
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	100	---	100	---
(N)	BREVIG MISSION, AK	100	---	100	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	115	---	---	---
(N)	COASTAL STUDIES NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT, AK	220	---	220	---
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	140	---	---	---
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	150	---	150	---
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	128	---	---	---
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED STUDY, AK	235	---	---	---
(E)	NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK	120	---	---	---
(N)	NOME HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AK	---	253	---	253
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	150	---	---	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK	---	58	---	58
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	230	---	---	---
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	150	---	---	---
(N)	WRANGELL HARBOR, AK	---	284	---	284
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
(N)	WESTERN DISTRICT HARBOR, AS	125	---	---	---

	ARIZONA				
(SPE)	COLONIAS ALONG U.S. - MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX	200	---	600	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	342	---	342	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, SANTA CRUZ RIVER BASIN, AZ	200	---	200	---
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	50	---	50	---
	PIMA COUNTY, AZ	---	---	100	---
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	250	---	250	---
(FDP)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	263	---	263	150
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX REACH, AZ	---	1,545	200	1,545
(E)	RIO SALADO, TEMPE REACH, AZ	---	100	---	233
	SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ	---	---	250	---
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	200	---	300	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	---	50	---	50
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	486	---	486	---
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	420	---	420
	ARKANSAS				
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER (NAVIGATION STUDY), FORT SMITH, AR	100	---	1,000	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	200	---	200	---
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	---	307	---	307
	CALIFORNIA				
(E)	ALISO CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	161	---	161	---
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	5,000	---	5,000
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	150	---	800
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200	---	332	---
	CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	---	---	100	---
	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	---	---	100	---
	ENCINITAS, CA	---	---	100	---
(FC)	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	---	480	---	480
	HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA	---	---	300	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	---	582	---	582
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	---	---	250
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	---	---	100	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	250	---	250
(E)	MALIBU CREEK WATERSHED, CA	100	---	---	---
(N)	MARE ISLAND STRAIT DREDGING EXPANSION, CA	50	---	---	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA	25	---	25	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	---	50	---	50
(N)	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	100	---	100	---
	MATILIJA DAM, CA	---	---	100	---
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	300	---	300	---
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	100	---	100	---
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA	150	---	150	---
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA	---	100	---	100
	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK, CA	---	---	750	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	150	---	150	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	200	---	---	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	150	---	---	---
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	275	---	---	---
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	---	---
	NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA	---	---	700	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	200	---	200
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	140	---	140	---
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	---	400	---	400
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	100	---	100	---
	ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA	---	---	500	---
	ORANGE COUNTY SPECIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, CA	---	---	400	---
	PAJARO RIVER BASIN, WATSONVILLE, CA	---	---	---	500
	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	---	---	100	---
	PAJARO RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	---	---	100	---
	PENINSULA BEACH, CA	---	---	300	---
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	---	100	---	---
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	150	---	300	---
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	200	---	400
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	200	---	200	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	125	---	125	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	200	---	200	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	2,000	---	3,000	---
	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	100	---	100	---
	SAN CLEMENTE SHORELINE, CA	---	---	100	---
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	100	---

(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	---	50	---	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR (DEEPENING), CA	116	---	116	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	50	---	50	---
(E)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	200	---	800	---
	SAN GABRIEL TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	---	---	100	---
	SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	---	---	100	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS, CA.	50	---	50	---
	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, CORRAL HOLLOW CREEK, CA	---	---	100	---
	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	---	---	100	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	125	---	125	100
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA	200	---	380	---
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	150	---	375	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	250	---	436	---
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	414	---	414	---
	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	---	100	---
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	SANTA MARGARITA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, CA	232	---	232	100
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
(E)	SANTA YNEZ RIVER, CA	100	---	---	---
	SOLANA BEACH, CA	---	---	100	---
(FC)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	500	---	500
(N)	SOUTHAMPTON SHOAL CHANNEL AND EXTENSION, CA	70	---	---	---
(RCP)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	500	---	500	---
	SUISUN MARSH, CA	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	SUTTER BASIN, CA	60	---	300	---
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	150	---	---	---
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	250	---	500	---
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA	---	150	---	800
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	300	---	300
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	250	---	250	---
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	100	---	100	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER, POSO AND DEER CREEKS, CA	60	---	500	---
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	150	---	700
	COLORADO				
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	340	---	340	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	200	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEPE	---	500	---	500
	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ	---	---	---	1,075
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	79	---	79	349
	FLORIDA				
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL	400	---	400	---
	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BASIN, FL	---	---	100	---
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	---	---	100	---
	MILE POINT, JACKSONVILLE, FL	---	---	100	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	---	105	---	105
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	---	188	---	188
	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA CHANNEL, FL	---	---	---	175
	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER BASIN, FL	---	---	100	---
	GEORGIA				
	ALLATOONA LAKE (ETOWAH RIVER), GA	---	---	425	---
	ALLATOONA LAKE (LITTLE RIVER), GA	---	---	250	---
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA	189	---	189	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	469	---	469
	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEK, GA	---	---	100	---
	INDIAN, SUGAR, INTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS WATERSHED, GA	---	---	100	---
(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	480	---	480	---
(RCP)	NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, GA & SC	442	---	442	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	100	---	100
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	500	---	500	---
	UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	---	---	100	---
	HAWAII				
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	40	---	---	---
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	---	380	---	380

(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	225	---	225	---
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI	125	---	---	---
(N)	IDAHO				
	BOISE RIVER, ID	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, ID	---	---	100	---
	PAYETTE COUNTY, ID	---	---	100	---
	ILLINOIS				
(FC)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	---	375	---	375
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	247	---	247
	ILLINOIS BEACH, IL	---	---	131	---
(RCP)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	350	---	350	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	295	---	295	---
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	300	---	300	---
(E)	ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	200	---	---	---
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	2,100	---	2,100	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	6,700	---	15,000	---
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	450	---	450
(FDP)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	201	---	201	---
	INDIANA				
	HAMMOND, IN	---	---	100	---
	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	---	---	100	---
(N)	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	---	1,000	---	1,000
(FDP)	MISSISSINEWA RIVER, MARION, IN	---	---	100	---
	MUNCIE, WHITE RIVER, IN	---	---	100	---
	ST. JOSEPH RIVER AND SPY RUN CREEK, IN	---	---	100	---
	IOWA				
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	400	---	400	---
(FDP)	INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	90	---	---	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	211	---	211	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	266	---	500
	WALNUT RIVER BASIN, KS	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	KENTUCKY				
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, KY	150	---	150	---
	BANKLICK CREEK, KENTON COUNTY, KY	---	---	100	---
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS NAVIGATION DISPOSITION, KY	70	---	70	---
	GREENUP, KY	---	---	200	---
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	150	---	250	---
	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, LA	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	304	---	304	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	400	---	400	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	7,157	---	7,157	---
	RUSSELL, KY	---	---	200	---
	LOUISIANA				
	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	---	100	---
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	691	---	691	---
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	---	---	100	---
(N)	CAMERON LOOP, CALCASIEU PASS, LA	300	---	---	---
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA	---	134	---	134
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	700	---	700	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	415	---	415	---
(SP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA, LA	---	---	1,750	---
(FDP)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	225	---	225	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	500	---	500	---
	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	700	---	700	---
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, NORTHWEST BRANCH, MD & DC	---	300	---	300
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC	600	---	600	---
(FC)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, DEEP RUN/TIBER HUDSON, MD	---	400	---	400
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	200	---	200	---

(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD	100	---	---	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	153	---	153	---
(FC)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	---	50	---	50
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	156	---	156	---
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	300	---	---	---
	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	---	---	100	---
	MICHIGAN				
	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	---	---	100	---
	KALAMAZOO, MI	---	---	100	---
	MUSKEGON LAKE, MI	---	---	100	---
	WHITE LAKE, MI	---	---	100	---
	MINNESOTA				
	UPPER MISSISSIPPI R FROM LAKE ITASCA TO LOCK DAM 2, MN	---	---	100	---
	MISSOURI				
(FDP)	BALLWIN, ST LOUIS COUNTY, MO	150	---	150	---
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	377	---	377
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	---	320	---	---
(FDP)	CHESTERFIELD, MO	200	---	200	---
(FC)	FESTUS AND CRYSTAL CITY, MO	---	325	---	325
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO & KS	315	---	315	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	275	---	275	---
	RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	---	---	50
(RCP)	ST LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	285	---	285	---
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	322	---	322
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	58	---	58	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	153	---	153
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	72	---	72	---
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	350	---	508	92

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	NEVADA				
(FDP)	CARSON RIVER, NV	16	---	---	---
(FDP)	FALLON, NV	16	---	---	---
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100	---	---	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	---	103	---	---
(E)	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE RESERVATION,	87	---	---	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	550	---	550
	NEW JERSEY				
(N)	ARTHUR KILL EXTENSION TO PERTH AMBOY, NJ & NY	100	---	100	---
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	400	---	400	---
	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ	---	---	---	200
	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	338
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	226	---
	HUDSON-RARITAN ESTUARY, NJ & NY	---	---	100	---
	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS TO CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	---	---	---	178
	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	310	---
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ.	519	---	519	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	545	---	895	200
	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MONMOUTH COUNTY, NJ.	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	569	---	569	---
	STONY BROOK, NJ	---	---	100	---
	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	---	---	---	400
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	WOODBRIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ	100	---	100	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	50	---	50	---
(E)	RIO GRANDE WATER MANAGEMENT, NM, CO & TX	50	---	---	---
(E)	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	250	---	250	---

NEW YORK

(RCP)	ADDISON, NY	150	---	150	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	---	1,312	---	1,312
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY...	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY.....	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN,NY.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	CHEMUNG RIVER BASIN ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY & PA	100	---	100	---
	CLINTON COUNTY, NY.....	---	---	100	---
	ELLICOTT CREEK, NY.....	---	---	100	---
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	600	---	600	---
	HAMLIN BEACH AND LAKESIDE BEACH, NY.....	---	---	100	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	---	100	---	100
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	100	---	100	---
	HUDSON RIVER, HUDSON, NY.....	---	---	100	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	---	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	166	---	166	---
(FDP)	LINDENHURST,NY.....	100	---	100	---
	MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	---	---	287	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ.....	---	2,534	---	2,534
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ.....	884	---	884	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY.....	300	---	300	---
	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	---	---	200	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY.....	50	---	50	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY.....	130	---	130	---
(E)	OTSEGO LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NY.....	150	---	150	---
(E)	SAWMILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	50	---	---	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY.....	350	---	350	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	---	60	---	60
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	101	---	101	---
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	300	---	---	---

NORTH CAROLINA

	BOGUE BANKS, NC.....	---	---	100	---
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC.....	---	850	---	850
	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC.....	---	---	---	100
	JOHN H. KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC.....	---	---	100	---
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	400	---	---	---
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	---	350	---	---
(E)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC.....	100	---	---	---
	NEW RIVER BASIN, NC, VA & WV.....	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, EASTERN BAND CHEROKEE NATIO	398	---	---	---
(E)	TENNESSEE RIVER AND TRIBS, FRANKLIN, MACON COUNTY, NC.	199	---	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	300	---	300	---
	OHIO				
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	600	---	600
	BERLIN LAKE, OH	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	400	---	400	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	100	---	---	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH.	200	---	---	---
(N)	MAUMEE RIVER, OH	---	116	---	116
	MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	---	---	100	---
	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	---	---	100	---
	MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	---	---	100	---
	RICHLAND COUNTY, OH	---	---	100	---
	OKLAHOMA				
	CIMARRON RIVER BASIN, OK & KS	---	---	100	---
	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA, OK	---	---	100	---
	WARR ACRES AND BETHANY, OK	---	---	100	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	---	892	---	892
(E)	COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OR	95	---	---	---
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR...	200	---	---	---
(E)	WALLA WALLA RIVER WATERSHED, OR & WA	90	---	---	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	291	---	291	---
	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	---	---	100	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	300	---	---	---

	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	184	---	300	---
(E)	CONEMAUGH RVR BASIN, NANTY GLO ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATI	---	140	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, BRUSH CREEK ENV RESTORATION, PA	191	---	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, LYONS RUN ENV RESTORATION, PA	223	---	---	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	255	---	---	---
	UPPER SUSQUEHANA RIVER BASIN, PA & NY	---	---	250	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	403	---	403
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	---	463	---	463
	RHODE ISLAND				
(E)	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	177	---	---	---
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & SRTM DMG REDU	157	---	---	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	400	---	400	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	150	---	---	---
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	150	---	150	---
(E)	SANTEE, COOPER, CONGAREE RIVERS - GOOSE CREEK RESERVOI	---	68	---	---
(E)	YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	---	50	---	50
(E)	YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	182	---	182	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	JAMES RIVER, SD & ND	100	---	100	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD	---	95	---	95
	TENNESSEE				
(E)	DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	394	---	---	---
(E)	NOLICHUCKY WATERSHED, TN	200	---	---	---
(E)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	288	---	288	---
	TEXAS				
	BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	300	---	300	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	672	---	672	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	300	---	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	1,553	---	1,553
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	830	---	830	---
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	770	---	770	---
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	840	---	840	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	560	---	560
	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS, TX	---	---	400	---
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	328	---	328
	LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	---	---	500	---
(E)	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	220	---	500	---
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	300	---	300	---
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	250	---	250	---
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	---	62	---	62
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	100	---	300
	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	---	---	100	---
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	700	---	700	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	600	---	600
(E)	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	245	---	245	---
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	720	---	1,195	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS				
(N)	CROWN BAY CHANNEL, VI	---	241	---	241
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	370	---	370	---
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA	---	---	245	---
(E)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	339	---	339	---
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	195	---	195
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	1,050	---	1,050	---
(FDP)	POQUOSON, VA	100	---	100	---
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	240	---	---	---

(E)	POWELL RIVER, ELY/PUCKETTS CREEK, VA	---	250	---	---
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	200	---	---	---
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	200	---	200	---
	WASHINGTON				
	BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	---	---	100	---
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	---	250	---	250
	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	---	---	100	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	152	---	---	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	20	---	---
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	888	---	3,000
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	100	---	300	---
	OCEAN SHORES, WA	---	---	100	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	300	---	300	---
	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	313	---	313	---
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	66	---	66	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	201	---	---	---
(E)	TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	200	---	---	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
	ISLAND CREEK, LOGAN, WV	---	---	400	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV	650	---	650	---
	LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WV	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	403	---	403	---
(E)	NORTH BRANCH POTOMAC RIVER ENVIRON RESTORATION, WV, MD	---	50	---	50
	WISCONSIN				
	FOX RIVER, WI	---	---	100	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	---	340	---	---
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	1,500	---	1,300	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	100	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET ESTIMATES PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	400	---	400	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,000	---	8,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM (SEC. 401)	---	---	500	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	500	---	500	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	1,900	---	340	---
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	8,100	---	8,000	---
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,500	---	5,300	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	400	---	400	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	300	---	300	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	27,000	---	27,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100	---	100	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	700	---	700	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	700	---	700	---
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	650	---	650	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-23,496	---	-24,710	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	102,362	32,638	119,410	39,583

Lubbub Creek, Reform, Alabama.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of environmental and flooding problems along the Lubbub Creek near Reform in Pickens County, Alabama.

Perdido Key Beaches, Alabama and Florida.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of beach erosion along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico in Baldwin County in the southwestern part of Alabama and Escambia County in the southwestern part of Florida.

Colonias Along U.S.-Mexico Border, Arizona and Texas.—The recommendation includes an addition of $400,000 to the budget request for projects at Douglas, Old Nogales Highway, and San Luis, Arizona.

Pima County, Arizona.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to evaluate opportunities for environmental restoration and related matters in Pima County, Arizona. This study is to proceed with particular reference to recommendations and findings included in the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, Pima County, Arizona, dated October 21, 1998.

Rio de Flag, Arizona.—The Committee has provided additional funds to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Rio de Flag, Arizona, project.

Rio Salado, Phoenix Reach, Arizona.—The Committee has provided funds to conduct reconnaissance level reviews of two additional reaches of the Salt River in Phoenix, Arizona. These reaches, extending to the east and west of the Rio Salado, Arizona, project as currently proposed, are to be studied for environmental restoration and related purposes.

Rio Salado, Tempe Reach, Arizona.—The Committee recommendation includes additional funds to complete plans and specifications for the Tempe Reach of the Rio Salado, Arizona, project.

Santa Cruz River, Arizona.—The recommendation includes $250,000 to investigate structural and non-structural methods of flood control along the Santa Cruz River from Fort Lowell Road to Grant Road in metropolitan Tucson, Arizona.

Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias), Arizona.—The Committee has provided an increase of $100,000 above the budget request to initiate an expanded feasibility study of the Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias), Arizona, project.

Arkansas River (Navigation Study), Fort Smith, Arkansas.— The Committee is aware of continuing concerns and problems associated with the operation of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation System. Sustained high flows result in difficult navigation conditions and continued flooding in the vicinity of Fort Smith, Arkansas. As the operation of the flood control features of the navigation system are keyed to the Van Buren gage, the flooding and navigation problems are interrelated. Consequently, the Committee has provided additional funds to expand the Arkansas River, Fort Smith, Arkansas, study to examine operational and other navigational improvements along the Arkansas River.

Red River Navigation, Southwest Arkansas.—The Committee has included language in the bill directing the Corps of Engineers to continue feasibility phase studies of extending commercial navigation on the Red River upstream of Shreveport-Bossier City, Lou-

isiana, into southwest Arkansas using funds previously appropriated for the Red River Waterway, Shreveport to Daingerfield, Texas, project.

Arroyo Pasajero, California.—The recommendation includes $650,000 above the budget request to advance by one year completion of preconstruction engineering and design of the Arroyo Pasajero, California, project.

Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided funding in excess of the budget request to accelerate completion of the feasibility phase of the Bolinas Lagoon Ecosystem Restoration, California, project.

City of San Bernardino, California.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems related to groundwater in the City of San Bernardino, California.

Coast of California, Los Angeles County, California.—The Committee has included funds to update a Project Study Plan for the Coast of California Storm and Tidal Wave Study, Los Angeles County, California.

Encinitas, California.—The recommendation includes funds to complete the reconnaissance phase of a shoreline study for the City of Encinitas, California. This study will investigate storm damage protection options for the City of Encinitas, as well as environmental restoration opportunities for the San Elijo Lagoon.

Huntington Beach, Blufftop Park, California.—The Committee has included funding to initiate a feasibility study of the Huntington Beach, Blufftop Park, California, project.

Llagas Creek, California.—The recommendation includes $250,000 to complete a Limited Reevaluation Report and to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Llagas Creek, California, project.

Los Angeles County, California.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of a regional dredged material management plan for contaminated sediments in Los Angeles County, California.

Matilija Dam, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a reconnaissance study related to the potential removal of the Matilija Dam on the Ventura River in the vicinity of Ojai, California.

Newport Bay (LA–3 Site Designation Study), California.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to complete the LA–3 Site Designation Study for Newport Bay, California.

Northern California Streams, Cache Creek, California.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate the feasibility phase of the Northern California Streams, Cache Creek, California, project.

Orange County Coast Beach Erosion, California.—The recommendation includes $500,000 to complete a reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility phase of a shoreline protection project for Orange County, California.

Orange County Special Management Plan, California.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to continue development of a Special Area Management Plan (SAMP) for Orange County, California. The SAMP will be conducted in coordination with the existing California Natural Community Conservation Plan for San Diego and San Juan Creek Watersheds of Orange County.

Pajaro River at Watsonville, California.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to initiate plans and specifications for the Pajaro River at Watsonville, California, project, consisting of levees and channel improvements on the Pajaro River and Corralitos and Salsipuedes Creeks.

Pajaro River Basin Study, California.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of flood protection improvements in the Pajaro River Basin of California, including potential flood damage reduction measures in the community of Morgan Hill.

Pajaro River Mainstem, California.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control improvements to the Pajaro River Mainstem, California, project.

Peninsula Beach, California.—The Committee has included $300,000 to initiate a feasibility study of shoreline protection options for Peninsula Beach in the City of Long Beach, California.

Port of Stockton, California.—The Committee has provided $150,000 above the budget request to expedite completion of the feasibility study for the Port of Stockton, California, project.

Rancho Palos Verdes, California.—The recommendation includes an increase of $200,000 over the budget request to accelerate preconstruction engineering and design of the Rancho Palos Verdes, California, project.

Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 above the budget request for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study. These funds are provided to maintain an optimal schedule and to advance completion of the study by twelve months.

San Antonio Creek, California.—The recommendation includes funds for a reconnaissance study of flood control opportunities along San Antonio Creek, California.

San Clemente Shoreline, California.—The Committee recommendation includes funds for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a reconnaissance study investigating shoreline protection alternatives for San Clemente, California.

San Diego County Shoreline, California.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of the coastal erosion problem of communities in the San Diego region. Among other things, this study should assess the contribution of navigation structures at Camp Pendleton to the regional erosion problem.

San Francisco Bay, California.—The recommendation includes an increase of $600,000 over the budget request to accelerate the feasibility phase of the San Francisco Bay, California, project.

San Gabriel to Newport Bay, California.—The Committee recommendation provides funding for a reconnaissance study of potential modifications to the existing Federal shore protection project along the Orange County, California coastline from the mouth of the San Gabriel River to the entrance of Newport Bay.

San Jacinto River, California.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a reconnaissance study to examine flood control, environmental enhancement and re-

lated purposes along the San Jacinto River, California, between the City of San Jacinto and the City of Lake Elsinore.

San Joaquin River Basin, Corral Hollow Creek, California.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control issues along Corral Hollow Creek, California.

San Joaquin River Basin, Frazier Creek, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance of flooding problems along Frazier Creek in California.

San Joaquin River Basin, Pine Flat Dam, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the San Joaquin River Basin, Pine Flat Dam, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Restoration, California, project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California.—The Committee has included funds above the budget request for the San Joaquin River Basin, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California, project. The additional funds provided by the Committee will advance completion of the feasibility phase of this project by one year.

San Joaquin River Basin, Tuolumne River, California.—The Committee has provided $375,000 for the San Joaquin River Basin, Tuolumne River, California, project. Funding above the budget request is provided to advance completion of this project by twelve months.

San Joaquin River Basin, West Stanislaus County, California.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request to advance by one year completion of the feasibility phase of the San Joaquin River Basin, West Stanislaus County, California, project.

San Luis Obispo County Streams, California.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control and environmental restoration opportunities along the San Luis Obispo County Streams, California.

Santa Margarita River and Tributaries, California.—The Committee has provided $332,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete a feasibility study and initiate preconstruction engineering and design of a flood control project for Murrieta Creek within the Santa Margarita Watershed in California.

Solana Beach, California.—The Committee has provided funds for a reconnaissance study of the shoreline along the City of Solana Beach in San Diego County, California. This study will investigate shore protection improvements for storm damage reduction, environmental restoration and protection, and related purposes.

Southampton Shoal Channel and Extension, California.—The Committee understands that the feasibility study of the Southampton Shoal Channel and Extension, California, project has been suspended. Accordingly, the recommendation does not include the budget request for this project.

Suisun Marsh, California.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate the Suisun Marsh Levee Enhancement and Managed Wetland Protection Program.

Sutter Basin, California.—The recommendation includes $240,000 above the budget request to initiate the feasibility study of the Sutter Basin, California, project.

Tijuana River Environmental Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided an increase of $250,000 above the budget request for the Tijuana River Environmental Restoration, California, project.

Tule River, California.—The Committee has recommended $800,000 for the Tule River, California, project. This level of funding will accelerate preconstruction engineering and design of the project by two years.

White River, Poso, and Deer Creeks, California.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request to complete the reconnaissance phase and continue into the feasibility phase of the White River, Poso, and Deer Creeks, California, project.

Yuba River Basin, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $550,000 above the budget request to advance preconstruction engineering and design of the Yuba River Basin, California, project by two years.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey.—Of the amount provided for the Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey, project, $100,000 is to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Broadkill Beach element; $100,000 is to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Oakwood Beach element; $25,000 is to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Port Mahon element; $200,000 is to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Reeds Beach to Pierces Point element; $200,000 is to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Roosevelt Inlet and Lewes Beach element; and $450,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Villas and Vicinity element.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware.—In addition to the amount included in the budget for the Fenwick Island element of the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware, project, the Committee has provided $349,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Bethany Beach to South Bethany element of the project.

Hillsborough River Basin, Florida.—The Committee recommendation provides funding to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control, environmental restoration and related purposes in the Hillsborough River Basin in Florida.

Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, Florida.—The Committee has included funding for a reconnaissance study of potential interior channel improvements at Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County, Florida.

Mile Point, Jacksonville, Florida.—The Committee recommendation provides funding for a reconnaissance study of erosion and sinkholes along the St. Johns River at Mile Point, Jacksonville, Florida.

Tampa Harbor, Alafia River, Florida.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Tampa River, Alafia River, Florida, project.

Withlacoochee River Basin, Florida.—The Committee recommendation provides funding to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control, environmental restoration and related purposes in the Withlacoochee River Basin in Florida.

Allatoona Lake (Etowah River), Georgia.—The Committee has provided $425,000 to conduct feasibility phase investigations to identify and recommend measures to alleviate shoreline erosion and sedimentation problems, including structural and non-structural solutions, along Lake Allatoona and the Etowah River.

Allatoona Lake (Little River), Georgia.—The recommendation includes $250,000 to conduct a feasibility phase investigation to evaluate environmental problems and recommend environmental restoration measures, including structural and non-structural approaches, for the Little River within Lake Allatoona, Georgia.

Metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia.—The Committee has included funding for three separate reconnaissance studies of flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration in Metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia: Indian, Sugar, Intrenchment and Federal Prison Creeks Watershed, Georgia; Long Island, Marsh, and Johns Creeks, Georgia; and Utoy, Sandy, and Proctor Creeks, Georgia.

Boise River, Idaho.—Funding has been provided to initiate the Boise River, Idaho, reconnaissance study of drainage and flood control issues.

Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, Idaho.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control opportunities along the Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, Idaho.

Little Wood River, Idaho.—The recommendation includes $100,000 to complete a reconnaissance study of the Little Wood River Containment System project in the city of Gooding, Idaho.

Payette County, Idaho.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to complete a reconnaissance study of flood prevention opportunities along the Payette and Snake Rivers in Payette County, Idaho.

Illinois Beach, Illinois.—The Committee recommendation provides funding to complete a feasibility report for shore protection along the Illinois Beach between Zion and Waukegan.

Kankakee River Basin, Illinois and Indiana.—The recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request for the Kankakee River Basin, Illinois and Indiana, project. The Committee reiterates its strong support for this project and urges the Corps to use all reasonable means to assure that the feasibility study is completed on schedule in fiscal year 2001.

Upper Mississippi and Illinois Navigation Study, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—The recommendation provides funds above the budget request for preliminary engineering and design activities for potential lock improvements.

Hammond, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of potential shore protection measures for the vicinity of Hammond, Indiana.

Indiana Harbor, Indiana.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of environmental dredging of Indiana Harbor, Indiana.

Muncie, White River, Indiana.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of flooding issues affecting Muncie, White River, Indiana.

Mississinewa River, Marion, Indiana.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study to evalu-

ate alternative flood damage reduction measures along the Mississinewa River in the vicinity of Marion, Indiana.

St. Joseph River and Spy Run Creek, Indiana.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flooding problems along the St. Joseph River in the vicinity of Leo-Cedarville, Indiana and along Spy Run Creek in the vicinity of Fort Wayne, Indiana. Among other things, this study will assess the potential creation of upstream wetlands to reduce downstream flooding.

Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas and Missouri.—Funding above the budget request is provided to accelerate the completion of preconstruction engineering and design of the Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas and Missouri, project.

Walnut River Basin, Kansas.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control and related water resource issues in the Walnut River Basin, Kansas.

Banklick Creek, Kenton County, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of solutions to flooding and related water resource problems along the Banklick Creek, Kenton County, Kentucky.

Greenup, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided funds to initiate a feasibility study of flooding and other water resource problems in Greenup, Kentucky.

Licking River, Cynthiana, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request to advance completion of the feasibility study of flooding problems along the Licking River in Cynthiana, Kentucky.

Metropolitan Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of ecosystem restoration and related water resource issues in Metropolitan Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky.

Russell, Kentucky.—The Committee recommendation includes funds to initiate a feasibility study of flooding and related water resource issues in Russell, Kentucky.

Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of ecosystem restoration along the Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana.

Calcasieu River Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to initiate a reconnaissance study of flood control and environmental enhancements for the Calcasieu River Basin, Louisiana.

Louisiana Coastal Area, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $1,750,000 to initiate an ecosystem restoration feasibility study of the Louisiana coast. This effort, known as Coast 2050, will comprehensively address critical loss of coastal landscape in Louisiana.

Boston Harbor, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study to evaluate the deepening of the Main Ship, Reserved and Entrance Channels to Boston Harbor, Massachusetts.

Detroit River, Michigan.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of environmental dredging of the Detroit River, Michigan.

Kalamazoo River, Michigan.—The Committee recommendation includes funds for a reconnaissance level study to assess the potential for habitat restoration, ecosystem enhancement, and erosion control along the Kalamazoo River in the vicinity of Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Muskegon Lake, Michigan.—The Committee has included funds for a reconnaissance study of environmental dredging of Muskegon Lake, Michigan.

White Lake, Michigan.—Funding is provided in the recommendation for a reconnaissance study of environmental dredging of White Lake, Michigan.

Upper Mississippi River from Lake Itasca to Lock and Dam 2, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided funding to conduct the reconnaissance phase of a comprehensive watershed study of the Upper Mississippi River Basin from Lake Itasca to Lock and Dam 2 in Hastings, Minnesota.

River des Peres, Missouri.—Funds are included in the recommendation to resume preconstruction engineering and design of the Deer Creek portion of the River des Peres, Missouri, project.

Lower Platte River and Tributaries, Nebraska.—The Committee recommendation includes $600,000 for the Lower Platte River and Tributaries, Nebraska, project. The Committee understands that this project will incorporate actual existing conditions into the baseline for problem identification and analysis. The recommendation includes funding to complete the interim feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the Lake Wanahoo project in Saunders County, Nebraska.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Brigantine Island element of the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Great Egg Harbor to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey.—Funding is included in the recommendation to complete the feasibility study of the Great Egg Harbor to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey and New York.—The Committee has recommended funding for a reconnaissance study of harbor estuary opportunities in the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, New Jersey and New York.

Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes funding for preconstruction engineering and design of the Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point, New Jersey, project.

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided funding to complete the feasibility study of the Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—Of the funds added to the budget request by the Committee for the Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, project, $200,000 is to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Port Monmouth element; $100,000 is to initiate a feasibility study of the Highlands

element; $100,000 is to initiate a feasibility study of the Keyport element; and $150,000 is to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Cliffwood element.

Shrewsbury River and Tributaries, Monmouth County, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate and complete a reconnaissance study of flooding problems and environmental restoration opportunities along the Shrewsbury River and Tributaries, Monmouth County, New Jersey.

Stony Brook, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes $100,000 to fund a reconnaissance study of flooding problems and environmental restoration opportunities along Stony Brook, New Jersey.

Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has included funding to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Clinton County, New York.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control, environmental restoration and related purposes in the Great Chazy and Saranac River Basins and Tributaries in Clinton County, New York.

Ellicott Creek, New York.—The Committee has recommended funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control and environmental restoration opportunities along Ellicott Creek, New York.

Hamlin Beach and Lakeside Beach, New York.—The Committee has provided funding for a watershed and shoreline erosion study of Hamlin Beach and Lakeside Beach, New York.

Hudson River, Hudson, New York.—Funding has been provided for a reconnaissance study of water resource issues along the Hudson River at Hudson, New York. This study is to emphasize navigation and environmental restoration.

Montauk Point, New York.—The recommendation includes funding to continue a feasibility study of erosion control measures to protect Montauk Point, New York.

North Shore of Long Island, New York.—Funds have been included by the Committee to continue the feasibility study of the Asharoken reach of the North Shore of Long Island, New York, project.

Bogue Banks, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided funds for the reconnaissance phase of the Bogue Banks, North Carolina, shore protection project.

Dare County Beaches, North Carolina.—The recommendation includes funding for preconstruction engineering and design of the Dare County Beaches, North Carolina, project.

John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, North Carolina.—The Committee recommendation provides funding for a reconnaissance study to review the existing project for potential ecosystem and operational improvements at the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir, North Carolina.

New River Basin, North Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of the New River Basin, North Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia. This effort will support the American Heritage River Initiative for the New River.

Berlin Lake, Ohio.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to investigate reallocation of reservoir storage at Berlin Lake, Ohio.

Mahoning River, Ohio and Pennsylvania.—The Committee reiterates its support of the Mahoning River, Ohio and Pennsylvania, environmental dredging project and notes that sufficient carryover funding is available to meet project requirements for fiscal year 2000. The Committee is aware that potential local sponsors have been unable to commit to the study requirements due to extreme financial hardships. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to consider application of "ability to pay" provisions of existing law to relieve the financial burden on non-Federal interests and to permit this important project to proceed.

Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir, Ohio.—The Committee recommendation includes $100,000 to investigate reallocation of reservoir storage at Michael J. Kirwan Dam and Reservoir, Ohio.

Mosquito Creek Lake, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to investigate reallocation of reservoir storage at Mosquito Creek Lake, Ohio.

Muskingum Basin System Study, Ohio.—The Committee has provided funds to initiate the Muskingum Basin System Study in Ohio.

Richland County, Ohio.—Funding has been included to initiate a study of flood damage reduction opportunities in Richland County, Ohio.

Cimarron River Basin, Oklahoma and Kansas.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of environmental restoration and flood control opportunities within the Cimarron River Basin in Oklahoma and Kansas.

Southeast Oklahoma, Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided funding for a reconnaissance study of flooding and related water resource issues in Southeast Oklahoma, Oklahoma.

Warr Acres and Bethany, Oklahoma.—The recommendation includes funding for a reconnaissance study of flood control problems and opportunities in Warr Acres and Bethany, Oklahoma.

Willamette River Environmental Dredging, Oregon.—The Committee has recommended funding for a reconnaissance study of environmental dredging of the Willamette River, Oregon.

Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania.—The recommendation includes $300,000 to expedite completion of the feasibility study of flood control options for Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania.

Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York.—The recommendation includes $250,000 for continuation of the Upper Susquehanna River Basin, Pennsylvania and New York, study.

French Broad Watershed, Tennessee.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $200,000 of available fiscal year 1999 funds to initiate a feasibility study for ecosystem restoration, flood control, and related purposes in the French Broad River watershed in Knox, Blount, Jefferson, Sevier, and Cocke counties, Tennessee.

Bois D'Arc Creek, Bonham, Texas.—Funds are included in the recommendation for a reconnaissance study of flooding and related water resource problems along the Bois D'Arc Creek near Bonham, Texas.

Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers, Texas.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for an expanded reconnaissance study of water resource issues within the Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins in Texas.

LaQuinta Channel, Texas.—The recommendation includes $500,000 for an interim feasibility study of the LaQuinta Channel, Texas, to be accomplished separately from the Corpus Christi Ship Channel study. The study will investigate potential extension of the existing project.

Lower Colorado River Basin, Texas.—Funds have been provided to expand the Onion Creek, Texas, feasibility study to comprehend water resource issues in the Lower Colorado River Basin in Texas.

North Padre Island, Corpus Christi, Texas.—The recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request for continued investigation of the North Padre Island, Corpus Christi, Texas, project.

Raymondville Drain, Texas.—Funding above the budget request has been included to accelerate the Raymondville Drain, Texas, project.

Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay, Texas.—The recommendation includes funding for an expedited reconnaissance study of coastal erosion problems along the Texas coastline from Sabine Pass to Galveston Bay.

Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The recommendation of the Committee provides $1,195,000 for the Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas, project. Funds above the budget request are provided to expedite completion of the Dallas Floodway study and to initiate a feasibility study of the Trinity River Environmental Enhancement/ Fort Worth Floodway component of the project.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $245,000 to continue investigations associated with the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia, project.

Bellingham Bay, Washington.—The recommendation provides $100,000 for a reconnaissance study to evaluate navigation improvements and ecosystem restoration in the estuary and watershed at Bellingham Bay in Whatcom County, Washington. In conducting this study, the Corps shall consider information generated by the Bellingham Bay Demonstration Pilot Project.

Centralia, Washington.—The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request to continue preconstruction engineering and design efforts associated with the Centralia, Washington, project in western Lewis County, Washington.

Chehalis River Basin, Washington.—The Committee has recommended funding for a reconnaissance study of flood damage prevention and ecosystem restoration opportunities within the Chehalis River Basin, Washington.

Howard Hanson Dam, Washington.—The recommendation includes $3,000,000 to accelerate preconstruction engineering and design of the additional storage project at Howard Hanson Dam, Washington.

Lake Washington Ship Canal, Washington.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request to expedite the feasibility study of the Lake Washington Ship Canal, Washington, project.

