AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–693

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001

JUNE 23, 2000.—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. 4733]

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, 2001, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number Bill	Page Number Report
Introduction	.....	4
I. Department of Defense—Civil:		
Corps of Engineers—Civil:		
Introduction	.....	5
General Investigations	2	6
Construction, general	3	31
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	5	45
Operation and maintenance, general	5	48
Regulatory program	6	64
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	8	65
General expenses	8	65
Revolving Fund	9	65
Administrative provisions	9	.....
General Provisions	9	66
II. Department of the Interior:		
Central Utah Project completion account	10	67

	Page Number Bill	Report
Bureau of Reclamation:		
Water and related resources	11	67
Bureau of Reclamation loan program account	13	77
Central Valley Project restoration fund	14	79
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	.....	79
Policy and administration	14	80
Administrative provision	15	.....
General Provisions	15	80
III. Department of Energy:		
Introduction	.....	.....
Energy supply	16	.....
Non-defense environmental management	17	91
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	.....	91
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	17	91
Science	17	93
Nuclear waste disposal	18	97
Departmental administration	20	98
Office of the Inspector General	21	100
Atomic energy defense activities:		
National Nuclear Security Administration	.....	100
Weapons activities	21	101
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	21	104
Naval reactors	22	110
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	22	111
Defense facilities closure projects	23	115
Defense environmental management privatization	23	117
Other defense activities	24	117
Defense nuclear waste disposal	24	120
Power marketing administrations:		
Bonneville Power Administration	24	121
Southeastern Power Administration	25	123
Southwestern Power Administration	26	123
Western Area Power Administration	27	124
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	28	124
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	28	125
General Provisions	29	136
IV. Independent agencies:		
Appalachian Regional Commission	33	139
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	33	139
Delta Regional Authority	.....	139
Denali Commission	.....	140
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	34	140
Office of Inspector General	35	141
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	35	142
V. Rescissions	36	143
VI. General provisions	36	145
House reporting requirements	.....	147

Summary of Estimates and Recommendations

The Committee has considered budget estimates which are contained in the Budget of the United Stats Government, 2001. The following table summarizes appropriations for fiscal year 2000, the budget estimates, and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 2001.

	2000	2001 estimate	2001 recommendation	2001 recommendation compared with—	
				2000 appropriation	2001 estimate
Title I—Department of Defense—Civil	4,126,560,000	4,063,700,000	4,123,607,000	(2,953,000)	59,907,000
Title II—Department of the Interior	805,802,000	840,973,000	770,468,000	(35,334,000)	(70,505,000)
Title III—Department of Energy	16,606,924,000	18,146,243,000	17,293,425,000	686,501,000	(852,818,000)
Title IV—Independent Agencies	128,510,000	177,166,000	107,500,000	(21,010,000)	(69,666,000)
Title V—Rescissions	(20,749,000)	(85,000,000)	(85,000,000)	(64,251,000)	.....
Subtotal	21,647,047,000	23,143,082,000	22,210,000,000	562,953,000	(933,082,000)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(450,078,000)	(448,238,000)	(467,000,000)	(16,922,000)	(18,762,000)
Grand Total of bill	21,196,969,000	22,694,844,000	21,743,000,000	546,031,000	(951,844,000)

INTRODUCTION

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee recommendation for programs within its jurisdiction for fiscal year 2001 totals $21.7 billion, which is $546 million above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000, and $951.8 million below the President's budget request. However, for fiscal year 2001, the subcommittee has received separate section 302b allocations for defense and non-defense activities. Therefore, an analysis of the bill requires that these functions be looked at separately.

For non-defense activities within the subcommittee's jurisdiction, the 302b allocation of $8.85 billion is approximately $210 million below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000 and $761 million below the President's budget request. Under these constrained conditions, the Committee believes that funding priority must be given to the following areas: maintaining the existing inventory of Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation water resources projects; continuing the construction of ongoing water resources projects to avoid contract termination costs and the increased costs associated with stretching out project schedules; protecting the basic science programs of the Department of Energy; providing sufficient funds for the Department of Energy to make a recommendation on the suitability of Yucca Mountain as a repository for the Nation's nuclear waste; and providing for the cleanup of Department of Energy non-defense facilities such as the gaseous diffusion plants at Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio. In order to achieve those goals, the Committee has been unable to provide funds for new projects, both studies and construction projects, within the water resources programs of the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, and has been unable to provide funds for the new and exciting science initiatives or the increases in solar and renewable energy research proposed by the Administration for the Department of Energy.

For atomic energy defense activities, the subcommittee's 302b allocation of $12.893 billion is a decrease of $191 million from the budget request, and an increase of $755.5 million over fiscal year 2000. This funding includes $6.2 billion for the new National Nuclear Security Administration that maintains the nuclear weapons stockpile, supports international nonproliferation programs, and funds the naval nuclear program. In addition, $5.86 billion is provided for environmental cleanup programs throughout the nation; $592 million is provided for security and emergency operations, intelligence and counter-intelligence activities, and environment, safety and health programs; and $200 million is provided for the defense contribution to the nuclear waste fund program in support of a final geologic repository for high-level nuclear waste.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

INTRODUCTION

The Committee has been and remains very concerned about the amount of time and effort it takes the Corps of Engineers and the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army to review and approve project decision documents and project cooperation agreements. In light of that concern, the Committee last year directed the Chief of Engineers to provide to the Committee, by February 1, 2000, a report outlining plans for improved and streamlined project decision, review, and agreement processes. That report still has not been received by the Committee. At our hearing this year on the Corps of Engineers fiscal year 2001 budget, the Committee learned that the Chief of Engineers had completed the required report, but that it was being held in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. The Committee wishes to repeat that finding ways to streamline the project review process and project cooperation agreement process is one of its highest priorities. Therefore, the Committee strongly urges the Assistant Secretary to release the report prepared by the Corps of Engineers so the Congress can begin a dialog with the Administration on ways to improve these processes.

Earlier this year, allegations were raised that certain Corps of Engineers officials acted improperly by manipulating data in connection with the ongoing study of navigation improvements on the upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway in order to manufacture a rationale for the construction of improvements to the system. The Committee views these charges very seriously and a number of independent investigations of these charges are underway. Because those investigations have not yet been completed, the Committee believes it would be premature to take any specific actions regarding the allegations of wrongdoing in connection with the Upper Mississippi River/Illinois Waterway study.

The Corps of Engineers has also been accused of improperly trying to "grow" its Civil Works program. While the Committee agrees that any efforts by senior Corps of Engineers officials to pressure planners and engineers to inappropriately justify projects is unacceptable, the Committee believes that it is a proper role of the Chief of Engineers to advise the Administration, the Congress, and the Nation of the level of investment in water resources infrastructure that he believes is needed to support the economy and improve the quality of life for our citizens. The Chief of Engineers testified

that its backlog of critical deferred maintenance will grow from $329 million in fiscal year 2000 to over $450 million in fiscal year 2001. At current funding levels, the backlog could grow to $1 billion in 10 years. In addition, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works testified that an additional $700 million per year would be required to permit projects to move forward on their most efficient schedules. Inefficient construction schedules lead to increased costs, and perhaps more importantly, result in forgone benefits that the projects are designed to provide. The Committee hopes that the increased awareness of this problem brought about by the statements of the Chief of Engineers will cause the Administration and the Congress to recognize that there may be a need for increased investment in the Nation's water resources infrastructure.

Last year, the Committee noted that the Corps of Engineers had 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 continues to look favorably upon future cooperative efforts of the Corps and NFWF.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 2000	$161,994,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	137,700,000
Recommended, 2001	153,327,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−8,667,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+15,627,000

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 REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	ALABAMA				
(N)	ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	200	---	200	---
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	100	---	100	---
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	521	---	521	---
(FDP)	BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	50	---	50	---
(SPE)	CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50	---	50	---
	COOSA RIVER, AL	---	---	---	150
(N)	DOG RIVER, AL	250	---	250	---
(FDP)	LUBBUB CREEK, AL	50	---	50	---
(SPE)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
	ALASKA				
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	108	---	108	---
(N)	AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	---	150	---	150
(FDP)	ANIAK, AK	50	---	50	---
(SP)	BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	150	---	150	---
(SPE)	CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK	50	---	50	---
(E)	CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	422	---	422	---
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	109	---	109	---
(N)	DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	50	---	50
(N)	FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	---	250	---	250
(N)	GASTINEAU CHANNEL MODIFICATION, AK	50	---	50	---
(E)	KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
(E)	MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100	---	100	---
(E)	NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
(N)	NAPASKIAK HARBOR, AK	69	---	69	---
(N)	PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	120	---	120	---
(N)	PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	107	---	107	---
(N)	QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
(E)	SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	53	---	53	---
(N)	SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	100	---	100	---
(N)	ST. GEORGE HARBOR, AK	---	---	200	---

(N)	UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	74	---	74	---
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	209	---	209	---
(N)	UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	---	58	---	58
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	43	---	43	---
(N)	VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	150	---	150
	AMERICAN SAMOA				
(N)	TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	275	---	275	---
	ARIZONA				
	COLONIAS ALONG THE U.S./MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX	---	---	---	260
(FDP)	GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	212	---	212	---
(SPE)	LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	100	---	100	---
(E)	PIMA COUNTY, AZ	75	---	175	---
(E)	RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	290	---	290	---
(FC)	RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	250	---	375
(E)	RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ	175	---	175	---
(E)	RIO SALADO OESTE, AZ	175	---	400	---
	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (GRANT RD. TO LOWELL RD.), AZ	---	---	300	---
(E)	SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	100	---	335	---
(E)	TRES RIOS, AZ	---	250	---	500
(FC)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	432	---	800
	ARKANSAS				
	ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	---	---	---	400
(N)	ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	753	---	753	---
(FDP)	MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	247	---	247	---
(FC)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	---	200	---	200
(N)	RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	200	---	200	---
	SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	---	---	900	---
(COM)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	500	---	---	---
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR	---	---	300	---
	CALIFORNIA				
(E)	ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	50	---	500	---
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,285	---	3,285
(FC)	ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	500	---	500
(E)	BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	---	300	---	300
(FDP)	CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	175	---	175	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	COAST OF CALIFORNIA STORM AND TIDAL WAVE STUDY, CA....	---	---	500	---
	HAMILTON AIRFIELD WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA.....	---	---	---	200
	HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA.....	---	---	211	---
(E)	LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(FC)	LLAGAS CREEK, CA.....	---	240	---	240
(SPE)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA.....	225	---	225	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA.....	---	375	---	750
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.....	---	325	---	325
	MALIBU CREEK, CA.....	---	---	400	---
	MARE ISLAND, CA.....	---	---	---	500
	MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA.....	---	---	500	---
(SPE)	MATILIJA DAM, CA.....	150	---	150	---
(E)	MIDDLE CREEK, CA.....	---	160	---	160
(SPE)	MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA.....	200	---	200	---
(E)	MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA.....	250	---	250	---
(E)	MUGU LAGOON, CA.....	250	---	250	---
(FC)	MURRIETA CREEK, CA.....	---	300	---	750
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA.....	150	---	150	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	237	---	237	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA.....	90	---	90	---
(E)	N CA STREAMS, SUISUN MARSH, CA.....	65	---	65	---
(E)	NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA.....	300	---	300	---
(E)	NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA.....	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	NCS, LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VIC,	300	---	500	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	350	---	350
	NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA.....	---	---	800	---
(E)	NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA.....	381	---	381	---
	ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA.....	---	---	475	---
(E)	ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	100	---	100	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	---	600	---	600
(E)	PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA.....	50	---	50	---
	PENINSULA BEACH (CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA.....	---	---	250	---
(E)	PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,.	---	300	---	300
(N)	PORT OF STOCKTON, CA.....	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	POSO CREEK, CA.....	150	---	500	---
(FC)	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA.....	---	200	---	200

(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	250	---	250	---
(E)	RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200	---	200	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	300	---	300	---
(E)	SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	1,500	---	3,000	---
(FDP)	SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	125	---	125	---
(FDP)	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	100	---	100	---
	SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	325	---
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	125	---	125	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	250	---	700	---
	SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	---	---	150	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	225	---	225	---
	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	---	150	---	150
(RCP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	100	---	100	---
(E)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	150	---	150	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CORRAL HOLLOW CREEK, CA	65	---	65	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	65	---	250	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	180	---	180	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	150	---	300	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	213	---	213	---
(E)	SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	200	---
(FDP)	SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA	170	---	170	---
(E)	SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
(E)	SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	300	---	300	---
	SOLANA BEACH, CA	---	---	350	---
(FC)	SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	200	---	200
	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS, CA.	---	---	1,882	---
(FDP)	STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	150	---	300	---
(FDP)	SUTTER BASIN, CA	150	---	150	---
(E)	TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	150	---	150	---
(SPE)	TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	205	---	500	---
(FC)	TULE RIVER, CA	---	400	---	400
(FC)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	500	---	500
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	300	---	300	---
(E)	UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	100	---	100	---
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	400	---	400	---
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	150	---	150	---
	WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	---	500
(FC)	YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	400	---	400

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	COLORADO				
(RCP)	CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	250	---	250	---
	COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
(N)	NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, CNMI.....	100	---	---	---
	CONNECTICUT				
(E)	COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT.....	80	---	80	---
	DELAWARE				
(N)	C&D CANAL, BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEPE	---	100	---	100
	DELAWARE COAST FROM BETHANY BEACH TO SOUTH BETHANY, DE	---	---	---	33
	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, ROOSEVELT INLET/LEWES BEACH, D	---	---	---	124
	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, BROADKILL BEACH, DE.....	---	---	---	304
	FLORIDA				
(FDP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	543	---	543	---
(FDP)	HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL.....	114	---	114	---
(N)	LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL.....	114	---	114	---
(N)	MILE POINT, FL.....	114	---	114	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL.....	160	---	160	---
(FDP)	WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL.....	114	---	114	---
	GEORGIA				
(FDP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, ETOWAH RIVER, GA.....	90	---	90	---
(E)	ALLATOONA LAKE, LITTLE RIVER, GA.....	40	---	40	---
(FDP)	AUGUSTA, GA.....	500	---	500	---
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	---	50	---	50
(E)	INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	50	---	50	---
(E)	LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA.....	50	---	50	---

(E)	METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	499	---	499	---
(E)	SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	450	---	450	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	100	---	100
(COM)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	400	---	400	---
(E)	UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	100	---	100	---
	HAWAII				
(E)	ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	140	---	140	---
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	---	173	---	173
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	200	---	200	---
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI	150	---	150	---
(N)	KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	40	---	40	---
	IDAHO				
(FDP)	BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	165	---	165	---
(FDP)	KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	60	---	60	---
(FDP)	LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	165	---	165	---
	ILLINOIS				
(E)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	---	200	---	200
(FC)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	400	---	400
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	250	---	750	---
	ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	---	---	---	325
(E)	ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	500	---	500	---
(FDP)	KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	300	---	600	---
(SPE)	PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	400	---	400	---
(E)	ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	700	---	700	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	2,105	---	2,105	---
(N)	UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	---	4,707	---	4,707
(SPE)	UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	888	---	888	---
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	300	---	300
(FC)	WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	310	---	310
	INDIANA				
	INDIANA HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, IN	---	---	500	---
(N)	JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	---	2,210	---	2,210
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER (CADDY MARSH DITCH), IN	---	---	---	250
	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	---	---	---	300
	WHITE RIVER, MUNCIE, IN	---	---	250	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	IOWA				
(FDP)	DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	400	---	600	---
(FDP)	INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	80	---	80	---
	KANSAS				
(RCP)	TOPEKA, KS	200	---	200	---
(FC)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	353	---	353
(E)	WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	200	---	200	---
	KENTUCKY				
(FDP)	BANKLICK CREEK, KY	100	---	100	---
(N)	GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	1,300	---	1,300
(FDP)	LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	260	---	260	---
(E)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	100	---	100	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	250	---	250	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	161	---	161	---
(N)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	4,141	---	4,141	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY	---	---	---	400
	LOUISIANA				
(E)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	200	---	400	---
(N)	CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	339	---	339	---
(FDP)	CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	100	---	300	---
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	686	---	686	---
(FC)	JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	---	215	---	500
(FC)	LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	---	200	---	200
(E)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	1,750	---	1,750	---
(FC)	ORLEANS PARISH, LA	---	164	---	300
(FDP)	ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	100	---	500	---
(FDP)	WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	346	---	346	---

	MARYLAND				
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	500	---	500	---
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC.....	455	---	455	---
(FDP)	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD.....	68	---	68	---
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD.....	---	700	---	700
(E)	EASTERN SHORE, MD.....	400	---	400	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD.....	100	---	100	---
(E)	LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD.....	250	---	250	---
(E)	PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.....	---	100	---	100
(E)	SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD.....	---	100	---	100
	MASSACHUSETTS				
(E)	BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI.....	310	---	310	---
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL).....	150	---	150	---
(E)	COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA.....	100	---	---	---
	MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA.....	---	---	---	500
(E)	SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA & VT.	100	---	100	---
	MICHIGAN				
	DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI.....	---	---	250	---
	MUSKEGON LAKE, MI.....	---	---	100	---
(N)	SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI.....	---	1,000	---	1,000
	MINNESOTA				
(E)	UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	250	---	250	---
	MISSISSIPPI				
	PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS.....	---	---	50	---
	MISSOURI				
(FC)	CHESTERFIELD, MO.....	---	250	---	250
(RCP)	KANSAS CITY, MO & KS.....	312	---	312	---
(COM)	MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJE	500	---	---	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	220	---	220	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	330	---	330
(N)	ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL.....	---	265	---	265
(FC)	ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO.....	---	445	---	445
(FC)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	170	---	170

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	MONTANA				
(COM)	YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	500	---	---	---
	NEBRASKA				
(FC)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	275	---	275
(FDP)	LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	217	---	217	---
(FC)	SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	---	220	---	220
	NEVADA				
(E)	LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100	---	100	---
(FC)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	500	---	500
(E)	WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	100	---	100	---
	NEW JERSEY				
(E)	BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	---	50	---	50
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	450
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	391
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ & DE	---	---	---	222
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT	---	---	---	135
(SP)	DELWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS AND VICINITY, NJ & DE	---	---	---	155
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS TO CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	---	---	---	345
(FDP)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	---	---	100
(SP)	MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
(E)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	218	---	218	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	---	---	---	300
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	550	---	550	---
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	291	---	291	---
(FDP)	SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES IN MONMOUTH COUNTY, N	120	---	120	---
(FDP)	SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	450	---	450	---
(E)	STONY BROOK, NJ	120	---	120	---
(FDP)	UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	300	---	300	---

(FDP)	UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ.....	300	---	300	---
(FDP)	WOODBRIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ.....	200	---	200	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	50	---	50	---
(COM)	RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX.....	500	---	---	---
(E)	SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	330	---	330	---
	NEW YORK				
	ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK MONITORING PROGRAM, NY.....	---	---	1,000	---
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	---	347	---	347
(FDP)	AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY...	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY.....	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY.....	250	---	450	---
	BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY.....	---	---	100	---
(FDP)	CLINTON COUNTY, NY.....	150	---	150	---
(E)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY.....	520	---	520	---
(E)	HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ.....	800	---	800	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	---	50	---	50
(N)	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	50	---	50	---
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, HUDSON, NY.....	120	---	120	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	50	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	296	---	296	---
	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	---	---	200	---
(FDP)	LINDENHURST, NY.....	100	---	100	---
	MONTAUK POINT, NY.....	---	---	200	---
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ.....	---	2,528	---	2,528
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY.....	259	---	259	---
(SP)	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY.....	300	---	300	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY.....	250	---	250	---
(E)	SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY.....	50	---	100	---
	SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY.....	---	---	---	750
(E)	SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	90	---	90	---
(SP)	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY.....	400	---	400	---
(E)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	---	100	---	100
(E)	UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY.....	776	---	776	---
	UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY.....	---	---	50	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
	BOGUE BANKS, NC.....	---	---	250	---
(E)	CURRITUCK SOUND, NC.....	100	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	50	---	50	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLAND, NC	---	---	500	---
(E)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	600	---	600	---
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	---	250	---	250
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	100	---
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(SPE)	DEVILS LAKE, ND	50	---	2,050	---
(FC)	GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND	---	900	---	900
	OHIO				
(E)	ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	384	---	384
(FDP)	BUTLER COUNTY, OH	100	---	---	---
(FDP)	COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	600	---	600	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH	306	---	306	---
(E)	HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH	200	---	200	---
	MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA	---	---	500	---
(E)	MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	100	---	100	---
	OHIO RIVER FLOW COMMODITY STUDY, OH	---	---	200	---
(FDP)	RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO	100	---	100	---
	STEUBENVILLE, OH	---	---	175	---
	OKLAHOMA				
(E)	CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM & CO	200	---	200	---
(E)	SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	200	---	700	---
(FDP)	WARR ACRES, OK	200	---	200	---
	OREGON				
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	---	923	---	923
(E)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	274	---	274	---
(COM)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	210	---	210	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	114	---	114	---
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	200	---	200	---

	PENNSYLVANIA				
(FDP)	BLOOMSBURG, PA	441	---	441	---
(E)	LOWER WEST BR, SUS RIVER, ENV RESTORATION, BUFFALO CRE	250	---	250	---
(E)	TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	66	---	66	---
	PUERTO RICO				
(FC)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	441	---	441
	RHODE ISLAND				
(E)	RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	191	---	191	---
(E)	RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & STRM DMG REDU	54	---	54	---
	SOUTH CAROLINA				
(RCP)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	581	---	581	---
(E)	CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	150	---	150	---
(SP)	PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	219	---	219	---
(E)	YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	---	50	---	50
	TENNESSEE				
(FDP)	DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	200	---	200	---
(E)	DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	50	---	50	---
(E)	FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	500	---	500	---
(E)	NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	50	---	50	---
	TEXAS				
(FDP)	BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	200	---	200	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	230	---	230	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	456	---	456	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,008	---	1,008	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	100	---	100
(N)	GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	195	---	195	---
(RCP)	GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	500	---	500	---
(N)	GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	728	---	728	---
(N)	GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	---	100	---	200
(RCP)	GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	653	---	653	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	434	---	434
(E)	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	200	---	200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FC)	HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	100	---	337
(E)	LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600	---	1,500	---
(E)	MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	300	---	300	---
(E)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	---	50	---	50
(E)	NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	---	164	---	164
(FDP)	NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	280	---	280	---
(FC)	PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	---	100	---	100
(FC)	RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	100	---	700
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	544	---	544	---
(E)	SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	114	---	114	---
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	574	---	574
(E)	SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	---	50	---
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	500	---	1,100	---
	UTAH				
(FDP)	PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	---	100	---
	VIRGINIA				
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	342	---	342	---
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, VA	---	---	170	---
(E)	ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	247	---	247	---
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	277	---	277
(FDP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	200	---	200	---
	LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAM AND SPILLWAY, VA	---	---	---	150
(E)	LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	300	---	300	---
	NEW RIVER BASIN, VA, NC, & WV	---	---	200	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	1,188	---	1,188	---
(E)	POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	165	---	165	---
(E)	POWELL RIVER, STRAIGHT, REEDS AND JONES CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
(E)	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	205	---	205	---
(E)	RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	257	---	257	---

	WASHINGTON				
(E)	BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	60	---	60	---
(FC)	CENTRALIA, WA	---	250	---	500
(E)	CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	150	---	150	---
(E)	DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	222	---	222
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	600	---	600
(RCP)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	350	---	350	---
(SP)	OCEAN SHORES, WA	100	---	100	---
(N)	PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	250	---	250	---
(E)	PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	65	---	65	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA	270	---	270	---
(E)	SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	100	---	100	---
(E)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	225	---	225
(E)	TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	250	---	250	---
	WEST VIRGINIA				
	ERICSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	---	---	---	500
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	---	200	---	200
(FC)	LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	650	---	650
(FDP)	MERCER COUNTY, WV	107	---	107	---
	WEIRTON PORT, WV	---	---	---	750
	WISCONSIN				
	FOX RIVER, WI	---	---	250	---
	WYOMING				
(E)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	---	100	---	100
	MISCELLANEOUS				
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION	2,300	---	2,200	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	700	---	100	---
	FLOOD DAMAGE DATA	400	---	400	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	9,000	---	8,200	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM	---	---	600	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	500	---	500	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	500	---	500	---
	NATIONAL SHORELINE	300	---	---	---
	OTHER COORDINATION PROGRAMS	8,900	---	8,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	HOUSE ALLOWANCE INVESTIGATIONS	HOUSE ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,500	---	5,600	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	400	---	400	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT	300	---	300	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	26,000	---	25,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	100	---	100	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	800	---	700	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	800	---	700	---
	TRI-SERVICE CADD/GIS TECHNOLOGY CENTER	650	---	650	---
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	-23,250	---	-35,971	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	101,519	36,181	105,176	48,151

Coosa River, Alabama and Georgia.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update the economic evaluation for the Coosa River navigation project in Alabama and Georgia.

Saint George Harbor, Alaska.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the feasibility study of navigation improvements at Saint George Harbor, Alaska.

Colonias Along the U.S./Mexico Border, Arizona and Texas.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to provide technical assistance to the Old Nogales Highway in Pima County, Arizona, and $60,000 to provide technical assistance for four identified colonias in Cameron County, Texas.

Pima County, Arizona.—The Committee recommendation includes $175,000 for a feasibility study to evaluate opportunities for environmental restoration projects that fulfill the objectives of the Pima County Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, and for a Special Management Plan for Pima County, Sonoran Desert Area, Gila River and Tributaries.

Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona.—The Committee recommendation includes $375,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Rio de Flag project in Flagstaff, Arizona.

Rio Salado, Oeste, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies for the Rio Salado, Oeste, Arizona, project.

Santa Cruz River (Gila River and Tributaries), Arizona.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for feasibility phase studies of flooding problems along the Santa Cruz River from Grant Road to Ft. Lowell Road.

Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias), Arizona.—The Committee has provided $335,000 to continue the feasibility study of the Santa Cruz River (Paseo de las Iglesias), Arizona, project.

Tres Rios, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue the preconstruction engineering and design effort for the Tres Rios, Arizona, project.

Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona.—The Committee has provided $368,000 above the budget request to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona, project.

Arkansas River Levees, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake preconstruction engineering and design for the rehabilitation of levees along the Arkansas River as authorized by section 110 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

Southeast Arkansas, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $900,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continues the Southeast Arkansas feasibility study, which will examine flooding, agricultural water supply, and environmental problems in the Boeuf-Tensas and Bayou Bartholomew areas of Arkansas.

White River Navigation, Arkansas.—The Committee has included $300,000 to continue general reevaluation studies for the White River Navigation to Newport, Arkansas, project.

Aliso Creek Mainstem, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance

study and initiate the feasibility phase for the Aliso Creek Mainstem project.

Coast of California Storm and Tidal Wave Study, Los Angeles, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility phase of the Coast of California Storm and Tidal Wave study in Los Angeles County, California.

Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to identify the Federal interest in incorporating the Bel Marin Keys into the Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration project.

Huntington Beach, Blufftop Park, California.—The Committee has provided $211,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the feasibility study for the Huntington Beach, Blufftop Park, project.

Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening, California.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Los Angeles Harbor Main Channel Deepening project.

Malibu Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate the feasibility study of the potential for environmental restoration in the Malibu Creek Watershed, including the potential for the removal of Rindge Dam.

Mare Island Straight, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a General Reevaluation Report to study the current and potential future uses of the Mare Island channel.

Marina del Rey and Ballona Creek, California.—The bill includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the sediment control plan component of the Marina del Rey and Ballona Creek project and expand the study to include the investigation of additional alternatives for Ballona Creek.

Murrietta Creek, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $450,000 for the Murrietta Creek, California, project. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use the additional funds to develop a comprehensive plan for flood control, environmental restoration, and recreation-related activities for Murrietta Creek through the communities of Murrieta and Temecula.

Newport Bay (LA–3 Site Designation Study), California.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the designation study for the LA–3 offshore dredged material disposal site.

Northern California Streams, Lower Cache Creek, California.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request to continue the feasibility phase of the Northern California Streams, Lower Cache Creek, California, study.

Orange County Coast Beach Erosion, California.—The Committee has provided $475,000 to complete the reconnaissance report and initiate the feasibility study for the Orange County Coast Beach Erosion project, which includes the coastline at San Clemente, California.

Peninsula Beach (City of Long Beach), California.—The bill includes $250,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the study of ongoing beach erosion along the shoreline in Long Beach, California.

Poso Creek, California.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request to continue and advance completion of the Poso Creek, California, feasibility study.

Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, California.—The Committee has provided funding of $1,500,000 above the budget request to continue feasibility studies and advance completion of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins Comprehensive Study, California.

San Diego County Shoreline, California.—The Committee has provided $325,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance phase and initiate the feasibility study for the San Diego County Shoreline project.

San Francisco Bay, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $450,000 to continue feasibility studies of the San Francisco Bay, California, project.

San Gabriel River to Newport Bay, California.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility phase for the San Gabriel River to Newport Bay, California, project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Frazier Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to complete the reconnaissance report and initiate the feasibility study for the San Joaquin River Basin, Frazier Creek, California, project.

San Joaquin River Basin, Tuolumne River, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the feasibility phase of the San Joaquin River Basin, Tuolumne River, California, study.

San Juan Creek Watershed Management, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the San Juan Creek Watershed Management feasibility study.

Solana Beach, California.—The Committee has provided $350,000 to complete the reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility study of the southern California coastline in the cities of Encinitas and Solana Beach, California.

Southern California Special Area Management Plans, California.—The Committee has provided $1,882,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the process of developing Special Area Management Plans for southern California. This work will result in comprehensive plans that allow for protection of aquatic resources while considering reasonable economic growth. The amount provided includes $882,000 to continue the Orange County Special Area Management Plan, and $500,000 each for the plans in San Diego and Riverside Counties. These Special Area Management Plans shall be conducted in coordination with the existing southern California Natural Community Conservation Plan.

Strong and Chicken Ranch Sloughs, California.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the feasibility phase study for Strong and Chicken Ranch Sloughs, California.

Tijuana River Environmental Restoration, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to broaden the scope of the Tijuana River Environmental Restoration study to identify the need for a regional water supply infrastructure that would integrate existing surface water storage and potential groundwater storage and recovery projects in the United States

and Mexico, and to explore the opportunity to improve water quality for San Diego County and the Tijuana region through desalting shared groundwater basins and imported water supplies.

