United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2000 No. 131

House of Representatives

The House met at 4 p.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, sometimes we are bewildered by what occurs around us. Forgive us, if we think our difficulties are so extraordinary. The fear of pain reveals us as human. We are vulnerable when anticipating troublesome times.

If we are to suffer, Lord, let it not be for our misdeeds, mistaken judgments or because we have infringed on the rights of others. If any one of us is suffering, let there be no disgrace.

You reveal Yourself as the God of compassion, You are close to all who suffer. Be their strength that in Your name, they may persevere in seeking justice and doing what is right.

Even the weakest among us, by being faithful, can give You glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILMAN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1066. An act to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to encourage the use of and research into agricultural best practices to improve the environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1109. An act to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 1482. An act to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–65, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, and in consultation with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on the National Military Museum:

John G. Campbell, of Virginia.

Henriette V. Warfield, of Virginia.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 18, 2000, at 9:27 a.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2296.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5212.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 428.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

UNITED NATIONS CONSIDERING RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ISRAEL REGARDING ONGOING VIOLENCE IN MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

NOTICE

Effective January 1, 2001, the subscription price of the Congressional Record will be $393 per year or $197 for six months. Individual issues may be purchased for $4.00 per copy. The cost for the microfiche edition will remain $141 per year with single copies remaining $1.50 per issue. This price increase is necessary based upon the cost of printing and distribution.

Michael F. DiMario, *Public Printer*

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues are fully aware that Israel is being treated abysmally at the hands of the United Nations, principally in the General Assembly. Regrettably, the Palestinians have promoted and have adopted anti-Israel and anti-peace process resolutions.

Today, unfortunately, is no different. Despite UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's recent statement that, ''words can inflame or soothe, and everyone needs a restoration of calm and quiet so as to create the best possible atmosphere for resumption of peace talks,'' the UN General Assembly is presently in an emergency session in which they will be considering, despite U.S. opposition, a resolution condemning Israel regarding the ongoing violence in the Middle East.

As our U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Richard Holbrooke, stated, ''the General Assembly wants to beat up on Israel'' once again. It sounds to me that it is similar to the UN's ''Zionism is Racism'' resolutions of old. Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to join in condemning this latest act of incitement at the UN.

CHINA BOLDLY TRYING TO PICK OUR PRESIDENT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, news reports say a Chinese spokesman said, ''America is our enemy, and we must prepare to fight them.'' Now, if that is not enough to infuriate Ronald Reagan, the spokesman further stated, ''China does not want to see George Bush get elected.'' He said, ''Bush will support and bolster Taiwan, and Bush will, in fact, build a missile shield around America, weakening China.'' I say that is a compliment to George Bush.

Because think about it, last election, China got away with funneling cash illegally to the Democratic National Committee. No investigation. This time they are boldly trying to pick our President. Beam me up, Congress. It is time to mandate an independent investigation into this Chinese business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the lessons we should have learned at Pearl Harbor.

NATIONAL SECURITY THREATENED BY A LETTER

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The Clinton-Gore administration is illegally threatening vital national security interests of the American public.

This time the illegality involved a letter written by Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin to Vice President GORE about a secret, illegal nuclear arms deal with an unidentified terrorist nation ''that was not to be conveyed to third parties, including the United States Congress.''

Yes, sadly, Vice President GORE kept his promise to the Russian Prime Minister instead of his promise to the American public.

He did not tell Congress about the letter or about Moscow's continued sale of nuclear equipment to Iran, a blatant violation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

Instead of being open and honest with Congress about this high level national security threat, GORE simply filed the letter away and kept silent.

Mr. Speaker, America deserves an administration that will work with Congress to protect the national security interest of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back Mr. GORE's flagrant disregard for our Constitution, our security, and our country.

COSPONSOR H. RES. 635, EXECUTIVE STEEL DEFENSE RESOLUTION

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to consider cosponsoring House Resolution 635, the Executive Steel Defense Resolution. We currently have 205 cosponsors calling upon the President of the United States to initiate a section 201 trade case to bring to an end illegally traded steel in the U.S. domestic market.

Despite investing $35 billion to modernize, despite the loss of 240,000 jobs, despite cutting back capacity by 20 percent, despite doubling productivity since 1983 because of collusion overseas, because of illegal dumping from countries overseas, particularly during the intervening time from 1998 until now, we have seen six bankruptcies of steel companies. We have seen an additional 6,000 steelworkers lose their jobs. We have seen capacity utilization decline from 90 percent to 75 percent.

We cannot afford to wait till the next Congress. We cannot afford to wait for the next administration. I call upon President Clinton to immediately file a section 201.

REMEMBERING COURAGEOUS SAILORS ABOARD U.S.S. ''COLE''

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, today we remember those courageous sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* whose dedication and conviction to freedom and democracy cost them their lives. We honor the sacrifice of those who were killed and pray for the speedy recovery of those who were injured and for the families of all those brave Americans.

To EMC Fred Stozier of Jacksonville, my thoughts are with him and his family as he recovers from his injuries.

We can never be completely immune from the darker forces of terrorism that lurk in every corner of the world. We must counter these threats with a complete commitment to preparedness and strength. Our adversaries must know we will not shy away from our responsibility to preserve our national security and the precious ideals of democracy. The sacrifice of these Americans on the altar of freedom will never be forgotten. May God bless their souls and may God bless America.

UNITED STATES IN THIRD YEAR OF IMPORT STEEL CRISIS

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, what happens when a crisis is not resolved, a crisis that is allowed to grow, both in scope and intensity? In time, that crisis will become a disaster. Such a time is near at hand for our domestic steel industry.

We are in the third year of an import steel crisis. Our steel companies and workers are buckling under the weight of unprecedented, record-breaking foreign imports, much of it illegal. Thousands of our workers have been laid off. Six of our steel companies in the last 2 years have gone bankrupt. With this year's imports running higher than ever, the continued existence of a viable steel industry in this country is at risk.

The only way to avert such a disaster is to cut imports, to reverse the trend which is threatening an industry that is vital to our economy and our national defense.

That is why I join the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN) in introducing the bipartisan Executive Steel Defense Resolution. That is why I have joined the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY); the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), from my home State; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MASCARA); and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) in the bipartisan effort to achieve relief against disastrous steel import levels.

We call on the President to initiate a 201 proceeding, Mr. Speaker.

EFFORTS TO REDUCE PUBLIC DEBT AND PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE HELD HOSTAGE BY ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, our efforts to reduce public debt and protect

the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are being held hostage by the Clinton-Gore administration.

It has been 36 days since Congress proposed locking away Social Security and Medicare surpluses and dedicating 90 percent of the total surplus to paying off the public debt; and still no response from President Clinton and Vice President AL GORE.

There is a good reason they have not responded. They want to overspend.

President Clinton has threatened to veto seven appropriations bills because he claims they do not spend enough. Vice President GORE's budget proposal spends the entire surplus and raids the Social Security Trust Fund.

The President and Vice President should put debt reduction and protection of Social Security and Medicare ahead of spending and support the 90–10 debt reduction plan proposed by the Republican Congress.

REMEMBERING CHERONE LOUIS GUNN, KILLED ON U.S.S. ''COLE''

(Mr. COLLINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, a terrorist bomb left, not only a hole in the side of the U.S.S. *Cole*, but a hole in the lives of families and friends of the 17 sailors killed by the blast. This is especially true of friends and family of 23-year-old Signalman Seaman Recruit Cherone Louis Gunn.

Seaman Gunn's life was marked by service to family, friends, community and Nation. His neighbors in Rex, Georgia remember him for always being available to help the local youth.

His passion to serve his community fueled his ambition to serve in law enforcement.

His desire to serve his Nation was expressed by his decision to follow his father's footsteps and join the Navy, where he would gain valuable experience which would help him enter law enforcement upon the end of his tour of duty.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, Cheron Louis Gunn always sought to serve his country, knowing the risk inherent in the military and in law enforcement. Yet he did not shrink from making his commitment.

I wish to offer my condolences to the Gunn family. It may be inadequate consolation, but it is important to remember that Seaman Gunn serves as a bright example of the qualities of honor and self-sacrifice which inspire the men and women of our Armed Forces.

CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2348, AUTHORIZING BUREAU OF RECLAMATION TO PROVIDE COST SHARING FOR ENDANGERED FISH RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS FOR UPPER COLORADO

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 151) to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill, H.R. 2348, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 151

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2348) entitled ''An Act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basins.'', the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following correction:

Strike section 4 and insert:

''SEC. 4. EFFECT ON RECLAMATION LAW.

''Specifically with regard to the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, any action taken pursuant to or in furtherance of this title will not—

''(1) be considered in determining whether a district as defined in section 202(2) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390bb) has discharged its obligation to repay the construction cost of project facilities used to make irrigation water available for delivery to land in the district;

''(2) serve as the basis for reinstating acreage limitation provisions in a district that has completed payment of its construction obligations; or

''(3) serve as the basis for increasing the construction repayment obligation of the district and thereby extending the period during which the acreage limitation provisions will apply.''.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5308, FIVE NATIONS CITIZENS LAND REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 5308) to amend laws relating to the lands of the citizens of the Muscogee (Creek), Seminole, Cherokee, Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations, historically referred to as the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes, the Clerk be authorized to make the following correction that I have placed at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

At the end of section 403, add the following new paragraph:

''(2) OTHER CONSTRUCTION NOT VALID.—Nothing in this subsection is intended to or shall be construed to create, affect, or imply the existence or nonexistence of authority of any federally recognized Indian tribe over—

''(A) any other federally recognized Indian tribe;

''(B) the members of any other federally recognized Indian tribe; or

''(C) any land in which any other federally recognized Indian tribe or any member of any other federally recognized Indian tribe has or is determined by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction to have any interest.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when proceedings resume on the unfinished business of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 964) to provide for equitable compensation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes, as amended, that the amendment be deemed to include the corrections that I have placed at the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALDEN of Oregon:

Strike Title IV of the bill and insert instead—

''TITLE IV—CONVEYANCE OF KINIKLIK VILLAGE

''SEC. 401. CONVEYANCE OF KINIKLIK VILLAGE.

''(a) That portion of the property identified in United States Survey Number 628, Tract A, containing 0.34 acres and Tract B containing 0.63 acres located in Section 26, Township 9 North, Range 10 East, Seward Meridian, containing 0.97 acres, more or less, and further described as Tracts A and B Russian Creek Church Mission Reserve according to U.S. Survey 628 shall be offered for a period of one year for sale by quitclaim deed from the United States by and through the Forest Service to Chugach Alaska Corporation under the following terms:

''(1) Chugach Alaska Corporation shall pay consideration in the amount of $9,000.00;

''(2) In order to protect the historic values for which the Forest Service acquired the land, Chugach Alaska Corporation shall agree to and the conveyance shall contain the same reservations required by 43 CFR §§2653.5(a) and 2653.11(b) for protection of historic and cemetery sites conveyed to a Regional Corporation pursuant to section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

''(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Forest Service shall deposit the proceeds from the sale to the Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration Fund established by Public Law 102–154 and may be expended without further appropriation in accordance with Public Law 102–229.''.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous

consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY) at 5 p.m.

HONORING MEMBERS OF THE CREW OF THE GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYER U.S.S. ''COLE''

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 631) honoring the members of the crew of the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG–67) who were killed or wounded in the terrorist bombing attack on that vessel in Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000, expressing the sympathies of the House of Representatives to the families of those crew members, commending the ship's crew for their heroic damage control efforts, and condemning the bombing of that ship, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 631

Whereas the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. COLE (DDG–67) was severely damaged on October 12, 2000, when a boat bomb exploded alongside that ship while on a refueling stop in Aden, Yemen;

Whereas the explosion resulted in a 40-by-45 foot hole in the port side of the ship at the waterline and left seven of the ship's crew dead, ten of who as of October 17, 2000, are missing and presumed dead, and over three dozen wounded;

Whereas the U.S.S. COLE had stopped in Aden for routine refueling while in transit from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf to conduct forward maritime presence operations in the Persian Gulf region as part of the U.S.S. George Washington battle group;

Whereas the members of the United States Navy killed and wounded in the bombing were performing their duty in furtherance of the national security interests of the United States;

Whereas United States national security interests continue to require the forward deployment of elements of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces are routinely called upon to perform duties that place their lives at risk;

Whereas the crew members of the U.S.S. COLE who lost their lives as a result of the bombing of their ship on October 12, 2000, died in the honorable service to the Nation and exemplified all that is best in the American people; and

Whereas the heroic efforts of the surviving crew members of the U.S.S. COLE after the attack to save their ship and rescue their wounded shipmates are in the highest tradition of the United States Navy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, in response to the terrorist bombing attack on the U.S.S. COLE (DDG–67) on October 12, 2000, while on a refueling stop in Aden, Yemen, hereby—

(1) honors the members of the crew of the U.S.S. COLE who died as a result of that attack and sends heartfelt condolences to their families, friends, and loved ones.

(2) honors the members of the crew of the U.S.S. COLE who were wounded in the attack for their service and sacrifice, expresses its hopes for their rapid and complete recovery, and extends its sympathies to their families;

(3) commends the crew of the U.S.S. COLE for their heroic damage control efforts; and

(4) condemns the attack against the U.S.S. COLE as an unprovoked and cowardly act of terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 631.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound sense of sadness that I join my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), in offering this resolution for consideration by the House.

Last Thursday, October 12, 2000, a small boat exploded alongside the U.S.S. *Cole* during a brief refueling stop in the port of Aden in Yemen. The blast ripped a 40 by 45 foot hole in her side, killing 17 sailors and wounding some three dozen more.

This unprovoked and cowardly act of terrorism was perpetrated against an American warship while en route to the Persian Gulf to conduct maritime operations in the legitimate pursuit of our national security interests abroad.

The resolution before the House condemns this senseless act of violence against our military forces and expresses the sympathies of the House of Representatives to the families of those crew members who were killed or wounded in the attack.

What can you say? What can you do? How can you really express to the families of these young men and women our profound sympathies and appreciation for their commitment?

Mr. Speaker, as we meet today, hundreds of thousands of young Americans from all corners of our great Nation are serving in the military, overseas and here at home. They go about their daily duty quietly and without fanfare. Yet, until something like this happens, we, as a Nation, tend to forget what they do every single day of the year to uphold our values, to protect our freedom and deter those who seek to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, we forget; freedom is not free.

The resolution before us today appropriately, I think, recognizes and honors the price of freedom paid by the members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*.

We are free and secure as a Nation today because of all the men and women of our military who fought to gain our freedom and independence, in the very first instance during the Revolutionary War, and have gone all over this world in war and peace since that time defending that freedom, every day. People who are no longer with us, they have done it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I think as we honor these today, who have paid the price for freedom, and their families too, I think of all the others who have gone before too, who have paid the price, with their lives, their limbs, their health, many were prisoners of war, many are still missing in action, we should remember every single day we live that the price of freedom has been paid by other people, so that we can be free today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Members speak on this floor for many reasons. We debate, we advocate, we commemorate, we celebrate.

Today, though, I rise to give honor to a crew of brave Americans, the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*, and to give warning.

I want to honor those who gave their lives or were wounded while serving their country in a distant port, far away from home and in the cause of furthering the national security interests of our country. I also want to honor the surviving crew members, who stayed with the crippled ship and worked valiantly to recover their wounded or missing shipmates and to repair the damage to their ship.

And while I say I speak to give them honor, truly it is they who honor us. They and the millions of others who wear our country's uniform, who honor America by their gift of service and dedication.

I also want to extend my deepest sympathies to the families and to the friends of those who perished in this tragedy. Although I know they are saddened by their loss, they should take comfort in that their loved ones died pursuing the most noble of callings, serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. They should know that we in Congress, and indeed the people of this great Nation, are grateful for their extraordinary service and sacrifice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give warning. Those who committed this barbarous act are already being judged beyond our capacity to review. But to those whose dark and craven hearts conceived it, hear this: While you may walk free today in a sunshine you have denied so many others, so many families, so many communities, know simply and surely that you will be held accountable.

Our memory is long, our reach is no less so. This outrage cost lives, Mr. Speaker, and it left others in peril. We hear that this many men were hurt, or that many women were hurt. No, Mr. Speaker. They are all American sailors, one and all, and an injury to anyone is an insult to America.

I do not doubt that such insult was the goal of the perpetrators. But they should understand that they will pay a price for this heinous act. Justice and the memory of those whose lives have been lost demand no less.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. My heartfelt condolences go out to the families of the men and women who were killed or wounded in this cowardly act, an act that was despicable and premeditated.

This tragedy is a distressing reminder though of how dangerous the world has become since the end of the Cold War. As the unprovoked attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* demonstrates, the men and women of the Armed Services are exposed daily to very real threats of death, violence and destruction. For these reasons, our men and women in uniform, indeed, all Americans, must remain vigilant in the defense of freedom and our interests. Equally important, we must do everything we can to provide for our military personnel the resources necessary to protect them as they defend our interests around the world and that of our allies.

While these brave defenders of freedom will greatly be missed, their spirit and legacy lives on. It is their values and their beliefs of duty, honor, courage and commitment to God, country, family and our fellow men and women that serve as an example for all of us to live and aspire.

I urge the President to take appropriate action against the perpetrators once the investigation is concluded and to take appropriate measured response.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and my heart goes out to the deceased sailors of the U.S.S. *Cole*.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY).

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, you have just heard it again. We said it last Thursday on this floor; the world is still a very dangerous place.

Many members of the Virginia delegation last Saturday met with the families of the wounded and the deceased in Norfolk, and many of us in this body just returned from Norfolk where we attended services honoring those who gave their lives on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

First, our condolences and prayers go out to the sailors who were hurt or killed and their families. We will continue to provide them with the best care and assistance that we possibly can.

For all of us from Hampton Roads, the fact that the U.S.S. *Cole*'s home port is Norfolk, and I use the present tense, because that ship is coming home, the fact that U.S.S. *Cole* is a Norfolk ship brought this terrible tragedy a little closer to home.

It reminds us how much these young men and women in uniform really mean to us. They are our sons and our daughters, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, neighbors and friends.

Knowing what happened makes us feel immeasurable pride in their lives, inconsolable grief for their deaths, and gratitude for the homecoming of their shipmates. Their ship made a sacrifice for which we feel an unbearable sense of loss.

In the Bible, when his friends died in battle, King David said: ''They were beloved and pleasant in life, and in death they were together; they were swifter than eagles, they were strong as lions.''

That is exactly what we say.

And now it is our responsibility to love and support their families, protect and defend their country, and honor their memory forever.

But those who survive may face the toughest challenge, and I want them to know that all Americans are deeply grateful for their service to our country.

Indeed, this world is still a very dangerous place.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart in support of House Resolution 631, to honor the men and women of the U.S.S. *Cole*.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, as well as the leadership, for moving rapidly and allowing the House of Representatives to speak to this important national moment.

I represent Navy country in south Texas, so we have a special perspective of their service and a loss in a hostile action. Two of the soldiers who lost their lives in the insidious act of terror were south Texas' Specialist Third Class Ronchester Mananga Santiago of Kingsville and Fireman Gary Graham Swenchonis, Jr. of Rockport, Texas.

Texas also lost Information Systems Technician Seaman Timothy Lee Gauna of Rice.

Two women from south Texas were also on the ship, Elizabeth Sanchez LaFountaine of Brownsville, who sustained a broken leg, and Esther Arriaga Hood of Corpus Christi, who is still aboard the *Cole*.

Texans are proud that our sons and daughters seek to serve a larger purpose by volunteering to serve in the United States military service. It is, Mr. Speaker, a noble undertaking, but it often means that those sons and daughters pay a heavy price to serve and protect the United States' interests.

Our hearts wrench at the thought of our neighbors answering the door to see the drawn faces of naval officers there to deliver the most devastating news a parent can ever hear.

This should bring home the reality of all others that service in our military today is a highly dangerous prospect for our soldiers and sailors.

Just because we are not at war does not guarantee a level of safety for those who serve in our military. This tragic incident has brought together the ship's crew in a way no other experiences could, the way only sailors have seen and been in battle together can understand.

These young people have learned to depend upon each other in the aftermath of this cowardly act. They worked tirelessly to save the U.S.S. *Cole* after the explosion.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn the young people who perished. We will hold up those who were injured, and we will continue to pray for the safety of men and women in uniform around the world. We offer our condolences to the families.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), a member of the committee.

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep admiration that I rise to express gratitude and respect for the sacrifices given of the men and women serving on board the U.S.S. *Cole*.

Speaking as the senior Democrat on the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services, I want to indicate that these men and women, like thousands of other Americans across the world, volunteered each and every day to defend and protect this Nation. Sadly, on October 12, several sailors of the U.S.S. *Cole* paid the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our country while carrying out their duties.

My heart and prayers are with these sailors' friends, families and loved ones.

Despite the explosion that ripped through the U.S.S. *Cole* and wounded many members of the crew, these dedicated sailors continue to defend their ship and rescue other wounded shipmates. Their actions exemplify the perseverance of Americans and the finest tradition of our Armed Services.

I want to commend and pay tribute to these selfless Americans for their service and dedication and wish them a speedy recovery.

Mr. Speaker, terrible events such as these put a face to patriotism. They remind us that those in uniform around the world are young men and women from our towns and cities who volunteer in service to their country. Last year, they graduated from high school down the street; perhaps they worked at the corner store. Today they unflinchingly stare danger in the face with selfless dedication.

This tragedy reminds us of the human element of our armed forces and highlights the importance of maintaining a focus on those policies that best serve these young patriots, our military personnel, and enhance the quality of their lives.

Finally, this tragedy offers a window into the composition of today's military. I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, a piece from yesterday's Boston Globe: ''The faces of the 17 sailors who were killed aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* by a terrorist bomb attack last week are a portrait of today's America, a mosaic of colors of which the U.S. military is justly proud. To call out their given names is to sing a contemporary chorus of 'This Land is Your Land.' Two of the casualties even represent a grim kind of civil rights milestone: They are the first women killed in naval action.''

Mr. Speaker, the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* embodies what is great in America—our people and their courage, dedication, commitment, and sacrifice. To the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*, their families, friends and loved ones, thank you for your service to a most grateful nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out and our prayers go out to the families of the 17 men and women who were lost in this tragic incident in the Red Sea. Coming from a naval family myself, born on a Navy base and raised with a father who went off to sea months at a time, I understand the challenges that not only the active duty personnel go through but also the trials and tribulations of those who are left behind, the families, the loved ones.

This is a great Nation that demands great sacrifices to maintain its greatness, and I think we underestimate the price of our greatness so often. This last week, we were able to see exactly what kind of price Americans have to pay for our greatness. San Diego has some of the largest military installations in the world, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is the largest naval facility on the West Coast.

San Diego is especially proud of our military tradition; but this week, we are grieving for the loss of our native daughter, Lakiba Nicole Palmer. Ms. Palmer was only 22 years old and a seaman recruit fresh out of boot camp. She was looking forward to a bright new future and a challenging new career.

Along with another woman, Seaman Palmer sadly are the first women killed in a hostile action against an American combat ship.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly tragic for this family and to our community is that she was looking so much towards her service as an American sailor. She was an athlete at San Diego High School in my district, Mr. Speaker, and she was a member of the all-academic team on the track in 1995. It was known that she was a fierce competitor who always tried harder than anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the family of this young lady and our sympathies to the family. And I just ask every one of us to remember when we vote here in the House at what price the freedom of representative government comes to and what a great responsibility we have, not just to our colleagues and our citizens, but also to our men and women who stand in harm's way every day and every night.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and thank him for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE), at this terrible tragic time for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 631, honoring the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* and extending our sympathy to their families and their loved ones. My wife, Carolina, and I attended the memorial service held this morning for the brave sailors who have lost their lives in this tragic and despicable act of terrorism.

All of our thoughts and our prayers are with them and their family members as they persevere under these very difficult times. My thoughts this morning, on a gray and somewhat drizzly midmorning ceremony, were that we simply do not do enough for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

It is truly unfortunate that it takes the loss of fine American men and women like these sailors to remind us again of the dangers and sacrifices that the men and women of our armed forces face each and every day. However, at the memorial service this morning, it was also reminded that we sometimes forget the everyday sacrifices that the families and the loved ones of our service members make each and every time their husbands, wives, sons, and daughters deploy.

We simply do not do enough for our men and women in uniform and their families. I am moved by their strength under these difficult circumstances and a difficult time and their commitment to the importance of their loved ones' mission and service to their country.

In return for that strength, we can only offer them our prayers and our guarantees that our country will not stop until we find the individuals responsible for this horrific act of senseless violence and bring them to justice.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I fervently believe we do not do enough for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Norfolk, Virginia, area (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying homage to the brave young crew members of the U.S.S. *Cole* who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, as well as those who are still missing and others who were injured and, of course, the families of all of these fine sailors.

Mr. Speaker, this is a particular tragedy for Virginia, because the U.S.S. *Cole* is home-based to the Norfolk Naval Base in Virginia. We were honored to have the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, both of our United States Senators, as well as all of the local congressmen in Norfolk today for the memorial service.

Mr. Speaker, while it is imperative that we take swift action to bring those responsible to justice, we must not jump to hasty conclusions. We should remember that after the Oklahoma bombing, an innocent man was arrested for that heinous act, simply because of his ethnicity.

When we determine who is responsible for this attack, we will remember President Clinton's frequent admonition that America takes care of its own. When we determine who is responsible, our response will make those who did it sorry they did it, and we will cause others who might be thinking of doing the same to change their minds.

Mr. Speaker, all of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Cole* are to be saluted for their bravery and dedication to duties. These casualties remind us that freedom is not free. Their service to our Nation will long be remembered.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join my fellow colleagues in supporting this commemoration and this resolution.

I grew up in a military family. I remember when I was a young boy, I was 10 years old, my father was stationed in Japan. We lived in a small enclave of military families. All the kids' fathers were pilots, and one day the news came that the Chinese had shot down one of our friend's father's plane, and I still remember the heartache and the crying and the tears just as a little boy.

I remember seeing that and wondering what it was all about. But this family would no longer have a father, a wife would no longer have a husband, and there would be a vacant place around the Thanksgiving table and the Christmas tree. These sacrifices that our military people make, I do not think anybody knows the name of that gentleman and many gentlemen like him, men and women who have given their lives during the Cold War and since in order to protect our country.

They are truly heroes; and wherever they go, whatever job there is in the military, they know they are taking the chance, the chance of giving their lives and leaving their own loved ones alone in order to protect all of us and our loved ones. And how much greater tribute and how much greater sacrifice and how much greater service can there be than that?

□ 1730

So this resolution and the sacrifice of the American sailors who perished and suffered injuries on the U.S.S. *Cole* is something that we have to commemorate. This represents the voice of Congress, this resolution, in expressing our condolences to the families of those heroes who made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Unfortunately, the official radio of the United States government, the Voice of America, has been prevented by our State Department, this administration, from doing the same thing that we are now doing in this resolution.

On October 16, the State Department, in an official message to the Voice of America, denied approval of the Voice of America editorial that would have been broadcast worldwide expressing the sorrow of the American people over the loss of our sailors, the damage done to the U.S.S. *Cole* and the loss of life of our brave defenders.

I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of this disgraceful State Department message to Voice of America saying that they cannot commemorate, cannot broadcast, this opinion about our brave men and the sacrifice they made. I will read that, for those who are listening and are reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this is from the State Department to a request from the Voice of America to have an editorial memorializing these brave Americans who gave their lives for us.

It said: ''This editorial will reach an audience that is caught up in violence in Israel and the Occupied Territories. The 17 or so dead sailors,'' that is American dead sailors, ''does not compare to the 100+ Palestinians who have died in recent weeks where we have remained silent.''

I would suggest it is the job of this administration and of the State Department to care more about our American military personnel who give their lives than it is to care about things, tragic events that are going on overseas. If our military people give their lives for their country, they should expect that we will memorialize them in a fitting way, and that this administration and that the State Department will not get in the way because of some far-flung event in another part of the world.

This is an insult. This is an insult to those brave people who gave their lives. As we remember them today, let us pass this resolution. Let us say our prayers for those families, and let us be very sincere in this effort. I am sorry that I had to read this State Department position here today, but I think it is important for the American people to know just what the attitude of this administration is toward our people who are defending this country and give their lives for us.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I have a young sailor, a bosun's mate, Richard Ying, that was hurt severely aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*. My staff has talked to him several times. I tried to call and he was in rehabilitation. He is back home, and they expect him to be back in Windber, Pennsylvania, by Friday.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I had anticipated trying to go to visit the U.S.S. *Cole* over the weekend just to see how it was going. All of us sympathize with the families who lost loved ones, and all of us feel badly about the ones that were wounded.

But there is something else here that shows how good our troops are operating. It was marvelous. I went aboard the U.S.S. *Roberts* when it hit a mine. It had a hole about the size of a bus in the side. This hole was even bigger, 40 feet. People do not realize how close it came to sinking. We are talking about a ship that was in the harbor in water that was calm, and it almost sank. If it had not been for the heroic effort of this crew, actually using buckets to bail out the water, we would have probably lost that ship.

So I want to commend the men and women that served on the *Cole* for the phenomenal job they did in saving this ship. All of us hate to see our men and women in harm's way. We have responsibilities and we cannot withdraw from those responsibilities. But one thing for sure, that ship was saved by the dedication of the men and women who served aboard the *Cole*.

I add my commiseration and sympathy to the families, but I want to commend the captain and the shipmates aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* for the phenomenal job they did in saving that magnificent vessel.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know by now, 17 sailors were either killed or are missing from the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*. Information Systems Technician Seaman Timothy Gauna, a constituent of mine from Rice, Texas, is among the missing. Like all the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*, he was serving his country bravely and honorably when this vicious attack took place.

I join the Gauna family, and all the families of the missing sailors, in hoping that they will soon be accounted for.

Immediately after the attack, Mr. Speaker, I had the chance to visit personally with seaman Gauna's family. I spoke with a mother who is proud of her son's courage and patriotism. I talked to various family members who admire Tim's dedication to America.

I do not know all the sailors on the U.S.S. *Cole*, Mr. Speaker, but I know the family of Seaman Gauna. They, like all of the U.S.S. *Cole*'s sailors and their families, have America's gratitude and our prayers.

I was moved by the memorial service today in Norfolk that a number of us attended. There the entire Nation joined injured sailors, some fresh from the hospital, their IVs still attached to their arms, in paying tribute to their fallen and missing comrades.

But our obligation to these brave men and women is greater than that, Mr. Speaker. We must continue to be vigilant in the face of threats from terrorists around the world. We must find the criminals responsible for this cowardly act, and they must be brought to justice. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, these terrorists will soon learn that America responds quickly and forcefully whenever we are attacked.

The FBI has now more than 60 agents in place investigating this attack, and the Navy has assigned six U.S. warships to Aden harbor to assist the U.S.S. *Cole* and its exhausted crew.

Mr. Speaker, every time anyone in uniform gets into a ship, a plane, or a tank, they risk their lives in defense of America. For that, we owe these great men and women of the United States Armed Forces our most profound gratitude. They have it, Mr. Speaker, as well as the solemn promise that America stands with them always and everywhere.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member and the chairman of the committee for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I joined my colleagues to memorialize our fallen and missing sailors of the U.S.S.

Cole. What I am most reminded of, as I saw the humanity and love and respect permeating and moving throughout that huge and enormously sad audience, was the greatness of America.

The Chaplain who offered the invocation reminded us that freedom is not free. This morning was a moment personally of profound grief, for my State of Texas suffered great losses. But the country suffered a loss, because these were bright and young and energetic and aspiring young people, none over the age of 26.

So I join in the support of this resolution, and I join this Nation in expressing sadness, loss, and resolve. I celebrate the lives of these young people, some found, some still missing.

It is impossible to capture the pain of the family members, mothers and fathers, grandmothers and grandfathers, aunts, uncles, cousins, sisters and brothers who bear this great loss. But I do believe we can speak today for this Nation that gathers around and embraces each other in time of trouble.

We must salute the Navy, along with the entire military. These young sailors who dedicated their lives to the Navy, and like gladiators of old, took pride in their service to country, and wore their patriotism as a shield so the world could sleep under a blanket of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to say to those who have done this dastardly act that we have no fear, and that those who would do this evil act, that we will find them and they will pay the appropriate price. We must be safe, but the only way that we are safe is with these strong men and women who have offered themselves to protect our freedom.

There is a poem, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer, ''Genuine Grace in Command'':

''Define me a legend,
A soldier of infinite truth;
Define for me a soldier of valor, successful or obtuse,
Enlighten me of nobility,
A birthright of kings and queens.
Fill all the pages of history books with stories forever sung.
I swear I can hear them saying:
It is simple, the reason we fight:
Freedom, liberty, integrity,
These were given as our birthright.''

As I close, Mr. Speaker, in my salute to these fallen and missing heroes and to their families, let me simply repeat Psalm 23.4:

''Even as I go through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me.''

We in this Nation, we as a Congress, we as family members, we fear no evil, for Thou art with us.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I traveled to Norfolk, Virginia where I took part in a memorial service with President Clinton, Defense Secretary Cohen, Attorney General Reno, Secretary Danzi, Members of Congress from both the House and the Senate, members from all the military branches, the sailors and family from the U.S.S. *Cole,* the Norfolk Naval community, to honor our fallen sailors who dedicate their lives to ensuring our freedom here in the United States.

This morning was a moment of profound grief for me as I joined the country in expressing sadness, loss and resolve; and the celebration of the lives of our fallen sons and daughters through love and prayers. It is impossible for me to describe the pain that the family members and the country bears over this great loss. But I can speak of the love that this Nation has for those who dedicated their lives to the Navy, and like the gladiators of old, took pride in their service to country, and wore their patriotism as a shield so the world could sleep under a blanket of freedom.

As I think of our brave fallen soldiers, I am reminded of a poem entitled Genuine Grace in Command:

Define for me a legend, a soldier of infinite truth, define for me a soldier of valor, successful or obtuse? Enlighten me of nobility, a birthright of kings and queens? Fill all the pages of history books, with stories forever sung!

But while you regale nameless faces of glory, times over and over again! I beg you remember the individuals, who's honors I now proudly present!

I speak here of soldiers with humility, yet clearly a leaders. Quietly commanding, entirely through their presence within. Their desires were not for greatness, simply the survival of team! Their goal not for fame or fortune, but to share their gift till the end!

Many times we are left with a memory, which overshadows us all! Many times we are left and dishearten, wondering why we fought for the cause?

And yet here were soldiers who never questioned, the mission life had set them on! Perhaps the greatest gift they gave us was the understanding of truth!

I swear I can hear them saying, it's simple the reason we fight. Freedom, liberty, integrity, these were given as our birthright.

We must fight to preserve what was given us, even fight unmercifully to the end!

We shall provide their tomorrow even their better life! Let it not dishearten you, the lack which they seem to know. There will come a day when we are remembered for what we had to show!

To the sailors of the U.S.S. *Cole* who sacrificed their lives for us, you will be remembered for the sacrifice you showed the world.

I pay tribute to our missing and lost U.S. Sailors:

Electronics Technician Chief Petty Officer Richard Costelow, of Morrisville, Pennsylvania.

Hull Maintenance Technician Third Class Kenneth Clodfelter, of Mechanicsville, Virginia.

Mess Management Specialist Seaman Lakeina Francis, of Woodleaf, North Carolina.

Information Systems Technician Seaman Timothy Gauna, from Rice, Texas.

Signalman Seaman Apprentice Cherone Gunn, of Rex, Georgia.

Seaman James McDaniels, of Norfolk, Virginia.

Engineman Second Class Mac Nieto, of Fond Du Lac, Wisconsin.

Electronics Warfare Technician Third Class Ronald Owens of Vero Beach Florida.

Engineman Fireman Joshua Parlett, of Churchville, Maryland.

Seaman Apprentice Lakiba Nicole Palmer of San Diego, California.

Fireman Apprentice Patrick Roy of Cornwall on Hudson, New York.

Electronics Warfare Technician Second Class Kevin Rux, of Portland, North Dakota.

Mess Management Specialist Third Class Ronchester Santiago, of Kingsville, Texas.

Operations Specialist Second Class Timothy Saunders, of Ringold, Virginia.

Fireman Gary Swenchonis, Jr., of Rockport, Texas.

Ensign Andrew Triplett, of Mason, Mississippi.

Seaman Apprentice Craig Wibberley, of Williamsport, Maryland.

They were the best America had to offer, for they took upon themselves an oath taken by men and women from the beginning of time, and that is the oath of service to country.

For those of you who have caused this misery, I assure you, this country will not rest until you are found and brought to justice. The United States will not shy away from its commitment for ensuring peace, freedom and stability in the Middle East and around the world.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for introducing this important resolution at this time.

I am pleased to join in supporting this timely bipartisan resolution condemning the terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* and honoring its courageous crew and those who lost their lives or were injured, and recognizing the heroic efforts that were made to save this ship despite massive damage to its hull.

The terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole,* which was docked in Yemen for refueling, reminds us all that despite our best efforts, it is not always possible to harden every U.S. target abroad.

It also highlights the need for increased intelligence capacity in these dangerous parts of the world.

Our U.S. embassy in Yemen is a highly secure facility with substantial set backs, making it hard to hit with terrorist bombs. The search for softer targets is how the determined new terrorists now operate as we harden more and more traditional U.S. diplomatic targets abroad.

Greater intelligence efforts are essential as these ruthless terrorists search for our soft underbelly. In this day of local criminal elements supporting terrorist networks through collaboration in the drug trade, and in supplying stolen vehicles, explosives, and safe houses, we often overlook one key source of better intelligence on terrorists; that is, the police in the tough regions such as the Middle East.

We need better and closer cooperation on the police front, both in fighting the crime and terrorism from

abroad targeting our Nation, and we need their help.

Under Director Louis Freeh, the FBI has been trying to help some moderate and friendly Arab nations get an international law enforcement style type regional police training at the police academy, the ILEA, off the ground in the Middle East. These police schools help create the vital cop-to-cop relations and links on the ground that result in greater crime-fighting information and information-sharing with our U.S. law enforcement entities, and especially among the various regional police agencies.

Washington bureaucratic inertia stalled these FBI efforts in the Middle East until our House Committee on International Relations recently urged action on that initiative. Movement is now underway for a Middle East regional police training school, costing the taxpayer no monies to satisfy State Department bureaucratic concerns.

Another lesson from the U.S.S. *Cole* attack is the need for prompt and aggressive law enforcement response to preserve evidence, to interview witnesses, to pursue leads before the terrorists and their followers flee to safe havens. We must make certain that those responsible are brought to justice.

I am proud that our committee played a key role in giving the FBI new commercial leasing authority for transport planes for a quick response to these kinds of attacks.

□ 1745

I commend our FBI, our diplomatic security and other agencies for their quick action to help secure facilities in Aden and the efforts to apprehend those responsible for this heinous crime.

I want to again commend the authors of this resolution in bringing this issue to the floor today as our Nation honors the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*. With all of us working together, I am certain we can bring those responsible to justice for this attack and work to ensure that we minimize the likelihood of any other similar attack in the future.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I think that, in this hour, it perhaps does us good to put aside for a minute the geopolitical discussions advanced by the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), my friend speaking before me, and concentrate instead on the loss that we have suffered, memorialize and honor the service of the men and women of the U.S.S. *Cole*, and grieve with them the loss of their classmates.

When the terrible news about this terrorist attack flashed across the television sets of this country, we had a sick feeling across the entire country about this senseless loss of life in a pathetic, cowardly terrorist act.

This feeling of sadness became much deeper when we learned that one of the dead was one of our own. Kevin Shawn Rux from Portland, North Dakota. Kevin was 30 years old. He was an electronic warfare technician, second class. He was the son of a Navy man, the nephew of another Navy man, and he was in his 11th year of service to our country in the United States Navy.

Earlier, in the week, Kevin had called his wife Olivia in Norfolk, Virginia to extend his love on their 10th anniversary. He was halfway across the world, serving his country. On his anniversary, perhaps his last visit with Olivia, he extended his love in this fashion.

We cannot really fully appreciate, until a tragedy drives us to really think about it, the measure of commitment and sacrifice that the men and women in our military make. I mean they are some of our finest. They are in really up-close personal ways some of our very finest.

Some of those who went to high school with Mr. Rux were quoted as saying, ''He was a friendly, good student, wrestler, not a trouble maker, had his head screwed on straight.'' His former wrestling coach was quoted as saying, ''Kevin was a tough little cookie. He was all business. He was consistent. He was always there. He knew his role.''