Ocean Shores, Washington.—The Committee has provided funding to initiate a feasibility study of storm damage reduction alternatives for the City of Ocean Shores in Grays Harbor County, Washington.

Puget Sound Nearshore Marine Habitat, Washington.—Funds have been included to initiate the Puget Sound Nearshore Marine Habitat Restoration, Washington, study.

Skokomish River Basin, Washington.—The Committee recommendation includes full funding of the budget request for the Skokomish River Basin, Washington, project. The Committee directs that this feasibility study take into account the values of both flood reduction and ecosystem restoration.

Island Creek at Logan, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to continue design and related activities associated with the Island Creek at Logan, West Virginia, project.

Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to complete a Limited Reevaluation Report for the Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia, project.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The recommendation includes $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of a potential environmental dredging project at Fox River, Wisconsin.

Flood Plain Management Services.—Of the amount provided for the Flood Plain Management Services program, $100,000 is to complete Phase IV of the Nassau River, Florida, Comprehensive Floodplain Management Study. $150,000 is for completion of cross section surveys and analysis of the hydrology and hydraulics of the Yellowstone River in the Glendive area to provide current flood plain information.

Great Lakes Remedial Action Program.—The Committee has added funds to continue the provision of technical assistance in areas of concern through the Great Lakes Remedial Action Program.

Other Coordination Programs.—The recommendation for Other Coordination Progams includes the full amount of the budget request for the Chesapeake Bay Program.

Planning Assistance to States.—The Committee is aware that channel shifting of the Yellowstone River in Montana has left the Laurel water supply intake unreliable. The Committee notes that the Corps of Engineers is scheduled to complete a Section 22 study of this problem in fiscal year 1999. The Committee urges the Corps to continue its cooperation with the City of Laurel in order to address this problem.

Of the amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program, $100,000 is for technical assistance associated with water resource development in Lewis and Lawrence Counties, Tennessee.

Research and Development.—Of the amount provided for Research and Development, $1,250,000 is for the National Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1999	$1,464,885,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	1,239,900,000
Recommended, 2000	1,412,591,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−52,294,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+172,691,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	18,900	3,000	3,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	305,568	700	700
	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL & MS	---	---	1,730
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	37,000	750	750
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	30,800	3,600	3,600
	ALASKA			
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	5,589	4,357	4,357
(N)	COOK INLET, AK	9,450	500	500
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	18,000	2,568	2,568
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	14,349	500	500
	ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ	16,100	645	645
	ARKANSAS			
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	29,700	11,964	11,964
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	632,500	3,080	3,080
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000	20,000	45,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR & TX	---	---	4,000
	RED RIVER WATERWAY (INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX)	---	---	275
	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO NEWPORT, AR	---	---	1,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED (NATOMAS), CA	34,210	4,000	4,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	47,600	17,000	17,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	43,800	500	500
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	78,500	5,000	5,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	12,300	3,200	---
	IMPERIAL BEACH (SILVER STRAND SHORELINE), CA	---	---	351
	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	---	---	2,500
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	150,000	30,000	50,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CA	116,200	9,785	4,785
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,660	2,317	2,317
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	32,260	300	300
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800	500	500
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	14,900	4,000	4,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	91,000	4,500	4,500
	NORCO BLUFFS, CA	8,025	---	2,200
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900	7,000	7,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	16,550	3,000	6,000
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	13,230	4,800	4,800
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	896,000	20,000	28,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,360	4,960	4,960
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA	36,000	14,800	16,195
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	30,900	1,250	1,250
	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CA	---	---	400
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,640	3,055	3,055
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	24,700	7,700	7,700
	DELAWARE			
	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND	---	---	325
(BE)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	11,800	259	259
	FLORIDA			
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	21,479	---	5,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL	6,600	830	830
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	124,470	2,750	2,750
	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	---	---	3,900
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	2,586,300	52,300	52,300
(BE)	DADE COUNTY, FL	163,300	2,000	5,000
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	75,000	21,100	21,100
	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL	28,000	---	1,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	35,600	6,000	6,000
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	243,500	39,800	28,100
	LAKE WORTH INLET SAND TRANSFER PLANT, FL	4,500	---	1,000
	LEE COUNTY, FL	---	---	350
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	19,885	4,700	4,700
	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	---	---	250
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	47,566	15,000	15,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	18,700	3,000	7,000
	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	---	---	250
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	144,600	2,000	2,000
	TAMPA HARBOR (YBOR CHANNEL), FL	---	---	3,200
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,900	3,650	3,650
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	20,800	1,500	1,500
	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA	---	---	200
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	619,521	8,500	8,500
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700	8,000	8,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	14,297	219	219
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	4,997	75	75
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	11,329	272	272
	ILLINOIS			
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	24,500	1,600	2,100
(E)	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL	2,000	100	300
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	169,600	7,629	13,129
	DES PLAINES WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION, IL	---	---	1,075
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	32,335	2,000	2,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL, IL	---	---	488
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISS RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REHABILITA	63,400	5,044	5,044
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	25,900	4,456	4,456
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	22,500	3,888	3,888
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	489,000	2,500	4,500
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	740,700	2,900	2,900
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	1,020,000	28,634	28,634
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MO, MN	242,862	18,955	18,955
	INDIANA			
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	37,021	4,000	4,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	39,975	---	10,991
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	40
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	131,000	3,900	9,400
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,200	2,000	2,000
	WHITE RIVER, INDIANAPOLIS (NORTH), IN	---	---	500
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)..	15,500	2,600	2,600
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 14, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)..	20,000	4,092	4,092
(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	81,400	5,000	10,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	139,193	3,000	3,000
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND, IA	6,820	2,500	2,500
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	42,580	9,500	9,500
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	27,400	4,300	4,300
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS	6,600	154	154
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	159,799	1,450	1,450
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	13,700	2,500	2,500
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	533,000	7,750	15,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	268,000	2,800	10,800
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	12,115	3,251	3,251
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	---	2,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA	7,078	581	581
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	82,700	4,000	4,000
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	533,000	13,000	15,900
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	520,000	11,887	16,000
	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORMWATER DISCHARGE, LA	---	---	500
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,000	2,000	2,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	171,000	1,500	1,500
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	171,000	1,400	2,000
(N)	PORT FOURCHON, LA	2,557	2,184	2,184
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	1,895,691	21,113	23,600
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	374,000	47,066	47,066
(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	192,000	7,000	15,070
	MARYLAND			
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	12,000	4,031	4,031
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	270,300	200	200
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (BREWERTON CHANNEL), MD.	44,521	9,578	9,578
	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENVIRON RESTOR AND PROT, MD, VA, & PA	---	---	340
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD	2,500	559	559
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000	9,502	16,000
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA	12,150	1,000	1,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	30,500	5,000	5,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	18,600	3,257	3,257
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	30,600	1,500	1,500
	MINNESOTA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	15,400	3,200	3,200
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	7,850	2,275	2,275
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	9,820	3,390	3,390
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, STILLWATER, MN	8,700	---	1,158
	MISSISSIPPI			
	JACKSON COUNTY, MS	---	---	800
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	39,041	7,792	7,792
	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS AND BAYOU PORTAGE, MS	---	---	1,000
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	211,000	13,700	13,700
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	36,293	1,900	1,900
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	28,030	3,500	3,500
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	274,000	3,000	3,000
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	36,100	7,000	7,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200	13,000	13,000
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000	300	300
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	10,000	100	100
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	208,500	20,100	20,100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	NEW JERSEY			
	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	7,000
(BE)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	87,700	1,700	1,700
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	214,000	16,500	16,500
(BE)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	358,800	419	419
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	72,100	2,000	2,000
(E)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	18,300	1,800	1,800
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	8,000
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	11,240	1,300	1,300
	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ	---	---	200
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	286,000	1,000	1,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	979,000	9,000	9,000
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000	1,500	1,500
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	41,400	700	700
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600	2,400	2,400
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	46,800	600	600
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	62,300	600	600
	NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	91,000	300	300
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	63,000	3,320	3,320
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	532,000	3,000	3,000
(BE)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	571,400	3,250	5,250
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	823,300	60,000	40,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY&NJ	136,000	---	1,000
	NEW YORK STATE CANAL SYSTEM, NY	---	---	4,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	70,700	7,000	7,000
	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	---	200
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	247,100	18,300	18,300
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	40,000	5,000	---
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	29,000	10,000	---
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	37,100	6,500	6,500
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	175,900	10,000	10,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	16,000	3,000	3,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	7,800	500	500
	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND (BALDHILL POOL RAISE)	---	---	1,700
	OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,500	1,400	1,400
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	13,035	2,266	2,266
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000	915	915
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	91,700	8,000	16,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	9,800	500	500
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	37,900	6,800	6,800
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	104,600	10,800	10,800
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	73,966	6,368	6,368
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	174,000	500	180
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	28,000	262	262
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	70,600	1,700	1,700
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,664	6,800	6,800
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000	21,600	53,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	58,085	520	520
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,576	3,500	3,500
	SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	---	3,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,300	20,000	20,000
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,500	2,500	2,500
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	430,300	5,434	5,434
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	63,300	1,000	1,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	321,000	9,566	10,566
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	24,100	8,000	8,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	98,444	37,284	37,284

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	---	---	2,200
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	108,000	2,000	---
(MP)	PIERRE, SD	100,000	10,000	10,000
	TENNESSEE			
	BLACK FOX, MURFREE SPRINGS, AND OAKLAND WETLANDS, TN	5,845	---	2,000
	TENNESSEE RIVER, HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	6,669	---	1,500
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	293,010	9,800	9,800
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	26,820	8,700	8,700
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX	75,830	3,200	3,200
	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX	---	---	4,569
(FC)	EL PASO, TX	116,300	6,200	6,200
(N)	GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	20,660	9,000	9,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	415,543	60,000	60,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	41,895	2,000	2,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	153,100	610	610
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	214,320	18,300	18,300
	WALLISVILLE SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	---	---	4,756
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	23,100	3,000	3,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	59,600	1,400	1,400
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	137,496	550	550
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	28,800	1,197	1,197
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	247,300	---	22,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	---	---	1,400
	WASHINGTON			
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	1,376,330	100,000	65,000
(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000	1,300	---
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	195,800	540	540
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	94,000	2,300	2,300
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	107,300	750	750
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,837,841	5,400	20,750
(M)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	20,300	600	600
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	294,000	9,600	11,350
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	363,474	7,150	7,150
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	---	2,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	7,500	2,900	2,900
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA	---	---	2,600
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	226,900	1,400	1,400
	WISCONSIN			
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	17,000	---	3,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	---	3,000	2,000
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	---	4,500	4,500
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	2,500	2,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	---	1,000	350
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	---	20,000	6,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	---	8,500	5,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	---	19,554	19,554
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	---	26,900	35,800
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE	---	45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE	---	185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111)	---	500	100
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)	---	4,500	7,500
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	8,500	8,500
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA	---	25,000	---
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208)	---	100	100
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SIPPAGE, AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	---	-211,789	-211,789
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL		1,239,900	1,412,591

Tennessee-Tombigbee Wildlife Mitigation, Alabama and Mississippi.—The bill includes sufficient funding to complete land acquisition in satisfaction of wildlife mitigation requirements associated with the Tennessee-Tombigbee, Alabama and Mississippi, project.

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $45,000,000 to advance completion of the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas, project by one year.

Red River Basin Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Texas.—The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for the Red River Basin Emergency Bank Protection, Texas and Arkansas, project.

Red River Waterway (Index, Arkansas to Denison Dam, Texas).—Funding has been added by the Committee to the Red River Waterway (Index, Arkansas to Denison Dam, Texas) project for Phase II of the Sediment Transportation Study.

White River Navigation to Newport, Arkansas.—The recommendation includes $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the White River Navigation to Newport, Arkansas, project.

Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California.—In the past three fiscal years, Congress has appropriated $14,500,000 for construction of the Humboldt Harbor and Bay, California, project. The total estimated Federal cost of this project is only $12,300,000, and yet the Administration has requested additional funding for fiscal year 2000. The Corps of Engineers is directed to use funds previously appropriated for this project to fund any remaining project requirements in fiscal year 2000.

Imperial Beach (Silver Strand Shoreline), California.—The recommendation includes funding to complete the General Re-evaluation Report on the Imperial Beach (Silver Strand Shoreline), California, project.

Kaweah River, California.—The Committee has provided $2,500,000 to initiate construction of the Kaweah River, California, project.

Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California.—The Committee has included in its recommendation $50,000,000 for the Los Angeles County Drainage Area, California, project. Despite the Administration's use of the LACDA project to illustrate the costs of project delay, it has once again failed to budget adequately for this project. The Committee's recommendation maintains the optimum construction schedule for the project and will advance completion of the overall project by one year.

Los Angeles Harbor, California.—The recommendation includes $4,785,000 to fully fund fiscal year 2000 project requirements for the Los Angeles Harbor, California, project. This amount has been reduced from the budget request due to reprogramming actions completed in fiscal year 1999.

Napa River, California.—The Committee recommends the full amount of the budget request to initiate the Napa River, California, project.

Norco Bluffs, California.—The Committee has provided $2,200,000 to complete the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, California.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000, double the budget request, for the Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District,

California, project. This level of funding will advance completion of the gradient restoration facility by six months. The Committee recognizes that this project is an important component of the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District fish protection program being implemented by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation and urges the continued cooperative efforts of these two agencies.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The recommendation includes $28,000,000 for the Santa Ana River Mainstem, California, project. Of this amount, $5,000,000 is to initiate construction of the Prado Dam element of the project. The Committee remains fully supportive of the San Timoteo Creek feature of the project and understands that sufficient funding is available to ensure its completion on an optimum schedule.

Santa Paula Creek, California.—Funding above the budget request has been added to accelerate completion of the Santa Paula Creek, California, project.

Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach, California.—The Committee has provided funding for stage 11 of the Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach, California, project.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate construction of the Rehobeth Beach to Dewey Beach element of the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Delaware, project.

Brevard County, Florida.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 to initiate construction of the Brevard County, Florida, project.

Cedar Hammock, Wares Creek, Florida.—The Committee has recommended $3,000,000 for construction of the channel improvement project at Cedar Hammock, Wares Creek, Florida.

Dade County, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes an addition of $3,000,000 above the budget request for the Dade County, Florida, project.

Fort Pierce Beach, Florida.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 for the Fort Pierce Beach, Florida, project.

Kissimmee River, Florida.—The recommendation provides $28,100,000 to fully fund fiscal year 2000 program requirements for the Kissimmee River, Florida, project.

Lake Worth Sand Transfer Plant, Florida.—The recommendation provides $1,000,000 for construction of the Lake Worth Inlet Sand Transfer Plant, Florida.

Lee County, Florida.—The recommendation includes $350,000 to complete remaining work on the general reevaluation report on Estero and Gasparilla Islands in Lee County, Florida. Funds are also to be used to complete plans and specifications for the project and to execute a project cooperation agreement with local sponsors.

Martin County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to prepare plans and specifications for the initial renourishment of the Martin County, Florida, project.

Palm Valley Bridge, Florida.—The Committee has added $4,000,000 to the budget request to accelerate completion of the Palm Valley Bridge, Florida, project.

Panama City Beaches, Florida.—The Corps is directed to credit toward the non-Federal share of the project cost the cost of any

work performed by non-Federal interests on the Panama City Beaches, Florida, project, subsequent to project authorization, to the extent the Secretary determines that work to be compatible with, and integral to, the project.

Panama City Harbor, Florida.—Funding is included in the recommendation to initiate the expansion project at Panama City Harbor, Florida.

Tampa Harbor (Ybor Channel), Florida.—The Committee has provided $3,200,000 to initiate and complete a project to widen the Ybor Channel Turning Basin at Tampa Harbor, Florida.

Lower Savannah River Basin, Georgia.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate real estate acquisition associated with the Lower Savannah River Basin, Georgia, project.

Chain of Rocks Canal, Mississippi River, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $2,100,000, an increase of $500,000 over the budget request, to advance work on the Chain of Rocks Canal, Mississippi River, Illinois, deficiency correction project.

Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $300,000, trebling the budget request, for the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier, Illinois, project.

Chicago Shoreline, Illinois.—The recommendation includes $13,129,000, an increase of $5,500,000 over the budget request, to expedite the Chicago Shoreline, Illinois, project.

Des Plaines River, Wetlands Demonstration, Illinois.—The Committee has included in its recommendation $1,075,000 to initiate work on additional demonstrations as part of the Des Plaines River, Wetlands Demonstration, Illinois, project.

East St. Louis Interior Flood Control, Illinois.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to complete the general reevaluation report on the East St. Louis Interior Flood Control, Illinois, project.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request to accelerate construction of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, project.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The recommendation includes $10,991,000 to advance completion of the Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, project.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The recommendation includes funding for continued monitoring of the Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana, project.

Little Calumet River, Indiana.—$5,500,000 above the budget request has been provided for the Little Calumet River, Indiana, project. The Committee directs that the value of flowage easements acquired in the East Reach Remediation Area be credited toward the non-Federal share of the project cost, to the extent the Secretary determines that acquisition of the easements is compatible with, and integral to, the project.

White River, Indianapolis (North), Indiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate construction of the White River, Indianapolis (North), Indiana, project.

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000

over the budget request for the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Mitigation, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, project.

Perry Creek, Iowa.—The recommendation includes $9,500,000, the full amount of the budget request for the Perry Creek, Iowa, project.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky.—The recommendation provides an increase of $7,250,000 over the budget request to accelerate completion of the Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky, project.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky and Indiana.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 above the budget request to advance the schedule for completion of the McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky and Indiana, project.

Salyersville, Kentucky.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to use any available excess funds previously appropriated for the Salyersville, Kentucky, project to provide additional flood control damage reduction measures (such as snagging and clearing along Burning Fork, State Road Fork and the Licking River) in conjunction with local interests.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes $2,000,000 for the Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, project.

Comite River, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 to initiate construction contracts and continue construction of the Comite River Diversion project, as authorized by Section 101(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 and modified by Section 301(b)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes an increase of $2,900,000 above the budget request for the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock, Louisiana, project. The Committee is aware of the community impacts and disturbances that will be endured by the local residents during the lengthy construction period of the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal Lock replacement project. Therefore, the recommendation includes the full amount requested to implement the community impact mitigation plan associated with the project, as authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana.—Additional funds above the budget request have been included for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, project.

Lake Pontchartrain Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana.—The recommendation adds funding to continue the Lake Pontchartrain Stormwater Discharge, Louisiana, project.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request for the Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana, hurricane protection project. The Committee recognizes that life-threatening situations have occurred several times by the closure of the Golden Meadow floodgates to protect its "interior" citizens from storm surges. While it supports the use and operation of this flood control system, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite, to the fullest extent possible, the completion of the Post Authorization Change

with a recommendation on allowing the unimpeded passage of mariners seeking safe harbor north of the floodgates on Bayou Lafourche.

New Orleans to Venice, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee has provided an additional $600,000 above the budget request to continue construction of the New Orleans to Venice, Louisiana, hurricane protection project.

Port Fourchon, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes $2,184,000 to initiate construction of the Port Fourchon, Louisiana, navigation project.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes additional funds to accelerate completion of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project. Of the total amount recommended for this project, $2,487,000 is provided to accelerate construction contracts for the Cognac and Poisson Revetments. Additionally, the Corps is directed to use up to $1,000,000 to reinforce the Cupples Landing Revetment.

West Bank, Vicinity of New Orleans, Louisiana (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee recommendation includes additional funding to continue construction of the West Bank, Vicinity of New Orleans, Louisiana, hurricane protection project.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels (Brewerton Channel), Maryland.—The recommendation includes $9,578,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the Baltimore Harbor and Channels (Brewerton Channel), Maryland.

Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection, Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania.—Funds provided for the Chesapeake Bay Environmental Restoration and Protection, Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania, project are for oyster bed restoration at Rappahannock, Virginia.

Poplar Island, Maryland.—The recommendation includes $16,000,000 to accelerate completion of the Poplar Island, Maryland, project.

St. Croix River, Stillwater, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $1,158,000 to complete the St. Croix River, Stillwater, Minnesota, project.

Jackson County, Mississippi.—The recommendation includes $800,000 for the Jackson County, Mississippi, project.

Wolf and Jordan Rivers and Bayou Portage, Mississippi.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Wolf and Jordan Rivers and Bayou Portage, Mississippi, project.

Brigatine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes $7,000,000 to initiate construction of the Absecon Island element of the Brigatine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Passaic River Streambank Restoration, New Jersey.—The Committee has included in its recommendation $8,000,000 for continuation of the Passaic River Streambank Restoration, New Jersey, project.

Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey.—The recommendation includes $200,000 to complete the review report on the Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, project.

Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York.—The Committee has provided full funding for the Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York, project. The Committee understands that the amount provided is sufficient to complete a full nourishment cycle in fiscal year 2000.

Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York.—Of the additional funding above the budget request provided for the Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York, project, $1,500,000 is for construction of the west of Shinnecock Inlet project, and $500,000 is for activities associated with the Fire Island Interim Plan.

Kill van Kull and Newark Bay Channel, New York and New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000 to fully fund fiscal year 2000 project requirements for the Kill van Kull and Newark Bay Channel, New York and New Jersey, project. This amount is reduced from the budget request due to favorable construction bids received by the Corps of Engineers.

Long Beach Island, New York.—The Committee remains fully supportive of the Long Beach Island, New York, project and understands that sufficient carryover funding is available to satisfy program requirements for fiscal year 2000.

New York City Watershed, New York.—The Committee understands that sufficient prior year appropriations are available to meet New York City Watershed, New York, project requirements in fiscal year 2000.

New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York.—The Committee has provided fiscal year 2000 funding for the New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York, project.

New York State Canal System, New York.—The recommendation includes $4,000,000 to continue the New York State Canal System, New York, project.

Orchard Beach, New York.—The Committee understands that sufficient funding will be carried over into fiscal year 2000 to satisfy fiscal year 2000 project requirements for the Orchard Beach, New York, project.

Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate construction of the Ocean Isle Beach element of the Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina, project.

Grand Forks, North Dakota—East Grand Forks, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 to initiate construction of the Grand Forks, North Dakota—East Grand Forks, Minnesota, project.

Sheyenne River, North Dakota (Baldhill Pool Raise).—The recommendation includes $1,700,000 to initiate construction of the Sheyenne River, North Dakota (Baldhill Pool Raise), project.

Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio.—The Committee understands that sufficient carryover funding is available in fiscal year 2000 to continue the development of plans and specifications for the Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio, project.

West Columbus, Ohio.—The recommendation has provided an additional $8,000,000 over the budget request to maintain the optimum completion schedule for the West Columbus, Ohio, project.

Elk Creek Lake, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $180,000 for the Elk Creek Lake, Oregon, project. These funds, along with

funds previously appropriated for the project, are available to plan and implement long term management measures at Elk Creek Dam, to maintain the project in an uncompleted state, and to take necessary steps to provide for trap and haul transport around the project.

Willamette River Temperature Control, Oregon.—The Committee has provided $1,700,000 to initiate construction of the Willamette River Temperature Control, Oregon, project.

Lock and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has added $31,400,000 to the budget request to maintain the optimum construction schedule for the Lock and Dams 2, 3, and 4, Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, project.

Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.—The recommendation includes $3,000,000 to continue the Southeastern Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, project.

Rio Puerto Nuevo, Puerto Rico.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 above the budget request to maintain the optimum construction schedule for the Rio Puerto Nuevo, Puerto Rico, project.

Charleston Harbor, South Carolina (Deepening and Widening).—The recommendation includes $37,284,000 for the Charleston Harbor, South Carolina, deepening and widening project.

Big Sioux River, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided $2,200,000 to initiate construction of the Big Sioux River, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, project.

Pierre, South Dakota.—The Committee has recommended $10,000,000 for continuation of the Pierre, South Dakota, project.

Black Fox, Murfree and Oakland Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The recommendation includes final year funding of $2,000,000 for the Black Fox, Murfree and Oakland Springs Wetlands, Tennessee, project. These funds are to be applied only toward continued construction of wetland restoration sites.

Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee.—The Committee has included in its recommendation $1,500,000 for continued construction of the Tennessee River, Hamilton County, Tennessee, project.

Cypress Creek, Houston, Texas.—The recommendation includes $4,569,000 to initiate the Cypress Creek, Houston, Texas, project.

Neches River and Tributaries Saltwater Barrier, Texas.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Neches River and Tributaries Saltwater Barrier, Texas, project.

Wallisville Saltwater Barrier, Texas.—The Committee has provided $4,756,000 to complete construction of the Wallisville Saltwater Barrier, Texas, project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia.—The recommendation includes $22,000,000 to continue the Virginia Beach, Virginia, hurricane protection project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Reimbursement).—The Committee has provided funds to reimburse the City of Virginia Beach, Virginia for an annual cycle of beach nourishment.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon and Idaho.—The recommendation for the Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon and Idaho, project includes a reduction of $5,600,000 from the mitigation analysis budget. Funds are not to be expended for phase II of the lower John Day drawdown study

or for any investigation of drawdown from the McNary Lock and Dam without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

Mount St. Helens Sediment Control, Washington.—The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request for the Mount St. Helens Sediment Control, Washington, project. The Committee recognizes that additional studies are required to predict whether operation of the spillway in the Sediment Retention Structure will result in a change in downstream dispositions with potential impacts on the resultant level of flood protection. The Corps of Engineers is directed, using the latest hydrology data available, to maintain levels of protection not less than those described in the October 1985 Decision Document (the basis for the project cost-sharing agreement with the non-Federal sponsors) and authorized in Public Law 99–88.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big and Sandy Rivers and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky.—Of the amount above the budget request included in the recommendation for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big and Sandy Rivers and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky, project, funds are provided for the following elements in the amounts specified: $4,500,000 for Harlan/Clover Fork, Kentucky; $5,000,000 for Middlesboro, Kentucky; $1,600,000 for Pike County, Kentucky, including $500,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Tug Fork; $900,000 for Martin County, Kentucky; $500,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky; $750,000 for initiation of a Detailed Project Report for Bell County, Kentucky; $800,000 for completion of a Detailed Project Report for Buchanan County, Virginia; $700,000 for a Detailed Project Report for Dickenson County, Virginia; and $600,000 for engineering and design of the Haysi Dam, Virginia, feature.

Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, West Virginia.—The recommendation includes an amount of funding in excess of the budget request sufficient to maintain the optimum construction schedule for the Marmet Lock, Kanawha River, West Virginia, project.

Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure, West Virginia.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 for the Southern West Virginia Environmental Infrastructure, West Virginia, project.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has added $2,600,000 for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania, project.

LaFarge Lake, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin.—The recommendation includes $3,000,000 for authorized reimbursements associated with the LaFarge Lake, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, project.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Of the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control Program, $100,000 is for the control of hydrilla in the Potomac River and its tributaries in Virginia, Maryland, and Washington, D.C.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorizes the Corps of Engineers to carry out aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects if the Secretary of the Army determines that such projects

will improve the quality of the environment, are in the public interest, and are cost-effective. The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request for the Section 206 program. Within the funds provided, the recommendation includes: $100,000 for the Huntsville, Madison County, Alabama, project; $1,481,000 for the Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration, California, project; $10,000 for a project restoration plan for the remediation of a contaminated backwater of Lake Natoma, California; $600,000 for the Santa Anita Creek Ecosystem Restoration, California, project; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study of erosion impacts on a lagoon system at Chicago Botanical Gardens, Illinois; $123,000 to initiate an ecosystem restoration report for the Wabash River Environmental Restoration, West Lafayette, Indiana, project; $60,000 for the Rivers South Wetland Restoration, St. Louis County, Missouri, project at LeMay, Missouri; $160,000 for the Little Sugar Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, North Carolina, project; $59,000 for the Clatskanie River, Oregon, project; $200,000 for the Springfield Millrace, Oregon, project; $200,000 for the Hughes Borehole Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Pennsylvania, project in the Upper Conemaugh River Basin, Cambria County, Pennsylvania; $1,000,000 for the Upper Jordan River Restoration, Utah, project; $250,000 for the West Jordan, Utah, project; and $150,000 to conduct evaluations at each of two sites within the Green River Early Action, King County, Washington, project.

The Committee remains fully supportive of the Nine Mile Run habitat restoration demonstration program in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania and understands that previous appropriations are sufficient to meet project requirements in fiscal year 2000. The Committee supports the proposed Hayden Diversion Project on the Yampa River in Colorado, because it will alleviate the agricultural need for temporary diversion structures, which are harmful to the river ecosystem. The Corps of Engineers is encouraged to determine this project's eligibility for Section 206 funding, and if warranted, to participate in this project with state and local agencies and the Natural Resource Conservation Service. The Committee also urges funding of the Upper Rogue Basin, Oregon, project.

The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to complete the Ecosystem Restoration Report and initiate plans and specifications for the Koontz Lake, Indiana, project within available funds. In addition, the Secretary of the Army shall allow credit toward the costs of the Koontz Lake, Indiana, project for the design and implementation of aquatic ecosystem measures by the non-Federal sponsor accomplished prior to the execution of the project cooperation agreement, to the extent the Secretary determines such work to be compatible with, and integral to, the project.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided level funding for the Section 204 program. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to emphasize projects that use dredged materials to recreate habitat, such as those at Duluth Harbor, Minnesota and the Cat Island Chain, Wisconsin.

Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program.—Of the amount recommended for the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities Program, $4,000,000 is to complete design and initiate construction ac-

tivities associated with the development of a confined disposal facility at Indiana Harbor and Canal, Indiana.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Within the funds provided, the recommendation includes: $40,000 for planning and design analysis of bank stabilization requirements at Chicago Botanical Gardens, Illinois; $825,000 for the Russell, Kentucky, project; $300,000 for the Greenup, Kentucky, project; $100,000 for a shoreline protection project at Muskegon, Michigan; $534,000 for the City of Escanaba, Delta County, Michigan, project; $635,000 for the Coulson Park Landfill, Billings, Montana, project; $40,000 for the Poughkeepskie, New York, project; $1,000,000 for the Swannanoa River, Buncombe County, North Carolina, project; $40,000 for bank stabilization work only at Athens County, Ohio; and $90,000 for a project along the east bank of the Fox River in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided funding in excess of the budget request for the Section 205 program. Within the funds provided, the recommendation includes: $200,000 for the Big Nance Creek, Lawrence County, Alabama, project; $300,000 for the Dallas Branch and Pinhook Creek, Huntsville, Alabama, project; $400,000 for the City of Folsom, Humbug and Willow Creek, California, project; $100,000 for the Fox Field Industrial Corridor, California, project; $300,000 for the Hamilton City, California, project; $1,700,000 for the Magpie Creek, Sacramento, California, project; $100,000 for the Mare Island, California, project; $100,000 for the Tehama, California, project; $50,000 for the Farm River, North Branford, Connecticut, project; $20,000 for the Goodwin Brook, East Hartford, Connecticut, project; $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of a flood control project at Plant City, Florida; $100,000 for the Coeur d'Alene River at Cataldo, Idaho, project; $175,000 for the St. Joe River at St. Maries, Idaho, project; $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Calumet Park, Illinois, project; $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Chicago Heights, Thorn Creek, Illinois, project; $100,000 for a reconnaissance study of the Flossmoor, Butterfield Creek, Illinois, project; $200,000 for the Oak Forest and Midlothian (Natalie Creek), Illinois, project; $640,000 for the Stony Creek, Illinois, project; $150,000 for the Tinley Park/Hickory Creek, Illinois, project; $318,000 to complete construction of the Flatrock River, Rushville, Indiana, project; $25,000 for the Pipe Creek, Alexandria, Indiana, project; $150,000 for the Pleasant Creek, Greenwood, Indiana, project; $100,000 for the White River, Anderson, Indiana, project; $100,000 for the Frankfort, Jones Run Pump Station, Kentucky, project; $75,000 for a flood damage reduction study of the Yellowstone River in the vicinity of Glendive Montana; $175,000 for the Mill Brook, Highland Park, New Jersey, project; $200,000 for the Poplar Brook, Monmouth County, New Jersey, project; $300,000 for the Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, project; $100,000 for the Vinton, Gallia County, Ohio, project; $100,000 for the Mill Creek, Bristol Township, Pennsylvania, project; $100,000 for the Southampton Creek, Upper Southampton Township, Pennsylvania, project; $75,000 for the Tawney Run Creek, Pennsylvania, project; $175,000 for the Bailey Fork, Paris, Henry County,

Tennessee, project; $200,000 for the Cane Creek, Camden, Benton County, Tennessee, project; $50,000 for the Finley, Tennessee, project; $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study of flooding problems in Gates and Halls, Tennessee; $150,000 for the Mountain City, Johnson County, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for the Town Creek, Lenoir City, Tennessee, project; $100,000 for the Big Moccasin and Little Moccasin Creeks, Gate City, Scott County, Virginia, project; $200,000 for the Snoqualmie River at North Bend, Washington, project; and $1,900,000 for the Snoqualmie River at Snoqualmie, King County, Washington, project.

The Committee is aware of the ongoing development of the Lone Star Water Management, Arkansas, project and encourages the Corps of Engineers to give careful consideration to funding this project from the Section 205 program. The Corps is directed to proceed with the North Little Rock, Arkansas (Dark Hollow), project within available funds. The Committee directs the Corps to proceed with the Novato Creek Tributary (Rush Creek), California, project, subject to a determination that the project satisfies all Section 205 program requirements. The Committee directs the Corps to proceed with the Deer Creek, Illinois, project with funds provided to this program. The Committee directs the Corps to proceed with the Muddy River, Boston, Massachusetts, project, subject to a determination that the project satisfies all Section 205 program requirements. The Committee also directs the Corps to proceed with the Mill Creek, The Dalles, Oregon, project within available funds

Navigation Mitigation Projects (Section 111).—The Committee remains fully supportive of the Ogden Dunes, Indiana, project and understands that sufficient funds to complete a study of this project will be carried over into fiscal year 2000

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $7,500,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the Section 107 program. Within the funds provided, the recommendation includes: $200,000 for the Yellow Bend Port, Arkansas, project; $400,000 for the Port of Hueneme, California, project; $869,000 for the Intracoastal Waterway, Palm Beach County, Florida (Palm Beach Harbor), project; $50,000 for the Westport, Massachusetts, project; $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Duluth (McQuade Road) Harbor, Minnesota, project; $94,000 to complete plans and specifications for the New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, project; $90,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Pemiscot County Harbor, Missouri, project; $200,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Buffalo Inner Harbor, New York, project; $175,000 for navigation improvements in Rochester Harbor, New York; and $200,000 for the Clarksville Public Port, Montgomery County, Tennessee, project.

The Committee is supportive of a small navigation project at the Port of Morrow, Oregon and directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project within available funds.

Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $8,500,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the funds provided, the recommendation includes: $4,250,000 for the Tucson (Ajo) Detention Basin Wetlands Development, Arizona, project; $490,000 to complete the Playa del Rey Wetlands (Ballona) Restoration, California,

project; $500,000 for the Colusa Basin Wetlands Restoration, California, project; $300,000 for the Chicopit Bay, Florida, project; $100,000 to complete the preliminary restoration plan and initiate the Ecosystem Restoration Report for the Jacksonville Harbor (Mill Cove), Florida, project; $274,000 for the Bayou Plaquemine, Louisiana, project; $300,000 for the Rochester Harbor, New York, project; $70,000 for the East Harbor State Park, Habitat Restoration, West Harbor, Ohio, project; $150,000 for the Lake Washington Ship Canal Smolt Passage Restoration, Washington, project; and $100,000 to complete project restoration plans and initiate planning for five sites along the Green and Duwamish River in King County, Washington.

Using available funds, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the Pine Flat Dam, California, project and with three separate projects for ecosystem restoration on the North Canadian River in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The Committee remains supportive of the Fox Creek, Oregon, project and understands that sufficient funds are available to provide for its completion in fiscal year 1999.