Whitewater River Basin, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the Whitewater River Basin project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Broadkill Beach, Delaware.—The bill includes $304,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Delaware Bay Coastline, Broadkill Beach project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet/Lewes Beach, Delaware.—The Committee has provided $124,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Delaware Day Coastline, Roosevelt Inlet/Lewes Beach project.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Bethany Beach to South Bethany, Delaware.—The Committee recommends $33,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Bethany Beach to South Bethany element of the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island project.

Illinois Beach State Park, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $325,000 to negotiate a design agreement and initiate preconstruction engineering and design for the project at Illinois Beach State Park, Illinois.

Kankakee River Basin, Illinois and Indiana.—The Committee has provided $300,000 above the budget request to continue and advance completion of the Kankakee River Basin, Illinois and Indiana, feasibility study.

Des Plaines River and Tributaries, Phase II, Illinois and Wisconsin.—The Committee has provided $500,000 above the budget request to advance studies associated with the feasibility phase of the Des Plaines River and Tributaries, Phase II, Illinois and Wisconsin, study.

Indiana Harbor Environmental Dredging, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the feasibility phase of the study of the need to perform environmental dredging in Indiana Harbor, Indiana.

Little Calumet River (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana.—The bill includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the Little Calumet River (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, project.

Ohio River Greenway Public Access, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to undertake preconstruction engineering and design for the Ohio River Greenway Public Access project in Indiana.

White River, Muncie, Indiana.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate feasibility phase studies of flooding problems along the White River in Muncie, Indiana, including rehabilitation of the White River Dam.

Des Moines and Raccoon Rivers, Iowa.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 to continue the feasibility study, including the study of environmental remediation of brownfields sites adjacent to the Racoon River.

Ohio River Shoreline, Paducah, Kentucky.—The Committee has included $400,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design for rehabilitation of flood control structures at Paducah, Kentucky.

Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the Ascension Parish portion of the Amite River and Tributaries, Louisiana, study.

Calcasieu River Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $300,000 to continue the Calcasieu River Basin, Louisiana, feasibility study.

Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $285,000 to advance completion of preconstruction engineering and design for the Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, project.

Orleans Parish, Louisiana.—The bill includes $300,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Orleans Parish, Louisiana, project.

St. Bernard Parish Urban Flood Control, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate and advance completion of the St. Bernard Parish Urban Flood Control, Louisiana, feasibility study.

West Shore, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of concerns expressed by St. John the Baptist Parish regarding proposed levee alignments north of Interstate 10. The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with parish officials to determine a mutually acceptable levee alignment for this project.

Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue its review of flood control and environmental restoration needs for the Muddy River in Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.

Detroit River Environmental Dredging, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to complete the reconnaissance study and initiate the feasibility study for the Detroit River Environmental Dredging, Michigan, project.

Muskegon Lake, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate feasibility level studies for the Muskegon Lake, Michigan, project.

Pearl River Watershed, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $50,000 to resume the Pearl River Watershed, Mississippi, flood damage prevention feasibility study.

Lower Platte River and Tributaries, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided the budget request of $217,000 for the Lower Platte River and Tributaries study. These funds may also be used to conduct studies authorized by section 503 (d)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $450,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Harbor Inlet, New Jersey, project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet (Brigantine Island), New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $391,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design, including plans and specifications, for the Brigantine Island, New Jersey, project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Oakwood Beach, New Jersey and Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $222,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Oakwood Beach element of the Delaware Bay Coastline project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Reeds Beach to Pierces Point, New Jersey and Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $135,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design of the Reeds Beach to Pierces Point element of the Delaware Bay Coastline project.

Delaware Bay Coastline, Villas and Vicinity, New Jersey and Delaware.—The Committee recommendation includes $155,000 to complete plans and specifications for the Villas and Vicinity element of the Delaware Bay Coastline project.

Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee has provided $150,000 to negotiate and execute a design agreement and to initiate plans and specifications for the Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet project.

Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $345,000 to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point project.

Lower Saddle River, New Jersey.—The Committee has included $100,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Lower Saddle River project.

Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $150,000 to initiate preconstruction engineering and design of the Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet project.

Passaic River, Harrison, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $300,000 to prepare a final feature design and decision document for the Passaic River, Harrison, New Jersey, project.

Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico.—The Committee has included language in the bill which provides that in conducting the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction, Albuquerque, New Mexico, study, the Corps of Engineers shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from feasibility analysis based on restrictive policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

Atlantic Coast of New York Monitoring Program, New York.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the monitoring program directed at addressing post-storm actions and long-term shoreline erosion control along the south shore of Long Island.

Bronx River Basin, New York.—The Committee has provided $450,000 for continuation of the feasibility study, including a brownfields assessment at the Cement Plant site and an analysis of the best public access plan for Soundview Park which shall consider provision of a bridge and walkways between Hunts Point and Soundview Park. The results of the Cement Plant site assessment shall be made available prior to completion of the overall feasibility report.

Buffalo Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $100,000 to initiate a feasibility study of environmental dredging at Buffalo Harbor, New York.

Lake Montauk Harbor, New York.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for a feasibility study of navigation improvements at Lake Montauk Harbor, New York.

Montauk Point, New York.—The Committee has provided $200,000 to continue the Montauk Point, New York, feasibility study.

Saw Mill River and Tributaries, New York.—The Committee has provided an additional $50,000 to continue the Saw Mill River and Tributaries feasibility study.

Sawmill River at Elmsford/Greenburgh, New York.—The Committee has included $750,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the project at Sawmill River, Elmsford and Greenburgh, New York.

South Shore of Staten Island, New York.—Within the funds provided for the South Shore of Staten Island study, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to examine the feasibility of reconstructing the Crescent Beach seawall.

Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York.—The Committee has included $50,000 to initiate the feasibility study of the Upper Susquehanna River Basin, New York.

Bogue Banks, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $250,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the Bogue Banks, North Carolina, study.

Dare County Beaches, Hatteras and Ocracoke Island, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate the feasibility phase of the study at Dare County Beaches, North Carolina.

Devils Lake, North Dakota.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to continue feasibility phase studies of measures to control flooding caused by the high lake levels of Devils Lake, North Dakota. The study should include all relevant requirements to serve as basis for project authorization, including economic and environmental analyses, compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other environmental statutes, and compliance with the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

Mahoning River Environmental Dredging, Ohio and Pennsylvania.—The Committee recommendation includes $500,000 to continue feasibility studies of the need for environmental dredging of the Mahoning River in Ohio.

Ohio River Commodity Flow Study, Ohio.—The Committee has included $200,000 for completion of a system wide commodity flow study on the Ohio River.

Steubenville, Ohio.—The Committee has provided $175,000 for a feasibility level master plan study of a public port site on the Ohio River at Steubenville, Ohio.

Southeast Oklahoma Water Resources Study, Oklahoma.—The Committee has included $700,000 for the Southeast Oklahoma Water Resources Study, which will advance the study completion by 4 years.

Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Matagorda Bay, Texas.—The Committee recommendation includes $200,000 for preconstruction engi-

neering and design of modifications of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway at Matagorda Bay, Texas.

Hunting Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $337,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for a portion of the Federal share of the project costs for the Hunting Bayou, Texas, project.

Lower Colorado River Basin, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $900,000 to accelerate completion of the study of flooding problems in the Lower Colorado River Basin of Texas.

Raymondville Drain, Texas.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for continued preparation of a general reevaluation report to solve flooding problems at Raymondville, Texas.

Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas.—The Committee has provided $1,100,000 for continuation of the Upper Trinity River Basin, Texas, feasibility study. The amount provided above the budget request is to expedite completion of the Dallas Floodway study and continue the feasibility of the Trinity River Environmental Enhancement/Fort Worth Floodway component of the project.

Chesapeake Bay Shoreline, Hampton, Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $170,000 to continue feasibility phase studies for the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline project at Hampton, Virginia.

Lake Merriweather, Goshen Dam and Spillway, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for a final decision document, a design agreement, and initiation of plans and specifications for upgrading Goshen Dam.

New River Basin, Virginia, North Carolina and West Virginia.—The Committee has included $200,000 to continue the New River Basin study.

Centralia, Washington.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to continue preparation of a general reevaluation report and environmental impact statement for the project at Centralia, Washington.

Erickson/Wood County Public Port, West Virginia.—The Committee has included $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with preconstruction engineering and design for the Erickson/Wood County Public Port, West Virginia.

Weirton Port, West Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Weirton Port, West Virginia, project.

Fox River, Wisconsin.—The Committee recommendation includes $250,000 to continue the Fox River, Wisconsin, study.

Coastal Field Data Collection Program.—Within the amount provided for the Coastal Field Data Collection program, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to determine wave characteristics along the California coastline to aid in the prediction of coastal processes.

Flood Plain Management Services.—Within the amount provided for the Flood Plain Management Services Program, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to undertake a flood plain management study for the Yellowstone River at Glendive, Montana.

Planning Assistance to States.—Within the amount provided for the Planning Assistance to States program, the Committee urges

the Corps of Engineers to update the daily flow model for the Delaware River Basin.

Stream Gaging.—Within the amount provided for the Stream Gaging program, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to replace and maintain the stream flow gages on Pescadero and Pilarcitos Creeks in California.

Research and Development.—Within the amount provided for Research and Development, $2,000,000 is for the National Shoreline Erosion Control Development and Demonstration Program authorized by section 227 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2000	$1,385,032,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	1,346,000,000
Recommended, 2001	1,378,430,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−6,602,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+32,430,000

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 REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	ALABAMA			
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	18,950	2,000	2,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	331,021	499	499
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	38,700	3,000	3,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	31,200	2,500	2,500
	ALASKA			
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	6,050	1,312	1,312
(N)	KAKE HARBOR, AK	18,000	5,508	5,508
(N)	ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	22,925	5,616	5,616
	ARIZONA			
(E)	RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	61,630	2,000	---
	ARKANSAS			
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	651,000	3,300	3,300
(N)	MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	242,000	20,000	25,000
(MP)	OZARK POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	51,800	1,230	---
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	---	2,000
	CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	72,200	10,000	10,000
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS	97,500	5,000	---
	BERRYESSA CREEK, CA	---	---	1,000
(FC)	CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	21,900	100	100
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	78,500	3,500	3,500
	IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	---	800
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA	23,500	500	3,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	150,000	9,821	9,821
(FC)	LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	4,810	1,485	1,485
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	32,550	760	760
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	91,800	500	500
(FC)	MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	14,900	2,000	2,000
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA	91,000	4,000	4,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	179,900	3,300	5,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	20,000	4,100	4,100
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	---	250
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	16,330	4,000	4,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	883,000	18,000	23,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,450	5,000	5,000
	STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA	---	---	5,000
(FC)	SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	30,900	1,000	1,000
	SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CA	---	---	5,000
(FC)	UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	5,720	1,665	1,665
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	17,700	1,775	1,775
	DELAWARE			
	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	---	---	3,000
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	13,000	254	254
	FLORIDA			
	BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	---	5,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	133,750	847	847
(FC)	CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	12,300	200	200
(E)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	2,109,274	92,423	80,423
(SP)	DADE COUNTY, FL	177,300	3,058	8,000
(SP)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL	111,200	3,800	3,800
(E)	EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	74,792	20,525	20,525
(E)	HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FL	13,500	4,562	---
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	30,600	4,500	4,500
(E)	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	224,800	20,000	20,000
(SP)	MANATEE COUNTY, FL	43,600	200	200
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	25,185	10,828	10,828
(SP)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL	35,800	2,419	2,419
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	49,059	6,591	6,591
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	18,700	4,000	7,500
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	25,449	706	706
(SP)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	167,200	1,321	1,321
	ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	---	4,000
	ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	---	---	5,000
	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	---	---	300
	GEORGIA			
(MP)	BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	33,700	2,455	2,455
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	3,167	1,500	1,500
(FC)	OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	11,208	332	---
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	519,570	2,666	2,666
(MP)	THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	69,700	5,000	5,000
	HAWAII			
(FC)	IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	14,807	239	239
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	5,039	3,437	3,437
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	11,446	325	325
	ILLINOIS			
(N)	CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	23,728	2,100	2,100
(E)	CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	2,130	400	400
(SP)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	170,071	19,192	19,192
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL	37,861	900	900

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL			150
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	69,994	5,750	5,750
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL	21,000	4,010	4,010
(FC)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	503,828	2,800	7,800
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	740,700	1,400	1,400
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	1,000,000	38,142	38,142
(E)	UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	532,740	18,000	21,000
	INDIANA			
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	35,991	1,088	1,088
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY)	60,000	3,291	3,291
	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	---	1,000
	INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	---	7,000
(FC)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	12,746	934	934
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	134,509	5,343	8,843
(FC)	OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	15,500	1,500	---
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	7,200	5,200	5,200
	IOWA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	24,600	3,210	---
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	15,500	5,260	5,260
(E)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	84,500	12,000	12,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	140,518	4,400	4,400
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA	45,400	7,178	7,178
	KANSAS			
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS	27,800	5,100	5,100
	KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	161,199	1,000	1,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	14,700	3,832	3,832
(N)	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	533,000	14,900	19,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	268,000	14,000	18,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	13,524	4,000	4,000
	SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	---	4,000
	LOUISIANA			
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA	107,200	10,000	10,000
(N)	INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	575,000	14,349	14,349
	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	---	500
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	1,893,651	18,040	21,040
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	525,000	3,100	8,100
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	80,000	1,414	2,414
	MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA	---	---	500
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	176,000	719	719
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	173,000	1,800	1,800
(FC)	SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	399,000	47,260	47,260
(FC)	WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	199,000	8,065	7,565
	MARYLAND			
(E)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	12,000	3,951	3,951
(SP)	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	16,900	2,500	---
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	270,300	185	185
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	21,000	5,000	---
(E)	CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA.	900	608	608
	CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	---	---	500
(E)	POPLAR ISLAND, MD	320,000	19,190	19,190
	MASSACHUSETTS			
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	31,400	8,600	8,600
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	32,850	100	100
	MINNESOTA			
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	16,200	5,000	5,000
(FC)	MARSHALL, MN	8,010	1,312	1,312
(N)	PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	10,200	3,873	3,873
	MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	47,101	6,663	6,663
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	2,740	1,337	1,337
	MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	216,000	10,500	10,500
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	36,694	2,350	2,350
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	29,232	3,000	3,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	274,327	6,500	6,500
(FC)	STE GENEVIEVE, MO	34,532	6,000	6,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	60,200	5,920	5,920
	NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	21,000	300	300
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	10,536	1,600	3,000
	NEVADA			
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	209,700	20,000	20,000
	NEW JERSEY			
	BRIGANTINE INLET/GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON ISL).	---	---	5,000
(SP)	CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	92,700	100	100
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	224,000	29,756	29,756

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(SP)	GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	393,000	5,100	5,100
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	82,200	5,649	10,000
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	19,300	1,700	1,700
	PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	---	2,300
	RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH, NJ	---	---	750
(FC)	RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	11,700	2,717	2,717
(FC)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	295,600	4,000	4,000
(SP)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,162,900	6,383	6,383
	NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	66,000	900	900
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM	41,400	3,000	3,000
(FC)	LAS CRUCES, NM	6,600	2,841	2,841
(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			
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	221,700	5,000	---
(SP)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	101,000	500	500
(SP)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	64,000	1,000	1,000
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	236,000	500	1,500
(SP)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	573,100	3,000	3,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	607,600	53,000	53,000
	NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	---	---	3,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	---	5,000
	NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	70,200	1,000	1,000
	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	---	4,200
(SP)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	193,970	2,000	2,000
	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	---	330
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	248,100	40,600	40,600
	NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	40,129	4,700	4,700
(FC)	DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	76,600	24,000	---
(MP)	GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	37,122	5,300	5,300
(FC)	GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	180,900	13,044	13,044
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	15,900	8,000	8,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	30,890	2,600	2,600
	OHIO			
(FC)	BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	3,500	897	897
	LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH	---	---	1,000
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	16,913	3,024	3,024
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH	163,000	500	500
(FC)	WEST COLUMBUS, OH	97,000	6,000	10,000
	OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	9,700	2,400	2,400
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	39,800	4,500	4,500
	OREGON			
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB).	110,800	6,110	6,110
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	75,860	5,000	5,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	176,900	500	500
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	27,800	200	200
(E)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	72,900	8,200	8,200
	PENNSYLVANIA			
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	32,500	7,000	7,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	705,000	35,000	35,000
(SP)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	66,335	580	580
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	10,575	4,300	4,300
	SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	---	---	20,000
	WILLIAMSPORT, PA	---	---	446
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	108,300	23,092	23,092
	PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR	12,500	4,102	4,102
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	430,300	9,590	9,590
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	64,900	3,493	3,493
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	150,700	743	---
(FC)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	8,900	198	---
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	321,000	11,000	13,800
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	26,400	6,940	6,940
	SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	98,444	16,227	16,227
	LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	---	---	3,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	30,450	1,500	1,500
(E)	CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	108,000	4,000	4,000
(MP)	PIERRE, SD	35,000	4,000	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL (IN THOUSANDS)

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	TOTAL FEDERAL COST	BUDGET REQUEST	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	TENNESSEE			
(E)	BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN..	---	---	1,000
	HAMILTON COUNTY, TN.....	---	---	1,500
	TEXAS			
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	306,113	5,500	6,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	27,378	6,104	6,104
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	88,660	1,525	1,525
(FC)	EL PASO, TX.....	116,300	5,200	5,200
(N)	GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.....	17,900	1,176	1,176
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	418,736	53,492	53,492
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX....	42,795	9,000	9,000
	RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX.....	---	---	1,300
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX.....	---	---	900
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	154,500	900	900
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	220,087	11,820	11,820
	UTAH			
(FC)	UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT.....	9,660	800	800
	VIRGINIA			
(N)	AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA.....	24,054	8,492	8,492
	ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, FRONT ROYAL, VA.....	---	---	7,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)..	62,300	4,000	4,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	137,496	600	600
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	29,700	1,000	1,000
	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	---	---	5,000
(SP)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT).....	---	---	1,100
	WASHINGTON			
(E)	COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID.....	1,376,330	91,000	80,000
(E)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	232,000	1,000	1,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA.....	198,400	710	710
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY).....	80,918	2,000	2,000
(MP)	THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	101,000	7,000	7,000
	WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY).....	115,800	6,300	3,300
(FC)	GREENBRIAR RIVER BASIN, WV.....	---	---	1,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	1,853,766	12,100	32,000
(N)	LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB).	22,200	1,800	1,800
(N)	MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV.....	313,000	6,500	6,500
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH.....	369,474	2,700	2,700
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA WV.....	---	---	3,000
(FC)	TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY).....	9,500	4,293	4,293
	WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA.	---	---	3,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV.....	227,500	300	300
	WISCONSIN			
	LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI.....	---	---	2,000
	MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206).....	---	10,000	14,500
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM.....	---	3,000	3,000
	BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204).....	---	4,000	4,000
	DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM...	---	3,000	3,000
	DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM.....	---	5,000	5,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	---	9,000	6,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	---	19,200	19,200
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	---	25,000	30,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSE.....	---	45	45
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSE.....	---	185	185
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION PROJECT (SECTION 111).....	---	300	300
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	---	7,000	9,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	---	14,000	18,000
	RECREATION MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.....	---	27,000	---
	RIVERINE ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION AND FLOOD HAZARD MITIGA	---	20,000	---
	SHORELINE PROTECTION PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	---	2,500	2,500
	SNAGGING AND CLEARING PROJECT (SECTION 208).....	---	200	600
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE AND CARRYOVER BALANCES.....	---	-165,253	-218,967
	TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....		1,346,000	1,378,430

Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 for construction of the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam project in Arkansas.

Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.—The bill includes $2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on revetments within the state of Arkansas.

Berryessa Creek, California.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the General Reevaluation Report for the Berryessa Creek, California, project.

Imperial Beach, California.—The Committee has provided $800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete plans and specifications for the Imperial Beach, California, project.

Kaweah River, California.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Kaweah River project in California.

Sacramento River Bank Protection, California.—The bill includes additional funds to advance completion of the Sacramento River Bank Protection project in California.

San Francisco Bay to Stockton, California.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the General Reevaluation Report of the feasibility of constructing a turning basin near Avon, California.

Santa Ana River Mainstem, California.—The bill includes an additional $5,000,000 for the Santa Ana River Mainstem project in California for the continued construction of the San Timoteo Creek feature of the project.

Stockton Metropolitan Area, California.—The bill includes $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the local sponsor for construction costs on the Stockton Metropolitan Area, California, project under the authority of section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach, California.—The bill includes $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake periodic nourishment of the Surfside-Sunset and Newport Beach project in California.

Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware.—The bill includes $3,000,000 to continue construction of the Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach element of the Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island project.

Brevard County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the North Reach of the Brevard County, Florida, project.

Central and Southern Florida, Florida.—The Committee has been advised by the Corps of Engineers that the amount requested for fiscal year 2001 for the Central and Southern Florida is excess to currently anticipated needs. This is due to delays in completing the General Reevaluation Report for the C–111 project and the fact that the amount requested for engineering and design for the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan was based on a cost sharing formula of 75% Federal/25% non-Federal. Cost sharing for engineering and design will actually be 50/50, reducing the requirement for Federal funds in fiscal year 2001. Accordingly, the Com-

mittee has reduced the amount requested for the project by $12,000,000.

Dade County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $8,000,000 for the Dade County, Florida, project for the Corps of Engineers to complete renourishment of the Sunny Isles reach, and initiate work on north Miami and Haulover reaches.

Palm Valley Bridge, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 to accelerate construction of the Palm Valley Bridge project in Florida.

St. Johns County, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the St. Johns County project in Florida.

St. Lucie Inlet, Florida.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 for construction of the remaining authorized elements of the St. Lucie Inlet, Florida, project.

Sarasota County, Florida.—The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to reimburse the City of Venice, Florida, the Federal share of the construction costs of an artificial reef that is to be considered an integral part of the Sarasota County beach nourishment project as well as the Federal share of the costs of constructing and/or relocating any stormwater outfall whose primary purpose is to drain storm water from public property.

Tampa Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a General Reevaluation Report of navigation problems in Tampa Harbor, with particular emphasis on the need for a deep draft anchorage area.

East St. Louis and Vicinity Interior Flood Control, Illinois.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the General Reevaluation Report for the East St. Louis and Vicinity Interior Flood Control project in Illinois.

McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 to accelerate construction of the McCook and Thornton Reservoirs project in Illinois.

Indiana Shoreline Erosion, Indiana.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for renourishment of the beach at the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and for continued monitoring of the project.

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana.—The bill includes $7,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, project.

Little Calumet River, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,500,000 to accelerate construction of the Little Calumet River project in Indiana.

Kentucky Lock and Dam, Tennessee River, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to accelerate construction of the Kentucky Lock and Dam project.

McAlpine Locks and Dam, Ohio River, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for construction of the McAlpine Locks and Dam project. The Committee is interested in the development of more cost-effective methods of lock and dam construction and rehabilitation. Roller compacted concrete has been used in several Corps of Engineers projects, yet minimal research has been done to test the long term durability and shear strength of roller compacted concrete and grout enriched roller compacted

concrete. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use funds provided for the McAlpine Locks and Dam project to undertake research on roller compacted concrete and grout enriched roller compacted concrete in connection with construction of the McAlpine Locks and Dam project.

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky.—The bill includes $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue design and construction of selected environmental infrastructure projects in southern and eastern Kentucky.

Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the economic analysis and investigate the environmental benefits of the Grand Isle and Vicinity project.

J.Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 for the construction of additional features needed to ensure the reliability of the navigation channel.

Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana.—The Committee is very concerned by the budget request submitted for the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity project. The Committee has provided an additional $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the construction of parallel protection and other features of the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana, project and urges the Corps of Engineers to carefully evaluate its fiscal year 2002 request.

Larose to Golden Meadow, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Larose to Golden Meadow hurricane protection project. The Committee recognizes the life-threatening situations that have occurred several times by the closing of the Golden Meadow floodgates to protect its "interior" citizens from storm surges. While the Committee supports the use and operation of this flood control system, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite to the fullest extent completion of the Leon Theriot lock to allow for the unimpeded passage of mariners seeking safe harbor north of the floodgates on Bayou Lafourche.

Mississippi River Gulf Outlet, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the investigation of need to modify the existing project channel.

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Recovery, Maryland and Virginia.—The bill includes $500,000 for the preparation of a long-term master plan for the restoration of oyster habitat in Chesapeake Bay.

Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska.—The Committee recommendation includes an additional $1,400,000 to accelerate construction of the Wood River, Grand Island, Nebraska, project.

Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet (Absecon Island), New Jersey.—The bill includes $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Absecon Island feature of the Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet project in New Jersey.

New York Harbor and Adjacent Channels, Port Jersey Channel, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to accelerate construction of the Port Jersey Channel, New Jersey, project.

Passaic River Streambank Restoration, New Jersey.—The Committee recommendation includes $2,300,000 to continue construc-

tion of the Passaic River Streambank Restoration project in Newark, New Jersey.

Ramapo River at Mahwah, New Jersey and Suffern, New York.—The bill includes $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to resume engineering and design of the Ramapo River at Mahwah project.

Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, New York.—The Committee has recommended an additional $1,000,000 for additional dredging of Fire Island Inlet with the placement of sand on Gilgo and Tobay Beaches.

Long Beach Island, New York.—The Committee remains fully supportive of the Long Beach Island, New York, project and understands that sufficient carryover funds are available to satisfy program requirements in fiscal year 2001.

New York City Watershed, New York.—The bill includes $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the New York City Watershed project.

Onondaga Lake, New York.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue to implement projects to carry out the Onondaga Lake Management Plan.

Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $4,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete construction of the Ocean Isle Beach segment of the Brunswick County Beaches project in North Carolina.

West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, North Carolina.—The Committee has provided $330,000 for a General Reevaluation Report of the currently authorized project and the remaining shoreline at Topsail Beach.

Lower Girard Lake Dam, Ohio.—The bill includes $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the project to rehabilitate Lower Girard Lake Dam in Girard, Ohio, as authorized by section 507 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

West Columbus, Ohio.—The Committee recommendation includes $10,000,000 to advance completion of the West Columbus, Ohio, flood control project.

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has included $20,000,000 to continue the South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Improvement Program.

Williamsport (Hagerman's Run), Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $446,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete repairs to the Hagerman's Run flume and conduit, which are features of the existing Federal flood control project.

Rio Puerto Nuevo, Puerto Rico.—The bill includes an additional $2,800,000 to accelerate construction of the Rio Puerto Nuevo flood control project.

Lakes Marion and Moultrie, South Carolina.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the project for water supply and distribution for Calhoun, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Orangeberg, and Sumter Counties in South Carolina which has been initiated using other Federal funds.

Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs Wetlands, Tennessee.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to

continue construction of the Black Fox, Murfree, and Oaklands Springs ecosystem restoration project.

Hamilton County, Tennessee.—The bill includes $1,500,000 for completion of the Hamilton County, Tennessee, streambank stabilization project authorized by section 574 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

Brays Bayou, Texas.—The Committee has provided $6,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for a portion of the Federal share of the project costs for the Brays Bayou, Texas, project.

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma.—The Committee has provided $1,300,000 to complete the reevaluation report and continue the environmental monitoring program for the Red River Basin Chloride Control program.

Red River below Denison Dam Levees and Bank Stabilization, Texas.—The bill includes $900,000 for rehabilitation of the Bowie County Levee along Red River. The Committee has included language in the bill which directs that this levee be rehabilitated to the same standard as levees in Arkansas to ensure the integrity of the entire levee system.

Environmental Remediation, Front Royal, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $7,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the environmental remediation project in Front Royal, Virginia. The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers will award the contract for this project in fiscal year 2000 using Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites funds as provided for in the project authorization. The funds provided in this bill will enable the Corps of Engineers to complete this environmental remediation project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Hurricane Protection).—The Committee recommendation includes $5,000,000 to continue the Virginia Beach, Virginia, hurricane protection project.

Virginia Beach, Virginia (Reimbursement).—The Committee has included $1,100,000 to reimburse the non-Federal project sponsor for the Federal share of annual renourishment costs of the Virginia Beach, Virginia, project.

Columbia River Fish Mitigation, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.—The amount provided for the Columbia River Fish Mitigation program does not include funds for engineering and design, or other post-feasibility phase activities, associated with breaching Lower Snake River dams.

Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,000,000 to continue design and complete a detailed project report for the Marlington element of the Greenbrier River Basin, West Virginia, project.

Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky.—In addition to the amounts provided in the budget request, the bill includes $4,000,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,800,000 for the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $700,000 for the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,200,000 for the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the project, including $1,400,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Tug Fork and a Detailed Project Report for the Levisa Fork;

$3,500,000 for the Martin County, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,200,000 for additional studies along the tributaries of the Cumberland River in Bell County, Kentucky; $800,000 to continue the detailed project report for the Buchanan County, Virginia, element of the project; and $700,000 to continue the detailed project report for the Dickenson County, Virginia, element of the project as generally defined in Plan 4 of the Huntington District Engineer's Draft Supplement to the Section 202 General Plan for Flood Damage Reduction dated April, 1997, including all Russell Fork tributary streams within the County and special consideration as may be appropriate to address the unique relocation and resettlement needs of floodprone communities within the County.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control, West Virginia and Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 to complete detailed project reports for Philippi and Belington, West Virginia, and complete the emergency flood warning system for the Tygart River Basin in West Virginia, and $1,000,000 to continue work on projects within Pennsylvania.

Southern West Virginia, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided $3,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue work on the Southern West Virginia environmental infrastructure project.

LaFarge Lake, Kickapoo River, Wisconsin.—The Committee has included $2,000,000 to continue the project at LaFarge Lake, Wisconsin.