Well, those observations of a high school wrestling coach were very true of his service to our country in the Navy as well. He had his head screwed on straight. He was always there. He was a tough little cookie.

What a tragedy for his wife and his family. What a tragedy for us in North Dakota. What a tragedy for our country to have lost sailors the caliber of Mr. Rux.

So I ask that we in this time think and pray for the departed and their families. They have served their country very well.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to both celebrate and mourn the loss of life of those who carried our freedom and beliefs across the seas aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*.

One of the 17 who died was 35-year-old Richard Costelow who grew up in my county of Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Richard attended Morrisville High School, and he graduated in 1983. As one of his teachers remembered him, Richard ''gave 100 percent every day. That kind of kid doesn't come along too often.''

Richard joined the Navy in 1988 and worked his way up to the ranks to electronic technician, first class. As the President mentioned at this morning's memorial service, he spent 5 years in the White House Communications Office and received the prestigious National Defense Service Medal.

My heart goes out to the Costelow family, his wife Sharla, and their three boys as well as to his parents and extended family.

Today we mourn this tragic loss, but we will never forget those who served to protect the ideals we as a Nation hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly grotesque that these young men and women killed and injured in this event were in service of the greatest beacon of freedom ever in the history of the world, and that so often those who commit these acts of terrorism are individuals who themselves are victimized by brutal leaders who, while keeping their boot on the faces of the people of their countries, use the United States as a scapegoat for the frustration and the agony that their own people feel.

Someday we will conquer this ignorance, and someday all of the peoples of the world will be free. Until that day comes, we will rely on the Richard Costelows of the world to protect us from those who live in ignorance.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the House Committee on Armed Services for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 631 in honor of the crew members killed and wounded on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am continually impressed by the dedication to duty of those serving in the armed services. These young men and women volunteer. They volunteer, and they put their lives on the line to defend the freedoms that many of us take for granted.

Last week, this Nation was reminded of their sacrifice. Seventeen people died, and 39 were injured serving aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* when a cowardly act of terrorism changed their lives forever and the lives of their families.

This incident opens up old wounds such as the 1983 bombing of the Marine barracks in Lebanon that killed 241 and the 1996 bombing of the Khobar Towers that killed 19.

Our Nation is blessed with many virtues. Unfortunately, these incidents affirm that none are as precious as the men and women who risk their lives in the service of this country.

It has been said ''For those who manned the battle line the bugle whispers low, and freedom has a taste and price the protected never know.''

Our hearts go out to the families of the brave men and women we honor today. They are now part of the soul of our great Nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, well, again, thanks to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member.

Seventeen young crew members in the U.S. Navy were serving their country. In an instant, their lives were taken as a result of this terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*. Of those killed, most were young. Most came from our typical American hometown. They all left families and friends to mourn them. My thoughts and prayers go out to those families and friends. We, as a country, grieve with them.

I feel, I think, some of this grief as I remember that day in 1957 when we received word that my brother's plane had gone down, and he was killed. The family is never quite the same.

A senseless tragedy like this attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*, I think, allows us to reflect on all those military service members and their families who sacrifice so much while serving this great country.

Our brave men and women in all the branches of the armed services stand ready to defend America, not only within our borders, but throughout unpredictable international waters and lands.

Let us continually stand behind them and support them and humbly recognize their sacrifices. I think too often we take their services for granted. We would not be enjoying the freedoms we have now without the sacrifices of so many during our great country's history.

I hope we will often remember how important America's military is to ensure the freedoms and liberties we have in this country.

Again, my very sincere condolences go out to the family and the loved ones of those service men and women who had their life taken. May God help them through this difficult time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we all send our deep-felt thoughts to the families of those who are lost and injured. Any of us who have military facilities in our districts know that the daily sacrifice that the men and women in uniform give to this Nation is something that keeps us free and frankly keeps the world free. Without American service personnel, this world would not be a world filled with burgeoning democracies.

But for those families whose tragic loss by these cowardly terrorists, every Member in this Chamber, everyone in the administration will take every effort to make sure that they are caught and punished.

America is the leading force in the world for freedom, and often we are the leading target of the mad men of this world. They will not succeed. We will join together with other freedom-loving Nations, and we will end terrorism. We will win this fight, and we will do this united with many of our friends across the globe.

All of my constituents and all my colleagues again send our prayers to the families and our gratitude to all the men and women in uniform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). The Chair announces that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 3 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has the right to close.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of our Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time. I thank both the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our distinguished ranking member, for this particular legislation.

I rise with a deep sense of sorrow shared by all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in remembering those brave Americans who paid the ultimate price for the freedom and democracy that we enjoy.

It is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that, during this time of reflection on the lives of these individuals, these young sons and daughters and mothers and fathers, these young relatives of so many families in America that have been taken away from us, that we reflect on the value of our military and the role they perform every day of the year.

Mr. Speaker, we lost 17 brave Americans. We lost dads who left kids. We lost daughters who left behind moms and dads. We lost people who were involved in their community and charity events and church organizations. We lost future leaders of America. Perhaps even among them was a Member of Congress. I heard the President say today that one of the individuals actually had worked at the White House, helping with the computer system.

These were not just sailors. These were individuals who were destined to become a part of the American fabric, who were going to eventually assume their leadership role in both the military and also in civilian life. Tragically, they were cut down.

□ 1800

I would ask our colleagues to remember the individuals that are being honored here tonight and the entire crew of the ship, and that we think about the implications of having a Navy where one-third of our ships are right now deployed, and over one-half of those ships underway steaming across the seas to distant lands to protect America. We have military personnel in dozens of cities and countries around the world today performing important functions of keeping peace, allowing us to have that forward presence and making sure that the world is stable.

Sometimes I think we take that for granted as a nation, and it takes this kind of incident to remind us that these are human beings; that we have the responsibility to give them the proper benefits, the responsibility to give them the proper equipment, and the proper training.

I agree with what the President has been saying and what Governor Bush has been saying and Vice President Gore. We do have the best military in the world, and it is the best-trained military in the world. But I can tell my colleagues that I am concerned. We cannot cut our Navy back from 585 to 317 and keep the level of deployments up. We cannot continue to have 35 deployments in 9 years all over the world and not expect additional pressures like what we have seen.

Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a full investigation of this incident, and there needs to be a full accounting for those who perpetrated the act and the reasons why this act occurred.

But today we remember those brave souls, those brave heroes, and I join with my colleagues in extending our warmest and deepest sympathy to the families and loved ones of these brave sailors. I ask all of us in America to reflect on the importance of our military and make a renewed commitment in honor of those brave 17 Americans and the entire crew of the *Cole* that we will continue to provide the full support of all Americans in providing the funding for an adequate military, for the proper quality of life, for proper health care, and for all those other commitments that America needs to make to its uniformed personnel.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support for this resolution introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and the ranking member.

At a tragic time like this, it is important to remember that freedom is not defended by ships or airplanes or tanks, freedom is defended by people; people from all walks of life and people from all around the country; people who are capable of doing individual things and making their contribution to the Nation. These sailors who were victims of a very cruel and vicious act are amongst freedom's best, are amongst America's best.

Terrorist acts are supposed to inspire terror. I think that this resolution, I think the comments of many of the Members today, I think the sentiments of the American public, I think the moving memorial service earlier today indicates that America is anything but terrorized by this act. Instead, we are

galvanized to do the best that we can by our men and women in uniform, to continue the policy of trying to extend freedom around the world and to protect it wherever it is threatened.

So today at this time I think we want to extend our deepest and sincerest condolences to the families and again to pay tribute to these fine young Americans.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PICKETT), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Today, in Norfolk, Virginia, we were touched as a Navy family, community, and Nation as we mourned the brave American sailors who paid the ultimate sacrifice on board the U.S.S. *Cole* in the name of liberty and freedom. These men and women, our fathers and sons, brothers and sisters, mothers and daughters, were violently attacked as they stood watch for their country. Instantly, the promise and hope of 17 voices were forever quieted by an act of hate. Even now, the captain, officers, and crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* are working around the clock to save their ship. Let there be no mistake, the United States condemns those responsible for these acts and will relentlessly pursue the attackers until their identity is known and justice is served.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, in times of peace and prosperity, which we largely enjoy today, it is easy to forget the perils our men and women in uniform face each day. Our sailors, soldiers, airmen, and Marines put their lives on the line not just when they are deployed in harm's way in the world's volatile areas like those aboard the *Cole*, but also each day as they train to get ready for such missions. These brave Americans heard the call of duty to serve their country, and like all men and women in the service, the U.S.S. *Cole* answered that call to travel to far-off lands to keep the peace and carry American ideals to places where they are so desperately needed. Their bravery is exemplary of the American spirit and one reason the United States serves as a beacon of hope and freedom to others around the world.

To these servicemen and women courageously serving their country, we say thank you. We will find these attackers and they will be brought to justice.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), who is a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend on the Committee on Armed Services for yielding me this time.

I know my entire State and my district back home in Indiana send their thoughts and prayers not only to the 17 families but all our families that are present overseas today and tomorrow doing the great job they do to protect this great Nation.

As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, a few days ago I received a briefing out at Langley, and I know that the intelligence community is working tirelessly, day in and day out, to follow every lead to gather all the evidence and the facts so that we can find out who did this and make sure when we find out that there is swift justice. We will find the culprits and the cowards that inflicted this on our people, and justice hopefully will be done soon.

Our prayers go to our service personnel and to our intelligence and military community to help us address this very serious situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds of that time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of our committee.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and let me extend my profound and personal sense of grief and appreciation to the families of those brave Americans who served on the *Cole*.

Let me say this. I know these words will be of little comfort to those who have suffered such a great loss, but to those who question the character of the young people in America today, I would say that we have a resounding answer. We had young people who were willing to enlist voluntarily in the service of their country and give their lives. They have done so with great honor. We are very proud of them, and their families should know they have given their lives nobly and will not be forgotten.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it was the Roman orator Cicero who once said that gratitude is the greatest of all virtues. This morning in a ceremony next to the U.S.S. *Eisenhower* at Norfolk, Virginia, commemorating the lives of those 17 sailors, feelings came to each of us; feelings of sympathy for the families of those injured and those deceased, admiration for the sailors who carried on and saved their ship and did so well by doing their duty, and anger, anger at those who perpetrated this deed. And yet that anger will fade into determination to cause America to seek justice.

I will repeat the words of Admiral Robert Natter, as he spoke during the ceremony: ''All Americans should remember. Remember the *Cole*.''

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here on this very solemn occasion to honor these people who have paid the price for our freedom. How can we honor them? What can we say? What can we do?

I think one thing we can do as a Nation is to assure those families of these young men and women, and the ones who were injured and all the other members of our armed forces today who are paying the price every day in all kinds of ways all over this world. The price for what? Freedom.

We have heard many of us use the word freedom many times today. And some might wonder, what does that have to do with it? That is what it is all about. These young men and women not only today but in the past who served our country have not only given us our freedom but defended it every day all over this world at great sacrifice. Why is that freedom so important? Without it, where would we be?

Some wonder about some of us who are so strong for national defense, that is why. Freedom is so important. Without freedom, we would not have the environment necessary to consider all the other problems we have in this country to deal with. First, we must have our freedom. In a free society we can then go about dealing with the rest of our problems. But I never, never, never get away from the fact that we, every day, take for granted what other people before us over the years have done in giving us and defending our freedom for us today who have not paid that price.

As I said earlier, I think every day we should honor people, not just one day every so often when these kinds of things happen. We should every day pay honor to those who have given us our very freedom.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, events are sometimes so horrible that words alone do not fully describe the pain and sorrow that is in all of our hearts. The tragedy aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* was just such an event. This act of cowardice and malice against 17 Americans who were simply doing their duty is beyond all reason.

These brave soldiers died in the line of duty, and the resolution before us honors those who so valiantly gave their lives in the service of their country.

It is a simple gesture, but it is so necessary.

Our fallen sailors are the true heroes of our society.

They worked day after day and week after week to protect our nation from harm. They spent their time promoting peace in the world. They were symbols of American values—democracy, diversity, human tolerance and understanding, opportunity and freedom.

Today, America is stronger because of your brave service overseas—and the world is a better place because of your sacrifice.

We say as a country that we will not let heinous acts of terrorism deter us from our mission of peace in the Middle East and around the world. We will not rest until the people responsible for this crime are brought to justice. And we will not shrink from our duties in the world—we will continue to maintain our presence and promote freedom, democracy, and better relations among all people.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to the victims' families. Our thoughts and prayers are with you. You, too, have made the ultimate sacrifice, and we as a country are forever in your debt. Our hearts and gratitude also go out to the injured and their families who have also suffered from this attack.

I salute the brave souls who fought to reclaim their ship—to save their vessel under the most difficult, wrenching circumstances. They are a tribute to our armed forces and they embody the best values in our society.

Finally, I want to say, humbly, that America will never forget our fallen heros. We will always honor the sacrifice you have made so that others might live in peace.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 631, honoring our servicemen and women who were victims of the terrorist attack on the destroyer U.S.S. *Cole.*

I was saddened and outraged by the cowardly attack carried out against the U.S.S. *Cole* on October 12 off the Yemeni Coast. First and foremost, my thoughts and prayers are with the families and friends of those who laid down their lives serving their country and representing the highest traditions of the United States Navy.

As I sat and watched the television that dark Thursday morning, I could not help but feel for the loved ones of the fallen. I hope that time and reflection and God's healing hand can put their pain at ease.

The 17 sailors who perished and the over three dozen wounded were carrying out a mission of vital national interest to America. They were part of a carrier battle group that projects our forward maritime presence by taking station in the Persian Gulf region. These brave Americans's knew they were going into a volatile region. They were made ever more aware of their situation as fighting broke out between the Israeli government and Palestinians. However, members of our armed forces are regularly called upon to carry out their assignments that place them in harms way. Still, when even one American dies in the line of duty, it is a time for reflection and sorrow.

The heroic damage control efforts of the U.S.S. *Cole*'s crew after the explosion saved not only the ship, but lives. After the blast that ripped a 40 by 45 foot hole in the port side of the ship and exploded windows on land, the crew was able to maintain composure and stop the flooding. I can only image what it must have taken for a sailor aboard to see the havoc but still have the courage and presence of mind to do their duty by sealing off the bulkheads and evacuating the injured.

The terrorists that carried out this cowardly mission perished in the blast, but there are numerous responsible parties that financed, trained, and planned the attack. Our government must locate these perpetrators and bring them to justice no matter where they are in the world as soon as possible.

America must always be vigilant for those who wish to do harm to our troops and citizens. We must never let those who harm U.S. citizens go unpunished. However, America will not be deterred by this act from carrying out missions that are vital to our national interests in the region.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring the entire crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*, and in offering my heartfelt condolences to the families of those sailors who gave their lives in service to their country.

As often as I can, I offer my sincere appreciation and admiration to the men and women who proudly serve in uniform on behalf of the United States of America. The efforts of these fine Americans, both in peacetime and in war, not only have allowed this nation to achieve its stature as the greatest institution of democracy and liberty the world has ever known, but have ensured the high level of security and prosperity we now know.

However, on this day we must sadly confront the harsh reality that national security is not without risk. Today we are reminded that our soldiers, sailors and airmen are, in fact, our front line of defense in an unpredictable and sometimes dangerous world. We realize, as is carved in granite at the National Korean War Memorial, ''peace is not free.'' Sometimes the cost of peace comes at a very high price.

The sailors of the U.S.S. *Cole*, those cruelly snatched from this Earth, those injured in the blast, and those still on board who bravely worked to assist their mates and who continue to struggle to maintain their ship, represent the noblest principles of our nation and of our history.

Almost 140 years ago, when consecrating the graves of Americans who gave their lives in the fields of Gettysburg, President Abraham Lincoln said: ''The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but we must never forget what they did here.'' Few words ring as true through the ages, or as appropriate on this solemn day.

Today, my colleagues and I grieve and pray with the families who lost loved ones on board the *Cole*, and with the sailors recovering from injuries sustained in the vicious attack. Our nation's resolve to find those responsible for this tragedy is strong, and our will to ensure justice is unbending. All Americans, across this nation and at all points of the globe, must never forget the ultimate sacrifice of these men and women and of their families. But, I submit, each of us must also strive to better remember and honor the acts of bravery and sacrifice our men and women in uniform commit each and every day.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the brave young men from Texas who died in last week's attack against the U.S.S. *Cole*—Ronchester M. Santiago of Kingsville, Timothy L. Gauna of Rice, and Gary G. Swenchonis, Jr. of Rockport.

These young men, none older than 26, were pillars of their communities who joined the U.S. Navy to serve their country and protect our national security. Specialist Third Class Santiago, a cook aboard the *Cole,* was remembered as an excellent student and well-respected by his peers.

Seaman Gauna, an information systems technician, was a standout on his high school basketball and baseball teams. He also served as a bilingual teacher's aide at a local elementary school after graduation, before joining the Navy.

Fireman Swenchonis, who had not joined the Navy until January 1999, was remembered as a good student, always willing to volunteer or lend a helping hand.

They are just three of the 17 sailors killed or presumed dead in this despicable act of terrorism. Our sympathies are with the families of those sailors, along with the families of the injured, including Kesha Stidham of Austin, who lies in critical condition.

As the Navy continues to recover its dead, the FBI, along with military and Yemeni authorities, are working around the clock to find those who are responsible. I congratulate them on their quick work so far and hope that additional leads and arrests will be forthcoming.

Let those who conceived this brutal act, however, heed our words. America will not stand idly by as her young men and women are slaughtered by cowardly men in cowardly acts. You will be found, you will be brought to justice, and you will be punished.

Mr. Speaker, our resolve will not be affected by this attack. The United States will continue to work for peace and stability to the Middle East, and we will continue to oppose those who seek to deal in the currency of violence and terror.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Petty Officer First Class Douglas Hancock, a brave young sailor from Enterprise who was injured in the disgusting and cowardly act of terrorism that was the attack on the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG–67).

In the early hours of October 12, 2000, a worried Grady White called my office asking for my assistance in determining whether his grandson was injured or killed in the attack. Due to some confusion over who was listed on Douglas' notification list, the Hancock family was worried they might not be contacted. The Navy did an admirable job keeping all the families of the crew members of the U.S.S. *Cole* informed under the circumstances. However, when CNN ran footage of injured sailors being carried into the hospital, Mrs. Becky Hancock, Douglas' mother, was both relieved and worried when she recognized Douglas' face as one of the injured sailors.

Douglas Hancock suffered a broken jaw and cuts from the explosion. He was one of the 37 injured. He was not among the seven confirmed dead or the ten missing and presumed dead. He is going home to his close-knit family and friends.

I salute Petty Officer Douglas Hancock and the rest of the U.S.S. *Cole*'s crew for their bravery and service to our nation.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we honor the brave young men and women who lost their lives in last week's shocking attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* in the Port of Aden, Yemen. This terrorist attack provides us with another painful reminder that the United States military must always remain vigilant in a world often hostile to our country's interests.

Our military is constantly threatened by enemies of peace throughout the world. From peace-keeping operations in the Balkans, to preventing communist aggression on the Korean Peninsula, to keeping a cautioned eye on the increasing turmoil in the Middle East—our military is spread disturbingly thin. In order to deter our enemies and protect the lives of our courageous servicemen and women, Congress must continue to make every effort to strengthen our armed forces' ability to stop these types of attacks from happening in the first place.

This tragedy also reminds us that though we are living in an era of relative peace and prosperity, we must never take it for granted. America would not be free today without the sacrifices of the brave individuals who choose to serve our country for many reasons, but who all share the risk and sacrifice this service brings. The men and women of our armed

forces exemplify personal courage by facing fear, danger and adversity every day. And they carry out their duties with honor, integrity, and respect.

Our hearts, and our prayers, go out to the families of the young men and women killed in Yemen, and to all American military men and women serving our nation all over the world. Their sacrifice and their spirit call upon each generation of Americans to recognize and appreciate those who pay the ultimate price for our nation's freedom. We will always remember and honor their sacrifice.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, almost a week ago, people all over the world awoke to the news of a terrorist strike against one of our naval ships. Like countless other Americans, I was stunned by the early reports. Over the next several hours and days, the gravity of the situation became clearer. The Navy has reported that seventeen sailors were killed by this blast and another 33 were injured. Today, I join many with my colleagues in rising to honor these men and women who gave their lives to protect our nation and all she stands for.

Today, the families of those lost honored them at a memorial service in Norfolk, Virginia, the *Cole*'s home port. Throughout the ceremony we were reminded of the sacrifice by not only those in uniform, but their families as well. Unfortunately this sacrifice is often forgotten, but it is never unappreciated. It is truly an extraordinary person who is willing to commit to this type of service and dedicate his/her life to something larger than him/herself. It is an individual's commitment to the service of this country that we are reminded of as we mourn those who gave their lives. My own district also suffered the loss of a loved one in this attack. Patrick Roy, a onetime resident of Cornwall on Hudson, New York was a Fireman Apprentice on the U.S.S. *Cole,* and I offer my deepest sympathies to his friends and family.

I want to applaud the efforts of the remainder of the *Cole*'s personnel who did their job, manned their stations and saved their ship even while they knew that they had suffered the possible terrible loss of shipmates and members of their naval family.

The United States military has served as liberator and protector and has provided a source of hope for millions around the world in times of peace and in war. While it may be of little solace to those who have lost a loved one, the men and women of the *Cole* who gave their lives in an effort to serve as a protector will remain beacons of hope and will be remembered as heroes. My deepest condolences go out to all of the friends and families who have lost a loved one in this cowardly attack.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, today I commend the valiant sailors of the U.S.S. *Cole* and to express my deepest condolences to the families and loved ones who suffered losses due to an act of terrorism.

On October 12, 2000, the Navy family suffered a tremendous loss, when the U.S.S. *Cole* fell victim to terrorism while attempting to refuel at the Port of Aden in Yemen. My heart continues to go out to the families and friends of the American sailors who were killed, injured or are still missing. I comment our valiant sailors who responded quickly to this tragedy, minimizing casualties and damage to their ship.

It was an honor to assist three families from my District as they waited to hear news on their loved ones. Fortunately, the families and friends of Petty Officer Kevin Benoit of Cairo, NY, Ensign & Deck Division Commander Gregory McDearmon of Ballston Lake, NY, and Chief Petty Officer Charles Sweet of Broadalbin, NY, after hours of waiting, received word that their loved ones were safe.

It is important that we always remember that these brave men and women are serving our Nation and we should pay tribute to them. These sailors have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country. This is a loss felt by the entire nation.

This tragedy highlights the constant dangers faced by our armed forces around the world. Our country must remain vigilant in protecting them from future terrorist or other attacks. Our government must work diligently to protect and provide aid to those who are injured and work with the families who are going through a period of grieving.

Again, Mr. Speaker, our prayers go out to the sailors, their families and friends.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday a terrible and cowardly act of terrorism was made against America and our armed forces. The U.S.S. *Cole*, which had entered the Yemeni port of Aden, was blindsided by a small boat in a group helping to moor the ship for refueling. The boat was loaded with explosives and blew up alongside the U.S.S. *Cole.*

Mr. Speaker, 17 sailors were either killed or are missing from the blast, and 39 were injured.

Information Systems Technician Seaman Timothy Gauna, a constituent of mine from Rice, Texas, is among the missing. Like all the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*, he was serving his country bravely and honorably when this vicious attack took place. I join the Gauna family, and all the families of the missing sailors, in hoping that they will soon be accounted for.

Immediately after the attack Mr. Speaker, I flew down to North Texas to visit Seaman Gauna's family. There, I spoke with a mother who is proud of her son's courage and patriotism. And I talked to various family members who admire Tim's dedication to America.

I do not know all the sailors on the U.S.S. *Cole*, Mr. Speaker, but I know the family of Seaman Gauna. They—like all of the U.S.S. *Cole's* sailors and their families—have America's gratitude, and our prayers.

That's why I was so moved by the memorial service today in Norfolk, Virginia. There, the entire nation joined injured sailors—some fresh from the hospital, their IV's still attached to their arms—in paying tribute to their fallen and missing comrades.

But our obligation to these brave men and women is greater than that, Mr. Speaker. We must continue to be vigilant in the face of threats from terrorists around the world. We must find the criminals responsible for this cowardly atrocity, and they must be brought to justice.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, these terrorists will soon learn that America responds quickly and forcefully whenever we are attacked. The FBI now has more than 60 agents in place investigating this attack and the Navy has assigned six U.S. warships to Aden harbor to assist the U.S.S. *Cole* and its exhausted crew.

Mr. Speaker, every time anyone in uniform gets into a ship, a plane, or a tank, they risk their lives in defense of America. For that, we owe the great men and women of the United States Armed Forces our most profound gratitude. They have it, Mr. Speaker, as well as the solemn promise that America stands with them—always and everywhere.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when we are confronted by the despicable, cowardly attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* during a simple refueling stop in a troubled port, our first reaction is anger and a desire to punish those who are responsible.

But today I believe we should put those thoughts aside and consider instead on the sacrifice made by those members of the *Cole*'s crew, and reflect on how our country—and the entire world—depends on such sacrifices by all our men and women in uniform around the globe.

These crew members put themselves at risk to bring peace to a region that could self-destruct at any time if our warships were not present. The U.S.S. *Cole* was in Yemen, a nation with a history of antagonism to the United States, to help establish a new relationship of trust and friendship. They put their lives on the line not only to keep the peace, but spread its benefits.

The force of the explosion gouged a 40-foot-by-40 foot hole in the side of the *Cole*. If this attack had occurred to a ship of almost any other navy in the world, the ship would have sunk with many lives lost. But the *Cole*'s crew showed the intense training, high skill level and sheer determination that we have come to expect of all of America's armed forces. Twice in three days they contained the damage, keeping the ship afloat and saving many of their injured colleagues.

Because of the unselfish dedication of Americans like those on the U.S.S. *Cole,* the United States is one of the few nations in history that can reduce military tensions anywhere simply with the presence of our warships. The hearts of peace-loving people around the world are lifted at the sight of a U.S. Navy ship steaming into port. And sadly, the angry dreams of those who would disrupt the peace focus on destroying those peacekeepers, as well.

The crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* knew that they could be in danger in an unsettled region, and would not be deterred from performing their duty as our front-line peacekeepers. We are aware that there are those who will go to any extreme, including trying to sink the *Cole,* in a desperate effort to undermine America's commitment to bring peace to this war-torn part of the world. When the attack came, the crew of the *Cole* would not allow their ship to sink.

Our nation is deeply saddened by the loss of the brave men and women who gave their lives so that peace may spread around the world. But we say to the enemies who would attack us in the hopes of spreading war: Look carefully at the lesson of determination that is the U.S.S. *Cole.* We will not be deterred.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join Chairman SPENCE and Ranking member SKELTON, and all Americans, in honoring the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* and expressing the nation's sympathies to the families of those killed or injured.

Like my colleagues, I was struck by the photographs of the 17 sailors killed or presumed dead that appeared in the newspapers in the days following the terrorist attack against the *Cole*. Even the eldest of them—aged 35—died all too young.

As has been stated elsewhere, the photos put faces to the phrase ''in harm's way.'' Particularly young faces.

The phrase is also part and parcel to another: ''doing one's duty.''

We know from service members that the phrase ''doing one's duty'' is more than a combination of words. It is also reflective of a spirit, a commitment, a calling that attracts the very best of our youth to military service.

And it is not a phrase not taken lightly.

The crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* is but one of hundreds of units of men and women deployed around the world. Each knows the risk of such service. Each also knows of the contribution they make to our nation's defense and the defense of freedom around the world.

But, all too often, the contribution and sacrifice these men and women make is taken for granted. Too often, we have only assembled after a tragic incident like the bombing of the *Cole* to belatedly express our appreciation and thanks.

Let us resolve to thank the men and women of our Armed Forces everyday for their dedication, sacrifice, and courage. And let us remember 17 members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* for making the ultimate sacrifice.

To their families and friends, we assure you that their memory will not be forgotten. And the values for which they gave their lives will be forever cherished, honored and protected.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the sacrifice and the memory of the crew of America's guided missile destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* who were killed or wounded on October 12 as a suspected terrorist bomb ripped through the ship's hull. The State of Texas mourns the loss of three of its sons: Fireman Gary Graham Swenchonis, Jr. of Rockport, TX; Information Systems Technician Timothy Guana of Rice, TX; and Petty Officer 3rd Class Ronchester Santiago of Kingsville, TX. We Texans add our sadness and pride in our Nation to the family of Americans in saluting the honor and valor of all seventeen patriots and the remaining crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*.

The Nation especially grieves the loss of our first female sailors killed in hostile action aboard a U.S. combat ship. It is important to acknowledge that this historic sacrifice was made by two African American women. Lakeina Monique Francis of Woodleaf, North Carolina, a 19 year-old Mess Management Specialist Seaman, followed in her father's footsteps to serve her country in the Navy. Lakiba Nicole Palmer of San Diego, California was a 22 year-old Seaman Recruit. History will record their sacrifice as a milestone of great proportions. For today, there can be no doubt that America's sons and America's daughters will lay down their lives for freedom and peace around the globe. I urge this Congress to resolve that as this story is written and retold, the names of these women must not be forgotten as has too often been the case for the legacy and sacrifice of African American women throughout our Nation's history.

I stand with my colleagues to offer sincere condolences to every loved one who survives each of the seventeen patriots we honor through this resolution. Their supreme sacrifice compels us to live for peace and redouble our efforts to broker a lasting Middle East peace with the strongest determination.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, I pray God's blessing on the memories of these sailors, God's comfort for their families, and may God bless an America that is more resolute that ever to preserve the peace!

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave American sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* whose lives were taken off the coast of Yemen on October 12, 2000. I would like to express my deepest sympathies to the sailors' families during this difficult time.

We will never forget the sailors and the sacrifice they have made for our country. It is through their courageous service that all Americans are allowed to live in freedom.

I would also like to honor the other sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole*, both those injured and non-injured. This tragedy should be a reminder to all Americans that on a daily basis our men and women serving in the military are continually putting their lives on the line for our country in many parts of the world. Even in times of relative peace, the potential dangers faced by our service members never cease to exist.

This horrible incident is of particular concern to me because my District is home to Naval Air Station, Lemoore. Men and Women in my district proudly serve their country and bravely confront serious dangers. I know that the tragedy aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* evokes a painful reminder of these dangers to all military families. My thoughts are with the Navy families in my district who are mourning the loss of their fellow service men and women.

I am hopeful we will find those who were responsible for this cowardly act and hold them accountable. We owe it to the lost sailors and their families.

Today, as the families and friends of the victims come together in Norfolk, Virginia to honor their loved ones, I would like to offer my condolences and prayers. They will not be forgotten.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my heartfelt support for House Resolution 631, honoring the crew of the U.S.S. *Cole*. Today on a gray and sad day in Norfolk, Virginia and around the country, our nation mourns the loss of life and celebrates the service of sailors on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the seventeen sailors killed, and the thirty six injured in the terrorist bombing attack off the coast of Yemen. Our nation owes a profound debt of gratitude to these proud sailors who lost their lives or suffered injury defending the American people and the values of freedom and democracy on which our nation stands.

I extend my deep admiration to the entire crew of the U.S.S. *Cole* for the bravery and professionalism they displayed in caring for their wounded and stabilizing their ship. This tragedy underscores the commitment and sacrifice of our nation's fighting men and women who put their lives in danger on a daily basis for the security of our country.

This attack was an unconscionable act of cowardice and those responsible will be sought out and swiftly brought to justice. The United States will stay the course, acting as the leading force of stability and freedom in the fight against terrorism.

We will not be bowed or intimidated by this attack, as will carry the memory of the U.S.S. *Cole* in our hearts to strengthen our resolve and continue the struggle for world peace. Just as these seventeen sailors protected us in life, we shall honor and protect the memory of their sacrifice by standing firm against this type of senseless violence.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Resolution 631 will be followed by several 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules that were debated yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 531]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg

Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—46

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Chenoweth-Hage
Conyers
Delahunt
Dooley
English
Fattah
Forbes
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Goode
Graham
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hostettler
Houghton
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Klink
Kolbe
Lazio
Lipinski
McCollum
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Nethercutt
Ney
Oxley
Pascrell
Pitts
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanders
Shaw
Spratt
Stupak
Talent
Turner
Walsh
Weygand
Wise

□ 1833

Mrs. CUBIN changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, October 17, 2000, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 415, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3218, by the yeas and nays;

Concurring in Senate amendments to H.R. 3671, de novo;

H.R. 4148, de novo; and

S. 964, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each electronic vote in this series.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 415.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 415, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—376

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—56

Barrett (WI)
Bilbray
Bonilla
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Chenoweth-Hage
Conyers
Cubin
Delahunt
Dooley
English
Fattah
Forbes
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Goode
Graham
Gutierrez
Hansen
Herger
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Kasich
Kennedy
Klink
Kolbe
Lazio
Lipinski

Lucas (OK)
McCollum
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pitts
Radanovich
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanders
Schakowsky
Shaw
Sherwood
Stearns
Stupak
Talent
Turner
Walsh
Watt (NC)
Weygand
Wise

□ 1840

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 532, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER CONFIDENTIALITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3218.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3218, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 0, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Barrett (WI)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Chenoweth-Hage
Conyers
Cubin
Cunningham
Delahunt
Dickey
Dooley
English
Fattah
Forbes
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Goode
Graham
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hostettler
Houghton
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Lazio
Lipinski
McCollum
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Nethercutt
Ney
Oxley
Pascrell
Pitts
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Sanders
Shaw
Stupak
Talent
Turner
Weygand
Wise

□ 1847

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISH AND WILDLIFE PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT AND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CENTENNIAL ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3671.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3671.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBAL CONTRACT SUPPORT COST TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4148, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4148, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 964, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 964, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act, 20 USC 1098(c), the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a 3-year term:

Mr. Henry Givens, St. Louis, Missouri.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WALSH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–988)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4635) ''making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes'', having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

Section 1. (a) The provisions of the following bills of the 106th Congress are hereby enacted into law:

(1) H.R. 5482, as introduced on October 18, 2000.

(2) H.R. 5483, as introduced on October 18, 2000.

(b) In publishing this Act in slip form and in the United States Statutes at Large pursuant to section 112 of title 1, United States Code, the Archivist of the United States shall include after the date of approval at the end appendixes setting forth the texts of the bills referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

; And the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES T. WALSH,
TOM DELAY,
DAVE HOBSON,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
ANNE M. NORTHUP,
JOHN E. SUNUNU,
VIRGIL GOODE, Jr.,
BILL YOUNG,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
MARCY KAPTUR,
CARRIE P. MEEK,
DAVID E. PRICE,
BUD CRAMER,
DAVE OBEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
CONRAD BURNS,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
TED STEVENS,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
PATRICK LEAHY,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
TOM HARKIN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
HARRY REID,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying report.

This conference agreement includes more than the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001. The conference agreement has been expanded to include the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001, as well as the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001. Both of these Acts have been enacted into law by reference in this conference report; however, a copy of the referenced legislation has been included in this statement for convenience.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

The conference agreement would enact the provisions of H.R. 5482 as introduced on October 18, 2000. The text of that bill follows:

A BILL Making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of Article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540–548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), $22,766,276,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $17,419,000 of the amount appropriated shall be reimbursed to ''General operating expenses'' and ''Medical care'' for necessary expenses in implementing those provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and in the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992 (38 U.S.C. chapters 51, 53, and 55), the funding source for which is specifically provided as the ''Compensation and pensions'' appropriation: Provided further, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to ''Medical facilities revolving fund'' to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61, $1,634,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, other than under subsection (a)(1), (2), (5) and (11) of that section, shall be charged to the account: Provided further, That funds shall be available to pay any court order, court award or any compromise settlement arising from litigation involving the vocational training program authorized by section 18 of Public Law 98–77, as amended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487, $19,850,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That during fiscal year 2001, within the resources available, not to exceed $300,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $162,000,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $1,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 3698, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $3,400.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $220,000, which may be transferred to and

merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $52,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $2,726,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $432,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter V, as amended, $532,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Not to exceed $750,000 of the amounts appropriated by this Act for ''General operating expenses'' and ''Medical care'' may be expended for the administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter VI.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the department; and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in the department; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department; oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; aid to State homes as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 1741; administrative and legal expenses of the department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the department as authorized under 38 U.S.C. chapter 17, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq., $20,281,587,000, plus reimbursements: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, $900,000,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 2001, and shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed $500,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed $28,134,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses'': Provided further, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct by contract a program of recovery audits for the fee basis and other medical services contracts with respect to payments for hospital care; and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), amounts collected, by setoff or otherwise, as the result of such audits shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which funds are appropriated under this heading and the purposes of paying a contractor a percent of the amount collected as a result of an audit carried out by the contractor: Provided further, That all amounts so collected under the preceding proviso with respect to a designated health care region (as that term is defined in 38 U.S.C. 1729A(d)(2)) shall be allocated, net of payments to the contractor, to that region.

In addition, in conformance with Public Law 105–33 establishing the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund, such sums as may be deposited to such Fund pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 1729A may be transferred to this account, to remain available until expended for the purposes of this account.

None of the foregoing funds may be transferred to the Department of Justice for the purposes of supporting tobacco litigation.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 73, to remain available until September 30, 2002, $351,000,000, plus reimbursements.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities, $62,000,000 plus reimbursements: Provided, That technical and consulting services offered by the Facilities Management Field Service, including project management and real property administration (including leases, site acquisition and disposal activities directly supporting projects), shall be provided to Department of Veterans Affairs components only on a reimbursable basis, and such amounts will remain available until September 30, 2001.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, $1,050,000,000: Provided, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under 38 U.S.C. 3104(a) (1), (2), (5) and (11) that the Secretary determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed $45,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That funds under this heading shall be available to administer the Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training Act.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of the National Cemetery Administration, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemeterial expenses as authorized by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for use in cemeterial operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $109,889,000: Provided, That travel expenses shall not exceed $1,125,000: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $125,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $46,464,000: Provided, That of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $28,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''General operating expenses''.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is $4,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, $66,040,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That except for advance planning of projects (including market-based assessments of health care needs which may or may not lead to capital investments) funded through the advance planning fund and the design of projects funded through the design fund, none of these funds shall be used for any project which has not been considered and approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: Provided further, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 2001, for each approved project shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2001; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2002: Provided further, That the Secretary shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project in which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established above: Provided further, That no funds from any other account except the ''Parking revolving fund'', may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than $4,000,000, $162,000,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous ''Construction, minor projects'' appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than $4,000,000: Provided, That funds in this account shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department which are necessary because of loss

or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8109, income from fees collected, to remain available until expended, which shall be available for all authorized expenses except operations and maintenance costs, which will be funded from ''Medical care''.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8131–8137, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 2408, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2001 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 103. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for ''Construction, major projects'', ''Construction, minor projects'', and the ''Parking revolving fund'') shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 104. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under 5 U.S.C. 7901–7904 or 42 U.S.C. 5141–5204), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the ''Medical care'' account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 for ''Compensation and pensions'', ''Readjustment benefits'', and ''Veterans insurance and indemnities'' shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 106. Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2001 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100–86, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from ''Compensation and pensions''.

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the ''General operating expenses'' account for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: Provided, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an insurance program in fiscal year 2001, that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: Provided further, That if the cost of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: Provided further, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2001, which is properly allocable to the provision of each insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in such insurance program.

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, collections authorized by the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106–117) and credited to the appropriate Department of Veterans Affairs accounts in fiscal year 2001, shall not be available for obligation or expenditure unless appropriation language making such funds available is enacted.

SEC. 109. In accordance with section 1557 of title 31, United States Code, the following obligated balance shall be exempt from subchapter IV of chapter 15 of such title and shall remain available for expenditure until September 30, 2003: funds obligated by the Department of Veterans Affairs for a contract with the Institute for Clinical Research to study the application of artificial neural networks to the diagnosis and treatment of prostate cancer through the Cooperative DoD/VA Medical Research program from funds made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1995 (Public Law 103–335) under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide''.

SEC. 110. As HR LINK$ will not be part of the Franchise Fund in fiscal year 2001, funds budgeted in customer accounts to purchase HR LINK$ services from the Franchise Fund shall be transferred to the General Administration portion of the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation in the following amounts: $78,000 from the ''Office of Inspector General'', $358,000 from the ''National cemetery administration'', $1,106,000 from ''Medical care'', $84,000 from ''Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses'', and $38,000 shall be reprogrammed within the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation from the Veterans Benefits Administration to General Administration for the same purpose.