Snagging and Clearing (Section 208).—The Committee has provided the full amount of the budget request for the Section 208 program. These funds are to be used for clearing and snagging projects on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries in California.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriation, 1999	$323,649,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	280,000,000
Recommended, 2000	313,324,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−10,325,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+33,324,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
	SURVEYS:			
	GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALEXANDER COUNTY, IL AND SCOTT	350	30	30
(FDP)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,150	700	700
(FDP)	DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	3,500	250	250
(COM)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	2,075	675	675
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	125,000	1,767	1,767
(FC)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	88,400	700	1,000
(FC)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	21,450	318	318
	SPRING BAYOU, LA	---	---	100
(FC)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	11,765	525	525
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	365	365
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		5,330	5,730
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,667,000	37,685	37,685
(FC)	EIGHT MILE CREEK, AR	9,000	700	700
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	245,350	21,900	13,900
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,370	2,190	2,190
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	1,995,000	23,250	25,250
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	387,000	4,350	4,850
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	185,000	7,500	7,500
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,720,000	19,750	23,750
	L'ANGUILLE RIVER, AR	---	---	100
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	19,500	3,000	9,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	66,900	100	100
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	99,200	10,400	10,400
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	166,900	8,930	8,930
	YAZOO BASIN:	(1,513,837)	(24,278)	(40,065)
(FC)	BACKWATER LESS ROCKY BAYOU, MS	254,491	20	20
(FC)	BACKWATER PUMP, MS	97,840	500	500
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	109,383	3,915	3,915
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	244,284	6,294	20,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	194,431	20	20
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408	1,570	1,570
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	243,000	340	340
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	338,000	11,620	13,700
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	58,800	7,800	9,800
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	17,941	2,500	2,500
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	143,000	2,398	2,398
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		176,732	199,118
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	55,876	55,876
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	---	284	284
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	---	443	443
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	---	66	66
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	---	108	108
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	3,736	3,936
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	---	6,300	8,700
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,344	2,344
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	964	964
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	---	45	45
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	---	25	25
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	644	644
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	10,560	10,560
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	157	157
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	101	101
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	1,068	1,068
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	---	373	373
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	84	84
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	---	436	436
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	4,027	4,027
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	2,927	2,927
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	333	333
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	---	193	193
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	199	199
	YAZOO BASIN:	---	(20,475)	(23,413)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	3,265	4,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	209	209
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	3,214	4,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	946	946
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	4,280	5,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,059	1,059
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	4,334	5,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,269	1,300
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	493	493
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	560	560
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	846	846
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	---	202	202
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	3,500	3,500
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	---	113	113
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	---	800	800
(FC)	MAPPING	---	1,117	1,117
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		117,500	123,038
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-19,562	-14,562
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		280,000	313,324

The Committee has provided $33,324,000 above the budget request to continue ongoing construction of Mississippi River and Tributaries projects and to expedite award of contracts in fiscal year 2000 to alleviate the impacts of continued flooding and to relieve the suffering of affected communities.

Morganza, Louisiana to the Gulf.—The Committee has provided $300,000 above the budget request for the Morganza, Louisiana to the Gulf, project to continue expedited engineering and design of the Houma Locks and to advance completion of the study.

Spring Bayou, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes funding for an investigation of the Spring Bayou in Louisiana. This study will focus on ecosystem restoration and preservation, flood damage prevention, improved drainage, and related water resource issues.

Wolf River, Memphis, Tennessee.—The recommendation provides the full amount of the budget request for preconstruction engineering and design of the Wolf River, Memphis, Tennessee, project.

Channel Improvement, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee supports the expeditious construction of Phase II of the Natchez Front Revetment project and understands that sufficient funds have been programmed to complete the project during the current fiscal year.

L'Anguille River, Arkansas.—The Committee is aware of the frequent flooding and environmental degradation problems along the L'Anguille River, Arkansas, and the need to reevaluate the project. Consequently, the Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a project re-evaluation.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request for construction of the Mississippi River Levees project. Of this additional amount, $1,000,000 is to continue construction of the Commerce to Birds Point, Missouri, grade raise, and $1,000,000 is to advance construction on the addition to the Drinkwater Pumping Station.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has added $500,000 to the budget request for the St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri, project, to accelerate the completion of critical channel improvement work.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 above the budget request for continued construction of the Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana, project. Funds have been provided for: continued floodproofing efforts on the waterfronts of Morgan City and Berwick, Louisiana; construction of the Bayou Yokely Basin pumping stations; and repairs to address slides and sloughing along the west guide levee.

Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $6,000,000 above the budget request for the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana, project. The Corps is directed to allow credit toward the non-Federal share of the project cost for any work performed by non-Federal interests on the Louisiana State Penitentiary Levee, Louisiana, project, subsequent to project authorization, to the extent the Secretary determines that work to be compatible with, and integral to, the project.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The Committee has included $20,000,000, an increase of $13,706,000 over the budget request, for the Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi, project. This program is a continuation of a joint effort by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture in the Yazoo Basin, Mississippi. The funds provided will allow the Corps of Engineers to accomplish construction work in some of the following watersheds: Abiaca Creek, Batupan Bogue, Black Creek, Burney Branch, Cane-Mussacuna Creek, Coldwater River, Hickahala-Senatobia Creek, Hotophia Creek, Hurricane-Wolfe Creek, Long Creek, Otoucalofa Creek, Pelucia Creek, Toby Tubby Creek, and the Yalobusha River Watersheds. The work to date by the Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service has shown positive results in reduction of flood damages, decreased erosion and sediments, and improvements to the environment. These positive results show that continued funding for the program is important and that it should be completed to realize the total benefits of the program. This may well be a case where the completed program gives results that are much greater than the sum of the individual items of work. The additional funds are provided to continue design, real estate acquisition, monitoring of completed work, and initiation of continuing contracts. The Committee expects the Administration to continue to request funds for this important project.

Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Projects, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $13,700,000 for construction of the Yazoo Basin, Upper Yazoo Projects, Mississippi, project. These funds have been included to accelerate completion of channel item four and to purchase mitigation lands.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.—The recommendation includes $2,000,000 above the budget request for construction of the St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri, project. These funds are included to advance construction of the New Madrid pumping station by one year.

Mississippi River Levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request for maintenance of the Mississippi River Levees project. These funds are included to replace a dilapidated culvert along the mainline Mississippi River near New Madrid, Missouri and to enhance the integrity of the levee.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided $2,400,000 above the budget request for maintenance of the St. Francis River and Tributaries, Arkansas and Missouri, project. These additional funds should be first applied to channel work at Arkansas Highway 90 and Missouri Highway 84.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request for maintenance of the Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana, project. High priority should be accorded to levee slides and sloughing within the project area, as well as to guidewall repair at various locks.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided the full amount requested for maintenance of the Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana, project. The Committee urges the Corps

of Engineers to continue to work with the oyster fishing industry to resolve any impacts resulting from the construction and operation of this project.

Yazoo Basin, Mississippi.—The recommendation includes additional funds for maintenance of Arkabutla Lake, Sardis Lake, Enid Lake, Grenada Lake, and Yazoo Basin Tributaries.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1999	$ 1,752,952,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	1,835,900,000
Recommended, 2000	1,888,481,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+135,529,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+52,581,000

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA		
(FC)	ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	3,000	3,000
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,185	5,385
	BAYOU CODEN, AL	---	500
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	10	10
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	15,917	19,200
	BON SECOUR, AL	---	150
	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	---	500
	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	---	500
	REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT PILOT PROJECT, AL & FL	---	1,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,000	6,758
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	40	40
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	5,560	5,560
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	17,562	19,062
	PERDIDO PASS, AL	---	250
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	300	300
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	6,183	6,183
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	95	95
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	19,999	21,529
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	7,910	7,910
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,794	1,794
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,552	1,552
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	401	401
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	188	188
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	180	180
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	460	460
(N)	PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	88	88
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	502	502
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	384	384
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	1,024	1,024
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,180	1,180
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	75	75
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,118	1,118
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	27	27
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	155	155
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	3,702	3,702
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,585	5,585
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,117	1,117
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	5,536	5,536
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,673	5,673
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,167	4,167
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,285	1,285
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	1,054	1,054
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	1,002	1,002
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	4,946	4,946
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	295	295
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	283	283
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR	25,086	25,086
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,816	1,816
(MP)	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,498	3,498
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,367	1,367
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,803	3,803
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	523	523
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,538	6,538
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,515	5,515
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,363	2,363
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	171	171
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,844	1,844
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	2,055	2,055
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	170	170
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,877	3,877
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,272	4,272
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	332	332
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	2,069	2,069
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,189	4,189
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	1,021	1,021
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE MITIGATION, CA	3,700	3,700
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	1,456	1,456
	LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, CA	---	3,340
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	165	165
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	100	1,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,940	3,940
	MARINA DEL REY, CA	---	3,500
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	277	277
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	246	246
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	2,818	3,818
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,894	1,894
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,081	1,081
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	NOYO RIVER & HARBOR, CA	758	758
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,149	8,149
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,170	1,170
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,301	2,301
	PORT OF HUENEME, CA	---	2,700
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,138	1,138
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,546	5,546
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	1,656	1,656
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,149	1,149
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA.	153	153
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,289	2,289
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,473	2,473
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,441	2,441
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	1,662	1,662
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,007	3,007
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,646	1,646
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,516	1,516
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,880	1,880
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	2,995	2,995
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,684	1,684
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,875	2,875
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	36	36
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	454	454
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	778	778
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	330	330
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	129	129
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	2,051	2,051
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	300	300
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	702	702
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	328	328
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	412	412
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	232	232
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	797	797
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	512	512
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	290	290
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	340	340
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	556	556
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	418	418
	DELAWARE		
(N)	CEDAR CREEK, DE	265	265
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL, ST GEORGE'S BRIDGE REPL	4,000	4,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	19,518	19,518
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	456	456
(N)	MISPILLION RIVER, DE	305	305
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE	430	430
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,395	3,395
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	880	880
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	985	985
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	37	37
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &.	30	30
	APALACHICOLA BAY, FL	---	1,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	7,332	7,332
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	8,470	8,470
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,652	2,652
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	1,023	1,023
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,.	50	50
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	3,286	3,286
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,193	7,193
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,699	5,699
	LAGRANGE BAYOU, WALTON COUNTY, FL	---	250
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	2,620	2,620
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	4,200	5,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	4,680	4,680
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL	10	10
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	2,101	2,101
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	1,300	1,300
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	7,696	7,696
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	2,900	2,900
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	400	400
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,130	3,130
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	70	70
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL	2,242	2,242
	ST PETERSBURG, FL	---	3,200
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	7,041	7,041
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	34	34

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	6,328	6,328
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,830	7,330
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,310	2,310
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	6,231	6,231
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,000	7,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	8,150	8,150
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	9,500	9,500
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	41	41
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	8,750	8,750
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	8,000	8,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,757	13,757
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	2,340	2,340
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	6,200	6,200
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	121	121
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	279	279
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	750	750
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,759	2,759
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,304	2,304
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	82	82
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,238	1,238
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	176	176
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ID	63	63
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	2,539	2,539
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	4,879	4,879
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	5,146	5,146
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	185	185
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	405	405
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN	25,368	25,368
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	432	432
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	1,588	1,588
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	837	837
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,558	5,558
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO &.	103,547	103,547
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL	150	150
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,881	3,881
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	736	736
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	844	844
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,829	1,829
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN	266	766
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	709	709
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	837	837
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	1,064	1,064
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	92	92
(FC)	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	802	802
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	213	213
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	825	825
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	803	803
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	730	730
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	741	741
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	154	154
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,755	2,755
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	109	109
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	211	211
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	7,182	7,182
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,147	2,147
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,577	3,577
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	3,905	3,905
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,582	1,582
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,130	1,130
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	560	560
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	716	716
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,184	1,184
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	938	938
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	275	275
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	975	975
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,370	1,370
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,331	1,331
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	2,016	2,016
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,856	1,856

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	900	900
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	2,089	2,089
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,752	1,752
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	347	347
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	468	468
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	1,767	1,767
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	1,731	1,731
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	7,382	7,382
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,057	2,057
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,170	1,170
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,209	1,209
(FC)	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,364	1,364
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	819	819
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,293	1,293
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	340	340
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,609	1,609
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,113	1,113
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,142	1,142
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	1,826	1,826
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	112	112
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,084	2,084
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,780	1,780
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	17	17
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	662	662
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	76	76
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	1,907	1,907
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	83,884	83,884
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	5,789	5,789
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	932	932
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,625	1,625
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,043	1,043
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,345	5,995
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,071	1,071
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	12,631	13,221
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	2,119	2,119
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	509	509
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	5	5
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25	25
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	32	32
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	212	5,212
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	127	127
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	7,560	9,310
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	3,585	3,585
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	455
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	12,506	13,646
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,443	3,443
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	260	260
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	579	579
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	93	93
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	2,445	2,445
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,743	2,743
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	64,430	64,430
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	14,989	16,000
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	8,781	10,781
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,270	2,270
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	209	209
	MAINE		
(N)	PORTLAND HARBOR, ME	6,985	6,985
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,030	1,030
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	440	440
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	625	625
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,142	16,142
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	140	140
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	324	324
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,616	1,616
(N)	KNAPPS NARROWS, MD	770	770
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD	850	850
(N)	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD	770	770
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	380	380
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	143	143
(N)	TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	5,800	5,800
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	895	895
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	494	494
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	423	423
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	443	443
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	10,816	10,816

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	202	202
(N)	CHATHAM (STAGE) HARBOR, MA	215	215
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	168	168
(N)	CUTTYHUNK HARBOR, MA	118	118
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	375	375
(N)	GREEN HARBOR, MA	332	332
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	381	381
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	362	362
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	395	395
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	280	280
(N)	NEW BEDFORD HARBOR, MA	230	230
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,227	3,227
(N)	SALEM HARBOR, MA	175	175
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	391	391
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	550	550
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	414	414
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	441	441
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	68	68
(N)	BAY PORT HARBOR, MI	227	227
(N)	CASEVILLE HARBOR, MI	333	333
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	500
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	512	512
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	133	133
(N)	CLINTON RIVER, MI	368	368
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	3,235	3,235
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	363	363
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	615	615
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR, MI	345	345
(N)	HARRISVILLE HARBOR, MI	142	142
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	379	379
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	43	43
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	205
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	291	291
(N)	LAC LA BELLE, MI	156	156
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	156	156
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR, MI	247	247
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI	97	97
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	1,152	1,152
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	52	52
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	1,356	1,356
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	28	28
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	137	137
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI	120	120
(N)	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	444	444
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	400	400
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	1,708	1,708
(N)	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR, MI	328	328
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	579	579
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI	134	134
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	195	195
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	57	57
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,387	1,387
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR, MI	2,042	2,042
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	488	488
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	1,064	1,064
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	667	667
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	21,957	21,957
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	2,426	2,426
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	324	324
(N)	WHITEFISH POINT HARBOR, MI	115	115
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	209	209
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,480	2,480
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	161	161
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	527	527
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	155	155
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	561	561
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	57	57
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	242	242
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	3,219	3,219
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	64	64
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	15	15
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	108	108
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	150	150
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,216	2,216
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	360	360
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	104	104
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	1,620	1,620
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,417	3,417
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	263	263
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	1,034	1,034
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	15	15

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	200	200
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,174	5,174
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,248	2,248
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	8,613	8,613
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	669	669
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	825	825
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	801	801
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,544	13,544
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	269	269
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	1,888	1,888
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	30	30
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,083	1,083
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	421	421
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,247	3,247
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	5,963	5,963
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	20	20
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,842	3,842
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MT	21	21
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,520	2,520
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MT	48	48
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MT	67	67
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	7,184	7,184
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,379	2,379
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NE	150	150
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	900	900
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING, NE	250	250
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	678	678
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	796	796
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	106	106
	NEVADA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	37	37
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	532	532
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	181	181
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	361	361
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	394	394
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	502	502
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	941	941
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	479	479
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	485	485
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,270	2,270
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	545	545
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	15,356	15,356
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,280	3,280
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	1,854	1,854
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	165	165
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	700	700
(N)	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	1,191	1,191
	SALEM RIVER, NJ	---	940
(N)	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	70	70
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,198	1,198
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,926	1,926
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,150	1,150
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	315	315
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	103	103
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	600	600
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	836	836
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	115	115
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	303	303
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	451	451
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	228	228
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY	70	70
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	1,053	1,053
(N)	BRONX RIVER, NY	70	70
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	1,425	1,425
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY	700	700
(N)	CATTARAUGUS CREEK HARBOR, NY	50	50
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	510	510
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	150	150
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	250	250
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	463	463
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY	2,000	2,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	505	533

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	810	810
(N)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	325	325
(N)	GLEN COVE CREEK, NY	125	125
(N)	GREAT SODUS BAY HARBOR, NY	200	200
(N)	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	40	40
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	200	200
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY	2,575	2,575
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	808	808
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	250	250
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	1,200	1,200
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	60	60
(N)	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	200	200
(N)	MATTITUCK HARBOR, NY	220	220
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY	70	70
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	3,975	3,975
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	953	953
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	4,955	4,955
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	740	740
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	6,105	6,105
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	395	395
(N)	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	60	60
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	1,706	1,706
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	815	815
(N)	ROUSES POINT, NY	25	25
(N)	SAG HARBOR, NY	800	800
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	100	100
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	728	728
(N)	STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15	15
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	565	565
(N)	WESTCHESTER CREEK, NY	70	70
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	542	542
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,552	5,552
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,346	1,346
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	550	550
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	707	707
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,346	1,346
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,029	1,029
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	380	380
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,998	4,998
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	3,709	3,709
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	825	825
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	210	210
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	59	59
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,660	1,660
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	6,431	6,431
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	204	204
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	7,997	7,997
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	174	174
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ND	13	13
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,460	1,460
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	802	802
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	368	368
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	667	667
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	845	845
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	4,503	4,503
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,228	1,228
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	719	719
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	5,535	5,535
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	1,352	1,352
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	670	670
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	1,917	1,917
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	746	746
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	481	481
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	840	840
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	228	228
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	790	790
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,200	1,200
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,422	1,422
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,078	7,078
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	327	327
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	673	673
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR, OH	80	80
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	74	74
(N)	ROCKY RIVER, OH	340	1,760
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	1,037	1,037

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	174	174
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	3,385	3,385
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	279	279
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	574	574
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	856	856
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	403	403
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	611	611
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,508	1,508
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	30	30
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	2,497	2,497
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	1,020	1,020
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	7,366	7,366
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	4,034	4,034
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	751	751
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	259	259
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	697	697
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,404	1,404
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	491	491
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	91	91
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	2,740	2,740
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,543	6,543
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,947	3,447
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	74	74
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,414	1,414
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,501	4,501
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	1,287	1,287
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	369	369
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	1,084	1,084
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,400	3,400
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,997	1,997
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,066	3,066
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	679	679
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	872	872
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	297	297
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	5,747	5,747
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	442	442
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	15,173	17,473
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,426	7,426
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	356	356
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,112	4,112
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	434	434
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	913	913
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	690	690
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	178	178
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	609	609
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	556	556
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	433	433
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	997	997
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,001	1,001
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	334	334
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	163	163
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	3,450	3,450
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,692	1,692
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	3,594	3,594
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,501	4,501
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	737	787
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	137	137
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	866	866
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	105	105
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	809	809
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	1,013	1,013
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	7	7
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	14	14
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,254	1,254
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	514	514
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	66	66
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	637	637
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	3,691	4,141
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	9,789	9,789
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	749	749
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	232	232
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	875	875
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,002	2,002
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	940	940
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,824	1,824
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	2,312	2,312
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	669	800
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	884	884
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	123	123
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	712	712
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	796	796
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	248	248
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	143	143
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	13	13

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,388	1,388
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,086	1,086
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	879	879
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	12,395	12,395
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	86	86
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	935	935
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,042	3,900
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	2,565	2,565
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,121	2,121
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	387	387
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	70	70
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	1,968	1,968
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	2,075	2,075
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	259	259
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	796	796
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	542	542
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,184	2,184
	RHODE ISLAND		
(N)	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE, RI	675	675
(N)	PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	3,906	3,906
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,391	3,391
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	5,779	5,779
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,375	3,375
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	236	236
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	4,064	4,064
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	1,424	1,424
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	75	75
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	811	811
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	345	345
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,853	6,853
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	644	644
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	223	223
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,091	8,091
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SD	13	13
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	642	642
(MP)	MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	130	130
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	10,812	10,812
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	61	61
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	5,167	5,167
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,704	5,704
	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	---	2,800
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,220	4,220
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,200	4,200
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	4	4
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,396	3,506
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,006	6,516
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	16,123	16,123
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	388	388
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	602	602
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,242	1,242
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	1,000	1,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,436	1,436
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,625	1,625
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	2,542	2,542
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,896	1,896
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	1,062	1,062
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,034	2,034
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,265	2,265
(N)	CEDAR BAYOU, TX	1,131	1,131
(N)	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX	950	950
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,690	4,690
(MP)	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	6,728	6,728
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	14	14
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,288	2,288
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	5,100	5,100
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	1,985	1,985
(N)	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	315	315
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,652	1,652
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,267	2,267
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	23,072	23,072
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,201	1,201
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	6,416	6,416
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	854	854
(FC)	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,045	1,045
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	740	740
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	154	154
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,390	2,390
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	3,123	3,123

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	3,780	3,780
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,950	2,950
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,456	1,456
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,934	1,934
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,488	1,488
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	1,974	1,974
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,490	1,490
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	50	50
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,093	1,093
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	9,500	9,500
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,572	4,572
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	235	235
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,508	2,508
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	2,006	2,006
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,062	2,062
	TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	---	1,900
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,907	3,532
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,090	1,090
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	5,088	5,088
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,587	2,587
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	63	63
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	414	414
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	703	703
(N)	BURLINGTON HARBOR BREAKWATER, VT	160	160
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	536	536
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	511	511
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	631	631
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	724	724
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	520	520
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	391	391
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA	2,364	2,364
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	45	45
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	842	842
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,566	1,566
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	920	920
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	59	59
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	3,983	5,100
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	11,190	11,190
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,347	1,487
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	282	282
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	5,815	6,815
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	340	340
(N)	PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	2,252	2,252
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA	660	660
	POTOMAC RIVER AT MOUNT VERNON, VA	---	400
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	630	630
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	1,002	1,002
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA	648	648
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	3,347	3,347
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,185	1,185
	WASHINGTON		
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA	512	512
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	811	811
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	450	450
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	6
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,225	1,225
(N)	FRIDAY HARBOR, WA	300	300
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	13,150	16,150
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,710	1,710
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,791	2,791
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	177	177
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	8,530	8,530
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,138	1,138
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	5,920	5,920
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,801	1,801
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	870	870
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	409	409
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	3,157	3,157
(N)	OLYMPIA HARBOR, WA	927	927
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	308	308
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	1,041	1,041
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	1,061	1,061
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	453	453
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	3,400	3,400
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	727	727
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	195	195
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	59	59
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	72	72
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	2,402	2,402
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	727	727

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,076	1,076
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,218	2,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,390	1,390
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,585	1,585
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	16	16
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	84	84
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,314	7,314
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,643	1,643
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	937	937
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,505	1,505
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,648	1,648
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	1,923	1,923
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ALGOMA HARBOR, WI	107	107
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	195	195
(N)	BIG SUAMICO HARBOR, WI	368	368
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	685	685
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	3,487	3,487
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	996	996
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	494	494
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	69	69
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	52	52
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	226	226
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	832	832
(N)	OCONTO HARBOR, WI	168	168
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WI	93	93
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	230	230
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR & LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	507	507
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	707	707
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	117	117
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,126	1,126
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WY	288	288
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000	2,500
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	2,000	1,500
	DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	12,450	12,450
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,085	500
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000	8,000
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,500	1,500
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	500	500
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	575	575
	MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	975	500
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000	1,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	20
	NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	20	20
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000	5,000
	NATIONAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT (NRMS) PROGRAM	1,850	1,000
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,365	415
	PROTECT, CLEAR AND STRAIGHTEN CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	50	50
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	500
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	950	650
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,542	4,000
	WETLANDS FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	1,000	---
	ZEBRA MUSSEL CONTROL	1,500	1,500
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-19,284	-22,624
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,835,900	1,888,481

Alabama-Coosa River, Alabama.—The recommendation includes an additional $200,000 above the budget request for additional dredging of the Alabama-Coosa River, Alabama, project.

Bayou Coden, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the Sound and Bayou channels at Bayou Coden, Alabama.

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.—The recommendation includes $19,200,000 for operation and maintenance of the Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, project. Funding above the budget request is for dredging of the navigation channel and purchase and construction of dredged material disposal areas.

Bon Secour, Alabama.—The Committee has included funding for maintenance dredging of the navigation channel at Bon Secour, Alabama.

Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama.—The recommendation includes $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the Pass Drury and Fort Gaines channels of Dauphin Island Bay, Alabama.

Dog and Fowl Rivers, Alabama.—The recommendation includes $500,000 for maintenance dredging of the river and bay portions of the Dog and Fowl Rivers, Alabama, project.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $2,758,000 above the budget request for additional maintenance dredging of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Alabama, project.

Mobile Harbor, Alabama.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 above the budget request for additional maintenance dredging of Mobile Harbor, Alabama.

Perdido Pass, Alabama.—The recommendation includes funds for maintenance dredging of the entrance channel at Perdido Pass, Alabama.

Regional Sediment Management Pilot Project, Alabama and Florida.—The recommendation includes $1,000,000 to begin implementation of a regional sediment management pilot project.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $1,530,000 above the budget request for additional maintenance dredging of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi, project and for the repair and maintenance of upland disposal areas. Within funds available for this project, the Corps of Engineers is directed to expend such funds as are necessary to meet its obligations to operate and maintain the Ward Bayou, Mississippi wildlife management area.

Isabella Lake Mitigation, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to conduct the measures required by the April 18, 1997 Biological Opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with respect to the long-term operation of Isabella Reservoir, Kern County, California. The Committee further expects the Corps of Engineers to identify the least costly actions available, including, whenever possible, the utilization of partnerships with other Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations, so that the Corps can continue to operate and maintain Isabella Dam and Reservoir for flood control and water conservation purposes as provided in the October 23, 1964 contract among the United States of America and various public agencies.

Larkspur Ferry Channel, California.—The recommendation includes $3,340,000 for dredging of the Larkspur Ferry Channel, California, project.

Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Los Angeles County, California.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Los Angeles County, California, project for activities associated with maintenance dredging.

Marina Del Rey, California.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,500,000 for maintenance dredging of the navigation channel at Marina Del Rey, California.

Morro Bay Harbor, California.—The recommendation includes an addition of $1,000,000 above the budget request for the Morro Bay Harbor, California, project for repairs to the south jetty.

Port of Hueneme, California.—The Committee has provided $2,700,000 for repairs to the east and west jetties at the Port of Hueneme, California, project.

Santa Ana River Basin, California.—Within available funds, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to participate with local agencies, including agencies managing the Santa Ana Conservation Trust Fund, for ongoing arundo removal activities in the Santa Ana River Basin, California.

Cherry Creek Lake, Colorado.—The Committee prohibits the Corps of Engineers from proceeding with the Cherry Creek Basin Study until the Corps completes an independent peer review of the National Weather Service data in order to determine the appropriate design flood for the Cherry Creek Basin. The recommendation does not include funds requested in the budget for the basin study.

Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, St. George's Bridge Replacement, Delaware.—The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for final reimbursement payment to the State of Delaware for construction costs associated with the replacement of St. George's Bridge.

Apalachicola Bay, Florida.—The recommendation includes $1,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the W.N. (Newt) Creekmore Channel at Apalachicola Bay, Florida.

Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Florida.—The recommendation includes $3,286,000 for operation and maintenance of the Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami, Florida, project. Within this amount, funding is provided to address the most serious maintenance dredging needs along the Intracoastal Waterway in Brevard, Indian River, and St. Lucie counties.

LaGrange Bayou, Walton County, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes funding for preliminary requirements associated with dredging of the LaGrange Bayou, Walton County, Florida, project.

Miami Harbor, Florida.—The recommendation includes an addition above the budget request for accelerated maintenance dredging of the Miami River at Miami Harbor, Florida.

St. Petersburg, Florida.—The recommendation includes $3,200,000 for maintenance dredging of the St. Petersburg, Florida, project.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama and Florida.—The recommendation includes $250,000 above the

budget request for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama and Florida, project to conduct model studies to address the shoaling problem below George W. Andrews Lock and Dam; $750,000 above the budget request for additional maintenance dredging; and $500,000 above the budget request to conduct model studies on the Apalachicola River from Chipola cutoff to Corley Slough to address structural changes to reduce dredging and to address beneficial uses of dredge material.

Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin.—Of the funds provided for operation and maintenance of the Mississippi River Between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri and Wisconsin, project, $6,000,000 is for urgent bank stabilization work along the Sny Island Levee system.

Burns Waterway Small Boat Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 above the budget request for operation and maintenance of the Burns Waterway Small Boat Harbor, Indiana, project.

Kentucky River, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes $1,000,000 above the budget request for repair and disposition activities associated with the transfer to the State of Kentucky of locks and dams within the Kentucky River, Kentucky, project.

Wolf Creek Dam, Lake Cumberland, Kentucky.—The recommendation includes an additional $650,000 for the Corps of Engineers to enhance the trash removal efforts of the debris rack upstream from Lake Cumberland, including equipment, yard modifications, and construction of additional floating booms.

Atchafalaya River and Bayou Chene, Beouf and Black, Louisiana.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request for additional maintenance dredging of the Atchafalaya River and Bayou Chene, Beouf and Black, Louisiana, project.

Bayou Teche, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 above the budget request for maintenance dredging associated with channel restoration at Bayou Teche, Louisiana. The Committee is very concerned about the low priority accorded to this project by the Corps of Engineers and strongly urges the Corps to expedite work on the channel and locks.

Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana.—The Committee has included $1,750,000 above the budget request for additional dredging of the Calcasieu River and Pass, Louisiana, project.

Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $455,000 for the Federal share of maintenance of the Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, project.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana.—Funds above the budget request have been recommended to continue dredging the mainstem of the Gulf Coastal Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana, project.

Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $16,000,000 for the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, project. The Committee is concerned with efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency to insinuate itself in the future management of the Mississippi River-Gulf Outlet, Louisiana, project. The Committee emphasizes that the responsibility for identifying and evaluating options for the mitigation of potentially ad-

verse project impacts resides within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may at his discretion seek to utilize the expertise of other agencies as he deems necessary.

Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana.—In order to reduce the existing backlog of critical maintenance items, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 above the budget request for the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland.—The Committee understands that the Corps of Engineers recently released a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed placement of eighteen million cubic yards of dredged material in an open water site, known as Site 104, located just northeast of the William Preston Lane, Jr. Memorial Bridge (the Chesapeake Bay Bridge). The Committee is deeply concerned about the potential approval of this site and imposes upon the Corps an obligation to thoroughly analyze and review all practicable alternatives. In the reviewing the alternatives, the Corps should conduct an exhaustive analysis of each site to include how re-suspension of sediments will affect nutrient loading and whether there is a resident population of shortnose sturgeon that would be impacted by the proposed placement of dredged material. Since other dredge disposal sites are available, the Corps is directed to exhaust the space in these other sites before using Site 104 for disposition of dredged material.

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided funding in its recommendation for repairs to the west breakwater at Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.

Missouri River Between Fort Peck Dam, Montana and Gavins Point Dam, South Dakota and Nebraska.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to fully exploit opportunities to use non-traditional methods to combat bank erosion along the Missouri River between the communities of Fort Peck and Culbertson, Montana.

Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—In addition to fully funding the budget request for maintenance dredging of the Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey, project, the Committee has provided $1,000,000 for other maintenance and repair activities at the project.

Salem River, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $940,000 for maintenance dredging of the Salem River, New Jersey, project.

Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request to fully to permit the award of a full nourishment cycle contract for the Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York, project.

Rocky River, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $1,760,000 for the Rocky River, Ohio, project. Recommended funding above the budget request is for activities associated with breakwall reconstruction along the Rocky River in Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

Oolagah Lake, Oklahoma.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request for the Oolagah Lake, Oklahoma, project. These funds are provided for the Corps of Engineers to initiate a study of water resource problems at the lake and to develop a water management plan.

Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers Below Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon.—An additional $2,300,000 has been provided by the Committee for repairs to the north breakwater at the Astoria east boat basin within the Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers Below Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon, project.

Port of Port Orford, Oregon.—The recommendation includes funding to initiate the Port of Port Orford Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Study.

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon.—Additional funds in the amount of $450,000 have been included by the Committee for reconstruction of the north jetty at Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oregon.

Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has included funding above the budget request for enhanced operation and maintenance of facilities and flood control infrastructure at Curwensville Lake, Pennsylvania.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided additional funding for operation and maintenance of the Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania, project. These funds are for enhanced operation of the facility, physical improvements, and maintenance of flood control capabilities.

Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania.—Of the amount provided for operation and maintenance of the Schuylkill River, Pennsylvania, project, $900,000 is provided for the Corps of Engineers to address an emergency water depth problem at Boathouse Row along the race course on the river above Fairmont Dam.

Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee.—The recommendation includes $2,800,000 for continued repairs to Chickamauga Lock, Tennessee.

J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, Tennessee.—The Committee recommendation provides funding above the budget request for handicap accessibility improvements to the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir, Tennessee, project.

Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tennessee.—The recommendation for the Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Tennessee, project includes $510,000 for handicap accessibility improvements.

Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas.—The Committee has added $900,000 to the budget request for the Trinity River and Tributaries, Texas, project for the completion of maintenance dredging of the Channel to Liberty in the vicinity of Smith Point. An additional $1,000,000 has been added for maintenance dredging of the Trinity River to Liberty, Texas.

Waco Lake, Texas.—The recommendation includes funding above the budget request for improvements to Waco Lake, Texas.

James River Channel, Virginia.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the operation and maintenance of the James River Channel, Virginia, project to permit year-round navigation in the channel.

John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir, Virginia. The recommendation includes $140,000 for handicap accessibility improvements at John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir, Virginia.

Norfolk Harbor, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 above the budget request for enhanced maintenance of the Norfolk Harbor, Virginia, project.

Potomac River at Mount Vernon, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $400,000 for activities associated with maintenance dredging of the Potomac River and Mount Vernon, Virginia, project.

Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request for the Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Washington, project for rehabilitation of the Grays Harbor north jetty at Ocean Shores, Washington.

Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.—Funding above the budget request has been provided for drift and debris management activities at the Bluestone Lake, West Virginia, project.

Dredging Operations and Environmental Research.—The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to include phytoremediation technology as a priority environmental quality research activity within the Dredging Operations and Environmental Research program.

National Invasive Species Act.—The Corps of Engineers is directed to review its relevant programs to determine appropriate ways to incorporate the objectives of the President's Executive Order on Alien Invasive Species.

Zebra Mussel Control.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,500,000 for the Zebra Mussel Control program.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1999	$106,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	110,000,000
Recommended, 2000	117,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	11,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	7,000,000

NOTE.—In addition to the $110,000,000 budget estimate, $7,000,000 is proposed for the program, to be derived from permit fees dependent upon the enactment of proposed legislation.

This appropriation provides for salaries and related costs to administer laws pertaining to the 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.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommends $117,000,000, an increase of $11,000,000 over the fiscal year 1999 level and $7,000,000 over the Administration's budget request.

The Committee has tired of the Administration's excuses for its failure to implement a full administrative appeals process for wetlands decisions, including jurisdictional determinations, as directed by Congress in previous fiscal years. Accordingly, the Committee has included statutory direction to implement such a process, as well as $5,000,000 for its implementation in fiscal year 2000.

The Committee has concluded that the Corps of Engineers has paid insufficient attention to the potential impacts of its proposed nationwide replacement permits. Before replacement permits are implemented, it is imperative that the Corps of Engineers better understand their impacts on the Regulatory program workload and their potential cost impacts on the regulated community. As a consequence, the Committee has included statutory language requiring study and analysis of these issues before the Secretary of the Army

may adopt replacement permits or terminate the current nationwide 26 permit.

The Committee recognizes the difficulties the Iowa Drainage District and Pocahontas County Board of Supervisors have had in enduring years of frustration in their effort to close environmentally hazardous drainage wells. As a result of these difficulties, the Committee strongly encourages the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to submit a rewritten set of Section 404(b)(1) guidelines that would propose to recognize existing land uses and the prior investments made on farmed wetland.

The Committee is aware of efforts by the Corps of Engineers in San Diego County, California to include considerations such as traffic congestion and air quality issues in the evaluation of Section 404 wetland permit applications for several projects. These issues are, by and large, within the jurisdiction of other Federal and local agencies. The Committee believes that this practice establishes a bad precedent for future permit applications and believes that the Corps lacks the authority to expand its jurisdiction to these ancillary issues in the context of permit application reviews.

The Committee has been made aware of the Section 404 permit application of the State of Utah for construction of a highway in the southern portion of Davis County, Utah. The Committee further recognizes the merits of the Locally Preferred Alternative (Alignment C). The Committee understands that the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) is proposing to build a new north-south highway that would basically parallel Interstate 15 and be adjacent to the Great Salt Lake. The Section 404 permit application was submitted by UDOT in the fall of 1998. The Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Statement evaluated three alternative routes for the new highway, all of which would impact wetlands in the Great Salt Lake ecosystem and require a Section 404 permit. The Committee understands that each alignment would impact wetlands in the southern portion of the Great Salt Lake Ecosystem but that neither alignment A nor alignment C would have a major impact. Within the immediate area of the project, each of these two alignments would impact or sever about one tenth of one percent of the southern portion of the floodplain. Under the proposal by the State of Utah for the Legacy Nature Preserve, approximately 1600 acres would be held in trust by the State, providing an ecological buffer and producing a unique project that not only solves a serious transportation problem but provides net benefits to the aquatic ecosystem. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to approve a permit for alignment C.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1999	$140,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	150,000,000
Recommended, 2000	150,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $150,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 1998, Congress transferred re-

sponsibility for cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. In appropriating FUSRAP funds to the Corps of Engineers, the Committee intended to transfer only the responsibility for administration and execution of cleanup activities at eligible sites where remediation had not been completed. It did not intend to transfer ownership of and accountability for real property interests that remain with the Department of Energy. The Committee expects the Department to continue to provide the institutional knowledge and expertise needed to best serve the nation and the affected communities in executing this program.