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration (Section 206).—The Committee has provided $14,500,000 for the Section 206 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $500,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the Clear Lake Basin Watershed Restoration, California, project; $300,000 for the Delta Science Center project in California; $500,000 for the Lake Natoma Pond Study and Remediation, California, project; $300,000 for the Pacific Flyway Center, California, project; $100,000 to initiate an ecosystem restoration report to address aquatic restoration including control of non-native weeds in the Santa Clara River Basin, California; $203,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the Upper Truckee River, California, project; $300,000 for the Turtle Bay Museums, Redding, California, project; $100,000 to complete a preliminary restoration plan and intiate an ecosystem restoration report for the Hayden Diversion, Colorado; $100,000 for the Panama City Harbor (East Pass), Florida, project; $2,000,000 for the Stevenson Creek Estuary, Florida, project; $50,000 for a study of Butler Creek Detention Pond, Cobb County, Georgia; $261,000 to initiate and complete a feasibility study for Iowa River and Clear Creek, Iowa; $1,000,000 for the Chicago Botanical Garden, Illinois, project; $300,000 for the Kankakee River, Illinois, project; $150,000 to initiate a feasibility study of Squaw Creek Basin, Illinois; $100,000 for a study to evaluate aquatic ecosystem restoration along Spy Run Creek in Fort Wayne, Indiana; $110,000 to initiate and complete the feasibility phase and plans and specifications for the Wabash River, West Lafayette, Indiana, project; $3,000,000 for the Lower Cumberland River, Kentucky, project; $126,000 to initiate the feasibility study for Belle Isle Piers, Detroit, Michigan; $40,000 to complete the preliminary res-

toration plan and initiate the feasibility report for LeMay Wetlands Restoration, St. Louis County, Missouri; $250,000 for the Little Sugar Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, North Carolina, project; $210,000 to prepare a preliminary restoration plan and an ecosystem restoration report for Lake Weamaconk, New Jersey; $100,000 to initiate a preliminary restoration plan for Silvery Minnow Habitat, Rio Grande, New Mexico; $200,000 to initiate the feasibility phase for Port Jefferson Harbor Oyster Habitat Restoration, Brookhaven, New York; $10,000 for a Preliminary Restoration Plan for Weir Creek, New York; $1,000,000 for the Nine Mile Run, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, project; $133,000 to initiate and complete construction of the North Fork Obion River, Tennessee, project; $500,000 to complete the ecosystem restoration report and initiate plans and specifications for the project at West Jordan, Utah; $500,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for Upper Jordan River Restoration, Utah; and, $1,516,000 to complete construction of the Goldsborough Creek, Mason County, Washington, project.

The Committee is aware that since the 1960s, the Mill Creek watershed in Bryan County, Georgia, has been substantially degraded due to a combination of factors, including a Natural Resources Conservation Service channelization project and effluent discharges from a municipal sewage treatment facility. Therefore, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to use funds available under the section 206 program for an Ecosystem Restoration Report for Mill Creek.

Beneficial Uses of Dredged Material (Section 204).—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for the Section 204 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $55,000 to complete the feasibility phase of the Twenty First Avenue West Channel, Duluth, Minnesota, project.

Emergency Streambank and Erosion Control (Section 14).—The Committee has provided $6,000,000 for the Section 14 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $480,000 for the South Fork Coeur d'Alene River at Wallace, Idaho, project; $184,000 for the project at Bellevue, Iowa; $50,000 for the English Park at Owensboro, Kentucky, project; $40,000 to initiate the planning and design analysis for the Belle Isle South Shore, Detroit, Michigan, project; $40,000 for the planning and design analysis for Middle Ground Island, Bay City, Michigan; $600,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and to initiate construction on the Lake Michigan Center, Muskegon, Michigan, project; $40,000 to prepare a planning and design analysis for repair of erosion endangering the roads and bridge on Bayou Pierre, Mississippi; $700,000 to continue construction of the Fargo, North Dakota, project; $160,000 to complete the planning and design analysis and initiate construction on the Little Miami River, Anderson Township, Ohio, project; $250,000 for the Bogachiel River near La Push, Washington, project.

Small Flood Control Projects (Section 205).—The Committee has provided $30,000,000 for the Section 205 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $98,000 to complete plans and specification for the project along Dallas Branch and Pinhook Creek in Huntsville, Alabama; $500,000 for the Al-

hambra Valley Estates and Nancy Boyd Park Area Drainage and Flood Control, California, project; $203,000 to continue the feasibility study for the Coyote Creek at Rock Springs, California, project; funds to continue the Mission Zanja Creek, California, project; $600,000 to complete the detailed project report and initiate and complete plans and specifications for the City of Folsom, Willow and Humbug Creek, California, project; $1,000,000 to initiate construction of the Magpie Creek, Sacramento, California, project; $500,000 to initiate and complete a general reevaluation report for Mare Island, California; $200,000 to initiate and complete a detailed project report and plans and specifications on North Cache Creek Slide, Lake County, California; $260,000 to complete a detailed project report on the Westside Storm Water Retention Facility, Lancaster, California, project; $100,000 to complete a feasibility study on a project at Farm River, North Brandford and East Haven, Connecticut; $100,000 to complete a feasibility study on Harbor Brook, Meriden, Connecticut; $100,000 to initiate a reconnaissance study of a project at Plant City, Florida; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility phase for a project on the Weiser River, Idaho; $412,000 to continue construction of the Deer Creek, Illinois, project; $862,000 to initiate construction on the East Peoria, Illinois, project; $50,000 to complete the Grafton, Illinois, project feasibility study; $100,000 to initiate the Matteson, Illinois, feasibility study; $300,000 to continue construction of the Stoney Creek, Illinois, project; $50,000 to initiate the feasibility phase on the Willow Creek Drainage District, Illinois, project; $50,000 to complete the Mad Creek at Muscatine, Iowa, feasibility study; $100,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems along Spy Run Creek in Fort Wayne, Indiana; $500,000 for the Jean Lafitte, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, project; $20,000 to initiate a study of flood protection at Ell Pond, Melrose, Massachusettes; $70,000 to continue study of the Yellowstone River at Glendive, Montana; $500,000 to continue the project at Wahpeton, North Dakota; $2,600,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the project at McKeel Brook, Dover and Rockaway Township, New Jersey; $100,000 to initiate the feasibility phase on the Medford, Oregon project; $100,000 for the Wissahickon Watershed, Pennsylvania, project; $140,000 for design and construction of the Baxter Bottom project in Tipton County, Tennessee; $300,000 to complete the feasibility study for Beaver Creek, Bristol, Tennessee and Bristol, Virginia; $175,000 for a feasibility study of flooding problems in Erwin, Tennessee; $500,000 to complete the feasibility study and initiate plans and specifications for the First Creek, Knoxville, Tennessee, project; $75,000 for engineering and design of the Rossville, Tennessee, project; $300,000 to continue work on the City of Renton, Washington, project; $1,717,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Snoqualmie River project at Snoqualmie, Washington; and, $50,000 to continue feasibility studies of flood damage reduction on the Snoqualmie River at North Bend, Washington.

In addition, the Committee is aware of the devastation that occurred at Augusta, Kansas, during the Halloween flood of 1998, which resulted in millions of dollars in property damages to more than 600 homes and businesses. Therefore, the Committee strongly

encourages the Corps of Engineers to expeditiously complete the feasibility study for the project using funds available for the section 205 program so that construction may begin as soon as possible.

The Committee is also aware that the Corps of Engineers will use available fiscal year 2000 funds to complete plans and specifications for the Pipe Creek, Alexandria, Indiana, and White River, Anderson, Indiana, projects. The Committee expects the Corps to expeditiously move to the construction phase of these projects.

The Committee understands that the cost of the flood control project being constructed on the Petaluma River in California under the authority of section 205 has increased dramatically since the initial cost estimate was made by the Corps of Engineers and an agreement between the City of Petaluma and the Corps was entered into for construction of the project. Because the City entered into the agreement based on the Corps' cost estimate, the Committee is concerned that the inaccuracy of that estimate and the Corps' management of the project have contributed significantly to the increase in the City's financial obligation. Recognizing the importance of the project to the health, safety, and economic well-being of the community, and that the project is nearing completion, the Committee believes that it is important that the project be completed and encourages the Corps of Engineers to use available funds to continue the project.

Shoreline Protection Projects (Section 103).—The Committee has provided the requested amount of $2,500,000 for the Section 103 program. Within the amount provided $75,000 is recommended for use in continuing the Lake Erie at Old Lakeshore Road, Hamburg, New York, feasibility study, and $1,500,000 is recommended for the Sylvan Beach, New York, project.

Small Navigation Projects (Section 107).—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Section 107 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $2,000,000 to initiate construction of the Ouzinkie Small Boat Harbor, Alaska, project; $30,000 for the Blytheville Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas, project; $1,000,000 for Russellville Slackwater Harbor, Arkansas; $100,000 for the project at Oyster Point Harbor, California; $2,700,000 to initiate and complete construction at Port Hueneme, California; $600,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the San Diego Harbor, California, project; $100,000 for a feasibility study of the Whiting Shoreline Waterfront project in Whiting, Indiana; $205,000 to complete the feasibility phase on Westport River, Massachusettes; $100,000 for the Detroit River Navigation Improvement, Michigan, feasibility study; $735,000 to initiate and complete construction of the New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, project; $50,000 for design of the Northwest Tennessee Regional Harbor project; and, $200,000 to initiate and complete plans and specifications and construction for the Lake Shore State Park, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, project.

Project Modifications for the Improvement of the Environment (Section 1135).—The Committee has provided $18,000,000 for the Section 1135 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes: $340,000 to complete the environmental restoration study for Rillito River Riparian and Wetlands Restoration, Arizona; $3,300,000 to complete construction of the Tucson

Detention Basin Wetlands Development, Arizona project; $765,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Ballona Wetlands Tide Gate, California, project; $1,400,000 to continue construction of the Gunnerson Pond, Lake Elsinore, California, project; $2,000,000 to complete construction of the Pine Flat Turbine Bypass, California, project; $1,500,000 to initiate construction of the Colfax Reach, South Platte River, Colorado, project; $200,000 to complete the study and initiate plans and specifications for the Chicopit Bay, Florida, project; $800,000 for preliminary restoration reports and ecosystem restoration reports for Sea Lamprey Control within the Great Lakes Basin; $150,000 for the Lake Calumet, Illinois, project; $4,000,000 to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction on the Sea Turtle Habitat Restoration, Long Beach, North Carolina, project; $167,000 to prepare an ecosystem restoration report for the Rahway River Environmental Restoration, New Jersey, project; $100,000 to initiate and complete construction of the Buffalo River Habitat Restoration, New York, project; $500,000 to prepare plans and specifications and initiate construction on the Rochester Harbor Habitat Restoration, New York, project; $210,000 to initiate the feasibility study on the Times Beach Environmental Improvement, Buffalo, New York, project; $176,000 to complete the feasibility phase for the Town of Brookhaven, New York Hard Clam Restoration project; $720,000 to complete the feasibility phase, initiate and complete plans and specifications, and initiate construction on the Pasco Shoreline Restoration, Washington, project; and, $250,000 to complete a preliminary restoration plan and initiate feasibility phase studies on the Dry Slough Restoration, Skagit County, Washington, project.

Snagging and Clearing (Section 208).—The Committee has provided $600,000 for the Section 208 program. Within the amount provided, the recommendation includes $500,000 for the San Joaquin River and Tributaries, California, project; and, $80,000 for the Farrenburg Ditch, Missouri, project.

Aquatic Plant Control Program.—Within the amount provided for the Aquatic Plant Control Program, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $100,000 to continue to cooperate with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland on the control and tracking of aquatic plants in the Potomac River.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

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

Appropriation, 2000	$309,416,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	309,000,000
Recommended, 2001	323,350,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+13,934,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+14,350,000

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)	ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	3,150	750	750
(FDP)	DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	3,500	1,100	1,100
(SPE)	SPRING BAYOU, LA	2,600	100	100
(FDP)	COLDWATER RIVER BASIN ABOVE ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	1,500	350	350
(FDP)	COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	2,100	100	---
(COM)	MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	2,075	657	657
(FC)	BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	125,000	6,500	6,500
(FC)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	88,400	2,000	2,000
(FC)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	20,152	318	368
(FC)	WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	11,765	216	216
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	435	435
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		12,526	12,476
	CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	3,697,000	35,690	35,690
(FC)	FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	9,100	2,110	2,110
(FC)	GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	208,000	22,800	22,800
(FC)	HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	8,380	2,450	2,450
(FC)	L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	15,100	750	750
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	2,117,000	40,621	37,621
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	389,000	3,195	4,195
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	184,000	10,000	10,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	1,870,000	26,000	26,000
(FC)	LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	19,500	5,500	5,500
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	74,600	100	100
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	99,500	5,000	5,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	168,310	2,330	2,330
	YAZOO BASIN:	(1,125,294)	(11,195)	(26,195)
(FC)	BACKWATER PUMP, MS	190,343	500	500
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	110,000	3,500	3,500
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	199,543	25	25
	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	---	---	15,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	32,408	300	300
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	250,000	84	84
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS	343,000	6,786	6,786
(FC)	ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	59,609	700	5,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	17,925	2,000	2,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	147,000	500	500
	SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION		170,941	188,241
	MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	58,954	55,954
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	---	421	421
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	---	442	442
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	---	407	407
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	---	10	10
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	---	6,160	6,160
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	---	6,775	7,775
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	---	2,384	2,384
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	---	1,070	1,070
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	---	45	45
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	---	25	25
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	---	1,499	1,499
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	---	9,482	9,482
(N)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	---	210	210
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	---	56	56
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA	---	1,340	1,340
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	---	389	389
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	---	5,739	5,739
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	---	916	916
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA	---	4,720	4,720
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	---	3,048	3,048
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	---	626	626
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	---	193	193
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	---	480	480
	YAZOO BASIN:	---	(24,185)	(28,185)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	---	6,242	7,242
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	---	137	137
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS	---	3,376	4,376
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS	---	1,007	1,007
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS	---	4,232	5,232
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS	---	1,254	1,254
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	5,180	6,180
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,162	1,162
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	358	358
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	---	431	431
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS	---	806	806
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	---	202	202
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	7,000	7,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	---	113	113
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	---	1,085	1,085
(FC)	MAPPING	---	1,129	1,129
	SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		322,572	341,822
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-13,572	-18,472
	TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES		309,000	323,350

Reelfoot Lake, Tennessee and Kentucky.—The Committee has provided an additional $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform an analysis of potential flooding impacts associated with the construction of the proposed new spillway and its operation. None of the funds provided may be used for construction of the proposed new spillway.

Grand Prairie Region, Arkansas.—The Committee has provided $22,800,000 for the Grand Prairie Region, Arkansas, project, the same as the budget request. Within the amount provided, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $2,000,000 for an engineering review of additional water sources. None of the funds provided for the project may be used for construction of features to withdraw water from the White River until the engineering review of other water sources is completed and a specific appropriation of funds is made by Congress for construction of those features. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to work with large industrial users of groundwater to develop alternative sources of water, including the Arkansas River.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $26,000,000 for continuing construction of Atchafalaya Basin project, the same as the budget request. Though very concerned about escalating costs for this element, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to continue floodproofing efforts in the waterfronts of Morgan City and Berwick. In addition, the Committee expects that these funds will be used to complete the refurbishment of the Bayou Yokely pumping stations, and conduct repairs to the west guide levee sloughing/sliding as necessary to restore the integrity of the levees. The Committee supports the construction of the Amelia and Chacahoula pumping stations as a portion of the Barrier Plan and urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite these components of the plan as well as other plan components that will immediately address backwater flooding issues in the area.

Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided the budget request to perform operation and maintenance activities in the Mississippi Delta Region, Louisiana. It is the Committee's understanding that the Davis Pond pumping station will be operated with construction funds until the diversion project feature is completed. Additionally, 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.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to advance the construction of project elements within the state of Missouri.

St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway, Missouri.—The Committee has provided $5,000,000 for St. Johns Bayou and New Madrid Floodway project for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the next two items of construction, the New Madrid Pumping Station, and the St. Johns channel enlargement.

Yazoo Basin, Demonstration Erosion Control, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided $15,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the Yazoo Basin Demonstration Erosion Control Program. The work done 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 sedimentation, and improvements to the environment. These positive results show that continued funding for the program is important and that the program should be completed so the total benefits are realized. This may well be a case where the complete program yields results that are much greater than the sum of the individual items of work. The funds provided are to continue design, acquire real estate, monitor completed work, and initiate continuing contracts for new items of work. The Committee hopes that the next Administration is better able to recognize the value of this program and expects it to request funds to continue this important work.

St. Francis Basin, Arkansas and Missouri.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance backlog that continues to threaten the integrity of floodway levees.

Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided $9,482,000 for operation and maintenance of the Atchafalaya Basin project, the same as the budget request. The Committee recognizes the need to resolve flooding problems in the Bayou Portage-Guidry drainage area. In an effort to address these issues, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to expedite their efforts to dredge Catahoula Lake.

Yazoo Basin Lakes, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 each for the Arkabutla Lake, Enid Lake, Grenada Lake, and Sardis Lake projects to address the maintenance backlog at those projects.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 2000	$1,853,618,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	1,854,000,000
Recommended, 2001	1,854,000,000
Comparison.	
Appropriation, 2000	+382,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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	1,100	1,100
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,355	5,355
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,999	1,999
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	19,204	20,204
(N)	DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	60	60
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	66	66
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,734	4,734
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	4,999	4,999
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,665	18,665
	MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL	---	150
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	4,962	4,962
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	120	120
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	23,547	24,547
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	7,373	7,373
	ALASKA		
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,777	1,777
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,364	1,364
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	423	423
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK	191	191
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	186	186
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK	386	386
(N)	PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	394	394
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	512	512
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	2,438	2,438
	ARIZONA		
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,166	1,166
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	69	69
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,186	1,186
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	74	74
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	168	168
	ARKANSAS		
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,520	4,520
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,758	5,758
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,200	1,200
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,565	4,565
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,937	5,937
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,218	4,218
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,058	1,058
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR	988	988
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR	929	929
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,933	5,933
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	304	304
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	294	294
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	19,988	19,988
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,602	1,602
(MP)	NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,604	3,604
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,416	1,416
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,626	3,626
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	419	419
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,402	6,402
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,072	4,072
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR	2,258	2,258
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	125	125
	CALIFORNIA		
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,854	1,854
	BODEGA BAY, CA	---	200
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,580	1,580
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,000	3,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,403	3,403
	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	500
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,437	4,437
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA	313	313
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,616	1,616
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,710	4,710
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	843	843
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA	793	793
	JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL (SAN LEANDRO MARINA), CA	---	1,500
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	3,910	3,910
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,956	3,956
(N)	MARINA DEL REY, CA	5,335	5,335
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	288	288
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	251	251
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	170	170
	MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	700

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,778	1,778
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,135	1,135
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,118	8,118
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,535	2,035
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,248	2,248
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,256	1,256
	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	400
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,774	5,774
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,037	2,037
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,113	1,113
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	163	163
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,382	2,382
	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	200
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,000	2,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,573	2,573
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,028	2,028
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,086	3,086
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,615	1,615
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,153	1,153
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,898	1,898
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	3,117	3,117
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,659	1,659
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,240	3,440
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA	74	74
	COLORADO		
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	425	425
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,568	1,568
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	707	707
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	67	67
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,543	1,543
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	209	209
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	619	619
	CONNECTICUT		
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	309	309
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	399	399
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	269	269
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	819	819
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	335	335
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	344	344
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	311	311
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT	581	581
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	506	506
	DELAWARE		
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	19,707	14,757
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	433	433
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,217	3,217
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	910	910
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	235	235
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	38	38
	FLORIDA		
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &.	1,660	1,660
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	7,625	7,625
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	10,558	10,558
(N)	ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	1,000	1,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,705	2,705
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	1,051	1,051
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,.	147	147
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	4,035	4,035
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,755	7,755
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,855	5,855
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR, FL	3,080	3,080
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,323	1,323
	MIAMI RIVER, FL	---	4,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	5,811	5,811
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	4,577	4,577
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	50	50
	PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	---	2,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	46	46
	PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	---	500
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	600	600
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,340	3,340
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	50	50
(N)	ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	3,280	6,580
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,308	6,308
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	35	35

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
	GEORGIA		
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,520	4,520
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,055	6,055
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,460	2,460
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,271	5,271
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,275	7,275
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,489	7,489
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,875	11,875
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	100	100
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,585	10,585
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,190	6,190
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,869	14,369
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	650	650
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	3,977	4,977
	HAWAII		
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	153	153
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	165	165
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	1,296	1,296
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	706	706
	IDAHO		
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,291	2,291
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,689	2,689
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	73	73
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,206	1,206
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	332	332
	ILLINOIS		
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,758	4,758
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,112	5,112
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,762	2,762
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	195	195
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	562	562
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	22,808	23,808
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,598	1,598
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	473	473
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	2,081	2,081
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	837	837
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,209	5,209
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	39,842	43,842
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	14,499	14,499
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL	3,904	3,904
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,473	1,473
	INDIANA		
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	782	782
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,937	1,937
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	732	732
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	864	864
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN	429	429
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	101	101
(FC)	J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	824	824
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	806	1,206
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,182	1,182
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN	799	799
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN	731	731
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	749	749
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	62	62
	IOWA		
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,952	2,952
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	738	738
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	146	146
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,250	5,250
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,111	2,111
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,058	2,058
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,827	5,071
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,074	4,074
	KANSAS		
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,621	1,621
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,197	1,197
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS	487	487
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS	728	728
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,429	1,429
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	908	908
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	36	36

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,186	1,531
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,541	1,541
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS	1,354	1,354
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,872	1,872
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,906	1,906
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,074	1,074
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS	1,966	1,966
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS	1,830	1,830
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	193	193
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS	673	673
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,546	2,546
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS	2,017	2,017
	KENTUCKY		
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,330	10,330
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,544	2,544
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,497	1,497
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,685	1,685
(FC)	CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,542	1,542
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	868	868
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,429	1,429
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	361	361
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,890	1,890
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,366	1,366
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,079	1,079
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,917	2,917
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	123	123
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,149	1,149
	KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	750
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,357	1,357
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	21	21
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	714	714
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	100	100
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,285	2,285
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	31,813	31,813
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	6,007	6,007
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,016	1,016
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,827	1,827
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,892	5,892
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,211	1,211
	LOUISIANA		
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	14,026	14,026
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	570	570
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	509	509
(N)	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	726	726
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25	25
(N)	BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	735	735
(N)	BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	48	48
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA	132	132
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA	127	127
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,117	12,117
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	5,354	5,354
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,478	19,478
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,175	3,175
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	268	268
(N)	J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,907	10,907
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	559	559
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	108	108
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,933	1,933
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,773	2,773
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	63,359	63,359
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	11,286	11,286
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA	233	233
(N)	WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	45	45
	MAINE		
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,060	1,060
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
	UNION RIVER, ME	---	900
(N)	WELLS HARBOR, ME	1,455	1,455
	MARYLAND		
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455	455
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	710	710
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,354	16,354
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	141	141
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	55	55
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	327	327
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,616	1,616
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	1,810	1,810
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS. MD	450	450

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	70	70
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	140	140
(N)	ST JEROME CREEK, MD	175	175
(N)	TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	5,801	6,801
(N)	TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	75	75
(N)	UPPER THOROFARE, MD	220	220
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD	740	740
	MASSACHUSETTS		
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	368	368
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	439	439
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	361	361
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,787	8,787
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	213	213
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	147	147
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	267	267
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	462	462
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	390	390
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	461	461
(N)	NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	310	310
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	480	480
(N)	PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	500	500
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,113	3,113
(N)	SALEM HARBOR, MA	200	200
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA	436	436
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA	647	647
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	342	342
	MICHIGAN		
(N)	ALPENA HARBOR, MI	203	203
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	85	85
(N)	BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	306	306
	CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	1,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	458	458
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118	118
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,342	2,342
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	130	130
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,264	1,264
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	905	905
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI	33	33
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	205
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	256	256
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI	168	168
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	663	663
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	272	272
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	239	239
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	174	174
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI	695	695
	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	---	150
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	603	603
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	450	450
(N)	PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,974	1,974
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	275	275
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI	417	417
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,453	1,453
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	481	481
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	996	996
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,194	1,194
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI	20,502	20,502
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,197	3,197
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	290	290
	MINNESOTA		
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	178	178
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,310	5,310
	DULUTH ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY STUDY, MN	---	320
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	186	186
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	154	154
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	453	453
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	196	196
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	42,765	42,765
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN	315	315
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	25	25
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	101	101
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,805	2,805
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	64	64
(N)	TWO HARBORS, MN	208	208
	MISSISSIPPI		
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS	801	801
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	122	122
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	150	150
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500	2,500

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	360	360
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	133	133
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	955	955
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,406	5,406
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	250	250
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	645	645
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS	115	115
	MISSOURI		
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	184	184
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,196	5,196
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,015	2,015
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,688	7,688
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	473	473
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	854	854
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	931	931
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,384	13,384
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	259	354
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,065	2,065
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	26	26
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,160	1,160
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	401	401
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,486	3,486
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,485	6,485
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
	MONTANA		
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,620	3,620
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,273	2,273
	NEBRASKA		
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,151	6,151
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,198	2,198
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	709	709
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK	125	125
(MP)	MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	125	125
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	721	721
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	796	796
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	327	327
	NEVADA		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	34	34
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	522	522
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	193	193
	NEW HAMPSHIRE		
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH	389	389
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	412	412
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	478	478
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	984	984
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	554	554
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	469	469
	NEW JERSEY		
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400	1,400
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	580	580
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	19	19
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	16,355	16,355
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,180	3,180
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,005	2,005
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	120	120
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	140	140
(N)	RARITAN RIVER, NJ	120	120
(N)	SALEM RIVER, NJ	278	278
(N)	SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	175	175
	NEW MEXICO		
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,315	1,315
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,766	1,766
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,037	1,037
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM	305	305
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	50	50
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	445	445
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	846	846
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	73	73
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	313	313
	NEW YORK		
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY	468	468
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY	257	257

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,966	2,966
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	176	176
(N)	DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	310	310
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY	750	750
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,250	2,250
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	473	473
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	340	340
(N)	FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	1,000	1,000
(N)	FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	490	490
(N)	GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	1,540	1,540
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,265	1,265
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,485	2,485
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,340	1,340
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	460	460
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,410	1,410
(N)	JONES INLET, NY	200	200
(N)	LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	2,190	2,190
(N)	MORICHES INLET, NY	980	980
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,958	1,958
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	6,720	6,720
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	5,030	5,030
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740	740
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	12,319	12,319
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	353	353
(N)	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	200	200
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	3,038	3,038
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	725	725
(N)	SAG HARBOR, NY	1,600	1,600
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	2,000	2,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	739	739
(N)	STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15	15
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	564	564
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	517	517
	NORTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,831	5,831
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,500	1,500
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350	350
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	627	627
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	897	897
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,430	1,430
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC	1,276	1,276
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	455	455
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,995	4,995
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,737	4,737
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC	825	825
(N)	NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	610	610
(N)	PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	64	64
(N)	ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,742	1,742
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	8,405	8,405
	NORTH DAKOTA		
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	241	241
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	8,513	8,563
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND	153	153
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230	1,230
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	401	401
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND	292	292
	OHIO		
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	790	790
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	750	750
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,270	3,270
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,309	1,309
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,175	1,175
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,915	3,915
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	735	735
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	745	745
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777	777
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH	709	709
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,785	1,785
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH	790	790
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	240	240
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,152	2,152
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,033	1,033
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,329	1,329
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,993	7,993
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	544	544
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	661	661
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	85	85
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	870	870
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	174	174
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,550	4,550
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	350	350
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	565	565
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	821	821
	OKLAHOMA		
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK	417	417
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK	480	480
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,471	1,471
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK	18	18
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK	2,656	2,656
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK	823	823
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE, OK	7,240	7,240
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	5,954	5,954
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	838	838
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	209	209
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK	557	557
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK	1,639	1,639
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK	447	447
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	72	72
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK	1,756	1,756
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,435	6,435
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK.	4,588	4,588
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,353	2,353
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK	63	63
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,160	1,160
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,001	4,001
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK	944	944
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	386	386
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	947	947
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,178	3,178
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,441	1,441
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,297	3,297
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK	729	1,229
	OREGON		
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	748	748
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	332	332
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	6,250	6,250
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR	435	435
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	16,274	16,274
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,403	7,403
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	357	357
(N)	COOS BAY, OR	4,144	4,144
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR	316	316
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	919	919
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR	705	705
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR	3	3
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR	672	672
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR	580	580
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	619	619
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,277	1,277
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,050	1,050
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	408	408
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	220	220
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,507	4,507
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,990	1,990
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,919	2,919
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,989	4,989
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR	702	702
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR	641	641
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	67	67
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	822	822
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	176	176
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	148	148
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,421	1,421
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	1,234	1,234
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	285	285
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	646	646
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	7,895	7,895
	PENNSYLVANIA		
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,905	6,905
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	608	608
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	216	216
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	832	832
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,121	2,121
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,785	2,035
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,491	1,491
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	659	659

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	903	903
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA	125	125
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	713	713
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	663	663
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	321	321
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	95	95
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA	13	13
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,472	1,472
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,778	1,778
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,392	1,392
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,293	14,293
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	22,407	22,407
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	218	218
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	88	88
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA	437	437
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,533	4,783
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	740	740
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,644	2,644
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA	334	334
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	70	70
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,382	3,352
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,788	1,788
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA	258	258
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	817	817
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	517	517
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,011	2,011
	RHODE ISLAND		
(N)	PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	584	584
	SOUTH CAROLINA		
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,629	3,629
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	7,145	7,145
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,235	3,235
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC	266	266
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	5,234	5,234
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	21	21
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	60	60
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	477	477
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC	398	398
	SOUTH DAKOTA		
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,422	6,422
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	496	496
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	172	172
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,852	8,852
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	580	580
(MP)	MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	586	586
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	11,192	11,192
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	306	306
	TENNESSEE		
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,070	6,070
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,307	5,307
(N)	CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	1,900	1,900
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,916	4,916
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,191	4,191
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	5	5
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,278	3,278
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,326	6,326
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	14,484	14,484
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	348	348
	TEXAS		
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX	738	738
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,340	1,340
(N)	BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	314	314
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,453	1,453
(N)	BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,810	1,810
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX	3,103	3,103
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,975	1,975
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,029	2,029
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX	2,689	2,689
(N)	CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	2,627	2,627
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,036	5,036
(MP)	DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,517	5,517
(N)	DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	805	805
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	10	10
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,801	2,801
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	87	87

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(N)	GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	752	752
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,573	1,573
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,433	2,433
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	21,765	21,765
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,203	1,203
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,137	8,137
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	393	393
(FC)	JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,144	1,144
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX	759	759
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX	201	201
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX	2,439	2,439
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,959	2,959
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,315	4,315
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,953	2,953
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,524	1,524
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,785	1,785
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,005	1,005
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	941	941
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,709	1,709
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	75	75
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,002	1,002
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	10,013	10,013
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,191	4,191
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	249	249
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,773	2,773
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,744	1,744
(N)	TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	371	371
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,007	2,007
(N)	TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	29	29
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX	2,301	2,301
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,208	1,208
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,680	4,680
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,643	2,643
	UTAH		
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	55	55
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	305	305
	VERMONT		
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	607	607
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	46	46
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	561	561
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	583	583
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	629	629
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	464	464
	VIRGINIA		
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	593	593
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	1,750	1,750
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	1,325	1,325
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	120	120
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	877	877
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,465	1,465
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	995	995
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	77	77
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,294	4,294
(MP)	JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,041	8,041
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,525	1,525
(N)	LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA	605	605
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	225	225
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,105	6,105
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	406	406
	OCCOQUAN RIVER,VA	---	1,000
(N)	PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,060	3,060
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA	410	410
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	617	617
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA	646	646
(N)	STARLINGS CREEK, VA	551	551
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	204	204
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,185	1,185
	WASHINGTON		
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	2,113	2,113
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	3	3
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	6
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,212	1,212
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	9,820	10,470
(FC)	HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,849	1,849
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,094	6,094
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	146	146
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,797	6,797
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,537	1,537
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,291	4,291
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,821	2,821

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

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	925	925
(FC)	MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	312	312
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,440	2,440
(N)	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	316	316
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	967	967
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	37	1,007
(FC)	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	415	415
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	100	100
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	714	714
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	205	205
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	56	56
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	78	78
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	3,432	3,432
	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	---	650
	WEST VIRGINIA		
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,137	1,137
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,689	3,200
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,723	1,723
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,714	1,714
(FC)	ELKINS, WV	16	16
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	91	91
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,782	7,782
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	15,934	15,934
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,786	2,786
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,934	1,934
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,216	1,216
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,526	1,526
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,903	1,903
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV	3,568	3,568
	WISCONSIN		
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	170	170
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	735	735
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI	3,252	3,252
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,640	1,640
(N)	KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	925	925
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	490	490
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI	53	53
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	738	738
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	819	819
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	290	290
(N)	STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	1,534	1,534
(N)	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	28	28
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	537	537
	WYOMING		
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,163	1,163
	MISCELLANEOUS		
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000	2,500
	CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	3,000	1,500
	DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	13,500	9,000
	DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,166	500
	DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000	6,500
	DREDGING OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (DOTS) PROGRAM	2,100	1,500
	EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS PROGRAM FOR BUILDINGS AND LIFELINES	600	500
	GREAT LAKES SEDIMENT TRANSPORT MODELS	---	500
	HARBOR MAINTENANCE FEE DATA COLLECTION	975	575
	MANAGEMENT TOOLS FOR O&M	1,100	500
	MONITORING OF COASTAL NAVIGATION PROJECTS	2,000	1,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
	NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	25	20
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000	5,000
	PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	415
	PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
	RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,950	1,000
	REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
	RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	500
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS	500	500
	WATER OPERATIONS TECHNICAL SUPPORT (WOTS) PROGRAM	1,500	700
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS	4,600	4,000
	WETLANDS FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	1,000	---
	ZEBRA MUSSEL CONTROL	700	700
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-16,867	-37,941
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,854,000	1,854,000

Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for engineering and design of replacements for the Bankhead Lock gates.