SEC. 111. Not to exceed $1,600,000 from the ''Medical care'' appropriation shall be transferred to the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation to fund personnel services costs of employees providing legal services and administrative support for the Office of General Counsel.

SEC. 112. Not to exceed $1,200,000 may be transferred from the ''Medical care'' appropriation to the ''General operating expenses'' appropriation to fund contracts and services in support of the Veterans Benefits Administration's Benefits Delivery Center, Systems Development Center, and Finance Center, located at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Hines, Illinois.

SEC. 113. Not to exceed $4,500,000 from the ''Construction, minor projects'' appropriation and not to exceed $2,000,000 from the ''Medical care'' appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the Parking Revolving Fund for surface parking lot projects.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for ''Medical care'' appropriations of the Department of Veterans Affairs may be obligated for the realignment of the health care delivery system in Veterans Integrated Service Network 12 (VISN 12) until 60 days after the Secretary of Veterans Affairs certifies that the Department has: (1) consulted with veterans organizations, medical school affiliates, employee representatives, State veterans and health associations, and other interested parties with respect to the realignment plan to be implemented; and (2) made available to the Congress and the public information from the consultations regarding possible impacts on the accessibility of veterans health care services to affected veterans.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance to prevent the involuntary displacement of low-income families, the elderly and the disabled because of the loss of affordable housing stock, expiration of subsidy contracts (other than contracts for which amounts are provided under another heading in this Act) or expiration of use restrictions, or other changes in housing assistance arrangements, and for other purposes, $13,940,907,000 and amounts that are recaptured in this account to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $13,430,000,000, of which $9,230,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2000 and $4,200,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2001, shall be for assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937 (''the Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437): Provided further, That the foregoing amounts shall shall be for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 subsidy contracts, for amendments to section 8 subsidy contracts, for enhanced vouchers (including amendments and renewals) under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (47 U.S.C. 1437f(t)), contract administrators, and contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: Provided further, That amounts available under the first proviso under this heading shall be available for section 8 rental assistance under the Act: (1) for the relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or to other authority for the revitalization of severely distressed public housing, as set forth in the Appropriations Acts for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1997, and in the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996; (2) for the conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8; (3) for funds to carry out the family unification program; (4) for the relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency; (5) for tenant protection assistance, including replacement and relocation assistance; and (6) for the 1-year renewal of section 8 contracts for units in a project that is subject to an approved plan of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990: Provided further, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $11,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided further, That of the total amount provided under this heading, $40,000,000 shall be made available to nonelderly disabled families affected by the designation of a public housing development under section 7 of the Act, the establishment of preferences in accordance with section 651 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1361l), or the restriction of occupancy to elderly families in accordance with section 658 of such Act, and to the extent the Secretary determines that such amount is not needed to fund applications for such affected families, to other nonelderly disabled families: Provided further, That of the total amount provided under this heading,

$452,907,000 shall be made available for incremental vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 on a fair share basis and administered by public housing agencies:

Provided further, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $7,000,000 shall be made available for the completion of the Jobs Plus Demonstration: Provided further, That amounts available under this heading may be made available for administrative fees and other expenses to cover the cost of administering rental assistance programs under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937: Provided further, That the fee otherwise authorized under section 8(q) of such Act shall be determined in accordance with section 8(q), as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998: Provided further, That $1,833,000,000 is rescinded from unobligated balances remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading or the heading ''Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing'' or any other heading for fiscal year 2000 and prior years: Provided further, That any such balances governed by reallocation provisions under the statute authorizing the program for which the funds were originally appropriated shall not be available for this rescission: Provided further, That the Secretary shall have until September 30, 2001, to meet the rescission in the proviso preceding the immediately preceding proviso: Provided further, That any obligated balances of contract authority that have been terminated shall be canceled.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437), $3,000,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which up to $50,000,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act, for lease adjustments to section 23 projects and $43,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937: Provided further, That of the total amount, up to $75,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from emergencies and natural disasters in fiscal year 2001.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

For payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), $3,242,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For grants to public housing agencies and Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities for use in eliminating crime in public housing projects authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11901–11908, for grants for federally assisted low-income housing authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11909, and for drug information clearinghouse services authorized by 42 U.S.C. 11921–11925, $310,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to $3,000,000 shall be solely for technical assistance, technical assistance grants, training, and program assessment for or on behalf of public housing agencies, resident organizations, and Indian tribes and their tribally designated housing entities (including up to $150,000 for the cost of necessary travel for participants in such training) for oversight, training and improved management of this program, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for the operating and start-up costs of clubs located in or near, and primarily serving residents of, public housing and housing assisted under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and $10,000,000 shall be used in connection with efforts to combat violent crime in public and assisted housing under the Operation Safe Home Program administered by the Inspector General of the Department of Housing and Urban Development: Provided further, That of the amount under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be provided to the Office of Inspector General for Operation Safe Home: Provided further, That of the amount under this heading, $20,000,000 shall be available for the New Approach Anti-Drug program which will provide competitive grants to entities managing or operating public housing developments, federally assisted multifamily housing developments, or other multifamily housing developments for low-income families supported by non-Federal governmental entities or similar housing developments supported by nonprofit private sources in order to provide or augment security (including personnel costs), to assist in the investigation and/or prosecution of drug-related criminal activity in and around such developments, and to provide assistance for the development of capital improvements at such developments directly relating to the security of such developments: Provided further, That grants for the New Approach Anti-Drug program shall be made on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, $575,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which the Secretary may use up to $10,000,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: Provided, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (Public Law 104–330), $650,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $6,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, training, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to $300,000 for related travel: Provided, That of the amount provided under this heading, $6,000,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: Provided further, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $54,600,000: Provided further, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to $150,000 from amounts in the first proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses'', to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees: Provided further, That of the amount provided in this heading, $2,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for developing and maintaining information technology systems.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 3739), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $71,956,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to $200,000 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses'', to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901), $258,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary shall renew all expiring contracts that were funded under section 854(c)(3) of such Act that meet all program requirements before awarding funds for new contracts and activities authorized under this section: Provided further, That the Secretary may use up to 1 percent of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, $25,000,000 to remain available until expended, which amount shall be awarded by June 1, 2001, to Indian tribes, State housing finance agencies, State community and/or economic development agencies, local rural nonprofits and community development corporations to support innovative housing and economic development activities in rural areas: Provided, That all grants shall be awarded on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the HUD Reform Act.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

For grants in connection with a second round of empowerment zones and enterprise communities, $90,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $75,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for ''Urban Empowerment Zones'', as authorized in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, including $5,000,000 for each empowerment zone for use in conjunction with economic development activities consistent with the strategic plan of each empowerment zone: Provided further, That $15,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for grants for designated empowerment zones in rural areas and for grants for designated rural enterprise communities.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, $5,057,550,000: Provided, That of the amount provided, $4,409,000,000 is for carrying

out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the ''Act'' herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301), to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided further, That $71,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act, $3,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the Housing Assistance Council, $2,600,000 shall be available as a grant to the National American Indian Housing Council, $10,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National Housing Development Corporation, for operating expenses not to exceed $2,000,000 and for a program of affordable housing acquisition and rehabilitation, and $45,500,000 shall be for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Act of which $3,000,000 shall be made available to support Alaska Native serving institutions and native Hawaiian serving institutions, as defined under the Higher Education Act, as amended, and of which $3,000,000 shall be made available to tribal colleges and universities to build, expand, renovate, and equip their facilities: Provided further, That not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated herein (other than a grant made available in this paragraph to the Housing Assistance Council or the National American Indian Housing Council, or a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended) shall be expended for ''Planning and Management Development'' and ''Administration'' as defined in regulations promulgated by the department: Provided further, That $15,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided further, That $20,000,000 shall be for grants pursuant to the Self Help Housing Opportunity Program.

Of the amount made available under this heading, $28,450,000 shall be made available for capacity building, of which $25,000,000 shall be made available for ''Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing'', for LISC and the Enterprise Foundation for activities as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–120), as in effect immediately before June 12, 1997, of which not less than $5,000,000 of the funding shall be used in rural areas, including tribal areas, and of which $3,450,000 shall be made available for capacity building activities administered by Habitat for Humanity International.

Of the amount made available under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may use up to $55,000,000 for supportive services for public housing residents, as authorized by section 34 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and for residents of housing assisted under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) and for grants for service coordinators and congregate services for the elderly and disabled residents of public and assisted housing and housing assisted under NAHASDA.

Of the amount made available under this heading, $44,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives: Provided, That any unobligated balances of amounts set aside for neighborhood initiatives in fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 may be utilized for any of the foregoing purposes: Provided further, That these grants shall be provided in accord with the terms and conditions specified in the statement of managers accompanying this conference report.

Of the amount made available under this heading, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $60,000,000 shall be available for YouthBuild program activities authorized by subtitle D of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, and such activities shall be an eligible activity with respect to any funds made available under this heading: Provided, That local YouthBuild programs that demonstrate an ability to leverage private and nonprofit funding shall be given a priority for YouthBuild funding: Provided further, That no more than ten percent of any grant award may be used for administrative costs: Provided further, That not less than $10,000,000 shall be available for grants to establish YouthBuild programs in underserved and rural areas: Provided further, That of the amount provided under this paragraph, $4,000,000 shall be set aside and made available for a grant to Youthbuild USA for capacity building for community development and affordable housing activities as specified in section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, as amended.

Of the amounts made available under this heading, $2,000,000 shall be available to the Utah Housing Finance Agency for the temporary use of relocatable housing during the 2002 Winter Olympic Games provided such housing is targeted to the housing needs of low-income families after the Games.

Of the amount made available under this heading, $292,000,000 shall be available for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of targeted economic investments in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the statement of managers accompanying this conference report.

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $29,000,000, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $1,261,000,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: Provided further, That in addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $1,000,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For Economic Development Grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, for Brownfields redevelopment projects, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make these grants available on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, $1,800,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That up to $20,000,000 of these funds shall be available for Housing Counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968: Provided further, That $17,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program (as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended); the supportive housing program (as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act); the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program (as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program (as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act), $1,025,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not less than 30 percent of these funds shall be used for permanent housing, and all funding for services must be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee: Provided further, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: Provided further, That up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading is transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used for technical assistance for management information systems and to develop an automated, client-level Annual Performance Report System: Provided further, That $500,000 shall be made available to the Interagency Council on the Homeless for administrative needs.

SHELTER PLUS CARE RENEWALS

For the renewal on an annual basis of contracts expiring during fiscal years 2001 and 2002 under the Shelter Plus Care program, as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That each Shelter Plus Care project with an expiring contract shall be eligible for renewal only if the project is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance for the purchase, construction, acquisition, or development of additional public and subsidized housing units for low income families not otherwise provided for, $996,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $779,000,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance, and amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, for the elderly under such section 202(c)(2), and for supportive services associated with the housing, of which amount $50,000,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects and of which amount $50,000,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q–2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use: Provided further, That of the amount under this heading, $217,000,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, for project rental assistance, for amendments to contracts for project rental assistance, and supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of such Act: Provided further, That $1,000,000, to be divided evenly between the appropriations for the section 202 and section 811 programs, shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the

development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided further, That the Secretary may designate up to 25 percent of the amounts earmarked under this paragraph for section 811 of such Act for tenant-based assistance, as authorized under that section, including such authority as may be waived under the next proviso, which assistance is 5 years in duration: Provided further, That the Secretary may waive any provision of such section 202 and such section 811 (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance) that the Secretary determines is not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate, or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2000, and any collections made during fiscal year 2001, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA—MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2001, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of $160,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2001, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed $250,000,000: Provided, That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, $330,888,000, of which not to exceed $324,866,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and not to exceed $4,022,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses, $160,000,000, of which $96,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $65,500,000,000 on or before April 1, 2001 an additional $1,400 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments (including a pro rata amount for any amount below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $16,000,000.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z–3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended), $101,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $21,000,000,000: Provided further, That any amounts made available in any prior appropriations Act for the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans that are obligations of the funds established under section 238 or 519 of the National Housing Act that have not been obligated or that are deobligated shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the making of such guarantees and shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding the expiration of any period of availability otherwise applicable to such amounts.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed $50,000,000; of which not to exceed $30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $211,455,000, of which $193,134,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''; and of which $18,321,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Office of Inspector General''. In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, $144,000,000, of which $33,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: Provided, That to the extent guaranteed loan commitments exceed $8,426,000,000 on or before April 1, 2001, an additional $19,800,000 for administrative contract expenses shall be available for each $1,000,000 in additional guaranteed loan commitments over $8,426,000,000 (including a pro rata amount for any increment below $1,000,000), but in no case shall funds made available by this proviso exceed $14,400,000.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed $200,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, $9,383,000 to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed $9,383,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for ''Salaries and expenses''.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z–1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, $53,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That of the amount provided under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative: Provided further, That $3,000,000 shall be for program evaluation to support strategic planning, performance measurement, and their coordination with the Department's budget process: Provided further, That $500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for a commission as established under section 525 of Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, $46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $24,000,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: Provided, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by sections 1011 and 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, $100,000,000 to remain available until expended, of which $1,000,000 shall be for CLEARCorps and $10,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related environmental diseases and hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $1,072,000,000, of which $518,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, $9,383,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, $1,000,000 shall be provided from the ''Community development fund'' account, $150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Title VI Indian federal guarantees program'' account, and $200,000 shall be provided by transfer from the ''Indian housing loan guarantee fund program'' account: Provided, That the Secretary is prohibited from using any funds under this heading or any other heading in this Act from employing more than 77 schedule C and 20 noncareer Senior Executive Service employees: Provided further, That not more than $758,000,000 shall be made available to the personal services object class: Provided further, That no less than $100,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of Information Technology Systems: Provided further, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS–14 and GS–15 levels until the total number of GS–14 and GS–15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS–14 and GS–15 positions on the date of enactment of this provision by two and one-half percent: Provided further, That the Secretary shall submit a staffing plan for the Department by May 15, 2001: Provided further, That the Secretary is prohibited from using funds under this heading or any other heading in this Act to employ more than 14 employees in the Office of Public Affairs or in any position in the Department where the employee reports to an employee of the Office of Public Affairs.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $85,000,000, of which $22,343,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration and $10,000,000 shall be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home in the appropriation for ''Drug elimination grants for low-income housing'': Provided, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within the Office of Inspector General.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $22,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: Provided, That not to exceed such amount shall be available from the General Fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: Provided further, That the General Fund amount shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $0.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

FINANCING ADJUSTMENT FACTORS

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (Public Law 100–628; 102 Stat. 3224, 3268) shall be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

FAIR HOUSING AND FREE SPEECH

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2001 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS GRANTS

SEC. 203. (a) ELIGIBILITY.—Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2001 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2001 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2001 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome required under such clause.

(b) AMOUNT.—The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2001, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—Section 856 of the Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end:

''(h) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.—For purposes of environmental review, a grant under this subtitle shall be treated as assistance for a special project that is subject to section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994, and shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section.''.

ENHANCED DISPOSITION AUTHORITY

SEC. 204. Section 204 of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997, is amended by striking ''and 2000'' and inserting ''2000, and thereafter''.

MAXIMUM PAYMENT STANDARD FOR ENHANCED VOUCHERS

SEC. 205. Section 8(t)(1)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting ''and any other reasonable limit prescribed by the Secretary'' immediately before the semicolon.

DUE PROCESS FOR HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 206. None of the funds appropriated under this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prohibit or debar or in any way diminish the responsibilities of any entity (and the individuals comprising that entity) that is responsible for convening and managing a continuum of care process (convenor) in a community for purposes of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act from participating in that capacity unless the Secretary has published in the Federal Register a description of all circumstances that would be grounds for prohibiting or debarring a convenor from administering a continuum of care process and the procedures for a prohibition or debarment: Provided, That these procedures shall include a requirement that a convenor shall be provided with timely notice of a proposed prohibition or debarment, an identification of the circumstances that could result in the prohibition or debarment, an opportunity to respond to or remedy these circumstances, and the right for judicial review of any decision of the Secretary that results in a prohibition or debarment.

HUD REFORM ACT COMPLIANCE

SEC. 207. Except as explicitly provided in legislation, any grant or assistance made pursuant to Title II of this Act shall be made in accordance with section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 on a competitive basis.

EXPANSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSUMPTION AUTHORITY FOR HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 208. Section 443 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 443. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

''For purposes of environmental review, assistance and projects under this title shall be treated as assistance for special projects that are subject to section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994, and shall be subject to the regulations issued by the Secretary to implement such section.''.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS AND CORRECTIONS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 209. (a) SECTION 203 SUBSECTION DESIGNATIONS.—Section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (u);

(2) redesignating subsection (s), as added by section 329 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as subsection (t); and

(3) redesignating subsection (v), as added by section 504 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992, as subsection (w).

(b) MORTGAGE AUCTIONS.—The first sentence of section 221(g)(4)(C)(viii) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after ''December 31, 2002'' the following: '', except that this subparagraph shall continue to apply if the Secretary receives a mortgagee's written notice of intent to assign its mortgage to the Secretary on or before such date''.

(c) MORTGAGEE REVIEW BOARD.—Section 202(c)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''and'';

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''or their designees.'' and inserting ''and'';

(3) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end:

''(G) the Director of the Enforcement Center; or their designees.''.

INDIAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 210. Section 201(b) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a recipient may provide housing or housing assistance provided through affordable housing activities assisted with grant amounts under this Act to a law enforcement officer on the reservation or other Indian area, who is employed full-time by a Federal, state, county or tribal government, and in implementing such full-time employment is sworn to uphold, and make arrests for violations of Federal, state, county or tribal law, if the recipient determines that the presence of the law enforcement officer on the Indian reservation or other Indian area may deter crime.''.

PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF THE SALE OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS

SEC. 211. None of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide any grant or other assistance to construct, operate, or otherwise benefit a facility, or facility with a designated portion of that facility, which sells, or intends to sell, predominantly cigarettes or other tobacco products. For the purposes of this provision, predominant sale of cigarettes or other tobacco products means cigarette or tobacco sales representing more than 35 percent of the annual total in-store, non-fuel, sales.

PROHIBITION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF PUERTO RICO PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

SEC. 212. No funds may be used to implement the agreement between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rico Public Housing Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated June 7, 2000, related to the allocation of operating subsidies for the Puerto Rico Public Housing Administration unless the Puerto Rico Public Housing Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development submit by December 31, 2000 a schedule of benchmarks and measurable goals to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations designed to address issues of mismanagement and safeguards against fraud and abuse.

HOPE VI GRANT FOR HOLLANDER RIDGE

SEC. 213. The Housing Authority of Baltimore City may use the grant award of $20,000,000 made to such authority for development efforts at Hollander Ridge in Baltimore, Maryland with funds appropriated for fiscal year 1996 under the heading ''Public Housing Demolition, Site Revitalization, and Replacement Housing Grants'' for use, as approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development—

(1) for activities related to the revitalization of the Hollander Ridge site; and

(2) in accordance with section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

COMPUTER ACCESS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING RESIDENTS

SEC. 214. (a) USE OF PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL AND OPERATING FUNDS.—Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(E), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including the establishment and initial operation of computer centers in and around public housing through a Neighborhood Networks initiative, for the purpose of enhancing the self-sufficiency, employability, and economic self-reliance of public housing residents by providing them with onsite computer access and training resources'';

(2) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (I), by striking the word ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding after subparagraph (J) the following:

''(K) the costs of operating computer centers in public housing through a Neighborhood Networks initiative described in subsection (d)(1)(E), and of activities related to that initiative.''; and

(3) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking the word ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) assistance in connection with the establishment and operation of computer centers in public housing through a Neighborhood Networks initiative described in subsection (d)(1)(E).''.

(b) DEMOLITION, SITE REVITALIZATION, REPLACEMENT HOUSING, AND TENANT-BASED ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR PROJECTS.—Section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1)(G), by inserting before the semicolon the following: '', including a Neighborhood Networks initiative for the establishment and operation of computer centers in public housing for the purpose of enhancing the self-sufficiency, employability, an economic self-reliance of public housing residents by providing them with onsite computer access and training resources''; and

(2) in subsection (m)(2), in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following '', including assistance in connection with the establishment and operation of computer centers in public housing through the Neighborhoods Networks initiative described in subsection (d)(1)(G)''.

MARK-TO-MARKET REFORM

SEC. 215. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the properties known as the Hawthornes in Independence, Missouri shall be considered eligible multifamily housing projects for purposes of participating in the multifamily housing restructuring program pursuant to title V of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–65).

SECTION 236 EXCESS INCOME

SEC. 216. Section 236(g)(3)(A) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out ''fiscal year 2000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''fiscal years 2000 and 2001''.

CDBG ELIGIBILITY

SEC. 217. Section 102(a)(6)(D) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by—

(1) in clause (v), striking out the ''or'' at the end;

(2) in clause (vi), striking the period at the end; and

(3) adding at the end the following new clause:

''(vii)(I) has consolidated its government with one or more municipal governments, such that within the county boundaries there are no unincorporated areas, (II) has a population of not less than 650,000, (III) for more than 10 years, has been classified as a metropolitan city for purposes of allocating and distributing funds under section 106, and (IV) as of the date of enactment of this clause, has over 90 percent of the county's population within the jurisdiction of the consolidated government; or

''(viii) notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any county that was classified as an urban county pursuant to subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 1999, at the option of the county, may hereafter remain classified as an urban county for purposes of this Act.''.

EXEMPTION FOR ALASKA AND MISSISSIPPI FROM REQUIREMENT OF RESIDENT ON BOARD OF PHA

SEC. 218. Public housing agencies in the States of Alaska and Mississippi shall not be required to comply with section 2(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, during fiscal year 2001.

USE OF MODERATE REHABILITATION FUNDS FOR HOME

SEC. 219. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make the funds available under contracts NY36K113004 and NY36K113005 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development available for use under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act and shall allocate such funds to the City of New Rochelle, New York.

LOMA LINDA REPROGRAMMING

SEC. 220. Of the amounts made available under the sixth undesignated paragraph under the heading ''Community Planning and Development—Community Development Block Grants'' in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–276) for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) for grants for targeted economic investments, the $1,000,000 to be made available (pursuant to the related provisions of the joint explanatory statement in the conference report to accompany such Act (House Report 105–769)) to the City of Loma Linda, California, for infrastructure improvements at Redlands Boulevard and California Streets shall, notwithstanding such provisions, be made available to the City for infrastructure improvements related to the Mountain View Bridge.

NATIVE AMERICAN ELIGIBILITY FOR THE ROSS PROGRAM

SEC. 221. (a) Section 34 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''PUBLIC HOUSING'' and inserting ''PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting after ''residents,'' the following: ''recipients under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (notwithstanding section 502 of such Act) on behalf of residents of housing assisted under such Act,'' and

(B) by inserting after ''public housing residents'' the second place it appears the following: ''and residents of housing assisted under such Act'',

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting after ''project'' the first place it appears the following: ''or the property of a recipient under such Act or housing assisted under such Act'';

(B) by inserting after ''public housing residents'' the following: ''or residents of housing assisted under such Act''; and

(C) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting after ''public housing project'' the following: ''or residents of housing assisted under such Act''; and

(4) in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''State or local'' and inserting ''State, local, or tribal''.

(b) ASSESSMENT AND REPORT.—Section 538(b)(1) of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 is amended by inserting after ''public housing'' the following: ''and housing assisted under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996''.

TREATMENT OF EXPIRING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE GRANTS

SEC. 222. (a) AVAILABILITY.—Section 220(a) of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–74; 113 Stat. 1075) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''September 30, 2001''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out such section 220 (as amended by this subsection (a) of this section) notwithstanding any actions taken previously pursuant to section 1552 of title 31, United States Code.

HOME PROGRAM DISASTER FUNDING FOR ELDERLY HOUSING

SEC. 223. Of the amounts made available under Chapter IX of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 for assistance under the HOME investment partnerships program to the city of Homestead, Florida (Public Law 103–50; 107 Stat. 262), up to $583,926.70 shall be made available to Dade County, Florida, for use only for rehabilitating housing for low-income elderly persons, and such amount shall not be subject to the requirements of such program, except for section 288 of the HOME Investment Partnerships Act (42 U.S.C. 12838).

CDBG PUBLIC SERVICES CAP

SEC. 224. Section 105(a)(8) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by striking ''1993'' and all that follows through ''City of Los Angeles'' and inserting ''1993 through 2001 to the City of Los Angeles''.

EXTENSION OF APPLICABILITY OF DOWNPAYMENT SIMPLIFICATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 225. Subparagraph (A) of section 203(b)(10) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1709(b)(10)(A)) is amended, in the matter that precedes clause (i), by striking ''mortgage'' and all that follows through ''involving'' and inserting ''mortgage closed on or before December 31, 2002, involving''.

USE OF SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM FUNDS FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS

SEC. 226. Section 423 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended under subsection (a) by adding the following paragraph:

''(7) MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM.—A grant for the costs of implementing and operating management information systems for purposes of collecting unduplicated counts of homeless people and analyzing patterns of use of assistance funded under this Act.''.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE REFORM

SEC. 227. Section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''or as a result of a lack of access to private financial markets''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''refinance,'' after ''acquire,''.

USE OF SECTION 8 VOUCHERS FOR OPT-OUTS

SEC. 228. Section 8(t)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after ''contract for rental assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for such housing project'' the following: ''(including any such termination or expiration during fiscal years after fiscal year 1996 prior to the effective date of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001)''.

HOMELESS DISCHARGE COORDINATION POLICY

SEC. 229. (a) DISCHARGE COORDINATION POLICY.—Subtitle A of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 402. DISCHARGE COORDINATION POLICY.

''The Secretary may not provide a grant under this title for any governmental entity serving as an applicant unless the applicant agrees to develop and implement, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, policies and protocols for the discharge of persons from publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions) in order to prevent such discharge from immediately resulting in homelessness for such persons.''.

(b) ASSISTANCE UNDER EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM.—Section 414(a)(4) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting a comma after ''homelessness'';

(2) by striking ''Not'' and inserting the following: ''Activities that are eligible for assistance under this paragraph shall include assistance to very low-income families who are discharged from publicly funded institutions or systems of care (such as health care facilities, foster care or other youth facilities, or correction programs and institutions). Not''.

TECHNICAL CHANGE TO SENIORS HOUSING COMMISSION

SEC. 230. Section 525 of the Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act'' (42 U.S.C. 12701 note) is amended in subsection (a) by striking ''Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Care Facility Needs in the 21st Century'' and inserting ''Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century''.

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON THE HOMELESS REFORMS

SEC. 231. Title II of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act is amended—

(1) in section 202, under subsection (b) by inserting after the period the following:

''The positions of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall rotate among its members on an annual basis.''; and

(2) in section 209 by striking ''1994'' and inserting ''2005''.

SECTION 8 PHA PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE

SEC. 232. (a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (13) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) is amended to read as follows:

''(13) PHA PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A public housing agency may use amounts provided under an annual contributions contract under this subsection to enter into a housing assistance payment contract with respect to an existing, newly constructed, or rehabilitated structure, that is attached to the structure, subject to the limitations and requirements of this paragraph.

''(B) PERCENTAGE LIMITATION.—Not more than 20 percent of the funding available for tenant-based assistance under this section that is administered by the agency may be attached to structures pursuant to this paragraph.

''(C) CONSISTENCY WITH PHA PLAN AND OTHER GOALS.—A public housing agency may approve a housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph only if the contract is consistent with—

''(i) the public housing agency plan for the agency approved under section 5A; and

''(ii) the goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities.

''(D) INCOME MIXING REQUIREMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 25 percent of the dwelling units in any building may be assisted under a housing assistance payment contract for project-based assistance pursuant to this paragraph.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation under clause (i) shall not apply in the case of assistance under a contract for housing consisting of single family properties or for dwelling units that are specifically made available for households comprised of elderly families, disabled families, and families receiving supportive services.

''(E) RESIDENT CHOICE REQUIREMENT.—A housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph shall provide as follows:

''(i) MOBILITY.—Each low-income family occupying a dwelling unit assisted under the contract may move from the housing at any time after the family has occupied the dwelling unit for 12 months.

''(ii) CONTINUED ASSISTANCE.—Upon such a move, the public housing agency shall provide the low-income family with tenant-based rental assistance under this section or such other tenant-based rental assistance that is subject to comparable income, assistance, rent contribution, affordability, and other requirements, as the Secretary shall provide by regulation. If such rental assistance is not immediately available to fulfill the requirement under the preceding sentence with respect to a low-income family, such requirement may be met by providing the family priority to receive the next voucher or other tenant-based rental assistance amounts that become available under the program used to fulfill such requirement.

''(F) CONTRACT TERM.—A housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph between a public housing agency and the owner of a structure may have a term of up to 10 years, subject to the availability of sufficient appropriated funds for the purpose of renewing expiring contracts for assistance payments, as provided in appropriations Acts and in the agency's annual contributions contract with the Secretary, and to annual compliance with the inspection requirements under paragraph (8), except that the agency shall not be required to make annual inspections of each assisted unit in the development. The contract may specify additional conditions for its continuation. If the units covered by the contract are owned by the agency, the term of the contract shall be agreed upon by the agency and the unit of general local government or other entity approved by the Secretary in the manner provided under paragraph (11).

''(G) EXTENSION OF CONTRACT TERM.—A public housing agency may enter into a contract with the owner of a structure assisted under a housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph to extend the term of the underlying housing assistance payment contract for such period as the agency determines to be appropriate to achieve long-term affordability of the housing or to expand housing opportunities. Such a contract shall provide that the extension of such term shall be contingent upon the future availability of appropriated funds for the purpose of renewing expiring contracts for assistance payments, as provided in appropriations Acts, and may obligate the owner to have such extensions of the underlying housing assistance payment contract accepted by the owner and the successors in interest of the owner.

''(H) RENT CALCULATION.—A housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph shall establish rents for each unit assisted in an amount that does not exceed 110 percent of the applicable fair market rental (or any exception payment standard approved by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(D)), except that if a contract covers a dwelling unit that has been allocated low-income housing tax credits pursuant to section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 42) and is not located in a qualified census tract (as such term is defined in subsection (d) of such section 42), the rent for such unit may be established at any level that does not exceed the rent charged for comparable units in the building that also receive the low-income housing tax credit but do not have additional rental assistance. The rents established by housing assistance payment contracts pursuant to this paragraph may vary from the payment standards established by the public housing agency pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), but shall be subject to paragraph (10)(A).

''(I) RENT ADJUSTMENTS.—A housing assistance payments contract pursuant to this paragraph shall provide for rent adjustments, except that—

''(i) the adjusted rent for any unit assisted shall be reasonable in comparison with rents charged for comparable dwelling units in the private, unassisted, local market and may not exceed the maximum rent permitted under subparagraph (H); and

''(ii) the provisions of subsection (c)(2)(C) shall not apply.

''(J) TENANT SELECTION.—A public housing agency shall select families to receive project-based assistance pursuant to this paragraph from its waiting list for assistance under this subsection. Eligibility for such project-based assistance shall be subject to the provisions of section 16(b) that apply to tenant-based assistance. The agency may establish preferences or criteria for selection for a unit assisted under this paragraph that are consistent with the public housing agency plan for the agency approved under section 5A. Any family that rejects an offer of project-based assistance under this paragraph or that is rejected for admission to a structure by the owner or manager of a structure assisted under this paragraph shall retain its place on the waiting list as if the offer had not been made. The owner or manager of a structure assisted under this paragraph shall not admit any family to a dwelling unit assisted under a contract pursuant to this paragraph other than a family referred by the public housing agency from its waiting list. Subject to its waiting list policies and selection preferences, a public housing agency may place on its waiting list a family referred by the owner or manager of a structure and may maintain a separate waiting list for assistance under this paragraph, but only if all families on the agency's waiting list for assistance under this subsection are permitted to place their names on the separate list.

''(K) VACATED UNITS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (9), a housing assistance payment contract pursuant to this paragraph may provide as follows:

''(i) PAYMENT FOR VACANT UNITS.—That the public housing agency may, in its discretion, continue to provide assistance under the contract, for a reasonable period not exceeding 60 days, for a dwelling unit that becomes vacant, but only (I) if the vacancy was not the fault of the owner of the dwelling unit, and (II) the agency and the owner take every reasonable action to minimize the likelihood and extent of any such vacancy. Rental assistance may not be provided for a vacant unit after the expiration of such period.

''(ii) REDUCTION OF CONTRACT.—That, if despite reasonable efforts of the agency and the owner to fill a vacant unit, no eligible family has agreed to rent the unit within 120 days after the owner has notified the agency of the vacancy, the agency may reduce its housing assistance payments contract with the owner by the amount equivalent to the remaining months of subsidy attributable to the vacant unit. Amounts deobligated pursuant to such a contract provision shall be available to the agency to provide assistance under this subsection.

Eligible applicants for assistance under this subsection may enforce provisions authorized by this subparagraph.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—In the case of any dwelling unit that, upon the date of the enactment of this Act, is assisted under a housing assistance payment contract under section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(13)) as in effect before such enactment, such assistance may be extended or renewed notwithstanding the requirements under subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of such section 8(o)(13), as amended by subsection (a).

DISPOSITION OF HUD-HELD AND HUD-OWNED MULTIFAMILY PROJECTS FOR THE ELDERLY OR DISABLED

SEC. 233. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in managing and disposing of any multifamily property that is owned or held by the Secretary and is occupied primarily by elderly or disabled families, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall maintain any rental assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 that are attached to any dwelling units in the property. To the extent the Secretary determines that such a multifamily property owned or held by the Secretary is not feasible for continued rental assistance payments under such section 8, the Secretary may, in consultation with the tenants of that property, contract for project-based rental assistance payments with an owner or owners of other existing housing properties or provide other rental assistance.

FAMILY UNIFICATION PROGRAM

SEC. 234. Section 8(x)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C 1437f(x)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''any family (A) who is otherwise eligible for such assistance, and (B)'' and inserting ''(A) any family (i) who is otherwise eligible for such assistance, and (ii)''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and (B) for a period not to exceed 18 months, otherwise eligible youths who have attained at least 18 years of age and not more than 21 years of age and who have left foster care at age 16 or older''.

PERMANENT EXTENSION OF FHA MULTIFAMILY MORTGAGE CREDIT DEMONSTRATIONS

SEC. 235. Section 542 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1707 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''demonstrate the effectiveness of providing'' and inserting ''provide''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''demonstration'' and inserting ''the'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''determine the effectiveness of'' and inserting ''provide''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (5), and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) INSURANCE AUTHORITY.—Using any authority provided in appropriation Acts to insure mortgages under the National Housing Act, the Secretary may enter into commitments under this subsection for risk-sharing units.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''test the effectiveness of'' and inserting ''provide''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(4) INSURANCE AUTHORITY.—Using any authority provided in appropriation Acts to insure mortgages under the National Housing Act, the Secretary may enter into commitments under this subsection for risk-sharing units.'';

(4) by striking subsection (d);

(5) by striking ''pilot'' and ''PILOT'' each place such terms appear; and

(6) in the section heading, by striking ''**demonstrations**'' and inserting ''**programs**''.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, $28,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, including hire of passenger vehicles, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, $7,500,000, $5,000,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2001 and $2,500,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: Provided further, That there shall be an Inspector General at the Board who shall have the duties, responsibilities, and authorities specified in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended: Provided further, That an individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: Provided further, That the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of FEMA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES–3, $118,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $5,000,000 shall be for technical assistance and training programs designed to benefit Native American Communities, and up to $8,750,000 may be used for administrative expenses, up to $19,750,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to $1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: Provided, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $53,000,000.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed $500 for official reception and representation expenses, $52,500,000.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (referred to in the matter under this heading as the ''Corporation'') in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (referred to in the matter under this heading as the ''Act'') (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), $458,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That not more than $31,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses authorized under section 501(a)(4) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12671(a)(4)) with not less than $2,000,000 targeted for the acquisition of a cost accounting system for the Corporation's financial management system, an integrated grants management system that provides comprehensive financial management information for all Corporation grants and cooperative agreements, and the establishment, operation and maintenance of a central archives serving as the repository for all grant, cooperative agreement, and related documents, without regard to the provisions of section 501(a)(4)(B) of the Act: Provided further, That not more than $2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That not more than $70,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, shall be transferred to the National Service Trust account for educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.), of which not to exceed $5,000,000 shall be available for national service scholarships for high school students performing community service: Provided further, That not more than $231,000,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be available for grants under the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.) (relating to activities including the AmeriCorps program), of which not more than $45,000,000 may be used to administer, reimburse, or support any national service program authorized under section 121(d)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12581(d)(2)); and not more than $25,000,000 may be made available to activities dedicated to developing computer and information technology skills for students and teachers in low-income communities: Provided further, That not more than $10,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available for the Points of Light Foundation for activities authorized under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12661 et seq.): Provided further, That no funds shall be available for national service programs run by Federal agencies authorized under section 121(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12571(b)): Provided further, That to the maximum extent feasible, funds appropriated under subtitle C of title I of the Act shall be provided in a manner that is consistent with the recommendations of peer review panels in order to ensure that priority is given to programs that demonstrate quality, innovation, replicability, and sustainability: Provided further, That not more than $21,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for the Civilian Community Corps authorized under subtitle E of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.): Provided further, That not more than $43,000,000 shall be available for school-based and community-based service-learning programs authorized under subtitle B of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12521 et seq.): Provided further, That not more than $28,500,000 shall be available for quality and innovation activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12853 et seq.): Provided further, That not more than $5,000,000 shall be available for audits and other evaluations authorized under section 179 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12639): Provided further, That to the maximum extent practicable, the Corporation shall increase significantly the level of matching funds and in-kind contributions provided by the private sector, shall expand significantly the number of educational awards provided under subtitle D of title I, and shall reduce the total Federal costs per participant in all programs: Provided further, That of amounts available in the National Service Trust account from previous appropriations Acts, $30,000,000 shall be rescinded: Provided further, That not more than $7,500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, Inc. only to support efforts to mobilize individuals,

groups, and organizations to build and strengthen the character and competence of the Nation's youth: Provided further, That not more than $5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to the Communities In Schools, Inc. to support dropout prevention activities: Provided further, That not more than $2,500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to the Parents as Teachers National Center, Inc. to support childhood parent education and family support activities: Provided further, That not more than $2,500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America to establish an innovative outreach program designed to meet the special needs of youth in public and Native American housing communities: Provided further, That not more than $1,500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available to the Youth Life Foundation to meet the needs of children living in insecure environments.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $5,000,000, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2002.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–74) is amended under the heading ''Corporation for National and Community Service, National and Community Service Programs Operating Expenses'' in title III by reducing to $229,000,000 the amount available for grants under the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (the ''Act'') (with a corresponding reduction to $40,000,000 in the amount that may be used to administer, reimburse, or support any national service program authorized under section 121(d)(2) of the Act), and by increasing to $33,500,000 the amount available for quality and innovation activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the Act, with the increase in subtitle H funds made available to provide a grant covering a period of three years to support the ''P.A.V.E. the Way'' project described in House Report 106–379.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 7251–7298, $12,445,000, of which $895,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102–229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $17,949,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, $63,000,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, $75,000,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund pursuant to section 517(a) of SARA (26 U.S.C. 9507): Provided, That not withstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: Provided further, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2001, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $696,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; and not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,087,990,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol: Provided further, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement or administer the interim guidance issued on February 5, 1998, by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and designated as the ''Interim Guidance for Investigating Title VI Administrative Complaints Challenging Permits'' with respect to complaints filed under such title after October 21, 1998, and until guidance is finalized. Nothing in this proviso may be construed to restrict the Environmental Protection Agency from developing or issuing final guidance relating to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 1412(b)(12)(A)(v) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, the Administrator shall promulgate a national primary drinking water regulation for arsenic not later than June 22, 2001.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $34,094,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $23,931,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project; $1,270,000,000 (of which $100,000,000 shall not become available until September 1, 2001), to remain available until expended, consisting of $635,000,000, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101–508, and $635,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $11,500,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2002, and $36,500,000 shall be transferred to the ''Science and technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2002.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $75,000 per project, $72,096,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $15,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants

for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $3,628,740,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,350,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; $825,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; $75,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; $35,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; $335,740,000 shall be for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying this Act, except that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds herein and hereafter appropriated under this heading for such special needs infrastructure grants, the Administrator may use up to 3 percent of the amount of each project appropriated to administer the management and oversight of construction of such projects through contracts, allocation to the Corps of Engineers, or grants to States; and $1,008,000,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multimedia or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities: Provided, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2001 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2001, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2001, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under Title VI of that Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of such Act: Provided further, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available after June 1, 2001 to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all claims for principal and interest registered through any current grant dispute or any other such dispute hereafter filed by the Environmental Protection Agency relative to construction grants numbers C–180840–01, C–180840–04, C–470319–03, and C–470319–04, are hereby resolved in favor of the grantee: Provided further, That EPA, in considering the local match for the $5,000,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1999 for the City of Cumberland, Maryland, to separate and relocate the city's combined sewer and stormwater system, shall take into account non-federal money spent by the City of Cumberland for combined sewer, stormwater and wastewater treatment infrastructure on or after October 1, 1999, and that the fiscal year 1999 and any subsequent funds may be used for any required non-federal share of the costs of projects funded by the federal government under Section 580 of Public Law 106–53.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the obligated balances of sums available in multiple-year appropriations accounts shall remain available through the seventh fiscal year after their period of availability has expired for liquidating obligations made during the period of availability.