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

In the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for FY 1999, Public Law 105–245, Congress directed that the response actions by the Corps of Engineers under FUSRAP shall be subject to the administrative, procedural, and regulatory provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan. In appropriating funds to the Corps of Engineers for the cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP, the Committee does not intend that licensing of the Corps by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission shall be required for the implementation by the Corps of the responsibility for cleanup of contaminated sites under FUSRAP.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1999	$148,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	148,000,000
Recommended, 2000	148,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	.....
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the Division Offices, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

The Committee recommendation for General Expenses is $148,000,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation also includes bill language prohibiting the use of funds to support a congressional affairs office within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers and language prohibiting the use of funds to support more than one regional office in each division.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1999	$42,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	39,370,000
Recommended, 2000	37,190,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−5,310,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−2,180,000

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

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1999 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $37,190,000. Funding provided for program oversight and administration is the same as the fiscal year 1999 level, as is funding for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1999	$618,545,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	652,838,000
Recommended, 2000	604,910,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−13,635,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−47,928,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATE FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	---	6,996	---	6,996
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT (LCRBDF)	27,326	---	24,089	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I	1,036	12,056	1,036	12,056
LOWER COLORADO RIVER INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	50	---	---	---
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	580	---	200	---
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSE MESA DAM	---	1,590	---	1,590
SOUTH/CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	850	---	800	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT	5,873	---	5,598	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION	400	---	400	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	150	---	---	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS	109	15,423	109	15,423
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT	639	723	639	723
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	500	---	---	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJECT	1,500	---	1,500	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION	8,800	10,103	10,800	8,103
DELTA DIVISION	14,362	4,651	12,949	4,651
EAST SIDE DIVISION	575	3,781	575	3,781
FRIANT DIVISION	3,614	2,498	3,614	2,498
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	11,099	1,734	11,099	1,734
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, EXTRAORDINARY MAINTENANCE	---	8,500	---	---
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	7,032	1,649	7,032	1,649
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	1,163	---	585	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION	1,443	---	1,443	---
SHASTA DIVISION	3,480	7,139	3,426	7,139

SHASTA DIVISION	3,480	7,139	3,426	7,139
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION	8,006	4,807	7,806	4,807
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS	635	5,750	635	5,750
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT	5,912	6,302	5,744	6,302
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION	2,000	---	2,000	---
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM	3,564	---	3,564	---
LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	1,500	---	1,500	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJECT	7,500	---	7,500	---
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO PROJ	---	---	1,500	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO CNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJECT	1,500	---	1,500	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	1,500	---	1,500	---
ORLAND PROJECT	---	570	---	570
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	---	1,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	10,600	---	10,600	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	2,000	---	2,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	3,000	---	3,000	---
SOLANO PROJECT	995	1,005	995	1,005
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	625	---	175	---
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 AND 8	3,000	---	3,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	813	798	813	798
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	304	7,506	304	7,506
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	435	---	110	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	94	16	94	16
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	339	4,927	339	4,927
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, PUEBLO DAM	---	6,700	---	6,700
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	403	506	403	506
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	763	1,010	763	1,010
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP	---	319	---	319
MANCOS PROJECT	44	22	44	22
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	---	2,058	---	2,058
PINE RIVER PROJECT	362	58	362	58
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS DIV	316	3,591	316	3,591
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	293	23	293	23
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN SELENIUM STUDY	100	---	100	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATE FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	2,385	2,726	2,385	2,726
COLUMBIA-SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	13,122	---	9,500	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	200	---	200	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	363	---	325	---
LEWISTON ORCHARDS, RESERVOIR 'A' DAM	---	150	---	150
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	4,030	1,809	4,030	1,809
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	315	---	315	---
KANSAS				
EQUUS BEDS GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	---	---	423	---
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	400	---
WICHITA PROJECT	---	219	---	219
MONTANA				
FORT PECK RURAL WATER SYSTEM, MT	---	---	1,000	---
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	69	177	69	177
MILK RIVER PROJECT	145	353	117	353
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	446	---	274	---
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WTR RIGHTS SETTLEMENT STUDY	1,000	---	500	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	30	28	30	28
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150	---	150	---
NEVADA				
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,352	1,098	6,352	1,098

NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT	1,012	576	1,012	576
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	2,010	9,766	1,917	9,766
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	268	---	---
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	769	2,564	769	2,564
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	124	---	---	---
SO. NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	254	---	254	---
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	213	---	---	---
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	2,313	---	2,313	---
NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	200	---	---	---
DAKOTA TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	150	---	150	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	26,849	180	26,849	180
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	161	---	161
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	530	---	530
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	225	---	225
NORMAN PROJECT	---	156	---	156
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	275	---	150	---
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	255	---	255
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT	---	640	---	640
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	105	297	105	297
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	1,000	---	500	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	165	122	165	122
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	50	---	50	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	12,390	292	11,390	292
MALHEUR/OWYHEE/POWDER/BURNT RIVER BASINS	50	---	---	---
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	810	---	610	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	165	626	165	626
TUALATIN PROJECT	91	97	91	97
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT (PHASE III)	250	---	250	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	336	1,270	336	1,270

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATE FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
SOUTH DAKOTA				
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	5,000	10	15,000	10
MNI WICONI PROJECT	23,873	5,527	23,873	5,527
RAPID CITY WASTEWATER REUSE STUDY	50	---	---	---
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	---	23	---	23
TEXAS				
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	124	---	124
EL PASO WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE	---	---	1,000	---
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	---	387	---	387
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	---	541	---	541
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	255	---	255
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	390	---	---	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	49	12	49	12
MOON LAKE PROJECT	14	11	14	11
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	150	---	---	---
NEWTON PROJECT	35	12	35	12
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	350	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	67	18	67	18
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	335	293	335	293
SCOFIELD PROJECT	49	3	49	3
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	100	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	84	3	84	3
TOOELE WASTEWATER REUSE PROJECT	---	---	571	---
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,845	140	1,845	140
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	281	7	281	7

WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	5,030	8,984	5,030	8,984
LOWER ELWHA KLALLAM RURAL WATER SUPPLY FEAS. STUDY	100	---	---	---
TULALIP TRIBES WATER QUALITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	50	---	---	---
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	410	---	---	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	491	7,535	491	7,535
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WTR ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,734	---	11,434	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4	4,642	4	4,642
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	18	1,164	18	1,164
SHOSHONE PROJECT	38	859	38	859
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	20	---	---	---
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II	12,300	---	12,300	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5	4,222	1,014	3,356	902
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE, SECTION 8, RF&W	10,650	---	7,650	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT	75	---	75	---
DEPARTMENT IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM	3,600	---	2,000	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE	500	---	500	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	5,250	---	3,000	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	306	---	306
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENT. PROGRAM	15,118	---	15,118	---
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION	1,677	---	677	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,083	---	1,500	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES	---	3,892	---	3,892
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,375	---	375
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES	2,135	---	1,700	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	6,232	---	5,232	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM	13,540	---	6,540	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS	---	910	---	910
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION	1,300	---	1,300	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM	9,250	---	7,680	---
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING	1,048	---	884	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET ESTIMATE FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	98	538	98	538
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM - OTHER PROJECT	3,174	24,593	3,174	24,593
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES	1,031	642	1,023	550
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM	436	---	386	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION	5,235	---	4,696	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT - TITLE XXVIII	4,222	---	4,222	---
RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	2,053	---	1,891	---
SAFETY OF DAMS:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	---	1,600	---	1,600
SAFETY OF DAMS EVALUATION AND MODIFICATION	---	60,869	---	54,983
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,503	---	3,242	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	1,300	---	1,300	---
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	50	---	50	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION/ENHANCE	215	---	215	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT	300	---	300	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,000	---	1,000	---
SITE SECURITY	---	754	---	754
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	257	---	257	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,911	---	---	---
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY	2,214	---	2,050	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES - TECH SUPPORT	100	---	100	---
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	8,836	---	6,600	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	5,595	---	3,595	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	---	-30,800	---	-33,050
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	409,199	243,639	381,379	223,531

Central Arizona Project, Arizona.—The recommendation for the Central Arizona Project includes $150,000 for the Tucson Reliability Division and $1,224,000 for litigation activities associated with native fish protection.

Lake Powell, Arizona and Utah.—None of the funds provided in this recommendation may be used to study measures related to or associated with the drainage of Lake Powell.

Northern Arizona Investigations Program, Arizona.—The recommendation of $200,000 is for the Little Colorado River Sediment Transport study.

South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, Arizona.—Of the amount provided for the South/Central Arizona Investigations Program, $50,000 is for the Southern Arizona Regional Water Management study, $200,000 is for the Upper Gila River Watershed Restoration study, $400,000 is for the West Salt River Valley Water Management study, and $150,000 is for the Verde River Basin Management study.

Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act Project, Arizona.—The recommendation does not include funding to initiate the San Xavier farm extension project.

Tucson Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Study, Arizona.—Funding for the Tucson Area Water Reclamation and Reuse study is funded under the Bureau-wide Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—Within the amount provided for the American River Division of the Central Valley Project, $4,000,000 is for construction of a permanent pumping facility for the Placer County Water Agency. Using these funds and funds previously appropriated for this project, the Bureau is directed to execute continuing contracts for construction of the pumping plant as expeditiously as possible. The recommendation also includes $3,400,000, the full amount of the budget request, to initiate construction of the temperature control device at Folsom Dam.

Central Valley Project, Delta Division, California.—The amount provided for the Delta Division of the Central Valley Project includes full programmatic requirements for fiscal year 2000 for the Contra Costa Fish Screen Program (Rock Slough) and the Delta Barriers project. The recommendation does not include the funding requested to begin new research and technology activities or to initiate a new feasibility study. The recommendation also excludes the funding requested for Bay-Delta Oversight. Sufficient funding is provided in the California Bay-Delta Restoration account to provide for oversight and administration activities associated with the CALFED Bay-Delta program.

Central Valley Project, Miscellaneous Project Programs, California.—The Committee has included the budget proposal to fund Refuge Water Supply from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund. The Committee has recommended full funding for Refuge Water Supply from that Fund.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—The amount provided for the Sacramento River Division of the Central Valley Project includes $520,000 for the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock program and $1,000,000 for the Inte-

grated Watershed Management Project for the Colusa Basin Drainage District. The recommendation also includes $3,750,000 for the Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District fish screen improvement project at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant. The Committee continues to recognize that the fish screen facility and the gradient facility are both necessary to meet fish protection goals at the Hamilton City Pumping Plant. In the Construction, General Account of the Corps of Engineers, the Committee has provided $6,000,000 for continued construction of the gradient facility. The Committee repeats its direction that both agencies consider these activities as two elements of the same project, and that they take necessary steps to ensure that the projects are coordinated in every respect.

Central Valley Project, Shasta Division, California.—The recommendation does not include the funding requested to observe the reproductive success of bald eagles at Shasta Dam. The recommendation does include $2,006,000 for activities, including physical modifications, at the Coleman Fish Hatchery. The recommendation fully funds the budget request for the Clear Creek Restoration Program. In addition to the funding provided in this account for the Clear Creek Restoration Program, $2,050,000 is recommended from the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund.

Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division, California.—The Committee is aware of the Trinity River study addressing the effects of various flows on the anadromous fish populations in the river. The Committee is concerned about the potential impacts on water supply in the Bay-Delta system. As part of the study, the Secretary is directed to minimize the adverse impacts on the Central Valley Project and to ensure that the effects of the flow recommendations from the Trinity River study on the Bay-Delta system are fully assessed within the CALFED process before reaching a decision on implementing study recommendations.

Central Valley Project, West San Joaquin Division, California.—The amount provided for the West San Joaquin Division of the Central Valley Project includes $4,525,000 for continued operation of the San Luis Joint-Use Facilities. Also included is $851,000 for implementation of the Arroyo Pasajero sediment encroachment fix and the full amount of the budget request for flowage easements at Arroyo Pasajero. Within available funds, the Bureau is directed to continue to assist in the planning efforts associated with the Cantua Creek Stream Group.

Colorado River Front Work and Levee System, California and Arizona.—The recommendation includes $125,000 for design of the Palo Verde Drain project.

Mission Basin Brackish Groundwater Desalting Demonstration Project, California.—The recommendation includes funding for expansion of the Mission Basin Desalting Facility at the City of Oceanside, as authorized within the Title XVI water reclamation and reuse program.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The recommendation includes $1,000,000 for the Salton Sea Research Project in California.

Colorado Investigations Program, Colorado.—Funding provided for the Colorado Investigations Program is to complete the Mesa County Water Conservation investigation.

Upper Colorado River Basin Selenium Study.—The recommendation includes the full amount of the budget request to complete the Upper Colorado River Basin Selenium Study.

Idaho Investigations Program, Idaho.—Funding has been provided to complete the Treasure Valley Hydrologic Analysis and the Upper Salmon River Water Optimization study. Funds have also been included to continue the Lower Boise River Water Quality Plan and the Lower Payette River Water Quality Plan.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The Committee recommendation includes funding to complete the Federal cost share obligation for the Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project in Kansas.

Kansas Investigations Program, Kansas.—The recommendation includes $200,000 for the Cheney Reservoir Water Quality Assessment. The remaining funds are provided to complete the Cheyenne Bottoms Investigation.

Fort Peck Rural Water System, Montana.—The Committee is aware of ongoing efforts to secure non-Federal participation in development of the Fort Peck Rural Water System. The Committee further understands that prior year funds will be available for expenditure on this project if such non-Federal participation is secured in fiscal year 2000. In addition to such prior year funds, the Committee has added $1,000,000 for the Fort Peck Rural Water System for fiscal year 2000.

Montana Investigations Program, Montana.—The recommendation includes the full amount of funding requested to complete the Nevada Reservoir study, the North Fork of the Blackfoot River investigation, and the Jefferson River Basin Return Flow investigation. The remaining funds are provided for the Montana River System investigation.

Nebraska Investigations Program, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided full funding of the budget request to complete the Nebraska Rainwater Basin Wetlands investigation.

Carlsbad and Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico.—The Committee prohibits the use of appropriated funds for the diversion or instream use of non-Federal water in the Middle Rio Grande Project and the Pecos River Project in New Mexico for aquatic habitat or species protection until such time as all existing Federal water allocations have been exhausted for such purposes. The Committee supports the efforts in New Mexico to enhance the habitat of the fish species generally known as the silvery minnow and blunt nosed shiner, but requires those efforts to be performed without negatively affecting current water policy on the Rio Grande and Pecos Rivers in New Mexico.

Southern New Mexico/West Texas Investigations Program, New Mexico and Texas.—The recommendation includes final year funding for the Rio Grande Project River and Drains Water Quality Assessment.

Oklahoma Investigations Program, Oklahoma.—The funds recommended for the Oklahoma Investigations Program are for continuation of the Lugert-Altus Water Resources Management Assessment.

Grande Ronde Water Optimization Study, Oregon.—The recommendation includes final year funding to complete the Grande Ronde Water Optimization Study.

Oregon Investigations Program, Oregon.—The recommendation includes funds to continue the Rogue River Basin study, the John Day River Basin study, the Grande Ronde River Basin Study, and investigations of the Malheur, Owyhee, Powder, and Burnt River Basins. The recommendation also includes funding to complete the Deschutes River Basin study.

Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project, South Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes an addition of $10,000,000 above the budget request for acceleration of the Mid-Dakota Rural Water Project in South Dakota.

Mni Wiconi Project, South Dakota.—The Committee has provided $29,400,000, the full amount of the budget request, for the Mni Wiconi Project in South Dakota.

Rapid City Wastewater Reuse Study, South Dakota.—Funding for the Rapid City Wastewater Reuse Study has been provided under the Bureau-wide Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.

El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, Texas.—The Committee has recommended $1,000,000 for construction of the Haskell Street portion of the El Paso Water Reclamation and Reuse Project.

Northern Utah Investigations Program, Utah.—The recommendation includes $250,000 in final year funding for the Ashley/Brush Creeks Area Water Management investigation and $100,000 in final year funding for Ogden River Basin Water Quality Management investigation.

Southern Utah Investigations Program, Utah.—The recommendation includes final year funding of $100,000 for the Carbon/Emery Counties Water Management investigation.

Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project, Utah.—The recommendation includes $571,000 to complete Federal participation in the Tooele Wastewater Reuse Project.

Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, Washington.—The Committee has provided $11,434,000 for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project in Washington. The recommendation does not include funding for the Interim Comprehensive Basin Operating Plan, the budget request for which exceeds the current authorized ceiling. The Committee recognizes the potential benefits of diverting water for the Kennewick and Columbia Irrigation Districts from the Columbia River instead of the Yakima River. This could greatly enhance instream river flows where they are most needed to benefit endangered salmon. The Bureau of Reclamation is encouraged to investigate this proposal to the extent permitted by existing authorities.

Endangered Species Recovery Implementation Program.—The recommendation includes $15,118,000, the full amount of the budget request, to continue the Endangered Species Recovery Implementation Program.

Reclamation Recreation Management (Title XXVIII).—Of the amount provided for the Title XXVIII program, $500,000 is for renovations and enhancements at Lost Creek within the Weber Basin Project in Utah.

Safety of Dams.—The recommendation includes the full amount of fiscal year 2000 requirements to complete repair and improvements to the Wasco Dam within the Wapinitia Project.

Soil and Moisture Conservation.—Within the funds provided for the Soil and Moisture Conservation program, the Bureau is directed to initiate a sediment management plan for Twitchell Reservoir in California.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—Of the amount provided for the Bureau-wide Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse program, $200,000 is for planning activities associated with the Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse Project; $150,000 is for the Tucson Area Water Reclamation and Reuse study; $400,000 is for a feasibility study of the Watsonville Area Wastewater Recycling Project; $750,000 is for a feasibility study of the Santa Fe Water Reclamation and Reuse Project; $50,000 is for completion of the Rapid City Wastewater Reuse study; and $500,000 is included to complete construction prerequisites for the City of West Jordan Water Reuse Project in Utah.

Water Management and Conservation Program.—The Committee supports development of a water plan for Orange County, California, and understands that funding will be provided from the Water Management and Conservation Program to complete this activity in fiscal year 1999.

Wetlands Development.—Of the amount provided for the Wetlands Development program, $1,000,000 is provided for construction of the second phase of the restoration project at South Lake Tahoe, including efforts at Trout and Angora Creeks. Also included in the recommendation is $750,000 for the Brawley Wetlands project to improve conditions in the New River and Alamo River in California. $382,000 is for the Sierra Vista/San Pedro wetlands development project.

The Committee understands that the Bureau is completing construction of sewage treatment plant modifications, wetlands treatment system, and the effluent recharge basins at Sierra Vista/San Pedro with funds provided in fiscal year 1999. The community is struggling to balance the future stability of the watershed with the rapidly developing border region. The Committee is aware that a coalition—the San Pedro Partnership—has been formed to bring together interested parties to review the problems and to develop solutions. The Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to actively participate and cooperate in this important effort.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1999	$8,421,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	12,425,000
Recommended, 2000	12,425,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+4,004,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	

Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l), loans and/or grants may 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.

Under the Fort McDowell Water Rights Settlement Act, the Fort McDowell Indian Community's irrigation distribution system was funded through the Small Reclamation Projects Act loan program. The Committee understands that the original development plan required setting aside 330 acres of Reservation land for mitigation and the acreage identified for development was reduced by 175–200 acres to avoid impacts to cultural resource sites. Given this reduction of land, the Tribe asserts that it is not receiving the full benefits of the water rights settlement and that this situation must be corrected. The Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to negotiate a solution with the Tribe that will ensure that the Fort McDowell Indian Community receives the full benefits of the settlement. The Bureau is further directed to provide a report on the results of these negotiations to the Committee by April 1, 2000.

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
LOAN PROGRAM			
CALIFORNIA			
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	14,307	2,600	2,600
CHINO BASIN DESALINATION PROJECT	10,249	117	117
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION	9,293	1,700	1,700
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT	28,100	6,408	6,408
TEMESCAL VALLEY PROJECT	5,327	1,175	1,175
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION	---	425	425
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM		12,425	12,425

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 1999	$33,130,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	47,346,000
Recommended, 2000	47,346,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+14,216,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

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

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA RESTORATION

Appropriation, 1999	$75,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	95,000,000
Recommended, 2000	75,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	.....
Budget Estimate, 2000	−20,000,000

The California Bay-Delta Restoration account funds the Federal share of ecosystem restoration and other activities being developed for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by a State and Federal partnership (CALFED). Federal participation in this program was authorized in the California Bay-Delta Environmental and Water Security Act enacted in the fall of 1996. That Act authorizes the appropriation of $143,300,000 for ecosystem restoration activities in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000. The funds appropriated in this account are transferred to participating Federal agencies based on a program recommended by the CALFED group and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the participating agencies.

Of the $75,000,000 recommended for fiscal year 2000, $45,000,000 is for continued ecosystem restoration activities, and $30,000,000 is for other authorized purposes, such as projects to promote or develop water use efficiency, water quality, groundwater storage, surface storage, levees, conveyance systems and watershed management.

The Committee is extremely concerned about the use of Federal funds to acquire and retire productive lands in the Central Valley of California. Specifically, the Committee recognizes that land acquisition and changes in land use could have enormous impacts on the social character, tax base and economic development of communities in northern California. Consequently, the Committee directs that Bay-Delta funds shall not be used for land and water right acquisitions without proper consideration to, and mitigation of, the economic impacts associated with such acquisitions.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1999	$47,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	49,000,000
Recommended, 2000	45,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−2,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−4,000,000

The general administrative expenses program provides for the executive direction and management of all Reclamation activities, as performed by the Commissioner's offices in Washington, DC, and Denver, Colorado, and in the 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.

For fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended $45,000,000, a $2,000,000 reduction from the enacted level for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management, the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, Weapons Activities, Defense Environmental Management, Other Defense Activities, Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal, the Power Marketing Administrations, and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Due to severe funding constraints, funding recommendations for Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2000 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 2000 budget request.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

In House Report 105–581, the Committee asked the Department to perform a comprehensive management and field structure review. Based on this review, the Secretary made several changes to realign field office reporting relationships. However, the size of the field structure and the overlapping and duplicative roles and responsibilities were not addressed. Numerous reports have identified issues with the Department's field structure which hamper the efficient and effective execution of Departmental programs. The Galvin report in February 1995 identified ". . . a counterproductive federal system of operation." A March 1997 report prepared by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) identified a series of problems with Defense Program's management processes and noted that many of the issues could not be addressed by a single program, but required Department-wide management changes. The General Accounting Office has issued several reports on improving the management of Federal agencies. Finally, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board report on security problems at the Department seriously questions the layers of bureaucracy and states that:

> Layer upon layer of bureaucracy, accumulated over the years, has diffused responsibility to the point where scores claim it, no one has enough to make a difference, and all fight for more. Convoluted, confusing, and often contradictory reporting channels make the relationship between DOE headquarters and the labs, in particular, tense, internecine, and chaotic. In between the headquarters and the laboratories are field offices, which the panel found to be the locus of much confusion. In background briefings of the panel, senior DOE officials often described them as redun-

dant operations that function as a shadow headquarters, often using their political clout and large payrolls to push their own agendas and budget priorities in Congress. Even with the latest DOE restructuring, the weapons labs are reporting to far too many DOE masters.

The list of reviews and reports questioning the Department's field structure and field and Headquarters roles and responsibilities goes on and on. The Committee had hoped that the Secretary of Energy would seek to examine the need for the overlapping and duplicative field structure which has evolved. Since that has not happened, the Committee has reduced funding for the Department's field offices and expects to see at least a 10 percent reduction in the field staffing levels by the end of fiscal year 2000. The Department is expected to analyze the functions performed in the operations offices, field offices, regional offices, and area offices, and determine which are duplicative, add little value to the process, and are no longer needed.

IMPROVING PROJECT MANAGEMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

A report released by the National Research Council on July 1, 1999, "Improving Project Management in the Department of Energy," questions the credibility of the Department's procedures to develop designs and cost estimates and to manage projects and outlines several reasons for this deficiency. The report was thorough and includes many recommendations to begin to correct the deficiencies in the Department's project management system. The Committee is well aware there are broad and systemic problems in the Department and encourages the Department to use this report as an outline to address these fundamental problems in project management. There are no quick fixes. The Committee expects the Department to continue to work with the National Research Council to address each of the recommendations in the report. The National Research Council should review and assess the Department's efforts to improve its project management and report to the Committee semi-annually on the steps to be taken and the progress being made to strengthen project management in the Department.

At the request of the Committee, the Department has had external, independent project assessments prepared for many of its current construction projects. These assessments have identified several problems with individual projects and have led to the rescoping of several of them. The Department is to work with the National Research Council to formalize a process to ensure that the recommendations for each of the external independent reviews are implemented.

EXTERNAL, INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENTS OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

None of the funds provided for fiscal year 2000 new construction projects may be obligated until an external, independent assessment of the baseline cost and schedule has been performed and provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for review and approval.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee continues to be concerned about excessive use of support service contractors and other non-Federal employees throughout the Department of Energy. In fiscal year 1998, the Department spent approximately $50,000,000 on management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to Headquarters program organizations and to support M&O contractor offices in the Washington metropolitan area. In addition to permitting contractor employees to make policy and manage Federal programs, some M&O employees are being paid through overhead accounts to track legislation and lobby Congress, market their services to other Federal agencies, and walk the halls of the Department's headquarters office to seek more Departmental funding.

It is apparent that the Department has been completely negligent in monitoring both the direct and indirect overhead costs incurred by M&O contractors. While many of these activities are quite beneficial to the contractor, they are of significantly less benefit to the U.S. taxpayer. The Committee has drastically reduced funding for these activities in several program accounts and directs the Department to eliminate immediately all funding for contractor lobbying and marketing activities. The Department is directed to reduce these costs to not more than $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2000. The Committee should be notified if the Department needs special authority to hire Federal employees with the skills needed to replace these contractor employees.

Reporting Requirement.—The Committee directs the Department to provide a report at the end of fiscal year 1999 on the use of all support service contractors (those funded directly by Headquarters, and those funded by M&O contractors and assigned to Headquarters) and M&O contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include the use of support service contractors and M&O employees at Headquarters and at each field, area, or site office. The report is to include for each support service contract: the name of the contractor; the program organization (at the lowest organization level possible) hiring the contractor; a descriptive and detailed list of the tasks performed; the number of contractor employees working on the contract; and the annual cost of the contract. The report is to identify all M&O contractor employees who work in the Washington metropolitan area, including the name of the employee, the name of the contractor, the organization to which he or she is assigned, the job title and a description of the tasks the employee is performing, the annual cost of the employee to the Department, the program account funding that employee, and the length of time the employee has been detailed to the Department. The report should also include detailed information on the cost of maintaining each M&O office in the Washington metropolitan area. This report is to include actual data for the period October 1, 1998 through September 30, 1999, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2000.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

Throughout this report, the funding recommendations for many of the Department's programs include reductions for activities

which the Committee believes are inappropriate or excessive. A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report outlined the Department's spending for contractor travel which was in the range of $250,000,000 annually. One contractor was averaging 87 trips a week to Washington. Based on this abuse, the Committee has limited the amount of funding for contractor travel to $125,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

The Department is directed to review the rules and regulations pertaining to contractor travel expenses to ensure they are not more generous than the rules and regulations which pertain to the travel of Federal employees in fiscal year 2000. Domestic and international travel for contractor employees should not permit the use of first class or business class fares unless specifically approved by the appropriate Assistant Secretary funding the travel. The Department should report to the Committee by January 31, 2000 on the changes made to contractor travel regulations to be consistent with those applied to Federal employees. This report should also identify the amount of funds spent by each contractor for travel in fiscal year 1999.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Department currently allows each laboratory director to use six percent of all operating funds provided to the laboratory to conduct employee-suggested research and development projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. For fiscal year 2000, the Department estimates that the laboratories will spend $273,000,000 on Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) and additional funds on Director's Discretionary Research and Development (DDRD).

Discretionary research and development funding was initiated to provide funds for cutting-edge, high-risk research. However, the size of the fund has increased significantly as overall funding levels increased throughout the Department, and there are notable areas of abuse. These funds have been used for marketing and business development, international travel, research for other Federal agencies, and initiating programs in advance of Congressional funding. In addition, this funding provides a significant advantage to the largest laboratories which have more than $50,000,000 of "walking around" money annually for the laboratory director to use to compete for research funding within the Department, with other Federal agencies, and with the private sector. This can be a significant advantage for the laboratories.

The Committee will not argue there is no value to some of these activities, but questions the lack of oversight of this spending and whether this is the best use of taxpayer dollars in times of constrained budgets. Thus, the Committee has eliminated all funding for LDRD and DRDD in fiscal year 2000.

OVERHEAD COSTS

The Committee directs the Department to review the costs included in the overhead charges of the management and operating contractors and report to the Committee on the reasonableness of these charges. In addition, the Department should determine which charges should more appropriately be funded as direct program

costs. There are many activities being charged to overhead accounts which may be more appropriately charged as direct program costs. For example, some contractors are direct funding security investigation costs while others are charging these costs to overhead accounts. The costs of management and operating contractor offices in Washington are charged to overhead accounts, and thus, have received little review. The laboratories also appear to establish centers of excellence in many areas while charging these centers to overhead accounts without the approval that would normally be required for direct program activities.

COMPUTER SECURITY

In House Report 105–581, the Committee requested a report by March 30, 1999, identifying a computer security policy and implementation plan that stated the overall Departmental policy on computer security, the roles and responsibilities of Departmental organizations for computer security both in headquarters and field installations, the steps being implemented to protect the Department's publicly accessible computer systems from external attempts to alter or delete data, and the steps being taken to ensure that all sites remove classified and sensitive information from internet-accessible computers and strengthen the programs to prevent recurrences. The Department requested a two month extension, but the Committee has not yet received the required report.

Events of the past few months have highlighted the Department's computer weaknesses, but it is still not clear that the concerns expressed by the Committee last year have been addressed. Thus, the Committee directs that all funding for the corporate management systems be withheld from obligation until the Department has provided this report to the Committee.

REPROGRAMMING GUIDELINES

The Committee requires the Department to promptly and fully inform the Committee when a change in program execution and funding is required during the fiscal year. To assist the Department in this effort, the following guidance is provided for programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

Definition.—A reprogramming includes the reallocation of funds from one activity to another within an appropriation, or any significant departure from a program, project, or activity described in the agency's budget justification as presented to and approved by Congress. For construction projects, a reprogramming constitutes the reallocation of funds from one construction project identified in the justifications to another or a significant change in the scope of an approved project.

Criteria for Reprogramming.—A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if delay of the project or the activity until the next appropriations year would result in detrimental impact to an agency program or priority. Reprogrammings may also be considered if the Department can show that significant cost savings can accrue by increasing funding for an activity. Mere convenience or desire should not be factors for consideration.

Reprogrammings should not be employed to initiate new programs or to change program, project, or activity allocations specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. In cases where unforeseen events or conditions are deemed to require such changes, proposals shall be submitted in advance to the Committee and be fully explained and justified.

Reporting and Approval Procedures.—The Committee has not provided statutory language to define reprogramming guidelines, but expects the Department to follow the spirit and the letter of the guidance provided in this report. Consistent with prior years, the Committee has not provided the Department with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2000, unless specifically identified in the House, Senate, or conference reports. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the Committees in writing and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees on Appropriations.

INAPPROPRIATE USE OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Committee continues to be concerned about the inappropriate use of trade associations and other non-governmental organizations in the development of budget requests and execution of Department programs. In prior years, the Department reimbursed certain groups for the following activities: answering the organization's phones, faxes and e-mails; updating non-DOE web sites; getting industry together to develop "consensus positions" on Department programs; conference calls with Department employees once a month; publishing association journals and other publications; and attending domestic and international conferences to represent their industry members. These contracts and grants were especially suspect considering that funds were routinely awarded noncompetitively.

The Committee has been assured that the Department has discontinued these practices. The Committee commends the Department for working toward better controls and using competitive procedures in funding programs within its purview. Consistent with last year's direction, the Department should procure services from contractors in arms-length arrangements. In cases where it is determined that a specific service or product is needed, and it is in the interest of the Department to secure the service or product through a grant or contract, the Department should procure or award using competitive procedures.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations for Department of Energy programs are described in the following sections. A detailed funding table is included at the end of this title.

ENERGY SUPPLY

Appropriation, 1999	$727,091,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	834,791,000
Recommended, 2000	577,579,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−149,512,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−257,212,000

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: solar and renewables; nuclear energy; environment, safety and health; and technical information management. The Committee recommendation includes transferring and consolidating the funding for field offices and Oak Ridge landlord activities in the Science account consistent with the Department's management restructuring. In prior years, the Committee recommended significant reductions to programs in this account including reductions to solar and renewable programs of 30%. This year, the Committee recommendation is generally supportive of the level of funding provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999.

In prior years, Administrations have sought to justify large spending increases for this account based on the Department's role to end the oil crisis, control pollution, promote solar businesses and save the environment. This year, this Administration is justifying large spending increases based on a new role for the Department: to prevent the sun from over-heating the Earth. To accomplish this goal, the Administration developed a two-pronged strategy: increase the number of spending programs and increase spending for existing programs.

The Committee rejects this strategy. As a first step, the Committee has been actively working to improve the scope and management of the Department's research and development programs. Before it can be determined whether more funding is needed for existing programs, there are basic questions about the purpose and value of these activities. These questions include: the balance of basic research versus development; the prioritization of technologies; the wisdom of awarding non-competitive grants and contracts to the same groups of beneficiaries year after year; the ability (and desire) to actually track and collect the thousands of research and development "deliverables"; the inability to spend funds appropriated in prior years; and the very basic question of the applicability of some of these activities to the lives of American taxpayers.

The Committee notes that the Department has acknowledged that improvements must be made in the Department's management practices. The Committee has enjoyed a good working relationship with the new management team and fully supports efforts to better prioritize spending for these programs. There is widespread agreement that there is greater value that can be gained from the current level of spending, which is substantial. There may never be agreement on what amount of spending is appropriate, but there should be no disagreement on the need to get better value for the dollars being spent by the Department.

With regard to the Administration's request to increase spending for programs it identifies as part of the Climate Change Technology

Initiative (CCTI), the Committee rejects the premise of the Administration's argument for more spending. For example, the Committee believes that prior year funding levels identified by the Administration as part of the CCTI represent an arbitrary amount considering the programs not included. Why not include the tens of millions of dollars the Office of Energy budgeted for solar and renewable energy research? Why wouldn't the $8,200,000 provided for the National Institute for Global and Environmental Change be counted in the effort to study global and environmental change?

In short, the Committee believes that the tens of billions of dollars spent on renewable energy, nuclear energy, fusion energy, and the Federal workforce needed to manage these programs, has been a significant amount of funding. The hundreds of millions recommended by the Committee last year and in this bill again this year represent a serious and significant level of funding. Rather than suggesting this funding is insufficient by proposing unrealistic and dramatic increases, the Committee observes that American taxpayers are supporting a level of effort for these technologies unrivaled by any other nation.

SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Committee recommendation for solar and renewable research and development is $326,450,000, a reduction of $39,455,000 from the amount provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for the current fiscal year, and a reduction of $119,571,000 from the amount in the budget request. The Committee continues to be concerned that, over the years, the Department has placed a higher priority on providing funds to corporations and other private interests extensively expanding efforts to commercialize technologies that are not yet ready to fully compete in the marketplace. These efforts have come at the expense of a more proper role for government: fostering peer-reviewed research which could lead to cutting-edge discoveries in plant research, chemical and materials sciences and other areas fundamental to development of these technologies. With the goal of better coordinating the efforts of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Science, the Committee combined the budgets of these offices and directed the Department to submit a comprehensive research and development budget. The Committee commends the Department for its effort to coordinate the efforts of these offices, which share common goals. The Committee further encourages program managers in both offices to explore the opportunities for more relevant research and better directed development of these technologies.

Following are specific recommendations for programs:

Solar building technology research.—The Committee notes that solar water heating is a mature technology. The Committee recommendation of $1,500,000 includes $300,000, the amount requested, to continue efforts to establish voluntary certification standards for system installations. The remaining funds are provided to complete ongoing research and development activities.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The Committee continues to strongly support the goals of this program. The Committee recommendation provides $69,847,000 including $2,847,000, the same

amount as the budget request, for related research conducted by the Office of Science. The recommendation includes support for basic research and thin-film partnerships. The Committee recommendation includes continuation of support for the ongoing research in photovoltaics conducted by the Southeast and Southwest regional photovoltaic experiment stations. The recommendation does not include an increase over the current fiscal year for PV Building Opportunities activities.