Mobile Area Digital Mapping and Geographic Information System, Alabama.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop criteria for a comprehensive Geographic Information System database of the Mobile, Alabama, area.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama.—The Committee has provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance backlog on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project.

Bodega Bay, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the Dredge Material Management Plan for the Bodega Bay project in California.

Crescent City Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake the studies necessary to identify a permanent ocean disposal site for material dredged from the Crescent City Harbor project.

Isabella Lake, California.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated in this Act 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.

Jack D. Maltester Channel (San Leandro Marina), California.—The Committee has provided $1,500,000 for maintenance dredging of the Jack D. Maltester channel.

Moss Landing Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $700,000 for the Corps of Engineers to prepare a management plan for future disposal of dredged material from the Moss Landing Harbor, California, project.

Oceanside Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers for removal of the submerged groin at the Oceanside Harbor project.

Redwood City Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided $400,000 to allow the Corps of Engineers to conduct sediment testing prior to the start of maintenance dredging scheduled for fiscal year 2002 at Redwood City Harbor.

San Francisco Bay Long Term Management Strategy, California.—The Committee has provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the development of a long term strategy for the disposal of dredged material in San Francisco Bay area.

Ventura Harbor, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to repair the breakwater at the Ventura Harbor, California, project.

Cherry Creek Lake, Colorado.—None of the funds provided for operation and maintenance of the Cherry Creek Lake project in Colo-

rado may be used to undertake a study of dam safety at the project.

Intracoastal Waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Delaware and Maryland.—The Committee has not provided the funds requested for the demolition of the St. Georges Bridge. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to use $50,000 of the funds provided for a study to determine the adequacy and timing for maintaining good and sufficient crossings over the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to address the maintenance dredging backlog on the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers project.

Miami River, Florida.—The Committee has provided $4,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Miami River, Florida, project.

Pensacola Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $2,000,000 for maintenance dredging of the Pensacola Harbor and Bayou Chico Channels, Florida, project.

Port St. Joe Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided $500,000 to initiate a dredged material management plan for the Port St. Joe Harbor, Florida, project.

St. Petersburg Harbor, Florida.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,300,000 for the St. Petersburg Harbor, Florida, project.

Savannah Harbor, Georgia.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 enable the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study of sediment disposal in nearshore areas and adjacent beaches as part of continuing maintenance of the Savannah Harbor, Georgia, project.

West Point Dam and Lake, Georgia and Alabama.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 to address the maintenance backlog at the West Point Dam and Lake, Georgia and Alabama, project.

Red Rock Dam and Lake, Iowa.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request for repair and replacement of various features of the Red Rock Dam and Lake, Iowa, project.

Illinois Waterway, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,000,000 for the acquisition of dredged material disposal sites as authorized by section 102 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Illinois.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to address the critical maintenance backlog within the Rock Island District portion of the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis navigation project.

Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request for critical maintenance of the Burns Waterway Harbor, Indiana, project.

Michigan City Harbor, Indiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $800,000 to complete dredging of the entrance channel, the turning basin, and Trail Creek at Michigan City Harbor, Indiana.

John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kansas.—The Committee has provided an additional $345,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete the ongoing reallocation study, which will determine an equitable distribution of sediment storage between the conservation and flood control pools and to evaluate the environmental impacts of the appropriate reallocation at John Redmond Dam and Reservoir, Kanasa.

Kentucky River Locks and Dams 5–14, Kentucky.—The Committee has provided $750,000 for the Corps of Engineers to complete dam stabilization repairs at Locks and Dams 13 and 14. Of this amount, funds are provided for additional construction activities at Lock and Dam 14 (including fencing, landscaping, and user facilities), in conjunction with local interests.

Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black, Louisiana.—The Committee is aware of safety and navigation problems on the Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf and Black caused by "fluff" on the channel bottoms. The Committee is very concerned about this issue and directs the Corps of Engineers to take immediate steps necessary to resume safe, unimpeded navigation to the true authorized 20 foot depth. In addition, the Committee directs the Corps to work with the Waterways Experiment Station to determine the cause of this phenomenon and to develop and implement long term solutions to this problem.

J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to the budget request to allow additional critical maintenance and repair at the J. Bennett Johnston Waterway, Louisiana, project.

Union River, Maine.—The Committee has provided $900,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging of the Union River, Maine, project.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 above the budget request to allow completion of the Tolchester Channel S-Turn straightening project.

Port of Baltimore Dredged Material Disposal, Maryland.—The Committee has previously expressed concern about the limited analysis and consideration given to alternatives to the proposed open water dredge material disposal site known as Site 104. It is the Committee's understanding that in response to the concerns of the Committee and others, the Corps of Engineers will release a Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement this summer. Once again, the Committee underscores its intent that the Environmental Impact Statement contain full consideration and thorough evaluation of practicable alternatives to Site 104.

New Buffalo Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to perform maintenance dredging and condition surveys at the New Buffalo Harbor, Michigan, project.

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to continue the west breakwater repairs at Cedar River Harbor, Michigan.

Duluth Alternative Technology Study, Minnesota.—The Committee has provided $320,000 to continue the development of plans and the testing of techniques to process dredged materials from Duluth-Superior Harbor.

New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.—The Committee has provided funding above the budget request to provide for adequate maintenance dredging at New Madrid Harbor, Missouri.

Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 to provide for increased maintenance dredging at the Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi, project.

Garrison Dam, Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota.—The Committee recommendation includes funding above the budget request to carry out management activities for mosquito control near the City of Williston.

Broken Bow Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee expects the Corps of Engineers to give due consideration to any request from the State of Oklahoma to further development of marina operations on Broken Bow Lake in McCurtain County, Oklahoma.

Wister Lake, Oklahoma.—The Committee has included $500,000 above the budget request for studies associated with identification of water quality problems and management goals to improve water quality at the Wister Lake, Oklahoma, project.

Cowanesque Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $250,000 above the budget request to provide for updating the Cowanesque Lake, Pennsylvania, project master plan, including an analysis of recreation and natural resource management needs.

Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,250,000 for construction of facilities and structures at Raystown Lake Pennsylvania, to interpret and understand environmental conditions and trends.

Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania.—The Committee has provided $970,000 above the budget request to provide for updating the Tioga-Hammond Lakes, Pennsylvania, project master plan, including an analysis of recreation and natural resource management needs, and to provide for the design of a new ranger station and visitor center at the entrance to the Ives Run recreation area.

Occoquan River, Virginia.—The Committee has provided $1,000,000 to provide for maintenance dredging of the Occoquan River, Virginia, project.

Willapa River and Harbor, Washington.—The Committee has provided $650,000 for a study of navigation conditions at the Willapa River and Harbor, Washington, project.

Quillayute River Navigation Project, Washington.—The Committee has provided $970,000 above the budget request to provide necessary minimum maintenance at the Quillayute River Navigation Project, Washington.

Grays Harbor, Washington.—The Committee has included $650,000 above the budget request to complete the basic work on the South Jetty major maintenance contract at Grays Harbor, Washington.

Bluestone Lake, West Virginia.—The Committee has provided funds above the budget request for dam modifications and actions necessary to manage drift and debris at the Bluestone Lake, West Virginia, project.

Great Lakes Sediment Transport Models.—The Committee has provided $500,000 for continued development of sediment transport models for high priority tributaries to the Great Lakes.

Hopper Dredges.—The Committee has provided $9,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to maintain the hopper dredge WHEELER in ready reserve status, the same as the amount provided in fiscal year 2000. This is consistent with the amount estimated to be needed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works in his report to the Congress dated June 12, 2000. The Committee strongly supports the report recommendation that the hopper dredge McFARLAND also be placed in ready reserve status. The Committee is aware that the Corps is currently evaluating the extent to which the McFARLAND needs to be rehabilitated to serve in the ready reserve fleet. The Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to report to Congress on the extent of repairs needed before making expenditures to rehabilitate the McFARLAND.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2000	$117,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	125,000,000
Recommended, 2001	125,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+8,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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 2001, the Committee recommends an appropriation of $125,000,000, the same as the budget request and $8,000,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000. The Committee has not included language proposed by the Administration that would direct the Secretary of the Army to change the current fee structure for the Regulatory Program.

The Committee has included language to improve the analysis and public and congressional notification of the costs of regulatory program nationwide permit modifications and permit processing time requirements. The language directs the Corps of Engineers to: (1) revise a cost analysis of modified nationwide permits based on promulgated rules rather than proposed rules; (2) prepare a plan to manage and reduce backlog associated with new and replacement permits issued on March 9, 2000, and develop criteria to measure progress in reducing the backlog; (3) provide quarterly reporting on program performance based on the above criteria; (4) provide quarterly reporting, on a one year pilot basis, of all Regulatory Analysis and Management System data for South Pacific Division; (5) publish in Division Office websites decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process and allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the appeals conference; and (6) record in its data base the dates of initial permit application or notification.

The Committee is aware of on-going staffing issues in the San Diego office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Committee is concerned that these staffing issues will result in a further backlog of work and delays for many in the San Diego area who rely on timely and appropriate responses and approvals of projects by

the Corps. The Corps of Engineers is, therefore, directed to report to the Committee within 60 days of enactment of this Act on these staffing problems, including any proposed remedies.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Appropriation, 2000	$150,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	140,000,000
Recommended, 2001	140,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−10,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

The Committee recommendation for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) is $140,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 1998, Congress transferred responsibility 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.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2000	$149,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	152,000,000
Recommended, 2001	149,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	.....
Budget Estimate, 2001	−2,500,000

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 $149,500,000, the same as the fiscal year 2000 level and $2,500,000 below 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.

REVOLVING FUND

The Committee has included language in the bill which provides that funds available in the Corps of Engineers Revolving Fund may be used for the costs of relocating the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers headquarters to office space in the General Accounting Office headquarters building in Washington, D.C.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund.—The Committee has included language in the bill proposed by the Administration which extends the authorization for spending Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund receipts through fiscal year 2001.

Joe Pool Lake, Texas.—Section 102 provides for the transfer of responsibility of local sponsorship of recreation development at Joe Pool Lake, Texas from the Trinity River Authority to the City of Grand Prairie, Texas.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2000	$39,233,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	39,940,000
Recommended, 2001	39,940,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+707,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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 2001 to carry out the provisions of the Act is $39,940,000, the same as the budget request, and $707,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

Appropriation, 2000	$605,992,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	643,058,000
Recommended, 2001	635,777,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+29,785,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−7,281,000

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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
WATER AND RELATED				
ARIZONA				
AK CHIN INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT PROJECT....	---	6,762	---	6,762
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT.....	33,667	---	39,467	---
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE I.....	1,068	10,315	1,068	10,315
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK AND LEVEE SYSTEM.....	3,722	380	3,722	380
NORTHERN ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	300	---	300	---
SOUTH CENTRAL ARIZONA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	690	---	890	---
SOUTHERN ARIZONA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT.....	5,189	---	5,189	---
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	550	---	550	---
TUCSON AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE STUDY.....	300	---	300	---
YUMA AREA PROJECTS.....	1,738	17,450	1,738	17,450
CALIFORNIA				
CACHUMA PROJECT.....	666	401	666	401
CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM.....	1,293	---	1,793	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJ.....	500	---	500	---
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:				
AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.	4,740	10,708	10,240	10,708
DELTA DIVISION.....	14,636	4,706	14,636	4,706
EAST SIDE DIVISION.....	585	3,595	585	3,595
FRIANT DIVISION.....	4,170	2,531	4,170	2,531
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	11,824	1,009	11,824	1,009
REPLACEMENTS, ADDITIONS, EXTRAORDINARY MAINT.....	---	8,013	---	8,013
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	6,171	1,612	8,691	1,612
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.....	897	---	897	---
SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION.....	2,608	---	2,608	---
SHASTA DIVISION.....	3,474	7,356	3,474	7,356
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION.....	7,116	4,791	7,116	4,791
WATER AND POWER OPERATIONS.....	897	6,490	897	6,490
WEST SAN JOAQUIN DIVISION, SAN LUIS UNIT.....	6,385	5,447	7,385	5,447
YIELD FEASIBILITY INVESTIGATION.....	1,800	---	1,800	---

LONG BEACH AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROJECT	2,000	---	2,000	---
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION/REUSE PROJ	740	---	740	---
MISSION BASIN BRACKISH GROUNDWATER DESALTING DEMO	---	---	503	---
NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY AREA WATER RECYCLING PROJ	2,000	---	5,000	---
ORANGE COUNTY REGIONAL WATER. RECLAMATION PROJ	2,000	---	2,000	---
ORLAND PROJECT	---	617	---	617
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT	1,000	---	5,000	---
SAN DIEGO AREA WATER RECLAMATION PROGRAM	7,500	---	7,500	---
SAN GABRIEL BASIN PROJECT	2,000	---	2,000	---
SAN JOSE AREA WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROG	3,500	---	3,500	---
SOLANO PROJECT	1,084	1,088	1,084	1,088
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	624	---	624	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM	---	5,500	---	5,500
COLORADO				
ANIMAS-LAPLATA PROJECT, SECTIONS 5 & 8	2,000	---	2,000	---
COLLBRAN PROJECT	132	967	132	967
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT	355	7,381	355	7,381
COLORADO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	188	---	188	---
FRUITGROWERS DAM PROJECT	102	16	102	16
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	285	4,653	285	4,653
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP	412	507	412	507
LEADVILLE/ARKANSAS RIVER RECOVERY PROJECT	469	1,291	469	1,291
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	69	---	69	---
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	332	---	332
MANCOS PROJECT	42	22	42	22
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, CRBSCP, TITLE II	---	2,058	---	2,058
PINE RIVER PROJECT	90	58	90	58
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN/CONEJOS DIV	410	2,812	410	2,812
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT	287	23	287	23
IDAHO				
BOISE AREA PROJECTS	1,746	5,683	1,746	5,683
COLUMBIA AND SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT	4,622	---	4,622	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	250	---	250	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	248	---	248	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,466	1,841	3,766	1,841
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	288	---	288	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	400	---
WICHITA PROJECT	---	226	---	226
MONTANA				
HUNGRY HORSE PROJECT	---	283	---	283
MILK RIVER PROJECT	325	512	325	512
MONTANA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	251	---	251	---
ROCKY BOYS INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT	16,000	---	---	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	35	53	35	53
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	17	---	17	---
NEVADA				
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	800	---	800	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,864	1,577	6,864	1,577
NEW MEXICO				
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,345	607	2,345	607
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	---	---	250	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	2,604	8,480	2,604	8,480
PECOS RIVER BASIN WATER SALVAGE PROJECT	---	176	---	176
RIO GRANDE PROJECT	947	2,287	947	2,287
SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	183	---	183	---
SO. NEW MEXICO/WEST TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAMS	238	---	238	---
TUCUMARI PROJECT	18	5	18	5
UPPER RIO GRANDE BASIN INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	164	---	164	---
VELARDE COMMUNITY DITCH PROJECT	3,880	---	3,880	---

NORTH DAKOTA				
DAKOTA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	387	---	387	---
DAKOTA TRIBES INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	187	---	187	---
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP	17,416	3,875	17,416	3,875
OKLAHOMA				
ARBUCKLE PROJECT	---	168	---	168
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	---	535	---	535
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT	---	232	---	232
NORMAN PROJECT	---	163	---	163
OKLAHOMA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	234	---	234	---
W.C. AUSTIN PROJECT	---	262	---	262
WASHTIA BASIN PROJECT	---	638	---	638
OREGON				
CROOKED RIVER PROJECT	384	307	384	307
DESCHUTES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECT	500	---	500	---
DESCHUTES PROJECT	294	137	294	137
EASTERN OREGON PROJECTS	205	249	205	249
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY	50	---	50	---
KLAMATH PROJECT	10,837	348	10,837	348
OREGON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	601	---	601	---
ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, TALENT DIVISION	260	623	260	623
TUALATIN PROJECT	197	123	197	123
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	100	---	---	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	571	1,723	571	1,723
SOUTH DAKOTA				
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	6,000	40	10,960	40
MNI WICONI PROJECT	23,570	6,165	27,570	6,165
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT	---	30	---	30
TEXAS				
BALMORHEA PROJECT	31	---	31	---
CANADIAN RIVER PROJECT	---	131	---	131

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	---	393	---	393
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT	---	546	---	546
SAN ANGELO PROJECT	---	262	---	262
TEXAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	346	---	596	---
UTAH				
HYRUM PROJECT	62	11	62	11
MOON LAKE PROJECT	15	5	15	5
NAVAJO SANDSTONE AQUIFER RECHARGE STUDY	250	---	250	---
NEWTON PROJECT	39	14	39	14
NORTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	230	---	230	---
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT	76	29	76	29
PROVO RIVER PROJECT	401	340	401	340
SCOFIELD PROJECT	91	24	91	24
SOUTHERN UTAH INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	235	---	235	---
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT	88	7	88	7
WEBER BASIN PROJECT	1,267	141	1,267	141
WEBER RIVER PROJECT	296	32	296	32
WASHINGTON				
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT	3,600	7,524	3,600	7,524
WASHINGTON INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	264	---	264	---
YAKIMA PROJECT	523	7,483	523	7,483
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT PROJECT	11,056	---	11,056	---
WYOMING				
KENDRICK PROJECT	4	5,597	4	5,597
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT	19	1,295	19	1,295
SHOSHONE PROJECT	42	905	42	905
WYOMING INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	70	---	70	---

VARIOUS

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL, TITLE II.....	11,085	---	11,085	---
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 5.....	3,813	1,455	3,813	1,455
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT, SECTION 8, RFW.....	7,135	---	7,135	---
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.....	150	---	75	---
DAM SAFETY PROGRAM:				
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,700	---	1,700
INITIATE SOD CORRECTIVE ACTION.....	---	51,600	---	51,600
SAFETY EVALUATION OF EXISTING DAMS.....	---	17,500	---	17,500
SAFETY OF DAMS CORRECTIVE ACTION STUDIES.....	---	1,000	---	1,000
DEPARTMENTAL IRRIGATION DRAINAGE PROGRAM.....	3,000	---	2,000	---
DROUGHT EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.....	500	---	1,900	---
EFFICIENCY INCENTIVES PROGRAM	3,169	---	3,000	---
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND DISASTER RESPONSE PROG.....	---	309	---	309
ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY IMPLEMENT. PROG.....	12,179	---	12,179	---
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.....	1,824	---	1,000	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	2,155	---	1,500	---
EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES.....	30	4,740	30	3,892
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,400	---	1,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES.....	1,842	---	1,700	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	6,484	---	5,232	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM.....	13,729	---	13,729	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS.....	---	506	---	506
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.....	1,300	---	1,300	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM.....	8,500	---	7,680	---
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING.....	1,254	---	884	---
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	169	865	96	538
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM - OTHER PROJ.....	3,232	25,667	3,232	27,417
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES.....	1,023	473	1,023	473
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM.....	464	---	436	---
RECLAMATION LAW ADMINISTRATION.....	4,914	---	4,696	---
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGEMENT ACT - TITLE XXVIII.	3,743	---	3,743	---
RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAM ADMIN.....	2,766	---	1,891	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	1,225	---	1,000	---
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,249	---	3,242	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	300	---	300	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROT/EHNANCE.....	660	---	215	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	283	---	283	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	933	---	933	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION (IN THOUSANDS)

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	HOUSE ALLOWANCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	HOUSE ALLOWANCE FACILITIES OM&R
SITE SECURITY	---	1,043	---	754
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION	263	---	257	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	1,840	---	1,000	---
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM	1,460	---	3,960	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES- TECH SUPPORT	50	---	50	---
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM	7,605	---	6,600	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT	3,750	---	3,595	---
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS	-31,120	---	-49,686	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES	353,822	289,236	346,655	289,122

Central Arizona Project, Indian Distribution Division, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $6,000,000 to accelerate work on the Gila River Indian Community distribution system.

Central Arizona Project, Native Fish Protection, Arizona.—The bill includes $1,510,000 for native fish protection activities on the Central Arizona Project, $200,000 below the budget request.

San Carlos Irrigation Project, Arizona.—The Committee is concerned with accountability in the Federal management of San Carlos Irrigation Project (SCIP) electric power resources. The Committee is aware that management of SCIP resources affects customer financing of operation and maintenance costs and could impact the economics of the pending Gila River Community Indian water rights settlement. Therefore, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, is directed to review electric power programs (including relevant power, allocation, contract, delivery, and scheduling data and associated values) and policies related to the San Carlos Irrigation Project. The Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration is directed to cooperate in this review, which should further address, and not be limited to, the following issues: the role of any current or potential Federal agency power management programs in SCIP operations; the role and oversight of any non-Federal consultants in SCIP management; and compliance with applicable Federal law. The Secretary shall provide this collaborative review to the Committee no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act. The report shall include recommendations for SCIP power management services.

South Central Arizona Investigations Program, Arizona.—The Committee has provided an additional $200,000 for the West Salt River Valley Water Management Study.

California Investigations Program, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $500,000 to expand the ongoing California Investigations Program to include studies of ways to increase the reliability of water supplies in southern Orange County, California, which includes the Central Pool Augmentation Program.

Central Valley Project, American River Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $5,300,000 for the construction of a permanent pumping facility for the Placer County Water Agency. The Committee has also included language in the bill which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation for closure of the Auburn dam diversion tunnel or restoration of the American River channel through the Auburn Dam construction site. In addition, the Committee has provided $200,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare plans and specifications and undertake the environmental review needed for a temperature control device on the El Dorado Irrigation District's intake at Folsom Reservoir.

Central Valley Project, Sacramento River Division, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the fish passage improvement project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam. The Committee has also provided an additional $520,000 to continue the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon Captive Broodstock Program.

Central Valley Project, West San Joaquin Division, San Luis Unit, California.—The Committee has provided an additional

$1,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to obtain flowage easements in the vicinity of the Arroyo Pasajero and continue to participate in the studies of the flooding problems.

Mission Basin Brackish Groundwater Desalting Demonstration Program, California.—The Committee has provided $503,000 to continue the Mission Basin Brackish Groundwater Desalting Demonstration Program.

North San Diego Area Water Recycling Project, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $3,000,000 to advance completion of the North San Diego County Water Recycling Project.

Salton Sea Research Project, California.—The Committee has provided an additional $4,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake pilot projects to explore various methods of harvesting salt from the Salton Sea, including enhanced evaporation system technology. Of the funds provided, up to $1,000,000 may be used to continue the program for the development of wetlands and other activities designed to improve the water quality in the New River and Alamo River.

Minidoka Area Projects, Idaho.—The Committee has provided an additional $300,000 to continue the study of erosion problems on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

Equus Beds Groundwater Recharge Demonstration Project, Kansas.—The pilot project for the Equus Beds is complete. As final reports are assembled, the Committee strongly encourages the Bureau of Reclamation to work with the affected communities and the State of Kansas on design and engineering of the full-scale project.

Pick Sloan Missouri River Basin, North Loup Division, Nebraska.—The Committee has provided $1,750,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to repair the Twin Loups Reclamation District's Mirdan Canal.

Eastern New Mexico Water Supply Project, New Mexico.—The Committee has provided $250,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to continue work on the Eastern New Mexico Water Supply study.

Middle Rio Grande Project, New Mexico.—The Committee is aware that the budget request for the Middle Rio Grande project includes $830,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to lease water and work cooperatively with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District to make flows available during the irrigation season in support of the silvery minnow, a Federally-listed endangered species. The Committee is very supportive of these efforts and expects the Bureau of Reclamation to work cooperatively with the Corps of Engineers and the Fish and Wildlife Service in implementing the recovery plan for the silvery minnow.

Texas Investigations Program, Texas.—The Committee has provided an additional $250,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake a study to identify potential mechanisms to enhance water supplies in Mills County, Texas.

Drought Emergency Assistance Program.—The Committee has provided an additional $1,400,000 for the acquisition of water for the San Carlos Reservoir on the Gila River in Arizona.

Efficiency Incentives Program.—From within funds available for the Efficiency Incentives Program, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to use up to $750,000 to support the Navajo

Nation in its efforts to implement conservation measures on the Ganado Irrigation Project.

Environment and Interagency Coordination.—Within the amount provided for Environment and Interagency Coordination, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to use up to $50,000 to expand regional cooperation on issues related to the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act in southern Arizona.

Technical Assistance to States.—Within the amount provided for Technical Assistance to States, the Committee urges the Bureau of Reclamation to use up to $150,000 to participate in a pilot project to investigate the technical feasibility and associated costs of using slowsand as a pretreatment for reverse osmosis treatment of Central Arizona Project water.

Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program.—The Committee is aware of the WateReuse Research Foundation' ongoing efforts to conduct research on the science and technological aspects of water reclamation. After more than 30 years, the Committee recognizes a need exists to ensure that the framework governing the use and application of reclaimed water supplies, including risk assessments and technology assessments, requires review and updating. The effective and efficient use of this important resource will continue to encounter unsubstantiated impediments because of a reliance on outdated science and technologies. Accordingly, the Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation to support the WateReuse Foundation's research program under the authority of section 1605 of Public Law 102–575.

In addition, of the funds provided for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to use $300,000 to continue the Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse (Aqua Fria) project in Arizona.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 2000	$11,577,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	9,369,000
Recommended, 2001	9,369,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−2,208,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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.

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.....	14,284	1,300	1,300
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION.....	9,557	800	800
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT.....	28,100	6,844	6,844
VARIOUS			
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	---	425	425
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....		9,369	9,369

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

Appropriation, 2000	$42,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	38,382,000
Recommended, 2001	38,382,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−3,618,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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.

Within the funds made available through the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund, the Committee intends that $5,000,000 be made available for the San Joaquin River Restoration program, which is being developed and implemented jointly by water users in the Friant Division of the Central Valley Project and environmental interests.

CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

Appropriation, 2000	$60,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	60,000,000
Recommended, 2001	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−60,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−60,000,000

The California Bay-Delta Ecosystem 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 Committee has been and continues to be very supportive of the Bay-Delta program and the CALFED process. However, in light of the fact that the authorization for this program ends in fiscal year 2000, the Committee has recommended no new funding for fiscal year 2001. Should the program be reauthorized before work is completed on the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, the Committee will reconsider its recommendation. The Committee expects that the remaining unobligated balances in this program will be used equally for ecosystem restoration activities and other authorized activities, such as projects to promote or develop water use efficiency, water quality, groundwater storage, surface storage, levees, conveyance systems, and wa-

tershed management. Since this has been and continues to be a state-wide program, the Committee also expects that there will be an equitable balance of work between northern California, the delta region, and southern California.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2000	$47,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	50,224,000
Recommended, 2001	47,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	.....
Budget Estimate, 2001	−3,224,000

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 2001, the Committee has recommended $47,000,000, the same as the fiscal year 2000 level, and $3,224,000 below the budget request.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Middle Rio Grande/Carlsbad Projects, New Mexico.—Section 201 provides that none of the funds appropriated by this or any other act may be used to purchase or lease water in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad projects in New Mexico unless the purchase or lease is in compliance with the requirements of section 202 of Public Law 106–60.

Trinity County, California.—Section 202 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make an annual assessment upon Central Valley Project water and power contractors for the purpose of making an annual payment to the Trinity Public Utilities District.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in Title III provide for Department of Energy programs relating to: Energy Supply, Non-Defense Environmental Management, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation, Science, Nuclear Waste Disposal, Departmental Administration, the Inspector General, the National Nuclear Security Administration, 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 many of the Department of Energy programs in fiscal year 2001 are significantly below the Department's fiscal year 2001 budget request.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Department has established an Office of Engineering and Construction Management to strengthen its project management capabilities. The Committee strongly supports this effort. The Department has also proposed a new budget line item for preliminary project engineering and design (PED) which would be used to achieve a 30 to 35 percent level of design for new construction projects before the projects are submitted to Congress for authorization and appropriations. This should provide a more mature technical and cost baseline and a greater likelihood of achieving the project cost and schedule. As part of the fiscal year 2002 budget request, the Department should submit a PED line item for each program area which anticipates funding new construction projects in future budgets.