For fiscal year 2001, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) Notwithstanding paragraph 5, this subsection shall not apply with respect to an area designated nonattainment under section 107(d)(1) until one year after that area is first designated nonattainment for a specific national ambient air quality standard. This paragraph only applies with respect to the national ambient air quality standard for which an area is newly designated nonattainment and does not affect the area's requirements with respect to all other national ambient air quality standards for which the area is designated nonattainment or has been redesignated from nonattainment to attainment with a maintenance plan pursuant to section 175(A) (including any pre-existing national ambient air quality standard for a pollutant for which a new or revised standard has been issued).''.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $5,201,000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, $2,900,000: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds other than those appropriated under this heading shall be used for or by the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $33,660,000, to be derived from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), $300,000,000, and, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 5203, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $2,900,000 may be transferred to ''Emergency management planning and assistance'' for the consolidated emergency management performance grant program; and up to $15,000,000 may be obligated for flood map modernization activities following disaster declarations: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading in this and prior Appropriations Acts and under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to the State of Florida, $3,000,000 shall be for a hurricane mitigation initiative in Miami-Dade County.

For an additional amount for ''Disaster relief'', $1,300,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: Provided further, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $1,678,000, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $25,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $427,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5

U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $215,000,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $10,000,000: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall also serve as the Inspector General of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404–405), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, $269,652,000: Provided, That for purposes of predisaster mitigation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5131(b) and (c) and 42 U.S.C. 5196(e) and (i), $25,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available until expended for project grants.

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2001, as authorized by Public Law 106–74, shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by FEMA necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year. The methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable; and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Fund as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2001, and remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

To carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100–77, as amended, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3½ percent of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended, not to exceed $25,736,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed $77,307,000 for flood mitigation, including up to $20,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act, which amount shall be available for transfer to the National Flood Mitigation Fund until September 30, 2002. In fiscal year 2001, no funds in excess of: (1) $55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) $455,627,000 for agents' commissions and taxes; and (3) $40,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

In addition, up to $17,730,000 in fees collected but unexpended during fiscal years 1994 through 1998 shall be transferred to the Flood Map Modernization Fund and available for expenditure in fiscal year 2001.

Section 1309(a)(2) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)), as amended by Public Law 104–208, is further amended by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''December 31, 2001''.

The first sentence of section 1376(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4127(c)), is amended by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''December 31, 2001''.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Notwithstanding sections 1366(b)(3)(B)–(C) and 1366(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, $20,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2002, for activities designed to reduce the risk of flood damage to structures pursuant to such Act, of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from the National Flood Insurance Fund.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Federal Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,122,000, to be deposited into the Federal Consumer Information Center Fund: Provided, That the appropriations, revenues, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Federal Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of $12,000,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2001 in excess of $12,000,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of human space flight research and development activities, including research, development, operations, and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $5,462,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and technology research and development activities, including research, development, operations, and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $6,190,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

MISSION SUPPORT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out mission support for human space flight programs and science, aeronautical, and technology programs, including research operations and support; maintenance; construction of facilities including revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; travel expenses; purchase, lease, charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; not to exceed $40,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase (not to exceed 33 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,608,700,000 to remain available until September 30, 2002.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $23,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', ''Science, aeronautics and technology'', or ''Mission support'' by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities as authorized by law, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated in ''Mission support'' pursuant to the authorization for minor revitalization and construction of facilities, and facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'', ''Science, aeronautics and technology'', or ''Mission support'' by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Mission support'' and ''Office of Inspector General'', amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 2001 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, costs associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year. Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying this Act, no part of the funds appropriated for ''Human space flight'' may be used for the development of the International Space Station in excess of the amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted as part of the budget request for fiscal year 2001.

No funds in this or any other Appropriations Act may be used to finalize an agreement prior to December 1, 2001 between NASA and a nongovernment organization to conduct research utilization and commercialization management activities of the International Space Station.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2001, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions, as authorized by 12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq., shall not exceed $1,500,000,000: Provided, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility shall not exceed $296,303: Provided further, That $1,000,000 shall be transferred to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund, of which $650,000, together with amounts of principal and interest on loans repaid, shall be available until expended for loans to community

development credit unions, and $350,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance to low-income and community development credit unions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; authorized travel; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; $3,350,000,000, of which not to exceed $275,592,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: Provided further, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally: Provided further, That $65,000,000 of the funds available under this heading shall be made available for a comprehensive research initiative on plant genomes for economically significant crops: Provided further, That no funds in this or any other Act shall be used to acquire or lease a research vessel with ice-breaking capability built or retrofitted by a shipyard located in a foreign country if such a vessel of United States origin can be obtained at a cost no more than 50 per centum above that of the least expensive technically acceptable foreign vessel bid: Provided further, That, in determining the cost of such a vessel, such cost be increased by the amount of any subsidies or financing provided by a foreign government (or instrumentality thereof) to such vessel's construction: Provided further, That if the vessel contracted for pursuant to the foregoing is not available for the 2002–2003 austral summer Antarctic season, a vessel of any origin may be leased for a period of not to exceed 120 days for that season and each season thereafter until delivery of the new vessel.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

For necessary expenses of major construction projects pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, including authorized travel, $121,600,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $787,352,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally: Provided further, That $10,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Innovation Partnerships.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $160,890,000: Provided, That contracts may be entered into under ''Salaries and expenses'' in fiscal year 2001 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $6,280,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), $90,000,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be for a homeownership program that is used in conjunction with section 8 assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937: Provided, That of the amount made available, $2,500,000 shall be for an endowment to establish the George Knight Scholarship Fund for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institute.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101–4118 for civilian employees; and not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; $24,480,000: Provided, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefore in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: Provided, That this provision does not apply to accounts that do not contain an object classification for travel: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: Provided further, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefore set forth in the estimates in the same proportion.

SEC. 402. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 403. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 405. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made; or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between their domicile and their place of employment, with the exception of any officer or employee authorized such transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344 or 5 U.S.C. 7905.

SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: Provided, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 408. None of the funds in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for level IV of the Executive Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 409. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 410. Except as otherwise provided under existing law, or under an existing Executive Order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are: (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection; and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within 24 months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 411. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this

Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), for a contract for services unless such executive agency: (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder; and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning: (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared; and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 412. Except as otherwise provided in section 406, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 413. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 414. None of the funds appropriated in title I of this Act shall be used to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than $300,000 unless the Secretary submits, in writing, a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress and a period of 30 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 415. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 416. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–21.

SEC. 417. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2001 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 418. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 419. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2001 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: Provided, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 420. Notwithstanding section 320(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(g)), funds made available pursuant to authorization under such section for fiscal year 2001 may be used for implementing comprehensive conservation and management plans.

SEC. 421. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term ''qualified student loan'' with respect to national service education awards shall mean any loan made directly to a student by the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, in addition to other meanings under section 148(b)(7) of the National and Community Service Act.

SEC. 422. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act, no part of any appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be available for any activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 423. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Fed. Reg. 31040, or any similar proposals. The Environmental Protection Agency may proceed with the development of such a rule.

SEC. 424. Except in the case of entities that are funded solely with Federal funds or any natural persons that are funded under this Act, none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties to lobby or litigate in respect to adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act. A chief executive officer of any entity receiving funds under this Act shall certify that none of these funds have been used to engage in the lobbying of the Federal Government or in litigation against the United States unless authorized under existing law.

SEC. 425. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 426. None of the funds provided in title II for technical assistance, training, or management improvements may be obligated or expended unless HUD provides to the Committees on Appropriations a description of each proposed activity and a detailed budget estimate of the costs associated with each activity as part of the Budget Justifications. For fiscal year 2001, HUD shall transmit this information to the Committees by December 1, 2000, for 30 days of review.

SEC. 427. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the designation, or approval of the designation, of any area as an ozone nonattainment area under the Clean Air Act pursuant to the 8-hour national ambient air quality standard for ozone that was promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency on July 18, 1997 (62 Fed. Reg. 38,356, p. 38855) and remanded by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals on May 14, 1999, in the case, American Trucking Ass'ns. v. EPA (No. 97–1440, 1999 Westlaw 300618) prior to June 15, 2001 or final adjudication of this case by the Supreme Court of the United States, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 428. Section 432 of Public Law 104–204 (110 Stat. 2874) is amended—

(a) in subsection (c) by inserting ''or to restructure and improve the efficiency of the workforce'' after ''the National Aeronautics and Space Administration'' and before ''the Administrator'';

(b) by deleting paragraph (4) of subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof—

''(4) The provisions of subsections (1) and (3) of this section may be waived upon a determination by the Administrator that use of the incentive satisfactorily demonstrates downsizing or other restructuring within the Agency that would improve the efficiency of agency operations or contribute directly to evolving mission requirements.''

(c) by deleting subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof—

''(i) REPORTS.—The Administrator shall submit a report on NASA's restructuring activities to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate not later than September 30, 2001. This report shall include—

''(1) an outline of a timetable for restructuring the workforce at NASA Headquarters and field Centers;

''(2) annual Full Time Equivalent (FTE) targets by broad occupational categories and a summary of how these targets reflect the respective missions of Headquarters and the field Centers;

''(3) a description of personnel initiatives, such as relocation assistance, early retirement incentives, and career transition assistance, which NASA will use to achieve personnel reductions or to rebalance the workforce; and

''(4) a description of efficiencies in operations achieved through the use of the voluntary separation incentive.''; and

(d) in subsection (j), by deleting ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30, 2002''.

SEC. 429. Section 70113(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2000'', and inserting ''December 31, 2001''.

SEC. 430. All Departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of ''E-Commerce'' technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 431. Title III of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, Public Law 85–568, is amended by adding the following new section at the end:

''SEC. 312. (a) Appropriations for the Administration for fiscal year 2002 and thereafter shall be made in three accounts, 'Human space flight', 'Science, aeronautics and technology', and an account for amounts appropriated for the necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General. Appropriations shall remain available for 2 fiscal years. Each account shall include the planned full costs of the Administration's related activities.

''(b) To ensure the safe, timely, and successful accomplishment of Administration missions, the Administration may transfer amounts for Federal salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; publishing services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services among accounts, as necessary.

''(c) The Administrator, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall determine what balances from the 'Mission support' account are to be transferred to the 'Human space flight' and 'Science, aeronautics and technology' accounts. Such balances shall be transferred and merged with the 'Human space flight' and 'Science, aeronautics and technology' accounts, and remain available for the period of which originally appropriated.''.

TITLE V—FILIPINO VETERANS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 501. (a) RATE OF COMPENSATION PAYMENTS FOR FILIPINO VETERANS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES.—(1) Section 107 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''Payments'' in the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (c), payments''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In the case of benefits under subchapters II and IV of chapter 11 of this title paid by reason of service described in subsection (a) to an individual residing in the United States who is a citizen of, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in, the United States, the second sentence of subsection (a) shall not apply.''.

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to benefits paid for months beginning on or after that date.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR HEALTH CARE OF DISABLED FILIPINO VETERANS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES.—Section 1734 of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''The Secretary,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) An individual who is in receipt of benefits under subchapter II or IV of chapter 11 of this title paid by reason of service described in section 107(a) of this title who is residing in the United States and who is a citizen of, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in, the United States shall be eligible for hospital and nursing home care and medical services in the same manner as a veteran, and the disease or disability for which such benefits are paid shall be considered to be a service-connected disability for purposes of this chapter.''.

(c) HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS RESIDING IN THE PHILIPPINES.—Section 1724 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) Within the limits of an outpatient clinic in the Republic of the Philippines that is under the direct jurisdiction of the Secretary, the Secretary may furnish a veteran who has a service-connected disability with such medical services as the Secretary determines to be needed.''.

TITLE VI—DEBT REDUCTION

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

For deposit of an additional amount for fiscal year 2001 into the account established under section 3113(d) of title 31, United States Code, to reduce the public debt, $5,172,730,916.14.

Titles I–VI of this Act may be cited as the ''Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001''.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 106–674 and Senate Report 106–410 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Unless specifically addressed in this report, the conferees agree to retain the reprogramming thresholds for each department or agency at the level established by the fiscal year 2000 conference agreement.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

Appropriates the budget request of $1,634,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,664,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees retain bill language as proposed by the Senate ensuring that all administrative services are charged to the general operating expenses appropriation.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $162,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $161,484,000 as proposed by the House.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL CARE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Retains the transfer of $28,134,000 as proposed by the House instead of $27,907,000 as proposed by the Senate from medical care to the general operating expenses appropriation for expenses of the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication.

Retains bill language delaying the availability of $900,000,000 for equipment and land and structures until August 1, 2001 and remaining available until September 30, 2002 as proposed by the Senate instead of $927,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Retains bill language making $500,000,000 available until September 30, 2002 as proposed by the Senate instead of $900,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Deletes bill language limiting $3,000,000,000 for maintenance and operations expenses. The conferees strongly support the redirection of medical resources from the maintenance and operations of unneeded buildings to support direct patient care. The conferees understand that for fiscal year 2001 VA is anticipating spending less than $3,000,000,000 in this area. The conferees direct that VA carefully monitor maintenance and operation expenditures and that significant efforts to reduce those expenditures be undertaken prior to and in conjunction with full CARES evaluation and implementation over the next several years. A report that identifies these fiscal year 2001 costs by network and the efforts to reduce these costs this year should be submitted by March 31, 2001.

Retains bill language proposed by the House prohibiting the transfer of medical care funds to the Department of Justice for the purpose of pursuing tobacco litigation.

The conferees direct the Department to submit one report within four months of enactment of this Act addressing the concerns regarding hepatitis C expenditures, testing and treatment contained in House Report 106–674 and Senate Report 106–410.

The House report contained language directing the VA to reimburse hepatitis C treatment as a complex care component starting in fiscal year 2001. The conferees recognize VA for releasing $20,000,000 from the National Reserve in June 2000 to address the growing need for treatment and the geographic differences in prevalence of the disease. The conferees also note the action by the Department in August 2000 to amend the VERA policy to reimburse hepatitis C treatment as a complex care component effective fiscal year 2001. The conferees direct the Department to continue adjusting testing and treatment funds as more is learned about the prevalence of the disease and keep the Committees on Appropriations informed about funding levels and decisions.

The conferees urge the Department to establish up to five centers of excellence for motor-neuron diseases such as Parkinson's disease and multiple sclerosis.

The conferees urge the implementation of the telemedicine project in Huntsville, Alabama.

The conferees direct that the Department include in the fiscal year 2002 budget justification estimates for all national programs, projects and initiatives totaling $5,000,000 or more. The conferees further direct that the Department include in the fiscal year 2001 operating plan its efforts to implement management efficiencies, including instituting best practices on a national basis.

The conferees direct the Department to continue the demonstration project involving the Clarksburg VAMC and the Ruby Memorial Hospital at West Virginia University.

The conferees direct that of the amounts provided, not to exceed $250,000 may be used to host The Sixth International Paralympic Committee Scientific Congress on ''Sport and Human Performance Beyond Disability.'' The conferees believe this conference is within the mission of VA considering the Department's current programs, which support disabled athletes.

The conferees support the expansion of the Joslin Vision Network to additional pilot sites in fiscal year 2001. Estimated costs for fiscal year 2001 are $5,000,000.

The conferees encourage VA to initiate a national demonstration project of excellence in the care of aging veterans with rehabilitative needs involving a collaborative effort between the Atlanta Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Emory Healthcare, and its affiliated network of community-based services, Atlanta Senior Care.

The conferees are aware that the VA undertakes numerous pilot projects in hospitals and VISNs across the country in hopes of providing better access to medical care more efficiently to our nation's veterans. The conferees trust that the Department's leadership carefully reviews the costs and benefits of pilot projects to determine the project's feasibility and value for standard operation prior to inclusion in the Department's budget justification. No funds may be obligated for new pilot projects authorized by law in fiscal year 2001 exceeding $10,000,000 in cost until a reprogramming request is submitted by the Department and approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

The conferees are concerned with the issues raised in the GAO report ''Disabled Veterans' Care, Better Data and More Accountability Needed to Adequately Assess Care'' regarding VA's ability to measure compliance with maintaining a certain level of care for special disability programs such as spinal cord injury and mental illness. The conferees urge the VA to re-examine GAO's recommendation to establish a work group to monitor these programs. In addition, the conferees direct VA to develop outcome measures applicable to each VISN to evaluate the Department's performance in these areas.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

Appropriates $351,000,000 for medical and prosthetic research as proposed by the House instead of $321,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are aware of the impact that drug addiction has on the veterans population and are pleased with the VA's leadership role in pursuing and developing new treatments for addiction. The conferees strongly encourage the VA to increase its support for addiction research efforts in this area, and note that an effective research program must include large clinical trials, as well as, biochemical and neuro-pharmacological basic research.

The conferees are encouraged by the progress made by the VA and the National Technology Transfer Center (NTTC) during the past year in identifying promising VA technological advances that offer the potential for commercial applications. The conferees direct that this partnership should be continued at the current level of effort and that a targeted partnership identification process is essential to the successful marketing and licensing process.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriates $1,050,000,000 for general operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,006,000,000 as proposed by the House. Retains bill language proposed by the Senate making $45,000,000 available until September 30, 2002, instead of $50,050,000 as proposed by the House.

Deletes without prejudice the provision proposed by the House regarding transfers. The conferees have no objection to fund transfers authorized by law.

Retains bill language as proposed by the Senate allowing administrative services provided for rehabilitation services to be charged to the general operating expenses account.

The conferees direct that of the amount provided, $826,488,000 is for the Veterans Benefits Administration. Funding priority should be given to hiring additional FTEs for improving claims processing time and accuracy.

The conferees are aware that there is a pressing need for renovating the Lafayette Building at 811 Vermont Avenue to the benefit of both the VA and the Export-Import Bank. The House report included language requesting a feasibility study to be conducted on the potential utilization of enhanced-use leasing authority by the VA as a means of renovating the Lafayette Building. In lieu of the feasibility study recommended by the House, the conferees direct the General Services Administration to work with the VA and the Export-Import Bank on an expedited basis to develop a renovation plan considering all alternatives authorized by law for the Lafayette Building which would ensure the continued ability of both agencies to collocate in the building and submit a joint report to the Committee by June 1, 2001.

The conferees have provided funds for the coreFLS and HR LINK$ projects and expects VA to implement these initiatives as top priorities. The conferees direct VA to submit a report by December 1, 2000 on the milestones and funding commitments for the projects through fiscal year 2002.

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $109,889,000 for the National Cemetery Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $106,889,000 as proposed by the House.

Retains House language transferring not to exceed $125,000 from the national cemetery administration appropriation to the general operating expenses appropriation for expenses of the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication instead of $117,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Retains language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing a travel limitation of $1,125,000 for the National Cemetery Administration.

The conferees are aware of the provision in the Veterans Millennium Heath Care and Benefits Act (P.L. 106–117) requiring VA to conduct a national cemetery needs survey. The conferees direct the National Cemetery Administration to complete this survey expeditiously and include in a report to the Committees on Appropriations the geographic areas in need of a cemetery within 75 miles of veterans populations, when the currently-available cemeteries will close, and a priority ranking for establishing new cemeteries. The survey should include the Albuquerque area of New Mexico.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Retains House language transferring not to exceed $28,000 from the Office of Inspector General appropriation to the general operating expenses appropriation for expenses of the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication instead of $30,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Appropriates $66,040,000 for construction, major projects instead of $62,140,000 as proposed by the House and $48,540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes the following changes from the budget estimate:

+$1,000,000 for advanced planning of a national cemetery in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

+$2,500,000 for advanced planning of a national cemetery in Atlanta, Georgia.

+$15,000,000 for land acquisition for a national cemetery in South Florida.

+$12,000,000 for cemetery construction in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

+$1,000,000 for design of a nursing home at the Beckley, West Virginia VAMC.

−$26,600,000 from Palo Alto NHCU.

−$0 for the medical design fund.

+$1,400,000 for National Cemetery Administration advance planning.

−$1,735,000 from the working reserve.

The conferees encourage the Department to begin planning efforts for a national cemetery in New Mexico.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

Appropriates $162,000,000 for construction, minor projects as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees reiterate the expectation that VA will review and approve all minor construction projects in a manner that is consistent with the process applied by the Capital Investment Board which reviews major projects, and consistent with the Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) initiative. A central office work group, consisting of both VHA and other Department officials, is to review all minor projects using criteria consistent with those developed for CARES. If the total costs of projects being initiated at any facility or integrated health care system exceeds $4,000,000, the recommendations of the work group must be approved by the Deputy Secretary.

The conferees urge the Department to give highest priority to projects improving female patient privacy in VA health facilities.

The conferees recommend $150,000 for construction of a sunscreen structure for the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific.

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

Retains language proposed by the Senate permitting operation and maintenance costs of parking facilities to be funded from the medical care appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Appropriates $100,000,000 for grants for construction of state extended care facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees note that the VA has not yet promulgated regulations for the state grant program as directed in the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (P.L. 106–117). Until those regulations are issued, many state and local governments which seek to obtain these grants are severely disadvantaged by the lack of criteria available to determine eligibility. The conferees direct the VA to move expeditiously to issue the regulations mandated by P.L. 106–117.

GRANTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES

The conferees encourage the Department to work with California as the state applies for a state cemetery grant.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Retains language proposed by the Senate requiring receipts collected under the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (P.L. 106–117) to be maintained in the collections fund subject to appropriation.

Retains language proposed by the House extending the availability of previously appropriated funds for artificial neural networks research with the Department of Defense until September 30, 2003.

Retains language proposed by the House transferring funds from the Office of Inspector General ($78,000), national cemetery administration ($358,000), medical care ($1,106,000), and medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses ($84,000) accounts, and reprogrammed within the general operating expenses account ($38,000) to general operating expenses for HR LINK$ services.

Retains language proposed by the House transferring $1,600,000 from medical care to general operating expenses for general counsel services.

Deletes language proposed by the House directing Capital Investment Board pre-approval for large procurement actions and a report on the establishment of mental illness, education and clinical centers.

Retains language proposed by the Senate transferring up to $1,200,000 from medical care to general operating expenses for Hines Data Center services.

Retains language proposed by the Senate transferring up to $4,500,000 from minor construction and up to $2,000,000 from medical care to the parking revolving fund for surface parking lot projects.

Retains language proposed by the Senate establishing a 60–day wait period for any action related to VISN 12 realignment after the Secretary makes a recommendation and consults all pertinent stakeholders.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $13,940,907,000 for the housing certificate fund, instead of $13,275,388,000 as proposed by the House and $13,171,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes:

$12,972,000,000 for expiring section 8 housing assistance contracts, section 8 amendments, and contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act;

$452,907,000 to provide 79,000 ''incremental'' section 8 housing assistance vouchers, to increase the number of low-income individuals and families receiving assistance. The conferees note that HUD took more than 12 months awarding new vouchers despite the fact that a formula dictates their distribution. The delay can be attributed, in large part, to including the voucher Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) with the ''Super NOFA,'' which is rarely published until March—six months into the fiscal year.

HUD is encouraged to issue the NOFA earlier, so that vouchers can be awarded within eight months of enactment of this appropriations measure. The Committees will be following HUD's progress making these awards, and will act appropriately if the funds are not awarded with alacrity.

$40,000,000 to provide section 8 housing vouchers to non-elderly, disabled residents who are affected by the designation of public and assisted housing as ''elderly-only'' developments as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House;

$192,000,000 is for section 8 contract administrators as proposed by the House. The Senate did not provide a specific appropriation for this activity; and

$266,000,000 is for tenant protection vouchers, including for relocating residents impacted by a HOPE VI project.

Deletes language proposed by the House providing $37,000,000 for Shelter Plus Care renewals. A new account called ''Shelter Plus Care'' was created for this purpose.

Deletes language proposed by the House providing $66,000,000 for low-income tax credit vouchers. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

Deletes language proposed by the House providing $660,000 for systems needed to monitor PHAs that increase the payment standard of vouchers. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

Includes language proposed by the House transferring $11,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund for developing and maintaining information technology systems. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

Includes language proposed by the House to cancel obligated balances of terminated contract authority. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing that funds for administrative fees may be used to cover costs of administering section 8 programs. The House did not include a similar provision.

Inserts new language appropriating $7,000,000 to complete the funding required for the Jobs-Plus Demonstration program.

Rescinds $1,833,000,000 in excess section 8 recaptures.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $3,000,000,000 for the public housing capital fund instead of $2,955,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,800,000,000 as proposed by the House. Like last year, the conferees recommend increasing this account above the request, and above levels provided in the House and Senate bills, recognizing the serious unmet needs for capital improvements to the nation's public housing.

Transfers $43,000,000 from this account to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

Recognizing that public housing for the elderly serves the poorest, the most racially and ethnically diverse, the oldest, and the largest number of seniors of the assisted housing programs, the conferees reiterate the House report regarding the potential importance of the Elderly Plus demonstration which proposes to retrofit these buildings.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND

Appropriates $3,242,000,000 for the public housing operating fund instead of $3,139,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,192,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Like the increase to the public housing capital fund, this increase reflects the conferees' commitment to providing adequate resources to public housing—in this case for basic costs like water, gas and electric utilities, security, and routine maintenance.

The conferees remain troubled by the Department's implementation of the ''Public Housing Assessment System'' (PHAS). The system has had problems with the reliability of the inspections, the training and skills of some contract inspectors, and the effectiveness of quality assurance measures. Accordingly, the conferees direct HUD to continue to assess the accuracy and effectiveness of the PHAS system and to take whatever remedial steps may be needed, including implementing the recommendations made by GAO in its July 2000 report. Specifically, the conferees direct HUD to revise its April 2000 quality assurance plan to ensure that quality assurance activities it contains will provide HUD with the information it needs to evaluate (1) inspection contractors' compliance with provisions in their contracts and quality control program, (2) inspectors' performance in applying HUD's inspection protocol, (3) the accuracy of the inspections and resulting scores, and (4) the performance of the program as indicated by the precision and replicability of the inspection protocol. Further, the conferees direct HUD to perform a statistically valid test of PHAS, conduct a thorough analysis of the results, and have the methodology and results reviewed by an independent expert. The Department should provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 2001, that describes the results of these reviews and the steps taken to improve the accuracy and reliability of PHAS. In the interim, HUD should not take any adverse actions against housing authorities solely on the basis of PHAS scores.

DRUG ELIMINATION GRANTS FOR LOW—INCOME HOUSING

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $310,000,000 for drug elimination grants as proposed by the Senate instead of $300,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Includes $20,000,000 for the New Approach Anti-Drug program as proposed by the Senate instead of no funding as proposed by the House.

Includes $3,000,000 for technical assistance grants instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and Senate. This account was reduced from the requested level of $10,000,000, and the House and Senate proposed levels of $5,000,000. The conferees are displeased about HUD's refusal to provide information in a timely way about the amount of funds expended and/or obligated on HUD's gun buyback program—an unauthorized activity according to a legal opinion by the Comptroller General of the United States. Even if HUD's attorneys interpret existing legal authority differently from the Comptroller General, refusing to provide information to the Committees, especially about matters clearly within their purview, is unacceptable and will be dealt with accordingly.

Includes $2,000,000 for the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for operating expenses and start up costs of clubs operating in or near public housing, or in housing assisted under the Native American housing block grant program.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING

(HOPE VI)

Appropriates $575,000,000 for the revitalization of severely distressed public housing program as proposed by the Senate instead of $565,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Recognizing the importance of affordable basic financial services in low-income neighborhoods, the conferees urge grantees to encourage and facilitate the establishment of community credit unions as part of HOPE VI housing revitalization projects. The conferees further direct HUD to provide technical assistance in meeting this goal, working in cooperation with appropriate staff of the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA).

The conferees commend HUD's decision to continue support for the Campus Affiliates Program, a unique partnership of HUD, the Housing Authority of New Orleans, higher education, and the private sector. This program has begun to meet the needs of public housing residents in New Orleans by providing assistance and activities that foster self-sufficiency. The conferees expect HUD to continue to participate in this activity.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $650,000,000 for Native American Housing Block Grants as proposed by the Senate instead of $620,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Appropriates $6,000,000 for technical assistance grants as proposed by the House instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree not to provide $2,000,000 to the National American Indian Housing Council (NAIHC) as proposed by the House or $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Transfers $2,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems as proposed by the House. Similar language was not included by the Senate.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Historically, Native Americans have had limited access to private mortgage capital because much of the land in Indian country is held in trust by the Federal government. As such, the land cannot be encumbered or alienated. The Indian Home Loan Guarantee Program was created to address the lack of mortgage capital by authorizing HUD to guarantee loans made by private lenders. Getting a loan, however, depends on the borrower securing a leasehold on tribally-held lands. This leasehold, which is used as security for the mortgage, can only be obtained after the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) conducts a title status report (TSR). HUD cannot endorse the guarantee until a final TSR is completed and is part of the financial package.

Fortunately, HUD and BIA have made considerable progress making their program requirements more compatible with one another; however, if the loan guarantee program is to be used to its greatest potential, additional progress needs to be made, especially on the length of time it takes to complete a TSR. HUD and BIA should continue their dialogue on removing any impediments to this process.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH AIDS

Appropriates $258,000,000 for housing opportunities for persons with AIDS instead of $250,000,000 as proposed by the House and $232,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount, one percent is appropriated for technical assistance as proposed by the House instead of .75 percent as proposed by the Senate.

Includes language that requires HUD to renew all expiring HOPWA contracts funded under the non-formula component of the HOPWA program so long as the project meets all other program requirements. The conferees believe that it is critical to maintain the federal investment in existing projects to the maximum extent feasible.

RURAL HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Appropriates $25,000,000 for rural housing and economic development instead of

$27,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

AMERICA'S PRIVATE INVESTMENT COMPANIES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conferees are aware that the President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives have agreed to a framework for a ''New Markets Initiative'' that includes providing $37,000,000 in credit subsidy for APIC. As part of this conference agreement, the conferees agree, when the initiative is enacted, to provide these funds through a supplemental appropriation measure, or through another appropriate vehicle.

EMPOWERMENT ZONES/ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES

Inserts new language providing $75,000,000 for grants to urban empowerment zones to be used in conjunction with economic development activities detailed in the strategic plans of each empowerment zone. Neither the House nor the Senate included a similar provision.

Inserts new language providing $15,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture for grants to designated empowerment zones. Neither the House nor the Senate included a similar provision.

As with APIC, the conferees agree to provide an additional $110,000,000 for EZ/ECs when the New Markets Initiative is enacted.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $5,057,550,000 for the community development fund instead of $4,505,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,800,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inserts language proposed by the House creating the Community Development Fund (CDF) and identifying the various set-asides in the account. The conferees agree to the following earmarks;

$4,409,000,000 for formula grants under the community development block grant program;

$71,000,000 for grants to Indian tribes instead of $67,000,000 as proposed by the House and Senate;

$45,500,000 for section 107 grants. The House provided $39,500,000 for section 107 grants and the Senate provided $41,500,000 for section 107 grants. The conference agreement provides the following earmarks within section 107:

$3,000,000 is for community development work study;

$10,000,000 is for historically black colleges and universities;

$8,000,000 is for the Community Outreach Partnerships program;

$7,000,000 is for insular areas;

$3,000,000 for tribal colleges and universities;

$3,000,000 for Alaska Native-Serving Institutions and native Hawaiian- serving institutions;

$6,500,000 is for Hispanic-Serving Institutions; and

$5,000,000 is for management information systems;

$2,600,000 for the National American Indian Housing Council instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate;

$10,000,000 for the National Housing Development Corporation (NHDC), for continuation of its program of acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of at-risk affordable housing. The conferees direct NHDC to establish benchmarks for performance (addressing matters such as the amount of capital and loan funds raised, the degree to which federal investment is leveraged through non-federal sources, and the number of units of housing acquired and transferred to new owners who will continue and protect the housing's affordability for low-income residents), and to report to the Committees on Appropriations regarding performance and progress in meeting those benchmarks;

$28,450,000 for the Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing program, authorized by section 4 of P.L. 103–120, as in effect before June 12, 1997, instead of $23,450,000 proposed by the House and $25,000,000 proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided, at least $5,000,000 shall be for capacity building activities in rural areas as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House. Additionally, $3,450,000 is for Habitat for Humanity International as proposed by the House. The Senate did not provide funds for this program;

$60,000,000 for Youthbuild as proposed by the Senate instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the House. This amount includes $4,000,000 for capacity building activities and $10,000,000 for underserved and rural areas as proposed by the Senate. The House did not include similar language;

$20,000,000 for grants to eligible grantees under section 11 of the Self-Help Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996, as proposed by the House. The Senate did not include funds for this item;

$44,000,000 for the Neighborhood Initiatives program instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and no funding as proposed by the Senate, of which:

$5,000,000 is for the Institute for Software Research for construction related to a high-technology diversification initiative;

$10,000,000 is for the City of Syracuse for the Neighborhood Initiative Program;

$2,000,000 is for the Louisville Community Development Bank for the Louisville Neighborhood Initiative;

$5,000,000 to the Vandalia Heritage Foundation, Inc. for community and neighborhood revitalization and economic diversification initiatives;

$2,500,000 for the Omaha Housing Initiative to create affordable housing and encourage homeownership in Omah, Nebraska;

2,000,000 for the Community Development Corporation of Kansas City and Health Midwest Partners for Change in Kansas City, Missouri for the revitalization initiative on the northwest corner of 63rd Street and Prospect Avenue;

$2,850,000 for the Missouri Botanical Gardens in St. Louis, Missouri for development and revitalization activities associated with McRee Town;

$2,500,000 for Downtwon Now for revitalization efforts of the Old Post Office District in St. Louis Missouri;

$2,000,000 for the Kansas City Neighborhood Alliance in Kansas City, Missouri for the Neighborhood Preservation Initiative in the Blue Hills and Vineyard neighborhoods;

$1,500,000 for the City of South Bend, Indiana for the redevelopment of the Studebaker Corridor;

$1,500,000 for the Midtown Development Corporation in Kansas City, Missouri for the redevelopment of the Mount Cleveland Community;

$850,000 for the City of Spartanburg, South Carolina for Arkwright/Forest Park revitalization;

$300,000 for the City of Beloit, Wisconsin for the Beloit urban renewal project;

$500,000 for the City of Waterloo, Iowa for the redevelopment of blighted portions of the downtown area;

$500,000 for Patterson Park Development Corporation for the purchase and rehabilitation of homes in the Patterson Park neighborhood in Baltimore, Maryland;

$1,000,000 for the City of Des Moines, Iowa for planning of the redevelopment of the Riverpoint area;

$1,200,000 for City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin for revitalization of the Menomonee Valley industrial area;

$500,000 for the City of Woodbury, New Jersey for downtown economic development activities;

$1,000,000 for the City of Wildwood, New Jersey for revitalization of the Pacific Avenue Business District;

$500,000 for the City of Gardena, California for planning of downtown redevelopment;

$300,000 for the City of Chicago, Illinois for the South Chicago Housing Initiative;

$500,000 for the city of Detroit, Michigan for the Detroit River Promenade Project.

$29,000,000 is appropriated separately for credit subsidy for section 108 loan guarantees as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,000,000 as proposed by the House. Limits loan guarantees to $1,261,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,217,000,000 as proposed by the House;

$2,000,000 is for the Utah Housing Finance Agency for temporary housing necessary for the 2002 Olympic Games to be held in Salt Lake City, Utah, as proposed by the Senate. The House did not have similar language;

$15,000,000 is to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development of information technology systems;

$292,000,000 for economic development initiatives. The targeted grants shall be made as follows:

$500,000 for The Palace Theater for its renovation in Manchester, New Hampshire;

$300,000 for the Manchester Historic Association for the restoration of the Millyard Museum in Manchester, New Hampshire;

$700,000 for Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon for construction and program activities at Bicentennial Hall in Portland, Oregon;

$1,000,000 for the Omaha Housing Initiative to create affordable housing and encourage homeownership in Omaha, Nebraska;

$1,000,000 for the LOVE Social Services Center in Fairbanks, Alaska for a facility to serve disadvantaged youth and provide other services;

$250,000 for the Portland Oregon Visitors Association for the Pioneer Courthouse Square Lobby Renovation project in Portland, Oregon;

$250,000 for Portland State University for the Portland State Engineering Building and Central City Streetcar;

$1,100,000 for the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois for the development of the ''Sue'' exhibit, a showcase of a 67 million-year-old T-Rex;

$1,000,000 for the Community Action Agency of Southern New Mexico, Inc., for construction of a regional food bank and supporting offices;

$700,000 for the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, to construct a permanent site for the Santa Fe Area Farmers Market at the historic Santa Fe rail yard;

$250,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Las Cruces, New Mexico to upgrade existing facilities;

$500,000 for Tatum, New Mexico to replace its community center;

$150,000 for the Bataan Death March Memorial renovations in Las Cruces, New Mexico;

$1,000,000 for Granite Falls, Minnesota to aid in recovery efforts from a tornado and severe thunder storms;

$1,020,000 for the University of Idaho for the construction of the Center for Science and Technology in Idaho Falls, Idaho;

$200,000 for Elmore County, Idaho for meeting water system needs in the town of Atlanta;

$1,000,000 for the City of Salmon, Idaho for land acquisition, construction, and alteration for the Sacajawea Interpretive, Cultural, and Education Center;

$500,000 for the Clearwater Economic Development Association in Northern Idaho, for implementation of the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Plan;

$500,000 for Lewis-Clark State College for start-up activities associated with the Idaho Virtual Incubator;

$1,200,000 for MSU-Billings for the acquisition of a College of Business facility to house economic development activities;

$1,000,000 for Billings, Montana for the completion of the Billings depot project;

$100,000 for Miles Community College in Miles City, Montana for a feasibility study regarding the conveyance of a VA medical facility;

$500,000 for the Jefferson County Local Development Corporation in Whitehall, Montana for economic development activities;

$350,000 for the Human Resources Development Council in Bozeman, Montana for the restoration of a historic property for community services offices;

$300,000 for the City of Columbia Falls, Montana for the restructuring of the Old Main Veterans Facility;

$1,500,000 for the City of Memphis for the construction of the Stax Museum of American Soul Music in Memphis, Tennessee;

$500,000 for the City of Chattanooga, Tennessee, Department of Parks Recreation, Arts, and Culture for revitalization efforts in Alton Park;

$700,000 for Winston-Salem-Forsyth County, North Carolina for the development of the Science Center and Environment Park of Forsyth County, North Carolina;

$700,000 for the redevelopment of Midwest City, Oklahoma from damage from a tornado;

$250,000 for the Allen County Historical Society for the redevelopment of the Funston Museum complex in Iola, Allen County, Kansas;

$1,000,000 for the Detroit Rescue Mission Ministries for the purchase and renovation of a building;

$500,000 for Northern Initiatives to capitalize an Upper Peninsula Michigan Equity Fund to assist in the development of small businesses;

$250,000 for the City of Jackson, Michigan for downtown redevelopment;

$250,000 for William Tyndale College in Tyndale, Michigan for a learning resource center;

$500,000 for the University of Utah for the planning and design of the Museum of Science and Nature;

$700,000 for the Covenant House Michigan for the construction costs of a permanent Rights of Passage facility;

$1,000,000 for West Valley City, Utah for the construction of the West Valley City Multi-Cultural Community Center.