Concentrating solar power.—The Committee recommendation provides $13,000,000 to continue and complete ongoing research and development activities. The Committee commends the Department for completing its participation in the Solar Two project. This project and other system development activities have demonstrated that these technologies can produce electricity. While there are off-grid and other niche markets for these products, there are more promising and dramatic advances for baseload generation in photovoltaics and biomass programs. The funding provided this year represents a transition from an aggressive program to use thermal systems for baseload generation to a more focused program for portable or other niche market systems.

Biomass/biofuels energy systems.—The total Committee recommendation is $97,490,000, including $26,740,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research conducted by the Office of Science. The recommendation includes $29,000,000 for the power systems program and $41,750,000 for the transportation program. The Committee has eliminated and reduced funding for other solar programs, but strongly supports the basic research and maintenance of a Federal role in promising biomass programs. The recommendation does not include funding for the Vermont gasification project for which the Department will complete validation in fiscal year 1999, nor the Minnesota agri-power project, which the sponsors have canceled. The funding level provided represents an increase over last year's appropriation given the completion of these two projects which were budgeted to receive $4,300,000 and $12,000,000, respectively in fiscal year 1999.

The Committee urges the Department to follow through on its commitment to perform a government-wide assessment of biomass activities to eliminate duplication and better focus each agency's program. The Committee recommends the use of up to $6,000,000 within the funds available for the Bioenergy Initiative. Funding for this initiative may be derived from both the power and transportation programs. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee as part of the fiscal year 2001 budget request which identifies each Federal agency that provides funding related to producing power or fuels from biomass and the amounts spent by each program for each agency. The report should include recommendations that eliminate duplication and lay out specific unique roles for each program listed.

Wind energy systems.—The Committee recommendation is $25,283,000, including $283,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research conducted by the Office of Science. The Government Accounting Office (GAO) reported this year that U.S. taxpayers have spent close to one billion dollars on research, development and deployment of wind power systems since 1978.

Over this period of time, the cost of generating wind power has been driven down from $0.20 to $0.40 per kWh to $0.03 to $0.06 per kWh. Wind plant production is at record levels with installations in excess of 800 megawatts, representing a 55% increase in installations from the installed capacity in 1996. Wind energy is a mature technology.

The Department's budget does not recognize that wind energy has arrived in the marketplace. The Department continues to propose spending increases for this program, including an increase for product development to provide funds for a subsidiary of the largest corporate beneficiary, with reported 1998 revenues of $1.6 billion, including its oil and gas business lines. The Committee strongly supports wind energy, but believes that funding levels should be adjusted so that prioritization can be given to hydrogen, photovoltaic, biomass and superconductivity systems. These programs promise dramatic reductions in generation costs and efficiencies.

The Committee supports the Department's efforts to focus resources of the wind program on accelerating the use of wind power in rural areas of the United States. Within the funds appropriated for the wind program, up to $5,000,000 may be used to support certification services and standards development, wind-diesel and other hybrid systems, and monitoring and analysis of new wind projects. The Committee is pleased to see the wind program's FY 1999 accomplishment of establishing Underwriters Laboratories as the first U.S. certification agent for wind energy technology

Renewable energy production incentive (REPI).—The Committee recommendation does not include funding for this troubled program. For several years, the Department has requested and awarded funding to a fraction of eligible applicants. This year, the Department provided testimony that $20,000,000 would be required in fiscal year 2000 to reimburse all eligible applicants for fiscal year 1999 activities. The Department has requested only $1,500,000 or 7.5% of the amount required. The Committee requested an estimate of fiscal year 2000 requirements, but the Department declined to provide an estimate except to state that the amount would be in excess of the 1999 requirement. The Committee has stated its opposition to the Department's prior year practice of selecting "good" renewable energy (wind and biomass, for example) over "bad" renewable energy (methane recapture). This year, the Committee recommends that this program be eliminated rather than putting the Department in the position of determining which eligible utilities will be given awards and which eligible utilities will be denied.

Solar program support.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000, an $8,000,000 reduction from the budget request. The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 for electricity restructuring activities and $1,000,000 for feasibility studies in preparation for a competitive solicitation. The Committee looks forward to working with the Department on better prioritizing funds for various technologies supported by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and cost-effective ways to support deployment of the most promising technologies.

International solar energy.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 exclusively for the U.S. Initiative on Joint Implementation. No funds provided in this or any prior Act are to be made available for the America's 21st Century or CORECT programs.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL).—The Committee recommendation includes $1,100,000, the same amount as the budget request, for infrastructure and general purpose equipment.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $18,000,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 from the amount provided in last year's Energy and Water Development appropriations bill (adjusted to exclude $6,500,000 provided for the geothermal heat pump deployment program). Like the wind energy program, geothermal energy production is a mature technology. The Committee strongly supports geothermal energy, but believes that funding levels should be adjusted so that prioritization can be given to hydrogen, photovoltaic, biomass and superconductivity systems. These programs promise dramatic reductions in generation costs and efficiencies.

Hydrogen.—The Committee recommendation is $23,970,000, including $2,970,000, the same amount as the budget request, for related research conducted by the Office of Science. The Committee commends the Department for its efforts to better coordinate the research and development performed by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and the Office of Science. The Department is encouraged to ensure that the work of these two offices is complementary.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for cost-shared research and development of "fish-friendly" turbines, the same amount as provided in the current fiscal year.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The recommendation includes $31,000,000 for high-temperature superconductivity, the same amount as the budget request. The Committee fully supports the efforts to demonstrate truly first-of-a-kind high-temperature superconducting technologies. The Committee strongly supports the goals of these programs, especially superconducting transmission lines, motors and storage devices which have the potential to greatly enhance the viability of renewable energy resources in the near term.

The recommendation also includes $2,500,000 for transmission reliability and $4,500,000 for energy storage systems, the same amounts as provided in the current fiscal year. Distributed power technologies that generate electricity in close proximity to the consumer have tremendous potential to improve reliability and power quality, reduce electricity costs and minimize the impact of electricity production on the environment. The Committee endorses the Department's efforts in this area and has provided up to $500,000 to remove cross-cutting technical, regulatory, and institutional barriers to distributed power

Program direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $17,000,000, approximately the same as the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy continues to lead the Department in the ratio of salaries and expenses to program dollars. The rec-

ommendation for program direction includes all funding for support service contractors and Assistant Secretary/cross-cutting activities.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation is $265,700,000, a decrease of $18,266,000 from the current fiscal year. The Federal government funds research to improve efficiencies in coal, natural gas, hydropower and other renewable technologies. The modest nuclear research programs requested by this Administration and supported by this Committee represent a commitment to ensuring that nuclear power remains an important contributor to the nation's electricity generating capability. These programs address the entire spectrum of nuclear issues including safety, efficiency, advanced fuels, and long-term safe storage of wastes. Regardless of whether new plants are constructed, each of these issues are important to the people of the nation, who currently rely on nuclear power for 18% of the electricity consumed across the country.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The recommendation includes $32,000,000, a $5,000,000 reduction from the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee continues to be concerned about the lack of interest the Department has shown in streamlining management, reducing the infrastructure, and reducing the extensive level of support service contractors in this program. The Committee strongly urges the Department to negotiate new agreements with the beneficiary and customer of this program, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Test reactor area landlord.—The recommendation includes $9,000,000, the same amount included in the budget request.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The recommendation includes $12,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the current fiscal year. The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for the peer-reviewed Nuclear Engineering Education Research grant program (NEER), $1,400,000 for the university graduate fellowship program, and $1,000,000 for the industry-matching program. The recommendation also provides support to the university nuclear engineering community with full funding for the reactor fuel, sharing, and instrumentation programs.

Nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO).—The recommendation includes $5,000,000, the same amount included in the budget request. The Committee strongly supports this Administration initiative to help ensure that currently operating nuclear power plants are operated as safely and efficiently as possible. The Committee directs that all awards be matched dollar for dollar from industry contributions.

Nuclear energy research initiative (NERI).—The recommendation includes $20,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee strongly supports this program which awards grants to laboratories, universities and consortia using a formal peer-review process. Research topics include: nuclear safety and risk analysis, proliferation-resistant reactor and fuel technologies and new technologies for nuclear wastes. The Committee strongly supports research to ensure that nuclear power remains a safe, efficient and environmentally-friendly contributor to the nation's power generation portfolio.

Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF).—The recommendation is $30,000,000, the same amount as the budget request. The Committee notes that the Department has announced yet another review to determine whether a mission exists for this facility. The Committee urges the Department to demonstrate leadership and bring an end to the cycle of uncertainty that has made it impossible to plan and budget for this facility in a responsible manner.

Termination costs.—The recommendation is $75,000,000, a $10,000,000 reduction from the current fiscal year, but a $10,000,000 increase over the amount requested by this Administration. The recommendation includes $40,000,000 for electrometallurgical-related activities including $20,000,000 for the nuclear technology research and development program to continue study of treating spent fuel using electrometallurgical technology and $20,000,000 to demonstrate electrometallurgical technology at the Fuel Conditioning Facility.

Uranium programs.—The Committee recommendation includes $40,000,000, a $1,000,000 reduction from the amount provided in the budget request. The Committee urges the Department to ensure that funds from the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) are first committed to cover the costs of the burden of USEC cylinders for which the Department has assumed responsibility.

Isotope support.—The Committee recommendation is $18,000,000, a $3,000,000 reduction from the amount requested. The Committee is concerned that demand for medical isotopes could require production increases of up to fourteen percent per year over the next twenty years. Human clinical trials and treatment protocols using medical isotopes are increasingly showing promise in the treatment of cancer, cardiovascular disease, arthritis and other diseases. Furthermore, the potential for reduced health care costs, less debilitating side effects, and higher quality of life made possible through these treatments should be pursued. The Committee directs the Department to work with the National Institutes of Health to identify production priorities for future research work. Furthermore, the Committee expects the Department to incorporate the recommendations and peer review process of the Nuclear Energy Research Advisory Committee in selecting the medical isotope research projects to be funded. Consideration should be given to funding options that include cost-sharing from other sources, including the National Institutes of Health.

The Department is encouraged to accelerate its plan to privatize the molybdenum production operation, which should include reimbursement of these costs.

Program direction.—The recommendation includes $24,700,000, the same amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee notes that in prior years the Office failed to observe internal budget procedures by providing funding for support service contracts from program funds. The Committee directs that all support service contracts be funded from the amount provided for program direction.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The recommendation includes $36,750,000, a reduction of $14,000,000 from the budget request of $50,750,000. Funding for contractors who provide technical assistance to other Department of Energy contractors and Federal employees has been reduced by $14,000,000. As the Committee has consistently noted, the Department relies too much on outside contractors for activities which should be performed by Federal employees. This should not be a significant problem as the Department currently has 1,230 Federal employees performing environment, safety and health activities at Headquarters and in the field.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation is $8,600,000, a reduction of $500,000 from the budget request. The Department is directed to reduce the redundancy currently found between its database and the National Technical Information Service database maintained by the Department of Commerce. The Committee supports the continued downsizing of this program and directs that the Department provide a program plan detailing the program and funding requirements anticipated through fiscal year 2002.

OSHA funding.—The Committee is aware that the Department of Energy and the Department of Labor have been working to clarify that Department of Energy non-nuclear facilities that are not covered by the Atomic Energy Act fall under the jurisdiction of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). There are also efforts to ensure the safety and health of non-Federal employees who are working in Departmental facilities which have been transferred to non-Federal entities for economic development purposes. The Committee expects the Departments of Energy and Labor to complete these agreements to ensure the proper regulation of worker health and safety of all workers at all Departmental sites. This regulatory gap has existed for too long, and the current Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health is to be commended for working quickly to clarify these issues.

The Committee recommendation provides $1,000,000 to be transferred to the OSHA for conducting these activities.

Field offices.—The Department has reorganized the reporting structure for the field offices included in this account, and these offices now report directly to an Assistant Secretary. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation moves the funding for these offices from the Energy Supply appropriation account. Funding for the Chicago, Oakland, and Oak Ridge Operations Offices has been moved to the Science account. Funding for the Idaho Operations Office has been moved to the Environmental Management account.

Oak Ridge landlord.—In recognition of the Department's reorganization, the Committee recommendation provides funding for this program in the Science account.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Energy Supply includes several funding adjustments. Two adjustments are included in the budget request.

The $47,100,000 adjustment represents the funding provided for renewable energy research programs managed by the Office of Science and funded in the Science account. The Committee recommendation also includes the Department's proposal to transfer $5,821,000 from available prior year balances in the geothermal resources development and United States Enrichment Corporation funds. These are the same amounts as the amounts transferred in the budget request.

The recommendation also includes three adjustments not included in the budget request. Recent reviews by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Department's Inspector General (IG) indicate that the Department has been very lax in reviewing expenses incurred by the management and operating contractors. The Committee expects the Department to review all costs incurred by the contractors, make judgments on the validity of those costs, and reduce those which cannot be justified to the satisfaction of the taxpayer. The Department's program managers should be monitoring all of these costs. Reports by the GAO and IG indicating wasteful and excessive spending cast doubt on the validity of all the program costs.

Contractor travel.—According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), in fiscal year 1998, programs funded in the Energy Supply account were charged approximately $6,000,000 for contractor travel expenses. The Committee recommends a reduction of $3,000,000 to be allocated to contractor travel expenses in fiscal year 2000.

Management and operating contractor employees in Washington.—Energy Supply programs spend approximately $6,000,000 on contractor employees and contractor offices in the Washington metropolitan area. The Committee seriously questions the need for this contractor presence in Washington and has reduced this funding by $3,000,000.

Laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) Funding.—The Department currently allows each laboratory director to use six percent of all operating funds provided to the laboratory to conduct employee-suggested research and development projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. For fiscal year 2000, the Committee estimates that approximately $2,000,000 of that will come from the Energy Supply account, and thus, has eliminated this funding.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1999	$431,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	330,934,000
Recommended, 2000	327,223,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−103,977,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−3,711,000

The Non-Defense Environmental Management program includes funds to manage and clean up sites used for civilian, energy research, and non-defense related activities. These past efforts resulted in radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste contamination which requires remediation, stabilization, or some other type of action. The three major activities are: Site Closure where cleanup will be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006 and no further

DOE mission is anticipated; Site/Project Completion where cleanup will be completed by 2006, but DOE programs will continue; and Post 2006 Completion where cleanup activities at the site will extend beyond 2006.

The Committee recommendation is $327,223,000, a reduction of $3,711,000 from the budget request. No funds have been provided for the National Low-Level Waste Program in fiscal year 2000. Over $80,000,000 has been provided for the low-level waste program over the past two decades, and State expertise is now mature enough that Federal funding is no longer required.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 1999	$ 220,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	240,198,000
Recommended, 2000	240,198,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+19,998,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

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 United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC), as well as Department of Energy facilities at these and other uranium enrichment sites. The sites covered by this D&D Fund include the operating uranium enrichment facilities at Portsmouth, Ohio, and Paducah, Kentucky, and the inactive K–25 site in Tennessee, formerly called the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant. Environmental restoration efforts at these three sites are supported from the D&D Fund established by a tax on domestic utilities and by Congressional appropriations. In fiscal year 2000 the Department of Energy will transfer $420,000,000 into this Fund.

The Committee recommends $240,198,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee continues to encourage the Department to review all costs included in the UED&D program and seek to minimize those of lesser priority. The Committee believes there are many efficiencies to be made in all areas of the environmental management program.

The Committee recommendation includes $30,000,000, the same as the budget request, to implement the reimbursement program authorized under Title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act, for active uranium and thorium processing sites which sold uranium and thorium to the United States Government. This program is to assist site owners by compensating them on a per ton basis for the restoration and disposal costs of those mill tailings resulting from sale of materials to the government.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 1999	$ 2,682,860,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	2,839,178,000
Recommended, 2000	2,718,647,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+35,787,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	− 120,531,000

The Science account includes the following programs: high energy and nuclear physics; biological and environmental research; basic energy sciences; computational and technology research; other energy research; fusion energy sciences; Oak Ridge landlord; and program direction (including headquarters and field offices). The Committee continues its very strong support for these basic science programs. While the Committee has eliminated many Department of Energy programs and substantially reduced funding for others, the Committee has provided generous increases for physics programs and other basic research activities funded under this account.

The Committee has taken extraordinary steps to provide the increases included in this recommendation. This year, the Committee was forced to reduce net funding for domestic programs by more than $200,000,000 from the amount provided in last year's bill and more than $300,000,000 from the amount in the budget request. As in prior years, the Committee was able to identify lower priority programs for reductions while protecting basic research programs funded in the Science account.

CLIMATE CHANGE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

The Committee has strongly supported the fundamental science pursued by the Department. The value and credibility of the Department's science program is dependent upon responsible leadership committed to ensuring that research is properly peer-reviewed and wholly independent from the policy positions of any Administration. While it is critical that science inform policy, it is equally critical that policy not direct scientific conclusions. The Committee strongly supports the data collection and peer-reviewed science sponsored by the Department.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

High energy physics research seeks to understand the nature of matter and energy at the most fundamental level, as well as the basic forces which govern all processes in nature. The recommendation continues the Committee's strong support for these fundamental pursuits.

The recommendation is $715,525,000, a $19,025,000 increase over the amount provided in the current fiscal year and an $18,435,000 increase over the amount of the budget request. The recommendation includes a $16,435,000 increase over the budget request for facility operations, and a $2,000,000 increase for the research and development program. The increase reflects the Committee's continued support for full utilization of user facilities. The recommendation also includes funding for orderly and complete transition of the use of the Alternating Gradient Synchrotron for the nuclear physics program.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The goal of nuclear physics research is to improve understanding of the structure and properties of atomic nuclei and the fundamental forces between the constituents that form the nucleus. Nuclear processes determine essential physical characteristics of our

universe and the composition of matter that forms it. The recommendation continues the Committee's support for these fundamental pursuits. The recommendation is $357,940,000, a $22,840,000 increase over the amount provided in the current fiscal year and a $5,115,000 increase over the amount requested. The increase reflects the first full year of operations at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC), the budget amendment to continue operations at the Bates Laboratory and the Committee's continued support for full utilization of the Department's world-class user facilities.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation is $406,170,000, a $37,430,000 reduction from the current fiscal year. The Committee recommendation is the same amount as the budget request, adjusted to exclude funding set aside for the Garden State Cancer Center.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $735,989,000, a reduction of $73,111,000 from the current fiscal year, and a $152,095,000 reduction from the budget request.

The Committee remains committed to robust basic energy research programs which are characterized by cutting-edge basic research, availability of world-class facilities to the scientific and research community, and direction to meet current and future energy-related challenges. For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2000, funding may be reallocated by the Department among all operating accounts in basic energy sciences. The recommendation includes $7,000,000, the same amount as the budget request, for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).

High-Flux Beam Reactor.—The Committee has included statutory language prohibiting the Department from re-starting the High-Flux Beam Reactor. This reactor has been shut down since December, 1996. The Department has failed to meet its own deadlines for making a decision about the future of this reactor. The Committee directs that the Department complete the environmental impact study (EIS) no later than the date provided to the Committee, November 30, 1999, and issue a record of decision no later than thirty days after issuing the final EIS. The Committee has watched deadlines pass while the Department continues funding necessary caretaking and safety improvements with requirements of more than $20,000,000 per year. The Committee further directs the Department to provide a budget and program plan reflecting the record of decision with the submittal of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Spallation Neutron Source.—The recommendation provides $67,900,000, including $17,900,000, the same amount as the budget request, for underlying research and development needed to confirm design for this unique machine and $50,000,000 for construction, a reduction of $146,100,000 from the amount requested. The Committee has again recommended a reduction in the funding level for this project based on several unfavorable reviews of the management of this project including reviews by the Department

of Energy (DOE), the General Accounting Office (GAO), and the comprehensive independent review commissioned by the Committee (EG&G). In testimony to the Committee, the Department stated that: "The only reason for the change in the total project cost is the change in the fiscal year 1999 budget for the project from $157 million to $130 million." Each of the reports cited problems including, for example, the need to reorganize the project office, the need for better lines of responsibility through the lab structure, and the need for project managers with project manager experience. Each of these are significant issues that must be addressed before construction commences. None of these are attributable to the Congress's recognition that this project was not ready for full funding last year. It is unfortunate that the Department chose to first blame Congress when cost estimates were increased.

Despite these problems, the Committee is encouraged that the Department is re-evaluating the costs and proposals submitted by the proposed participating laboratories. The Department has already announced that this project is now on track and that its new management team and project management structure have eliminated all of the problems and concerns of the reports cited above. The Committee has grown accustomed to the Department immediately solving all problems with the issuance of a press release; however, the Committee is holding onto its confetti.

The Committee will continue to closely follow the progress of this project and urges the Department to follow through on its stated commitment to put the goals and interests of this taxpayer-funded project above the goals and interests of the individual labs that ultimately participate in this project. Consistent with the authorization bill recently passed by the House Committee on Science, the Department is prohibited from obligating funds provided in this Act until the following are provided to the committees of jurisdiction, namely the Committee on Science of the House, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate:

(1) Certification that senior project management positions for the project have been filled by qualified individuals;

(2) Cost baseline and project milestones for each major construction and technical system activity, consistent with the overall cost and schedule submitted with the Department's fiscal year 2000 budget, that have been reviewed and certified by an independent entity, outside the Department and having no financial interest in the project, as the most cost-effective way to complete the project;

(3) Binding legal agreements that specify the duties and obligations of each laboratory of the Department in carrying out the project;

(4) A revised project management structure that integrates the staff of the collaborating laboratories working on the project under a single project director, who shall have direct supervisory responsibility over the duties and obligations described in subparagraph (3) above,

(5) Official delegation by the Secretary of primary authority with respect to the project to the project director;

(6) Certification from the Comptroller General that the total taxes and fees in any manner or form paid by the Federal government on the SNS and the property, activities, and income of the Department relating to the SNS to the State of Tennessee or its counties, municipalities, or any other subdivision thereof, does not exceed the aggregate taxes and fees for which the Federal government would be liable if the project were located in any other State that contains a national laboratory of the Department; and

(7) Annual reports on the SNS project, included as part of the Department's annual budget submission, including a description of the achievement of milestones, a comparison of actual costs to estimated costs, and any changes in estimated project costs or schedule.

OTHER ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation for the Computational and Technology Research program is $143,000,000, the same amount as the current fiscal year, and a reduction of $53,875,000 from the budget request. The recommendation does not include funds for the Scientific Simulation Initiative (SSI) or the Next Generation Internet (NGI) programs. The Committee has had to cut existing programs and make hard choices and was unable to justify starting these new spending programs.

The budget justification for NGI failed to explain the need for a multi-million dollar government program at a time when hundreds of private companies are investing billions of dollars on hardware and software innovations. The Committee was informed that funds would be used to upgrade hardware at laboratories and universities and that the Department would study ways to improve the capabilities of the internet. The Committee notes that these activities have been funded in this account and that it is unnecessary to create a new program to continue these efforts.

The budget justification for SSI failed to justify the need to establish a second supercomputing program in the Department of Energy. The Congress has been supportive of the ASCI program which the Department claimed would have benefits in addition to the defense purposes for which it was originally created. The ASCI program, for which Congress is providing more than $300,000,000 per year, seeks to build and operate massively parallel computers with a performance goal of 100 TeraOps by 2004. The proposed SSI program has a goal of building and operating a separate, yet similar, program dedicated exclusively to domestic purposes. At this time, the Committee cannot support this massively parallel proposal to manage and fund two separate supercomputing programs.

The Committee recognizes that the Department has re-classified some of its ongoing activities and therefore has not reduced the budget request by the $85,000,000 requested for these two "new" programs. The Committee appreciates the advantages of modeling and having computing capability to analyze complex problems. The Committee would like to work with the Department to get better answers to questions it has about this new proposal. (For example, the Department declined to answer direct questions about the outyear costs for this program.) The Committee looks forward to fur-

ther discussions to identify a program that has mutually supportable budget and program plans.

Energy research analysis.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000, the same amount as the current fiscal year and the budget request.

Multi-program energy labs.—The Committee recommendation includes $21,260,000, an increase of $1,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee regrets that the Department has failed to meet its obligations for payments of lieu of taxes and has provided sufficient funding to pay arrearages and obligations through fiscal year 1998. The Department is directed to make these payments, some of which are delinquent from fiscal year 1994, as expeditiously as possible.

University and science education.—The Committee has not provided funds for a new university and science education program. The Office of Energy Research informs the Committee that grants to colleges and universities amount to approximately one-half billion dollars in the current fiscal year. This level of funding is consistent with the Committee's direction that the Department fully support higher education. Three years ago, the Committee eliminated the university and science education program and directed that the Department fully support university programs by providing funds from programs. The Committee urges the Department to continue to place a high priority on graduate and post-graduate students. The Committee continues to believe that the Department should place the highest priority on university programs. The use of program funds benefits the missions of the Department and directly connects our nation's future scientists to cutting edge research.

The recommendation includes $4,500,000, the same amount as the budget request, for the Laboratory Cooperative, National Science Bowl and Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowships programs in the program direction account.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation is $250,000,000, a $27,386,000 increase over the budget amount. The Committee commends the Department for its efforts to pursue the most promising paths towards producing electricity from fusion. The Committee has provided sufficient funding to accelerate and fully utilize the user facilities currently in operation. The Committee will work closely with the Department to review the work done by the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board and continue to support the goals of the fusion energy sciences program.

The Committee remains committed to a fusion program that is based on both quality science and the ultimate goal of practical fusion energy. A positive development in this regard is the "roadmapping" process, which the fusion community is now undertaking and which includes both the MFE and IFE approaches. Positive aspects of this process include the emphasis on increasing diversity in the program and strengthening of peer review. The Committee is pleased with the advanced-tokamak emphasis of current tokamak research, which is in keeping with the program emphasis on innovation.

Additional funds are provided to support new work in concept innovation in both MFE and IFE, to provide for more effective utilization of the existing national research facilities, and to support the underlying technology development which sustains this research. The Department is directed to provide an updated spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations within thirty days of enactment of the accompanying bill. The Committee looks forward to working with the Department on budget and program plans to accelerate the accomplishments in the fusion program.

The recommendation includes $13,600,000, the same amount as the budget request, to continue landlord activities and begin decontamination and decommissioning of the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR). The Committee expects that decontamination and decommissioning of the TFTR facility will go forward as proposed and will be managed by the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory. In developing future budgets and program plans, the Committee strongly encourages the Department of Energy and the Administration to ensure that this work can proceed without negatively affecting the ongoing research program.

OAK RIDGE LANDLORD

The Committee recommendation provides $11,800,000, a reduction of $12,000 from the budget request. This program was transferred from the Energy Supply account.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The recommendation is $126,963,000. This includes $52,360,000, the same amount as the budget request, for headquarters activities, and $74,603,000 for the field offices for which funding was transferred to this account. The Committee has provided $47,860,000 for standard program direction activities, and an additional $4,500,000 to fund the Laboratory Cooperative, National Science Bowl, and Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowships programs. The Committee takes this action to establish a legitimate funding mechanism for these activities. The Office of Science is directed to provide full funding for programs as directed by the Congress. In the past, the Department has funded these and other Secretary/Director initiatives despite the lack of appropriations and at the expense of other programs. The Committee directs that the Department refrain from surreptitiously funding programs not included in the budget request and programs for which funding has been specifically denied by Congress.

Field offices.—The Department has reorganized the reporting structure for the field offices formerly included in the Energy Supply account. These offices now report directly to an Assistant Secretary. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation moves the funding for the Chicago, Oakland, and Oak Ridge Operations Offices to the Science account. The Committee recommendation includes $74,603,000, a reduction of $8,289,000 from the budget request. The Committee urges the Department to take a leadership role in establishing a more streamlined and efficient management structure.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Science includes several funding adjustments. Recent reviews by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Department's Inspector General (IG) indicate that the Department has been very lax in reviewing expenses incurred by the management and operating contractors. The Committee expects the Department to review all costs incurred by the contractors, make judgments on the validity of those costs, and reduce those which cannot be justified to the satisfaction of the taxpayer. The Department's program managers should be monitoring all of these costs. Reports by the GAO and IG indicating wasteful and excessive spending cast doubt on the validity of all the program costs. To the extent practicable, the Committee directs that these reductions not be applied to the operation of user facilities.

Contractor travel.—According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), in fiscal year 1998, programs funded in the Science account were charged approximately $16,000,000 for contractor travel expenses. The Committee recommends a reduction of $8,000,000 to be allocated to contractor travel expenses in fiscal year 2000.

The following reductions make up the $43,000,000 general reduction recommended by the Committee.

Management and operating contractor employees in Washington.—Science programs are charged approximately $6,000,000 on contractor employees and contractor offices in the Washington metropolitan area. The Committee seriously questions the need for this contractor presence in Washington and has reduced this funding by $3,000,000.

Science education funding.—Rather than requesting funding for this program in a visible line item as it has in prior years, the Department chose to bury $10,000,000 in five of the nineteen program lines. The Committee recommendation has included $4,500,000 for Laboratory Cooperative, National Science Bowl, and Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowships programs in the program direction lines, but has not included funds for these new programs as proposed in the budget request.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Funding.—The Department currently allows each laboratory director to use six percent of all operating funds provided to the laboratory to conduct employee-suggested research and development projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. For fiscal year 2000, the Committee estimates that approximately $30,000,000 of that will come from the Science account, and thus, has eliminated this funding.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1999	$169,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	258,000,000
Recommended, 2000	169,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	.....
Budget Estimate, 2000	−89,000,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 established a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radio-

active waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities. These laws also established the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommends $169,000,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 2000, the same funding as provided in fiscal year 1999. Combined with the appropriation of $112,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $281,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 2000.

The Department is to review all cost components to see what savings can be achieved in fiscal year 2000. The Committee has not provided funding for the State of Nevada nor for the affected units of local government.

The Committee is aware that the Department proposes to compete the contract for operating the Yucca Mountain Site. The Department should ensure that the competitive process is fair and expeditious, and that the process does not result in any additional delays to the proposed date for opening this facility.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1999	$200,475,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	240,377,000
Recommended, 2000	193,769,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−6,706,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−46,608,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 1999	$−136,530,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−116,887,000
Recommended, 2000	−106,887,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	29,643,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	10,000,000

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. In fiscal year 2000, the Committee has provided funding for Departmental Administration activities in two appropriation accounts. The Committee has provided $193,769,000 in this account, and $25,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account, for total funding of $218,769,000, a reduction of $21,608,000 from the budget request.

The Committee continues to believe that Headquarters staffing for many administrative functions is excessive, and has reduced the funding for certain offices accordingly. Funding has been provided for severance payments for the Office of Field Management.

Information management.—The recommendation includes $12,000,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 from the budget request, for the Corporate Management Information Program. Full funding has been provided for the Corporate Business Management Information System and the Corporate Human Resources Information System.

No funding has been provided for the Corporate Technology Supported Learning new initiative.

The Committee believes that the investment in these systems has the potential to generate substantial savings over the next five years, but is concerned that the project management is not sufficient to ensure success. The Department is directed to provide the Committee with an annual status report by November 1, 1999, showing project milestones, cost schedules, performance measures, and progress to date. The report should also describe any current issues or concerns which could adversely impact the cost or schedule of the project.

Working Capital Fund.—The Department is using a charge back program similar in nature to a working capital fund which charges benefiting programs and organizations with certain administrative and housekeeping activities traditionally funded in a central account. The Committee continues to support this, but wants to reiterate its expectations that: no salaries or other expenses of Federal employees may be charged to the fund; Departmental representation on the Board establishing the policies should be broad based and include smaller organizations; the pricing policies used must be sound and defensible and not include added factors for administrative costs; the advanced payments at any time may be no more than the amount minimally required to adequately cover outstanding commitments and other reasonable activities; and a defined process must be established to dispose of excess advance payments (accumulated credits). Additionally, it is the Committee's expectation that the fund manager will ensure that the fund will neither be managed in a manner to produce a profit nor allow the program customers to use the fund as a vehicle for maintaining unencumbered funds.

The working capital fund should be audited periodically by the Department's Inspector General to ensure the integrity of the accounts, and the Committee expects to be apprised of any recommendations to improve the charge back system.

Use of Prior Year Deobligations and Construction Project Reserves.—Throughout the fiscal year, funds often become available as projects are completed and contracts closed out throughout all of the Department's appropriation accounts. These funds become available for reuse and are retained by the Controller as either prior year deobligations or transferred to construction project reserve accounts. During fiscal year 2000 these funds are not available for reallocation within the Department unless approved by Congress as part of a reprogramming or specifically identified in the budget request.

Cost of Work for Others.—The recommendation for the cost of work for others program is $34,027,000, the same as the budget request. 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 Department's revenue estimate for fiscal year 2000 is $116,887,000. However, the Committee recommendation is $106,887,000, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated that the Department's revenues will be less than the budget request in fiscal

year 2000. The Committee has included the CBO recommended level of revenues.

Transfer from Other Defense Activities—For many years, full funding for all corporate and administrative activities of the Department has been provided in the energy portion of this bill despite the fact that over 70 percent of the Department's funding is provided in the national security programs. The Committee has distributed these costs more equitably in fiscal year 2000 and provided $25,000,000 from national security programs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 1999	$29,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	30,000,000
Recommended, 2000	30,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+1,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

The Office of Inspector General performs agency-wide 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 inspections 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.

The Committee recommendation is $30,000,000, the same as the budget request.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include Weapons Activities; Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Other Defense Activities; and Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal. Descriptions of each of these accounts are provided below.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1999	$4,400,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	4,524,900,000
Recommended, 2000	4,000,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−400,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−524,900,000

The goal of the Weapons Activities program is to maintain confidence in the safety, security, reliability and performance of the Nation's enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. This must be done within the constraints of a comprehensive test ban, using a science-based approach to stockpile stewardship in a smaller, more efficient weapons complex infrastructure. The program must maintain the safety, reliability and performance of the current nuclear weapons stockpile without underground nuclear testing; maintain the capability to return to the design and production of new weapons

and to underground nuclear testing, if directed by the President; and dismantle excess weapons safely and dispose of or store excess components.

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

The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $4,000,000,000, a decrease of $400,000,000 from the fiscal year 1999 appropriation, and a decrease of $524,900,000 from the budget request of $4,524,900,000.

Controlling Costs.—The reduction to the fiscal year 2000 budget request reflects the Committee's concern that the Department is still not seriously seeking to control costs throughout the nuclear weapons complex. The recent GAO report on contractor travel highlighted the Department's lax attitude toward controlling costs at nuclear weapons laboratories. Contractors at the nuclear weapons complex spent $146,000,000 on travel in fiscal year 1998, and of that amount, the three nuclear weapons laboratories accounted for $116,000,000. A report by the Inspector General highlighted the excessive costs of operating the Department's aircraft at Albuquerque. In addition, six percent of all operating funds provided to each laboratory is allocated to the laboratory director for discretionary research. The three weapons laboratory directors control the use of approximately $200,000,000 with little Congressional oversight. Then, there are the contractor overhead charges paid by the Department with little thought. These overhead costs include management and operating (M&O) contractor offices maintained in Washington for the convenience of the contractor, "centers of excellence" established by the contractor to support efforts to seek new missions, and tiered overhead costs which multiply the cost to the government for work performed by subcontractors to the M&O. When the Department can convince the Committee that it really understands and can control contractor costs and can show that all costs relate directly to the Federal government's interests (not the contractor's), then the Committee will be less harsh in its assessment of Departmental oversight of contractor spending.

RESTRUCTURING THE NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

The Committee has included a provision that would delay the obligation of $1,000,000,000 until after June 30, 2000, and Congress has enacted legislation restructuring the national security programs currently under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy. This delayed obligation will give Congress time to craft careful, bipartisan legislation while ensuring that actions are taken to

address the serious problems which have been identified at the Department of Energy.

The report by the Special Investigative Panel of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board concludes that for the past two decades, the Department of Energy has embodied science at its best and security of secrets at its worst. After going through a litany of the problems in security administration, the Panel concludes that the Department is incapable of reforming itself—bureaucratically and culturally—in a lasting way, even under an activist Secretary.

This was only the last in a long line of reports that have documented management problems at the Department of Energy and made numerous recommendations to solve these problems. Unfortunately, there have been few positive results from these reports, and the Committee is concerned that the Department will once again pay lip service to the recommendations while taking very little action.

The report of the Special Investigative Panel suggested two alternative solutions. The first would create a new semi-autonomous agency within the Department with responsibility for weapons research and development. The second proposal would create a wholly independent agency. The Committee has watched while many have developed elaborate legislation to create a new semi-autonomous agency within the Department. But, the Committee does not believe this fully addresses the problems. This solution would not free the weapons program from systemic problems. The same people staffing this new organization would be those who have created the problems over the past two decades.