The Committee will not require that an external, independent assessment of the baseline cost and schedule of all fiscal year 2001 construction projects be performed before funds can be obligated. However, the Committee directs the Department to identify and document the process that will be used to determine which projects will require an external independent review and at which phase of the project the review should be conducted. The report should also identify how the use of PED will be incorporated into construction project development. This report should be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by December 31, 2000.

AUGMENTING FEDERAL STAFF

The Committee continues to believe that there is too much reliance on support service contractors and other non-Federal employees throughout the Department of Energy. The Department re-

duced the number of management and operating (M&O) contractor employees assigned to the Washington metropolitan area to 277 in fiscal year 2000. The Committee directs the Department to reduce the number to no more than 220 contractor employees in fiscal year 2001.

The Department is to provide a report to the Committee at the end of fiscal year 2000 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.

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, 1999 through September 30, 2000, and is due to the Committee on January 31, 2001.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The Committee has retained in fiscal year 2001 the limitation of $150,000,000 for contractor travel. The Department is expected to ensure that critical mission assignments are funded first and administrative travel to Washington is limited.

Contractor travel funding was limited in fiscal year 2000 to $150,000,000 after a General Accounting Report identified significant travel abuses including one national laboratory that was averaging over 80 trips a week to Washington. Even with the reduction in funding in fiscal year 2000, data provided through February 2000 on contractor travel indicates that the same laboratory is still averaging 70 trips a week to Washington. The Committee strongly urges the Department to review the need for this many trips to Washington and ensure that contractor travel for specific program needs throughout the nuclear weapons complex is not being curtailed by an excess of management trips to Washington.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has retained the limitation of four percent on laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) that was included in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill. This program allows each laboratory director to use four percent of all operating funds provided to the laboratory to conduct research and development projects selected at the discretion of the laboratory directors. For fiscal year 2001, the Department estimates that the labora-

tories will spend $300,000,000 on LDRD and additional funds on Director's Discretionary Research and Development (DDRD). The Committee recommendation would provide approximately $200,000,000 for LDRD, the same level as fiscal year 2000.

Rather than allowing each laboratory to tax all operating dollars that are sent to the laboratory, the Committee directs the Department to submit a separate line item for LDRD funding in each appropriation account in the fiscal year 2002 budget request. This will provide the visibility and accountability for this type of funding that the Committee believes has been lacking in prior years. It also addresses another concern of the Committee that LDRD funding is automatically taken off the top of each program performed at the laboratory. This has the effect of placing LDRD funding in a completely protected funding category at the expense of all other programs in the Department. The Committee supports some LDRD funding, but believes it should be placed on equal terms with other important programs. The Department is directed to submit a specific request for laboratory directed research and development funding in each program in the annual budget submission.

INDEPENDENT CENTERS

The Fiscal Year 2000 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act required the Department to identify all independent centers at each laboratory or facility, the annual cost, number of employees, and the source of funding. As a result of this requirement, the Department identified 183 centers that were funded through various programs, laboratory directed research and development funds, and overhead accounts. The Department is directed to provide a report to the Committee by January 15, 2001 on all centers funded in fiscal year 2001. The report should be at the level of detailed included in the fiscal year 2000 report to Congress. All centers should be specifically identified in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission and should be funded in program accounts, rather than overhead.

OVERHEAD COSTS

The Committee is aware the Department is reviewing costs included in the overhead charges of the management and operating contractors and expects to be kept informed of the progress made during this review. Changes made by the Department to remove safeguards and security costs from overhead accounts will improve accountability and oversight for that activity. The Committee's recommendation to move LDRD and independent center funding from overhead accounts in fiscal year 2002 will also improve this accountability and oversight.

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 2001, 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.

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, 2000	$637,962,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	752,895,000
Recommended, 2001	576,482,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−61,480,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−176,413,000

The Energy Supply account includes the following programs: renewable energy resources; nuclear energy; environment, safety and health; and technical information management. In prior fiscal years, Congress has provided one year funding for this appropriation account. However, for fiscal year 2001, the Committee is recommending that the funds remain available until expended.

As requested by the Administration, statutory language is included allowing for the receipt of royalties to compensate the De-

partment for its participation in the nuclear energy First-of-a-Kind Engineering program.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The Committee recommendation for renewable energy resources is $350,519,000, a reduction of $106,081,000 from the budget request, and $11,721,000 less than fiscal year 2000. This program consists of renewable energy technologies, electric energy systems and storage, renewable support and implementation, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, and program direction.

National Academy of Public Administration Review.—A recent review of the management and organization of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) identified four principal themes: fragmentation of EERE, emphasis on process rather than product, poor communications, and weak decision-making processes. One of the most important issues discussed in the report is EERE's fragmentation: ". . . its different parts operate as independent entities without common purpose and synergy. EERE speaks with different voices, and it is hard to derive a clear picture of its programs and priorities."

The report further notes that, ". . . EERE has not had a formal program and budget formulation process, supported by an independent analytic capability, to insure clarification of mission, setting of priorities, identification of cross-functional goals and objectives, creation of an integrated program of work linked to goals and priorities, and establishment of milestones and anticipated results." The current renewable energy resources budget request reflects the NAPA findings. All of the renewable programs are requesting increases of 30 to 50 percent with no clear integration or explanation of why such increases are warranted in all programs simultaneously. The budget request reflects little integration or prioritization, and the Committee cannot support the large increases. However, the Committee is aware that the Assistant Secretary is working to address the concerns raised by the NAPA review and strongly supports this effort.

Coordination of Basic Research.—The Committee is concerned that there is scant cooperation and coordination between the Office of Science and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy on the fundamental research needed to improve renewable energy technologies. Each year the Committee provides funding for the Office of Science to support basic research in energy programs, including renewable programs. There appears to be little coordination or consultation between the two offices on the synergies among these programs. The Committee directs these two offices to identify ways in which coordination can be improved and research conducted which is mutually beneficial, and to inform the Committee how coordination will be improved.

Renewable energy technologies

Renewable Energy Technologies include biomass/biofuels energy systems, geothermal, hydrogen, hydropower, solar energy, and wind. To more accurately reflect the total funding being spent by the Department on these renewable technologies, the Committee

also includes the funding spent on basic research in support of these technologies by the Office of Science.

Biomass/biofuels energy systems.—The Committee recommendation for biomass/biofuels energy systems is $101,000,000, including $26,740,000 for related research conducted by the Office of Science. This is a reduction of $28,181,000 from the budget request of $129,181,000. The recommendation includes $32,000,000 for the power systems program and $42,260,000 for the transportation program. The Committee strongly supports the basic research and maintenance of a Federal role in promising biomass/biofuels programs.

Geothermal.—The Committee recommendation is $24,000,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the budget request of $27,000,000. The Committee supports geothermal energy, but believes that other technologies are a higher priority when resources are limited.

Hydrogen.—The Committee recommendation is $24,970,000, including $2,970,000 for related research conducted by the Office of Science. This is a reduction of $1,000,000 from the budget request of $25,970,000 due to funding constraints.

Hydropower.—The Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request of $5,000,000, due to severe funding constraints. However, the Committee has provided an additional $2,000,000 in the Bonneville Power Administration to support this program.

Solar energy.—Solar energy technologies include concentrating solar power, photovoltaics, solar building technology research, and the Office of Science contribution in basic research for solar photoconversion. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $92,107,000, a reduction of $26,500,000 from the budget request of $118,607,000.

The recommendation for concentrating solar power is $6,000,000, a reduction of $9,000,000 from the budget request of $15,000,000. A recent programmatic review of the Department's renewable energy programs by the National Research Council indicated that the overall commercial prospects for concentrated solar power technologies were not very promising. The Council's report, *Renewable Power Pathways,* recommended that the Department "limit or halt its research and development on power-tower and power-trough technologies because further refinements would not lead to deployment." The review further stated that the Department "should reassess the market prospects for the solar/dish engine technologies to determine whether continued research and development would result in a technology that warrants further expenditures." Consistent with this recommendation, the Committee has provided funding for solar/dish engine technologies, but eliminates funding for power-tower and power-trough technologies.

The photovoltaic energy systems program is funded at $69,847,000, a reduction of $15,000,000 from the budget request due to funding constraints, but the same funding as the current year. This includes $2,847,000 for related research conducted by the Office of Science.

Funding of $2,000,000, the same as fiscal year 2000, is provided for solar building technology research, and $14,260,000, the same

as the budget request, is provided for solar photoconversion energy research.

Wind energy systems.—The Committee recommendation is $33,283,000, a reduction of $17,500,000 from the budget request, but the same level as last year. The recommendation includes $283,000 for related research conducted by the Office of Science.

Electric energy systems and storage

The Committee recommendation for electric energy systems and storage is $37,000,000, a reduction of $11,000,000 from the budget request of $48,000,000. The Committee supports the Department's efforts to continue its work with electric utilities to facilitate voluntary, cost-effective means to reduce emissions from power generation and the use of up to $100,000 for this purpose.

The Committee recommendation includes $28,000,000 for high temperature superconducting research and development, $4,000,000 for energy storage systems, and $5,000,000 for transmission reliability. The recommendation includes the budget request of $3,000,000 for the distributed power program. The distributed power program supports efforts to integrate distributed resources into the power system; develop new interconnection hardware, software, and operational concepts; and develop regulatory and institutional approaches to remove existing market barriers.

The Committee notes that Real Energy of California and Nextek Power Systems of New York are participating in a consortia that is privately funding public-private pilot programs in distributed energy resources (DER), such as solar panels, fuel cells, or micro-turbines that are installed at or near their point of use. Deployment of these technologies has significant public benefits including environmental protection and support for the nation's burdened electrical grid systems. The Committee requests that DOE report back no later than October 1, 2001 with recommendations on how the Federal government can facilitate increased private funding, and what steps can be taken to coordinate local, state, and federal regulations to more effectively deploy DER.

Renewable support and implementation

The renewable support and implementation program includes departmental energy management, international renewable energy, the renewable energy production incentive (REPI) program, renewable Indian energy resources, and renewable program support. The Committee recommendation is $13,000,000, a reduction of $19,000,000 from the budget request of $32,000,000. The recommendation provides $2,000,000 for the Departmental energy management program; $4,000,000 for international renewable energy; $1,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive program; $2,000,000 for renewable Indian energy resources; and $4,000,000 for renewable program support.

The Committee encourages the Department to fully utilize the Departmental energy management program to strengthen the energy management programs and achieve energy savings at DOE facilities.

National Renewable Energy Laboratory

The Committee recommendation is $4,000,000 for the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) in Golden, Colorado, an increase of $2,100,000 over the budget request. The Committee is concerned that the Department continues to under-fund infrastructure improvements and maintenance at its laboratories. The additional funding for NREL will prevent further deterioration of these facilities. The Department should submit a budget request that adequately funds the existing infrastructure.

Program direction

The Committee recommendation for program direction is $18,159,000, the same as the budget request.

NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommendation is $231,815,000, a decrease of $76,630,000 from the budget request of $308,445,000. This reduction reflects the transfer of $53,400,000 for uranium programs to a new appropriation account as well as funding constraints. The nuclear energy programs represent a commitment to ensure 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.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The Committee recommendation is $29,200,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request. Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee did not fund the new initiative for special purpose fission power technology.

Isotopes.—The Committee recommendation for isotope support and production is $15,215,000, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request. Total isotope funding in fiscal year 2001 is estimated to be $23,215,000 which includes a direct appropriation of $15,215,000 and the use of $8,000,000 in offsetting collections to be received from the sale of isotopes and other services in fiscal year 2001. Due to severe fiscal constraints, the Committee has provided only $500,000 for the Advanced Nuclear Medicine Initiative, a reduction of $2,000,000 from the budget request of $2,500,000.

The recommendation includes the budget request of $900,000 to process uranium material to obtain alpha-emitting isotopes that will be used in medical research and human clinical trials for the cure of various cancers.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The Committee recommendation is $12,000,000, the same as the budget request. This program provides support for university research reactors and supports education, training, and innovative research at U.S. universities.

Research and development.—The research and development program includes programs to support continued use of nuclear energy. The Committee recommendation is $5,000,000 for the nuclear energy plant optimization (NEPO) program, the same as the budget request. The Committee strongly supports this initiative to help ensure that existing 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.

The Committee recommendation is $22,500,000 for the nuclear energy research initiative (NERI) program, a reduction of $12,500,000 from the budget request of $35,000,000, but the same as last year. The Committee strongly supports this program which awards grants to laboratories, universities and consortia using a formal peer-review process.

Infrastructure.—The Committee has modified the Department's proposed budget structure to consolidate the facilities and infrastructure which support the nuclear energy programs. This includes facilities at Argonne National Laboratory-West in Idaho, the Test Reactor Area at Idaho, and the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) at Richland, Washington.

The Committee recommendation for ANL-West operations infrastructure is $39,150,000, the same as the budget request, which was originally included in the termination costs program. The recommendation for the FFTF is $39,000,000, a reduction of $5,010,000 from the budget request due to severe funding constraints. The recommendation for the Test Reactor Area at Idaho is $9,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Termination costs.—Funding of $74,000,000 requested for termination costs has been split between two program accounts. Funding of $39,150,000 for ANL-West Operations has been moved to "Infrastructure". Funding of $34,850,000 for EBR–II shutdown, disposition of spent nuclear fuel and legacy materials, and disposition technology activities has been included in "Termination Activities".

Termination activities.—Funding for EBR–II shutdown, disposition of spent nuclear fuel and legacy materials, and disposition technology activities has been moved to this program. The Committee recommendation is $34,850,000, the same as the budget request, for these activities. The recommendation includes $8,800,000 for EBR–II shutdown activities; $16,200,000 for disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials; and $9,850,000 for disposition technology activities.

The Department will soon decide whether to proceed with further application of electrometallurgical technology (EMT) to the remaining inventory of sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel. However, considerable work is yet to be done on qualifying and characterizing waste products, particularly from the post-demonstration work. A recent National Research Council committee recommended that the Department review the options for disposal of recovered uranium so that the overall impacts of the process can be assessed.

In order to ensure that there is a clear and final disposal option for all the waste forms resulting from EMT and that no further treatment will be required, the Committee directs the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, the Office of Environmental Management, and the Office of Nuclear Energy to prepare a complete report on all waste forms generated through the use of EMT. This will include: ceramic waste forms (actinide elements and fission products in a glass-ceramic matrix), the metal waste forms (noble metal fission products in a fuel-cladding matrix), and the recovered uranium streams. The report should describe the volumes of waste generated, radioactive content, waste forms created, and

lifecycle costs in annual increments of processing 25 MT of Experimental Breeder Reactor II fuel. The final disposition path for each waste form should be identified, along with applicable storage and disposal costs. This report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 31, 2001.

The Committee is also concerned that the Department is considering application of this technology to other spent fuels before it has been fully demonstrated. The Committee is to be notified before the Department expands this program to spent fuel outside the current Sodium-bonded Fuel Environmental Impact Statement.

Uranium programs.—The Committee has transferred $53,400,000, the same as the budget request, for the uranium programs to a new appropriation account, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

Program direction.—The recommendation includes $25,900,000, a reduction of $1,720,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $1,200,000 over fiscal year 2000.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The Committee recommendation is $35,000,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request of $40,000,000. The reduction should be applied to lower priority items and a reduction in the reliance on contractors who provide policy guidance to other Department of Energy contractors and Federal employees.

The recommendation for environment, safety and health also includes $1,000,000 to be transferred to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). These funds are to be used 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 and for those Department of Energy non-nuclear facilities that are not covered by the Atomic Energy Act.

ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Technical information management.—The Committee recommendation is $8,600,000, a reduction of $702,000 from the budget request, and the same funding level as fiscal year 2000.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Energy Supply includes several funding adjustments. 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 recommendation also includes an offset of $2,352,000 from royalties to be received to compensate the Department for its participation in the first-of-a-kind-engineering program for nuclear reactors. The Department's proposal to transfer $12,000,000 from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund has been included in the Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation account.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2000	$332,350,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	286,001,000
Recommended, 2001	281,001,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−51,349,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−5,000,000

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 $281,001,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes an additional $5,000,000 to expedite environmental cleanup at the Brookhaven National Laboratory.

Since Congress has not passed legislation authorizing the Department of Energy to initiate cleanup of the Atlas site in Moab, Utah, the Committee has not provided the $10,000,000 requested in the budget. Also, as proposed by the Department, no funds have been provided for the National Low-Level Waste Program in fiscal year 2001.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Appropriation, 2000	$249,247,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	303,038,000
Recommended, 2001	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−249,247,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−303,038,000

The Committee recommendation has transferred funding for the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Fund to a new appropriation account, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation. The new account consolidates uranium programs formerly funded in the Energy Supply account and the Uranium Enrichment D&D fund.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

Appropriation, 2000	$
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....
Recommended, 2001	301,400,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+301,400,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+301,400,000

The Committee has recommended a new appropriation account, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation, to include funding for uranium programs. Uranium programs are currently funded in the Energy Supply appropriation account which is managed by

the Office of Nuclear Energy and the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund appropriation account which is managed by the Office of Environmental Management. The funding split between two program organizations and two appropriation accounts makes it difficult to coordinate and manage remediation work performed at the uranium enrichment facilities in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio. To provide more visibility within the budget for uranium programs, the Committee has combined the funding into a single appropriation account in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommendation for Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation is $301,400,000, a reduction of $43,038,000 from the budget request of $344,438,000 due to funding constraints. Of this amount, $260,000,000 will be derived from the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund and $12,000,000 will be transferred from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund.

Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund.—The Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Fund, established by the Energy Policy Act of 1992, 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 annual appropriations. In fiscal year 2001 the Department of Energy will transfer $420,000,000 into this Fund.

Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee recommends $260,000,000, a reduction of $43,038,000 from the budget request for activities funded from the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund. The Committee is aware of the substantial cleanup requirements at each of the uranium enrichment sites, but is unable to provide the requested increase in fiscal year 2001.

Uranium/thorium reimbursements.—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.

Uranium programs.—This program funds the government's activities related to the Federal uranium enrichment programs which were not transferred to the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC). This includes management and remediation of leased and non-leased facilities at the gaseous diffusion plants in Paducah, Kentucky, and Portsmouth, Ohio; funding pre-existing liabilities such as post retirement life and medical costs for contractor employees prior to the establishment of USEC; management of the Department's inventory of depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6);

and management of other surplus uranium inventories. The Committee recommendation for uranium programs requested in the Energy Supply appropriation account is $53,400,000, the same as the budget request.

Depleted UF6.—Funding of $24,877,000, the same as the budget request, is included for activities associated with the depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6) management and conversion project. This includes $12,877,000 in appropriated funds in this program and an additional $12,000,000 from funds obtained under the Memoranda of Agreement with the United States Enrichment Corporation.

Domestic uranium industry.—The Committee is concerned about the protection of the public interest in maintaining a reliable and economical domestic source of uranium mining, enrichment and conversion services, as such interest is stated in the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act and Executive Order 13085. The Committee reminds the Secretary of the responsibilities delegated by the President to take action or propose to take action to prevent or mitigate any material adverse impact on such industries and expects the Secretary to work with the President and other parts of the Administration toward those ends with sharply and swiftly renewed vigor.

SCIENCE

Appropriation, 2000	$2,787,627,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	3,151,065,000
Recommended, 2001	2,830,915,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+43,288,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−320,150,000

The Science account includes the following programs: high energy and nuclear physics; biological and environmental research; basic energy sciences; advanced scientific computing research; energy research analysis; multi-program energy laboratories facility support; fusion energy sciences; and program direction. Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the significant budget increases requested by the Department in fiscal year 2001. It has been necessary to defer many on-going programs and new initiatives which the Committee views very favorably and regrets being unable to fund.

Statutory language proposed by the Administration to provide advance appropriations through fiscal year 2005 for the Spallation Neutron Source has not been included.

Coordination of Basic Research.—The Committee is concerned that there is scant cooperation and coordination between the Office of Science and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy on the fundamental research needed to improve renewable energy technologies. Each year the Committee provides funding for the Office of Science to support basic research in energy programs, including renewable programs. There appears to be little coordination or consultation between the two offices on the synergies among these programs. The Committee directs these two offices to identify ways in which coordination can be improved and research con-

ducted which is mutually beneficial, and to inform the Committee how coordination will be improved.

HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS

The high energy physics program of the Department of Energy has the lead responsibility for Federal support of high energy physics research. The program is directed at understanding the nature of matter and energy at the most fundamental level and the basic forces which govern all processes in nature. Fundamental research provides the necessary foundation that ultimately enables the Nation to progress in its science and technology capabilities, to advance its industrial competitiveness, and to discover new and innovative approaches to our energy future.

The Committee's recommendation for high energy physics is $714,730,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $6,840,000 over fiscal year 2000.

Research and technology.—The Committee recommendation for research and technology is $224,820,000, a reduction of $12,900,000 from the budget request of $237,720,000. For fiscal year 2001 the Department requested $19,200,000 for research and development on the Next Linear Collider and $8,700,000 for research and development on the Muon-Muon Collider. Due to severe funding constraints, the recommendation limits funding for these two activities to a total of $15,000,000. With the funding constraints on operating existing facilities and the need to fund major science projects currently under construction, the Committee is not anxious at this time to fund designs for expensive new facilities.

Facility operations.—The Committee recommendation for facility operations is $489,910,000, an increase of $12,900,000 over the budget request of $477,010,000. The Department requested $207,031,000 in fiscal year 2001 for facility operations at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in Batvia, Illinois. This level of funding would severely impact on-going operations at Fermi, so the Committee has provided $230,931,000, an additional $23,900,000, for Fermi operations in fiscal year 2001.

The Committee recommendation for the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is $59,000,000, a reduction of $11,000,000 from the budget request of $70,000,000. Funding is available since obligations for the LHC have been slower than anticipated, and there will be no negative impact on the project.

NUCLEAR PHYSICS

The goal of the nuclear physics program is to support basic research scientists, develop and operate the facilities, and foster the technical and scientific activities needed to understand the structure and interactions of atomic nuclei, and the fundamental forces and particles of nature as manifested in nuclear matter. The Committee recommendation for nuclear physics is $369,890,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $17,890,000 over fiscal year 2000.

BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The biological and environmental research program provides fundamental science to develop the knowledge needed to identify, understand, anticipate, and mitigate the long-term health and environmental consequences of energy production, development, and use.

The Committee recommendation is $404,000,000, a reduction of $41,260,000 from the budget request of $445,260,000, and $37,500,000 below fiscal year 2000. Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the requested level of funding for this program. While this appears to be a significant reduction from fiscal year 2000, it is actually comparable when funding is adjusted for the additional projects which were added to the program in fiscal year 2000.

Construction and infrastructure.—The Committee has deferred without prejudice funding to initiate construction of the Laboratory for Comparative Functional Genomics at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The Committee has also deferred funding to develop facilities and infrastructure at the University of South Carolina School of Public Health.

BASIC ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for basic energy sciences is $791,000,000, a reduction of $224,770,000 from the budget request, and an increase of $7,873,000 over fiscal year 2000. Due to severe funding constraints, the Committee was unable to provide the requested level of funding for this program. It has been necessary to defer funding for many new initiatives which the Committee views very favorably.

For purposes of reprogramming during fiscal year 2001, the Department may reallocate funding among all operating accounts in basic energy sciences. The recommendation includes $6,815,000, the same as last year, for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) program, and provides an increase of $7,873,000 to fund new waste management activities transferred to the program in fiscal year 2001.

Spallation Neutron Source.—The Committee recommendation provides $100,000,000, a reduction of $161,900,000 from the budget request of $261,900,000, and the same level as fiscal year 2000 for construction of the Spallation Neutron Source. The Committee is aware that the Department has made significant progress in improving the management of the project in the past year. The funding reduction does not reflect concern with the current status of the project, but rather the severe funding constraints under which the Committee is operating in fiscal year 2001.

ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING RESEARCH

The goal of the Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) program is to discover, develop, and deploy the computational and networking tools that enable researchers in the scientific disciplines to analyze, model, simulate, and predict complex phenomena.

The Committee recommendation is $137,000,000, a reduction of $44,970,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $5,000,000 over fiscal year 2000. The Committee is aware that the Department has worked hard to develop an advanced computing program to meet the needs of the science programs and laboratories. However, severe funding constraints make it impossible to fund a large new computing program in fiscal year 2001. The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for computer equipment upgrades at the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC) at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

ENERGY RESEARCH ANALYSIS

The energy research analysis program assesses research projects and programs and seeks to identify undesirable duplications and gaps. The Committee recommendation for energy research analysis is $1,000,000, the same as the budget request.

MULTI-PROGRAM ENERGY LABORATORIES FACILITIES SUPPORT

The multi-program energy laboratories facilities support program provides funding for general purpose facilities to support the infrastructure of the five Office of Science multi-program national laboratories and Oak Ridge, Tennessee, landlord costs. The Committee recommendation for multi-program energy laboratories facilities support is $33,930,000, the same as the budget request.

FUSION ENERGY SCIENCES

The Committee recommendation for fusion energy sciences is $255,000,000, an increase of $7,730,000 over the budget request, and the same as fiscal year 2000. Additional funding of $25,000,000 has been provided in the inertial confinement fusion program in the Weapons Activities appropriation account to support work on the development of high average power lasers.

Funds for this program should be allocated in accordance with the Fusion Energy Science Advisory Committee's (FESAC) report on Balance and Priorities. The Committee is pleased that the FESAC review process seems to be positioning the U.S. program to take advantage of the much larger international fusion research effort with the resources available and also positions the program to accelerate the development of fusion energy.

The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $19,600,000 for decontamination and decommissioning of the Tokomak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR).

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation for program direction is $138,000,000, a reduction of $3,245,000 from the budget request. Funding of $4,500,000, the same as last year, has been provided for the science education program.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The recommendation for Science includes a general reduction of $13,635,000 due to funding constraints.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2000	$ 239,601,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	325,500,000
Recommended, 2001	213,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−26,601,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−112,500,000

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, established the Federal government's responsibility and statutory framework to provide for the permanent geologic disposal of commercially generated spent nuclear fuel and the high-level radioactive waste generated by the Nation's nuclear defense activities. This law also established the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund to finance disposal activities through the collection of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste.

The Committee recommends $213,000,000 to be derived from the Fund in fiscal year 2001. Combined with the appropriation of $200,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $413,000,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 2001. This is a reduction of $24,500,000 from the budget request of $437,500,000, but the Committee believes the Department can meet its objectives in fiscal year 2001 with this level of funding.

Sufficient funding for this program is critical in fiscal year 2001. In fiscal year 2001, an investment of approximately $4 billion and almost 18 years of site investigations will culminate in a series of decisions on whether the repository should be sited at the Yucca Mountain site in Nevada. If the site is determined to be suitable and the Secretary of Energy decides to recommend the site for repository development, a Site Recommendation Report will be prepared and submitted to the President in fiscal year 2001. If the President, and then Congress, accept the site recommendation, a license application will be prepared and submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in fiscal year 2002.

State and local government funds.—The Committee recommendation includes $5,887,000 for the affected units of local government, the same as the budget request, and $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada, a reduction of $2,148,000 from the budget request, to conduct oversight responsibilities. The Committee has been reluctant in prior years to provide funding to the State of Nevada in view of the documented abuses by State employees, but believes it is important for the State of Nevada to oversee the program at this crucial stage in the site characterization process. The Committee has provided statutory language directing that the State funds be provided to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management for program management and execution. The Committee expects the Governor of Nevada to ensure that appropriated funds are expended according to Federal law and Congressional intent and that State employees fully comply with the law and Congressional directives. Statutory language is included prohibiting the payment of salaries and expenses of State employees.

Report requirement.—The Department is directed to update the report required by Section 303 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act regarding alternative approaches to financing and managing this pro-

gram. In conducting these studies, the Department shall consult with other Federal agencies and with financial and organizational management experts who would provide salient input to this study. As part of the study, the Department should identify models of effective organizations that might benefit the operation of the program. An updated report regarding alternative means of financing and managing this program shall be submitted to the Congress by June 30, 2001.

Statutory language.—The Committee has included statutory language proposed by the Administration that would allow the use of proceeds and recoveries from the sale of assets. Proceeds estimated at approximately $1,000,000 are anticipated in fiscal year 2001.

Waste acceptance and transportation.—The Committee is concerned about the steady erosion of Administration support for activities associated with the waste acceptance and transportation functions of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. The Department needs to demonstrate its ability to remove spent fuel from utility sites for Federal management, and, in particular, its commitment to the timely removal of spent fuel. Accordingly, the Department should submit to the Committee by December 31, 2000, a plan for the timely fabrication and deployment of waste acceptance capabilities. The plan should be developed after consultation with affected contract holders and consider currently licensed transportation systems and other transportation.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2000	$205,581,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	213,339,000
Recommended, 2001	153,527,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−52,054,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−59,812,000

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES

Appropriation, 2000	−$106,887,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−128,762,000
Recommended, 2001	−111,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−4,113,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+17,762,000

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 2001, the Committee has provided funding for Departmental Administration activities in two appropriation accounts. The Committee has provided $153,527,000 in this account, and $51,000,000 in the Other Defense Activities appropriation account, for total funding of $204,527,000, a reduction of $8,812,000 from the budget request. Funding for many offices has been reduced due to funding constraints and the availability of prior year carryover balances.

Office of Ombudsman.—The recommendation of $5,100,000 for the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity includes all funding

for salaries and expenses associated with the newly established Office of Ombudsman.

Working Capital Fund.—The Committee has included statutory language prohibiting the Department from including the salaries and expenses for Federal employees in this account. The Committee appropriates funds separately for all Federal employees and will continue to do so.

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.

Reprogramming guidelines.—The Committee has provided reprogramming authority of $500,000 or five percent, whichever is less, within the Departmental Administration account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. No individual program account may be increased or decreased by more than this amount during the fiscal year using this reprogramming authority. Congressional notification within 30 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required.