$500,000 for the Heart Mountain Wyoming Foundation for an interactive learning center in Powell, Wyoming;

$500,000 for the Vermont Rural Fire Protection Task Force of Randolph, Vermont for the purchase of equipment;

$500,000 for the Southern Vermont Recreation Center Foundation in Springfield, Vermont;

$500,000 for the Vermont Housing and conservation Board for the development of affordable housing in Northern Vermont;

$500,000 for Marlboro College for a technology incubator facility in downtown Brattleboro, Vermont;

$500,000 for the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board for the development of affordable housing in Williston, Vermont;

$500,000 for the Town of Hartford, Vermont for the development of the Railroad Row Historic District in downtown White River Junction, Vermont;

$500,000 for Vermont Technical College for economic development in Randolph, Vermont;

$250,000 for the Town of Fairfield, Vermont for the development of the President Chester A. Arthur visitor facility;

$800,000 for the City of Montrose, Colorado for the development of affordable low-income housing;

$900,000 for the Trinity Repertory Company in Providence, Rhode Island for the conversion of an abandoned banking building;

$300,000 for Upper Darby Township, Pennsylvania to assist residents with homes that are sinking due to soil subsidence;

$150,000 for the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for economic development on Pittsburgh's North Shore;

$100,000 for the City of Hazleton, Pennsylvania for economic development and revitalization activities;

$750,000 for the City of Johnstown, Pennsylvania for downtown economic development;

$300,000 for the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania to assist in the relocation of families in the Logan neighborhood whose homes were built on an improperly filled creek bed;

$500,000 for Ford City, Pennsylvania for brownfield revitalization;

$300,000 for the City of Chester, Pennsylvania for the redevelopment of DeShong Park;

$250,000 for Erie, Pennsylvania for the Discovery Square museum expansion;

$500,000 for the Please Touch Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for relocation costs;

$200,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Allentown, Pennsylvania for the Northern Lehigh Community Center;

$400,000 for Allegheny County, Pennsylvania for the redevelopment of the Braddock-Swissvale-Rankin industrial site;

$500,000 for the National Museum for American Jewish History in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for expansion efforts;

$500,000 for the Reading Berks Emergency Shelter in Reading, Pennsylvania for the construction of a transitional housing facility for the homeless;

$250,000 for the City of Lancaster, Pennsylvania for the development of the Lancaster Square project;

$100,000 for Clarion County, Pennsylvania for continued development of Liberty Towers Senior Activities Facility;

$250,000 for the Nueva Esperanza Community Development Corporation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania for economic revitalization of commercial and industrial facilities;

$200,000 for Light of Life Ministries in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania for infrastructure improvements at the Serenity Village homeless program;

$250,000 for Universal Community Homes for economic development activities in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

$250,000 for the City of Philadelphia to address the safety concerns related to abandoned and structurally impaired homes

$600,000 for the City of East Providence, Rhode Island to develop recreational facilities at Crescent Park;

$300,000 for the City of State Line, Mississippi for downtown infrastructure and economic revitalization;

$1,000,000 for the City of Madison, Mississippi for the renovation of the historic downtown of Madison, Mississippi;

$500,000 for Mississippi State University for the renovation and expansion of facilities for the Stoneville, Mississippi Research and Education Complex;

$500,000 for the City of Canton, Mississippi for the establishment of a State film complex;

$2,000,000 for the rehabilitation and restoration of Cain Hall on the campus of Hinds Community College in Raymond, Mississippi;

$400,000 for Nashua, New Hampshire for the redevelopment of the Mines Fall Park;

$1,000,000 for the City of Bangor, Maine for the installation of steel bulkheading on the Penobscot River;

$1,000,000 for the City of Portland, Maine for funding the Bayside Development Project;

$550,000 for Vinalhaven Elder Care Services, Inc. in Maine for the development of an elder care facility;

$500,000 for the City of Dayton, Ohio for the restoration of the Main Street historic district;

$500,000 for Cleveland Tomorrow in Cleveland, Ohio for the restoration of the Euclid Beach Carousel;

$700,000 for the City of Xenia, Ohio for the redevelopment of the area from damage due to a tornado.

$700,000 for the Cleveland Botanical garden for the development of a glass house conservatory;

$500,000 for Skagit County for the preservation of farmland in Skagit County, Washington;

$1,000,000 for the Pacific Science Center in Seattle, Washington to complete the Mercer Island Slough Environmental Education Center;

$500,000 for the Seattle Art Museum in Seattle, Washington for site development;

$1,000,000 for the City of Lincoln, Nebraska for the construction of the Northbridge Center for Children and Youth;

$500,000 for the Southwest Border Region Partnership for an assessment of the border region's future economic health;

$250,000 for the Centro de Salud familiar La Fe in El Paso, Texas for community outreach activities to assist low-income families;

$1,000,000 for the City of Houston for redevelopment activities within Freedman's Town;

$250,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Brownsville, Texas for building repairs and community services;

$250,000 for the George Gervin Youth center in San Antonio for the construction of a youth center;

$500,000 for the City of Beaumont, Texas to revitalize the Charlton-Pollard neighborhood;

$500,000 for the Bayfront Arts and Science Park in Corpus Christi, Texas for the expansion of the park;

$250,000 for West Texas A&M University to develop an integrated services center in Amarillo, Texas;

$250,000 for Sam Houston State University for the redevelopment of the Sam Houston Memorial Museum;

$7,000,000 for the University of Louisville for the expansion of the university's main library;

$1,000,000 for Oklahoma City, Oklahoma for the Oklahoma City Murrah Revitalization project;

$1,000,000 for the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor in Dover, Delaware for a variety of housing assistance programs;

$1,000,000 for the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama for the Gorgas House Renovation Project;

$100,000 for the Hammoundville Armory in the Town of Valley Head, Alabama for the renovation of a historic facility to enhance economic development and tourist activity;

$500,000 for Monroeville, Alabama for the Monroe County Courthouse Restoration Project;

$1,000,000 for the Mobile Public Library, Mobile, Alabama for the renovation of facilities as part of a neighborhood redevelopment project;

$500,000 for the City of LaFayette, (Chambers County) Alabama for the Chambers County Courthouse Restoration Project;

$100,000 for Union Springs, Alabama for the rehabilitation of facilities for downtown restoration/revitalization;

$250,000 for the Mobile Historic Development Commission for the Oakleigh District Revitalization Project;

$250,000 for the National Community College for the Deaf and Blind in Talladega, Alabama for the renovation of facilities for development of economic education program;

$500,000 for Tuscaloosa, Alabama for the Tuscaloosa Alberta City Project;

$500,000 for the City of Brundidge, Alabama for the completion of Pike County Covered Arena;

$500,000 for the City of Mobile, Alabama for the Battlehouse Restoration Project;

$700,000 for Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, Kansas for the restoration of the home of William Allen White;

$1,000,000 for the development of the Life Center at Franklin Pierce College in Ridge, New Hampshire;

$100,000 for the Housing Partnership in Portsmouth, New Hampshire to provide below market rents and to rehabilitate deteriorated buildings;

$400,000 for the Northern Forest Heritage Park in Berlin, New Hampshire to develop facilities;

$2,600,000 for the City of Meridian, Mississippi for the rehabilitation of the opera house;

$300,000 for the City of Laurel, Mississippi for the development of a veterans museum;

$100,000 for the City of Jackson, Mississippi for the revitalization of LeFleur's Bluff;

$500,000 for Rowan Oak for the restoration of the home of William Faulkner in Oxford, Mississippi;

$500,000 for the George Ohr Museum in Biloxi, Mississippi for the development of an African-American art center;

$500,000 for Ocean Springs, Mississippi for the restoration of the old high school administration building;

$500,000 for Mississippi State University School of Architecture in Starkville, Mississippi for rural revitalization;

$2,500,000 for the University of Alaska for a pilot training simulator;

$450,000 for Bird TLC in Alaska for the construction of Potter's Marsh Conservation Center;

$2,000,000 for Catholic Community Services in Alaska for the reconstruction of a homeless shelter and to acquire new housing stock for battered women;

$270,000 for the Fairbanks Hospitality House in Fairbanks, Alaska for the purchase and renovation of an emergency shelter;

$500,000 for Kids are People, Inc. for a transitional living program for homeless youth and an emergency shelter in Wasilla, Alaska;

$3,000,000 for the Alaska Pacific University for the restoration of a historic property in Anchorage, Alaska;

$250,000 for Marceline, Missouri for downtown redevelopment activities;

$500,000 for Ozark Action, Inc. of Missouri for low-income rural housing;

$400,000 for Sedalia, Missouri for the Katy Depot Restoration Project;

$200,000 for the Bond Family Housing Center in St. Louis, Missouri for the Transitional Housing Program;

$200,000 for Trenton, Missouri for community redevelopment, including renovation and restoration activities of modifying the Plaza hotel into a senior citizen apartment building;

$500,000 for Sullivan County, Missouri for water supply and interconnection projects;

$2,000,000 for James S. McDonnell Planetarium in St. Louis, Missouri for renovation;

$100,000 for Clarksville, Missouri for improved year-round facilities related to the Mississippi River and the American Bald Eagle;

$250,000 for the Center for Emerging Technologies in St. Louis, Missouri for incubator space development;

$300,000 for the Columbia Housing Authority in Missouri for installation of fire suppression sprinkler systems in Oak and Paquin Towers;

$200,000 for the Bonne Terre, Missouri for infrastructure improvement of an industrial development;

$100,000 for the Lamar Community Betterment Association for an open air pavillion in Lamar, Missouri;

$100,000 for the Roxy Theater Youth Center in Hopkins, Missouri for renovation;

$250,000 for the Bootheel Youth Museum in Malden, Missouri for expansion;

$500,000 for renovation of the Ridgway Center at the Missouri Botanical Gardens;

$2,000,000 for Arkansas State University at Mountain Home, Arkansas for the construction of a multipurpose auditorium;

$1,000,000 for Marion County, Indiana for the construction of the Sexually Transmitted Disease and HIV Prevention and Research Center;

$850,000 for the South Carolina Association of Community Development Corporations in Charleston, South Carolina for job creation, small business development and quality of life improvements within the State of South Carolina;

$850,000 for the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina to enlarge the main building at the University of South Carolina School of Public Health;

$500,000 for Helping Hands Hawaii in Honolulu, Hawaii for community based activities including the delivery of goods and services to Hawaii's needy;

$750,000 for Waipahu Community Association in Waipahu, Hawaii for renovations and the establishment of a Waipahu festival market fair;

$500,000 for the Kauai Economic Development Board in Lihue, Hawaii for site acquisition, design, construction and equipment for the West Kauai Technology Center;

$250,000 for the Maui Academy of Performing Arts in Puunene, Hawaii for the acquisition and renovation of the facility;

$250,000 for the Homestake Opera House in Lead, South Dakota for renovation of the interior of the Homestake Opera House;

$250,000 for the City of Fort Pierre, South Dakota for development of the Lewis and Clark Waterfront Trail;

$250,000 for Cedar Youth Services in Lincoln, Nebraska to complete construction of the Northbridge Center for Children and Youth;

$250,000 for Family Housing Advisory Services Project Jericho in Omaha, Nebraska for affordable housing activities;

$500,000 for the Lowell Cultural and Performing Arts Downtown Initiative in Lowell, Massachusetts for development of the site for the Lowell Performing Arts Center;

$500,000 for the City of Boston, Massachusetts for its Main Streets Program;

$500,000 for the City of New Bedford, Massachusetts for construction and renovation of the Portugese American Cultural Center;

$325,000 for the City of Racine, Wisconsin for construction of the Racine Root River Pathway;

$300,000 for the Historic Third Ward Association in Milwaukee, Wisconsin to establish a public market;

$250,000 for Jentry-McDonald Corporation in Baltimore, Maryland for capital improvements to the Jentry-McDonald House;

$250,000 for the City of Takoma Park, Maryland for the construction of the Takoma Park Computer Center;

$250,000 for Montgomery County, Maryland for costs associated with the Wheaton Small Business Technology Center;

$500,000 for the Central Montana Foundation to upgrade, install technology, and facilitate occupancy of One Stop Center in Lewistown, Montana;

$250,000 for the City of South Bend, Indiana for economic development activities related to the Studebaker Auto/Oliver Plow Works project;

$1,000,000 for the City of Belen, New Mexico for construction of a community center;

$350,000 for Rio Arriba County, New Mexico for an environmental impact statement;

$150,000 for Pueblo Cochiti, New Mexico for the construction of a community center;

$500,000 for Pueblo of Acoma, New Mexico for the construction of a multi-purpose facility;

$500,000 for the City of San Francisco, California for preservation and restoration of the Old Mint;

$500,000 for Booker T. Washington Outreach, Inc. in Monroe, Louisiana for construction of an Elderly Living Center;

$250,000 for UNITY for the Homeless in New Orleans, Louisiana for the Oasis project;

$2,400,000 for Wheeling Jesuit University in Wheeling, West Virginia for construction of science/computer centers;

$1,800,000 for the City of Hinton, West Virginia for construction of a high technology office building and small business incubator;

$250,000 for the Tubman African American Museum in Macon, Georgia for construction of the Tubman African American Museum;

$250,000 for the Lemmon Area Charitable and Economic Development Corporation in Lemmon, South Dakota for economic development activities;

$100,000 for the Mathilda Geppert Childcare Center in Vermillion, South Dakota for development of a child day care center;

$75,000 for the Spearfish Economic Development Corporation in Spearfish, South Dakota for infrastructure development in the city's industrial park;

$300,000 for the City of Brandon, South Dakota to construct a community library;

$1,500,000 for the City of Aberdeen, South Dakota for construction of a community center;

$500,000 for the Sioux Falls Empire Fair Association in Sioux Falls, South Dakota for infrastructure improvements to the W.H. Lyons Fairgrounds;

$250,000 for the City of Redfield, South Dakota for infrastructure improvement at its industrial park;

$250,000 for the West River Foundation in Sturgis, South Dakota for a statewide business development initiative;

$100,000 for South Dakota Housing Development Authority in Pierre, South Dakota for the development of an employer assisted housing program;

$500,000 for Fairfield University in Fairfield, Connecticut for continued construction of an Information Technology Center;

$250,000 for Prince George's County, Maryland for the Prince George's County Technology Commercialization Center;

$100,000 for the American Visionary Arts Museum in Baltimore, Maryland for expansion of the museum;

$1,500,000 for the Discovery Center in Williston, North Dakota for construction of a visitor center and reconstruction of former barracks at Fort Buford State Historic Site;

$500,000 for the Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones in North Dakota;

$250,000 for North Dakota State University in Fargo, North Dakota for development of a campus-based technology park;

$500,000 for the City of Taylorville, Illinois for an emergency services center;

$1,000,000 for Loyola University in Chicago, Illinois for development of a life sciences center;

$200,000 for the Merit Music Program in Chicago, Illinois to expand Project BEGIN;

$400,000 for the City of Freeport, Illinois for Brownfields cleanup;

$100,000 for the City of Benton, Illinois for streetscape and beautification of downtown Benton;

$250,000 for the City of Charlotte, North Carolina for economic development activities within Charlotte's Wilkinson Boulevard Corridor;

$250,000 for Asheville-Buncome Technical College in Asheville, North Carolina for construction of a small business incubator;

$250,000 for the Museum of Latin American Art in Long Beach, California to expand and upgrade existing facilities;

$250,000 for FAME Renaissance in Los Angeles, California to continue work on a small business incubator;

$750,000 for the City of Fresno, California for the Fresno Community Health Centers regional medical center;

$250,000 for the City of Inglewood, California for the Market Street Senior Center;

$250,000 for the City of San Francisco, California for a homeless housing initiative;

$250,000 for the City of Santa Ana, California for the IDEA high-tech education center;

$1,800,000 for Comprehensive Housing Assistance, Inc., in Baltimore, Maryland for renovations to the Concord Apartments;

$500,000 for the City of Davenport, Iowa for development of Friendly House;

$500,000 for the City of Council Bluffs, Iowa for land purchase and construction of an elderly community center;

$10,000 for LaCrosse County, Wisconsin for economic development information centers;

$450,000 for the Biomedical Research Foundation of Northwest Louisiana, Shreveport, Louisiana for infrastructure improvements for InterTech Park and construction of a Cleanroom Biotechnology Incubator;

$1,000,000 for University Heights Science Park, Newark, New Jersey for University Heights Science Park's Newark Digital Century Center;

$500,000 for Bayshore Economic Development Corporation for development of the Henry Hudson Trail;

$400,000 for Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, West Virginia for renovation of Scarborough Library;

$400,000 for Bethany College in Bethany, West Virginia for continued work on a health and wellness center;

$250,000 for the Town of Millville, New Jersey for development of the Glasstown Center project;

$400,000 for the City of Burlington, Vermont for Firehouse Center for the Visual Arts;

$400,000 for the City of Montpelier, Vermont for Pyralisk Arts Center;

$200,000 for the Vermont Youth Orchestra Association, Colchester, Vermont for rehabilitation of the Fort Ethan Allen Riding Hall;

$250,000 for the Kellogg-Hubbard Library, Montpelier, Vermont for restoration of historic library and addition to the children's library;

$750,000 for the Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Brattleboro, Vermont for rehabilitation of the Westgate apartments;

$500,000 for the City of Detroit, Michigan for the Detroit River Promenade Project;

$500,000 for the Bushnell Theatre, Hartford, Connecticut for final completion of renovation;

$225,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Drew County, Arkansas for construction of general purpose facility;

$250,000 for the Frank Lloyd Wright Darwin Martin House, Buffalo, New York for restoration work;

$250,000 for the Westside Rowing Club of Buffalo, New York for construction of the Frank Lloyd Wright Boathouse;

$1,750,000 for the Washington State Department of Community Development to address farmworker housing issues in the State;

$250,000 for the Three Rivers Community Foundation in Tri-Cities, Washington for economic development activities in Benton, Franklin and Grant counties related to the Hanford Reach National Monument;

$250,000 for the Trinity Repertory Pell-Chafee Theatre, Providence, Rhode Island for theater expansion and operations;

$250,000 for the City of Providence, Rhode Island for construction of the Lillian Feinstein Senior Center;

$1,250,000 for the City of Henderson, Nevada for downtown redevelopment and infrastructure upgrade;

$350,000 for Opportunity Village Foundation, Las Vegas, Nevada for start-up funding for downpayment assistance program to disabled;

$500,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Las Vegas, Nevada for the renovation and expansion of existing facilities;

$750,000 for Henry and Martinsville Counties, Virginia for economic development activities;

$300,000 for CityArts for Youth, Inc. in Providence, Rhode Island for renovations for a business incubator;

$250,000 for Bayview Citizens for Social Justice and the Northampton-Accomack Planning District Commission to support economic development projects on the Eastern Shore of Virginia;

$250,000 for Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York to establish a Virtual Campus Center;

$250,000 for the West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine in Lewisburg, West Virginia for expansion of the ambulatory care facility;

$400,000 for Prince George's County, Maryland for architecture, design and engineering work for redevelopment of McGuire House;

$500,000 for Howard County, Maryland for renovations to Route 1;

$250,000 for the City of Atlanta, Georgia for continued construction of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Community Center;

$500,000 for Philander-Smith College, Arkansas for facilities and equipment upgrades for scientific and emerging technology research;

$250,000 for University of Arkansas in Pine Bluff, for facilities and equipment upgrades for scientific and emerging technology research;

$100,000 for the Boys and Girls Club of Olney, Maryland for facility construction;

$100,000 for the Wesley Acres Independent Living Retirement Center in Mitchell, South Dakota for capital and other improvements;

$500,000 for Liberty County, Georgia Economic Development Authority for planning and engineering the industrial park project in coastal Georgia;

$500,000 for County of Maui, Hawaii for land acquisition, planning and design, and construction of a senior housing/housing division office building in Central Maui, Hawaii;

$500,000 for Vermont Historical Society for the Vermont Historical Society renovation project;

$250,000 for Eva's Village in Patterson, New Jersey for renovation of new transitional housing sites;

$500,000 for the Iowa Finance Authority and Muscatine Center for Strategic Action to reduce illegal and predatory mortgage lending practices;

$500,000 for City of Reno, Nevada for land acquisition for downtown revitalization;

$500,000 for the City of Sheboygan, Wisconsin to redevelop a contaminated former industrial site to mixed use development;

$500,000 for El Centro de la Raza in Seattle, Washington for acquisition of the Beacon Hill School;

$250,000 for North Dakota State University for the development of the Virtual Archival Storage Terminal;

$250,000 for the Smyrna-Clayton Heritage Association in Smyrna, Delaware, for restoration work on the Smyrna Opera House;

$400,000 for the Montana World Trade Center for the Informational Outreach Project;

$325,000 to Boaz, Alabama for the Senior Citizens Center;

$20,000 to the Blount County Multi-need Center in Alabama for equipment for the mentally retarded and severely handicapped;

$800,000 to San Diego, California for final construction of San Diego's Children's Convalescent Hospital;

$930,000 to Barry University in Miami Shores, Florida for an intercultural community center;

$1,110,000 to Long Island University in New York for restoration of the Tilles Center for the Performing Arts;

$575,000 for Tennessee Valley Family Services in Guntersville, Alabama for construction and repair costs for the A+ house for homeless children;

$1,145,000 to the Lubbock Science Spectrum Museum in Texas for construction costs of the Brazos River Exhibit;

$930,000 to Provo City, Utah for the Ironton Redevelopment Site;

$1,110,000 to Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey for construction of a science building;

$150,000 for the Owensboro Riverfront Project in Kentucky for development of its waterfront;

$1,000,000 to the Louisville Zoo, Kentucky for construction of the Gorilla Forest Exhibition;

$193,500 to the town of Yucca Valley, California for community regional park improvements to provide recreational opportunities to the local community;

$51,600 to Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania for construction of an industrial park and facility;

$215,000 to complete the Logan, Utah Emergency Services Training Facility project;

$344,000 to the City of Ackerman and Choctaw County, Mississippi for development of a community center;

$800,000 to Aurora, Illinois to revitalize downtown through adaptive reuse of architecturally significant structures;

$860,000 to Waukegan, Illinois for renovation of the historic Genesee Theater;

$430,000 to Riverside, California for the Goeske Center for Senior and Disabled Citizens;

$200,000 to St. Stephen's Community Center in Kentucky for expansion of the life center;

$258,000 to West Palm Beach, Florida to refurbish and expand the Northwood Community and Recreation Center;

$825,000 to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania for the Capitol Theatre project;

$60,000 to the Coos Economic Development Corporation in New Hampshire for the Connecticut River Byway Gateway Center including purchase and renovation of a former cog mill;

$365,500 to the Boys and Girls Club of Camden, Arkansas;

$77,400 to Wayne County, Pennsylvania to establish a revolving loan fund for a Small Business Incubation Program;

$350,000 to the Patrick Henry Development Council (PHDC) of Virginia for economic development;

$215,000 to Escondido, California for the Quail Hills Development Program;

$860,000 to Dillard University in Louisiana to continue construction of the International Center for Economic Freedom;

$215,000 to the City of Charlotte, North Carolina for economic development activities within Charlotte's Wilkinson Boulevard Corridor;

$215,000 to Proctor Hospital in Peoria, Illinois for the Women's Health Center;

$172,000 to Baton Rouge, Louisiana for Downtown Development/Plan Baton Rouge;

$430,000 to the Center for Hazards Assessment, Response and Technology in New Orleans, Louisiana for emergency assessment and response;

$43,000 to the Borough of Tunkhannock, Wyoming County, Pennsylvania for upgrade of the Dietrich Theater Cultural Center;

$200,000 to the Marcelino Plan y Vino, Inc. A 501(c)(3) in Virginia for the MAPAVI program to provide assistance to communities and individuals coping with the financial burden of catastrophic illness;

$1,000,000 to Sandy City, Utah for the purchase of land related to the Little Cottonwood Watershed Protection project;

$34,400 to the YWCA of Walla Walla, Washington for the repair and enhancements to the family emergency shelter;

$430,000 to Columbus, Ohio for a Housing Trust Fund;

$250,000 to Motor City Blight Busters in Detroit, Michigan to establish a revolving loan fund for new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of distressed homes;

$430,000 to Daytona Beach, Florida for design and construction of Community Center;

$43,000 to the County of San Bernardino, California for roadway signage improvements to historic Route 66 between Topock and Victorville;

$430,000 to Montgomery County, Kentucky for a community center;

$430,000 to Hackensack University Medical Center in New Jersey for women's and children's hospital;

$1,720,000 to the Olympic Regional Development Authority to upgrade the Lake Placid, New York winter sports facilities;

$258,000 to the Hamlet Historic Train Depot in North Carolina for depot restoration;

$43,000 to Highland Falls, New York to renovate downtown;

$473,000 to Monroe County, Pennsylvania for construction of an industrial park;

$860,000 for the restoration of Glamorgan Castle in Alliance, Ohio;

$301,000 to the City of Redlands, California for infrastructure activities related to the Redlands Community Center;

$172,000 to Ouachita County, Arkansas for Tate's Bluff Bridge;

$430,000 to Doane College—Crete, Nebraska for rehabilitation of historic Whitcomb Conservatory for performing arts center;

$215,000 to Memorial Health System in Springfield, Illinois for initial facility planning for a Cardiology Center;

$301,000 to Ft. Wayne, Indiana for revitalization of the of Bowser Avenue and Hanna-Creighton brownfield area;

$430,000 to the Town of Skaneateles, New York for construction of a recreation center;

$645,000 to Carnegie Hall in New York for continuation of Carnegie Hall's Third Stage project;

$430,000 to the MCB Foundation of Wichita, Kansas for revitalization of the downtown community recreation center;

$430,000 to the VA Greater Los Angeles Health Care System in California for renovation of the gymnasium on the Sepulveda campus;

$438,600 to the Children's Hospital and Health Center in San Diego, California for construction and infrastructure improvements;

$301,000 to the Port of South, Louisiana for expansion of the Globalplex intermodal terminal facility;

$430,000 to the City of Tucson, Arizona for clean-up and development of brownfield;

$344,000 to Carmel, New York to create a downtown park and commercial area;

$1,240,000 to Spring Hill College in Alabama for the Regional Library Resource Center;

$25,600 to the City of Thibodaux, Louisiana for infrastructure improvements to the Civic Center;

$430,000 to Tuscaloosa, Alabama for the Alberta City housing initiative;

$444,000 to Knoxville, Tennessee for equipment needs of the Halls-Powell Boys and Girls Club of Greater Knoxville;

$200,000 to the Virginia Department of Transportation for engineering design and construction of a debris diverter on the Tripps Run in Falls Church, Virginia;

$64,500 to the Twentynine Palms Fire Department in Twentynine Palms, California for fire suppression equipment;

$250,000 to the Natural History Museum of the Adirondacks in Tupper Lake, New York for the construction of the Natural History Museum of the Adirondacks;

$430,000 to Redding, California for Stillwater Industrial Park within the Shasta Metro Enterprise Zone ''Distressed Community'';

$430,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Tucson, Arizona for new construction;

$430,000 to the Coach George E. Ford Cultural Arts Center in Georgia for building renovation;

$430,000 to the St. Francis Community Center in New Jersey for construction of indoor community pool;

$430,000 for the New York Institute of Technology Robbins Hall for renovation of the auditorium;

$215,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for infrastructure improvements to the Erie Canal Museum;

$430,000 to Kern County, California for infrastructure work in support of the new air terminal to Meadows Field;

$215,000 to the City of Medford, Oregon for the City of Medford Urban Revitalization Project;

$415,000 to Temecula, California for the Alternatives to Domestic Violence Shelter;

$21,500 to the City of Redlands, California for restoration projects at the historic Kimberly Crest House and Gardens;

$344,000 to the State University of New York at Albany for continued development of a manufacturing/workforce training center;

$645,000 to the Cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach and Hawthorne, California to ease traffic congestion along the Rosecrans corridor;

$645,000 to Jazz at Lincoln Center in New York City for facility construction;

$430,000 to Rochelle, Illinois for economic development and infrastructure improvements;

$172,000 to the ArtSpace Victory Center in Texas for the revitalization of the Our Lady of Victory Convent;

$98,900 to the Whitman County Rural Fire District No. 11 in Colfax, Washington for construction and repair of the Colfax Fire Station;

$215,000 to NewTown, Inc., Macon, Georgia for revitalization of downtown area;

$86,000 to the Economic Opportunity Authority of Chatham County, Georgia for the Austin House shelter for homeless;

$645,000 to the City of Leesburg, Virginia for preservation and infrastructure improvements for the George C. Marshall International Center at the Dodona Manor;

$1,118,000 to the United Cerebral Palsy of Suffolk County, New York for the Sports and Recreation Center and Education complex;

$1,000,000 to the Future of the Piedmont Foundation in Danville, Virginia for development of a regional higher education center;

$236,500 to Arkadelphia, Arkansas for the Streetscape project;

$21,500 to the Donald L. Heiter Community Center in Pennsylvania for renovation project;

$129,000 to Bruce, Mississippi for a multipurpose facility for economic development purposes;

$208,000 to Ashland, Alabama to complete renovations of the Clay County Courthouse;

$215,000 to the University of Cincinnati Medical Center in Ohio for renovation of the Medical Sciences Building;

$215,000 to Pike County, Pennsylvania for construction of an industrial facility to employ disabled individuals;

$430,000 to the Bethesda Academy of Performing Arts in Maryland for creation of children's art center;

$344,000 to the San Diego Youth and Community Services in California for the Storefront emergency shelter relocation of facilities ($172,000) and for the Take Wing transitional housing program for at-risk youth and families ($172,000);

$430,000 to restore and rehabilitate Mile Square Park in California;

$250,000 to Lysander, Van Buren, and Eldridge, New York for a water line extension for Jack's Reef;

$430,000 to Cheyenne, Wyoming for economic development and infrastructure improvements to the airport;

$129,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida for the City of Miami Beach North Beach Recreational Corridor;

$215,000 to Stamford, Connecticut to acquire property for the Mill River Corridor Revitalization Project;

$150,000 to the City of Johnstown, New York for rehabilitation and redevelopment work at the former Karg Brothers Tannery;

$1,220,000 to St. Petersburg, Florida for the Sunken Gardens improvement project;

$860,000 to Citrus Heights, California for Phase II of the Sunrise MarketPlace Revitalization project;

$215,000 to El Monte, California for renovation of recreational facility by replacing swimming pools, modernizing parking areas, developing youth center;

$430,000 to Fairview Health Services in Minnesota for the Fairview-University Medical Center for Healthy Mothers and Babies Technology Demonstration Initiative;

$86,000 to the City of New Iberia, Louisiana for economic development and revitalization of the downtown area;

$215,000 to the Titusville YMCA in Pennsylvania for the purchase of a new structure and preliminary renovation;

$86,000 to St. Charles Parish, Louisiana for the development of a bike path and enhancement of recreation opportunities;

$430,000 to the Terre Haute/Vigo County Department of Redevelopment in Indiana pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between the General Services Administration and the United States Postal Service;

$130,000 to El Rio, California for extension of water and wastewater infrastructure to the community center gymnasium;

$430,000 to Huntingdon College in Montgomery, Alabama for renovation and expansion of the Natural Sciences facility, Bellingrath Hall;

$200,000 to TeenPride Inc. in Morristown, New Jersey to expand outreach to low-income, at-risk teenagers and their families;

$258,000 to Mercer County, New Jersey for the Senior Citizen Centers of Hamilton Township and the City of Trenton;

$86,000 to the Upper Bucks County community of Quakertown, Pennsylvania for revitalization of former brownfield site;

$300,000 to Santa Paula, California purchase of new fire engine and equipment for the Fire Department;

$100,000 to the City of Rochester, New Hampshire for emergency housing;

$86,000 to Original Town of Liberal Revitalization, Inc. in Kansas for economic development activities;

$430,000 to Coachella, California for construction of Boys and Girls Club facility;

$400,000 to St. Joseph's Hospital Health Care Center for the Central New York Cardiac Care and Hemodialysis Enhancement Center in Syracuse, New York;

$75,000 to Paul Smith's College in Paul Smiths, New York for the construction of the Adirondack Information Resource Center;

$860,000 to Rockland County, New York for extension of water and wastewater infrastructure of the Western Ramapo Sewer District;

$450,000 to Xenia, Ohio for renovation of fire station No. 1;

$860,000 to the James Whitcomb Riley Hospital for Children in Indiana to expand services at the autism clinic;

$215,000 to the County of San Bernardino, California for a public park complex to meet the recreational needs of the Spring Valley Lake community in Victorville;

$430,000 to Laural, Mississippi for the Veterans Memorial Museum;

$1,500,000 for development of the Interactive Education Center at the Intrepid Sea Air and Space Museum in New York;

$415,000 to Oceanside, California for the Calle Montecito Neighborhood Center;

$100,000 to complete the Chattahoochee Indian Heritage Center at Fort Mitchell County Park, Alabama;

$17,200 to the City of Grand Isle, Louisiana for emergency service needs;

$395,000 to the City of Ellicottville, New York for use toward the repair and/or replacement of the City's waste water treatment plant;

$172,000 to Shea's Performing Arts Center in the City of Buffalo, New York for renovations to the main theater;

$430,000 to Bradford, Pennsylvania for the restoration of Bradford City Hall;

$495,000 for the Green County ''Spec Building'' in Kentucky for preparation and construction of an industrial site;

$430,000 to Oklahoma State University to continue and expand rural economic development;

$430,000 to the University of Missouri-Columbia for the Agriculture Product Utilization and Incubation Center;

$430,000 to Rural Enterprises Inc. of Oklahoma to continue and expand rural economic development;

$114,000 to Fairfax County, Virginia for the Computer Clubhouse Project at the Bailey's Community Center;

$430,000 to Yakima, Washington for railroad grade separations;

$215,000 to Bristol, Pennsylvania for construction of a gateway and beautification;

$172,000 to Stepping-Stones for Youth in Hutchinson, Kansas;

$35,000 to the St. Lawrence Aquarium and Ecological Center in Massena, New York for continued development and construction of the St. Lawrence Aquarium;

$245,100 to Holly Springs, Mississippi for North Memphis Street District Redevelopment and Revitalization Program;

$430,000 to the Museum of Aviation, Warner Robins, Georgia for development plan and expansion;

$500,000 to Somerset County, New Jersey for the Eldercare Center in Bridgewater Township;

$930,000 to the City of Cincinnati, Ohio for the expansion of Findlay Market;

$50,000 to the City of Ogdensburg, New York for reconstruction of Fort La Presentation;

$86,000 to Nike Base in the Town of Hamburg, New York for removal of storage tank;

$387,000 to Lake Worth Palm Beach County, Florida for the Mid-County Senior Center;

$25,000 to Safe Haven, Inc. in Oswego, New York for construction of a museum/interpretive center chronicling the Fort Ontario Emergency Refugee;

$215,000 to Memorial Temple Community Center in the city of Buffalo, New York for equipment for the inner-city community center;

$43,000 to Onondaga County, New York for restoration and preservation of Civil War flags;

$172,000 for the Huntington Station Enrichment Center in New York for renovation and conversion to a community center;

$215,000 to Fairfield University in Connecticut for establishment of Information Technology Center;

$215,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for renovations to the Salt City Theatre for the Performing Arts;

$400,000 to Marshall County, Alabama for drinking water infrastructure improvements on Merrill Mountain;

$430,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for monument repair and infrastructure improvements for Clinton Square;

$75,000 to Fulton-Montgomery Community College in Johnstown, New York for construction of a remote sensing/spatial information technology center;

$200,000 to the James Lee Community Center in Virginia;

$258,000 to Fort Worth, Texas for renovation of the historic Marine Theater;

$268,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of McGehee, Arkansas;

$430,000 to the Community House in Hinsdale, Illinois for renovation, upgrades and restoration to meet ADA compliance codes and local fire codes;

$430,000 to South Sioux City, Nebraska for downtown redevelopment for civic building site;

$430,000 to Sacramento County, California for rehabilitation and preservation of historic structures and physical improvements for the town of Locke;

$430,000 to Chester, Pennsylvania for the Institute for Economic Development for planning funds for high-tech building;

$860,000 to the City of Pikeville, Kentucky for an integrated transit/parking facility;

$250,000 to Elmira College in New York for the historic renovation of Cowles Hall;

$172,000 to the Millennium Port Commission for planning and development of the Millennium Port in south Louisiana;

$75,000 to Fayette County, Alabama for emergency services equipment;

$172,000 to Morgantown, Kentucky to construct recreation center;

$215,000 to Rockdale County, Georgia for Georgia's Veteran's Park for future veteran memorials and events;

$172,000 to the County of Inyo, California for facility and infrastructure improvements at the Bishop Airport to facilitate economic development and recreational access;

$430,000 to the New Britain Museum of American Art in Connecticut for expansion of facilities;

$860,000 to Arizona State University for the establishment of the Center for Basic Research and Applied Research within the Barry M. Goldwater Center for Science and Engineering;

$500,000 to Cortland County, New York for infrastructure and expanded operational improvements for Borg-Warner Automotive, Inc.;

$215,000 to the Town of Aurora, New York for renovation of the Aurora Senior's and Adult Day Care facility;

$860,000 to Winston-Salem, North Carolina for Downtown revitalization;

$258,000 to Albemarle, North Carolina for the Gateway to Albemarle project;

$400,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for equipment and infrastructure improvements for the Institute of Human Performance;

$215,000 to Jacksonville, Florida for redevelopment of Cecil Field;

$43,000 to the City of Dumas, Arkansas for the Tannenbaum Theatre renovations;

$344,000 to Broward County, Florida for the Museum of Discovery and Science;

$430,000 to Muncie, Indiana for downtown economic development project;

$258,000 to the Fund for the Preservation of the California State Mining and Mineral Museum;

$215,000 to Jackson, Michigan for the downtown redevelopment project;

$215,000 for Roberts Wesleyan College in Rochester, New York for infrastructure improvements along Westside Drive;

$86,000 to the Hamlet Opera House in North Carolina for development of a performing arts center;

$430,000 to the Hebrew Academy for Special Children in New York to construct a national service center for low-income and developmentally disabled;

$200,000 to the Village of Malone, New York for rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Hotel Flanagan Project;

$98,900 for the Inland Northwest Blood Center in Washington for construction and improvements of the blood center;

$56,000 to Fairfax County, Virginia for the Herndon Senior Center;

$77,400 to the City of Imperial Beach, California for lands purchased by the city for the Tijuana Wildlife Refuge;

$430,000 to Boyle County, Kentucky for Phase III of Millennium Park;

$129,000 to SocialServe.com in North Carolina for a demonstration grant to increase access to low-income and special needs housing;

$215,000 to Miami Beach, Florida for the Atlantic Greenway Corridor Initiative—North Beach Recreational Corridor;

$215,000 to the Economic Corporation of Newport, New Hampshire for rehabilitation of Eagle Block;

$86,000 to Vista Optimist Club, California for the Youth Activities Facility to build lighted ballfields;

$750,000 to William Tyndale College in Farmington Hills, Michigan for the construction of a science and computing learning center;

$688,000 to Baton Rouge, Louisiana for expansion of the South Louisiana Community Health Alliance;

$215,000 for renovation and rehabilitation of North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging, Manhattan, Kansas;

$800,000 to the Tawawa Community Development Corporation in Wilberforce, Ohio;

$215,000 to Shake-A-Leg Miami, Inc. in Florida for recreation facilities serving people with disabilities and at-risk youth;

$73,100 to Bellevue, Washington for Eastside Domestic Violence;

$172,000 to Grand Junction, Colorado for planning assistance for the Grand Valley Audubon Nature Center;

$430,000 to Lees-McRae College in North Carolina for a field laboratory to support the College's Biology departments and community outreach;

$860,000 to Pasadena, California for construction of a new fire station;

$205,000 to the Children's Center in Brooklyn, New York for the construction of a facility to house educational and therapeutic programs for disabled preschool children;

$270,000 to the County of San Bernardino, California for the construction of the Hall of Paleontology at the historic San Bernardino County Museum;

$250,000 to the Shiloh Community Renewal Center in Kentucky for rehabilitation of facilities;

$90,000 to the Fairfax County Parks Authority in Virginia for the Mason District Park;

$170,000 to the Pittsfield Library in New Hampshire for renovations necessary to meet ADA compliance;

$1,935,000 to Syracuse University in New York for completion of the Crouse-Marshall Street Improvement Project;

$50,000 to the Nelson County Senior Citizen Center in Virginia for renovation and expansion of the facility near Lovingston, Virginia;