Starting with a fresh slate is the only chance for solving many of the problems. Eliminating the cumbersome and redundant field structure will lead to cost savings and management efficiencies. Creating an independent agency at the sub-Cabinet level will free the agency from political influence and encourage the appointment of technically qualified managers. Direct lines of responsibility and authority will be established. Those interested primarily in maintaining the status quo will be thwarted.

There will ultimately be cost savings from this proposal. The Department of Energy has approximately 14,500 Federal employees in Headquarters and at various field offices throughout the country. Streamlining the agency and the Byzantine field structure, as recommended by the each of the independent reviews, will result in significant cost savings. The Department currently spends nearly $1.7 billion on administrative expenses associated with these Federal employees. The report of the Special Investigative Panel questioned the need for field offices. Downsizing the Headquarters staff and streamlining the field structure will result in immediate cost savings.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP

The stockpile stewardship program addresses issues of maintaining confidence in stockpile safety and reliability without nuclear testing through a science-based stockpile stewardship program using upgraded or new experimental and computational capabilities. Funding of $2,098,472,000, a decrease of $187,728,000 from

the budget request, has been recommended for fiscal year 2000. As noted above, the Committee believes there are many cost efficiencies to be achieved throughout the laboratory complex.

Core stockpile stewardship.—Core stockpile stewardship is funded at $1,482,632,000, the same as fiscal year 1999, but a reduction from the budget request of $1,635,355,000.

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative.—The budget request includes $341,000,000 for the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) which will provide the software, computer platforms, and operating environments to accelerate the development of simulation capabilities to ensure confidence in a safe and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile without underground nuclear testing. This is a significant increase over the fiscal year 1999 funding level of $300,926,000. The recommendation provides $316,000,000.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation for construction projects is $126,140,000, a reduction of $7,005,000 from the budget request, but a significant increase over the fiscal year 1999 funding level of $103,443,000. Funding for Project 99–D–108, Renovate Existing Roadways at the Nevada Test Site, has not been provided pending completion of additional information supporting the need for this project. No funds for fiscal year 2000 new construction projects may be obligated until an external, independent project assessment has been provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations for review and approval.

Inertial Fusion.—The Committee recommends $475,700,000 for the inertial fusion program, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request of $465,700,000, and $32,300,000 less than fiscal year 1999. The recommendation includes $254,000,000 for the National Ignition Facility, $30,450,000 for the University of Rochester's OMEGA laser, and $9,500,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory. Consistent with the fiscal year 1999 program, the recommendation includes $10,000,000 to further the development of high average power lasers.

Technology Transfer and Education.—Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee finds it necessary to focus resources on direct stockpile stewardship activities and has significantly reduced funding for technology transfer and education activities. In the technology transfer program, the budget request of $5,000,000 has been provided for the Amarillo Plutonium Research Center. Funding of $9,000,000, the same level of funding as provided in fiscal year 1999, has been provided for education activities. No funds are provided for the National Atomic Museum.

STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT

The stockpile management program supports the enduring stockpile, including maintenance, system refurbishment, and weapons dismantlement, and seeks to ensure an adequate supply of tritium. The Committee recommendation for stockpile management is $1,913,300,000, a decrease of $85,000,000 from the budget request of $1,998,300,000. The recommendation provides funding for activities necessary to sustain a reliable, quality production capability to support the nuclear weapons stockpile as it ages.

Transportation.—The Committee recommendation reflects the transfer of $60,000,000 which was requested in the stockpile man-

agement for transportation activities. To more accurately reflect program activities, a separate program has been established to include all funding for the Transportation Safeguards Division.

Tritium.—The Committee recommendation for the tritium program is $145,000,000, a reduction of $25,000,000 from the budget request of $170,000,000. Due to severe funding constraints, funding for the backup technology, the accelerator production of tritium, has been reduced from $88,000,000 to $63,000,000. The recommendation includes $22,000,000 for operating expenses and $41,000,000 for design activities.

Infrastructure improvements.—The Committee is aware that many areas of the nuclear weapons complex require significant upgrades and improvements to the existing infrastructure. Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee is unable to provide additional funding for these activities, but urges the Department to give such measures a high priority when allocating resources.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation for construction projects is $168,679,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget request. This additional funding has been provided for design only activities in Project 98–D–126, Accelerator Production of Tritium.

TRANSPORTATION SAFEGUARDS DIVISION

The Transportation Safeguards Division provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, strategic quantities of special nuclear material, and weapon components between military locations and nuclear complex facilities within the United States. Funding for this activity was included in the budget request in two separate accounts: salaries and other expenses of $31,812,000 were included in the program direction account, and equipment and other expenses of $60,000,000 were included in the stockpile management program. The Committee recommendation consolidates funding for the Transportation Safeguards Division as a separate activity and provides $91,812,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $199,500,000 for program direction is a reduction of $47,000,000 from the budget request of $246,500,000. This reflects the transfer of $31,812,000 for the Transportation Safeguards Division to a separate program, and a reduction of $15,188,000 for expenses at Departmental field offices.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Weapons Activities includes several funding adjustments. The Department has requested significant budget increases for the nuclear weapons program in fiscal year 2000. Recent reviews by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Department's Inspector General (IG) indicate that the Department has been very lax in reviewing expenses incurred by the nuclear weapons contractors. The Committee expects the Department to review all costs incurred by the contractors, make judgments on the validity of those costs, and reduce those which cannot be justified to the satisfaction of the taxpayer. The Department's program

managers should be monitoring all of these costs. Reports by the GAO and IG indicating wasteful and excessive spending cast doubt on the validity of all the program costs.

Contractor Travel.—According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), in fiscal year 1998, the nuclear weapons complex spent approximately $141,400,000 on contractor travel expenses. The Committee recommends a reduction of $75,000,000 to be allocated to contractor travel expenses in fiscal year 2000.

Management and Operating Contractor Employees in Washington.—Defense Programs spends approximately $9,200,000 on contractor employees and contractor offices in the Washington metropolitan area. The Committee seriously questions the need for this contractor presence in Washington and has reduced this funding by $5,000,000.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Funding.—The Department currently allows each laboratory director to use six percent of all operating funds provided to the laboratory to conduct employee-suggested research and development projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. For fiscal year 2000, the Department estimates that the three nuclear weapons laboratories will spend $215,000,000 on LDRD. The Committee estimates that approximately $100,000,000 of that will come from the Weapons Activities account, and thus, has eliminated this funding.

Use of Prior Year Balances.—Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee also recommends a reduction of $123,084,000 in fiscal year 2000.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1999	$4,310,227,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	4,503,276,000
Recommended, 2000	4,157,758,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−152,469,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−345,518,000

The 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 requiring remediation, stabilization, or some other type of cleanup action. Environmental management activities are budgeted under the following appropriation accounts: Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management; Defense Facilities Closure Projects; Defense Environmental Management Privatization; Non-Defense Environmental Management; and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

The Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management account includes site/project completion, post 2006 completion, science and technology, and a variety of crosscutting and program management activities. The three major activities are: Site Closure where cleanup will be completed by the end of fiscal year 2006 and no further DOE mission is anticipated; Site/Project Completion where cleanup will be completed by 2006, but DOE programs will

continue; and Post 2006 Completion where cleanup activities at the site will extend beyond 2006.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $4,157,758,000, a decrease of $345,518,000 from the budget request, and $152,469,000 below fiscal year 1999. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

The Committee commends the environmental management organization for the submission of the budget request on a project basis for the environmental cleanup program. This approach will make it easier for Congress to review projects and track the status of individual project costs, schedules, and milestones, and it will provide additional accountability for the Department's managers who oversee the cleanup and contractors who perform the work. This can only improve the performance of the program and the credibility of the Department in managing the program.

Project Changes.—The Committee was surprised to learn that the Department was making significant changes to the individual operating projects identified in the fiscal year 1999 budget justifications without notifying the Committee of these changes. In fiscal year 2000 the Department is directed to provide a report by January 15, 2000, showing the initial funding allocation by site for each individual project. After that, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations must be notified of any change that increases or decreases funding for any project by more than 20 percent. The Department should work with the Committee to establish the level of detail required in the initial report.

Reprogramming Authority.—The Committee continues to support the need for some flexibility to meet changing funding requirements at former defense sites which are undergoing remedial cleanup activities. In fiscal year 2000, each site manager may transfer up to $5,000,000 between Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program activities such as site/project completion and post-2006 completion, and construction projects to reduce health or safety risks or to gain cost savings as long as no program or project is increased or decreased by more than $5,000,000 once during the fiscal year. This reprogramming authority may not be used to initiate new programs or programs specifically denied, limited, or increased by Congress in the Act or report. The Committees on Appropriations in the House and Senate must be notified within thirty days after the transfer of funds occurs.

Research Funding.—The Committee understands that some Departmental sites may be using operating funds for discretionary research and development rather than the operational activities for which the funding was requested and appropriated. The Committee wants to make very sure that the Department understands that environmental management funding is provided for cleanup activities, not as a source of discretionary funding for the sites and laboratories. The need for cleanup funds far exceeds the availability of resources. The Department is directed to separate all research funding from operational funding. All research funding is to be included in the Science and Technology account and will be allocated based on a review of the merits of such research.

Economic Development.—None of the environmental management funds are available for economic development activities. The Committee appropriates funding for the "Worker and Community Transition Program" which is the only program authorized in the Department to provide economic development funding for communities, and this is the proper forum for evaluating the merits of the many proposals which the Department receives for economic development funding.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The site/project completion account will provide funding for projects that will be completed by fiscal year 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission will continue beyond the year 2006. This account focuses management attention on completing specific environmental projects at sites where the Department anticipates continuing missions, and distinguishes these projects from the long-term cleanup activities such as those associated with high level waste streams.

The Committee's recommendation for site/project completion activities is $970,219,000, a decrease of $10,700,000 from the budget request of $980,919,000. Funding has been adjusted to reflect the latest cost estimates for Project 96–D–406, Spent Nuclear Fuels Canister Storage and Stabilization Facility in Richland, Washington. Due to funding constraints, the Committee has not provided funding to move from design to construction of Project 99–D–404, the Health Physics Instrumentation Laboratory at Idaho.

POST 2006 COMPLETION

Environmental Management projects currently projected to require funding beyond fiscal year 2006 are funded in the Post 2006 completion account. This includes a significant number of projects at the largest DOE sites—the Hanford site in Washington; the Savannah River site in South Carolina; the Oak Ridge Reservation in Tennessee; and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in Idaho—as well as the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, the Nevada Test Site; and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad, New Mexico. A variety of multi-site activities are also funded in this account. The Committee's recommendation for Post 2006 completion is $2,848,548,000, a decrease of $105,000,000 from the budget request of $2,953,548,000.

Alternative Technology Development.—The Committee supports the efforts by the Department to develop alternative technologies to stabilize DOE-owned spent fuel in preparation for permanent disposal. Despite the technical and design risks, the Department's approach of narrowing technical alternatives from a range of potential technologies should minimize those risks. The Committee also understands that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has concluded that melt and dilute would be an acceptable concept for geologic disposal of aluminum-based spent nuclear fuel. The Department ignored Congressional intent in fiscal year 1999 when $10,000,000 was provided for this activity. The Committee expects the Department to fund this activity in fiscal year 2000 at a level to compensate for the inequitable reduction in fiscal year 1999.

Payment-in-Lieu-of-Taxes.—The Committee directs the Hanford site to review its budget priorities, and, to the extent possible within available resources in fiscal year 2000, make a payment-in-lieu-of-taxes to the local communities.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.—The Department should provide to the Committee a report detailing the feasibility and methodology of transferring the funding and oversight responsibilities of the Environmental Evaluation Group, a group tasked with oversight of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, to the State of New Mexico to better facilitate the State's regulatory responsibilities.

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund Contribution.—The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $420,000,000 for the defense contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486, the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Hazardous Waste Operations Emergency Response Program.—The Committee recommendation supports the budget request of $8,500,000.

Health Effects Studies.—The Committee recommendation does not include the budget request of $20,000,000 for worker and public health effects studies. All funding for worker and public health effects studies has been provided in the Defense Environment, Safety and Health account, and all studies are to be managed by the Office of Environment, Safety and Health.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation for science and technology development is $230,500,000, the same as the budget request, and a reduction of $16,500,000 from fiscal year 1999.

Technology Deployment.—Due funding constraints, the Committee is unable to provide additional funds for technology deployment, but urges the Department to reallocate funds to the extent possible to provide at least $15,000,000, the fiscal year 1999 funding level, to continue the Department's efforts to deploy cost-effective new technologies. Deployment of new technologies is a strategic activity affecting virtually all environmental management programs and sites and should be strongly supported as a complex-wide program to help meet compliance agreement milestones within a resource constrained budget. This funding should be used to accelerate the use of new technologies and leverage funding already available for deployment activities.

The Committee urges the Department to make every effort to seek cost effective cleanup alternatives available from outside the Department, and is aware that the international agreement with AEA Technology has been very successful in bringing cheaper and more efficient technologies to the Department's cleanup problems. The Department is urged to expand the use of this existing agreement.

The Department is also urged to expedite the use of the macroencapsulation method for immobilizing and treating low-level mixed waste. The use of these technologies should not be limited to the funding provided in this account, but should be incorporated throughout the complex using any available funds.

Environmental Management Science Program.—The Committee is disappointed that the Department was unable to provide funding for new grants in fiscal year 2000. The funding for the environmental management science program has been reduced from $47,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 to $32,000,000 in fiscal year 2000. This is a collaborative program between the Department's Office of Environmental Management and the Office of Energy Research that identifies long-term, basic science research needs and targets the research and development toward critical cleanup problems. This program has been given high marks by the National Research Council and the Department's Environmental Management Advisory Board. The Committee believes it is critical to provide continuity of funding for this research program, and recommends $10,000,000 from within available funds for the next round of new and innovative research grants in fiscal year 2000.

Education programs.—The Committee is aware of, and urges the Department to fully consider, a proposal from Voorhees College, Morris College, and Allen University to develop programs of study in environmental science and to develop research projects to meet the needs of the Department.

Oversight of Environmental Management Laboratories.—The Department should ensure that proper management oversight is provided for each laboratory reporting to the Office of Environmental Management. This should include a review by the Headquarters Office of Environmental Management of all research projects to assure mission relevancy and compliance with all applicable orders and regulations, as well as a review and evaluation of the institutional planning process for the program's national laboratory.

Risk Policy.—The Committee recommendation supports the budget request of $3,000,000 for the Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP).

University Robotics Program.—The Committee recommendation supports the budget request of $4,000,000 for the university robotics program.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $331,665,000 for program direction, a decrease of $17,744,000 from the budget request of $349,409,000. The change in funding results from transferring to this account the salaries and expenses of the Federal employees performing administrative functions at the Idaho Operations Office, consistent with the Department's new organization structure, and reducing expenses at Departmental field offices.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).—The Committee expects the Department to fulfill its responsibilities at FUSRAP sites, exclusive of the remedial actions to be performed by the Corps.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management has several funding adjustments. A reduction of $180,764,000, including $8,700,000 proposed in the budget request, has been applied to prior year balances. There is a $9,000,000 reduction for contractor travel, and a $3,000,000 adjust-

ment to reduce the use of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees at Headquarters and support for M&O contractor offices in the Washington metropolitan area.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—A reduction of $30,410,000 has been included to eliminate any funds being allocated for laboratory directed research and development or director's discretionary research and development. The Committee allocates funding to Departmental laboratories to clean up contaminated properties and facilities as quickly as possible, not to provide discretionary spending for the laboratory directors. The Committee is prohibiting the use of any environmental management funds for discretionary research and development activities. A peer-reviewed science and technology program is adequately funded in this program. Any laboratory seeking to do environmental research should submit proposals to the Office of Science and Technology and compete for these funds.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriation, 1999	$1,038,240,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	1,054,492,000
Recommended, 2000	1,054,492,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+16,252,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

The Defense Facilities Closure Projects account includes funding for sites which have established a goal of completing cleanup by the end of fiscal year 2006. After completion of cleanup, no further Departmental mission is envisioned, except for limited long-term surveillance and maintenance, and the sites will be available for some alternative use. Sites to be completed by 2006 include the Rocky Flats Closure Project in Colorado, and several sites in Ohio—Fernald, Miamisburg, Ashtabula, and Columbus.

This account is intended to highlight those sites where cleanup can be accelerated and substantial savings achieved by the resulting reduction in long-term program costs and ongoing support costs. The Committee strongly supports this program, and the recommendation for fiscal year 2000 funding is $1,054,492,000, the same as the budget request. Funding levels for each of the sites are addressed below.

Rocky Flats Closure Project.—The Committee has challenged the Department to close the Rocky Flats Site in Colorado by 2006. The Department's current plan is for site closure by fiscal year 2010 at a total project cost of $7.3 billion. Accelerating the cleanup schedule can save $1.3 billion. The Committee is aware that to meet the 2006 deadline, stable funding will be required over several years, and critical path work activities must be successfully completed, not only at Rocky Flats, but at other sites throughout the Department's complex. The Department should ensure that complex-wide funding issues are addressed as they relate to the closure of the Rocky Flats Site. It is only through the closure of smaller sites like Fernald and Rocky Flats that funds will be made available to support expensive future cleanup projects like the vitrification plants needed at Hanford and Idaho.

The Committee has provided fiscal year 2000 funding of $657,200,000, the same as the budget request.

Fernald Environmental Management Project.—The Fernald site in Ohio has implemented an accelerated cleanup schedule which provides for site closure with the completion of all currently established in-situ contaminant source remediation and risk mitigation by fiscal year 2005. Follow-up activities for fiscal years 2006 through 2008 include finalizing treatment and disposal of the silo wastes and structures. The site is currently seeking to complete all of these activities by 2006, and the Committee strongly supports these efforts. Current cost projections indicate that closing the Fernald site by 2006 would cost approximately $2.5 billion while closing it by 2011 increases costs to approximately $2.8 billion. The Committee recommendation for the Fernald site is $280,589,000, the same as the budget request.

Miamisburg.—The Department plans to complete cleanup at the Miamisburg, Ohio, site by fiscal year 2005 or earlier. The Committee recommends the budget request of $92,353,000.

Ashtabula.—The goal at the Ashtabula site in Ohio is to achieve complete cleanup by fiscal year 2003 with an associated cost reduction of $48,600,000 from the original baselines. The Committee supports the budget request of $15,405,000.

Columbus Environmental Management Project.—This project consists of two geographic sites in Columbus, Ohio. Activities at one of the sites were completed in 1998, and at the remaining site will be completed by fiscal year 2006. The budget request of $8,841,000 has been provided.

Report Requirement.—As part of the fiscal year 2001 budget submittal, the Department is directed to provide adequate detail showing the major projects to be accomplished and the project cost, scope, schedule, and technical assumptions which support closures by 2006. The Committee will work with the Department to ensure that the budget justifications provide adequate detail to permit Congress to track closure progress on an annual basis.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriation, 1999	$228,357,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	228,000,000
Recommended, 2000	228,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−357,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	

The Committee recommendation for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program is $228,000,000, the same as the budget request. The recommendation includes $106,000,000 for the Tank Waste Remediation System at Richland; $110,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project at Idaho; $20,000,000 for Environmental Management/Waste Management Disposal at Oak Ridge; $12,000,000 for Transuranic Waste Treatment at Oak Ridge; and $5,000,000 for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage at Idaho. The total amount is reduced by the use of $25,000,000 in prior year balances.

The Department has always relied on the private sector to accomplish environmental cleanup at DOE sites, usually through

cost-reimbursement contracts. In an effort to reduce costs and improve the timeliness of cleanup of environmental problems, the Department is pursuing an approach, referred to as "privatization," which requires the use of fixed price contracts and private financing of the construction of waste treatment facilities. The Department believes the privatization program is the most cost-effective approach for selected projects.

The Department requested advance appropriations for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System for fiscal years 2001 through 2004 and for the Idaho Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project for fiscal year 2001. The remaining privatization projects will be incrementally funded on an annual basis. The Committee has not provided advance appropriations for fiscal years 2001 and beyond, but will continue to review funding on an annual basis for all the privatization projects.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1999	$1,696,676,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	1,797,991,000
Recommended, 2000	1,651,809,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−44,867,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−146,182,000

This account provides funding for Nonproliferation and National Security Programs which include Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development, Arms Control, Emergency Management, Nuclear Safeguards and Security, Security Investigations, HEU Transparency Implementation, International Nuclear Safety, and Program Direction; Intelligence; Counterintelligence; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Worker and Community Transition; Fissile Materials Disposition; National Security Programs Administrative Support; the Office of Hearings and Appeals; and Naval Reactors. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

NONPROLIFERATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Competitive Research.—The Committee is concerned that 97 percent of the funding for research and development in the nonproliferation and national security budget goes to the DOE national laboratories. The Committee is even more concerned that the Department of Energy believes that this research and development is acquired through a competitive process because the DOE laboratories are asked to provide technical proposals to solve both current and future technical challenges to nonproliferation and national security issues. Asking the Department's own laboratories for proposals is not what the Committee believes to be a competitive process by any stretch of the imagination. The Department is directed to initiate a free and open competitive process for its research and development activities during fiscal year 2000. The Committee should be notified of any research and development which cannot be openly competed due to its classified nature.

NONPROLIFERATION AND VERIFICATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program conducts applied research, development, testing, and evaluation of science and technology for strengthening the United States response to threats to national security and to world peace posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons and special nuclear materials. Activities center on the design and production of operational sensor systems needed for proliferation detection, treaty verification, nuclear warhead dismantlement initiatives, and intelligence activities. The Committee recommendation is $210,000,000, the same funding level as fiscal year 1999, and a reduction of $11,000,000 from the budget request. No funding is provided for Project 00–D–192, Nonproliferation and International Security Center at Los Alamos. Funding has been provided in the Weapons Activities account for a new terascale simulation facility at Los Alamos in fiscal year 2000. In view of the Department's significant problems with project management, the Committee does not believe it is prudent to initiate construction of two new buildings at Los Alamos in fiscal year 2000.

The nonproliferation and verification research and development program consists of hundreds of projects executed primarily at the nuclear weapons laboratories. The Department has still provided no information to the Committee that shows the value of these disparate projects, and how they relate to an overriding program plan or technology roadmap. The Department should provide a report to the Committee by October 31, 1999, which identifies how the individual projects contribute to the overall objectives. The Department should also implement an external, peer-review process to examine each of the projects, their progress, and their value to the overall needs of the program.

ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION

The arms control and nonproliferation program supports the nation's arms control and nonproliferation policies by securing nuclear materials and expertise in Russia and the Newly Independent States; limiting weapons-usable fissile materials; establishing transparent and irreversible nuclear reductions; and controlling nuclear exports. The Committee recommendation is $256,900,000, the same level of funding as provided in fiscal year 1999, and a reduction of $39,100,000 from the budget request.

Materials Protection, Control and Accounting Program.—The recommendation supports the budget request of $145,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over fiscal year 1999, for the materials protection, control and accounting program to secure and safeguard nuclear materials in Russia and the Newly Independent States.

Initiatives for Proliferation Program and Nuclear Cities Initiative.—The Committee recommendation provides $22,500,000 for the Initiatives for Proliferation Program, the same as fiscal year 1999. A recent General Accounting Office report was highly critical of the fact that as much as 63 percent of these funds have been spent in the United States, mostly by the Department's national laboratories, rather than going to the scientific institutes of the Newly

Independent States. The Committee directs that no more than 20 percent of the funding may be spent in the United States.

The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative, significantly less than the budget request of $30,000,000. The Committee has several concerns with this program. First, and foremost, it is not clear that the Department of Energy is the best agency to implement this program since the most important training needed in these cities is marketing and business expertise. The Department should work with other Federal agencies that are implementing similar programs in Russia to ensure that this type of training is provided immediately. The Department relies solely on its national laboratories to implement this program, and the Committee does not believe that Department of Energy laboratories are useful guides for marketing expertise and successful commercial ventures. Additionally, the Committee is aware that access to these cities is very difficult and requires a 45 day advance notification period. With funding of $7,500,000 provided in fiscal year 1999 and an additional $1,500,000 in fiscal year 2000, the Committee is providing limited funds for this new initiative and will wait to see some tangible results before significantly increasing funding.

Treaty Monitoring.—The Committee believes that there is an appropriate role for university research to contribute to this program. The Department is directed to ensure there are opportunities made available for participants other than the national laboratories and that at least 50 percent of the funding should be openly competed.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The emergency management program encompasses all Departmental emergency management and threat assessment related activities, with the exception of the nuclear response activities funded in the Weapons Activities account, and ensures an integrated response to emergencies affecting Departmental operations and activities or requiring Departmental assistance. The Committee recommendation for funding is $21,000,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The nuclear safeguards and security program provides policy, programmatic direction, and training for the protection of the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, classified information, and facilities. The Committee recommendation for nuclear safeguards and security is $55,200,000, a reduction of $3,900,000 from the budget request of $59,100,000, but the same as fiscal year 1999. The fiscal year 1999 funding level of $55,200,000 included several one-time costs which are not included in the base funding for fiscal year 2000.

The Committee is well aware of the recent concerns about laboratory security. However, none of the reviews have identified lack of spending by the Department of Energy as the root cause of the security problems. Instead, the report by a Special Investigative Panel of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board found that

> Organizational disarray, managerial neglect, and a culture of arrogance-both at DOE headquarters and the labs themselves-conspired to create an espionage scandal waiting to happen. The physical security efforts of the weapons labs (often called "guns, guards, and gates") have had some isolated shortcomings, but on balance they have developed some of the most advanced security technology in the world. However, perpetually weak systems of personnel assurance, information security, and counterintelligence have invited attack by foreign intelligence services.

Until the Department has demonstrated by actions rather than words that it is addressing the fundamental concerns raised by the various panels that have addressed security issues at the Department, the Committee will not be providing additional resources to the same management for the same programs going to the same contractors.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The security investigations program funds background investigations for Department of Energy and contractor personnel who, in the performance of their official duties, require access to restricted data, national security information, or special nuclear material. The Committee recommendation is $30,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 2000 the program organizations which request background investigations for contractors and non-Federal employees will fund the investigations. This will provide a $20,000,000 funding offset to the budget request of $30,000,000. In the fiscal year 2001 budget, each program organization should clearly identify the funding for security investigations

HIGHLY ENRICHED URANIUM TRANSPARENCY IMPLEMENTATION

The highly enriched uranium (HEU) transparency implementation program is responsible for ensuring that the nonproliferation aspects of the February 1993 agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are met. This agreement covers the purchase over 20 years of low enriched uranium (LEU) derived from at least 500 metric tons of HEU removed from dismantled Russian nuclear weapons. Under the agreement, conversion of HEU components into LEU is performed in Russian facilities. The purpose of the program is to put into place those measures agreed to by both sides that permit the U.S. to have confidence that the Russian side is abiding by the agreement.

The Committee recommendation is $15,750,000, the same as the budget request.

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SAFETY

The international nuclear safety program is designed to reduce the threats posed by the operation of unsafe and aging Soviet-designed nuclear power plants in Russia and the Newly Independent States. The Committee recommendation for this program is $15,300,000, a reduction of $18,700,000 from the budget request. This reduction should be applied to the excessive prior year balances being carried in this program. The program currently has

uncosted balances that are double the total new funding provided in fiscal year 1999. From within available funds, activities directed at upgrading unsafe nuclear reactors are to be fully funded. Funding for all other activities proposed in the budget should be reduced accordingly.

Each year the Department seeks to expand this program beyond the original mission which was to upgrade unsafe reactors. A new focus in fiscal year 2000 is to create international environmental safety centers and to initiate work at Russian nuclear materials facilities. Previous efforts have created international nuclear safety centers and research laboratories. A key feature of these new programs is that a large portion of the money goes to the Department's national laboratories for administrative and programmatic expenses. Continued attempts to expand this program are of particular concern because there are continuing delays in executing the original program to upgrade unsafe nuclear reactors. There have been delays in many of the milestones for this program, and there are large uncosted balances which indicate that program execution is lagging. The Committee directs the Department to provide an annual report showing the status of each of the Soviet-designed reactors, the work to be accomplished, the total estimated cost for each reactor, the cost of completing the upgrades to each of the reactors, the schedule by fiscal year for accomplishing this work, and the cost of each task by fiscal year. The Department should work with the Committee on the level of detail which should be included in the annual report.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $86,900,000 for program direction is a reduction of $3,550,000 from the budget request of $90,450,000, but the same as the fiscal year 1999 funding level.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE

The intelligence program 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 recommendation is $36,059,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Office of Counterintelligence is to develop and implement an effective counterintelligence program throughout the Department of Energy. The goal of the program is to identify, neutralize, and deter foreign government or industrial intelligence activities directed at or involving DOE programs, personnel, facilities, technologies, classified information, and unclassified sensitive information.

The Committee recommendation is $39,200,000, a reduction of $591,000 from the budget request, but a significant increase over the fiscal year 1999 funding level of $15,641,000.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Environment, Safety and Health activities included in this account provide oversight processes to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department's environment, safety, health, and safeguards and security programs; fund epidemiologic studies to examine possible linkages between conditions at DOE sites and adverse health effects among workers and offsite populations; and oversee epidemiologic studies on the health of population groups in the Marshall Islands who have been exposed to ionizing radiation. The Committee recommendation is $96,600,000, an increase of $4,600,000 over the budget request of $92,000,000. The recommendation reduces funding for environment, safety and health evaluations to the fiscal year 1999 level of $8,900,000 and eliminates contractor support for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board liaison.

Health Effects Studies.—For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommendation for health effects studies is $46,956,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the budget request. No funding has been provided in the Environmental Management program to support these studies. The Committee is pleased with the progress to date in developing public health agendas for each DOE site. No funding has been provided in fiscal year 2000 for medical monitoring programs.

Occupational Illnesses.—The Committee is aware of the concerns about the health of contractor employees who may have been exposed to beryllium during the course of their work. There are other illnesses where the link between exposure to workplace hazards and occupational diseases is difficult to establish. The Committee directs the Department to enter into an agreement with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to begin a review of available scientific evidence to determine the association between workplace exposures in DOE facilities and specific diseases.

Radiation Effects Research Foundation.—The budget request of $13,500,000 has been provided for the Radiation Effects Research Foundation (RERF) to continue to analyze the medical effects of radiation on man or diseases that may be affected by radiation. The Committee directs the Department to review the continued usefulness of this program to the understanding of radiation effects since the most useful data for protecting current workers and public health and safety pertains to low dose radiation exposures.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $24,769,000, the same as the budget request.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $20,000,000, a decrease of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $30,000,000. This reduction should be applied to the excessive prior year balances being carried in this program.

The worker and community transition program was established to mitigate the impacts on workers and communities of contractor workforce restructuring by providing enhanced severance payments

to employees at defense sites, and assisting community planning for defense conversion through Federal grants. Using these tools, the Department of Energy contractor workforce has been successfully downsized from almost 150,000 to approximately 100,000 contractor employees through the end of fiscal year 1998. However, the cost of this program has not been insignificant. From fiscal year 1993 through fiscal year 1998, enhanced severance payments and benefits have totaled $786,000,000, and Federal grants to communities have totaled $193,000,000, for a total cost of $1,014,000,000.

Funding at DOE cleanup sites and the nuclear weapons complex has stabilized, and the need for enhanced severance payments to contractor employees and grants to local communities has declined. Worker and community transition is not an enduring mission of the government. The Committee does not intend to continue to fund this program, and the Department should prepare for significantly decreased or no funding in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for this program be used for additional severance payments and benefits for Federal employees.

FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION

The fissile materials 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 $190,000,000, a reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request of $200,000,000.

Funding for Project 99–D–141, Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility, has been reduced by $10,000,000. No funding is provided for long-lead procurement.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $25,000,000 to provide administrative support for national security programs. This will fund Departmental activities performed by offices such as the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Under Secretary, the General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources, Congressional Affairs, and Public Affairs.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) is responsible for all of the Department's adjudicatory processes, other than those administered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The Committee recommendation is $3,000,000, the same as the budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of Naval nuclear propulsion—from technology development through reactor operations to ultimate reactor plant disposal. This program provides for the design, development, testing, and evaluation of improved naval nuclear propulsion plants and reactor cores. These ef-

forts are critical to the continued success of over 110 reactors in operating nuclear-powered submarines and surface ships, and to the New Attack Submarine class currently under development.

The Committee recommendation is $677,600,000, an increase of $12,600,000 over the budget request of $665,000,000. Additional funding has been provided to continue test reactor inactivation efforts and preclude inefficiencies due to delaying environmental cleanup activities that are scheduled to be completed in fiscal year 2002.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes the use of $37,700,000 of prior year balances and an offset of $20,000,000 from user organizations which will fund security investigations through other program accounts. The recommendation does not include the Department's proposal to fund $12,559,000 of the Counterintelligence program by taxing other Departmental entities.

A funding adjustment of $39,000,000 reflects a reduction of $9,000,000 for management and operating contractors assigned to the Washington metropolitan area and $30,000,000 for eliminating Laboratory Directed Research and Development. An adjustment of $30,000,000 has been made for contractor travel savings.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1999	$189,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	112,000,000
Recommended, 2000	112,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−77,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

Since passage of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, the Nuclear Waste Fund has incurred costs for activities related to disposal of high-level waste generated from the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy. At the end of fiscal year 1998, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was approximately $1,191,000,000 (including principal and interest). The Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation was established to ensure payment of the Federal government's contribution to the nuclear waste repository program. Through fiscal year 1998, a total of $987,830,000 has been appropriated to support the nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee's recommendation is $112,000,000, the same as the budget request. However, the budget request included $73,000,000 in new budget authority and the release of $39,000,000 which the Committee had earmarked previously for interim waste storage. The recommendation does not include releasing these funds.

POWER MARKETING ACTIVITIES

Management of the Federal power marketing functions was transferred from the Department of Interior to the Department of Energy as directed in the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). The functions include power marketing activi-

ties authorized under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

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

The recommendation includes the Administration's proposal to discontinue appropriations for the power marketing administration's purchase power and wheeling programs. Across the country, electricity restructuring is opening transmission access, enabling more competitive pricing and creating opportunities for customers to form new and innovative cooperatives. Customers of the Federal power marketing administrations will no longer have to rely on the Federal government to arrange power purchase and wheeling services.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

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

Bonneville constructs, operates and maintains the nation's largest high-voltage transmission system, consisting of 14,800 circuit-miles of transmission line and 400 substations with an installed capacity of 21,500 MW. Public Law 93–454, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974, placed Bonneville on a self-financed basis. With the passage in 1980 of Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, Bonneville's responsibilities were expanded to include meeting the net firm load growth of the region, investing in cost-effective, region-wide 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 for these borrowing requirements. For fiscal year 2000, the Committee recommendation includes an additional increment of $352,000,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for

transmission system construction, power services, conservation and energy efficiency, and capital equipment programs.

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 2000, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $618,000,000, of which $164,000,000 is to repay principal on the Federal investment in these facilities.

Limitation on Direct Loans.—The Committee recommends that no new direct loans be made in fiscal year 2000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1999	$7,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....
Recommended, 2000	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−7,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

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.

Consistent with the budget request, the Committee recommends no funding in fiscal year 2000. No appropriation is necessary for fiscal year 2000 funding requirements of $4,727,000 due to the availability of $5,500,000 in prior year balances. The recommendation includes the Department's proposal to transfer $773,000 in surplus funds to the Southwestern Power Administration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1999	$26,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	27,940,000
Recommended, 2000	27,940,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+1,940,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

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

its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee recommendation is $27,940,000, including the transfer of $773,000 from the Southeastern Power Administration. The appropriation and the transfer are the same amounts as recommended in the budget request.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 1999	$203,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	171,471,000
Recommended, 2000	171,471,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−31,529,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

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. Western operates hydropower generating plants in 15 central and western states encompassing a 1.3 million square-mile geographic area. Western is also responsible for the operation and maintenance of 16,727 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 257 substations.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, 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 non-power investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins 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.

Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee recommendation is $171,471,000, the same amount as the budget request, and a reduction of $31,529,000 from the amount provided in the current fiscal year. The Committee has recommended $5,036,000, the same amount as the budget request, for deposit in the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 1999	$1,010,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	1,309,000
Recommended, 2000	1,309,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+299,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

Creation of the Falcon and Amistad Operation and Maintenance Fund was directed by the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995. This legislation also directed that the Fund be administered by the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration for use by the Commissioner of the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission to defray operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the

hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams in Texas. Prior to fiscal year 1996, funds for Falcon and Amistad were included in the appropriations of the Department of State.

The Committee recommendation is $1,309,000, the same as the amount requested, and $299,000 more than the amount provided in the current fiscal year.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1999	$167,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	179,900,000
Recommended, 2000	174,950,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+7,450,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−4,950,000

SALARIES AND EXPENSES—REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 1999	$−167,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−179,900,000
Recommended, 2000	−174,950,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−7,450,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+4,950,000

The Committee recommendation is $174,950,000, an increase of $7,450,000 over the amount provided in the current fiscal year. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Committee is very concerned about the reliability of the grid in a restructured regulatory environment. The Committee will work with the Commission during the budget process to ensure that sufficient resources are available to ensure reliability.