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 2001 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 2001 is $128,762,000. However, the Committee recommendation is $111,000,000, a decrease of $17,762,000 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 2001. 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 2001 and provided $51,000,000 from national security programs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriation, 2000	$29,500,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	33,000,000
Recommended, 2001	31,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+2,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−1,500,000

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 $31,500,000, a reduction of $1,500,000 from the budget request due to funding constraints.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs of the Department of Energy include the National Nuclear Security Administration which consists of Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors; 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.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, Public Law 106–65, established within the Department of Energy a separately organized agency to be known as the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and to become effective on March 1, 2000. The Committee's recommendations for funding in fiscal year 2001 reflect this new organization and budget structure.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2000	$4,427,052,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	4,594,000,000
Recommended, 2001	4,625,684,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+198,632,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+31,684,000

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. The program seeks to maintain and refurbish nuclear weapons to sustain confidence in their safety and reliability indefinitely under the nuclear testing moratorium and arms reduction treaties. The Committee's recommendation for Weapons Activities is $4,625,684,000, an increase of $31,684,000 over the budget request of $4,594,000,000.

Authorization of appropriations.—Consistent with the guidance in the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization bill passed by the House of Representatives, appropriations for Weapons Activities are being made available for obligation only until October 1, 2003.

Organization and Management Structure.—The Committee continues to believe that the Department's internal organization and management structure at Headquarters and in the field does not efficiently support the Department's current mission in the post Cold War environment. The Committee encourages the new Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs to review the urgent need for organization and management changes in the NNSA headquarters and field structure. Simply renaming the same employees, the same organizational structure, and the same management culture as the "National Nuclear Security Administration" will not address the fundamental problems that Congress sought to address by creating this new entity. The Committee does not need to outline the problems with overlapping, duplicative responsibilities and lack of accountability. There are numerous reports outlining these issues and offering solutions. The Committee strongly urges the new Administrator and Deputy Administrator to use this opportunity to make bold and strategic improvements.

Performance measures.—In fiscal year 1999, the Department identified 11 performance measures to be accomplished by Defense Programs. The Department met only six of these goals successfully while failing to meet five of the goals. Weapons alteration schedules were missed; construction of the National Ignition Facility was delayed; upgrades to key operations facilities fell behind schedule; and there were fewer warheads dismantled than scheduled. While the Department can explain why each of these delays occurred, the overall trend is disturbing. If the Department expects to retain credibility that it is capable of meeting critical national security goals, it would do well to focus more strongly on its core nuclear weapons mission.

Land conveyance and transfer.—The Department has identified ten tracts of land in the vicinity of the Los Alamos National Laboratory to be conveyed to the County of Los Alamos and the Department of Interior. Costs associated with this transfer include en-

vironmental and remediation activities and landlord activities. While the Committee supports the transfer, some of the landlord costs associated with this activity appear to be quite excessive. In order to track these costs, the Department is directed to include a specific funding request for the land conveyance and transfer program in the annual budget submission for Environmental Management and Weapons Activities.

DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK

Directed Stockpile Work includes all activities that directly support weapons in the nuclear stockpile, including maintenance, research, development, engineering, and certification activities. The Committee recommendation is $856,603,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request of $836,603,000. For stockpile maintenance, an additional $5,000,000 has been provided for the Kansas City plant in Missouri and $4,000,000 for the Y–12 plant in Tennessee. For stockpile evaluation, an additional $5,000,000 has been provided for the Pantex plant in Texas and $6,000,000 for the Y–12 plant in Tennessee.

CAMPAIGNS

Campaigns are focused efforts involving the three weapons laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, the weapons production plants, and selected external organizations to address critical capabilities needed to achieve program objectives. Campaigns have definitive milestones, specific work plans, and specific end dates. The Committee recommendation is $1,958,014,000, an increase of $653,775,000 over the budget request of $1,304,239,000. Most of this increase reflects a restructuring of the Department's budget request. For some campaigns, the recommendation incorporates funding which was requested by the Department in the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities program. The Committee has moved this funding to more accurately portray the cost of these campaigns.

Inertial Confinement Fusion.—The Committee recommends $364,600,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, an increase of $169,700,000 over the budget request of $194,900,000. The recommendation includes $144,700,000 which has been transferred to inertial confinement fusion from the readiness in technical base and facilities program, and $25,000,000 to further the development of high average power lasers.

Last year the Committee requested the Secretary of Energy to complete and certify a new cost and schedule baseline for the National Ignition Facility (NIF). This certification was to be submitted by June 1, 2000. If the Department was unable to provide such a certification, the Department was to prepare an estimate of the costs necessary to terminate the project. The Department has not been able to certify a new cost and schedule baseline, but has submitted an interim report calculating the total project cost at approximately $3.26 billion. The Committee does not believe that the information provided to date is an adequate basis for additional appropriations in fiscal year 2001. The Committee will reserve judgment on this project until the final report is submitted in September.

Although completion of the NIF project in a timely and cost effective manner is a high priority for the stockpile stewardship program, it is important that the Department continue to support and maintain the work at other inertial fusion facilities, and efforts in diagnostics, target fabrication, and cryogenic target development. These elements of the inertial confinement fusion program not only enable the goals of NIF, but have important roles in meeting the overall goals of stockpile stewardship. With significant delays in NIF, increased use of existing facilities and the continued development of the supporting activities are essential to the long term success of the program. The Committee recommendation includes the budget request of $9,750,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory and $32,150,000 for the University of Rochester.

Defense computing and modeling.—The budget request includes $776,175,000 for defense computing and modeling, an increase of $457,075,000 over the request of $319,100,000. The increase reflects the transfer of $477,075,000 for the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) from the readiness in technical base and facilities program. Funding for ASCI is then reduced by $20,000,000 from the budget request.

Pit manufacturing readiness.—The Committee recommendation for pit manufacturing readiness is $110,038,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request. To address concerns that the NNSA lacks a robust capability for replacement of plutonium pits and the difficulties currently being experienced in producing pits in a laboratory environment, the Committee has provided $2,000,000 to initiate conceptual design work on a pit manufacturing facility.

Tritium.—The Committee recommendation for the tritium program is $177,000,000, an increase of $25,000,000 over the budget request of $152,000,000. The Department requested no funding for Project 98–D–126, the Accelerator Production of Tritium project, but the Committee has provided $25,000,000 to continue design activities.

READINESS IN TECHNICAL BASE AND FACILITIES

The Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities program supports the physical and operational infrastructure at the laboratories, the Nevada Test Site, and the production plants. The Committee recommendation is $1,483,883,000, a decrease of $608,775,000 from the budget request of $2,092,658,000. Most of this reduction is due to transferring funds to other programs. Funding of $144,700,000 was transferred to the inertial confinement fusion program and $477,075,000 was transferred to the defense computing and modeling program for a total transfer out of the account of $621,775,000. The Committee recommendation also provides an additional $10,000,000 for infrastructure at the Y–12 plant in Tennessee; $10,000,000 for infrastructure at the Pantex plant in Texas; and $10,000,000 for infrastructure at the Kansas City plant in Missouri. Consistent with the recommendations contained in the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization bill, the Committee has not provided $17,000,000 requested for educational activities associated with the national weapons laboratories.

Uranium-233.—The Committee recommends that the Department process Uranium-233 stored in Building 3019 at the Oak

Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in a manner that would retain and make available isotopes for beneficial use. Isotopes such as Thorium-229 and its decay products have significant potential for the treatment of cancer. Efforts should be made to expedite processing of the Uranium-233 while considering the radiological and criticality hazards, safeguard limitations and environmental regulations associated with this material. The Committee recommends that the Department procure a well-qualified contractor for this project with a proven track record of meeting safety, quality, cost and schedule requirements.

Construction projects.—The Committee recommendation includes $14,500,000 for the preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D) project. The Department is directed to notify the Committee when PE&D funds are allocated for a specific project.

TRANSPORTATION SAFEGUARDS DIVISION

The Transportation Safeguards Division provides for the safe, secure movement of nuclear weapons, special nuclear materials, and non-nuclear weapon components between military locations and nuclear weapons complex facilities within the United States. The Committee recommendation is $115,673,000, the same as the budget request.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $216,871,000 for program direction is a reduction of $7,200,000 from the budget request of $224,071,000. The Committee expects the Department to initiate a five percent reduction in Federal staffing, consistent with the guidance contained in the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization bill.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

General reduction.—The Committee recommends a general reduction of $26,116,000 in fiscal year 2001. This reflects a reduction in the use of Laboratory Directed Research and Development funds from six percent as requested in the budget to four percent as recommended by the Committee.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Appropriation, 2000	$729,100,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	906,035,000
Recommended, 2001	861,477,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+132,377,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−44,558,000

Consistent with the legislation establishing the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Committee has provided a separate appropriation account for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation. This account includes funding for Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development, Arms Control, International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting, the Long-term Nonproliferation Program for Russia, HEU Transparency Implementation, International Nuclear Safety, Fissile Materials Disposition, and

Program Direction. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

GENERAL

Strategic Planning and Analysis.—U.S. engagement with the Russian nuclear complex has grown over the past few years resulting in securing nuclear materials and promoting nonproliferation strategies. This rapid growth of activities has contributed to multitudes of DOE federal employees, U.S. contractors, and national laboratory employees visiting Russia and the Newly Independent States (NIS). In addition, new programs such as the Administration's proposed $100 million initiative seek to expand this engagement. The Committee is deeply concerned with the sporadic appearance of initiatives and programs with ill defined scope, lack of an understanding of U.S. out-year financial obligations, and lack of documented commitments that these "joint" U.S./Russian initiatives are even supported by the Russians.

The Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) needs to demonstrate that its Russian programs are integrated, support the most urgent security needs, and clearly meet a strategic, measurable policy goal within a disciplined budgetary profile. The Committee strongly recommends that the Deputy Administrator form a long-range strategic planning group for Russian programs that can integrate DNN activities, such as treaty negotiations, DOE on-the-ground work in Russia, and advances in nonproliferation and verification research. Absent this integration, the current stove-piping of program offices has resulted in multitudes of DOE staff and representatives visiting Russia and the NIS, and often the same Russian officials, with duplicative or conflicting agendas. The Committee requests that a 5-year plan (FY 2001–2005) on U.S./Russian nonproliferation and arms control programs at DOE be submitted concurrent with the submittal of the fiscal year 2002 budget, that demonstrates how DNN programs are using an integrated approach to address urgent security needs in Russia. Consistent with this 5-year plan, corresponding funding profiles for each program should be provided, noting total life-cycle cost and end dates for each program.

Regional Threat Reduction.—The Department of Energy has a unique role in regional security and arms control, with nuclear experts that can analyze and understand nuclear weapons development programs. While significant DNN resources are targeted for Russian nuclear initiatives, the Committee is concerned that the Department has neglected proliferation concerns in other regions of nuclear instability. This important analysis can allow the U.S. to predict nuclear weapons development in proliferant states and form the basis for U.S. and international efforts to impede, prevent, and roll-back proliferation. The Committee urges the Department to focus resources, with experienced, credible leadership for regional security programs.

Competitive Research.—The Committee is concerned that the Department of Energy has not followed the language included in last year's conference report directing the Department to initiate a free and open competitive process for 25 percent of its research and development, including 25 percent of the treaty monitoring program.

The Committee directs the Department to provide a report immediately describing the status of competition in these programs. Furthermore, the Committee directs the Department to have a competitive, peer-reviewed program with outside experts by October 2000, for 25 percent of the Non-proliferation and National Security programs, including 25 percent of the Department's Treaty Monitoring program.

Limitation on Russian Program Funds.—The Committee remains concerned about the amount of funding for Russian programs which goes to the Department's own national laboratories rather than going to the facilities in Russia. The Committee directs that not more than 20 percent of the funding for any of these programs may be spent in the United States.

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 nonproliferation and verification research and development program consists of hundreds of projects executed primarily at the nuclear weapons laboratories. The Committee has consistently expressed concern that this appears to be an unfocused, level of effort activity performed at DOE laboratories. Last year the Committee directed the Department to implement an external, peer-review process to examine each of the projects, their progress, and their value to the overall needs of the program. The Committee also requested a report identifying the value of the individual research and development projects, and how the individual projects relate to an overriding program plan or technology roadmap. The Department has not submitted this information to the Committee.

In lieu of providing the specific information requested by the Committee, the Department established a panel to look at the quality of the research, technology transfer, and the balance of work and budgets across nonproliferation programs. While this information is helpful, it did not directly address the Committee's concerns and did not provide an external review of individual projects.

The Committee recommendation is $222,000,000, a decrease of $10,990,000 from the budget request of $232,990,000. This provides the budget request of $42,138,000 for chemical and biological nonproliferation, and the budget request of $7,000,000 for the Nonproliferation and International Security Center.

ARMS CONTROL

The arms control and nonproliferation program supports the Nation's arms control and nonproliferation policies; limiting weapons-usable fissile materials; establishing transparent and irreversible nuclear reductions; and controlling nuclear exports. The Committee has moved the International Materials Protection, Accounting, and

Control program from arms control and has established a stand-alone program for these activities.

The Committee recommendation is $141,514,000, an increase of $18,500,000 over the budget request of $123,014,000. The recommendation includes $17,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative and $22,500,000 for Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention. Within the Nuclear Cities Initiative, $10,000,000 is to fund the Accelerated Closure of Serial Production Facilities initiative for Avangard and Penza–19. The increase of $18,500,000 will fund long-term nonproliferation initiatives for Russia: $15,000,000 for spent fuel dry storage at Mayak; $500,000 for the plutonium registry at Mayak; $2,500,000 for geologic repository cooperation research and planning; and $500,000 for research reactor spent fuel acceptance.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

The International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting (MPC&A) activities are designed to work cooperatively with Russia to protect the direct use of nuclear materials. The focus is to improve the physical security at facilities that possess or process significant quantities of nuclear weapons-usable that are of proliferation concern. Activities include installing monitoring equipment, inventorying nuclear material, improving the Soviet security culture, and establishing a security infrastructure. The Department had included funding for this program in Arms Control, but the Committee has created a separate program for these activities.

The Committee recommendation is $169,856,000, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request of $149,856,000. The increase reflects the amount requested in the long-term nonproliferation program for Russia for expanded MPC&A activities at Russian naval sites and plutonium storage at Mayak.

LONG-TERM NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAM FOR RUSSIA

The Department of Energy proposed nine new initiatives to respond to previously recognized, but unaddressed threats to U.S. security. The initiatives are intended to supplement ongoing Department programs with Russia and seek to establish new and accelerated solutions. DOE requested $100,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 for these initiatives. The Committee has provided $48,500,000 for these initiatives, but has transferred the funding to the appropriate existing programs.

The Committee has provided $20,000,000 as requested for the Russian Naval Sites and the Mayak plutonium storage initiatives in the International Materials Protection, Control and Accounting program, and $10,000,000 as requested for accelerating the closure of serial production facilities, Avangard and Penza–19 in the Arms Control program. According to a General Accounting Office review of all nine initiatives, for these three programs, the scope of the project is defined, Russian commitments are in place, and a spending plan for fiscal year 2001 has been developed.

A review of the remaining initiatives found varying degrees of scope definition, incomplete or inadequate documentation on how requested funds will be spent, and lack of a firm commitment by the Russian Federation to participate in them. In particular, the $20,000,000 requested for Proliferation Resistant Reactors and

Fuels Research Program, and $2,000,000 Situation and Crisis Center appeared to be lacking in all three review categories. As such, the Committee provides no funding for these initiatives.

The Committee has provided partial funding for the following initiatives in the Arms Control program: $15,000,000 for spent fuel dry storage at Mayak, a decrease from the budget request of $38,000,000; $500,000 for the plutonium registry at Mayak, a decrease from the budget request of $2,000,000; $2,500,000 for geologic repository cooperation research and planning, a decrease from the budget request of $5,000,000; and $500,000 for research reactor spent fuel acceptance, a decrease from the budget request of $3,000,000.

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 $15,190,000, 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 $20,000,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $5,000,000 over fiscal year 2000.

A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) review of the Department of Energy's nuclear safety assistance activities "found that the Department of Energy had funded several projects that may have worthwhile objectives but are not directly related to improving the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear reactors and do not meet the Department's project selection criteria. For example, environmental centers in Russia and the United States—established by the Department to address nuclear waste issues—are not directly related to improving the reactors' safety. Similarly, GAO questions whether nine joint research projects being performed at nuclear safety centers in the United States and Russia are directly improving the safety of currently operating nuclear power plants."

The Committee believes the Department needs to focus its efforts on improving the safety of Soviet-designed nuclear reactors, and eliminate extraneous projects that do not contribute directly to this goal. As such, 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 re-

actors, the schedule by fiscal year for accomplishing this work, and the cost of each task by fiscal year.

In addition, the report should provide summary tables of total annual resources expended and planned at each reactor and each project/activity receiving funding outside explicit reactors for fiscal years 1993–2005, which total to the annual amount provided and projected to complete the program. The report should add a strategic plan outlining the most urgent and pressing safety priorities that remain and need to be addressed in order to close out the program by 2005 within current funding levels.

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 $241,449,000, an increase of $18,014,000 over the budget request of $223,435,000.

Funding of $139,517,000, an increase of $4,000,000 over the budget request, is provided for U.S. surplus materials disposition. This reflects an increase of $7,000,000 in operating dollars transferred from environmental management to the fissile materials disposition program for the highly enriched uranium blend down facility, and a decrease of $3,000,000 in operating dollars transferred to the MOX fuel fabrication facility project.

The Committee has provided $40,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the Russian plutonium disposition program. Within this amount $10,000,000, the same as the budget request, is for the support of the joint U.S./Russian program to develop the GT–MHR for the purpose of destroying surplus Russian plutonium. The Committee believes that monetary support of other governments is essential to the success of this program.

Report requirement.—The Committee is concerned that the cost estimate for the fissile materials disposition program has increased substantially. The estimated cost of the U.S. program is approximately $4,000,000,000, and the estimated cost of the Russian program is now in excess of $2,000,000,000. These estimated costs are significantly higher than the cost estimates provided to the Committee when the program was initiated. The Committee directs the Department to provide a detailed report on the full costs of this program with a cost and schedule baseline by year through completion of the program. The report should also provide detailed information by year on the funding to be contributed by Russia and other countries in support of this initiative. This report is due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by February 15, 2001.

The report should also address the Committee's concerns that the U.S. program is being conducted at a faster pace than the Russian program. The design of several expensive new facilities in the United States is underway while funding for comparable Russian facilities is still uncertain. The Department should include in the report the process by which parity between the two countries will be maintained throughout execution of the program.

Construction.—Funding of $20,932,000 for Project 01–D–407, the highly enriched uranium blend down facility, at the Savannah River Site has been included in this program. The Department requested funding for this project in the Environmental Management program, but it is more appropriately funded in the fissile materials disposition program.

The Committee has provided $18,000,000, an increase of $3,000,000 over the budget request of $15,000,000, for Project 99–D–143, the MOX fuel fabrication facility project. This funding was transferred from the operating account.

Program direction.—No program direction funds are provided in the fissile materials disposition program. Funds for salaries and expenses are included in the overall program direction account for defense nuclear nonproliferation.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommendation of $51,468,000 for program direction combines the budget request of $41,550,000 for defense nuclear nonproliferation and the request of $9,918,000 for fissile materials disposition.

NAVAL REACTORS

Appropriation, 2000	$677,600,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	677,600,000
Recommended, 2001	677,600,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	.....
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

Consistent with the legislation establishing the National Nuclear Security Administration, the Committee has recommended a separate appropriation account for the Naval Reactors program. 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 efforts are critical to the continued success of over 99 reactors in operating nuclear-powered submarines and surface ships and to development of the next generation reactor.

The Committee recommendation is $677,600,000, the same as the budget request. The Administration has once again under-funded the successful environmental cleanup program being executed by the Naval Reactors program. The Committee is aware that additional funds could be used 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. Unfortunately, the Committee is unable to accommodate this additional requirement.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 2000	$4,467,308,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	4,551,527,000
Recommended, 2001	4,522,707,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+55,399,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−28,820,000

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 Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

Statutory language proposed by the Administration is included providing that any amounts appropriated for economic assistance under the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act shall be used to reimburse costs of financial assurances required of a contractor by the State of New Mexico.

The Committee's recommendation for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management is $4,522,707,000, a decrease of $28,820,000 from the budget request of $4,551,527,000, and $55,399,000 over fiscal year 2000. Details of the recommended funding levels follow.

GENERAL

The Committee is concerned that some projects scheduled for completion by 2006 are slipping. The Department should be very careful not to underestimate the strong intent of the Committee that site cleanups remain on schedule for completion by 2006. The Department must demonstrate that it is capable of completing a project on schedule and within cost. Problems that arise during the course of project execution must be dealt with quickly to ensure project completion.

The Department should also begin to address the next round of cleanup projects to be completed within ten years. The current emphasis on project closure by 2006 has been very helpful in focusing the attention of the Department and its contractors on completing projects on time and within cost. The Committee now believes it is time to begin the next round of focused site and project cleanups by 2010 and that particularly the larger cleanup sites should identify discrete projects which can be completed within the next ten years. The Department is directed to include in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission a program for all sites and projects which can be completed by 2010. The Department should work with the Committee on the appropriate budget structure.

Purchase of motor vehicles.—The Committee has limited to 30 the number of motor vehicles that can be purchased in fiscal year 2001, a reduction of 37 from the request for 67 new vehicles. An audit by the Department's Inspector General of vehicle usage at

the Idaho site found that 45 percent of the vehicles were underused, and the fleet was larger than necessary. Despite this audit, the Department has requested 62 replacement vehicles for Idaho. The Department appears to seek replacement of dozens of vehicles without assessing the actual need and ignoring guidance from the Inspector General audit reports. The Committee believes this is unnecessary and directs the Department to review the process used to evaluate the number of motor vehicles needed by field operations.

Project Changes.—The Department is directed to provide a report by January 30, 2001, 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 25 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 2001, 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.

Economic development.—None of the environmental management funds are available for economic development activities.

National monument designation.—The Committee has provided no funding for the Department to use for the coordination, integration, or implementation of a management plan or any other activity related to a national monument designated under the 1906 Antiquities Act in the State of Washington.

SITE/PROJECT COMPLETION

The site/project completion account provides 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 recommendation for site/project completion activities is $941,711,000 a reduction of $29,240,000 from the budget request of $970,951,000. Additional funding of $10,000,000 is provided for the H-area stabilization project and $1,000,000 for the F-area stabilization project at the Savannah River Site. These funds will be used to support stabilization of plutonium materials and americium/cesium solutions as well as acceleration of authorization

basis work. Funding for the Highly Enriched Uranium Blend Down Project at the Savannah River Site has been transferred to the Fissile Materials Disposition Program. This included a reduction of $27,932,000 to Project 01–D–407 and a reduction of $10,000,000 in operating expenses associated with the project. In addition, $2,308,000 that was provided for the Idaho validation and verification program has been transferred to Science and Technology.

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 recommendation for Post 2006 completion is $3,067,765,000, a reduction of $40,692,000 from the budget request of $3,108,457,000. Funding requirements for the Savannah River Site have changed since the budget request was submitted, and the recommendation makes the following adjustments: an additional $3,000,000 for transuranic waste activities; an additional $3,000,000 for low level waste activities; a reduction of $10,000,000 for environmental remediation of the four mile branch project; and a reduction of $18,000,000 since operation of the Consolidated Incinerator Project will be suspended for an indefinite period. In addition, funding of $18,692,000 for validation and verification activities at Idaho has been transferred to the Science and Technology program where it has been funded previously.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).—The interim report on "Improving Operations and Long-Term Safety of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant" by the National Research Council found that the current system for managing transuranic waste does not "send DOE TRU waste to WIPP at a minimum risk (from all sources of risk, including radiological exposure and highway accidents) and cost." The report recommends that the Department review and revise waste management procedures with reduction of risk and cost as guiding principles. The Committee expects the Department to respond promptly to the guidance provided in this report. Improving the safety and cost effectiveness of WIPP operations would offer great benefits to many of the Department's cleanup sites.

National Programs.—The Committee is concerned with the fragmentation of funding related to the national programs such as Nuclear Criticality Safety Training, Transportation and Packaging Management, National Analytical Management, and Pollution Prevention in the budget request. The Department is directed to manage these programs centrally through the multi-site account.

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 Decontamina-

tion and Decommissioning Fund as authorized in Public Law 102–486, the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Health Effects Studies.—The Committee recommendation does not include any funding for worker and public health effects studies.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Office of Science and Technology conducts a national program that provides a full range of resources and capabilities—from basic research through development and demonstration, and technical and deployment assistance—that are needed to deliver scientific and technological solutions to cleanup and long-term environmental stewardship problems. The Committee recommendation for science and technology is $242,548,000, an increase of $46,000,000 over the budget of $196,548,000.

Technology Deployment.—The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for technology deployment activities in fiscal year 2000 to continue the Department's efforts to deploy cost-effective new technologies. The Administration had requested no funding for this program. 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 alternative cost effective cleanup technologies from outside the Department in cleaning up its legacy waste. The Committee 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 and urges the Department to renew this agreement. The budget request included $2,000,000 for this agreement in fiscal year 2001, but the Committee has allocated $4,000,000 from within available funds.

Environmental Management Science Program.—The Committee is disappointed that the Department was unable to provide funding for new grants in fiscal year 2001. 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 has provided $10,000,000 for the next round of new and innovative research grants in fiscal year 2001.

Idaho Validation and Verification Program.—The Committee has transferred $18,692,000 for the Idaho validation and verification program from the Post 2006 completion account and $2,308,000 from the site/project completion account to science and technology where it has been funded in prior years.

Long-Term Stewardship Program.—The Committee has recommended $5,000,000 to support the long-term stewardship pro-

gram. No funds were requested by the Administration. This program is required to protect human health and the environment from hazards remaining after cleanup is complete. Complete restoration to levels acceptable for unrestricted use cannot be accomplished at many sites. Long-term stewardship will be needed to ensure that the selected remedies will remain protective for future generations.

Oversight of Environmental Management Laboratories.—The Department should ensure that proper management and 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.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—The Committee recommendation includes the use of up to four percent of environmental management funds provided to government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories for Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) activities. However, the Department must ensure proper management and oversight of these funds. These funds must be applied only to environmental research and will be selected based on a rigorous proposal and review process to be established by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management. This process must include review and approval by the Headquarters' Office of Science and Technology to assure all research projects achieve mission relevancy and scientific merit. The Department is to provide the Committee with a report outlining the review process to be used.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

The Committee recommends $355,000,000 for program direction, a decrease of $4,888,000 from the budget request of $359,888,000. This reduction should be applied to lower priority activities.

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 includes two funding adjustments requested in the budget. Prior year balances of $34,317,000 and a pension refund of $50,000,000 will be used to offset current year funding requirements.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

Appropriation, 2000	$1,060,447,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	1,082,297,000
Recommended, 2001	1,082,297,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+21,850,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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 may 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—Ashtabula, Columbus, Fernald and Miamisburg.

This account is intended to highlight those sites where cleanup can be accelerated and substantial savings achieved by reducing long-term program costs and ongoing support costs. The Committee strongly supports this program, and the recommendation for fiscal year 2001 funding is $1,082,297,000, the same as the budget request. Funding levels for each of the sites are addressed below.

Rocky Flats Closure Project.—The Department has prepared a baseline schedule showing closure of the Rocky Flats Site in Colorado by 2006. 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 2001 funding of $664,675,000, the same as the budget request.

Ohio Sites.—The Committee recommendation is $417,622,000 for the four Ohio sites. Funding for the Ashtabula site which will achieve complete cleanup by fiscal year 2003 is $16,248,000, the same as the budget request. The budget request of $94,000 is provided for Ohio Field Office activities.

The Columbus Environmental Management 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 2005. The budget request of $16,134,000 has been provided.

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 2006. 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. Significant cost savings can be achieved with early closure. The Committee recommendation for the Fernald site is $290,793,000, the same as the budget request.

Cleanup at the Miamisburg, Ohio, site is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 2006. The Committee is concerned that the cleanup date has slipped from 2005 and expects the Department to do everything possible to maintain the closure of this site by 2006. The Committee has made accelerated closure of cleanup sites a

very high priority and expects the Department to do the same. The Committee recommends the budget request of $94,353,000.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

Appropriation, 2000	$188,282,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	515,000,000
Recommended, 2001	259,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+70,718,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−256,000,000

The Committee recommendation for the Defense Environmental Management Privatization program is $259,000,000, a reduction of $256,000,000 from the budget request. The recommendation includes a total of $370,000,000 for the Tank Waste Remediation System at Richland—$194,000,000 in new budget authority and the use of $176,000,000 of previously appropriated funds. The recommendation also includes the budget request of $65,000,000 for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project at Idaho, $25,092,000 for Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage at Idaho, and the use of $25,092,000 in prior year balances.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 2000	$309,199,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	555,122,000
Recommended, 2001	592,235,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+283,036,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+37,113,000

This account provides funding for Security and Emergency Operations; Intelligence; Counterintelligence; Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance; Environment, Safety and Health (Defense); Worker and Community Transition; National Security Programs Administrative Support; and the Office of Hearings and Appeals. Descriptions of each of these programs are provided below.

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

Security and emergency operations provides a domestic safeguard and security program for protection of nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, nuclear facilities, and classified and unclassified information, including cyber systems, against sabotage, espionage, terrorist activities, or any loss or unauthorized disclosure that could endanger the national security or disrupt operations. The Committee recommendation for security and emergency operations is $332,376,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request of $340,376,000.

The Committee recently received a budget amendment to consolidate safeguards and security funding throughout the Department. However, the amendment was received too late in the process to incorporate all the changes into the Committee's recommendation. The Committee will address these changes at a later date in the appropriations process.

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 is $116,409,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the budget request of $124,409,000.

The Administration requested $13,000,000 for a greatly expanded critical infrastructure protection program. The recommendation includes $3,000,000, an increase of $600,000 over fiscal year 2000, for this program. The Committee believes that many of these proposed initiatives are already being funded in other program areas of the Department and urges the Department to coordinate the activities already being performed in areas such as transmission and gas pipeline reliability and infrastructure.

The Committee has included $2,000,000 for procurement of security locks that meet the Federal specifications for containers that hold sensitive classified material.

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 $33,000,000, the same as the budget request. In fiscal year 2001 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 $33,000,000.

Emergency Management.—The Office of Emergency Response ensures that capabilities are in place to provide an appropriate response to any Department of Energy facility emergency and to any nuclear or radiological emergency within the United States or abroad. The Committee recommendation is $90,000,000, a reduction of $3,600,000 from the budget request of $93,600,000. This funding has been transferred to the program direction account. The Committee commends the program for seeking cost savings and greater program accountability by converting contractor positions to Federal employees and encourages the program to continue this initiative.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation is $92,967,000 for program direction, an increase of $3,600,000 over the budget request. These funds have been transferred from the emergency management program and will be used to fund Federal employees to do tasks previously performed by contractor employees.