$1,200,000 to the City of Syracuse, New York for the building of a temporary transmission tower during the transition of the public TV station from analog to digital television;

$430,000 for Madison County, New York for economic development and infrastructure improvements;

$430,000 to California State University and the City of Omaha, California for the Omaha Housing Initiative;

$430,000 to Shreveport, Louisiana for Convention Center Downtown Redevelopment and construction of infrastructure surrounding convention center;

$258,000 to the Kalamazoo Aviation History Museum in Michigan for the ''Legacy of Flight'' project;

$215,000 to the Boys Town National Research Hospital in Nebraska for establishing the National Center for the Study and Treatment of Usher Syndrome;

$43,000 for the Central Bucks, Pennsylvania Joint Municipal Planning Issues study;

$820,000 for Griffiss Business and Technology Park in Oneida County, New York for economic development and infrastructure improvements;

$860,000 to Midwest City, Oklahoma for construction of small conference center;

$645,000 to the University of Southern California to help create the Alfred E. Mann Institute and Biomedical Engineering Center;

$215,000 to Lebanon College in New Hampshire for a community center;

$430,000 to Monrovia, California for the renovation and upgrade of existing city facility into teen center;

$645,000 for the Cornell Agriculture and Technical Park-Geneva Station in Ontario County, New York;

$800,000 to the Washington Association in Harding Township, New Jersey;

$258,000 for the Troy Rent-to-Own Housing Pilot project in North Carolina;

$344,000 to the University Colleges of Technology at the State University of New York for the continued development of a Telecommunications Center for Education;

$309,000 to the New York Public Library for renovations and infrastructure improvements;

$500,000 to MBI International in Michigan for economic development activities that provide infrastructure to accelerate the development of biobased industrial product technologies;

$98,900 to the Oaksdale/Farmington Fire District No. 10 in Whitman County, Washington for the repair and construction of facilities;

$215,000 to the Tubman African American Museum in Macon, Georgia for the construction of the Tubman African American Museum;

$98,900 to the Coalition for Women on the Street in Spokane, Washington for the development of the Downtown Women's Shelter;

$20,000 to Culman, Alabama for a study to plan and design the Agriplex Agriculture Museum;

$172,000 to 1490 Enterprises Inc., City of Buffalo, New York for a Community Action Organization (CAO) Head Start Expansion;

$100,000 to the City of Bedford, Virginia for economic development and tourism in connection with the World War II D-Day Memorial;

$645,000 to Warren County, Virginia for asbestos remediation and lead paint removal at the Avtex Superfund site;

$430,000 to the Next Generation Economy Initiative in Albuquerque, New Mexico to enter into ''matching funds'' technology maturation partnerships with local companies using the expertise from the University of New Mexico and Sandia National Laboratories;

$125,000 to Escambia County in Florida for development costs for infrastructure of Central Commerce Park;

$600,000 to the City of Portland, Oregon for the Portland-Vancouver Regional Housing Affordability Pilot Program;

$750,000 to Northeast Ventures Corporation in Duluth, Minnesota to provide equity capital support for community development venture capital and microenterprise in Northeast Minnesota;

$350,000 to the City of Indianapolis, Indiana for infrastructure needs in the King Park homeownership zone;

$700,000 to the City of Takoma, Washington for the Downtown Revitalization and Shelter Improvements Program;

$15,000 to Renew Oakville in the town of Oakville, Missouri for a community enhancement program;

$200,000 to the City of Burlington, Vermont for a homeownership program designed to assist low and moderate income first time homebuyers in purchasing duplex housing, including down payment assistance;

$250,000 to the Township of Plainsboro, New Jersey for construction of a nature center at the Plainsboro Preserve;

$150,000 to Marin City, California for a Marin City Cultural and Community Center facility;

$350,000 to the Jefferson County, Missouri Parks & Recreation Department for improvements to existing county-owned parks;

$1,000,000 to the City of Johnstown, Pennsylvania for construction of an intermodal parking garage;

$1,000,000 to the Self-Help Ventures Fund in Durham, North Carolina to establish a revolving loan fund;

$150,000 to the Memphis Zoo in Memphis, Tennessee for the Northwest Passage Campaign;

$50,000 to the Historical Centre Foundation in San Antonio, Texas for construction of a community center and startup of a program for community outreach near the San Fernando Cathedral;

$175,000 to St. Ignace, Michigan for construction of a public library;

$200,000 to the Flint, Michigan Chamber of Commerce for economic development efforts;

$100,000 to the Wholistic Family Agape Ministries Industries in Arlington, Virginia for an HIV/AIDS/Substance Abuse program;

$125,000 to the Word of God Parish and School, St. Anselm site, in Swissvale, Pennsylvania for infrastructure rehabilitation projects;

$200,000 to the Sacramento, California Housing and Redevelopment Agency for the Smart Workplace Demonstration Center;

$100,000 to the City of Berwyn, Illinois for the expansion and renovation of Public Safety and Fire facilities;

$250,000 to the Baltimore, Maryland Symphony Orchestra for construction of a concert hall and youth music education center in Rockville, Maryland;

$100,000 to Essex County, Massachusetts for cyberdistrict economic development initiatives;

$250,000 to the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania for the rehabilitation and revitalization of the Garfield neighborhood;

$200,000 to the Governing Board of Tower Grove Park in St. Louis, Missouri for an ongoing renovation project;

$350,000 to the Town of Wilson, New York for repair and expansion of the pier at Wilson Harbor;

$300,000 to Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, Illinois for infrastructure needs related to the development of a University Research Park;

$1,000,000 to Ford City Borough, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania for development of the Ford City Heritage and Technology Park;

$310,000 to the West Virginia Humanities Council: $210,000 to support production of ''The Appalachians,'' a film documentary, and $100,000 for Council programs;

$500,000 to the Fairmont Community Development Partnership for downtown revitalization, and relocation of a homeless nutrition service program;

$400,000 to the City of Gainesville, Florida for the East Side Community Recreation Center, Cone Park;

$250,000 to Hampshire College in Amherst, Massachusetts for construction of the National Center for Science Education;

$50,000 to the Great Lakes Consortium for an International Training and Development program in Toledo, Ohio;

$100,000 to the Village of Chicago Ridge, Illinois for construction of a Municipal Complex;

$450,000 to the Potomac Heritage Partnership for the Potomac River Heritage Trail Project to improve access to parks;

$100,000 to the Washington County Economic Development Council in Washington County, Florida for economic development efforts;

$50,000 to the Institute for Economic Development for development of University Technology Park in Chester, Pennsylvania;

$1,000,000 to Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts for a pilot program on the health problems of urban communities;

$150,000 to Elkhart County, Indiana for natural gas and electric service to the Harrison Ridge subdivision project;

$100,000 to the New Kensington Redevelopment Authority in New Kensington, Pennsylvania for asbestos removal and demolition of the Ridge Avenue High School building;

$450,000 to the City of Durham, North Carolina for community development, employment training, and youth development efforts;

$300,000 to the City of Monticello, Florida for conversion of a school building to a multi-purpose community center;

$270,000 to the Somerset County Commission in Somerset County, Pennsylvania for facilities improvements at Windber Recreational Park;

$450,000 to Family Connections in Weirton, West Virginia for facility needs related to the provision of services to at-risk juvenile females;

$25,000 to the City of Jacksonville, Florida for development of a distinctive business district;

$200,000 to the Abilene, Texas Regional Airport for hangar renovation related to the Southwest Regional Fly-In;

$400,000 to the City of Salinas, California for the construction of a municipal pool;

$50,000 to the City of Thousand Oaks, California for planning and construction of a child care center;

$100,000 to the New York City, New York Department of Parks and Recreation for clean-up of the College Point Sports Complex in Queens;

$100,000 to the Brooke-Hancock County Veterans Memorial, Inc. in West Virginia for a community park improvement project, military history museum and memorial;

$100,000 to Covenant House Washington in Washington, D.C. for the construction of a Community Service Center;

$900,000 to the City of Wausau, Wisconsin for a supportive living facility to serve low income elderly residents;

$150,000 to the City of Tonawanda, New York for public works infrastructure and housing rehabilitation grants;

$200,000 to the St. Louis County, Missouri Parks & Recreation Department for renovation of the structures at Bee Tree Park;

$1,100,000 to Rush-Presbyterian St. Luke's Medical Center in Chicago, Illinois for the Center for Research on Aging;

$80,000 to the Borough of Latrobe, Pennsylvania for the Latrobe Veterans Plaza;

$200,000 to SW Resources, Inc. in Parkersburg, West Virginia for facilities expansion for the creation of additional job opportunities for people with disabilities;

$50,000 to the Cambria Historical Society in Cambria, California for the preservation of the Bianchini House;

$400,000 to the City of Dayton, Ohio for land acquisition for the Tool Town precision metal working park;

$80,000 to the St. Louis County, Missouri Parks & Recreation Department for the renovation of recreation facilities within Black Forest Park;

$150,000 to the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency for mortgage assistance in Chatham County;

$225,000 to the Alabama State University for facility needs related to the Environmental Microbiology program;

$100,000 to Lorain County Community College in Ohio for the establishment of the Learning Technology Center;

$100,000 to Salem International University in West Virginia for equipment, information technology and infrastructure needs;

$50,000 to Portland State University in Portland, Oregon for development of the Northwest Center for Engineering, Science, and Technology;

$400,000 to the UDI Community Development Corporation in Durham, North Carolina for economic development efforts;

$250,000 to the New York City, New York Department of Parks and Recreation for costs relating to construction of a Recreation Center in Chelsea;

$250,000 to the Upper Kanawha Valley Economic Development Corporation in Montgomery, West Virginia for the development of a technology community park;

$25,000 to CHANGE, Inc. Community Action Agency in Weirton, West Virginia for equipment needs for after-school programs for under-served youth;

$175,000 to the National Council of La Raza to provide technical and financial assistance to community development efforts through its Hope Fund;

$200,000 to the Southside Boys and Girls Club in St. Cloud, Minnesota for planning and construction of a community center;

$100,000 to the Fresno Community Medical Center in Fresno, California for development of a regional trauma and burn center;

$175,000 to the City of Houston, Texas for a homeownership program, involving down payment subsidy assistance for sewer/water hook-up;

$150,000 to the Multicultural Educational Counseling Through the Arts (MECA) program in Houston, Texas for operational and facilities needs;

$75,000 to the Lafayette, Louisiana Chamber of Commerce for the Zydetech Initiative;

$100,000 to the Village of Tuckahoe, New York for streetscape improvements;

$50,000 to the Cambridge, Massachusetts Redevelopment Authority for recreation development efforts;

$1,250,000 to the City of Mt. Clemens, Michigan for the establishment of a community recreation center;

$250,000 to the Los Angeles Neighborhood Initiative in Los Angeles, California for economic development efforts in the Fairfax Avenue Ethiopian Business District;

$250,000 to the City of Brownsville, Texas for reconstruction of downtown streets as part of city center redevelopment efforts;

$200,000 to the Village of Matteson, Illinois for renovation and expansion of a community center;

$500,000 to Southern West Virginia Community and Technical College in Logan, West Virginia for a cooperative economic development effort with the Appalachian Transportation Institute at Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia;

$250,000 to Culver City, California for the construction of the Culver City Senior Center;

$200,000 to the Safer Foundation in Chicago, Illinois for a workforce development program to provide ex-offenders with education and job training;

$125,000 to the Franklin County Community Development Corporation in Greenfield, Massachusetts for construction of a food processing center;

$200,000 to the Township of Stickney, Illinois for renovations related to a multipurpose municipal center;

$150,000 to Tulane University in New Orleans, Louisiana for facilities renovation and educational outreach at the AMISTAD Research Center;

$250,000 to Long Island University in Brooklyn, New York to study the feasibility of establishing a wellness center as a collaborative effort with Brooklyn Hospital;

$200,000 to the Sacramento, California Boys and Girls Club for the construction of a facility on Lemon Hill Avenue;

$200,000 to Calhoun Community College in Decatur, Alabama for the Aerospace and Advanced Technology Park;

$300,000 to the Township of North Bergen, New Jersey for the establishment of Technology Literacy Learning Centers;

$250,000 to Casa Puerto Rico in New York City, New York: $150,000 for a feasibility study and seed money for the restoration of a theater located in the Villa Alejandrina Apartments in South Bronx, New York, and $100,000 for a feasibility study and startup costs for the conversion of the Bronx Borough Courthouse into a Puerto Rican Historical, Cultural and Activities Center;

$800,000 to the Wausau Performing Arts Foundation, Inc. in Wausau, Wisconsin for the ArtsBlock project;

$150,000 to the City of Baytown, Texas for construction of an Emergency Operations Center;

$75,000 to Northern Kentucky University in Highland Heights, Kentucky for the Urban Learning Center;

$400,000 to Spelman College in Atlanta, Georgia for the historic preservation of Packard Hall;

$400,000 to Milwaukee County, Wisconsin for renovations to the Milwaukee County War Memorial;

$50,000 to the City of Norwalk, California for renovations at the Norwalk Aquatic Center;

$100,000 to the Tampa Port Authority in Tampa, Florida for infrastructure improvements related to the Channelside economic development project;

$200,000 to the L.I.F.T. Women's Resource Center in Detroit, Michigan for expansion of the Positive Change Project;

$50,000 to the 21st Century Council Adult Career Center in Scottsboro, Alabama for computer system improvements, acquisition of office equipment, and instructional materials;

$50,000 to the Tri-Valley Business Council in Livermore, California for a business incubator initiative known as Tri-Valley Technology Enterprise Center;

$400,000 to the City of New Haven, Connecticut for the restoration and rehabilitation of the West River Memorial Park;

$25,000 to the Township of Branchburg, New Jersey for the construction of a war veterans memorial;

$400,000 to Ohio University in Athens, Ohio for the Innovation Center, a technology business incubator;

$250,000 to the Wawashkamo Restoration and Preservation Fund in Mackinac Island, Michigan for initiatives related to the Mackinac Island Battlefield;

$100,000 to the City of Dallas, Texas for an affordable housing program operated by the T.R. Hoover Community Development Corporation;

$100,000 to the New London Development Corporation in New London, Connecticut for renovation related to affordable housing;

$100,000 to Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation of Kansas City, Kansas for development of low income housing;

$50,000 to the New York City, New York Department of Parks and Recreation for phase three of the rebuilding and restoration of Joyce Kilmer Park in South Bronx, New York;

$550,000 to the Springfield Library and Museum Association in Springfield, Massachusetts for construction and infrastructure improvements related to a national memorial and park honoring Theodor Geisel;

$225,000 to the City of Ferndale, Michigan for refurbishment of Washington Elementary School for use as a community center;

$100,000 to the City of Mollalla, Oregon for the conversion of a gymnasium into a public library, community and technology training center;

$300,000 to the City of Albany, New York for waterfront improvements;

$250,000 to the Berkeley County Commission in Martinsburg, West Virginia for the Historic Baltimore and Ohio Roundhouse Renovation Project;

$100,000 to the Cape Cod, Massachusetts Chamber of Commerce for the Cape Cod High Technology Center technology incubator initiative;

$100,000 to Consolidated Fruit Packers, Inc. in New Paltz, New York for a job retention program;

$1,000,000 to the National Children's Advocacy Center in Huntsville, Alabama for the establishment of a research and training facility;

$350,000 to the Richland County Neighborhood Technology Center in Richland County, South Carolina for facilities and equipment needs;

$500,000 to the Center for Economic Development at the University of San Francisco in San Francisco, California for economic development efforts;

$400,000 to the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans in Washington, DC for the provision of technical assistance to local organizations;

$150,000 to the Saugerties Historical Society in Saugerties, New York for historic preservation of the Kiersted House;

$200,000 to the Village of Glenwood, Illinois for renovations to the Glenwood Senior Center;

$150,000 to the Point Community Development Corporation in New York City, New York for the purchase and/or renovation as a boathouse of an abandoned factory at the corner of Lafayette Avenue and Edgewater Road in South Bronx, New York;

$500,000 to the City of Falls Church, Virginia to refinance the Winter Hill Apartments, low-income housing complex;

$100,000 to Roberts Wesleyan College in Rochester, New York for the establishment of a community service center;

$1,050,000 to Lucas County, Ohio for the acquisition and improvement of Quarry Farms Park;

$250,000 to Santa Monica College in Santa Monica, California for the Madison Site Theater Center;

$200,000 to the Lewiston Auburn Economic Growth Council in Lewiston, Maine for administering loans to stimulate economic growth;

$50,000 to the Borough of Peapack, New Jersey for facility improvements to the Township Hall;

$225,000 to the City of Los Angeles, California for construction of the Ernest E. Debs Nature Center;

$450,000 to the American Indian Business Development Corporation for construction of a multi-purpose facility to support business development in south Minneapolis, Minnesota;

$325,000 to the Berkshire South Regional Community Center in Great Barrington, Massachusetts for planning and construction;

$165,000 to the Millvale Borough Development Corporation in Millvale, Pennsylvania for the implementation of the Millvale Gateway and Riverfront Plan;

$200,000 to Nanticoke, Pennsylvania for downtown revitalization and infrastructure improvements;

$1,000,000 to the George Meany Center for Labor Studies in Silver Spring, Maryland for facility needs;

$500,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Nogales, Arizona for expenses related to the construction of a facility;

$250,000 to the City of Buffalo, New York for refurbishing of the exterior of St. Louis Church, including façade work;

$80,000 to the Eureka Volunteer Fire Department in Tarentum, Pennsylvania for asbestos removal and demolition of the Tarentum Municipal Building;

$150,000 to the Tioga County Rural Economic Area Partnership in Owego, New York for economic development efforts;

$100,000 to the Village of Hempstead, New York for infrastructure improvements to Kennedy Park;

$465,000 to the Prospect Park Alliance in New York City, New York for interior exhibits and furnishing for Prospect Park Audubon Center at the Boathouse;

$200,000 to the Ukrainian Museum Archives in Cleveland, Ohio for facilities improvements;

$25,000 to the Orlando Community Redevelopment Agency in Orlando, Florida for redevelopment of Otey Place;

$125,000 to the Academy Family Foundation in Fairmont, West Virginia for facility and programmatic needs;

$100,000 to the Little Tokyo Service Community Center in Los Angeles, California for the development of a job training program;

$200,000 to Broward County, Florida for the Broward County African-American Community and Cultural Center;

$50,000 to the County of San Diego, California for planning related to the development of a business park in East Otay Mesa;

$150,000 to the Indiana County Community Action Program in Indiana County, Pennsylvania for equipment, facilities and activities needs;

$200,000 to the City of East Palo Alto, California for the redevelopment of the Ravenswood Industrial Area;

$300,000 to the City of Huntington, New York for a sewage treatment facility;

$100,000 to the Town of Beacon Falls, Connecticut for the purchase of Pinesbridge Industrial Park;

$100,000 to the City of Worcester, Massachusetts for the Gardner-Kilby-Hammond Street neighborhood revitalization project;

$100,000 to the Bronx Museum of the Arts in New York City, New York for infrastructure improvements, construction, renovation, operation and facility upgrades;

$50,000 to the Eugene A. Obregon CMH Memorial Foundation for the creation of a memorial to honor Latinos who have served in the Armed Services;

$50,000 to the City of Garden Grove, California for planning and construction of the West Haven Park Community Center;

$250,000 to the City of Abilene, Texas for renovation of the historic Wooten Hotel;

$100,000 to the City of San Leandro, California for landslide mitigation efforts;

$200,000 to the City of Saint Marys, West Virginia for downtown revitalization, and vehicle and equipment needs to support the Senior Service Advisory Council's senior nutrition program;

$75,000 to the City of Hartford, Connecticut for the Temple Street redevelopment project;

$250,000 to the Brotherhood Crusade Business Development and Capital Fund in Los Angeles, California for facility infrastructure needs and/or technical assistance and loans to small businesses;

$200,000 to West Virginia University at Parkersburg for equipment needs related to the Caperton Center;

$500,000 to the International Glass Museum in Takoma, Washington for capital costs associated with a new facility;

$400,000 to the Montclair Art Museum in Montclair, New Jersey for facility expansion;

$225,000 to the South Sumter Resource Center in Sumter County, South Carolina for facilities renovation and equipment;

$40,000 to the Schuylkill County Fire Fighters Association in Morea, Pennsylvania for facilities improvements;

$100,000 to West Liberty State College in West Liberty, West Virginia for planning and development related to the SMART Center;

$200,000 to Oakwood College in Huntsville, Alabama for the establishment of a Wellness Center;

$200,000 to the Schlitz Audubon Nature Center in Milwaukee, Wisconsin for facilities construction;

$200,000 to the Filipino Community Center in Seattle, Washington for costs related to facilities relocation;

$250,000 to Augsburg College in Minneapolis, Minnesota for rehabilitation of Sverdrup Hall;

$50,000 to the government of the U.S. Virgin Islands for fire fighting efforts in territorial waters;

$1,000,000 to the Salvatore Mancini Center on Aging in North Providence, Rhode Island for facilities needs;

$400,000 to Rostraver Township, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania for economic development studies and activities;

$200,000 to the St. Louis County, Missouri Parks & Recreation Department for renovations and improvements to Jefferson Barracks Park;

$750,000 to John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio to support the Center for Mathematics and Science Education;

$50,000 to the Town of Pelham, New York for renovations to Memorial Park;

$75,000 to the Town of St. George, South Carolina for the Klauber Building Project;

$150,000 to the University of North Carolina at Wilmington School of Nursing to provide multidisciplinary nurse-managed primary health care services in rural northern Brunswick County and rural eastern Columbus County, North Carolina;

$950,000 to the Mid-Atlantic Aerospace Complex, Inc. for operating and marketing expenses, site use assessment, land acquisition and construction of facilities;

$600,000 to the National Civil Rights Hall of Fame in Gary, Indiana for facility construction;

$100,000 to Camp Kon-O-Kwee/Spencer YMCA camp in Beaver County, Pennsylvania for continued construction of a wastewater treatment facility;

$325,000 to the Seneca Center in New York City, New York for the acquisition and partial renovation of a permanent facility in South Bronx, New York;

$250,000 to the Huntington Park Oldtimers Foundation in Huntington Park, California for the rehabilitation of a senior center;

$50,000 to Ottawa County, Ohio for street improvements for the central business district in Rocky Ridge, Ohio;

$200,000 to the Peninsula Marine Institute in Newport News, Virginia for the acquisition of a permanent facility to house its juvenile offenders program;

$100,000 to the Martin Luther King Freedom Center in Oakland, California for planning and development purposes;

$1,500,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida to expand and improve the physical plant of the anchor industry in Poinciana Industrial Park;

$300,000 to St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York to establish an Institute of Teaching and Learning;

$200,000 to the Daniel Freeman Hospital in Inglewood, California for community health outreach to the uninsured and medically underserved;

$1,000,000 to Columbia University in New York City, New York for its audubon research project;

$400,000 to the University of California-Merced for the renovation of the civil engineering building on Castle Air Force Base;

$150,000 to the City of Moundsville, West Virginia for downtown revitalization associated with the Strand Theater;

$250,000 to the Mystic Valley Development Commission for a regional technology development project known as TeleCom City;

$200,000 to Bethune Cookman College in Daytona Beach, Florida for costs related to a community services and student union building;

$50,000 to the city of Dallas, Texas for the Pleasant Wood/Pleasant Grove Community Development Corporation for improvement efforts focused on West Dallas neighborhoods;

$1,200,000 to the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Foundation, Inc. for continued development of the I–79 Technology Park;

$100,000 to the City of Dallas, Texas for the Southfair Community Development Corporation for land acquisition and efforts to revitalize the Grand Avenue corridor;

$1,000,000 to the St. Coletta School in Alexandria, Virginia for facilities needs;

$50,000 to the St. Louis County, Missouri Economic Council for infrastructure and streetscape enhancements for the Affton/Gravois Business District;

$110,000 to the Reading Area Community College in Berks County, Pennsylvania for planning and development of an Advanced Technology Center;

$100,000 to Temple University Ambler in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania for a community planning and sustainable development initiative;

$150,000 to the Arlington Housing Corporation to purchase investor-owned units at the Arlington Oaks condominium complex for operation as affordable housing;

$100,000 to the Abington Township Public Library in Abington, Pennsylvania for facilities renovation;

$200,000 to Pittson, Pennsylvania for downtown revitalization and infrastructure improvements;

$1,000,000 to Concord College in Athens, West Virginia for infrastructure development for an information technology training program;

$200,000 to the St. Louis, Missouri City Parks Department for renovations of Wilmore Park;

$250,000 to the Village of Mamaroneck, New York for streetscape improvements;

$50,000 to the St. Louis County, Missouri Economic Council for infrastructure and streetscape enhancements for the LeMay Business District;

$1,000,000 to the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences' Center for Community Development at Case Western Reserve University for the establishment of the Lou Stokes Fellows Program in Community Organization and Development;

$50,000 to the City of Tuscumbia, Alabama for stage and infrastructure improvements at Spring Park;

$150,000 to Fulton County, Ohio for upgrades of emergency notification/siren systems;

$225,000 to the Town of Bolton, Mississippi for a business district restoration plan that includes job training and a revolving loan fund;

$300,000 to the Christiansburg Institute Board in Christiansburg, Virginia for renovation of a historic building into a museum and community learning center;

$1,000,000 to St. John's County, Florida for water, sewer, wastewater, and stormwater system improvements.

Excludes report language proposed by the Senate directing HUD to make a comprehensive report on all EDI grants. Similar language was not included by the House. However, the conferees agree that HUD should conduct a close-out review of each non-congressionally designated EDI grant within five years of the award. Any funds not obligated should be identified and reported to the Committees by May 1, 2001, for possible rescission and reallocation.

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

Appropriates $25,000,000 for brownfields redevelopment as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $1,800,000,000 for the HOME program instead of $1,585,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $1,600,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees increased the funding level for HOME above the Senate and House levels, and above the request, as an indication of their support for producing substantially more affordable homes for low-income Americans.

Recognizing the tremendous unmet need for affordable housing, and in light of the fact that 5,400,000 families pay more than half their income for rent, the conferees seriously considered proposing a new production program targeted at extremely low-income families. In addition to creating new affordable homes, the proposal would have encouraged the concepts of income-mixing, and tenant choice. Unfortunately, in deference to the committees of jurisdiction, the conferees agreed to withdraw the proposal. Nevertheless, the conferees encourage the authorizing committees to consider the need for additional homes for extremely low-income families, and to draft legislation that will meet these increasing needs.

Includes $20,000,000 for the Housing Counseling program as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House. For two consecutive years, HUD has been directed to develop a process for measuring the performance of housing counseling agencies. This year, several nonprofit intermediaries working cooperatively with HUD developed meaningful recommendations that include such measurements. The conferees direct HUD to implement these recommendations and, upon implementation, report to the Committees on Appropriations.

Transfers $17,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems as proposed by the House instead of no funding as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are concerned that there appears to be some ambiguity about whether Native American non-profit entities working on Indian lands are eligible to receive HOME funds. After reviewing the relevant statutes, the conferees see nothing that indicates Native American nonprofits are ineligible to compete for HOME funds at the state level. Furthermore, the conferees believe it is highly questionable for states to count low-income Native American residents in their funding calculations, but upon receipt of their allocation, be unwilling to share HOME funds with Native American non-profits. Economic and housing conditions on Native American lands are among the most challenging in the United States. The HOME program was designed to assist in meeting these challenges for all Americans and not to discriminate based on where an individual chooses to live.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $1,025,000,000 for homeless assistance grants instead of $1,020,000,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate. Funds provided in this account include funds for new Shelter Plus Care grants. Renewals of existing grants are included in a new account called ''Shelter Plus Care Renewals.''

Includes language proposed by the House requiring that all homeless programs be coordinated with health, social service, and employment programs. The Senate did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the House providing that 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for the program shall be for technical assistance and the development and maintenance of management information systems, instead of .75 percent as proposed by the Senate.

Appropriates $500,000 for the Interagency Council on the Homeless as proposed by the Senate. The House did not include similar language.

The conferees reiterate and endorse language included in the Senate report regarding the need for data and analysis on the extent of homelessness and the effectiveness of McKinney Act programs, the desirability of convening a group of experts to discuss alternatives to the current ''pro rata shares'' formula, the importance of oversight by HUD field staff, and the need to increase the supply of permanent supportive housing. The conferees concur with the importance of developing unduplicated counts of the homeless at the local level, as well as taking whatever steps are possible to draw inferences from this data about the extent and nature of homelessness in the nation as a whole.

Likewise, the conferees agree that local jurisdictions should be collecting an array of data on homelessness in order to prevent duplicate counting of homeless persons, and to analyze their patterns of use of assistance, including how they enter and exit the homeless assistance system and the effectiveness of the systems. HUD is directed to take the lead in working with communities toward this end, and to analyze jurisdictional data within three years. Implementation and operation of Management Information Systems (MIS), and collection and analysis of MIS data, have been made eligible uses of Supportive Housing Program funds. The conferees direct HUD to report to the Committees within six months after the date of enactment of this Act on its strategy for achieving this goal, including details on financing, implementing, and maintaining the effort.

Recognizing the need to provide assured funding for renewing Shelter Plus Care grants, the conferees have shifted renewal funding to a separate account. The conferees are aware that there is a similar permanent housing component to the Supportive Housing Program (SHP), which remains funded through the Homeless Assistance Grants account under this conference agreement. While the conferees have not shifted renewal funding for the SHP permanent housing program to the new account, they nevertheless believe there is good reason to provide for reliable renewal of permanent housing for the formerly homeless people with disabilities, addictions, and similar problems who are served by both of these programs.

Accordingly, the conferees direct HUD to implement a mechanism for renewing the permanent housing component of SHP grants as part of its process for awarding funds under this account—provided, of course, that the activities funded by the grant are determined to meet local needs and appropriate standards of performance and financial accountability.

SHELTER PLUS CARE RENEWALS

Appropriates $100,000,000 for renewing shelter plus care grants that expire in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 instead of $105,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House proposed renewing these contracts in the Housing Certificate Fund. These are the grants that would be subject to renewal in the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 funding cycles.

Because renewal funding is provided in this account for Shelter Plus Care grants being handled in the fiscal year 2000 continuum of care funding competition now underway, the conferees intend that grants qualifying for renewal under this account be removed from that competition and instead be renewed with funds in this account.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $996,000,000 for housing for special populations as proposed by the Senate instead of $911,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Includes $779,000,000 for section 202 housing for the elderly instead of $783,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $710,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Includes $217,000,000 for section 811 housing for the disabled instead of $213,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $210,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Includes language proposed by the House providing grants under section 202b for converting eligible projects to assisted living.

Includes language proposed by the Senate allowing the Secretary to designate up to 25% of amounts earmarked for section 811 for tenant-based assistance. The House included language that allowed the Secretary to earmark between 25% and 50% of the funds for this use.

Transfers $1,000,000 to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems as proposed by the House. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

FHA—MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Limits obligations for direct loans to no more than $250,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Transfers $96,500,000 from administrative contract expenses to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems as proposed by the House. The Senate did not include similar language.

The conferees reiterate report language included by the Senate regarding the implementation of the single family property disposition legislation, specifically the statutory authority to discount properties in distressed neighborhoods. In fiscal year 1999, legislation was enacted authorizing HUD to dispose of its HUD-held single family loans. As part of that agreement, seriously distressed neighborhoods where the possibility of disinvestment is greatest could be designated as asset control areas. For these areas, HUD was granted the authority to establish discounts on the price of foreclosed homes for local governments and nonprofit institutions that establish neighborhood redevelopment plans to revitalize these areas.

HUD, however, has not aggressively implemented this legislative mandate. In fact, HUD has instituted a pricing structure that is far more restrictive than required in the law, making it extremely difficult for local governments to repair deteriorated homes and to reinvigorate neighborhoods. The conferees reiterate their support for the solution contained in the fiscal year 1999 legislation, and direct HUD to implement it—specifically the discount provisions—in a way that allows local governments and nonprofits to rebuild neighborhoods. Furthermore, the conferees reaffirm the Senate's directive to report on the implementation of the disposition program by May 15, 2001.

Finally, the conferees are extremely concerned about the proliferation of predatory lending and commend HUD for acting to combat this practice. As directed in the Senate report, the conferees look forward to being briefed by HUD on the progress made in this area.

The conferees are disappointed that HUD utilized only a small fraction of the lending authority made available in fiscal year 1999 for direct loans to nonprofit organizations and local government agencies in connection with sales of HUD-owned single-family homes under section 204(g) of the National Housing Act. HUD is expected to make fuller use of this lending authority in fiscal year 2001. In particular, the conferees believe that section 204(g) loans could be a valuable tool to assist with the acquisition, rehabilitation, and sale of homes in the asset control areas created in the fiscal year 1999 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, and direct HUD to take steps to facilitate use of section 204(g) loans by nonprofit organizations working to revitalize neighborhoods in these areas.

FHA—GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Transfers $33,500,000 from administrative contract expenses to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems as proposed by the House. The Senate did not include similar language.

Deletes language included by the Senate requiring at least $50,000,000 of credit subsidy be directed to insuring multifamily projects where a portion of the units are targeted to extremely low-income families. However, HUD is directed to report back to the Committees on Appropriations on the feasibility of creating an insurance program that targets extremely low- and low-income families. As part of this report, HUD should include an estimate of the costs of providing credit subsidy, or of any other subsidies, that would be necessary for such a program to be successful.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriates $53,500,000 for research and technology instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $40,000,000 as proposed by the House. As proposed by the House, $3,000,000 of the amount provided is for program evaluation to support the inclusion of strategic planning and performance measurements in the preparation of the budget. The Senate did not include similar language.

Includes new language providing $500,000 for the Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Care Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century.

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Appropriates $46,000,000 for fair housing activities instead of $44,000,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate. Of the amount provided, $24,000,000 is for section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

Appropriates $100,000,000 for lead hazard reduction, as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Of the amount, $10,000,000 is for the Healthy Homes Initiative as proposed by the House instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Inserts language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing $1,000,000 for CLEARCorps.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate transferring balances from pre-existing lead reduction programs. This transfer was included in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations measure and has already been implemented.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $1,072,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,003,380,000 as proposed by the House and $1,002,233,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting per-employee costs (including benefits) to an average of $78,000. The House did not include similar language.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting HUD from employing more than 14 employees in the Office of Public Affairs. The House did not include similar language.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the number of HUD full time equivalent (FTE) positions to no more than 9,100.

Inserts new language limiting the personal services object class to no more than $758,000,000.

Inserts new language requiring that not less than $100,000,000 in the Working Capital Fund be used for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

Inserts new language limiting the number of outside employees that HUD may hire at grade levels of GS–14 and GS–15. Under the limitation, HUD may hire only 7 GS–14 and GS–15 level employees for every 10 such employees who leave the Department. The limitation will be lifted only when the number of GS–14 and GS–15 level employees falls 2.5 percent from the level at the date of enactment. This moratorium on hiring does not include promoting from within HUD, nor does it impact the number of Schedule C employees that can be hired at these grade levels.

The conferees are concerned about the growth of the personal service object class in the salaries and expenses account. To gain control over its growth, a cap of $758,000,000 has been placed on the personal service object class. Finally, HUD is directed to spend at least $100,000,000 on the development and maintenance of information technology systems. The conferees hope that HUD will use these tools in a constructive manner to deal with several serious issues.

First, HUD has been unable to accurately portray its salary and expense needs. In its fiscal year 2000 request, HUD requested funding for 9,300 people though only 9,030 people were on staff at the time. Despite this knowledge, which HUD did not share with the Committees, HUD threatened a reduction in force (RIF) unless more funds were forthcoming. Relying on the representation that a RIF was a real possibility, $20,000,000 more than was recommended was provided. Even then, HUD claimed this amount was insufficient.

However, during fiscal year 2000, instead of threatened staff reductions, HUD hired more than 700 employees, an unprecedented number of new hires. In addition, HUD increased the number of personnel receiving quality step increases from a negligible amount to approximately 30% of the total staff. This action brought the average cost per employee up to $81,500—a level that is $2,700 higher than estimated in the fiscal year 2001 budget request—thus making the fiscal year 2001 budget request insufficient by $18,650,000.

Making a bad situation worse, almost 25% of HUD's total staff—or 2,018 people according to HUD—are at the GS–14 and GS–15 levels of pay. Yet in fiscal year 2000 alone, HUD hired more than 200 new GS–14 and GS–15s, causing displacement of existing staff and making it virtually impossible for younger employees to expect upward movement in their careers in a reasonable amount of time.

Such poor management decisions only underscore other management deficiencies. For years, Congress has requested HUD to provide a staff plan that matches staffing requirements with programmatic responsibilities. For six years, HUD has systematically and deliberately ignored these Congressional requests and directives. Therefore, it isn't surprising that the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) recently reported that ". . . the basis for most staff level changes in the recent past has been top-down direction that HUD reduce staff levels to get to a target number. The lack of an analytical basis for much of that direction has not let top management know whether resulting staff levels in individual offices and overall are adequate to accomplish the department's mission." Not only does this conclusion concern the conferees, it flies in the face of HUD's own restructuring plan embodied in Management Reform Plan 2020.

Exacerbating these problems is HUD's annual transfer of funds from its information technology account to offset the personal services account, significantly delaying HUD's entry to the information age. HUD's inability to account for its appropriations—in terms of funding and in terms of results—and its raid of the IT account to supplement an inadequate personal services account is simply unacceptable. For that reason, the conferees have fenced the IT account and direct HUD to move forward on implementing an enterprise data warehouse that incorporates a geographic information system (GIS) platform for HUD as quickly as possible.

The conferees reassert the House report language directing HUD to present a comprehensive, multi-year budget plan that creates, maintains, and refines HUD's information technology systems. Finally, HUD is directed to provide a plan that matches staff resources with programmatic needs by May 15, 2001.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriates $85,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General instead of $83,000,000 as proposed by the House and $87,843,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate giving HUD enhanced authority to dispose of HUD-held mortgages.

Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate allowing HUD to set maximum payment standards for enhanced vouchers.

Deletes language proposed by the House authorizing PHAs to utilize any excess section 8 for increasing the value of a voucher in high cost areas, and for other purposes. The Senate had included similar language in its Title II of Division B.

Includes language proposed by the Senate to prohibit HUD from prohibiting or debarring entities that administer the continuum of care process for homeless grants without due process. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate to require all Title II programs to comply with the HUD Reform Act. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate enabling homeless programs to utilize the environmental assumption authority contained in section 305(c) of the Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate making technical changes and corrections to the National Housing Act. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate making law enforcement officers eligible for housing assistance under the Indian housing block grant program. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting federal assistance to facilities that sell predominantly cigarettes or other tobacco products. The House did not include similar language.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the implementation of the Puerto Rico PHA settlement agreement until management reform goals and benchmarks are identified including safeguards against fraud and abuse by inserting a date by which the report is due. The House did not include similar language.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate allowing a grant award to the Hollander Ridge project to be used for activities that benefit the site. The House did not include similar language.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate reducing the downpayment requirements for teachers and uniformed municipal employees. The House did not include similar language. However, the Office of Policy Development and Research is directed to contract with an outside entity to determine the feasibility of decreasing the downpayment requirements for these individuals and assess its impact on communities.

Includes language proposed by the Senate authorizing the ''neighborhood networks'' computer concept to be an eligible activity to receive funding under the modernization and HOPE VI grant programs. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate deeming a project in Independence, Missouri, to be eligible for mark-to-market reforms. The House did not include similar language.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate to extend section 236(g)(3)(A) of the National Housing Act for one year. The House did not include similar language.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate enabling a county to elect to remain an ''urban county'' if it was so defined in fiscal year 1999. The House did not include similar language.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize a low-income multifamily risk-sharing mortgage insurance program. The House did not include similar language.

Includes language proposed by the Senate exempting Alaska and Mississippi from the statutory requirement of having a resident on the board of a PHA. The House did not include similar language.

Includes new language making moderate rehabilitation funds available for use under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act for two projects in New Rochelle, New York.

Includes new language reprogramming $1,000,000 for the City of Loma Linda for infrastructure improvements at Redlands Boulevard and California Streets, for infrastructure improvements in the city related to Mountain View Bridge.

Includes new language making Native American communities eligible to receive funding under the Resident Opportunity and Social Services program.

Includes new language extending for one year an economic development initiative in Miami Beach, Florida.

Includes new language reprogramming funds from Homestead, Florida, to housing for low-income elderly persons in Dade County, Florida.