The Committee understands that the Commission is beginning to consider how it will implement the stranded cost provisions of Order 888 in the context of "retail turned wholesale" customers. The Committee urges the Commission to stand by its commitment to full cost recovery and believes that the agency should carefully examine, in this context, the use of a methodology that contains a recovery period sufficient to ensure the recovery of all generating assets included in state approved rates used to serve the departing customers.

The Committee is concerned that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed market link expansion project in Northern New Jersey (known as the TRANSCO pipeline) insufficiently addresses environmental impact and public safety, most specifically the dangers from a potential explosion. The Committee notes that the proposed pipeline's route through the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge poses a tremendous potential risk to Federal land designated by Congress as a wildlife preserve in 1966 and urges the Commission to provide better safeguards for this Federal land in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Committee also notes that the area in New Jersey where this pipeline is planned is one of the most densely populated regions in the country and an explosion involving this pipeline would have devastating consequences. Safety concerns need to be a high priority in any pipeline proposal. Fi-

nally, the Committee is concerned by the Commission's lack of analysis and future plan for capacity needs in this area. Therefore, the Committee directs the Commission to provide an analysis of how much expansion is anticipated for this area. The analysis should provide, but not be limited to, a 20-year outlook of the number of pipelines that will be needed to handle future capacity in this region.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's detailed funding recommendations for programs in Title III are contained in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY			
SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES			
Solar energy			
Solar building technology research	2,900	5,500	1,500
Photovoltaic energy systems	66,800	93,309	67,000
Photovoltaic energy research	2,883	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	69,683	96,156	69,847
Concentrating solar power	17,000	18,850	13,000
Biomass/biofuels energy systems			
Power systems	31,000	38,950	29,000
Transportation	41,750	53,441	41,750
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	72,750	92,391	70,750
Biomass/biofuels energy research	27,199	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass	99,949	119,131	97,490
Wind energy systems	33,200	45,600	25,000
Wind energy research	283	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	33,483	45,883	25,283
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	1,500	---
Solar program support	---	10,000	2,000
International solar energy program	3,750	6,000	3,000
National renewable energy laboratory	2,000	1,100	1,100
Solar photoconversion energy research	14,532	14,260	14,260
Total, Solar Energy	247,297	318,380	227,480
Geothermal			
Geothermal technology development	28,500	29,500	18,000
Hydrogen research	21,000	28,000	21,000
Hydrogen energy research	3,008	2,970	2,970
Total, Hydrogen	24,008	30,970	23,970
Hydropower	2,000	7,000	2,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	3,500	---	---
Electric energy systems and storage			
Transmission reliability	2,500	4,000	2,500
High temperature superconducting R&D	32,500	31,000	31,000
Energy storage systems	4,500	6,000	4,500
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	39,500	41,000	38,000
Federal building/Remote power initiative	4,000	---	---
Program direction	17,100	19,171	17,000
TOTAL, SOLAR AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES TECHNOLOGIES	365,905	446,021	326,450
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Nuclear energy R&D			
Advanced radioisotope power system	37,000	37,000	32,000
Test reactor area landlord	4,000	6,070	6,070
Construction			
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	341	1,430	1,430
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	2,425	1,500	1,500
Subtotal, Construction	2,766	2,930	2,930
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	6,766	9,000	9,000
University reactor fuel assistance and support	11,000	11,345	12,000
Nuclear energy plant optimization	---	5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	19,000	25,000	20,000
Total, Nuclear energy R&D	73,766	87,345	78,000
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	30,000	30,000	30,000
Termination costs	85,000	65,000	75,000
Uranium programs	49,000	41,000	40,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Isotope support	15,500	13,000	10,000
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	6,000	8,000	8,000
Total, Isotope support	21,500	21,000	18,000
Program direction	24,700	24,960	24,700
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	283,966	269,305	265,700
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	32,000	31,752	17,752
Program direction	18,398	18,998	18,998
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	50,398	50,750	36,750
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	1,600	1,600
Program direction	7,000	7,500	7,000
Total, Technical information management program	8,600	9,100	8,600
Transfer to OSHA	1,000	---	1,000
Field operations	104,127	102,000	---
Oak Ridge Landlord	11,000	11,812	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	124,727	122,912	9,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	824,996	888,988	638,500
Renewable energy research program	-47,905	-47,100	-47,100
Use of prior year balances	-50,000	---	---
General reduction	---	---	-5,000
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC	---	-5,821	-5,821
Contractor travel savings	---	-1,276	-3,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	727,091	834,791	577,579
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	254,344	211,146	211,146
Site/project completion	102,948	98,366	94,655
Construction			
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	---	2,500	2,500
Subtotal, Site/project completion	102,948	100,866	97,155
Post 2006 completion	83,908	18,922	18,922
Use of prior year balances	-10,000	---	---
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	431,200	330,934	327,223
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	190,200	210,198	210,198
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	30,000	30,000	30,000
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	220,200	240,198	240,198
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	215,865	227,190	229,190
Facility operations	459,635	441,200	457,635
Construction			
00-G-307 SLAC office building	---	2,000	2,000
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	6,700	4,700	4,700
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	14,300	22,000	22,000
Subtotal, Construction	21,000	28,700	28,700
Subtotal, Facility operations	480,635	469,900	486,335
Total, High energy physics	696,500	697,090	715,525

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Nuclear physics	318,480	352,825	357,940
Construction			
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider (BNL)	16,620	---	---
Total, Nuclear physics	335,100	352,825	357,940
Biological and environmental research	443,600	411,170	406,170
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	417,216	407,636	407,636
Chemical sciences	209,582	215,677	209,582
Engineering and geosciences	44,413	37,545	37,545
Energy biosciences	32,489	31,226	31,226
Construction			
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	101,400	196,100	50,000
96-E-300 Combustion research facility, Phase II, SNL/L	4,000	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	105,400	196,100	50,000
Total, Basic energy sciences	809,100	888,084	735,989
Other energy research			
Computational and technology research	143,000	196,875	143,000
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,000	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Infrastructure support	1,160	1,160	2,160
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	14,924	18,351	18,351
Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Construction			
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	4,908	749	749
Environment, safety and health			
Construction			
96-E-333 Multiprogram energy laboratories upgrades, various locations	268	---	---
Subtotal, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. suppor	21,260	20,260	21,260
Total, Other energy research	165,260	218,135	165,260
Fusion energy sciences program	223,300	222,614	250,000
Oak Ridge landlord	---	---	11,800
Program direction			
Headquarters	49,800	52,360	52,360
Field offices	---	---	74,603
Total, Program direction	49,800	52,360	126,963
Subtotal, Science	2,722,660	2,842,278	2,769,647
Use of prior year SSC balances	-7,600	---	---
Use of other prior year balances	-13,000	---	---
Contractor travel savings	---	-3,100	-8,000
General reduction	-5,700	---	-43,000
General reduction for policy papers for CCTI	-13,500	---	---
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,682,860	2,839,178	2,718,647
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	4,175	4,940	4,940
Board of contract appeals	715	838	838
Chief financial officer	22,350	23,792	23,792
Contract reform	3,200	3,200	3,000
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,900	4,910	4,910
Economic impact and diversity	4,700	5,046	4,700
Field management	7,500	8,080	1,000
General counsel	19,250	21,434	21,000
Management and administration	97,000	101,273	97,000
Policy office	14,000	17,430	12,000
Public affairs	3,500	3,963	3,700
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	181,290	194,906	176,880
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,700	1,700	1,700
Policy analysis and system studies	350	1,000	350
Environmental policy studies	2,000	2,432	500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Scientific and technical training	450	450	450
Corporate management information program	8,000	13,000	12,000
Subtotal, Program support	12,500	18,582	15,000
Total, Administrative operations	193,790	213,488	191,880
Cost of work for others	44,312	34,027	34,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	238,102	247,515	225,907
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	---	-7,138	-7,138
Transfer from other defense activities	-37,627	---	-25,000
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	200,475	240,377	193,769
Miscellaneous revenues	-136,530	-116,887	-106,887
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	63,945	123,490	86,882
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	29,000	30,000	30,000
TOTAL, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL	29,000	30,000	30,000
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,482,632	1,635,355	1,482,632
Construction			
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	8,000	8,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL Los Alamos, NM	---	26,000	26,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	---	1,800	1,800
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,000	3,900	3,900
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	2,000	2,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,500	2,400	2,400
99-D-105 Central health physics cailbration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	2,900	1,000	1,000
99-D-106 Model validation & system certication center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,600	6,500	6,500
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	7,005	---
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	36,000	61,000	61,000
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	20,423	2,640	2,640
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory	6,400	---	---
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory (SNL)	18,920	10,900	10,900
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition (LLNL)	6,700	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	103,443	133,145	126,140
Subtotal, Core stockpile stewardship	1,586,075	1,768,500	1,608,772
Inertial fusion	223,800	217,600	227,600
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	284,200	248,100	248,100
Subtotal, Inertial fusion	508,000	465,700	475,700
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	45,000	22,200	5,000
Education	9,000	29,800	9,000
Subtotal, Technology transfer/education	54,000	52,000	14,000
Total, Stockpile stewardship	2,148,075	2,286,200	2,098,472

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Stockpile management	1,986,803	1,839,621	1,744,621
Construction			
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,200	11,700	11,700
99-D-123 Replace mechanical utility systems, Y-12, Oak Ridge, TN	1,900	---	---
99-D-125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	1,000	---	---
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,700	17,000	17,000
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	1,108	3,429	3,429
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	9,700	11,300	11,300
98-D-123 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	27,500	21,800	21,800
98-D-124 Stockpile mgmt. restructuring initiative Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	10,700	3,150	3,150
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	---	33,000	33,000
various locations	---	31,000	41,000
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	2,500	---	---
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	6,400	4,800	4,800
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex plant	3,700	---	---
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	5,000	18,000	18,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	3,250	---	---
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	---	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Construction	97,658	158,679	158,679
Total, Stockpile management	2,084,461	1,998,300	1,913,300
Transportation safeguards division			
Operations and equipment	---	---	60,000
Program direction	---	---	31,812
Total, Transportation safeguards division	---	---	91,812
Program direction	250,000	246,500	199,500
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,482,536	4,531,000	4,303,084
Use of prior year balances	-82,536	---	-123,084
Contractor travel savings	---	-6,100	-75,000
Directed savings	---	---	-105,000
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,400,000	4,524,900	4,000,000
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	858,090	892,629	892,629
Construction			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	2,745	3,100	3,100
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	950	7,200	---
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	3,120	2,977	2,977
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	26,814	16,860	16,860
98-D-700 Road rehabilitation (INEL), ID	7,710	2,590	2,590
97-D-450 Savannah River nuclear material storage, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	79,184	4,000	4,000
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,000	12,220	12,220
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	38,680	24,441	20,941

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID	11,544	11,971	11,971
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	8,000	931	931
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID	485	---	---
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades Savannah River, SC	3,667	---	---
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	4,752	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	194,651	88,290	77,590
Total, Site/project completion	1,052,741	980,919	970,219
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,261,107	2,478,997	2,373,997
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	398,088	420,000	420,000
Construction			
00-D-401 Spent Nuclear Fuel treatment and storage facility Title I & II, Savannah River, SC	---	7,000	7,000
99-D-403 Privatization Phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	14,800	13,988	13,988
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	22,723	20,516	20,516
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, Richland, WA	171	---	---
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	32,860	4,060	4,060
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	15,214	8,987	8,987
Subtotal, Construction	85,768	54,551	54,551
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,744,963	2,953,548	2,848,548
Science and technology	247,000	230,500	230,500
Program direction	337,073	349,409	331,665
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,381,777	4,514,376	4,380,932
Use of prior year balances/general reduction	-71,550	---	-180,764
Contractor travel savings	---	-2,400	-9,000
Offsetting collections	---	-8,700	---
Directed savings	---	---	-33,410
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,310,227	4,503,276	4,157,758
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Closure projects	1,038,240	1,054,492	1,054,492
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	228,357	253,000	253,000
Use of prior year balances	---	-25,000	-25,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	228,357	228,000	228,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	5,576,824	5,785,768	5,440,250
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	210,000	215,000	210,000
Construction			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	---	6,000	---
Subtotal, Nonproliferation & verification	210,000	221,000	210,000
Arms control	256,900	296,000	256,900
Intelligence	41,600	---	---
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	508,500	517,000	466,900
Emergency management	21,000	21,000	21,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	55,200	59,100	55,200
Security investigations	30,000	30,000	30,000
HEU transparency implementation	---	15,750	15,750

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
International nuclear safety	---	34,000	15,300
Program direction - NN	86,900	90,450	86,900
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and national security	701,600	767,300	691,050
Intelligence	---	36,059	36,059
Counterintelligence	---	39,791	39,200
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	66,731	67,231	71,831
Program direction - EH	24,769	24,769	24,769
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	91,500	92,000	96,600
Worker and community transition	26,000	26,500	16,500
Program direction - WT	3,900	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	29,900	30,000	20,000
Fissile materials disposition	116,372	129,766	129,766
Program direction - MD	4,588	7,343	7,343
Construction			
00-D-142 Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	---	21,765	21,765
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	20,000	28,751	18,751
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, various locations	28,000	12,375	12,375
Subtotal, Construction	48,000	62,891	52,891
Subtotal, Fissile materials disposition	168,960	200,000	190,000
Nuclear energy (Defense)			
International nuclear safety:			
Soviet designed reactors	30,000	---	---
National Security programs administrative support	37,627	---	25,000
Office of hearings and appeals	2,400	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other national security programs	1,061,987	1,168,150	1,100,909
Contractor travel savings	---	-2,600	-30,000
Total, Other national security programs	1,061,987	1,165,550	1,070,909
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development	628,289	620,400	633,000
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	9,000	9,000	9,000
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	7,000	3,000	3,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	5,800	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Construction	21,800	24,000	24,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	650,089	644,400	657,000
Program direction	20,100	20,600	20,600
Total, Naval reactors	670,189	665,000	677,600
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,732,176	1,830,550	1,748,509
Use of prior year balances	-15,500	---	-37,700
Offset to user organizations	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Contribution from labs	---	-12,559	---
Directed savings	---	---	-39,000
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,696,676	1,797,991	1,651,809

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 1999 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	189,000	112,000	112,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,862,500	12,220,659	11,204,059
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance/program direction	4,370	---	---
Purchase power and wheeling	6,130	---	---
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	10,500	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-3,000	---	---
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	7,500	---	---
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	2,722	3,625	3,625
Purchase power and wheeling	59	---	---
Program direction	16,402	17,631	17,631
Construction	6,817	6,684	6,684
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	26,000	27,940	27,940
Transfer from Southeastern Power	---	-773	-773
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	26,000	27,167	27,167
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	20,802	26,802	26,802
System operation and maintenance	36,469	35,096	35,096
Purchase power and wheeling	53,886	---	---
Program direction	107,383	104,537	104,537
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,036	5,036	5,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	223,576	171,471	171,471
Use of prior year balances	-20,576	---	---
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	203,000	171,471	171,471
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	1,010	1,309	1,309
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	237,510	199,947	199,947
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	167,500	179,900	174,950
FERC revenues	-167,500	-179,900	-174,950
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	106,514	198,189	109,189
Program direction	58,486	59,811	59,811
Subtotal from Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund	165,000	258,000	169,000
Transfer from defense nuclear waste disposal	---	(39,000)	---
Civilian research and development	4,000	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	169,000	258,000	169,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	16,423,306	17,077,197	15,553,535

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Contract Competition.—Section 301 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver. Section 301 does not preclude extensions of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

The Committee's concerns regarding the Department's contracting procedures result from the Department's history of having management and operating contracts which have never been bid competitively, in some cases for over four decades. Ensuring competition for these situations in particular, and establishing competition as the norm for the Department's contracting, is imperative. However, the Committee is well aware that there may be circumstances where the existing contract has been competed in the past few years; the existing contractor has been doing a good job; the mission at a specific site has been scheduled to end in a limited amount of time; or the time required for a full competitive procurement would result in significant delays to an ongoing project. In particular, the Committee is concerned that the delays, additional costs, and loss of momentum involved in competing contracts for sites designated for accelerated closure could hamper the Committee's overriding interest in completing cleanup of these sites as quickly as possible. In those instances where it is clearly in the taxpayers' interest, the Committee would not object to a contract extension.

Use of Standard Contracting Clauses.—Section 302 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to award, amend, or modify a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. At least 60 days before such action, the Secretary of Energy must submit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report notifying the Committees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

The Committee directs the Department, as contracts are awarded or renegotiated, to standardize its contracts in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Limitation on Benefits for Federal Employees.—Section 303 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to prepare or implement workforce restructuring plans or provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants for Federal employees of the Department of Energy under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484. The Committee has provided no funds to implement workforce restructuring plans which would provide benefits to Federal employees of the Department of Energy

which are not available to other Federal employees of the United States Government.

Limitation on Funding for Section 3161 Benefits.—Section 304 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to augment the $20,000,000 made available for obligation in this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants authorized under the provisions of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1993, Public Law 102–484.

Limitation on Initiation of Requests for Proposals.—Section 305 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate requests for proposals or expressions of interest for new programs which have not yet been presented to Congress in the annual budget submission, and which have not yet approved and funded by Congress.

Transfer and Merger of Unexpended Balances.—Section 306 permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

Termination and Cancellation Costs.—Section 307 provides that funds may be used to enter into or continue multi-year contracts without obligating the estimated costs associated with cancellation or termination of the contract.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—Section 308 provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD). Currently, the Department of Energy laboratory directors are allowed to take up to six percent from all operating funding sent the laboratory to use for research and development of a creative and innovative nature selected by the director of a laboratory. They have the flexibility to use this funding with little Congressional oversight. While the Committee does not dispute the value of some level of funding for these activities, there are many instances where this funding has been used to augment program funding, circumvent program funding denials, initiate new programs which are not part of the Department's mission, and seek business and marketing advantages. The Committee is particularly concerned that work performed at the Departmental laboratories to clean up contaminated sites incurs an additional charge of six percent. In light of the Committee's constrained funding levels, the Committee has eliminated all funding for LDRD in fiscal year 2000.

Contractor Travel.—Section 309 provides that not more than $125,000,000 of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Energy are available for reimbursement of contractor travel expenses.

Submission of Laboratory Funding Plans.—Section 310 provides that none of the funds in this Act or any future appropriations Act may be expended under a contract for the management and operation of any of the Department's weapons laboratories except in accordance with a Laboratory Funding Plan that has been approved by the Secretary of Energy. The Committee has included this provision to ensure that the Secretary has a greater role in overseeing the activities funded by Federal dollars at the weapons laboratories. The Committee expects that Laboratory Funding Plans will be submitted by the Laboratory Directors at such level of detail as

the Secretary may require to enable him to exercise his role as the Federal official with ultimate responsibility for the activities of these facilities.

The Committee believes that imposing this requirement for Secretarial approval prior to expenditure of appropriated funds at the laboratories will increase transparency of laboratory fiscal management and improve communications with the Department regarding planned activities. The Department would benefit from receiving a greater level of detail in the budget proposal process than has been the case in the past.

Each broad budget category of the Department's programs: e.g. Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management in the Weapons Program, should be supported by a breakdown structure that includes each program element. Each program element, in turn, would be broken down into more detailed work packages. Departmental personnel are expected to work closely with the weapons laboratories at this level. In addition to the benefit that would result from both parties achieving a better understanding of expectations and planned activities early in the budget process, the availability of this level of detail will provide the basis for the weapons laboratories to construct the Laboratory Funding Plans for approval in accordance with the requirements of this section.

Contract Approvals.—Section 311 requires the Secretary of Energy to become directly involved in several details of laboratory management that are currently executed at the field office and Headquarters program office level. Recent events, such as the security breach at Los Alamos, have once again demonstrated the need for the Department to take control of the activities of its laboratories. Such involvement on the part of the Secretary will ensure closer oversight of laboratory spending, more uniformity in the application of incentives, greater responsiveness from laboratory officials, and, generally, a much needed high level of attention to Laboratory issues within the Department. The Committee is requiring this for the three nuclear weapons laboratories, but encourages the Secretary to extend this requirement to all multi-purpose national laboratories.

Centers and Partnerships Established for Various Purposes at DOE Laboratories.—Section 312 provides that none of the funds in the Act may be used to establish or maintain any center or programmatic partnership at a Department of Energy Laboratory or facility unless such funds have been specifically identified in the budget submission. Department of Energy laboratories have been establishing independent centers and funding them through a combination of direct program funds, overhead, and laboratory directed research and development funds with little oversight. These centers cover a broad range of programs: the Center for Global Security Research; the Center for International Security Affairs; the Center for Space Science and Exploration, and the Partnership for Natural Disaster Reduction. The merits of these centers and partnerships are not reviewed nor the costs identified in the Department's budget submission. The Committee objects to this process and has deleted all funding for such activities.

The Department should provide by November 30, 1999, a report identifying all centers which have been established, the funding

provided in fiscal year 1999 and proposed for fiscal year 2000, and the source of that funding. The report should provide a brief description of each center and the Assistant Secretary who approved the establishment of the center.

Waiving Overhead and Added Factor Charges.—Section 313 provides that none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to waive overhead charges for other Federal agencies or for other Department of Energy programs. The Department of Energy's laboratories have been trying to lower the cost of doing business with other Federal agencies by eliminating the overhead or added factor which the Department applies to work performed for other Federal agencies. This has the effect of augmenting other Federal agencies budgets while penalizing the rest of the Department. The Inspector General has also identified instances in which DOE field offices are not equitably distributing overhead costs resulting in windfalls for some programs at the expense of other DOE programs. The Committee objects to this type of inequitable financial practice.

Repeal of Prohibitions on Studies at Federal Public Power Authorities.—Section 314 repeals section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, and section 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986. Section 505 prohibits the use of funds to conduct studies relating to consideration of market or other non-cost pricing of hydroelectric power sales by the six Federal public power authorities. Section 208 prohibits the use of funds to conduct studies relating to selling the assets of the six Federal public power authorities. These provisions inhibit full participation by the Federal public power authorities as the Nation pursues extensive discussions on electricity restructuring.

Restart of the High Flux Beam Reactor.—Section 315 provides that no funds may be used to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor at the Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York.

Limitation on Federal Power Marketing Administrations.—Section 316 provides that no funds may be used by the Federal power marketing administrations for construction, expansion, or upgrades of fiber optic telecommunication lines, associated facilities, or purchase of equipment directly related to such efforts.

Additional Limitation on Federal Power Marketing Administrations.—Section 317 provides that no funds may be used by the Federal power marketing administrations to: rent or sell construction equipment, provide construction-type services, perform contract construction work, provide construction engineering services, or provide financing or leasing services for construction, maintenance, operational, or engineering services.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1999	$66,400,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	66,400,000
Recommended, 2000	60,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−6,400,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−6,400,000

The Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) is a regional economic development agency established in 1965. It is composed of the Governors of the thirteen Appalachian states and a Federal Co-Chairman who is appointed by the President. The Committee recommends $60,000,000, a reduction of $6,400,000 from the budget request.

The Committee recognizes the substantial challenges faced by the Appalachian region in adapting to the changes presented by welfare reform and welfare-to-work programs. In order to meet these challenges and to ensure the ultimate success of welfare reform efforts in the Appalachian region, the Committee urges the ARC to commit a greater share of available resources to new and innovative activities to break the cycle of poverty and to provide for improved child care and child development programs throughout Appalachia.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1999	$16,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	17,500,000
Recommended, 2000	16,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	.....
Budget Estimate, 2000	−1,000,000

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

Consistent with agency reductions that the Committee has made throughout this bill, the Committee recommendation is $16,500,000, a decrease of $1,000,000 from the budget request of $17,500,000. The Committee urges the Board to focus on those de-

fense nuclear production facilities that are operational and represent the highest radiological risk to workers and the public.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1999	$20,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....
Recommended, 2000	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−20,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

The bill includes language rescinding $18,000,000 appropriated in Public Law 105–245 for the Denali Commission.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1999	$465,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	465,400,000
Recommended, 2000	455,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−9,600,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−10,000,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1999	$−444,800,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−442,400,000
Recommended, 2000	−432,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+12,400,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	+10,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1999	$20,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	23,000,000
Recommended, 2000	23,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+2,800,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

The Committee recommendation is $455,400,000, a reduction of $9,600,000 from the current fiscal year and $10,000,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes $23,000,000 to be made available from the Nuclear Waste Fund and the General Fund, including $19,150,000 to support the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. The recommendation also includes $1,200,000, the same amount as the budget request, for the Commission's continuing efforts to study and provide technical assistance relating to external regulation of certain Department of Energy facilities, $2,050,000 for work related to the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System and $600,000 for assistance to the Agency for International Development for nuclear safety related work in the Former Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriation from the Nuclear Waste Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. This authority expires at the end of the current fiscal year. The Committee

has included a statutory provision providing for a one-year extension of this authorization. The extension of this authority is necessary to provide the resources needed to fund the activities of the Commission.

The Committee notes that the Commission has responded positively to a number of issues that the Congress has raised over the last few years with respect to moving toward a more efficient and effective regulatory system. The Commission as a whole, the five Commissioners individually, and the Commission staff deserve a great deal of credit for the accomplishments in the last year.

The Committee observes that much work remains to be done before the benefits of these reform initiatives are realized. The Committee expects that these changes, when implemented, will result in lower budget requirements and has therefore recommended a lower amount for fiscal year 2000 than requested by the Commission. Moreover, the Committee believes that for these changes to occur, the Commission must be able to decide what organizational structure will best enable it to meet its responsibilities. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as successor to the Atomic Energy Commission, was established as an independent agency by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. In subsequent legislation, the Commission was statutorily required to establish certain offices and functions. The Committee believes the Commission is in the best position to determine what organizational structure will best enable it to fulfill its statutory mandate to assure adequate protection of public health and safety and the common defense and security associated with the use of nuclear materials. Therefore, the Committee urges the Commission to consider submitting legislation to repeal those provisions of law.

The Committee believes that one of the most important challenges facing the Commission is the renewal of licenses for currently operating reactors. The Committee is pleased that the Commission has taken steps to put a two-year review process for license renewal applications in place. The Committee directs the Commission to provide a report that describes the lessons learned from the initial license renewal reviews and the actions being taken to ensure that the two-year timetable will be sustained and improved upon for future license renewal applicants.

The Committee supports the move to safety-focused, performance-based regulation. The Committee is aware that the Commission has recently directed the Commission staff to begin to revise the regulations to change the scope and technical requirements based on safety insights and operating experience. The Committee notes, however, that no timetable was given for completing this effort. The Committee directs the Commission to examine reforms to the scope of power reactor regulations that will promote a higher level of confidence that the revised regulations, when issued, are consistent with the fundamental accountability of the Commission and that regulations which do not contribute to adequate protection are eliminated. The Committee directs that these efforts be completed no later than December 31, 2000.

In addition, the Committee directs the Commission to review existing regulations to reform those that are outdated or paperwork

oriented to a set of regulations that are performance-based. This effort should also be completed by 2004.

The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and regulatory duties. The Committee notes that in addition to the power reactors regulations contained on 10 CFR 50, other parts affecting power reactor operation are in need of reform. The Commission should include in the monthly report to Congress its activity with respect to these other parts, particularly its efforts to harmonize its security regulations with part 50.

The Committee recommendation includes authority for the Commission to collect annual charges not to exceed a total of $432,400,000 from licensees in fiscal year 2000. The Committee recommendation includes an appropriation of $19,150,000 to be made available to the Nuclear Waste Fund and another $4,000,000 to be made available from the General Fund for other Federal agency activities. Due to severe budget constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the approximately $50,000,000 for Agreement State oversight, international activities, generic decommissioning and reclamation activities, the site decommissioning management program, regulatory support to Agreement States, the small entities program, and support to nonprofit educational institutions. The Committee urges the Commission and the Administration to provide statutory language and budget resources needed to remove these expenditures from the fee base currently imposed on licensees.

The Committee has recommended a $12,400,000 reduction for fiscal year 2000 to the regulatory and non-Federal programs. Consistent with the new regulatory practices and procedures, the Committee expects reductions in future budget requests and is committed to ensuring that out-year budget requirements will be reduced. The Commission is directed to include a comprehensive five-year plan as part of its fiscal year 2001 budget request. The five-year plan must provide a detailed staffing and organizational analysis and corresponding budget requirements for fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 1999	$4,800,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	6,000,000
Recommended, 2000	6,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	+1,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 1999	$−4,800,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−6,000,000
Recommended, 2000	−6,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−1,200,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	.....

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Pursuant to law, budget au-

thority appropriated to the Inspector General must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,000,000, equal to the amount of the budget request, and $1,200,000 more than the amount provided in the current fiscal year. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2214, this appropriation must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees, resulting in a net appropriation of $0.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

Appropriation, 1999	$2,600,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	3,150,000
Recommended, 2000	2,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	.....
Budget Estimate, 2000	−550,000

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

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,600,000, the same as the current fiscal year, and a reduction of $550,000 from the budget request.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 1999	$50,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	7,000,000
Recommended, 2000	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1999	−50,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2000	−7,000,000

Final year appropriations for the non-power functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority were provided by Congress for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Committee recommendation includes several general provisions pertaining to specific programs and activities funded in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.

Prohibition on Lobbying.—Section 501 provides that none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress, other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in section 1913 of Title 18, United States Code.

Buy American.—Section 502 requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable.

Drainage of the San Luis Unit.—Section 503 provides language clarifying the funding requirements for the San Luis Unit.

Extension of Authority for Nuclear Regulatory Commission to Collect Fees and Charges.—Section 504 provides a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds.

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration.—Section 505 repeals the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Act.

Denali Commission.—Section 506 repeals legislation authorizing the Denali Commission and amendments thereto.

Technical Change.—Section 507 makes a technical change to the provision of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorizing reimbursement for work by non-Federal interests on certain civil works projects of the Corps of Engineers.

Prohibition on Implementation of Kyoto Protocol.—Section 508 prohibits the use of funds to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees or orders for implementing the Kyoto Protocol prior to Senate ratification.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORT REQUIREMENTS

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that: "Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain the following: (1) A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution."

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law * * *"

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3(c)2 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section 302(a) allocation. This information follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) Allocation		This bill	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	19,390	19,168	20,190	19,673
Mandatory				

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority in the accompanying bill:

	Millions
Budget Authority	20,190
Outlays:	
2000	12,131
2001	6,342
2002	1,310
2003	83
2004 and beyond	205

ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local governments is as follows:

	Millions
Budget authority	43
Fiscal year 2000 outlays resulting therefrom	10

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

The following table shows the appropriations affected by the transfers:

Under Title I, Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program:

> * * * Provided further, That the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for these activities in this Act or any previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act may be transferred to and merged with this appropriation account, and thereafter, may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

> * * * of which $2,247,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $24,089,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund, and of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund: Provided, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriations under this heading: * * *

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, California Bay-Delta Restoration:

> * * * and of which such amounts as may be necessary to conform with such plans shall be transferred to appropriate accounts of such Federal agencies: * * *

Under Title III, Energy Supply:

> * * * of which $820,953 shall be derived by transfer from the Geothermal Resources Development Fund, and of

which $5,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund.

Under Title III, Operation and Maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration:

> * * * of which $773,000 shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in "Operation and Maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration" * * *

Under Title, III, General Provisions:

> SEC. 306. The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Balances so transferred may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

The bill proposes to rescind $18,000,000 from funds provided in Public Law 105–245 for the Denali Commission.

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Language has been included under Corps of Engineers, General Investigations, providing for detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction. Language is also included under General Investigations directing the Secretary of the Army to use unobligated funds appropriated in Public Law 102–377 for the feasibility phase of the Red River navigation, Southwest Arkansas, study.

Language has been included under Construction, General, permitting the use of funds from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, stating the following:

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

Language has been included under Operation and Maintenance, General, providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities and permitting the use of funds from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

Language has been included under the Regulatory Program regarding the regulation of navigable waters and wetlands. Language is also included directing the Corps of Engineers to implement an administrative appeals process and to prepare analyses of the impacts of the proposed replacement permits for the nationwide permit 26. Language is also included prohibiting termination of the nationwide permit 26 until such time as the aforementioned analyses are submitted to jurisdictional committees of Congress.

Language has been included under General Expenses regarding support of the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Support Center Activity, the Water Resources Support Center and headquarters support functions at the USACE Finance Center. Language is also included under General Expenses prohibiting the use of other Title I funds for the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the division offices. Language is also included prohibiting the use of funds to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. Language is also included prohibiting the use of funds to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers. Language is also included prohibiting the use of funds to support more than one regional office in each Corps of Engineers division.

Language has been included under Administrative Provision providing that funds are available for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Language has been included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds are available for fulfilling Federal responsibilities to Native Americans and for grants to and cooperative agreements with state and local governments and Indian tribes. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that such sums as necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund. Language is included under Water and Related Resources which permits fund transfers within the overall appropriation to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund. Language is included under Water and Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund of the special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l—6a(i). Language is included under Water and Related Resources which provides that funds contributed by non-Federal entities shall be available for expenditure. Language is included providing that funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation facilities are to be credited to the Water and Related Resources account. Language is also included permitting the use of funds available for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis.

Language has been included under the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund.

Language has been included under the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund directing the Bureau of Reclamation to assess

and collect the full amount of additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

Language has been included under the California Bay-Delta Restoration account, imposing limitations on the obligation of funds for ecosystem restoration and other activities.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal providing that none of the funds appropriated under that heading shall be distributed to the State of Nevada or affected units of local government for financial assistance.

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

Language has been included under the Departmental Administration account providing that notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act, such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others, as long as such increases are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amounts.

Language has been included under the Other Defense Activities account providing not to exceed $5,000 for official reception and representation expenses for national security and nonproliferation activities.

Language has been included under the Bonneville Power Administration account approving the Northeast Oregon Hatchery Master Plan, providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and precluding any new direct loan obligations.

Language has been included under the Southwestern Power Administration to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under the Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration account providing $5,036,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1992.

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

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that management and operating contracts must be awarded using competitive procedures unless Congress is notified 60 days in advance.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, requiring 60 days notice to the Committees on Appropriations if the Secretary of Energy awards, amends, or modifies

a contract in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare workforce restructuring plans or to provide enhanced severance payments and other benefits for Department of Energy employees under section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to augment the funding provided for section 3161 of Public Law 102–484.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for programs which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, providing that unexpended balances of prior appropriations may be transferred and merged with new appropriation accounts established in this Act.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, permitting the use of funds to enter into or continue multi-year contracts without obligating the estimated costs associated with cancellation or termination of the contract.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of funds for Laboratory Directed Research and Development and Director's Discretionary Research and Development.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, limiting to no more than $125,000,000 the funds available for reimbursement of contractor travel expenses.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the expenditure of funds under a laboratory contract unless the funds are expended in accordance with a Laboratory Funding Plan that has been approved by the Secretary of Energy.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, requiring the Secretary of Energy to review and approve various contractor fees and costs.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the expenditure of funds to establish independent program centers or partnerships at a Department of Energy facility or laboratory unless such funds are specifically identified in the budget.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the Department from waiving overhead or added factor charges for work performed for other Federal agencies or other Department of Energy programs.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, repealing section 505 of Public Law 102–377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, and section 208 of Public Law 99–349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986.

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the restart of the High Flux Beam Reactor.

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds by the Federal power marketing administrations for construction, expansion, or upgrades of fiber optic telecommunications lines, associated facilities, or purchase of equipment directly related to such efforts.

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds by the Federal power marketing administrations to provide construction equipment or related services to other entities.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission excluding the costs of NRC prelicensing activities related to the cleanup of the Hanford site from license fee revenues. Language is also included to permit the NRC to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Office of Inspector General, to utilize revenues collected to offset appropriations, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds in this Act to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress.

Language has been included under General Provisions requiring, to the greatest extent practicable, that all equipment and products purchased should be American-made, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as "Made in America."

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds to determine the point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of Interior and the State of California of a plan to minimize the impact of drainage waters.

Language has been included under General Provisions directing the Secretary of Interior to classify the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program as reimbursable or nonreimbursable.

Language has been included under General Provisions providing a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds.

Language has been included under General Provisions repealing the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and State of South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Act.

Language has been included under General Provisions repealing legislation, as amended, authorizing the Denali Commission.

Language has been included under General Provisions making a technical change to the provision of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 authorizing reimbursement for work by non-Federal interests on certain civil works projects of the Corps of Engineers.