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 $38,059,000, the same as the budget request.

OFFICE OF COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The Office of Counterintelligence seeks 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 threats directed at the Department's facilities, personnel, information, and technologies. The Committee recommendation is $45,200,000, the same as the budget request.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance is the focal point for independent evaluation of safeguards, security, emergency management, and cyber security. The Committee recommendation is $14,937,000, the same as the budget request.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The Office of Environment, Safety and Health develops programs and policies to protect the workers and the public, conducts independent oversight of performance, and funds health effects studies. The Committee recommendation is $103,163,000, a decrease of $5,887,000 from the budget request, but an increase of $5,163,000 over fiscal year 2000. The Department is directed to fund the requirements of the gaseous diffusion plants within this allocation.

Health Effects Studies.—The recommendation for health effects studies is $48,632,000, a decrease of $4,324,000 from the budget request, but the same as fiscal year 2000.

Program Direction.—The Committee recommendation for program direction is $22,604,000, the same as the budget request.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The Committee's recommendation for the worker and community transition program is $24,500,000, the same as the budget request. The Committee has provided $2,100,000 for infrastructure improvements at the former Pinellas plant. The Committee expects the Department to adequately fund and fulfill the commitment which was made to the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation.

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. However, the cost of this program has not been insignificant. Through fiscal year 1999, enhanced severance payments and benefits have totaled $817,000,000, and Federal grants to communities have totaled $220,000,000, for a total cost of $1,037,000,000.

The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for this program be used for additional severance payments and benefits for Federal employees.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The Committee recommendation includes $51,000,000 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. These funds also support the new offices to be established in the National Nuclear Security Administration.

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.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommendation includes an offset of $20,000,000, the same as the budget request, from user organizations which will fund security investigations through other program accounts.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 2000	$111,574,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	112,000,000
Recommended, 2001	200,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+88,426,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	+88,000,000

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 1999, the balance owed by the Federal government to the Nuclear Waste Fund was approximately $1,500,000,000 (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 1999, a total of $1,176,830,000 has been appropriated to support the nuclear waste repository activities attributable to atomic energy defense activities.

The Committee recommendation is $200,000,000, an increase of $88,000,000 over the budget request of $112,000,000. The budget request of $112,000,000 is not sufficient to reduce the outstanding balance of $1,500,000,000 which is owed for the defense portion of the repository. Eliminating this outstanding balance will require a significant increase in the amount paid each year and could require as much as $500,000,000 annually in future years. Since shipment of defense high level waste to the repository is contingent upon full payment of the balance owed at the time the repository is opened, the Committee believes it is prudent to address this funding shortfall sooner rather than later.

ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE

The Committee recommendation does not include the Administration's proposal to establish an account to fund the Energy Em-

ployees Compensation Initiative. Legislation establishing this program has not been enacted by Congress.

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 activities 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 have been deposited in the Treasury. For fiscal year 2001, the Committee recommendation includes the Administration's proposal to fund purchase power and wheeling from power revenues for the Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and Western Area Power Administration.

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.

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 over 15,000 circuit-miles of transmission line and 324 substations with an installed capacity of 22,500 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 2001, the Committee recommendation includes an additional increment of $331,200,000 in new borrowing authority, the same as the budget request, for transmission system construction, power services, conservation and energy efficiency, and capital equipment programs.

Voluntary Separation Incentives.—The Committee did not include language proposed by the Administration to extend Bonneville's voluntary separation incentives authority until 2005. The Department of Energy has statutory buy-out authority through fiscal year 2003 which can be utilized by Bonneville.

Energy Efficiency Services.—The Committee is concerned that Bonneville is interpreting certain activities as "inherently governmental functions" to the detriment of the private sector. For purposes of meeting energy efficiency goals, as set by statute or executive order, for any federal agency or department, federal funds may be used to contract with the private sector. The provision of energy efficiency products and services to federal agencies or departments shall not be considered to be an "inherently governmental function" as defined under the Federal Acquisition Inventory Reform Act of 1998. Such declaration of energy efficiency products and services as an "inherently governmental function" by any federal agency or department would limit that agency's or department's ability to contract directly with the private sector for such products and services.

Hydropower Technology.—The Department of Energy has been funding research and development activities that will provide a biological and engineering basis for a new generation of hydropower turbines. Successful development will significantly reduce turbine-induced fish mortality. Proof of concept testing of innovative designs selected through a competitive bidding process will be conducted in fiscal year 2001. Federal taxpayers have been funding this program in prior years, and the Committee recommendation includes $3,000,000 in the renewable energy technology program to continue this activity. To reflect the benefits that will accrue to the region upon successful demonstration of this project, the Committee strongly encourages Bonneville to provide $2,000,000 to support the testing of these turbine designs.

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 2001, Bonneville plans to pay the Treasury $620,000,000, of which $163,000,000 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 2001.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2000	$39,579,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	3,900,000
Recommended, 2001	3,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−35,679,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

The Southeastern Power Administration markets hydroelectric power produced at Corps of Engineers projects in 11 southeastern states. There are 23 projects now in operation with an installed capacity of 3,392 megawatts. Southeastern does not own or operate any transmission facilities and carries out its marketing program by utilizing the existing transmission systems of the power utilities in the area. This is accomplished through "wheeling" arrangements between Southeastern and each of the area utilities with transmission lines connected to the projects. The utility agrees to deliver specified amounts of Federal power to customers of the Government, and Southeastern agrees to compensate the utility for the wheeling service performed.

The Committee recommendation is $3,900,000, the same as the budget request. The total program level for Southeastern in fiscal year 2001 is $39,463,000 which is offset by the use of $1,100,000 in prior year balances and $34,463,000 in offsetting collections. Beginning in fiscal year 2001, customer receipts and net billing will pay for purchase power, transmission wheeling, and ancillary services. Purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by receipts of $34,463,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2000	$27,891,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	28,100,000
Recommended, 2001	28,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+209,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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, 46 microwave and VHF radio sites, and 23 substations, and sells its power at wholesale primarily to publicly and cooperatively owned electric distribution utilities.

The Committee recommendation is $28,100,000, the same as the budget request. Beginning in fiscal year 2001, Southwestern will utilize purchase power and wheeling revenues in the amount of $288,000 to finance purchase power and wheeling expenses previously funded by direct appropriations.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Appropriation, 2000	$192,602,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	164,916,000
Recommended, 2001	160,930,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−31,672,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−3,986,000

The Western Area Power Administration is responsible for marketing electric power generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission. 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 16,854 miles of high-voltage transmission lines with 260 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 $160,930,000, a reduction of $3,986,000 from the budget request, and a reduction of $31,672,000 from the amount provided in fiscal year 2000. The use of prior year balances has been increased by $2,986,000 for a total of $8,969,000. The Committee has recommended $4,036,000 for deposit in the Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account, a reduction of $1,000,000 from the budget request.

In fiscal year 2001, revenues collected from purchase power and wheeling sales will finance annual purchase power and wheeling activities previously funded by direct appropriations. Purchase power and wheeling costs will be offset by receipts of $35,500,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

Appropriation, 2000	$1,309,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	2,670,000
Recommended, 2001	2,670,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+1,361,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

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 $2,670,000, the same as the budget request, and $1,361,000 more than the current fiscal year. Extensive rehabilitation to protect critical powerhouse structures will be conducted in fiscal year 2001.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2000	$174,950,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	175,200,000
Recommended, 2001	175,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+250,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

REVENUES APPLIED

Appropriation, 2000	−$174,950,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−175,200,000
Recommended, 2001	−175,200,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−250,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

The Committee recommendation is $175,200,000, the same as the budget request, and an increase of $250,000 over the current year. Revenues are established at a rate equal to the amount provided for program activities, resulting in a net appropriation of zero.

The Committee understands that the Commission is establishing precedent in implementing 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 directs that the agency, in this context, use a methodology that contains a recovery period sufficient to ensure the recovery of all generating asset investments included in state approved rates used to serve the departing customers.

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 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
ENERGY SUPPLY			
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES			
Renewable energy technologies			
Biomass/biofuels energy systems			
Power systems	32,500	48,000	32,000
Transportation	39,500	54,441	42,260
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	72,000	102,441	74,260
Biomass/biofuels energy research	26,740	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass	98,740	129,181	101,000
Geothermal technology development	24,000	27,000	24,000
Hydrogen research	25,000	23,000	22,000
Hydrogen energy research	2,970	2,970	2,970
Subtotal, Hydrogen	27,970	25,970	24,970
Hydropower	5,000	5,000	3,000
Solar energy			
Concentrating solar power	15,410	15,000	6,000
Photovoltaic energy systems	67,000	82,000	67,000
Photovoltaic energy research	2,847	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	69,847	84,847	69,847
Solar building technology research	2,000	4,500	2,000
Solar photoconversion energy research	14,260	14,260	14,260
Subtotal, Solar energy	101,517	118,607	92,107
Wind energy systems	33,000	50,500	33,000
Wind energy research	283	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	33,283	50,783	33,283
Total, Renewable energy technologies	290,510	356,541	278,360
Electric energy systems and storage			
High temperature superconducting R&D	31,910	32,000	28,000
Energy storage systems	3,500	5,000	4,000
Transmission reliability	3,000	11,000	5,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	38,410	48,000	37,000
Renewable support and implementation			
Departmental energy management	---	5,000	2,000
International renewable energy program	4,000	11,500	4,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	1,500	4,000	1,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	4,000	5,000	2,000
Renewable program support	5,000	6,500	4,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation	14,500	32,000	13,000
National renewable energy laboratory	1,100	1,900	4,000
Program direction	17,720	18,159	18,159
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	362,240	456,600	350,519
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
Advanced radioisotope power system	34,500	31,200	29,200
Isotopes			
Isotope support and production	13,000	16,715	22,715
Construction			
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	7,500	500	500
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	20,500	17,215	23,215
Offsetting collections	---	---	-8,000
Total, Isotopes	20,500	17,215	15,215
University reactor fuel assistance and support	12,000	12,000	12,000
Research and development			
Civilian research and development	9,000	---	---
Nuclear energy plant optimization	5,000	5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	22,500	35,000	22,500
Total, Research and development	36,500	40,000	27,500
Infrastructure			
ANL-West operations	---	---	39,150
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	28,000	44,010	39,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Test reactor area landlord	6,070	7,575	7,575
Construction			
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,430	925	925
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,500	500	500
Subtotal, Construction	2,930	1,425	1,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	9,000	9,000	9,000
Total, Infrastructure	37,000	53,010	87,150
Termination costs	80,000	74,000	---
Termination activities			
EBR-II shutdown	---	---	8,800
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	---	---	16,200
Disposition technology activities	---	---	9,850
Total, Termination activities	---	---	34,850
Uranium programs	43,500	53,400	---
Program direction	24,700	27,620	25,900
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	288,700	308,445	231,815
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH			
Environment, safety and health	20,000	20,002	15,002
Program direction	18,998	19,998	19,998
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	38,998	40,000	35,000
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
Technical information management program	1,600	1,802	1,250
Program direction	7,000	7,500	7,350
Total, Technical information management program	8,600	9,302	8,600
Transfer to OSHA	1,000	---	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	9,600	9,302	8,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	699,538	814,347	625,934
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-1,155	---	---
Renewable energy research program	-47,100	-47,100	-47,100
General reduction	-6,000	---	---
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC	-5,821	-12,000	---
Contractor travel savings	-1,500	---	---
Offset from nuclear energy royalties	---	-2,352	-2,352
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	637,962	752,895	576,482
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
Site closure	216,946	81,636	81,636
Site/project completion	95,250	64,721	59,721
Construction			
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL	2,500	---	---
Total, Site/project completion	97,750	64,721	59,721
Post 2006 completion	18,922	139,644	139,644
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-1,268	---	---
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	332,350	286,001	281,001
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND			
Decontamination and decommissioning	220,198	273,038	---
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	30,000	30,000	---
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-951	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	249,247	303,038	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION			
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund			
Decontamination and decommissioning	---	---	230,000
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	---	---	30,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	---	---	260,000
Other Uranium Activities			
Maintenance of facilities and inventories	---	---	29,193
Pre-existing liabilities	---	---	11,330
Depleted UF6 conversion project	---	---	12,877
Total, Other uranium activities	---	---	53,400
Subtotal, Uranium facilities maint & remediation	---	---	313,400
Transfer from USEC	---	---	-12,000
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	---	---	301,400
SCIENCE			
High energy physics			
Research and technology	229,190	237,720	224,820
Facility operations	450,000	444,610	457,510
Construction			
00-G-307 SLAC office building	2,000	5,200	5,200
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	4,700	4,200	4,200
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	22,000	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, Construction	28,700	32,400	32,400
Subtotal, Facility operations	478,700	477,010	489,910
Total, High energy physics	707,890	714,730	714,730
Nuclear physics	352,000	369,890	369,890
Biological and environmental research	441,500	442,760	404,000
Construction			
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	---	2,500	---
Total, Biological and environmental research	441,500	445,260	404,000
Basic energy sciences			
Materials sciences	405,000	456,111	413,000
Chemical sciences	209,582	223,229	209,000
Engineering and geosciences	37,545	40,816	38,000
Energy biosciences	31,000	33,714	31,000
Construction			
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	100,000	261,900	100,000
Total, Basic energy sciences	783,127	1,015,770	791,000
Advanced scientific computing research	132,000	181,970	137,000
Energy research analyses	1,000	1,000	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support			
Infrastructure support	2,160	1,160	1,160
Oak Ridge landlord	11,800	10,711	10,711
Construction			
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	18,351	22,059	22,059
Multiprogram general purpose facilities			
Construction			
94-E-363 Roofing improvements (ORNL)	749	---	---
Total, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. support	33,060	33,930	33,930
Fusion energy sciences program	250,000	247,270	255,000
Safeguards and security	---	---	---
Program direction			
Field offices	78,748	83,307	82,062
Headquarters	52,360	51,438	51,438

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Science education	---	6,500	4,500
Total, Program direction	131,108	141,245	138,000
Subtotal, Science	2,831,685	3,151,065	2,844,550
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-12,224	---	---
Contractor travel savings	-10,834	---	---
General reduction	-21,000	---	-13,635
TOTAL, SCIENCE	2,787,627	3,151,065	2,830,915
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION			
Administrative operations			
Salaries and expenses			
Office of the Secretary	4,940	5,731	5,000
Board of contract appeals	838	878	878
Chief financial officer	26,000	30,748	28,000
Contract reform	3,000	2,500	2,500
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	4,910	5,146	5,000
Economic impact and diversity	4,700	5,126	5,100
Field management	1,000	---	---
General counsel	20,750	22,724	21,800
International affairs	---	9,400	7,000
Management and administration	98,000	78,699	77,800
Policy office	14,000	6,688	6,600
Public affairs	3,700	4,150	3,900
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	181,838	171,790	163,578
Program support			
Minority economic impact	1,700	1,500	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies	350	422	422
Environmental policy studies	1,000	1,600	1,000
Scientific and technical training	450	---	---
Corporate management information program	12,000	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Program support	15,500	15,522	14,922
Total, Administrative operations	197,338	187,312	178,500
Cost of work for others	34,027	34,027	34,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	231,365	221,339	212,527
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-784	---	---
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-15,000	-8,000	-8,000
Transfer from other defense activities	-10,000	---	-51,000
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	205,581	213,339	153,527
Miscellaneous revenues	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	98,694	84,577	42,527
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL			
Office of Inspector General	29,500	33,000	31,500
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stewardship operation and maintenance			
Core stockpile stewardship	1,610,355	---	---
Stockpile management	1,804,621	---	---
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile research and development	---	243,300	243,300
Stockpile maintenance	---	257,994	266,994
Stockpile evaluation	---	151,710	162,710
Dismantlement/disposal	---	29,260	29,260
Production support	---	149,939	149,939
Field engineering, training and manuals	---	4,400	4,400
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	---	836,603	856,603
Campaigns			
Primary certification	---	41,400	41,400
Dynamic materials properties	---	64,408	64,408

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Advanced radiography	---	43,000	43,000
Construction			
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	61,000	35,232	35,232
Subtotal, Advanced radiography	61,000	78,232	78,232
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	---	52,964	52,964
Enhanced surety	---	40,600	40,600
Weapons system engineering certification	---	16,300	16,300
Certification in hostile environments	---	15,400	15,400
Enhanced surveillance	---	89,651	89,651
Advanced design and production technologies	---	75,735	75,735
Inertial confinement fusion	---	120,800	290,500
Construction			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	248,100	74,100	74,100
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	248,100	194,900	364,600
Defense computing and modeling	---	249,100	706,175
Construction			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	---	2,300	2,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,000	5,000	5,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	26,000	56,000	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,800	6,700	6,700
Subtotal, Construction	35,800	70,000	70,000
Subtotal, Defense computing and modeling	35,800	319,100	776,175
Pit manufacturing readiness	---	108,038	110,038
Secondary readiness	---	15,000	15,000
Materials readiness	---	40,511	40,511
Tritium readiness	---	77,000	77,000
Construction			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	33,000	75,000	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	36,000	---	25,000
Subtotal, Construction	69,000	75,000	100,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	69,000	152,000	177,000
Subtotal, Campaigns	413,900	1,304,239	1,958,014
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of facilities	---	1,313,432	1,198,732
Program readiness	---	75,800	75,800
Special projects	---	48,297	31,297
Material recycle and recovery	---	22,018	22,018
Containers	---	7,876	7,876
Storage	---	9,075	9,075
Advanced simulation and computing	---	477,075	---
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	---	1,953,573	1,344,798
Construction			
01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design, various locations	---	14,500	14,500
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	17,800	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	3,000	3,000
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	3,900	---	---
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	5,000	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,400	2,800	2,800
99-D-105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	1,000	---	---
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,500	5,200	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	5,000	2,000	2,000
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,700	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
99-D-125 Replace boilers and controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	---	13,000	13,000
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	17,000	23,765	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	3,429	4,998	4,998
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	21,800	30,767	30,767
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	3,150	---	---
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	4,800	2,918	2,918
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization (Phase VI), various locations	2,640	---	---
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory (SNL)	10,900	---	---
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	15,000	13,337	13,337
Subtotal, Construction	111,219	139,085	139,085
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	111,219	2,092,658	1,483,883
Total, Stewardship operation and maintenance	3,940,095	4,233,500	4,298,500
Inertial fusion	227,600	---	---
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	14,500	---	---
Education	18,600	---	---
Total, Technology transfer/education	33,100	---	---
Transportation safeguards division			
Operations and equipment	60,000	79,357	79,357
Program direction	31,812	36,316	36,316
Total, Transportation safeguards division	91,812	115,673	115,673
Safeguards and security	---	---	---
Construction			
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	11,300	18,043	18,043
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,500	2,713	2,713
Subtotal, Construction	14,800	20,756	20,756
Total, Safeguards and security	14,800	20,756	20,756
Program direction	209,000	224,071	216,871
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,516,407	4,594,000	4,651,800
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-16,887	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-7,668	---	---
Contractor travel savings	-30,000	---	---
Directed savings	-5,000	---	---
General reduction	-29,800	---	-26,116
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,427,052	4,594,000	4,625,684
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	215,000	225,990	215,000
Construction			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	6,000	7,000	7,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	221,000	232,990	222,000
Arms control	281,000	123,014	141,514
International materials protection, control, and accounting	---	149,856	169,856
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia	---	100,000	---
HEU transparency implementation	15,750	15,190	15,190
International nuclear safety	15,000	20,000	20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Fissile materials disposition	134,766	---	---
U.S. surplus materials disposition	---	135,517	139,517
Russian surplus materials disposition	---	40,000	40,000
Program direction - MD	7,343	9,918	---
Construction			
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	---	---	20,932
01-D-142 Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	---	3,000	3,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	18,751	20,000	20,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations	12,375	15,000	18,000
Subtotal, Construction	31,126	38,000	61,932
Total, Fissile materials disposition	173,235	223,435	241,449
Program direction	89,000	41,550	51,468
Use of prior year balances	-49,000	---	---
Directed savings	-5,000	---	---
Contractor travel savings	-11,885	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	729,100	906,035	861,477
NAVAL REACTORS			
Naval reactors development	633,000	627,500	627,500
Construction			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations.	9,000	11,400	11,400
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	---	1,300	1,300
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	3,000	---	---
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	12,000	16,000	16,000
Subtotal, Construction	24,000	28,700	28,700
Total, Naval reactors development	657,000	656,200	656,200
Program direction	20,600	21,400	21,400
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	677,600	677,600	677,600
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	5,833,752	6,177,635	6,164,761
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	902,002	901,475	900,167
Construction			
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID	---	500	500
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	---	27,932	---
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	3,100	7,714	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	5,000	4,300	4,300
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	2,977	---	---
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	16,860	1,690	1,690
98-D-700 Road rehabilitation (INEL), ID	2,590	---	---
97-D-450 Savannah River nuclear material storage, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	4,000	---	---
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	12,220	3,949	3,949
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	20,941	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho chemical processing plant (INEL), ID	11,971	---	---
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	931	12,512	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC	---	8,879	8,879
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility (LLNL), Livermore, CA	2,000	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Construction	82,590	69,476	41,544
Total, Site/project completion	984,592	970,951	941,711
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,511,997	2,588,725	2,548,033
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	420,000	420,000
Construction			
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	---	1,300	1,300
00-D-401 Spent Nuclear Fuel treatment and storage facility Title I & II, Savannah River, SC	7,000	---	---
99-D-403 Privatization Phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	13,988	7,812	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	20,516	46,023	46,023
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	4,060	17,385	17,385
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	8,987	27,212	27,212
Subtotal, Construction	54,551	99,732	99,732
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,986,548	3,108,457	3,067,765
Science and technology	230,500	196,548	242,548
Safeguards and security	---	---	---
Program direction	339,409	359,888	355,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,541,049	4,635,844	4,607,024
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-17,041	---	---
Use of prior year balances/general reduction	-40,000	-34,317	-34,317
Contractor travel savings	-6,000	---	---
Pension refund	-8,700	-50,000	-50,000
Directed savings	-2,000	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,467,308	4,551,527	4,522,707
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS			
Site closure	1,064,492	1,082,297	1,082,297
Safeguards and security	---	---	---
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-4,045	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,060,447	1,082,297	1,082,297
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	233,000	540,092	284,092
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-718	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-44,000	-25,092	-25,092
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	188,282	515,000	259,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	5,716,037	6,148,824	5,864,004
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Other national security programs			
Security and emergency operations			
Nuclear safeguards	69,100	124,409	116,409
Security investigations	33,000	33,000	33,000
Emergency management	21,000	93,600	90,000
Program direction	---	89,367	92,967
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations	123,100	340,376	332,376

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
Intelligence	36,059	36,059	36,059
Construction			
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	---	2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Intelligence	36,059	38,059	38,059
Counterintelligence	39,200	45,200	45,200
Independent oversight and performance assurance	3,000	---	---
Program direction	2,000	14,937	14,937
Subtotal, Independent oversight	5,000	14,937	14,937
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	73,231	86,446	80,559
Program direction - EH	24,769	22,604	22,604
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	98,000	109,050	103,163
Worker and community transition	21,000	21,500	21,500
Program direction - WT	3,500	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	24,500	24,500	24,500
National Security programs administrative support	10,000	---	51,000
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other national security programs	338,859	575,122	612,235
Contractor travel savings	-1,115	---	---
Total, Other national security programs	337,744	575,122	612,235
Subtotal, Other defense activities	337,744	575,122	612,235
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-6,545	---	---
Offset to user organizations	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Directed savings	-2,000	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	309,199	555,122	592,235
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	112,000	200,000
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-426	---	---
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	111,574	112,000	200,000
ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE			
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund	---	12,800	---
Energy employees pilot project	---	2,000	---
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund	---	2,200	---
TOTAL, ENERGY EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION INITIATIVE	---	17,000	---
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,970,562	13,010,581	12,821,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS			
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Purchase power and wheeling	34,867	34,463	34,463
Program direction	4,727	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,594	39,463	39,463
Offsetting collections	---	-34,463	-34,463
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-15	---	---
Use of prior year balances	---	-1,100	-1,100
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	39,579	3,900	3,900
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Operating expenses	3,625	3,795	3,795
Purchase power and wheeling	833	288	288
Program direction	17,631	18,388	18,388
Construction	6,684	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	28,773	29,288	29,288
Offsetting collections	---	-288	-288
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-109	---	---
Transfer from Southeastern Power	-773	---	---
Use of prior year balances	---	-900	-900
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	27,891	28,100	28,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	FY 2000 ENACTED	BUDGET ESTIMATE	HOUSE ALLOWANCE
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION			
Operation and maintenance			
Construction and rehabilitation	26,802	23,115	23,115
System operation and maintenance	35,096	36,104	36,104
Purchase power and wheeling	41,886	35,500	35,500
Program direction	104,537	106,644	106,644
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,036	5,036	4,036
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	213,357	206,399	205,399
Offsetting collections	---	-35,500	-35,500
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-755	---	---
Use of prior year balances	-20,000	-5,983	-8,969
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	192,602	164,916	160,930
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND			
Operation and maintenance	1,309	2,670	2,670
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	261,381	199,586	195,600
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION			
Federal energy regulatory commission	174,950	175,200	175,200
FERC revenues	-174,950	-175,200	-175,200
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---	---
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Repository program	180,689	261,872	150,200
Program direction	59,811	63,628	62,800
Across-the-board cut (.38%) (P.L. 106-113)	-899	---	---
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	239,601	325,500	213,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	16,606,924	18,146,243	17,293,425

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 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 $24,500,000 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 Na-

tional 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 been 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.

Laboratory Directed Research and Development.—Section 307 provides that not more than four percent of the funds in this Act may be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD). The same limitation was enacted in fiscal year 2000. Department of Energy laboratory directors are allowed to take up to four 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. The Committee expects the Department to exert substantial oversight over the use of these funds.

Contractor Travel.—Section 308 provides that not more than $150,000,000 of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Energy are available for reimbursement of contractor travel expenses. Contractor travel funding was limited in fiscal year 2000 to $150,000,000 after a General Accounting Report identified significant travel abuses including one national laboratory that was averaging over 80 trips a week to Washington. Even with the reduction in funding in fiscal year 2000, data provided through February 2000 on contractor travel indicates that the same weapons laboratory is still averaging about 70 trips a week to Washington. The Committee strongly urges the Department to review the need for this many trips to Washington and ensure that contractor travel for specific program needs throughout the nuclear weapons complex is not being curtailed by excess management trips to Washington.

Limitation on Bonneville Power Administration.—Section 309 provides that none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Federal Salaries and Expenses.—Section 310 provides that none of the funds provided to the Department of Energy's Working Capital Fund in this or any previous Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act may be used to pay the salary and expenses of any United States Government employee. The Committee has made a strong effort to improve oversight and accountability of Federal employee costs by requiring the Department to consolidate all Federal salaries and expenses in separate accounts in the budget. The Committee is concerned that the Department is considering violating this provision by taxing programs for Federal salaries. This provision prohibits any taxing of program dollars to pay Federal salaries and expenses.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2000	$66,149,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	71,400,000
Recommended, 2001	63,000,000
Comparison:.	
Appropriation, 2000	−3,149,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−8,400,000

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 $63,000,000, a reduction of $8,400,000 from the budget request due to funding constraints.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 2000	$16,935,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	18,500,000
Recommended, 2001	17,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	65,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−1,500,000

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

Consistent with the recommendation in the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization bill, the Committee recommends $17,000,000, a decrease of $1,500,000 from the budget request of $18,500,000.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

Appropriation, 2000	.....
Budget Estimate, 2001	$30,000,000
Recommended, 2001	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	.....
Budget Estimate, 2001	−30,000,000

The Committee recommends no funding for the proposed Delta Regional Authority. Congress has not passed legislation authorizing establishment of this new Authority.

DENALI COMMISSION

Appropriation, 2000	$19,924,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	20,000,000
Recommended, 2001	.....
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−19,924,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−20,000,000

The Committee has recommended no funding for the Denali Commission in fiscal year 2001.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2000	$464,913,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	481,900,000
Recommended, 2001	481,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+16,987,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	.....

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2000	−$442,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−447,958,000
Recommended, 2001	−457,100,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−15,100,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−9,142,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2000	$22,913,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	33,942,000
Recommended, 2001	24,800,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	+1,887,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−9,142,000

The Committee recommendation for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is $481,900,000, the same as the budget request. This amount is offset by revenues of $457,100,000, resulting in a net appropriation of $24,800,000. The recommendation includes $21,600,000 to be made available from the Nuclear Waste Fund to support the Department of Energy's efforts to characterize Yucca Mountain as a potential site for a permanent nuclear waste repository. An additional $3,200,000 is made available from the General Fund for assistance provided to other Federal agencies and States including the Commission's work related to the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System under development by the Department of Energy.

The Committee congratulates the Commission for issuing the first license renewal of a nuclear power plant in the U.S. this year. The Committee notes that the Commission is making many changes and has responded positively to a number of issues that Congress has raised over the last few years. The Commissioners in-

dividually, and the Commission staff, are to be commended for the time and effort taken to implement a broad reform agenda.

Extension of authority to collect fees.—The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended, requires that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission recover 100 percent of its budget authority, less the appropriations from the Nuclear Waste Fund and the General Fund, by assessing license and annual fees. 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.

Revenues.—The Administration proposed to reduce the fee recovery requirement from 100 percent to 98 percent in fiscal year 2001, and further decrease the fee by an additional two percent per year until the fee recovery requirement was reduced to 90 percent in 2005. This proposal addressed fairness and equity concerns relating to charging NRC licensees for agency expenses which do not provide a direct benefit to them. While the Committee sees the merit in this proposal, it is a legislative issue which should be addressed by the authorizing committee. Thus, the Committee has not provided for this reduction in revenues.

Russian programs.—The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has provided valuable assistance in the U.S. nuclear safety assistance program for Soviet-designed nuclear power reactors. However, an April 2000 report by the General Accounting Office found that "the lack of coordination and communication between different NRC offices", and lack of a coherent planning strategy contributed to large unobligated balances in the program. The Committee understands that the Commission has taken steps to consolidate these nuclear safety assistance activities under one organization. The Committee emphasizes the need to have a focused approach in mitigating safety issues surrounding the Soviet-designed reactors, in order to accomplish program goals and complete the program in a timely, cost-effective manner.