Includes new language waiving the CDBG social services cap for the City of Los Angeles.

Includes new language extending FHA's downpayment simplification provisions to December 31, 2002.

Includes new language amending section 423 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act program to allow grants to be used to pay for the costs of implementing and operating management information systems.

Includes new language amending section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 by allowing the program to be used to refinance previously made loans for purposes of rehabilitation, and by eliminating the requirement to show lack of access to private financial markets.

Includes new language making enhanced vouchers available to residents who have continued to reside in section 8 properties which opted out of expired federal assistance contracts prior to enactment of Subtitle C of Title V of the fiscal year 2000 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act.

Includes new language requiring grantees under Subtitle A of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to coordinate their discharge policies.

Includes new language amending section 525 of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 2000 by changing the title of the ''Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Care Facility Needs'' to the ''Commission on Affordable Housing and Health Care Facility Needs for Seniors in the 21st Century.''

Includes new language amending the McKinney Act allowing for the chair of the Interagency Council for the Homeless to rotate between HUD, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate amending the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA), to allow PHAs to ''project-base'' up to 20 percent of their section 8 voucher funds. For many reasons, including burdensome implementation regulations, the option in QHWRA has never worked effectively. Therefore, the conferees have agreed to include legislation that makes substantive revisions to section 8(o)(13) of the United States Housing Act.

First, the revision makes the option to project-base vouchers more flexible, and allows PHAs to designate up to 20% of their available voucher funds for this purpose without any requirement that owners invest additional funding in the units. This change allows PHAs to decide whether to link project-basing to new construction, to rehabilitation, or simply to use project-basing as a tool to promote voucher utilization and to expand housing opportunities. A PHA may project-base their vouchers only if the choice is consistent with the housing needs and strategies identified in the PHA plan. If a PHA chooses this option, the initial contract term with the owner of the development may be no more than 10 years in duration, but may be extended, subject to the agreement of the owner and the PHA. All contracts are subject to the availability of appropriations.

Additionally, it requires PHAs to offer families with project-based vouchers a ''continued assistance option''—a program variation that allows families to move from the assisted building, and to retain federal housing assistance. Under this option, PHAs agree to link a specified number of subsidies to a particular development. The initial families are selected by the manager of the development from among families referred by PHAs. Families with the continued assistance option have the right to move after one year but retain their federal housing assistance by going to the top of the PHA waiting list, or by receiving assistance through other means devised by the PHA. Families that move from a subsidized unit are replaced by families referred from the PHA's waiting list, ensuring that the specified number of subsidies continue to be utilized at the development throughout the term of the PHA's contract with the owner. Special rules would be applied in tax credit units.

To promote mixed-income developments, only 25 percent of the units in a multifamily building may have project-based assistance. PHAs are allowed to offer vacancy payments to owners for no more than 60 days. However, PHAs and owners must seek to reduce the need for vacancy payments and such payments may not be made if the vacancy is the fault of the owner—for example, the unit does not pass re-inspection, or a PHA refers a reasonable number of families to the owner but the owner refuses to select any of them.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate requiring HUD to maintain section 8 rental assistance payments on HUD-held or HUD-owned properties that are occupied primarily by elderly or disabled families. If the properties are not viable affordable housing, the Secretary may contract for project-based assistance with other existing housing properties, or provide other rental assistance.

Modifies language proposed by the Senate making the family unification program more flexible.

Includes language proposed by the Senate making the FHA risk-sharing programs permanent.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $28,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $26,196,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees commend the ABMC for the progress made in reducing the backlogged maintenance needs throughout the ABMC system, and have provided funds in excess of the budget request to continue this important program.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $7,500,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Bill language has been included again

this fiscal year which limits the number of career Senior Executive Service positions to three. Of the available funds, $5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2001, and $2,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

In addition, language has been adopted which stipulates that the Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall also serve as the Inspector General of the Board, shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of FEMA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

The conferees agree that not later than March 1, 2002, and thereafter, the Chief Operating Officer of the Board shall prepare a financial report for the preceding year, covering all accounts and associated activities of the Board. Each such financial report shall be audited according to generally accepted accounting principles by the Inspector General of the Board or another qualified external auditor as determined by the Inspector General, and each such audit report shall be submitted to the Chief Operating Officer not later than June 30 following the fiscal year for which the audit was performed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Appropriates $118,000,000 for community development financial institutions fund program account instead of $105,000,000 as proposed by the House and $95,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Includes $5,000,000 for technical assistance to promote economic development in Native American communities. The conferees intend that this assistance be provided primarily through qualified community development lenders, organizations with experience and expertise in banking and lending in Indian country, Native American organizations, and other suitable providers, as well as through financial assistance to tribes and tribal organizations for procurement of appropriate expertise and services.

Provides $8,750,000 for administrative expenses instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House, and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Provides $19,750,000 for the cost of direct loans instead of $23,000,000 as proposed by the House, and $16,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Excludes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate regarding the accounting of certain administrative costs.

Eliminates language proposed by the Senate capping the Bank Enterprise Award program at $30,000,000. The House did not include similar language.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $52,500,000 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $51,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are in agreement that significant progress has been made by the Commission in reducing children's deaths in cribs. Despite this accomplishment, deaths in used cribs remain too high. Accordingly, the conferees urge the Commission to undertake an initiative to continue its excellent efforts to further reduce crib deaths.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $458,500,000 for national and community service programs operating expenses, instead of $433,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House proposed termination of the Corporation for National and Community Service using funds appropriated in prior years.

Limits funds for administrative expenses to not more than $31,000,000, instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have included language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corporation to use $2,000,000 for acquisition of a cost accounting system for the Corporation's financial management system, an integrated grants management system that provides comprehensive financial management information for all Corporation grants and cooperative agreements, and the establishment, operation and maintenance of a central archives. The conferees agree that improvements to the Corporation's accounting systems, including a cost accounting system, is of very high priority and deserves senior management's full attention. The conferees agree that the Corporation is prohibited from providing any salary increases (with the exception of locality adjustments and other appropriate adjustments provided to all government employees) or bonuses to its senior management until the Corporation has certified, with the IG's concurrence, that an adequate cost accounting and grants management system has been acquired, implemented, and conforms to all Federal requirements.

Limits funds as proposed by the Senate to not more than: $28,500,000 for quality and innovation activities; $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses; $70,000,000 for education awards, of which not to exceed $5,000,000 shall be available for national service scholarships for high school students performing community service; $231,000,000 for AmeriCorps grants, of which not to exceed $45,000,000 may be for national direct programs and $25,000,000 shall be for activities dedicated to developing computer and information technology skills; $10,000,000 for the Points of Light Foundation; $21,000,000 for the civilian community corps; $43,000,000 for school-based and community-based service-learning programs; and $5,000,000 for audits and other evaluations.

The conferees agree to add $3,000,000 to the national civilian community corps (NCCC) account to cover the additional costs of relocating a campus site in San Diego and to administer a program level of 1,100 members, which would match its fiscal year 1998 level. The conferees understand that the number of campuses would remain at the current level of five sites.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate which prohibits using any funds for national service programs run by Federal agencies; provides that, to the maximum extent feasible, funds for the AmeriCorps program will be provided consistent with the recommendation of peer review panels; and provides that, to the maximum extent practicable, the level of matching funds shall be increased, education only awards shall be expanded, and the cost per participant shall be reduced.

Rescinds $30,000,000 from the National Service Trust, instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have taken this action because the balances in the Trust appear at this time to be in excess of requirements based upon usage rates. The conferees direct the Corporation to provide a quarterly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the assets and liabilities of the National Service Trust fund, including information on interest earned and interest received and an explanation of the relationship between the amounts in the completed financial statements and the budget request.

The conferees agree to the Senate proposal to earmark $5,000,000 for Communities In Schools, Inc., $2,500,000 for Parents as Teachers National Center, Inc., $7,500,000 for America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, Inc., and $2,500,000 for Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

The conferees agree to provide $1,500,000 for the Youth Life Foundation (YLF). The YLF aims to replicate the programs it has developed in Washington, D.C. to address the challenges of children living in insecure environments and make those programs applicable to other parts of the Nation. The conferees recognize that America's Promise is already trying to establish partnerships with locally-based organizations such as YLF. Accordingly, the conferees expect YLF to continue its effort in coordinating and collaborating its activities with America's Promise.

The House proposed that the Corporation be terminated and did not include any of the foregoing limitations or provisions proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriates $5,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General, the same amount as provided by the House and the Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Includes an administrative provision, as proposed by the Senate, which provides a technical correction to language included in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations Act.

COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $12,445,000 for the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,500,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-CIVIL CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $17,949,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $15,949,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees note that the funding level represents an increase of over $5,000,000 above the previous fiscal year, and will be used for the highest priority maintenance and capital improvement projects as identified in the Cemetery's Ten-Year Plan.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

Appropriates $63,000,000 for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in a new, separate account instead of $60,000,000 as proposed in a new account by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed through the Environmental Protection Agency's Hazardous Substance Superfund account by the Senate. The conferees believe this new account structure will provide higher visibility and better oversight of the NIEHS. The conferees have deleted language proposed by the House making funding available until September 30, 2002.

Of the funds provided, $40,000,000 is for the research program and $23,000,000 is for the worker training program.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $75,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in a new, separate account instead of $70,000,000 as provided by the House in a new account and $75,000,000 as provided through the Environmental Protection Agency's Hazardous Substance Superfund account by the Senate. The conferees

believe this new account structure will provide higher visibility and better oversight of the ATSDR.

The conferees have also included bill language which permits the Administrator of the ATSDR to conduct other appropriate health studies and evaluations or activities in lieu of health assessments pursuant to section 104(i)(6) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended (CERCLA). The language further stipulates that in the conduct of such other health assessments, evaluations, or activities, the ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines imposed in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA. The conferees have deleted language proposed by the House making funding available until September 30, 2002.

Funds provided for fiscal year 2001 cannot be used by the ATSDR to conduct in excess of 40 toxicological profiles.

Within the appropriated level, ATSDR is to use up to $2,000,000 to continue the Great Lakes fish consumption study; up to $6,000,000 for medical monitoring and related activities in Libby, Montana; $500,000 to conduct subsistence and dietary studies of contaminents in the environment, subsistence resources, and people in Alaska Native populations; and up to $1,000,000 for completion of the Toms River, New Jersey cancer evaluation and research project. The ATSDR is further directed to provide support for the minority health professions program.

As in the past, ATSDR's administrative costs charged by the CDC are capped at 7.5 percent of the amount appropriated herein.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriates $696,000,000 for science and technology instead of $650,000,000 as proposed by the House and $670,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to the following increases to the budget request:

1. $2,500,000 for EPSCoR.
2. $4,000,000 for the Water Environment Research Foundation.
3. $4,000,000 for the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.
4. $2,000,000 for the National Decentralized Water Resource Capacity Development Project, in coordination with EPA, for continued training and research and development.
5. $1,500,000 for the National Jewish Medical and Research Center for research on the relationship between indoor and outdoor pollution and the development of respiratory diseases.
6. $1,900,000 for the National Environmental Respiratory Center at the Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute. The research should be coordinated with EPA's overall particulate matter research program and consistent with the recommendations set forth by the National Academy of Sciences report on PM research.
7. $1,000,000 for the Environmental Technology Commercialization Center to increase the transfer of federally-developed environmental technology.
8. $1,250,000 for the Center for Air Toxics Metals at the Energy and Environmental Research Center.
9. $1,500,000 for the Mickey Leland National Urban Air Toxics Research Center.
10. $250,000 for acid rain research at the University of Vermont.
11. $1,500,000 for the Gulf Coast Hazardous Substance Research Center.
12. $250,000 for the Institute for Environmental and Industrial Science at Southwest Texas State University.
13. $750,000 for the Integrated Public/Private Energy and Environmental Consortium (IPEC) to develop cost-effective environmental technology, improved business practices, and technology transfer for the domestic petroleum industry.
14. $1,000,000 for the University of South Alabama Center for Estuarine Research.
15. $4,527,000 for the Mine Waste Technology Program and the Heavy Metal Water Program at the National Environmental Waste Technology, Testing, and Evaluation Center ($3,902,000) and for a field demonstration of ceramic microfiltration technology ($625,000).
16. $400,000 for the Texas Institute for Applied Environmental Research at Tarleton State University.
17. $500,000 for the Consortium for Plant Biotechnology Research.
18. $750,000 for the Geothermal Heat Pump (GHP) Consortium.
19. $750,000 for the Kalamazoo River Watershed Initiative through Western Michigan University's Environmental Research Institute.
20. $900,000 to Old Dominion University in Virginia for the continued development, design, and implementation of a research effort on tributyltin-based ship bottom paints.
21. $1,000,000 to the University of California, Riverside for continued research of advanced vehicle design, advanced transportation systems, vehicle emissions, and atmospheric pollution at the CE–CERT facility.
22. $2,000,000 to the University of Miami in Florida for the Rosentiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.
23. $1,000,000 for the Environmental Protection Agency to become involved in the Department of Energy's fine particulate matter research program.
24. $3,000,000 to the National Technology Transfer Center to continue its cooperative agreement with EPA to assess, market and license technologies owned by EPA, and to conduct commercialization best practices training activities.
25. $2,000,000 to the Canaan Valley Institute for continuation of its regional environmental data center and coordinated information management system in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands in coordination with the Federal Geographic Data Committee and the National Spatial Data Infrastructure.
26. $1,000,000 above the budget request to the Canaan Valley Institute in close coordination with the Regional Vulnerability and Assessment (ReVA) initiative to develop research and educational tools using integrative technologies to predict future environmental risk and support informed, proactive decision-making.
27. $500,000 to establish the Center for Metals in the Environment in Delaware.
28. $625,000 to New Mexico State University to determine the Carbon Sequestration Potential of southwestern lands.
29. $1,400,000 to the University of New Hampshire for continuation of the Bedrock Bioremediation Center research project.
30. $990,000 for research associated with the restoration and enhancement of Manchac Swamp conducted by Southeastern Louisiana at the Turtle Cove Research Station.
31. $500,000 to the Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse and Central New York to continue assessing and mitigating the impact of exposure to multiple indoor contaminants on human health.
32. $3,637,000 to the National Alternative Fuels Foundation for research and development of a new class of alternative fuels known as vapor-phase combustion fuels.

The conferees have agreed to the following reductions from the budget request:

1. $26,089,000 from the CCTI Transportation research program; and
2. $1,138,000 from project EMPACT.

Within the funds transferred from the Hazardous Substance Superfund (HSS) account, $7,000,000 is for the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation (SITE) program, including $500,000 for a demonstration project at the Port of Richfield, Washington involving an innovative steam extraction technology. Also from within those funds transferred from HSS as well as from funds appropriated to science and technology, $4,500,000 is for continued operation of the Hazardous Substance Research Centers.

The conferees direct EPA to contract, within 30 days of enactment of this Act, with the National Academy of Sciences or other appropriate entity for a study of carbon monoxide episodes in meteorological and topographical problem areas, addressing the role of cold weather inversions and addressing public health significance and strategies, including the use of catalytic converter and other cold-start technology, for managing these rare occurrences in national ambient air quality standards non-attainment areas, due mostly to cold weather inversions. One of the major case studies is to be Fairbanks, Alaska, for which there shall be a preliminary report by September 1, 2001 in order to inform the further development of a State Implementation Plan for such area.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

Appropriates $2,087,990,000 for environmental programs and management instead of $1,895,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have included bill language as proposed by the House, identical to that carried in the fiscal years 1999 and 2000 Acts, which limits the expenditure of funds to implement or administer guidance relating to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, with certain exceptions. This provision does not provide the Agency statutory authority to implement its Environmental Justice Guidance. Rather, it simply clarifies the applicability of the Interim Guidance with respect to certain pending cases as an administrative convenience for the Agency.

The conferees have included bill language providing up to an additional 6 months for EPA to issue a final regulation for arsenic in drinking water. The conferees are very concerned about the cost of EPA's proposed arsenic drinking water rule to small communities. Moreover, the information EPA used to develop the proposed standard is the subject of considerable controversy and disagreement. The conferees believe EPA should take a full year—as intended by the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996—to finalize the new standard and therefore strongly recommend EPA not finalize the rule until June 2001 and provide significant, additional opportunity for public comment.

Bill language proposed by the House and the Senate has been included, as in the past two fiscal years, prohibiting EPA from spending funds to implement the Kyoto Protocol. The conferees note that this restriction on the use of funds shall not apply to the conduct of education activities and seminars by the agency.

The conferees note that several programs funded through this Act conduct science and technology research that are associated partly with global climate change. To the extent that the conferees have funded this work, they have done so based on each program's individual merits of contributing to issues associated with domestic energy production, national energy security, energy efficiency and cost savings, related environmental assessments, and general energy emission improvements. The bill language is intended to prohibit funds provided in this bill from being used to implement actions

called for solely under the Kyoto Protocol, prior to its ratification.

The Byrd-Hagel Resolution passed in 1997 (S. Res. 98) remains the clearest statement of the will of the Senate with regards to the Kyoto Protocol, and the conferees are committed to ensuring that the Administration not implement the Kyoto Protocol without Congressional consent. The conferees recognize, however, that there are also long-standing energy research programs which have goals and objectives that, if met, could have positive effects on energy use and the environment. The conferees do not intend to preclude these programs from proceeding, provided they have been funded and approved by Congress.

To the extent future funding requests may be submitted which would increase funding for climate change activities prior to Senate consideration of the Kyoto Protocol (whether under the auspices of the Climate Change Technology Initiative or any other initiative), the Administration must do a better job of explaining the components of the programs, their anticipated goals and objectives, the justification for any funding increases, a discussion of how success will be measured, and a clear definition of how these programs are justified by goals and objectives independent of implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. The conferees expect these items to be included as part of the fiscal year 2002 budget submission for all affected agencies.

The conferees have agreed to the following increases to the budget request:

1. $14,500,000 for rural water technical assistance and groundwater protection, including $8,600,000 for the NWRA, $2,600,000 for RCAP, $700,000 for GWPC, $1,600,000 for the SFC, and $1,000,000 for the NETC.

2. $1,000,000 for implementation of the National Biosolids Partnership Program.

3. $1,500,000 for source water protection programs. These funds are to be used to develop local source water protection programs within each state utilizing the infrastructure and process of an organization now engaged in groundwater and wellhead protection programs.

4. $1,250,000 for the national onsite and community wastewater treatment demonstration project through the Small Flows Clearinghouse.

5. $2,500,000 for the Southwest Center for Environmental Research and Policy.

6. $4,000,000 for the Small Public Water System Technology Centers at Western Kentucky University; the University of New Hampshire; the University of Alaska-Sitka; Pennsylvania State University; the University of Missouri-Columbia; Montana State University; the University of Illinois; and Mississippi State University.

7. $500,000 for the final year of Federal funding to assist communities in Hawaii to meet successfully the water quality permitting requirements for rehabilitating native Hawaiian fishponds.

8. $5,000,000 under section 104(b) of the Clean Water Act for America's Clean Water Foundation for implementation of on-farm environmental assessments for livestock operations, with the goal of improving surface and ground water quality.

9. $500,000 for the Ohio River Watershed Pollutant Reduction Program, to be cost-shared.

10. $1,650,000 to continue the sediment decontamination technology demonstration in the New York-New Jersey Harbor.

11. $1,500,000 for the National Alternative Fuels Vehicle Training Program.

12. $300,000 for the Coalition for Utah's Future to continue the Envision Utah project including the development of a sustainable plan for future growth and environmental stewardship in the Wasatch Front.

13. $300,000 for the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management.

14. $750,000 for planning, coordination and development of a comprehensive watershed based implementation program for the Santa Fe River.

15. $500,000 for the Brazos-Navasota watershed management project.

16. $500,000 for the Kentucky Center for Wastewater Research to establish training, education and database management for wastewater research to identify the greatest threats to regional watersheds.

17. $250,000 for the Maryland Bureau of Mines for an acid mine drainage remediation project to reduce or eliminate the loss of quality water from surface streams in the Kempton Mine complex.

18. $2,000,000 to the University of Missouri-Rolla for research and development of technologies to mitigate the impacts of livestock operations on the environment.

19. $500,000 for marsh restoration activities at Acowmin Marsh and Little River Marsh near North Hampton and Rye, New Hampshire.

20. $200,000 for the Tri-State Water Quality Council for development of voluntary nutrient reduction programs, establishing a basin-wide water quality monitoring program, and related activities.

21. $1,000,000 for the Global Environmental Management Education Center within the College of Natural Resources at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, to provide training and outreach education for safeguarding the quality of surface and groundwater resources.

22. $1,000,000 for the Frank Tejeda Center for Excellence in Environmental Operations to continue its efforts to demonstrate new technology for water and wastewater treatment.

23. $1,250,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Small Watershed Grants Program. Funds provided for the Chesapeake Bay small watersheds program are to be managed by the Fish and Wildlife Foundation and shall be used for community-based projects including those that design and implement on-the-ground and in-the-water environmental restoration or protection activities to help meet Chesapeake Bay Program goals and objectives.

24. $1,000,000 for the Lake Champlain management plan.

25. $4,500,000 for operation of the Long Island Sound Office and programs consistent with new authorization relative to the Long Island Sound. The total program is provided $5,000,000.

26. $500,000 for the Environmentors project.

27. $200,000 for the Northeast Waste Management Officials Association to continue solid waste, hazardous waste, cleanup and pollution prevention programs.

28. $2,000,000 for the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute's Missouri watershed initiative project to link economic and environmental data with ambient water quality.

29. $500,000 for the Small Business Pollution Prevention Center at the University of Northern Iowa.

30. $750,000 for the painting and coating compliance enhancement project through the Iowa Waste Reduction Center.

31. $1,890,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute for development and demonstration of environmental cleanup technologies.

32. $200,000 for the Hawaii Department of Agriculture and the University of Hawaii College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources to continue projects aimed at improving the acceptability and efficacy of agriculturally-based environmental restoration technologies.

33. $1,000,000 for the Animal Waste Management Consortium through the University of Missouri, acting with Iowa State University, North Carolina State University, Michigan State University, Oklahoma State University, and Purdue University to supplement ongoing research, demonstration, and outreach projects associated with animal waste management.

34. $1,000,000 to complete a cumulative impacts study by the National Academy of Sciences of North Slope oil and gas development.

35. $750,000 for an expansion of EPA's efforts related to the Government's purchase and use of environmentally preferable products focused on bio-based products with an emphasis on soy-based industrial oils, greases and hydraulic fluid. This includes $200,000 to complete the soy smoke initiative through the University of Missouri-Rolla.

36. $975,000 for the Alabama Department of Environmental Management water and wastewater training programs.

37. $250,000 for the Vermont Department of Agriculture to work with the conservation districts along the Connecticut River in Vermont to reduce nonpoint source pollution.

38. $600,000 for the Wetland Development project in Logan, Utah.

39. $500,000 for the Economic Development Alliance of Hawaii to accelerate commercialization of biotechnology to reduce pesticide use in tropical and subtropical agricultural production.

40. $100,000 for the Connecticut River Science Consortium to develop an interdisciplinary scientific monitoring and analysis project in the Connecticut River Basin.

41. $1,000,000 to develop and demonstrate new tools for imaging and monitoring the movement of fluids and contaminants in the shallow subsurface using time-lapse geophysical imaging and tomography techniques. This project will involve researchers from Boise State University, the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, other Federal labs and industry.

42. $500,000 for Mississippi State University, the University of Mississippi and the University of Georgia to conduct forestry best management practice water quality effectiveness studies in the States of Mississippi and Georgia.

43. $750,000 for the University of Idaho's groundwater assessment project for rural Idaho cities and towns.

44. $500,000 for a study by the City of Fairbanks using geographic information system mapping to assess methods to comply with NPDES requirements.

45. $150,000 to Colchester, Vermont to study nonpoint source influences on water quality in Mallets Bay on Lake Champlain and to plan for mitigation, with a focus on stormwater management and on-site disposal systems.

46. $750,000 for the Resource and Agricultural Policy Systems Project at Iowa State University.

47. $700,000 to continue the Urban Rivers Awareness Program at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia for its environmental science program.

48. $500,000 for the Kenai River Center for continued research on watershed issues and related activities.

49. $750,000 for the New Hampshire Estuaries Project management plan implementation.

50. $100,000 to continue the Design for the Environment for Farmers Program to address the unique environmental concerns of the American Pacific area through the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices.

51. $5,000,000 to the Gas Research Institute for the development of a bio-refinery commercialization pilot project which will utilize thermal-depolymerization technology to

break down waste streams into usable products.

52. $700,000 to the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission for programs as described in Senate Report 106–410.

53. $300,000 to Davie County, North Carolina for the Cooleemee Falls Project.

54. $1,000,000 to Union County, Arkansas for the continuation of the Union County Sparta Aquifer study.

55. $500,000 to Riverside County, California for the Community and Environmental Transportation Acceptability Process (CETAP).

56. $150,000 for the Santa Clara River Enhancement and Management Plan.

57. $450,000 to Ventura County, California for continued development of the Calleguas Creek Watershed management plan.

58. $1,200,000 to Gateway Cities, Council of Governments in California to complete Phase II of the Truck Impacted Intersections Program and develop the comprehensive Diesel Emissions Reduction Program.

59. $900,000 for continuation of the Sacramento River Toxic Pollution Control Project, to be cost shared.

60. $600,000 to Fort Lauderdale, Florida for design and construction as part of the Fort Lauderdale International Airport Wetlands Development Project.

61. $131,000 to Miami-Dade County, Florida for lead screening, testing, outreach, education and abatement in the Liberty City neighborhood.

62. $600,000 for fishery and habitat restoration in Lake Panasoffkee, Florida.

63. $600,000 to Osceola County, Florida to preserve the watershed and drainage system currently under attack by exotic aquatic plants.

64. $1,150,000 for the Tampa Bay Watch program.

65. $1,000,000 to St. Petersburg, Florida for the Clam Bayou Habitat Restoration Project.

66. $100,000 to Pinellas County, Florida for the cooperative exchange education module on environmental sustainability and the stewardship of natural resources.

67. $1,000,000 to the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for the ''Illinois Rivers 2020'' restoration program.

68. $600,000 for the Water Systems Council in Iowa to assist in the effective delivery of water to rural citizens nationwide.

69. $300,000 for investigation of pollution sources in the Lower Arkansas River in Wichita, Kansas.

70. $300,000 for the Urban Waste Management and Research Center in Louisiana.

71. $700,000 for the Louisiana Environmental Research Center.

72. $300,000 for the Oyster Habitat Restoration program in the Chesapeake Bay.

73. $800,000 for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Michigan to facilitate industrial input into EPA's compliance assistance clearinghouse and to expand the scope of compliance assistance centers ($500,000) and for continuation of EPA's Environmental Roadmapping Initiative ($300,000).

74. $300,000 to Mississippi State University for the Southeast Center for Technology Assistance for Small Drinking Water Systems.

75. $300,000 to the Ten Towns Great Swamp Watershed Management Committee in New Jersey.

76. $1,000,000 to Alfred University in New York for the Center for the Engineered Conservation of Energy (EnCo).

77. $1,000,000 to the Darrin Fresh Water Institute in New York to extend and expand studies of acid deposition.

78. $500,000 to Cortland County, New York for continued work on the aquifer protection plan of which $150,000 is for continued implementation of the comprehensive water quality management program in the Upper Susquehanna Watershed.

79. $1,200,000 for continued work on the water quality management plans for the Central New York watersheds in Onondaga and Cayuga Counties.

80. $300,000 to the Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board for the Oneida Lake and Watershed Management Plan.

81. $1,200,000 for the Dry Creek Flood Mitigation project in Cortland, New York.

82. $500,000 to the town of Pilot Mountain, North Carolina for stream restoration and upland protection in the watershed.

83. $300,000 to Charlotte, North Carolina for the Charlotte Surface Water Improvement and Management Program.

84. $855,000 to North Carolina Central University for the Environmental Risk and Impact Research Initiative.

85. $300,000 to Cleveland State University in Ohio for continuation of the Program of Excellence in Risk Analysis.

86. $1,000,000 to the Pennsylvania Geographic Information Consortium to continue development of a comprehensive environmental masterplan for Upper Susquehanna-Lackawanna Watershed.

87. $175,000 to the Pennsylvania State University Technical Assistance Center to provide technical expertise to operate public water systems.

88. $2,000,000 to the University of Houston, Texas and in consultation with the Greater Houston Partnership for Ozone Simulation and Forecasting.

89. $500,000 to Texas A&M University for the National Chemical Safety Data System.

90. $2,500,000 to the Salt Lake Organizing Committee or its designee for environmental programs and operations of the 2002 Winter Olympic and Paralympic Games. Eligible activities may include tree programs; environmental compliance activities; programs highlighting the use of environmentally-friendly technologies including, but not limited to, photovoltaic lighting and CNG fuel; waste management and recycling programs and operations; and public information and outreach efforts.

91. $600,000 to Fairfax County, Virginia for the Fairfax County Water Authority to conduct a study on water supply for drought resistance.

92. $1,000,000 to Arlington County and the City of Alexandria, Virginia for demonstration of environmental improvements to Four Mile Run.

93. $600,000 to Franklin, Grant and Adams counties in Washington for the Groundwater Management Area to address nitrate levels in drinking water.

94. $300,000 for the continuation of the Molten Carbonate Fuel Cell Demonstration project in King County, Washington.

95. $168,000 for the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission for technical work near the Crandon Mine in Wisconsin.

96. $1,225,000 to the Canaan Valley Institute for ongoing operations.

97. $2,400,000 for the National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) for continued activities of a comprehensive clean water initiative in cooperation with EPA Region III.

98. $2,800,000 to the Polymer Alliance Zone's MARCEE Initiative with oversight being provided by the Office of Solid Waste.

99. $500,000 to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for the Bioterrorism Water Quality Protection Program with the aim of developing highly automated and inexpensive testing protocols.

100. $500,000 to Water Project 2000 in Tennessee to provide a benchmark water quality study.

101. $500,000 to Fallon, Nevada to address levels of naturally occurring arsenic.

102. $500,000 to the University of Toledo in the Ohio Lake Erie Research Center for participation in the Western Lake Erie Basin Study authorized by Sec. 441 of WRDA 1999, Public Law 106–53.

103. $450,000 for the Water Resources Institute at California State University, San Bernardino to develop and maintain an information repository of water-related research and conflict resolution.

104. $600,000 for the San Bernardino Municipal Water District in California for research and design of a mitigation project addressing the City's contaminated high groundwater table and dangers presented by liquefaction.

105. $990,000 for continuation of the Soil Aquifer Treatment Project.

106. $200,000 to Miami-Dade County Department of Environmental Resources Management in Florida to expand the existing education program.

107. $300,000 to Leon County, Florida for the Aquifer Protection Assessment program.

108. $750,000 to Calhoun County, Michigan for development of a comprehensive research and development plan for Kalamazoo River Watershed.

109. $250,000 to the Northwest Straits Advisory Commission of Washington.

The conferees have agreed to the following reductions from the budget request:

1. $27,413,000 from the CCTI Buildings program.

2. $9,495,000 from the CCTI Transportation program.

3. $31,686,100 from the CCTI Industry program.

4. $5,076,200 from the CCTI International Capacity Building program.

5. $2,025,000 from the CCTI State and Local program.

6. $2,410,000 from the CCTI Carbon Removal program.

7. $848,800 from Project EMPACT.

8. $9,000,000 from the Integrated Information Initiative. The conferees have provided $5,000,000 for continued planning and design of this new initiative's exchange network.

9. $4,841,000 from the innovative community partnership program.

10. $9,000,000 from the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund.

11. $4,250,000 from the international environmental monitoring program.

12. $3,840,000 from the regional geographic program.

13. $3,395,000 from urban environmental quality and human health.

14. $10,000,000 as a reduction in payroll costs.

The seven Environmental Finance Centers and the Regional Environmental Enforcement Associations are to be funded at the fiscal year 2000 funding level, and the Environmental Education programs are to be funded as proposed in the budget submission. The conferees agree that operations of the Clean Water Act Sec. 104(g)(1) Wastewater Onsite Technical Assistance Centers shall remain at the current funding level.

The conference agreement includes the budget request of $34,100,000 for pesticides reregistration, and $39,300,000 for pesticides registration activities performed by EPA. Faster review and approval for registration applications will allow safer, more environmentally friendly products on the market sooner and ensure that farmers have the ability to protect their crop. The conferees expect no reductions to be proposed for these programs in the operating plan submission.

Similarly, the Endocrine Disruptor Screening and the Pesticide Residue Tolerance Reassessment programs are to receive $10,200,000 and $14,600,000, respectively. The Tolerance Reassessment program has been funded at a level that equals the budget request if a tolerance fee was imposed by EPA

and an additional $7,000,000 was recovered through that fee. The conferees have prohibited implementation of the fee again this year, due in part to provisions of that fee structure proposed by EPA which would charge more than 100 percent of actual costs and which would make such charges retroactive. Until the Agency works toward a fee-for-service proposal which is both fair and reasonable, the conferees do not expect to entertain approval. As noted previously, these programs are not to be proposed for reduction through the operating plan submission.

The Agency is directed to take no reductions below the budget request from the NPDES permit backlog, the High Production Volume Chemical Challenge Program, the Chesapeake Bay Program Office, and the water quality monitoring program along the New Jersey-New York shoreline. The Agency is expected to fund the Great Lakes Program Office and the National Estuary program at no less than the 2000 level, and is directed to fund compliance assistance activities at no less than $25,000,000.

The conferees direct EPA to contract expeditiously with the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for a review of the quality of science used to develop and implement TMDLs, and direct that the final report be submitted to Congress by June 1, 2001. Further, EPA is directed to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the potential State resources which will be required for the development and implementation of TMDLs and present the results of the study to Congress within 120 days of enactment of this Act. In conducting this cost assessment, EPA must, in addition to direction included in Senate Report 106–410, provide an estimate of the annual costs to the regulated community in both the private and public sectors; address concerns regarding the economic analysis performed by the Administrator on regulatory changes to the TMDL program that were identified by the Comptroller General in a June 21, 2000, report; and estimate the costs to small businesses that would result from regulatory changes to the TMDL program. In conducting these analyses, the Administrator shall solicit comment from the Comptroller General, each State, and the public regarding the Agency's assessment.

In addition, the conferees direct the Agency to prepare an analysis of the monitoring data needed for development and implementation of TMDLs, and further direct EPA Region IX as well as all other EPA Regions and EPA Headquarters not to impose or mandate new TMDL-related requirements or issue new guidance relative to new TMDL-related permits prior to the date the TMDL rule can be implemented under current law.

The conferees understand that in June 2000, EPA released a substantially revised draft dioxin reassessment after five years of considering recommendations from its Science Advisory Board (SAB). The SAB's November 1995 Report noted numerous weaknesses in the risk characterization and dose-response chapters of the 1994 draft reassessment and directed EPA to ensure that its conclusions were based on a more complete consideration of available scientific studies.

The conferees commend EPA for convening a peer review panel to assess two key sections of the revised reassessment prior to a second SAB review. The conferees are concerned, based on the report of this peer review panel, that EPA's key conclusions regarding dioxin risks remain controversial and do not completely address questions raised by the SAB in 1995.

The conferees understand that Congressional science and agriculture committees have called for a SAB review of the full dioxin reassessment, including all new information. The conferees further understand that the Department of Agriculture is finalizing an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to understand better the dioxin impacts on the U.S. food supply. Therefore, the conferees strongly encourage the Agency to await completion of these reviews before finalizing its dioxin reassessment.

This direction should not be interpreted to restrict EPA from issuing regulations to control dioxin emissions such as air toxics rules under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, which have reduced industrial emissions of dioxin by 90 percent.

In view of the uncertain future supply of pharmaceutical-grade CFCs, the conferees are mindful that a smooth and timely transition to chlorofluorocarbon-free metered dose inhalers (MDIs) is needed for patients to continue to have access to the treatments they need. The conferees are aware that a year ago FDA, in consultation with EPA, issued a proposed rule to determine when CFC MDIs are non-essential, and that a decision was proposed at a July 2000 Meeting of the Montreal Protocol's Open-Ended Working Group. The conferees understand that major patient and physician organizations, environmental groups and industry supported the July decision. This decision has now been revised. The conferees note that the July decision and this revised decision include a provision on the non-essentiality of new CFC MDIs unless certain specified criteria are met. The conferees believe that a decision by the Protocol Parties such as the revised decision could facilitate the transition without putting patients at risk, and believe it is important that a final decision make it clear that each national health authority make the finding as to whether the essentiality criteria are met for a particular product. The conferees strongly urge EPA to work with the U.S. Delegation to the Protocol's Meeting of the Parties this December to actively seek adoption of a decision which incorporates the essential use criteria contained in the revised July decision, which adheres to a timely phase-out of new CFC MDIs, and which retains the ability of FDA to protect the health and safety of U.S. citizens. The conferees further urge EPA to work with FDA on any final Protocol decision.

The conferees note that EPA's plans to promulgate a regulation pertaining to radon in drinking water have significant financial implications for states and local water districts across the United States. The conferees believe it is important that the Agency obtain cost data prior to finalizing such a rule. In this regard, the General Accounting Office is directed to study the financial impacts of the proposed EPA regulation and submit the report expeditiously to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. Prior to finalizing this rule, the Agency is strongly encouraged to consider fully the GAO's findings.

The conferees note with disappointment that the Agency has not solicited public comment regarding scientific community recommendations for exemptions from the 1994 proposed rule regarding so-called ''plant pesticides.'' The conferees urge EPA to solicit and consider public comment regarding such recommendations before completion of the ''plant pesticide'' rulemaking. EPA's failure to consider such exemptions timely is not a basis for promulgation of an overreaching final rule.

The conferees fully expect the Agency to follow through on its current commitment to the Sustainable Industry program. The program's success thus far with the metal finishing industry has focused on collaboration rather than confrontation with industry, improved EPA understanding of industry practices, and achieving better environmental results from companies in tandem with concrete improvements to the regulatory system. The Agency is encouraged to provide resources at the fiscal year 1999 level in order to support necessary personnel, outreach, grants, and EPA regional capacity for continued progress with the metal finishing industry and other key participating sectors, including specialty chemicals, meat processing, metal casting, shipbuilding and repair, photo processing, and travel and tourism.

The conferees are concerned that EPA has not submitted for independent peer review the Agency's application of the persistent, bioaccumulative toxicants (PBT) criteria and methodology to metals as utilized in various Agency programs and proposed regulations. Serious doubts about the scientific validity of applying PBT criteria and methodology to metals have been expressed by international scientific bodies, invited experts at a January 2000 public workshop cosponsored by EPA, and EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB). In May 2000, the SAB noted that ''classification of metals as PBTs is problematic, since their environmental fate and transport cannot be adequately described using models for organic contaminants.'' Therefore, the conferees urge EPA to seek independent peer review and refer to the SAB the question of the scientific appropriateness of applying PBT criteria and methodology to metals before any application of the PBT criteria and methodology to metals.

The EPA has proposed to redesignate the San Joaquin Valley Ozone Nonattainment area from ''serious'' to ''severe'' nonattainment. The conferees note that the East Kern County portion of this area is geographically separated from the San Joaquin Valley air basin and in itself may not warrant a reclassification and may not contribute to the ozone nonattainment in the San Joaquin Valley. The conferees also note that within the East Kern County area are two defense installations pursuing vital defense programs and a NASA laboratory conducting advanced aerospace research which could be hampered seriously by reclassification. In view of this the Administrator is strongly encouraged to exclude the East Kern County area from the San Joaquin area redesignation.

The conferees continue to be concerned with EPA's chosen preferred alternative for constructing secondary treatment facilities at the USIWTP near San Diego. The conferees are aware of EPA's request to raise the existing cap on construction spending at the IWTP in order to build 25 mgd of secondary ponds at the IWTP with previously appropriated monies in the BEIF. The conferees are also aware of the significant concerns which exist regarding the limited capacity of EPA's preferred alternative, the lack of available land on which future capacity could be constructed, and its inadequacy in addressing increasing future cross-border sewage flows in the region. Finally, the conferees note there is at least one private sector proposal to construct in Mexico similar secondary facilities which would have considerably greater potential capacity better suited to the long term sewage treatment needs of the rapidly growing border region.