Language has been included under General Provisions prohibiting the use of funds to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees or orders for implementing the Kyoto Protocol prior to Senate ratification.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:
- Construction, General
- Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program

Department of Energy:
- Energy Supply
- Non-Defense Environmental Management
- Science
- Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund
- Departmental Administration
- Office of the Inspector General
- Weapons Activities
- Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management
- Defense Facilities Closure Projects
- Defense Environmental Management Privatization
- Other Defense Activities
- Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal
- Power Marketing Administrations

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

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

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

The accompanying bill would repeal section 505 of Public Law 102–337, the fiscal year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

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

other agencies or authorities of the Federal Government except as may be specially authorized by Act of Congress hereafter enacted.]

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

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

The accompanying bill would amend Section 6101(a)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended:

Section 6101(a)(3) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 2214(a)(3)) is amended by striking "September 30, 1995" and inserting [**"September 30, 1999"**] *"September 30, 2000."*

The accompanying bill would repeal Title VI, division C, of Public Law 105–277, Making Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999.

[TITLE VI—CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE, AND STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION

SEC. 601. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) RESTORATION.—The term "restoration" means mitigation of the habitat of wildlife.

(2) TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT.—The term "terrestrial wildlife habitat" means a habitat for a wildlife species (including game and nongame species) that existed or exists on an upland habitat (including a prairie grassland, woodland, bottom land forest, scrub, or shrub) or an emergent wetland habitat.

(3) WILDLIFE.—The term "wildlife" has the meaning given the term in section 8 of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 666b).

SEC. 602. TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION.

(a) TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with this subsection and in consultation with the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior, the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux

Tribe, and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe shall, as a condition of the receipt of funds under this title, each develop a plan for the restoration of terrestrial wildlife habitat loss that occurred as a result of flooding related to the Big Bend and Oahe projects carried out as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program.

(2) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO SECRETARY.—On completion of a plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration, the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe shall submit the plan to the Secretary.

(3) REVIEW BY SECRETARY AND SUBMISSION TO COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall review the plan and submit the plan, with any comments, to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(4) FUNDING FOR CARRYING OUT PLANS.—

(A) STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.—

(i) NOTIFICATION.—On receipt of the plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the State of South Dakota, each of the Committees referred to in paragraph (3) shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the receipt of the plan.

(ii) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—On notification in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available in the State of South Dakota funds from the South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund established under section 803, to be used to carry out the plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the State and only after the Trust Fund is fully capitalized.

(B) CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE AND LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE.—

(i) NOTIFICATION.—On receipt of the plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, each of the Committees referred to in paragraph (3) shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the receipt of each of the plans.

(ii) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—On notification in accordance with clause (i), the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe funds from the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund, respectively, established under section 804, to be used to carry out the plan for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration submitted by the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, respectively, and only after the Trust Fund is fully capitalized.

(C) TRANSITION PERIOD.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—During the period described in clause (ii), the Secretary shall—

(I) fund the terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration programs being carried out on the date of enactment of this Act on Oahe and Big Bend project land and the plans established under this section at a level that does not exceed the highest amount of funding that was provided for the programs during a previous fiscal year; and

(II) fund the activities described in sections 803(d)(3) and 804(d)(3).

(ii) PERIOD.—Clause (i) shall apply during the period.—

(I) beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) ending on the date on which funds are made available for use from the South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund under section 803(d)(3)(A)(i) and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund under section 804(d)(3)(A)(i).

(b) PROGRAMS FOR THE PURCHASE OF WILDLIFE HABITAT LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State of South Dakota may use funds made available under section 803(d)(3)(A)(iii) to develop a program for the purchase of wildlife habitat leases that meets the requirements of this subsection.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, or the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe elects to conduct a program under this subsection, the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, or the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe (in consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Secretary and with an opportunity for public comment) shall develop a plan to lease land for the protection and development of wildlife habitat, including habitat for threatened and endangered species, associated with the Missouri River ecosystem.

(B) USE FOR PROGRAM.—The plan shall be used by the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, or the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in carrying out the program carried out under paragraph (1).

(3) CONDITIONS OF LEASES.—Each lease covered under a program carried out under paragraph (1) shall specify that the owner of the property that is subject to the lease shall provide—

(A) public access for sportsmen during hunting season; and

(B) public access for other outdoor uses covered under the lease, as negotiated by the landowner and the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, or the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

(4) USE OF ASSISTANCE.—

(A) STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.—If the State of South Dakota conducts a program under this subsection, the State may use funds made available under section 803(d)(3)(A)(iii) to—

(i) acquire easements, rights-of-way, or leases for management and protection of wildlife habitat, including habitat for threatened and endangered species, and public access to wildlife on private property in the State of South Dakota;

(ii) create public access to Federal or State land through the purchase of easements of rights-of-way that traverse such private property; or

(iii) lease land for the creation or restoration of a wetland on such private property.

(B) CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE AND LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE.—If the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe or the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe conducts a program under this subsection, the Tribe may use funds made available under section 804(d)(3)(A)(iii) for the purposes described in subparagraph (A).

(c) FEDERAL OBLIGATION FOR TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT MITIGATION FOR THE BIG BEND AND OAHE PROJECTS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.—The establishment of the trust funds under sections 803 and 804 and the development and implementation of plans for terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration developed by the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in accordance with this section shall be considered to satisfy the Federal obligation under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.) for terrestrial wildlife habitat mitigation for the State of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe for the Big Bend and Oahe projects carried out as part of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program.

SEC. 603. SOUTH DAKOTA TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the "South Dakota Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund" (referred to in this section as the "Fund").

(b) FUNDING.—For the fiscal year during which this Act is enacted and each fiscal year thereafter until the aggregate amount deposited in the Fund under this subsection is equal to at least $108,000,000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit $10,000,000 in the Fund.

(c) INVESTMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts deposited under subsection (b) only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed by the United States or in obligations guaranteed by the United States as to both principal and interest.

(d) PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All amounts credited as interest under subsection (c) shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, to the State of South Dakota for use in accordance with paragraph (3) after the Fund has been fully capitalized.

(2) WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Subject to section 802(a)(4)(A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall withdraw amounts credited as interest under paragraph (1) and transfer the amounts to the State of South Dakota for use as State funds in accordance with paragraph (3) after the Fund has been fully capitalized.

(3) USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the State of South Dakota shall use the amounts transferred under paragraph (2) only to—

(i) fully fund the annually scheduled work described in the terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration plan of the State developed under section 802(a); and

(ii) with any remaining funds—

(I) protect archaeological, historical, and cultural sites located along the Missouri River on land transferred to the State;

(II) fund all costs associated with the ownership, management, operation, administration, maintenance, and development of recreation areas and other lands that are transferred to the State of South Dakota by the Secretary;

(III) purchase and administer wildlife habitat leases under section 802(b);

(IV) carry out other activities described in section 802; and

(V) develop and maintain public access to, and protect, wildlife habitat and recreation areas along the Missouri River.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The amounts transferred under paragraph (2) shall not be used for the purchase of land in fee title.

(e) TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of the Treasury may not transfer or withdraw any amount deposited under subsection (b).

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as are necessary to pay the administrative expenses of the Fund.

SEC. 604. CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE AND LOWER BRULE SIOUX TRIBE TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION TRUST FUNDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There are established in the Treasury of the United States 2 funds to be known as the "Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund" and the "Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund" (each of which is referred to in this section as a "Fund").

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), for the fiscal year during which this Act is enacted and each fiscal year thereafter until the aggregate amount deposited in the Funds under this subsection is equal to at least $57,400,000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit $5,000,000 in the Funds.

(2) ALLOCATION.—Of the total amount of funds deposited into the Funds for a fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit—

(A) 74 percent of the funds into the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund; and

(B) 26 percent of the funds into the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat Restoration Trust Fund.

(c) INVESTMENTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest the amounts deposited under subsection (b) only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(d) PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All amounts credited as interest under subsection (c) shall be available after the Trust Funds are fully capitalized, without fiscal year limitation, to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe for their use in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) WITHDRAWAL AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Subject to section 802(a)(4)(B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall withdraw amounts credited as interest under paragraph (1) and transfer the amounts to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe for use in accordance with paragraph (3).

(3) USE OF TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe shall use the amounts transferred under paragraph (2) only to—

(i) fully fund the annually scheduled work described in the terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration plan of the respective Tribe developed under section 802(a); and

(ii) with any remaining funds—

(I) protect archaeological, historical, and cultural sites located along the Missouri River on land transferred to the respective Tribe;

(II) fund all costs associated with the ownership, management, operation, administration, maintenance, and development of recreation areas and other lands that are transferred to the respective Tribe by the Secretary;

(III) purchase and administer wildlife habitat leases under section 802(b);

(IV) carry out other activities described in section 802; and

(V) develop and maintain public access to, and protect, wildlife habitat and recreation areas along the Missouri River.

(B) PROHIBITION.—The amounts transferred under paragraph (2) shall not be used for the purchase of land in fee title.

(e) TRANSFERS AND WITHDRAWALS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), the Secretary of the Treasury may not Transfer or withdraw any amount deposited under subsection (b).

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as are necessary to pay the administrative expenses of the Fund.

SEC. 605. TRANSFER OF FEDERAL LAND TO STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall transfer to the Department of Game, Fish and Parks of the State of South Dakota (referred to in this section as the "Department") the land and recreation areas described in subsections (b) and (c) for fish and wildlife purposes, or public recreation uses, in perpetuity.

(B) PERMITS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND EASEMENTS.—All permits, rights-of-way, and easements granted by the Secretary to the Oglala Sioux Tribe for land on the west side of the Missouri River between the Oahe Dam and Highway 14, and all permits, rights-of-way, and easements on any other land administered by the Secretary and used by the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System, are granted to the Oglala Sioux Tribe in perpetuity to be held in trust under section 3(e) of the Mni Wiconi Project Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 2568).

(2) USES.—The Department shall maintain and develop the land outside the recreation areas for fish and wildlife purposes in accordance with—

(A) fish and wildlife purposes in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) a plan developed under section 802.

(3) CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—The transfer shall not interfere with the Corps of Engineers operation of a project under this section for an authorized purpose of the project under the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 701–1 et seq.), or other applicable law.

(4) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall retain the right to inundate with water the land transferred to the Department under this section or draw down a project reservoir, as necessary to carry out an authorized purpose of a project.

(b) LAND TRANSFERRED.—The land described in this subsection is land that—

(1) is located above the top of the exclusive flood pool of the Oahe, Big Bend, Fort Randall, and Gavin's Point projects of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program;

(2) was acquired by the Secretary for the implementation of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program;

(3) is located outside the external boundaries of a reservation of an Indian Tribe; and

(4) is located within the State of South Dakota.

(c) RECREATION AREAS TRANSFERRED.—A recreation area described in this section includes the land and waters within a recreation area that—

(1) the Secretary determines, at the time of the transfer, is a recreation area classified for recreation use by the Corps of Engineers on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) is located outside the external boundaries of a reservation of an Indian Tribe;

(3) is located within the State of South Dakota;

(4) is not the recreation area known as "Cottonwood", "Training Dike", or "Tailwaters"; and

(5) is located below Gavin's Point Dam in the State of South Dakota in accordance with boundary agreements and reciprocal fishing agreements between the State of South Dakota and the State of Nebraska in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, which agreements shall continue to be honored by the State of South Dakota as the agreements apply to any land or recreation areas transferred under this title to the State of South Dakota below Gavin's Point Dam and on the waters of the Missouri River.

(d) MAP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Department, shall prepare a map of the land and recreation areas transferred under this section.

(2) LAND.—The map shall identify—

(A) land reasonably expected to be required for project purposes during the 20-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) dams and related structures;

which shall be retained by the Secretary.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map shall be on file in the appropriate offices of the Secretary.

(e) SCHEDULE FOR TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department shall jointly develop a schedule for transferring the land and recreation areas under this section.

(2) TRANSFER DEADLINE.—All land and recreation areas shall be transferred not later than 1 year after the full capitalization of the Trust Fund described in section 803.

(f) TRANSFER CONDITIONS.—The land and recreation areas described in subsections (b) and (c) shall be transferred in fee title to the Department on the following conditions:

(1) RESPONSIBILITY FOR DAMAGE.—The Secretary shall not be responsible for any damage to the land caused by flooding, sloughing, erosion, or other changes to the land caused by the operation of any project of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program (except as otherwise provided by Federal law).

(2) EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, LEASES, AND COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—The Department shall maintain all easements, rights-of-way, leases, and cost-sharing agreements that are in effect as of the date of the transfer.

(g) HUNTING AND FISHING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title affects jurisdiction over the land and water below the exclusive flood pool of the Missouri River within the State of South Dakota, including affected Indian reservations. The State of South Dakota, the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe shall continue in perpetuity to exercise the jurisdiction the State and Tribes possess on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) NO EFFECT ON RESPECTIVE JURISDICTIONS.—the Secretary may not adopt any regulation or otherwise affect the respective jurisdictions of the State of South Dakota, the Lower Brule River Sioux Tribe, or the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe described in paragraph (1).

(h) APPLICABILITY OF LAW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the following provisions of law shall apply to land transferred under this section:

(1) The National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), including sections 106 and 304 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, 470w–3).

(2) The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.), including sections 4, 6, 7, and 9 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 470cc, 470ee, 470ff, 470hh).

(3) The Native American Graves Protection Act and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), including subsections (a) and (d) of section 3 of that Act (25 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 606. TRANSFER OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS LAND FOR INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Army shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior the land and recreation areas described in subsections (b) and (c).

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS.—The transfer shall not interfere with the Corps of Engineers operation of a project under this section for an authorized purpose of the project under the Act of December 22, 1994 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 701–1 et seq.), or other applicable law.

(3) SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—The Secretary of the Army shall retain the right to inundate with water the land transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under this section or draw down a project reservoir, as necessary to carry out an authorized purpose of a project.

(4) TRUST.—The Secretary of the Interior shall hold in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe the land transferred under this section that is located within the external boundaries of the reservation of the Indian Tribes.

(b) LAND TRANSFERRED.—The land described in this subsection is land that—

(1) is located above the top of the exclusive flood pool of the Big Bend and Oahe projects of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program;

(2) was acquired by the Secretary of the Army for the implementation of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program; and

(3) is located within the external boundaries of the reservation of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

(c) RECREATION AREAS TRANSFERRED.—A recreation area described in this section includes the land and waters within a recreation area that—

(1) the Secretary determines, at the time of the transfer, is a recreation area classified for recreation use by the Corps of Engineers on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) is located within the external boundaries of a reservation of an Indian Tribe; and

(3) is located within the State of South Dakota.

(d) MAP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the governing bodies of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, shall prepare a map of the land transferred under this section.

(2) LAND.—The map shall identify—

(A) land reasonably expected to be required for project purposes during the 20-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) dams and related structures;

which shall be retained by the Secretary.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map shall be on file in the appropriate office of the Secretary.

(e) SCHEDULE FOR TRANSFER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Chairmen of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe shall jointly develop a schedule for transferring the land and recreation areas under this section.

(2) TRANSFER DEADLINE.—All land and recreation areas shall be transferred not later than 1 year after the full capitalization of the State and tribal Trust Fund described in section 804.

(f) TRANSFER CONDITIONS.—The land and recreation areas described in subsections (b) and (c) shall be transferred to, and held in trust by, the Secretary of the Interior on the following conditions:

(1) RESPONSIBILITY FOR DAMAGE.—The Secretary shall not be responsible for any damage to the land caused by flooding, sloughing, erosion, or other changes to the land caused by the operation of any project of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program (except as otherwise provided by Federal law).

(2) HUNTING AND FISHING.—Nothing in this title affects jurisdiction, over the land and waters below the exclusive flood pool and within the external boundaries of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe and Lower Brule Sioux Tribe reservations. The State of South Dakota, the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe, and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe shall continue to exercise, in perpetuity, the jurisdiction they posses on the date of enactment of this Act with regard to hose lands and waters. The Secretary may not adopt any regulations or otherwise affect the respective jurisdictions of the State of South Dakota, the Lower Brule River Sioux Tribe, or the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe described in the preceding sentence. Jurisdiction over the land transferred under this section shall be the same as that over other land held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior on the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe reservation and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe reservation.

(3) EASEMENTS, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, LEASES, AND COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

(A) MAINTENANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall maintain all easements, rights-of-way, leases, and cost-sharing agreements that are in effect as of the date of the transfer.

(B) PAYMENTS TO COUNTY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall pay any affected county 100 percent of the receipts from the easements, rights-of-way, leases, and cost-sharing agreements described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 607. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title diminishes or affects—

(1) any water right of an Indian Tribe;

(2) any other right of an Indian Tribe, except as specifically provided in another provision of this title;

(3) any treaty right that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) any external boundary of an Indian reservation of an Indian Tribe;

(5) any authority of the State of South Dakota that relates to the protection, regulation, or management of fish, terrestrial wildlife, and cultural and archaeological resources, except as specifically provided in this title; or

(5) any authority of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, or the head of any other Federal agency under a law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(B) the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.);

(C) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(D) the Act entitled "An Act for the protection of the bold eagle", approved June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(E) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(F) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(G) the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

(H) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the "Clean Water Act") (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(I) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(J) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(b) FEDERAL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE.—Nothing in this title relieves the Federal Government of liability for damage to private land caused by the operation of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program.

(c) FLOOD CONTROL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary shall retain the authority to operate the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin program for purposes of meeting

the requirements of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, chapter 665; 33 U.S.C. 701–1 et seq.).

SEC. 608. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall arrange for the United States Geological Survey, in consultation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other appropriate Federal agencies, to conduct a comprehensive study of the potential impacts the transfer of land under sections 805(b) and 806(b), including potential impacts on South Dakota Sioux Tribes having water claims within the Missouri River Basin, on water flows in the Missouri River.

(b) NO TRANSFER PENDING DETERMINATION.—Not transfer of land under section 805(b) or 806(b) shall occur until the Secretary determines, based on the study, that the transfer of land under either section will not significantly reduce the amount of water flow to the downstream States of the Missouri River.

SEC. 609. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) SECRETARY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary—

(1) to pay the administrative expenses incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this title; and

(2) to fund the implementation of terrestrial wildlife habitat restoration plans under section 802(a) and other activities under sections 803(d)(3) and 804(d)(3).

(b) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as are necessary to pay the administrative expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out this title.]

The accompanying bill would repeal Title III, division C, of Public Law 105–277, Making Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999, and section 105 of Public Law 106–31, the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act.

[TITLE III—DENALI COMMISSION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Denali Commission Act of 1998".

SEC. 302. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are as follows:

(1) To deliver the services of the Federal Government in the most cost-effective manner practicable by reducing administrative and overhead costs.

(2) To provide job training and other economic development services in rural communities particularly distressed communities (many of which have a rate of unemployment that exceeds 50 percent).

(3) To provide rural development, provide power generation and transmission facilities, modern communication systems, water and sewer systems and other infrastructure needs.

SEC. 303. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the Denali Commission (referred to in this title as the "Commission").

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 7 members, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce (referred to in this title as the "Secretary"), of whom—

(A) one shall be the Governor of the State of Alaska, or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the Governor, who shall serve as the State Cochairperson;

(B) one shall be the President of the University of Alaska, or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the President of the University of Alaska;

(C) one shall be the President of the Alaska Municipal League or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the President of the Alaska Municipal League;

(D) one shall be the President of the Alaska Federation or Natives or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the President of the Alaska Federation or Natives;

(e) one shall be the Executive President of the Alaska State AFL–CIO or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the Executive President;

(F) one shall be the President of the Associated General Contractors of Alaska or an individual selected from nominations submitted by the President of the Associated General Contractors of Alaska; and

(G) one shall be the Federal Cochairperson, who shall be selected in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2).

(2) FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President pro temporare of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall each submit a list of nominations for the position of the Federal Cochairperson under paragraph (1)(G), including pertinent biographical information, to the Secretary.

(B) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary shall appoint the Federal Cochairperson from among the list of nominations submitted under subparagraph (A). The Federal Cochairperson shall serve as an employee of the Department of Commerce, and may be removed by the Secretary for cause.

(C) FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON VOTE.—The Federal Cochairperson appointed under this paragraph shall break any tie in the voting of the Commission.

(4) DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made no later than January 1, 1999.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Federal Cochairperson not less frequently than 2 times each year, and may, as appropriate, conduct business by telephone or other electronic means.

(2) NOTIFICATON.—Not later than 2 weeks before calling a meeting under this subsection, the Federal Cochairperson shall—

(A) notify each member of the Commission of the time, date and location of that meeting; and

(B) provide each member of the Commission with a written agenda for the meeting, including any proposals for discussion and consideration, and any appropriate background materials.

(e) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

SEC. 304. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(1) WORK PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Commission shall develop a proposed work plan for Alaska that meets the requirements of paragraph (2) and submit that plan to the Federal Cochairperson for review in accordance with the requirements of subsection (b).

(2) WORK PLAN.—In developing the work plan, the Commission shall—

(A) solicit project proposals from local governments and other entities and organizations; and

(B) provide for a comprehensive work plan for rural and infrastructure development and necessary job training in the area covered under the work plan.

(3) REPORT.—Upon completion of a work plan under this subsection, the Commission shall prepare, and submit to the Secretary, the Federal Cochairperson, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, a report that outlines the work plan and contains recommendations for funding priorities.

(b) REVIEW BY FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon receiving a work plan under this section, the Secretary, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, shall publish the work plan in the Federal Register, with notice and an opportunity for public comment. The period for public review and comment shall be the 30-day period beginning on the date of publication of that notice.

(2) CRITERIA FOR REVIEW.—In conducting a review under paragraph (1), the Secretary, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, shall—

(A) take into consideration the information, views, and comments received from interested parties through the public review and comment process specified in paragraph (1); and

(B) consult with appropriate Federal officials in Alaska including but not limited to Bureau of Indian Affairs, Eco-

nomic Development Administration, and Rural Development Administration.

(3) APPROVAL.—Not later than 30 days after the end of the period specified in paragraph (1), the Secretary acting through the Federal Cochairperson, shall—

(A) approve, disapprove, or partially approve the work plan that is the subject of the review; and

(B) issue to the Commission a notice of the approval, disapproval, or partial approval that—

(i) specifies the reasons for disapproving any portion of the work plan; and

(ii) if applicable, includes recommendations for revisions to the work plan to make the plan subject to approval.

(4) REVIEW OF DISAPPROVAL OR PARTIAL APPROVAL.—If the Secretary, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, disapproves or partially approves a work plan, the Federal Cochairperson shall submit that work plan to the Commission for review and revision.

SEC. 305. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as it considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon request of the Federal Cochairperson of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission. Agencies must provide the Commission with the requested information in a timely manner. Agencies may, upon request by the Commission, make services and personnel available to the Commission to carry out the duties of the Commission. To the maximum extent practicable, the Commission shall contract for competition of necessary work utilizing local firms and labor to minimize costs.

(b) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(c) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

SEC. 306. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during the time such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation that is in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their

homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Cochairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates.

(d) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(e) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Federal Cochairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(f) OFFICES.—The principal office of the Commission shall be located in Alaska, at a location that the Commission shall select.

SEC. 307. SPECIAL FUNCTIONS.

(a) RURAL UTILITIES.—In carrying out its functions under this title, the Commission shall as appropriate, provide assistance, seek to avoid duplicating services and assistance, and complement the water and sewer wastewater programs under section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926d) and section 303 of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 1263a).

(b) BULK FUELS.—The Commission, in consultation with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, shall develop a plan to provide for the repair or replacement of bulk fuel storage tanks in Alaska that are not in compliance with applicable—

(1) Federal law, including the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 484); or

(2) State law.

SEC. 308. EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Commission.

SEC. 309. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission to carry out the duties of the Commission consistent with the purposes of this title and pursuant to the work plan approved under section 4 under this Act, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available until expended.]

[SEC. 105. DENALI COMMISSION. (a) The Denali Commission Act of 1998 (title III of division C of Public Law 105–277) amended—

(1) in section 303(b)(1)(D) by striking in two instances "Alaska Federation or Natives" and inserting "Alaska Federation of Natives";

(2) in section 303(c) by striking "Members" and inserting "The Federal Cochairperson shall serve for a term of four years and may be reappointed. All other members";

(3) in section 306(a) by inserting after the first sentence the following: "The Federal Cochairperson shall be compensated at the annual rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.";

(4) in section 306(c)(2) by striking "Chairman" and inserting "Federal Cochairperson";

(5) by inserting at the end of section 306 the following new subsections:

"(g) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES AND RECORDS.—The Commission is hereby prohibited from using more than 5 percent of the amounts appropriated under the authority of this Act or transferred pursuant to section 329 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (section 101(g) of division A of this Act) for administrative expenses. The Commission and its grantees shall maintain accurate and complete records which shall be available for audit and examination by the Comptroller General or his or her designee.

"(h) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 8G(a)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 3, section 8G(a)(2)) is amended by inserting 'The Denali Commission,' after 'the Corporation for Public Broadcasting,'."; and

(6) in section 307(b) by inserting immediately before "The Commission" the following: "Funds transferred to the Commission pursuant to section 329 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (section 101(g) of division A of this Act) shall be available without further appropriation and until expended.".

(7) in section 305 by inserting at the end of a new section (d) as follows:

"(d) The Commission, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, is authorized to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements, award grants, and make payments necessary to carry out the purposes of the Commission. With respect to funds appropriated to the Commission for fiscal year 1999, the Commission, acting through the Federal Cochairperson, is authorized to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements, award grants, and make payments to implement an interim work plan for fiscal year 1999 approved by the Commission.".

(b) Amounts made available by this section are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided,* That such amounts shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emer-

gency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.]

The accompanying bill would amend Section 211(e)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–303, 110 Stat. 3682), as follows:

> (A) REIMBURSEMENT.—For work (including work associated with studies, planning, design, and construction) carried out by a non-Federal interest with respect to a project described in subsection (f), the Secretary shall, subject to amounts being made available [in advance in appropriations Acts], reimburse, without interest, the non-Federal interest an amount equal to the estimated Federal share of the cost of such work if such work is later recommended by the Chief of Engineers and approved by the Secretary.

The accompanying bill would establish a new independent agency for all matters pertaining to atomic energy defense activities.

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 1

Date: July 20, 1999.

Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2000.

Motion by: Mr. Visclosky.

Description of Motion: To delete from the bill language providing that the results of an administrative appeals process for jurisdictional determinations under section 404 of the Clean Water Act shall be considered final agency action under the Administrative Appeals Act.

Results: Rejected 23 yeas to 32 nays.

Members Voting Yea	Members Voting Nay
Mr. Clyburn	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Boyd
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Farr	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Dickey
Ms. Kaptur	Mrs. Emerson
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Lowey	Ms. Granger
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Hoyer
Mr. Moran	Mr. Istook
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Olver	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Latham
Mr. Porter	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Price	Mr. Miller
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Methercutt
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Packard
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Regula
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(a)(1)(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

ROLLCALL NO. 2

Date: July 20, 1999.

Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2000.

Motion by: Mr. Visclosky.

Description of Motion: To delete from the bill language requiring the preparation of studies and analyses of the impacts on the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Branch workload and on the cost of compliance by the regulated community of proposed replacement permits for the nationwide permit 26 under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Results: Rejected 22 yeas to 35 nays.

Members Voting Yea	Members Voting Nay
Mr. Clyburn	Mr. Aderholt
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Blunt
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Boyd
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Farr	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Cunningham
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Dickey
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mrs. Emerson
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mrs. Meek	Ms. Granger
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Istook
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Obey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Olver	Mr. Kolbe
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Latham
Mr. Price	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Roybal-Allard	Mr. Miller
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Serrano	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Packard
	Mr. Pastor
	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Tiahrt
	Mr. Walsh
	Mr. Wamp
	Mr. Wicker
	Mr. Wolf
	Mr. Young

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	161,747	135,000	158,993	-2,754	+23,993
Construction, general	1,429,885	1,239,900	1,412,591	-17,294	+172,691
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	35,000	.....	.....	-35,000	.....
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	321,149	280,000	313,324	-7,825	+33,324
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	2,500	.....	.....	-2,500	.....
Operation and maintenance, general	1,653,252	1,835,900	1,888,481	+235,229	+52,581
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	99,700	.....	.....	-99,700	.....
Regulatory program	106,000	117,000	117,000	+11,000	.....
FUSRAP	140,000	150,000	150,000	+10,000	.....
General expenses	148,000	148,000	148,000	.....	.....
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,097,233	3,905,800	4,188,389	+91,156	+282,589
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	25,741	21,002	20,431	-5,310	-571
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	10,476	12,047	10,476	.....	-1,571

Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	41,217	38,049	35,907	-5,310	-2,142
Program oversight and administration	1,283	1,321	1,283	.....	-38
Total, Central Utah project completion account	42,500	39,370	37,190	-5,310	-2,180
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	617,045	652,838	604,910	-12,135	-47,928
(By transfer)	(25,800)	.....	.....	(-25,800)	.....
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	1,500	.....	.....	-1,500	.....
Loan program	8,421	12,425	12,425	+4,004	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(38,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(+5,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	33,130	47,346	47,346	+14,216	.....
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	75,000	95,000	75,000	.....	-20,000
Policy and administration	47,000	49,000	45,000	-2,000	-4,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	782,096	856,609	784,681	+2,585	-71,928
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	824,596	895,979	821,871	-2,725	-74,108
(By transfer)	(25,800)	.....	.....	(-25,800)	.....
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	727,091	834,791	577,579	-149,512	-257,212
(By transfer)	.....	(5,821)	(5,821)	(+5,821)	.....
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	60,000	.....	.....	-60,000	.....
Non-defense environmental management	431,200	330,934	327,223	-103,977	-3,711
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	220,200	240,198	240,198	+19,998	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Science	2,682,860	2,839,178	2,718,647	+35,787	-120,531
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	15,000	.....	.....	-15,000	.....
Nuclear Waste Disposal	169,000	258,000	169,000	.....	-89,000
(By transfer)	.....	(39,000)	.....	.....	(-39,000)
Departmental administration	200,475	240,377	193,769	-6,706	-46,608
Miscellaneous revenues	-136,530	-116,887	-106,887	+29,643	+10,000
Net appropriation	63,945	123,490	86,882	+22,937	-36,608
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	10,000	.....	.....	-10,000	.....
Office of the Inspector General	29,000	30,000	30,000	+1,000	.....
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(5,576,824)	(5,785,768)	(5,440,250)	(-136,574)	(-345,518)
Non-defense function	(651,400)	(571,132)	(567,421)	(-83,979)	(-3,711)
Total	(6,228,224)	(6,356,900)	(6,007,671)	(-220,553)	(-349,229)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
Weapons activities	4,400,000	4,524,900	4,000,000	-400,000	-524,900
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,310,227	4,503,276	4,157,758	-152,469	-345,518
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	10,340	.....	.....	-10,340	.....
Defense facilities closure projects	1,038,240	1,054,492	1,054,492	+16,252	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	3,500	.....	.....	-3,500	.....

Defense environmental management privatization	228,357	228,000	228,000	-357	.....
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,590,664	5,785,768	5,440,250	-150,414	-345,518
Other defense activities	1,696,676	1,797,991	1,651,809	-44,867	-146,182
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	525,000	.....	.....	-525,000	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	13,650	.....	.....	-13,650	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal	189,000	112,000	112,000	-77,000	.....
Totai, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	12,414,990	12,220,659	11,204,059	-1,210,931	-1,016,600
Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	7,500	.....	.....	-7,500	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	26,000	27,167	27,167	+1,167	.....
(By transfer)	.....	(773)	(773)	(+773)	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	203,000	171,471	171,471	-31,529	.....
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,010	1,309	1,309	+299	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	237,510	199,947	199,947	-37,563	.....
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	167,500	179,900	174,950	+7,450	-4,950
Revenues applied	-167,500	-179,900	-174,950	-7,450	+4,950
Total, title III, Department of Energy	17,060,796	17,077,197	15,553,535	-1,507,261	-1,523,662
Appropriations	(16,423,306)	(17,077,197)	(15,553,535)	(-869,771)	(-1,523,662)
Supplemental appropriations	(75,000)	.....	.....	(-75,000)	.....
Emergency appropriations	(525,000)	.....	.....	(-525,000)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	(37,490)	.....	.....	(-37,490)	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,400	66,400	60,000	-6,400	-6,400
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	16,500	17,500	16,500	.....	-1,000
Denali Commission	20,000	.....	.....	-20,000	.....
Rescission	.....	.....	-18,000	-18,000	-18,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	465,000	465,400	455,400	-9,600	-10,000
Revenues	-444,800	-442,400	-432,400	+12,400	+10,000
Subtotal	20,200	23,000	23,000	+2,800	.....
Office of Inspector General	4,800	6,000	6,000	+1,200	.....
Revenues	-4,800	-6,000	-6,000	-1,200	.....
Subtotal	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	20,200	23,000	23,000	+2,800	.....
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,600	3,150	2,600	.....	-550
Tennessee Valley Authority: Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	.....	7,000	.....	.....	-7,000
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	50,000	.....	.....	-50,000	.....
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	175,700	117,050	84,100	-91,600	-32,950

Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	22,158,325	21,996,026	20,647,895	-1,510,430	-1,348,131
Appropriations	(21,493,635)	(21,996,026)	(20,665,895)	(-827,740)	(-1,330,131)
Rescissions	.....	.....	(-18,000)	(-18,000)	(-18,000)
Emergency appropriations	(664,690)	.....	.....	(-664,690)	.....
(By transfer)	(25,800)	(45,594)	(6,594)	(-19,206)	(-39,000)

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HONORABLE PETER J. VISCLOSKY

As the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, I submit these additional views on the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

I strongly support the bill, which was put together in a non-partisan way and with the complete cooperation of all members of the Committee. The Chairman of the Subcommittee was considerate of the needs of the minority and was fair in the distribution of resources in the bill. Given the constrained 302(b) allocation provided to the Subcommittee, the Chairman did a responsible job in distributing scarce resources to the numerous programs funded by the bill. While I am supportive of the bill, there are two legislative provisions included in Title I with which I disagree. I believe these provisions, related to wetlands protections in the Clean Water Act, would result in the unnecessary loss of wetlands.

First, the bill includes statutory language related to the new administration appeals process the Corps of Engineers is formulating for wetlands permitting. This language would short-circuit the review process for wetlands jurisdictional determinations by making the review of these initial decisions appealable to the Federal courts prior to a final permit decision. Although I support the creation of an administrative appeals process for these determinations, the bill would generate unnecessary and premature litigation, set back efforts to ensure a fair and amicable resolution of potential disputes, and undermine the ability of citizens and communities to participate on an equal footing in the permit process.

Second, the bill threatens excessive wetlands losses by delaying the termination and replacement of nationwide permit 26. By requiring an unnecessary study of the workload and cost effects of the proposed replacements for the current nationwide permit 26, the language would substantially delay promulgation and implementation of the replacement until such a study is completed. Implementation of the new nationwide permits is a high priority for the Administration because these permits will put into effect the special protections for flood plains, impaired waters, and pristine waters announced by President Clinton on October 7, 1998. These changes are essential to meeting the goals Congress established in the Clean Water Act for restoring water quality and reducing the loss of the nation's wetlands. The simple fact is that the U.S. is permanently losing 70,000 to 90,000 acres of wetlands every year to development. This cannot continue. Delays in the implementation of the replacement permits would place the regulatory program at substantial risk of litigation and would result in increased flooding, degradation of water quality, and the loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

PETER J. VISCLOSKY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MRS. PELOSI AND MR. FARR

We strongly object to the Committee Report language regarding the Central Valley Project, Trinity River Division.

The report language directs the Secretary of the Interior to do something he cannot do under current law. Specifically, we are concerned that this language would rewrite years of the legislative history of the Trinity Division, and would be inconsistent with the Secretary's trust responsibilities to the Hoopa valley and Yurok tribes.

Interior Secretary Babbitt clearly recognizes his responsibilities regarding both the Trinity River and California water supply networks in the Central Valley. He also recognizes that Federal law requires him to make an independent finding with regard to restoration of the Trinity River. In a statement May 20, 1999 before the House Resources Committee, Secretary Babbitt remarked,

> Mr. Chairman, the Trinity River is a distinct, defined, specific mandate in law which says I must make a decision about water flows sufficient to restore the fishery. That's the baseline. Now, obviously, that decision has impacts in the Sacramento Valley and indeed the entire system. And having made—once having made the decision about what's necessary for the flow regimes and the hydrograph, I think it is then possible and indeed imperative that we look at the management regimes in a way that is designed, to the extent possible, to minimize the impact in the Central Valley.

In other words, it is the Secretary's intent to minimize the impact on the Central Valley, but to do so by adjusting the way water is distributed and used in the Central Valley, not by reducing the flows needed to restore the Trinity River. The Committee report language would dramatically complicate this process and would add more frustration for water users, affected Indian Tribes, commercial fishermen, and environmentalists alike.

This report language was never formally requested by any affected party, and this topic has never been reviewed at any hearing convened by the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. It has no place in this report, and we object to its inclusion.

NANCY PELOSI.
SAM FARR.

○