Monthly report.—The Committee directs the Commission to continue to provide monthly reports on the status of its licensing and regulatory duties.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

GROSS APPROPRIATION

Appropriation, 2000	$5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	6,200,000
Recommended, 2001	5,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	500,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−700,000

REVENUES

Appropriation, 2000	$5,000,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−6,076,000
Recommended, 2001	−5,500,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	−500,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	576,000

This appropriation provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Pursuant to law, budget authority appropriated to the Inspector General must be recovered through the assessment of license and annual fees. Statutory language proposed by the Administration has been included that identifies licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections as the source of revenues to be retained and made available until expended.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $5,500,000, a reduction of $700,000 from the budget request. However, this is $500,000 more than the current fiscal year, or a 10 percent increase. The revenue estimate has also been reduced to $5,500,000, a reduction of $576,000 from the budget request. 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, 2000	−$2,589,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	3,200,000
Recommended, 2001	2,700,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 2000	111,000
Budget Estimate, 2001	−500,000

The Committee recommendation provides continued funding for the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act 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 $2,700,000, a reduction of $500,000 from the budget request.

TITLE V

RESCISSION

INTERIM STORAGE ACTIVITIES

(RESCISSION)

The Committee recommendation includes a rescission of $85,000,000 as proposed by the Administration. In Public Law 104–46, the Fiscal Year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, Congress set aside $85,000,000 in the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal appropriation account for activities to support interim storage of civilian spent nuclear fuel. These funds have remained unobligated and are now available to be rescinded.

TITLE VI

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 601 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 602 requires that American-made equipment and goods be purchased to the greatest extent practicable.

Drainage of the San Luis Unit.—Section 603 provides language clarifying the funding requirements for the San Luis Unit.

Extension of Authority for Nuclear Regulatory Commission to Collect Fees and Charges.—Section 604 provides a one-year extension of the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees and charges to offset appropriated funds.

Kyoto Protocol.—Section 605 prohibits the use of funds to take certain actions for the purpose of implementing, or in contemplation of preparing to implement, the Kyoto Protocol. Although the agency may under the current prohibition continue to conduct educational seminars and activities, it should ensure balance in those programs. Balance does not mean merely that there is an acknowledgment of viewpoints different from those of the Administration, but that qualified representatives of those viewpoints are included in the programs and in numbers roughly equal to the participants representing the Administration's positions. One dissenting voice in what is otherwise an obviously stacked or biased program does not constitute balance.

The bill language is intended to prohibit funds provided in this bill from being used to implement actions called for under the Kyoto Protocol, prior to its ratification. The bill language prohibits the proposing or issuing of rules, regulations, decrees, or orders, for the purpose of implementing, or in preparation of implementing, the Kyoto Protocol.

The Byrd-Hagel Resolution (S. Res. 98), which passed with a vote of 95–0 in July 1997, remains the clearest statement of the will of the Senate with regard to the Kyoto Protocol. Through the prohibition contained herein, the Committee is committed to ensuring that the Administration not implement the Kyoto Protocol without prior Congressional consent, including approval of any implementing legislation, regulation, programs, or initiatives.

Energy Policy and Conservation Act Amendment.—Section 606 amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act by authorizing ap-

propriations for fiscal year 2001 and changing the expiration date to September 30, 2001.

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 [1]	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	21,743	22,025	21,743	21,933
Mandatory	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Includes outlays scored in the House passed FY 2000 supplemental.

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	21,743
Outlays:	
2001	13,950
2002	6,678
2003	1,123
2004	9
2005 and beyond	14

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	68
Fiscal year 2001 outlays resulting therefrom	12

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.

Under Title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Water and Related Resources:

> * * * of which $1,916,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $33,667,000 shall be available for transfer to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund: of which such amounts as may be necessary may be advanced to the Colorado River Dam Fund; and of which is not to exceed $200,000 for financial assistance for the preparation of cooperative drought contingency plans under Title II of Public Law 102–250: *Provided,* That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriations under this heading: * * *

Under Title III, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation:

> * * * of which $12,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the United States Enrichment Corporation Fund: * * *

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.

Under Title V, Rescissions, Interim Storage Activities:

> Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 104–46 for interim storage of nuclear waste, $85,000,000 are transferred to this heading: * * *

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:

Rescission Recommended in the Bill

Department or Activity	*Amount*
Department of Energy, Interim Storage Activities	$85,000,000

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 which provides that the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study in New Mexico shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis bases on certain restrictive policies.

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 is provided under Construction, General earmarking specific amounts for the San Timoteo Creek, Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Southern and Eastern Kentucky, and certain elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River projects. Language has also been included under Construction, General directing the Secretary of the Army to proceed with the Town of Martin, Kentucky, project in accordance with a specific plan and directing the Secretary of the Army to undertake the Bowie County Levee, Texas, project in accordance with a specific plan.

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 included under the Regulatory Program which directs the Corps of Engineers to: (1) revise a cost analysis of modi-

fied nationwide permits based on promulgated rules rather than proposed rules; (2) prepare a plan to manage and reduce backlog associated with new and replacement permits issued on March 9, 2000, and develop criteria to measure progress in reducing the backlog; (3) provide quarterly reporting on program performance based on the above criteria; (4) provide quarterly reporting, on a one year pilot basis, of all Regulatory Analysis and Management System data for South Pacific Division; (5) publish in Division Office websites decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process and allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the appeals conference; and (6) record in its data base the dates of initial permit application or notification.

Language has been included under General Expenses regarding support of the Coastal Engineering Research Board, the Humphreys Engineer Center Support 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 has been included under the Revolving Fund which provides that funds available in the Corps of Engineers Revolving Fund may be used for the costs of relocating the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers headquarters to office space in the General Accounting Office headquarters building in Washington, D.C.

Language has been included under Administrative Provision providing that funds are available for purchase and hire of motor vehicles.

Language is included under General Provisions in section 101 which extends the authorization for spending Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund receipts through fiscal year 2001 and in section 102 which provides for the transfer of responsibility of local sponsorship of recreation development at Joe Pool Lake, Texas from the Trinity River Authority to the City of Grand Prairie, Texas.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE 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 are available for financial assistance for the preparation of cooperative drought emergency plans. Language is included under Water and

Related Resources providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund or 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 is included under Water and Related Resources amending the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act and increasing the amount authorized for the Minidoka project in Idaho. Language is included under Water and Related Resources which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation for closure of the Auburn Dam diversion tunnel or restoration of the American River channel through the Auburn Dam construction site.

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 Policy and Administration providing that funds may be derived from the Reclamation Fund and providing that no part of any other appropriation in the Act may be used for activities budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

Language has been provided under General Provisions in section 201 prohibiting the use of funds to purchase or lease water in the Middle Rio Grande or Carlsbad projects in New Mexico unless certain requirements are met and in section 202 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to assess and collect funds from Central Valley Project water and power contractors and remit the amount collected to the Trinity Public Utilities District.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Language has been included under Energy Supply providing that royalties received to compensate the Department of Energy for its participation in the First-Of-A-Kind-Engineering program shall be credited to this account.

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal providing that funds appropriated to the State of Nevada shall be made solely to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management for oversight activities, that within 90 days of completion of the fiscal year the State and local entities must certify that all funds were expended for authorized activities, and that none of the funds may be used to influence legislation pending before Congress or a State legislature.

Language has been included under Nuclear Waste Disposal making any proceeds and recoveries from the sale of assets estimated at $1,000,000 available for use in the program.

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 use 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 is included in Weapons Activities and Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation limiting the availability of funds until October 1, 2003.

Language has been included under Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation providing not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses for national security and nonproliferation activities.

Language has been included under Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management providing that amounts appropriated for economic assistance shall be used to the extent necessary to reimburse costs of financial assurances required of a contractor by any permit or license of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant issued by the State of New Mexico.

Language has been included under the Bonneville Power Administration account approving the Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program and the Cour D'Alene Tribe Trout Production facility; providing not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses; and precluding any new direct loan obligations.

Language has been included under Southeastern Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration to permit Southwestern to utilize reimbursements, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and to provide not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses. This language has been carried in previous appropriations Acts.

Language has been included under Southwestern Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under the Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration account providing $4,036,000 for deposit into the Utah Reclamation mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to Title IV

of the Reclamation Projects Act of 1992, and not to exceed $1,500 for official reception and representation expenses.

Language has been included under Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance, Western Area Power Administration providing that, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to the account as offsetting collections and remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

Language has been included under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to permit the hire of passenger motor vehicles, to provide official reception and representation expenses, and to permit the use of revenues collected to reduce the appropriation as revenues are received. This language has been included in previous appropriations Acts.

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, limiting to 4 percent the use of funds for Laboratory Directed Research and Development.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, limiting to no more than $150,000,000 the funds available for reimbursement of contractor travel expenses.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Language has been included under Department of Energy, General Provisions, prohibiting the use of Working Capital Funds to pay the salaries of any United States Government employee.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Language has been included under the Nuclear Regulatory Commission providing $15,000 for official representation expenses, and excluding the costs for regulatory reviews and assistance to other Federal agencies and States 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 VI—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, and 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 providing that none of the funds shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation or preparation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Language has been included under General Provisions amending the Energy Policy and Conservation Act by authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 and changing the expiration date to September 30, 2001.

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:
  Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program
Department of Energy:
  Energy Supply
  Non-Defense Environmental Management
  Science
  Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation

Nuclear Waste Disposal
Departmental Administration
Office of the Inspector General
Weapons Activities
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation
Naval Reactors
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 amend 16 U.S.C. 777c(a) as follows:

(a) INITIAL DISTRIBUTION—The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute 18 per centum of each annual appropriation made in accordance with the provisions of section 777b of this title as provided in the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (title III, Public Law 101–646) (16 U.S.C. 3951 et seq.). Notwithstanding the provisions of section 777b of this title, such sums shall remain available to carry out such Act through fiscal year [2000] *2001*.

The accompanying bill would amend section 301 of Public Law 102–250, the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in section 2243 of this title (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than $90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1999, [and 2000] *2000, and 2001*.

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, 2000"] "*September 30, 2001*."

The accompanying bill would amend Section 166 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6246) as follows:

Sec. 166. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 2000 *and 2001* such sums as may be necessary to implement this part[, to remain available only through March 31, 2000].

The accompanying bill would amend Section 181 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6251) as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, all authority under any provision of this subchapter and any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to such authority, shall expire at midnight, [March 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001*, but such expiration shall not affect any action or pending proceedings, civil or criminal, not finally determined on such date, nor any action or proceeding based upon any act committed prior to midnight, [March 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001*.

The accompanying bill would amend Section 281 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6285) as follows:

Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, all authority under any provision of this subchapter and any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to such authority, shall expire at midnight, [March 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001*, but such expiration shall not affect any action or pending proceedings, civil or criminal, not finally determined on such date, nor any action or proceeding based upon any act committed prior to midnight, [March 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001*.

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 rollcall 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: June 20, 2000.

Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Visclosky.

Description of motion: To perfect an amendment offered by Mr. Packard requiring Corps of Engineers Divisions to publish on websites all findings, rulings, decisions, and opinions rendered under the administrative appeals process by striking "findings, rulings, decisions, and opinions rendered" and inserting "key summary data and final appeal decision documents".

Results: Rejected 21 yeas to 32 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Bonilla
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Boyd
Mr. Farr	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Cramer
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Edwards
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Goode
Mrs. Lowey	Ms. Granger
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Hobson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Obey	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Olver	Mr. Latham
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Price	Mr. Miller
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Packard
Mr. Visclosky	Mr. Pastor
	Mr. Porter
	Mr. Regula
	Mr. Rogers
	Mr. Skeen
	Mr. Sununu
	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 rollcall 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: June 20, 2000.

Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Mr. Visclosky.

Description of motion: To replace language in the Committee report regarding the Kyoto Protocol with new report language.

Results: Rejected 27 yeas to 28 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Dixon	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Edwards	Mr. Goode
Mr. Farr	Ms. Granger
Mr. Forbes	Mr. Kingston
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Jackson	Mr. Latham
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Lewis
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Miller
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Nethercutt
Mrs. Meek	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Mollohan	Mr. Packard
Mr. Moran	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Murtha	Mr. Regula
Mr. Obey	Mr. Rogers
Mr. Olver	Mr. Skeen
Mr. Pastor	Mr. Sununu
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Porter	Mr. Tiahrt
Mr. Price	Mr. Walsh
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Wamp
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Wicker
Mr. Visclosky	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 rollcall 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. 3

Date: June 20, 2000.

Measure: Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

Motion by: Ms. Kaptur.

Description of motion: To increase the amount appropriated for renewable energy programs by $106,000,000.

Results: Rejected 21 yeas to 32 nays.

Members Voting Yea	*Members Voting Nay*
Mr. Boyd	Mr. Aderholt
Mr. Cramer	Mr. Bonilla
Ms. DeLauro	Mr. Callahan
Mr. Dicks	Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Edwards	Mr. DeLay
Mr. Farr	Mr. Dickey
Mr. Hinchey	Mr. Frelinghuysen
Mr. Hoyer	Mr. Goode
Mr. Jackson	Ms. Granger
Ms. Kaptur	Mr. Hobson
Ms. Kilpatrick	Mr. Kingston
Mrs. Lowey	Mr. Knollenberg
Mrs. Meek	Mr. Kolbe
Mr. Moran	Mr. Latham
Mr. Obey	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Olver	Mr. Miller
Ms. Pelosi	Mr. Nethercutt
Mr. Price	Mrs. Northup
Mr. Sabo	Mr. Packard
Mr. Serrano	Mr. Peterson
Mr. Visclosky	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 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations	161,994	137,700	153,327	-8,667	+15,627
Construction, general	1,385,032	1,346,000	1,378,430	-6,602	+32,430
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee	309,416	309,000	323,350	+13,934	+14,350
Operation and maintenance, general	1,853,618	1,854,000	1,854,000	+382	.....
Regulatory program	117,000	125,000	125,000	+8,000	.....
FUSRAP	150,000	140,000	140,000	-10,000	.....
General expenses	149,500	152,000	149,500	.....	-2,500
Total, title I, Department of Defense - Civil	4,126,560	4,063,700	4,123,607	-2,953	+59,907
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Central Utah Project Completion Account					
Central Utah project construction	22,436	19,566	19,566	-2,870	.....
Fish, wildlife, and recreation mitigation and conservation	10,476	14,158	14,158	+3,682	.....
Utah reclamation mitigation and conservation account	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
Subtotal	37,912	38,724	38,724	+812	.....

Program oversight and administration	1,321	1,216	1,216	-105	.....
Total, Central Utah project completion account	39,233	39,940	39,940	+707	.....
Bureau of Reclamation					
Water and related resources	605,992	643,058	635,777	+29,785	-7,281
Loan program	11,577	9,369	9,369	-2,208	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(43,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(-16,000)	.....
Central Valley project restoration fund	42,000	38,382	38,382	-3,618	.....
California Bay-Delta ecosystem restoration	60,000	60,000	.....	-60,000	-60,000
Policy and administration	47,000	50,224	47,000	.....	-3,224
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	766,569	801,033	730,528	-36,041	-70,505
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	805,802	840,973	770,468	-35,334	-70,505
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Energy supply	637,962	752,895	576,482	-61,480	-176,413
(By transfer)	(5,821)	.....	.....	(-5,821)	.....
Non-defense environmental management	332,350	286,001	281,001	-51,349	-5,000
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund	249,247	303,038	.....	-249,247	-303,038
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation	.....	.....	301,400	+301,400	+301,400
Science	2,787,627	3,151,065	2,830,915	+43,288	-320,150
Nuclear Waste Disposal	239,601	325,500	213,000	-26,601	-112,500
Departmental administration	205,581	213,339	153,527	-52,054	-59,812
Miscellaneous revenues	-106,887	-128,762	-111,000	-4,113	+17,762
Net appropriation	98,694	84,577	42,527	-56,167	-42,050
Office of the Inspector General	29,500	33,000	31,500	+2,000	-1,500

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Environmental restoration and waste management:					
Defense function	(5,716,037)	(6,148,824)	(5,864,004)	(+147,967)	(-284,820)
Non-defense function	(581,597)	(589,039)	(582,401)	(+804)	(-6,638)
Total	(6,297,634)	(6,737,863)	(6,446,405)	(+148,771)	(-291,458)
Atomic Energy Defense Activities					
National Nuclear Security Administration:					
Weapons activities	4,427,052	4,594,000	4,625,684	+198,632	+31,684
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	729,100	906,035	861,477	+132,377	-44,558
Naval reactors	677,600	677,600	677,600	.....	.....
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	5,833,752	6,177,635	6,164,761	+331,009	-12,874
Defense environmental restoration and waste management	4,467,308	4,551,527	4,522,707	+55,399	-28,820
Defense facilities closure projects	1,060,447	1,082,297	1,082,297	+21,850	.....
Defense environmental management privatization	188,282	515,000	259,000	+70,718	-256,000
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,716,037	6,148,824	5,864,004	+147,967	-284,820
Other defense activities	309,199	555,122	592,235	+283,036	+37,113
Defense nuclear waste disposal	111,574	112,000	200,000	+88,426	+88,000
Energy employees compensation initiative (proposal)	.....	17,000	.....	.....	-17,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	11,970,562	13,010,581	12,821,000	+850,438	-189,581

Power Marketing Administrations					
Operation and maintenance, Southeastern Power Administration	39,579	3,900	3,900	-35,679	.....
Operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration	27,891	28,100	28,100	+209	.....
(By transfer)	(773)	.....	.....	(-773)	.....
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration	192,602	164,916	160,930	-31,672	-3,986
Falcon and Amistad operating and maintenance fund	1,309	2,670	2,670	+1,361	.....
Total, Power Marketing Administrations	261,381	199,586	195,600	-65,781	-3,986
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission					
Salaries and expenses	174,950	175,200	175,200	+250	.....
Revenues applied	-174,950	-175,200	-175,200	-250	.....
Total, title III, Department of Energy	16,606,924	18,146,243	17,293,425	+686,501	-852,818
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Appalachian Regional Commission	66,149	71,400	63,000	-3,149	-8,400
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	16,935	18,500	17,000	+65	-1,500
Delta Regional Authority	.....	30,000	.....	.....	-30,000
Denali Commission	19,924	20,000	.....	-19,924	-20,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	464,913	481,900	481,900	+16,987	.....
Revenues	-442,000	-447,958	-457,100	-15,100	-9,142
Subtotal	22,913	33,942	24,800	+1,887	-9,142

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 2000 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2001—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Inspector General	5,000	6,200	5,500	+500	-700
Revenues	-5,000	-6,076	-5,500	-500	+576
Subtotal	.....	124	.....	.....	-124
Total	22,913	34,066	24,800	+1,887	-9,266
Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board	2,589	3,200	2,700	+111	-500
Total, title IV, Independent agencies	128,510	177,166	107,500	-21,010	-69,666
TITLE V - RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Corps of Engineers - Civil					
General investigations (rescission)	-930	.....	.....	+930	.....
Construction, general (rescission)	-12,819	.....	.....	+12,819	.....
Total, Corps of Engineers - Civil	-13,749	.....	.....	+13,749	.....
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY					
Nuclear Waste Disposal (rescission)	-4,000	.....	.....	+4,000	.....
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	.....	-85,000	-85,000	-85,000	.....

Power Marketing Administrations					
Southeastern Power Administration:					
Purchase power and wheeling (rescission)	-3,000	.....	.....	+3,000	.....
Total, title V, Rescissions	-20,749	-85,000	-85,000	-64,251	.....
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	21,647,047	23,143,082	22,210,000	+562,953	-933,082
Appropriations	(21,667,796)	(23,228,082)	(22,295,000)	(+627,204)	(-933,082)
Rescissions	(-20,749)	(-85,000)	(-85,000)	(-64,251)	.....
(By transfer)	(6,594)	.....	.....	(-6,594)	.....

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY AND HON. DAVID R. OBEY

We submit these additional views on the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The bill includes substantial funding for programs, projects, and initiatives within the Department of Energy and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. While the bill maintains the status quo related to these two agencies of the federal government, it fails to address the fundamental problem of continued under-investment of federal resources in science research and physical infrastructure. These two areas are suffering considerably after years of constrained budget levels.

Particular concern must be given to the failure of the Congress and the Administration to provide new resources to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. For example, in the thirty years from the mid-1960s to the late 1990s, the average annual funding (in 1999 dollars) for the general construction account in the bill has eroded in value from $5.5 billion to $1.4 billion. Since 1965, the civil works budget has continually become a smaller percentage of both the total federal budget and the Gross Domestic Product. Since 1955, civil works appropriations have not exceeded 1.1 percent of the budget. Today, they represent about 0.2 percent of all federal outlays.

As Corps spending power has fallen, Congress has authorized billions of dollars in new projects that have not been funded through the appropriations process. Administration officials testified earlier this year that $30 billion in authorized water projects were on the books waiting for funding. These projects, if funded by the government, would return two dollars in new benefits for each dollar expended constructing the project. We are also slipping behind maintaining our aging water infrastructure. The Corps estimates that the backlog of critical deferred maintenance at Corps facilities is expected to grow to $450 million in fiscal year 2001.

We are extremely concerned about the ongoing efforts to hamstring the Corps of Engineers regulatory program. On June 7, 2000, the Corps of Engineers made effective new nationwide permits designed to ensure that federal regulations are in compliance with the statutory requirements of the Clean Water Act. These new permits have been criticized by some in the regulated community as possibly extending the timeline for permit approvals by the Corps. Given that concern, we fail to see the reason the majority refused to include the funding the Corps needs to prevent additional delays in permit approval timelines. The Corps testified that it needed an additional $6 million over the budget request to prevent any delay in permit approval timelines. The majority did not include this funding.

In addition, the majority has included several new legislative provisions (unfunded mandates) directing the Corps to change a

number of its policies and procedures. Although we are greatly concerned about how these new mandates will affect Corps personnel and workload, we are particularly upset about language in the bill arbitrarily ordering the Corps to recalculate the way in which permit approval timelines are calculated. The bill proposes to change the date on which a permit application is considered filed with the government, from the day in which all aspects of the application are fully completed, to the day when a first-draft application is initially sent to the Corps.

This provision will artificially cause it to appear that the length of time a permit application is awaiting approval from the government has substantially increased overnight. We would not be surprised if members of the regulated community at some future date attempt to argue that the new nationwide permits are responsible for statistically higher permit approval timelines. The simple fact is that if Congress (1) arbitrarily changes the date permit applications are considered to be in the system; (2) refuses to fully fund the regulatory program at the needed level; and (3) imposes new unfunded mandates on regulatory staff, then permit approval timelines will inevitably lengthen. The problem will not be the new nationwide permits but rather the failure of Congress to help the Corps regulatory staff do its job and the statutory language artificially changing the way timelines are calculated.

During full committee consideration of the bill, the majority offered an amendment, (Roll Call No. 1), to improve bill language proposed by the majority imposing a new mandate on the Corps regulatory program. The fact that the amendment was rejected demonstrates to us that the majority is more interested in imposing new burdens on the Corps than solving the problem of wetlands destruction in the United States.

The bill also contains inadequate funding levels for basic science research and an anti-environmental rider related to the Kyoto Protocol. An amendment (Roll Call No. 2) was offered to strike language in the report that the minority considered too restrictive on the ability of the government to implement programs and initiatives authorized under current U.S. laws. The escalating emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere is an environmental issue that demands federal involvement. The language in the report to which we object would instruct the Department of Energy to refrain from working on any authorized programs or initiatives designed to improve our environment or reduce greenhouse gas emissions if similar measures or methods are called for in any Kyoto Protocol document. The report language is not acceptable to the minority.

The funding levels for basic science research are inadequate to advance scientific endeavors in which the government should be investing. In particular, nanotechnology research (the manipulation of matter on the atomic and molecular levels) represents a high-payoff field with potential benefits rivaling those of the integrated circuit chip. The bill fails to support the President's budget request for nanotechnology, advanced supercomputer research, spallation neutron source, renewable energy research, and other important scientific initiatives.

We would also note our continued opposition to the unrealistic and inadequate Congressional Budget Resolution and the 302(b) allocations provided to the committee. The funding levels contained in the bill do not provide the appropriate level of investment needed for the critical national programs encompassed in the bill.

PETER J. VISCLOSKY.
DAVE OBEY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. DAVID OBEY, HON. MARCY KAPTUR, AND HON. CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK

Despite the best efforts of the Energy and Water Subcommittee Chairman and Members to put together a bipartisan bill reflecting the priorities of the nation as a whole, the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development appropriations bill is yet another exercise in missed opportunities. At its best, it is the Majority Party's latest effort to cover the demands of national priorities with a fig leaf of budget allocation—some items are indeed covered, but there are still serious gaps. At its worst, it takes an inside-the-beltway perspective on vital issues, failing to address real-world concerns that will have to be dealt with before the bill is signed into law. Two critical concerns that are largely unaddressed in this bill are the soaring fuel prices in the Midwest and the low water levels along the Great Lakes.

Asleep at the pump on gas prices

The price of gasoline remains high around the country, and especially in the Midwest. It has topped $2 per gallon in many places, and everyone is looking for answers. The national average price for gas this week is $1.68 per gallon, up 5 cents from the previous week. While the Federal government has launched an investigation through the Federal Trade Commission in hopes of uncovering the answer to what is behind the soaring prices, there is still no question that the Republican-led Congress fails to adequately address the roots of the gasoline price problem. While there is no instant relief that this Committee can provide, the failure of the Majority party in this Congress to make even a minimal effort to deal with the issue borders on gross negligence.

When oil prices plunged to $8–$10 per barrel in March 1999, the Republicans took little action to protect domestic oil producers. When gas prices across the nation neared $1 per gallon, the Majority party leadership, including members of the Appropriations committee started a push to eliminate the Energy Department entirely. They ignored efforts by Members to replenish the Strategic Petroleum Reserve with oil from struggling domestic producers, and twiddled their thumbs while OPEC chose to cut production to boost prices. Had they acted, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve could have 115 million more barrels of oil, and we might have a healthier domestic oil industry, but they were asleep at the pump.

The Majority didn't do much of anything until March 2000, when the price had risen to such levels that they decided that political points could be scored by attacking the Administration for a pennies-on-the-gallon tax that funds highway safety programs. However, lobbying by the Administration helped produce an increase in production by OPEC countries, political opportunity subsided, and now they have nodded off again.

The reauthorization of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve itself gained much attention during that time, and the House managed to pass a bill by a large margin to reauthorize the Reserve. Once the political heat subsided slightly, the leadership lost interest, however, and while they dozed, the House-passed bill became tied up in political gamesmanship. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee has now given them another opportunity to deal with this issue by approving (by voice vote) an amendment by Ms. Kilpatrick and Ms. Kaptur to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve on this bill.

Awakened once again by the prospect of political gain, the Majority has been too busy pointing fingers to address the long-term solution to this problem. The Republicans blast the Administration for failing to have an energy policy, yet have systematically shut down Administration initiatives to fund energy research efforts that could help in finding a solution to this problem. This bill is $106 million short of the President's request in solar and renewable energy research, stifling hope for developing marketable solutions to what promises to be a perennial problem.

During consideration of this bill at Full Committee, Ms. Kaptur offered an amendment (Roll Call No. 3) to restore the line for Solar and Renewable Energy Research to the level requested in the President's budget. The amendment, which was rejected by the Committee on a party line vote, would have solved a problem, which is not unique to this bill. The House has just passed the VA/HUD appropriations bill, which slashes the President's budget request for the National Science Foundation by a half billion dollars. Floor action on the Interior bill made a bad situation worse, by leaving the bill $100 million below last year's level on energy efficiency research and over $200 million below the President's request. The debate in the full Committee markup of the bill featured Majority party members reassuring us that there was support for these programs in other bills, but the actions of the Majority have ensured that no such support is available. As a result any light at the end of the tunnel that represents a way out of this situation has been pushed that much further out of reach.

The Department of Energy and EPA have written the Federal Trade Commission, asking them to look into whether price gouging is taking place in the Upper Midwest, and people talk about pipeline problems and reformulated gas adding to prices. But these elements do not make up the crux of the problem—the problem is that we are over-reliant on imported petroleum to power our economy, and the big oil companies know it.

The Appropriations Committee does not have the ability or the desire to set fuel prices, but we should have the good sense to support research into ways to avoid the kind of shocks high fuel prices can deliver to the economy, by encouraging the development of alternative energy sources.

Great Lakes water levels

Just as the Majority has failed to recognize the impact of their ongoing neglect of sound energy policy, the Committee bill fails to reflect the growing crisis on the Great Lakes regarding the impact

of falling water levels on the environment and on Great Lakes shipping.

The historic plunge in Great Lakes water levels over the course of the last year has left the Army Corps of Engineers struggling to cope with one of their core tasks: maintaining the shipping channels. Maintenance of shipping channels in the Great Lakes is conducted with an assumption that Lake levels will not sink below a certain point, but on several Lakes, the lake levels are forecast to go below this threshold or to come dangerously close.

The decreasing water levels are resulting in higher demand by the Corps for dredging services, additional needs for disposal areas for dredge spoils, and an increase in the cost of fulfilling of those contracts. The Corps will require additional resources to meet the needs of the Great Lakes community. Given that navigation on the Lakes by large vessels has a small margin for error, and the increasing difficulty of getting ships into port, especially along the upper Lakes, the economic health of many of the port cities along the shores of the Lakes is threatened. The light loading demanded by shallower navigation channels puts a further strain on the economics of ship traffic.

As the Corps works to maintain the Great Lakes availability for shipping, they will also be called on to be sensitive to possible environmental impacts of vessel operations on the Great Lakes with significantly lower levels, as well as those of deeper dredging in certain areas. The Great Lakes represent a unique freshwater ecosystem as well as a transportation resource, and the Corps should be funded at a level so that Great Lakes operations are reflective of both the Corps environmental and transportation missions.

The Committee has tried to deal with the many demands placed upon it, that could never otherwise be met under the existing allocation, by sticking closely to a series of rules that have helped them be fair in allocation of resources to projects. While this may be the right thing to do under these circumstances, it is the circumstances themselves—the Majority's slavish devotion to a tax cut for the wealthy and the resultant discretionary spending allocations—that are unacceptable. These shortcomings must be addressed before this bill becomes law.

Conclusion

The fundamental problem with the process we are going through this year is that the Majority is too wrapped up in their game of budgetary hopscotch to move ahead on issues that are national priorities. By leaving these issues aside in the pursuit of tax cuts for the wealthiest two percent of America, the Majority is threatening to simultaneously leave the economy on an empty tank and in some parts of the country, literally on the rocks.

DAVE OBEY.
MARCY KAPTUR.
CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK.

○