The conferees are encouraged by the progress of separate authorizing legislation now pending before the Congress which would facilitate such a proposal, as well as the growing level of documented support for such a proposal by Mexican leaders. The conferees thus continue to believe that it would be inappropriate to lift the cap at this time or to permit construction of a limited capacity secondary treatment facility at the

IWTP which would not meet long-term sewage treatment needs. The conferees urge EPA to continue working with the IBWC, State Department, and its counterparts in Mexico to encourage and develop such a viable proposal in a timely manner.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriates $34,094,000 for the Office of Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $34,000,000 as proposed by the House. In addition to this appropriation, $11,500,000 is available to the OIG by transfer from the Hazardous Substance Superfund account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Appropriates $23,931,000 for buildings and facilities as proposed by the House instead of $23,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $1,270,000,000 for hazardous substance superfund as proposed by the House instead of $1,400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Bill language provides that $635,000,000 of the appropriated amount is to be derived from the Superfund Trust Fund, while the remaining $635,000,000 is to be derived from General Revenues of the Treasury. Additional language (1) provides for a transfer of $11,500,000 to the Office of Inspector General; (2) provides for a transfer of $36,500,000 to the Science and Technology account; and (3) provides that $100,000,000 of the appropriated amount shall not become available for obligation until September 1, 2001.

The conferees note that funds for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry and for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences have been provided in new, separate accounts elsewhere in this Act instead of through the Environmental Protection Agency as has been done in previous years.

The conferees have agreed to the following fiscal year 2001 funding levels:

1. $914,800,000 for Superfund response/cleanup actions.
2. $140,000,000 for enforcement activities.
3. $139,500,000 for management and support. Of this amount, $11,500,000 is to be provided by transfer to the Office of Inspector General.
4. $36,500,000 for research and development activities, to be transferred to the Science and Technology account.
5. $39,200,000 for reimbursable interagency activities, including $28,500,000 for the Department of Justice, $650,000 for OSHA, $1,100,000 for FEMA, $2,450,000 for NOAA, $5,500,000 for the Coast Guard, and $1,000,000 for the Department of the Interior.
6. The Brownfields program has been funded at the budget request level of $91,600,000, which includes funding from various programs within this account and the Environmental Programs and Management account.

The Agency is directed to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate of any non-ATSDR resources to be devoted to the Libby, Montana medical monitoring program and related activities.

The conferees remain concerned regarding the Agency's plans to conduct certain dredging or invasive remediation technology activities while these matters remain under study by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS). The pending NAS study is addressing dredging, capping, source control, natural recovery, and disposal of contaminated sediments, and is comparing the risks of each technology. The NAS expects to submit its draft report of this study during Fall 2000 and the conferees strongly encourage the NAS to issue a final report no later than January 2001. Accordingly, the conferees continue to direct the EPA to take no action to initiate or order the use of dredging or invasive remedial technologies where a final plan has not been adopted prior to October 1, 2000 or where such activities are not now occurring until the NAS report has been completed and its findings have been properly considered by the Agency. As in previous years, exceptions are provided for voluntary agreements and for urgent cases where contaminated sediment poses a significant threat to public health.

In adopting this direction to the Agency, the conferees do not intend to prevent EPA from publishing, issuing, or taking public comment on specific proposed or draft remediation plans; but do encourage the Agency to take into account the NAS study when available as it goes through the above process. However, any such plans are not to be finalized until June 30, 2001 or until the Agency has properly considered the NAS report, whichever comes first.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

Appropriates $72,096,000 for the leaking underground storage tank program as provided by the Senate instead of $79,000,000 as proposed by the House.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

Appropriates $15,000,000 for oil spill response as provided by both the House and the Senate.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Appropriates $3,628,740,000 for state and tribal assistance grants instead of $3,176,957,000 as proposed by the House and $3,320,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Bill language specifically provides $1,350,000,000 for Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) capitalization grants, $825,000,000 for Safe Drinking Water SRF capitalization grants, $75,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Border program, $35,000,000 for grants to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs in rural and native Alaska, $1,008,000,000 for categorical grants to the states and tribes, and $335,740,000 for grants for construction of water and wastewater treatment facilities and for groundwater protection infrastructure.

The conferees have included bill language which, for fiscal year 2001 only, authorizes the Administrator of the EPA to use funds appropriated under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA) to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 319 (h) and 518 (e) of FWPCA. In addition, bill language has been adopted by the conferees to permit states to include as principal amounts considered to be the cost of administering SRF loans to eligible borrowers, with certain limitations.

The conferees have further agreed to include bill language which resolves in favor of the grantee two disputed grants, docket numbers C–180840–01, C–180840–04, C–470319–03, and C–470319–04; as well as language carried in previous years' Acts which stipulates that none of the funds in this or any previous Act may be used by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants. As in past years, funds for such studies have been provided in other EPA accounts. In addition, language requested in the budget submission has been included which permits the Administrator to reserve up to 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for the SRF under Title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for grants under section 518 (c) of the Act.

Finally, the conferees have included language which stipulates that no funds provided in this Act to address water infrastructure needs of colonias within the United States along the U.S.-Mexico border shall be made available after June 1, 2001 unless the receiving governmental entity has established an enforceable ordinance or rule which prevents the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater or other necessary infrastructure.

Of the funds provided for the United States-Mexico Border Program, $3,500,000 is for the El Paso-Las Cruces sustainable water project, $2,000,000 is for the Brownsville, Texas water supply project, $1,000,000 is for the Del Rio/San Felipe Springs Water Treatment Plant, and $3,000,000 is for upgrades and expansion of the Nogales International Waste Treatment Plant, replacement of the International Outfall Interceptor, and replacement of sewer infrastructure facilities of the City of Nogales. Of the funds provided for rural and Alaska Native villages, $2,000,000 is for training and technical assistance. The State of Alaska must also provide a 25 percent match for all expenditures through this program.

The conferees agree that the $335,740,000 provided to communities or other entities for construction of water and wastewater treatment facilities and for groundwater protection infrastructure shall be accompanied by a cost-share requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is to be the responsibility of the community or entity consistent with long-standing guidelines of the Agency. These guidelines also offer flexibility in the application of the cost-share requirement for those few circumstances when meeting the 45 percent requirement is not possible. The Agency is commended for its past efforts in working with communities and other entities to resolve problems in this regard, and the conferees expect this level of effort and flexibility to continue throughout fiscal year 2001. The distribution of funds under this program is as follows:

1. $2,100,000 for the Jasper, Alabama sewer extension project.
2. $900,000 for the Scottsboro, Alabama drinking water project.
3. $3,000,000 for the Thomasville, Alabama water facility project.
4. $350,000 to Winfield, Alabama for sewer infrastructure improvements near the Corridor X highway.
5. $350,000 to Hamilton, Alabama for water and sewer infrastructure improvements.
6. $1,000,000 to Cullman County, Alabama for a water infrastructure improvements.
7. $150,000 to the Fayett County Water Board in Alabama for drinking water system enhancements.
8. $60,000 to Winston County, Alabama to complete Phase I of the Houston-Moreland water project.
9. $1,000,000 to Shelby County, Alabama for water infrastructure improvements.
10. $1,000,000 to the City of Huntsville, Alabama for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
11. $1,000,000 to the City of Hartselle, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
12. $1,000,000 to Morgan County, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Sherbrooke Sanitary Sewer System.
13. $500,000 to the Limestone County Water and Sewer Authority in Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
14. $250,000 to the City of Rogersville, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
15. $250,000 the City of Triana, Alabama for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
16. $3,000,000 for the State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation groundwater remediation project near the Kenai River. The match requirement can be met with non-Federally funded pre-award expenditures by the State of Alaska for this project.

17. $2,200,000 for water and sewer improvements in the North Star Borough, Alaska.
18. $1,100,000 for water and sewer improvements in Whittier, Alaska.
19. $2,200,000 for water and sewer improvements in Sitka, Alaska.
20. $2,500,000 for the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority of Arizona (WIFA) for a loan to Pima County, Arizona for wastewater treatment facility improvements. WIFA may lend the funds directly to Pima County or use the funds to support bonds to fund loans to Pima County and other Arizona communities on Arizona's SRF priority list. Pima County and other benefiting communities, if any, shall repay loans to Arizona's SRF.
21. $750,000 to Gila County, Arizona for water infrastructure improvements in the Kellner and Ice House Canyon areas.
22. $450,000 to Barling, Arkansas for water infrastructure development and engineering studies for future water and sewer improvements.
23. $2,000,000 to San Diego, California for the Coastal Low Flow Storm Drain Diversion Project.
24. $1,500,000 to the Mission Springs Water District in California to protect groundwater in the City of Desert Hot Springs.
25. $2,650,000 to Olivenhain Municipal Water District in California for continued construction of a water treatment plant.
26. $1,000,000 for the Cutler-Orosi Wastewater JPA for a wastewater treatment plant serving Cutler, Orosi, East Orosi, and Sultana, California.
27. $1,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure improvements at the Placer County, California Subregional Wastewater Treatment Plant.
28. $1,900,000 to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the Desalination Research and Innovation Partnership.
29. $1,500,000 to Lomita, California to upgrade water reservoir infrastructure.
30. $600,000 for the continuation of a water reuse nitrate treatment demonstration project in Yucca Valley, California.
31. $500,000 for continuation of water infrastructure improvements in Twentynine Palms, California.
32. $850,000 for the continuation of water infrastructure improvements in the Yucaipa Valley Water District in Yucaipa, California.
33. $1,300,000 for the Lower Owens River Project in Inyo County, California ($900,000) and in the City of Los Angeles ($400,000).
34. $500,000 for storm and wastewater drainage and infrastructure improvements in the City of Yucaipa, California .
35. $1,000,000 to San Clemente, California for the storm drainage management and pilot program implementation.
36. $1,750,000 to Carlsbad, California for the Encina Basin Recycled Water System.
37. $1,000,000 to San Joaquin County, California to rehabilitate water, sewer, storm drains, and surface infrastructure in East Stockton.
38. $1,250,000 to Huntington Beach, California for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements.
39. $1,000,000 for the City of Sacramento, California combined sewer overflow project.
40. $1,000,000 for the City of Vallejo, California for a sanitary sewer system at Mare Island.
41. $100,000 for wastewater and groundwater infrastructure improvements in Murrieta, California.
42. $500,000 for Eureka, California for work on the Martin Slough Interceptor.
43. $2,000,000 for the City of Montrose, Colorado sewage treatment upgrade.
44. $1,500,000 for the New Britain Water Department in Connecticut for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
45. $1,000,000 to the Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley, Connecticut for water and sewer improvements in the Naugatuck Valley.
46. $1,000,000 to Lewes, Delaware to construct pump stations, force mains, storage lagoons and spray irrigation facility.
47. $1,200,000 for the West Rehoboth Expansion of the Dewey Beach Sanitary District, Delaware.
48. $15,000,000 to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection for the Tampa Bay, Florida regional reservoir infrastructure project.
49. $1,700,000 to the City of Tallahassee, Florida for improvements to the stormwater drainage system.
50. $900,000 to the City of West Palm Beach, Florida for completion of wetlands-based indirect potable water and wastewater reuse program.
51. $1,325,000 to the City of Opa-locka, Florida for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements.
52. $2,325,000 to the City of North Miami Beach, Florida for wastewater and sewer infrastructure improvements in the Highland Village Neighborhood.
53. $1,500,000 to Sarasota Bay, Florida for wastewater infrastructure improvements necessary to reduce effluent discharge into the Bay.
54. $1,000,000 to the Escambia County Utilities Authority in Florida for extension of the sanitary sewer collection system.
55. $1,500,000 for the Homosassa Regional Wastewater Project in Citrus County, Florida.
56. $1,000,000 to Paulding County, Georgia for the Richland Creek Reservoir Project.
57. $1,000,000 to the City of Roswell, Georgia for infrastructure development and improvements of the Big Creek Watershed Demonstration Project.
58. $700,000 to the Toombs County Development Authority in Georgia to provide water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
59. $1,900,000 to Big Haynes Creek, Georgia for continued work on the basin stormwater retention and reuse project.
60. $500,000 for the Waimea Wastewater Treatment Plant Interim Expansion in the County of Kauai, Hawaii.
61. $1,000,000 for Burley, Idaho sewer system improvement project.
62. $2,300,000 for Granite Reeder, Idaho Water and Sewer District sewer system construction.
63. $1,500,000 for the McCall, Idaho water plant improvement project.
64. $500,000 to Burley, Idaho for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
65. $750,000 to the City of Hailey, Idaho for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
66. $750,000 to the City of Glenns Ferry, Idaho for the Glenns Ferry Water Improvement Project.
67. $500,000 to Burr Ridge, Illinois for a sanitary sewer improvement project.
68. $400,000 to Earlville, Illinois for a new wastewater treatment facility.
69. $250,000 to Maple Park, Illinois for wastewater infrastructure improvements.
70. $1,750,000 to North Aurora, Illinois for construction of water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities.
71. $1,000,000 to West Chicago, Illinois for construction of water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities.
72. $1,750,000 to Dixon, Illinois for construction of water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities.
73. $1,900,000 to Bloomington, Illinois for construction of water treatment and wastewater treatment facilities.
74. $350,000 to DuPage County, Illinois for the Village of Bensenville and the City of Wood Dale water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
75. $1,400,000 to Prospect Heights, Illinois for construction of a new drinking water conveyance system.
76. $1,000,000 for the Village of Johnsburg, Illinois wastewater treatment project.
77. $3,440,000 to the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District in Chicago, Illinois for continued development of the tunnel and reservoir project (TARP).
78. $550,000 to the City of Liberty, Indiana for the Waterworks System Improvement Project.
79. $1,000,000 to Evansville, Indiana for infrastructure development of the Pigeon Creek Enhancement project.
80. $1,000,000 to West Lafayette, Indiana for infrastructure improvements associated with the development of a new business district.
81. $1,000,000 to Mason City, Iowa for construction of a new water treatment facility.
82. $3,250,000 for Clinton, Iowa to separate storm and sewage systems.
83. $2,000,000 to Wichita, Kansas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
84. $500,000 to Clark County, Kentucky for the WMU head works facility.
85. $500,000 to upgrade the wastewater infrastructure facilities in Cynthiana, Harrison County, Kentucky.
86. $300,000 to the Bluegrass Area Development District in Kentucky for a regional water treatment feasibility study.
87. $200,000 to Scott County, Kentucky for construction of a water tower.
88. $500,000 to Madison County, Kentucky for sewer infrastructure improvements.
89. $100,000 to Mercer County, Kentucky for drinking water system enhancements.
90. $500,000 to the East Casey County Water District, Kentucky for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
91. $1,000,000 for the Northern Kentucky Area Development District for the expansion of the Carrollton, Kentucky Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant.
92. $1,000,000 to Pike County, Kentucky for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
93. $1,000,000 to Lawrence County, Kentucky for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
94. $400,000 to Christian County, Kentucky for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
95. $300,000 to the Crittenden-Livingston Regional Water System in Kentucky for the improvement of water distribution facilities.
96. $400,000 to Madisonville, Kentucky for sewer system improvements.
97. $300,000 to Centertown, Kentucky for sewer system improvements.
98. $3,000,000 for Logan/Todd, Kentucky Regional Water Commission for water system improvements.
99. $1,000,000 to the City of Monroe, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
100. $800,000 to the East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
101. $600,000 to the Town of Livingston, Louisiana to expand the town's water system.
102. $100,000 to Iberville Parish, Louisiana for water and sewer infrastructure improvements.
103. $1,000,000 to Shreveport, Louisiana to address infrastructure and storage problems affecting water quality as identified in a recent study.
104. $1,400,000 to St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.
105. $1,200,000 to Iberia Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the City of Iberia ($1,000,000) and to the City of Jeanerette ($200,000).

106. $100,000 to St. John Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

107. $50,000 to Ascension Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

108. $100,000 to Plaquemines Parish, Louisiana for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

109. $1,000,000 for the Corinna, Maine sewer upgrade.

110. $4,600,000 for biological nutrient removal on the eastern shore of Maryland, including $2,000,000 to the City of Crisfield; $1,800,000 for the City of Fruitland; and $800,000 for the Somerset County Sanitary District for Princess Anne.

111. $2,000,000 for Bristol County, Massachusetts, wastewater projects.

112. $1,000,000 for the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority's combined sewer overflow control plan.

113. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Taunton, Massachusetts.

114. $2,000,000 for St. Clair Shores, Michigan combined sewer overflow correction project.

115. $1,000,000 to Bad Axe, Michigan for continued drinking water infrastructure improvements.

116. $1,500,000 to Port Huron, Michigan for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

117. $500,000 to Mt. Clemens, Michigan for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

118. $1,000,000 to Higgins Lake, Michigan for a wastewater treatment program.

119. $1,500,000 to Grand Rapids, Michigan for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

120. $2,000,000 for continuation of the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project.

121. $800,000 to Oakland County, Michigan for infrastructure improvements within the George W. Kuhn Drainage District.

122. $1,000,000 for water system infrastructure improvements in Jackson, Mississippi.

123. $1,500,000 to the City of Picayune, Mississippi for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

124. $1,300,000 to Tupelo, Mississippi for water infrastructure needs.

125. $3,000,000 for the DeSoto County, Mississippi comprehensive water and wastewater management project.

126. $1,000,000 for the City of Pearl, Mississippi wastewater collection rehabilitation.

127. $3,000,000 for Jefferson County, Mississippi water and sewer infrastructure needs.

128. $1,000,000 for West Rankin Metropolitan Sewer Authority to develop alternative water and wastewater systems for Rankin County, Mississippi.

129. $6,500,000 for St. Louis and Kansas City, Missouri for the Meramec River enhancement and wetlands protection project ($3,500,000) and the Central Industrial District wastewater project ($3,000,000).

130. $100,000 for Allendale, Missouri wastewater infrastructure improvements.

131. $900,000 for Nodaway County, Missouri wastewater needs, including the communities of Pickering and Ravenwood.

132. $500,000 to Holt County, Missouri for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements including the communities of Mound City and Craig.

133. $2,000,000 to Jefferson County, Missouri for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

134. $700,000 to the City of Byrnes Mill, Missouri for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

135. $3,000,000 for the Lockwood, Montana wastewater collection system and wastewater treatment and disposal system.

136. $2,000,000 for the City of Belgrade, Montana wastewater collection, treatment and disposal system.

137. $1,000,000 for West Valley, Montana water and sewer development.

138. $1,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure needs of the Moapa Valley, Nevada Water District.

139. $1,000,000 to Omaha, Nebraska for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

140. $2,000,000 to Nashua, New Hampshire for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements.

141. $300,000 for Lebanon, New Hampshire combined sewer overflow elimination project.

142. $400,000 for the Newmarket, New Hampshire outflow discharge pipe.

143. $2,000,000 for the Berlin, New Hampshire water works improvement project.

144. $1,500,000 for the City of Elizabeth, New Jersey combined sewer overflow abatement project.

145. $1,500,000 for the City of Carteret, New Jersey combined sewer overflow improvements.

146. $2,500,000 to the Musconetcong Sewerage Authority in New Jersey to assist the plant in accommodating sewage from Hopatcong and Jefferson Township.

147. $800,000 to the Ocean County Utilities Authority in New Jersey for reimbursement of the completed Crestwood Interceptor project.

148. $1,700,000 to Las Cruces, New Mexico for improvements to the wastewater collection and treatment facilities.

149. $500,000 to Village Bosque Farms, New Mexico for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

150. $1,000,000 to Silver City, New Mexico for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

151. $4,380,000 for North and South Valley of the City of Albuquerque and the county of Bernalillo, New Mexico regional water and wastewater system improvements.

152. $990,000 for Corrales, New Mexico centralized water and wastewater treatment system.

153. $830,000 for Los Lunas, New Mexico wastewater system upgrade.

154. $750,000 for Clovis, New Mexico wastewater treatment system repair.

155. $750,000 to the Village of Morrisville, New York for the construction of a wastewater treatment system.

156. $1,400,000 to Genesee County, New York for Phase I of the Public Water Supply Program.

157. $14,000,000 for continued clean water improvements for Onondaga Lake, New York.

158. $2,500,000 to the City of Auburn, New York for the Auburn Municipal Water Filtration Plant and Water Reservoir.

159. $3,000,000 to Wayne County, New York for Phase I of the Wayne County wastewater treatment facility improvements.

160. $500,000 to Onondaga County, New York for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Village of Minoa.

161. $350,000 to Onondaga County, New York for drainage improvements in the Town of Onondaga for Nedrow.

162. $300,000 to Onondaga County, New York for drainage improvements in the Village of Marcellus.

163. $500,000 to the Town of Clarence, New York for construction of a sanitary sewer system.

164. $300,000 to the Village of McGraw, New York for the replacement of a water storage tank.

165. $8,000,000 for drinking water infrastructure needs in the New York City Watershed.

166. $1,350,000 for extension and construction of water infrastructure in Union County, North Carolina.

167. $650,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Stanly County, North Carolina.

168. $2,000,000 to the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center for water and wastewater treatment planning.

169. $1,500,000 to Henderson County, North Carolina for sewer line connections and improvements.

170. $1,000,000 to Rosman, North Carolina for facility repairs to the current wastewater treatment facility and engineering plans for a new facility.

171. $500,000 to Rutherford County, North Carolina for repairs to water and sewer lines in Lake Lure, Spindale and Chimney Rock, North Carolina.

172. $3,000,000 for Grand Forks, North Dakota water treatment plant.

173. $1,800,000 to the City of Toledo, Ohio for Secor Garden infrastructure improvements ($1,400,000) and for Erie Street Market water and wastewater infrastructure improvements ($400,000).

174. $300,000 to the City of Oregon, Ohio for extension of water and wastewater infrastructure.

175. $300,000 to Lucas County, Ohio for the Jerusalem Township water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

176. $200,000 to Swanton Township, Ohio for the Bittersweet Farms/Camp Courageous Infrastructure project.

177. $75,000 to Fulton County, Ohio for the Village of Lyons Sanitary Sewer Project.

178. $825,000 to Wood County Regional Water and Sewer District in Ohio for the Owens-Walbridge-Plumey Roads Sanitary Sewer Project ($325,000); for the Village of Millbury Infiltration Inflow project ($250,000); and for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Village of Walbridge ($250,000).

179. $1,650,000 for the Doan Brook Watershed Area in Ohio for continued development of a storm water abatement system.

180. $1,500,000 to Beach City, Ohio for a wastewater infrastructure improvement project.

181. $2,875,000 for Dunlap Reservoir and related infrastructure upgrades, and phase I and II wastewater treatment plant improvements for the city of Washington Court House, Ohio.

182. $875,000 for sewer infrastructure upgrades for the villages of DeGraff and Quincy, Ohio.

183. $250,000 for water and sewer infrastructure upgrades for the City of Springfield, Ohio.

184. $1,650,000 to Norman, Oklahoma for expanding existing wastewater treatment facilities.

185. $1,000,000 to Hood River, Oregon for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

186. $750,000 to Hermitage, Pennsylvania for the Pine Hollow Pump Station upgrade and forcemain replacement.

187. $750,000 to Sharon, Pennsylvania for storm and sanitary sewer projects repairs.

188. $1,000,000 to Washington County, Pennsylvania for construction of wastewater infrastructure improvements in Cecil Township.

189. $2,000,000 to Lincoln Township in Somerset County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

190. $500,000 to Monroe County, Pennsylvania for sewer and water infrastructure improvements.

191. $500,000 to Wayne County, Pennsylvania to upgrade and renovate a sewer system in the Borough of Honesdale.

192. $1,000,000 to Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania for upgrade of combined sewer overflow system for the Borough of Moosic ($500,000) and the Borough of Archbald ($500,000).

193. $450,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Sandy Township, Clearfield County, Pennsylvania.

194. $450,000 to Blair County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Logan Township.

195. $450,000 to the Clearfield Municipal Authority in Clearfield County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

196. $450,000 to the Bear Valley, Franklin County, Pennsylvania Joint Authority for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

197. $450,000 to Mifflin County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Lewistown Borough.

198. $450,000 to the Bedford Township Municipal Authority in Bedford County, Pennsylvania for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

199. $1,000,000 for the Springettsbury, Pennsylvania regional sewer project.

200. $5,000,000 for the Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration project, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

201. $750,000 for the Pawtucket, Rhode Island water treatment plant construction.

202. $1,000,000 to the Narragansett Bay Commission of Rhode Island for the combined sewer overflow control project.

203. $900,000 to the West Georgetown, South Carolina County Regional Wastewater Treatment System for construction of a wastewater interceptor transmission system.

204. $1,000,000 for the city of Florence, South Carolina for water and wastewater infrastructure.

205. $500,000 for Branchville, South Carolina water distribution system.

206. $1,000,000 for the City of York, South Carolina water treatment plant upgrade.

207. $500,000 for the City of Alcester, South Dakota for a wastewater treatment facility.

208. $3,000,000 for Rapid City, South Dakota to upgrade its water reclamation facility.

209. $4,000,000 for the City of Huron, South Dakota to upgrade its water treatment facility.

210. $1,000,000 to Athens, Tennessee for storm sewer reconstruction and improvements to the drainage basin.

211. $500,000 to Clinton, Tennessee for engineering study and design to address water and wastewater system flooding problems.

212. $1,000,000 to Oak Ridge, Tennessee for the extension of water and sewer infrastructure.

213. $1,000,000 to Sequatchie County, Tennessee for waterline infrastructure improvements.

214. $1,000,000 to the City of Meridian, Texas for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

215. $1,000,000 for the City of Abilene, Texas water treatment facility.

216. $1,750,000 to Grand Water and Sewer Service Agency in Utah for the extension of water and sewer lines to Arches National Park.

217. $2,000,000 for Ogden, Utah, water and sewer improvements.

218. $4,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Sandy City, Utah.

219. $1,000,000 for Montgomery, Vermont wastewater demonstration project.

220. $2,500,000 for the City of Pownal, Vermont wastewater treatment project.

221. $2,000,000 to Richmond, Virginia for continued development of combined sewer overflow improvements.

222. $2,000,000 to Lynchburg, Virginia for continued development of combined sewer overflow improvements.

223. $1,000,000 to Tazewell County, Virginia for construction of a public wastewater system to serve Bluefield and Divides.

224. $650,000 to the Smith Mountain Lake 4–H Education Center in Wirtz, Virginia for sewage treatment operation improvements.

225. $2,000,000 to Henry County, Virginia for the Henry County City of Martinsville's water and sewer infrastructure improvements project.

226. $250,000 to Buckley, Washington for water pipe replacement.

227. $85,000 to the City of Carnation, Washington for the engineering and design of wastewater treatment plant and collection facilities.

228. $3,000,000 for the City of Bremerton, Washington Callow 5 combined sewer overflow project.

229. $600,000 for the Hoodsport Water System, Mason County, Washington drinking water system improvements.

230. $2,000,000 for the Coulee Dam, Washington water infiltration system.

231. $650,000 for the Cowen Public Service District to provide water and sewer to the proposed Cowen Industrial Park in Webster County, West Virginia.

232. $10,200,000 to the Brooke County PSD, West Virginia for wastewater infrastructure needs in the Eldersville Road, Mahan's Lane and Bruin Drive areas.

233. $3,200,000 to the City of Thomas, West Virginia for water infrastructure needs.

234. $1,500,000 to Huntington, West Virginia for the Fourpole/Park Sewer project No. 1.

235. $680,000 to the Lake Tomahawk Sanitary District, Wisconsin for repayment of debt on a water treatment conveyance project.

236. $1,000,000 for Beloit, Wisconsin combined sewer overflow project.

237. $3,000,000 for Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Metropolitan Sewerage District for continued renovations and repairs to the sewer system.

The conferees have included bill language which allows the Administrator to use up to 3% of the appropriated amount of each above-listed project to administer the management and oversight of construction of such projects through contracts, allocation to the Corps of Engineers, or grants to the States.

The conferees intend that the non-federal share of the cost of planning, design and construction of water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in Bernalillo, New Mexico and in the North and South Valley areas of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico, may be paid in installments of any amount so long as the entire amount of the non-federal share is paid by the end of the 10–year project period, including fiscal year 2000. Bill language has been included regarding a grant provided in fiscal year 1999 for Cumberland, Maryland clarifying the intent of this grant.

Of the amount provided for categorical grants, $209,000,000 is for State and local air assistance grants, including $8,000,000 for section 103 grants to the states to develop regional haze programs under title I, part C of the Clean Air Act. It is the intention of the conferees that these funds be used to aid states in the development of emissions inventories, quantification of natural visibility conditions, monitoring and other data necessary to define reasonable progress and develop control strategies, and to support the states' participation in regional efforts to coordinate their strategies, where necessary, and at the election of the individual states. The conferees have also provided $238,000,000 for section 319 non-point source pollution grants and $172,262,300 for section 106 pollution control grants to, among other things, assist the States in meeting the long-term needs of the TMDL program. Included in the total is $2,000,000 for grants to coastal states as provided in Senate Report 106–410.

No funds have been provided for the new Great Lakes Initiative program, and funds for the Information Integration Initiative have been provided only in the Environmental Programs and Management account. Funds for the new Clean Air Partnership have not been provided by the conferees. Legislation proposed by the Agency to require a 40% cost-share for the section 106 grant program has not been approved by the conferees.

In the interest of minimizing the need for additional administrative appeals, judicial review, and legislative remedies relative to EPA's construction grant program, the conferees direct EPA to resolve, equitably and as expeditiously as its resources will allow, grantee requests for review or waiver, audit resolutions, and appeals in accordance with a specific set of guidelines set forth on page 62 of House Report 106–674. The conferees expect this process will eliminate the need for Congress to resolve specific audit disputes in the future.

The conferees agree that, due to economic hardship, EPA should not apply the normal cost-share requirements to a grant provided for the Fancy Farm, Kentucky water system in Public Law 106–74.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The conferees have included an administrative provision which, for fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, provides that the obligated balances of sums available in multiple year appropriations accounts shall remain available through the seventh fiscal year after their period of availability has expired for liquidating obligations made during the period of availability.

In addition, an administrative provision is included which stipulates that, for fiscal year 2001, the Administrator, in carrying out environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized tribes or duly authorized intertribal groups to assist the Administrator in implementing federal environmental programs for tribes required or authorized by law. Funds designated for State financial assistance agreements may not be used for such cooperative agreements.

Finally, an administrative provision has been included which reinstates the 12–month grace period following designation for new nonattainment areas for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards originally contained in EPA conformity regulations.

The conferees direct EPA to implement GPRA to the fullest extent possible. This includes defining its long-term strategic goals in terms of environmental, health, and other outcomes and tracking progress using appropriate outcomes measures. Such measures include indicators of health, ecology and welfare, exposure or body burden or uptake, ambient environmental conditions, discharges or emissions, and actions and/or responses by regulated parties.

The conferees recognize that the Agency may not be able to establish nor measure all the appropriate outcome measures by the time of its first Strategic Plan revision after 2000. The conferees therefore direct the Agency to make significant progress in its first revision after 2000, and in subsequent revisions to the Strategic Plan. Further, the conferees call on the Agency to organize and present performance measures in a manner that makes appropriate use of performance information supplied by EPA regions and states.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

Appropriates $5,201,000 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy as proposed

by the Senate instead of $5,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Public Law 105–261 transferred responsibility for satellite technology export licensing from the Department of Commerce to the Department of State as part of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). An unfortunate and unintended consequence of that move has been that university-based fundamental science and engineering research, widely disseminated and unclassified, has become subject to overly restrictive and inconsistent ITAR direction. The result has been critical delays in NASA-funded research projects and has forced some universities to forgo participation in such projects. Such research traditionally has been excluded from export controls under the fundamental research exemption. The conferees find the current situation to be unacceptable and direct the Office of Science and Technology Policy to work jointly with the National Security Council, in consultation with the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of State, to expeditiously issue clarification of ITAR that ensures that university collaborations and personnel exchanges, which are vital to the continued success of federally-funded research, are allowed to continue as they had under the long-standing fundamental research exception in the Export Administration Regulations, which had governed export controls over this technology when the Department of Commerce had jurisdiction over it. The conferees expect this review to be completed within 120 days of enactment of this Act. Upon the issuance of guidance, NASA shall ensure that university principal investigators are fully aware of their responsibilities.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Appropriates $2,900,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality as proposed by the House and the Senate. The conferees have once again included bill language which prohibits CEQ from using funds other than those appropriated directly under this heading. The Council is expected to implement this provision in a manner consistent with its implementation during fiscal years 1998 and 1999. Language has also been included again this year which, notwithstanding law, authorizes the Council to operate with one member, that member acting as chairman of the Council.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $33,660,000 for the Office of Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $33,661,000 as proposed by the House. Funds for this account are derived from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings and Loan Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund, and are therefore not reflected in either the budget authority or budget outlay totals.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Appropriates $300,000,000 for disaster relief as proposed by both the House and the Senate. In addition, appropriates $1,300,000,000 in emergency funding for disaster relief instead of $2,609,220,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House had proposed no emergency funding. Retains language proposed by the Senate authorizing the transfer of $2,900,000 to EMPA for the consolidated emergency management performance grant, in lieu of $5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree that up to $15,000,000 of the funds provided in this account may be used for flood map modernization activities in areas which receive Presidential disaster declarations, as proposed by the Senate. The House had proposed that $30,000,000 be transferred from this account to the Flood Map Modernization Fund for non-disaster and disaster-related flood map modernization.

The conferees do not agree with the House proposal to allow up to $50,000,000 of the disaster relief funds to be obligated for predisaster mitigation and repetitive loss property buyouts. The conferees have taken this action because additional funding was provided for buyouts and elevation of flood damaged properties as part of the fiscal year 2000 supplemental and these funds are not required at this time.

The conferees have agreed to include language in the bill making $3,000,000 from section 404 hazard mitigation grant funding available to the State of Florida hurricane mitigation initiative in Miami-Dade County, Florida. The conferees recognize that, in light of the devastation of Hurricanes Floyd, Irene, and Dennis to the Southeast United States, resources must be focused on mitigation activities because many communities are not adequately prepared to provide local emergency shelter for category 3 or higher hurricanes. To demonstrate the effectiveness of certain mitigation technologies, the conferees direct that a portion of the section 404 hazard mitigation grant funding available to the State of Florida be used for a pre-disaster hurricane mitigation program initiative in Miami-Dade County, Florida utilizing perforated metal technology employed in fixed, passive protection window applications as demonstrated through the Miami Wind Shutter Program.

The conferees are not in agreement with regard to the issue of insurance requirements for public and non-profit buildings. While the goal of reducing Federal costs associated with natural disasters is shared by the conferees, there is not agreement on the best way to achieve that goal. The House continues to believe that FEMA must ensure that the concerns of all interested parties are taken into consideration and that a detailed cost-benefit analysis must be completed prior to finalizing any rule in this regard. The Senate continues to believe that all relevant information is in hand and that a final rule should be promulgated expeditiously. The conferees acknowledge their inability to resolve this issue and urge the Congress to address this issue as part of a comprehensive legislative package.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conferees agree to provide a limitation of $25,000,000 on direct loans, a cost of $1,678,000 for direct loans, and a limitation on administrative expenses of $427,000 for the disaster assistance direct loan program account. The foregoing amounts are the same as proposed by the Senate. The House had proposed a limitation of $19,000,000 on direct loans, a cost of $1,295,000 for direct loans, and a limitation on administrative expenses of $420,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $215,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $190,000,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriates $10,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,015,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that the FEMA Inspector General shall also serve as the Inspector General for the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board. In order to fulfill these additional duties, the conferees agree to provide the Inspector General with additional funds and anticipate that the duties will require an increase of 8 FTE. To ensure the independence of the Office of Inspector General, funds are provided to enable the OIG to support its own administrative functions rather than relying on FEMA for support services such as budget and accounting, procurement and personnel.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

Appropriates $269,652,000 for emergency management planning and assistance as proposed by the Senate instead of $267,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree to include bill language earmarking $25,000,000 of the funds provided in this account for pre-disaster mitigation activities as proposed by the Senate. The House had included authority to use disaster relief funds for this purpose, to be administered through the EMPA account.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

Appropriates $140,000,000 for emergency food and shelter instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate.

FLOOD MAP MODERNIZATION FUND

Appropriates no funding for this activity in this account. The conferees have included authority within the disaster relief account to use up to $15,000,000 for post-disaster flood map activities in areas which receive Presidential disaster declarations.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The conferees agree to include bill language which authorizes the National Flood Insurance Program through December 31, 2001 instead of September 30, 2001 as proposed by the House and Senate. Without this authorization, new flood insurance policies could not be written throughout the fiscal year. In addition, the conferees direct FEMA to make $2,000,000 available to the New York Department of Environmental Conservation for initiating the Statewide Flood Plain Mapping Program.

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Provides for the transfer of $20,000,000 from the National Flood Insurance Fund to the National Flood Mitigation Fund as proposed by both the House and Senate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

Appropriates $7,122,000 for the Federal Consumer Information Fund as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The conferees agree with the requirement of the Senate that NASA must articulate a comprehensive agenda and strategy through a strategic plan for each of NASA's primary centers that links staffing, funding resources, mission activities and core competencies in a manner that will ensure each primary center will be vested with specific responsibilities and activities. Within each plan, NASA should identify where a center has or is expected to develop the same or similar expertise and capacity as another center, including the justification for this need. The plan should also include a specific 10–year profile of flight mission elements. This profile should identify the primary NASA center responsible for each flight's mission management. The profile also should articulate clearly the criteria that is used and/or will be used to permit missions to be built intramurally, as well as the strategy for using industry and leading academic laboratories for mission development and execution. These plans are to be updated annually, with the first plan to be submitted to

the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by July 31, 2001. For purposes of the foregoing reporting requirement, primary NASA centers shall include the nine centers and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory listed on page AS–21 of the fiscal year 2001 budget submission.

The conferees agree that information on the long-term consequences of reprogramming and operating plan actions should be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate when requested. While the Senate had proposed making the information a requirement to be submitted with all reprogrammings and operating plans, the conferees recognize that this would be a burden on the agency when most of the changes are relatively minor in nature. The conferees expect NASA to be responsive whenever such an information request is made.

The conferees agree that NASA should report annually on the issue of safeguarding sensitive technology as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that NASA should not be required to include an accounting of program reserves when addressing a program in the initial operating plan or subsequent operating plans. The conferees expect NASA to be able to provide this information when requested by the Committees on Appropriations.

The conferees have agreed to delete the general provision, proposed by the House which would have terminated all NASA-Air Force joint aeronautics and space-related research.

The conferees do not agree that NASA should conduct a joint study with the National Research Council and the National Academy of Public Administration on the research and analysis portions of NASA's programs. The conferees urge NASA to take actions to ensure that research and analysis funding is sufficient to support the goals of the various programs.

Of the amounts approved in the following appropriations accounts, NASA must limit transfers of funds between programs and activities to not more than $500,000 without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. Further, no changes may be made to any account or program element if it is construed to be policy or a change in policy. Any activity or program cited in this report shall be construed as the position of the conferees and should not be subject to reductions or reprogramming without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. Finally, it is the intent of the conferees that all carryover funds in the various appropriations accounts are subject to the normal reprogramming requirements outlined above.

The conferees recognize that personnel management at an agency such as NASA is difficult and note that the Congress has provided authority in the past for NASA to offer incentives to employees as a way to reduce the agency's overall workforce. The challenge NASA now faces is to ensure that the proper skill mix is in place at the various NASA Centers. To accomplish this task, NASA has proposed a continuation of its current buyout authority with modifications which allow the agency to retain the same number of full-time equivalent personnel, while offering incentives to achieve a workforce reduction in skill areas where an excess exists. The conferees agree to provide NASA with this authority for two years and have included the necessary statutory authority as a general provision of the bill.

The conferees agree to include the House provision on NASA full cost accounting instead of the Senate provision. The conferees remain concerned about the impact of full cost accounting on program and financial information that will be made available to the Congress through full cost accounting. If the program and financial information is determined to be inadequate, the conferees expect NASA to be able to address the concerns of the Congress. In addition, the conferees direct NASA to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the status of any program or activity that has exceeded its budget plan by 15 percent. The report should be provided to the Committees within 15 days of the date on which NASA has determined that the budget overrun has occurred. This report shall include the reasons for the budget overrun including any proposals for the termination or restructuring of the program or activity and the related impact on the funding of other programs or activities.

HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

Appropriates $5,462,900,000 for Human Space Flight instead of $5,472,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funding level arrived at for this account includes a reduction of $40,000,000 as proposed by NASA to provide additional funding for the Mars 2003 Lander program. This reduction includes $30,000,000 from shuttle reserves and $10,000,000 from the commercialization and technology program. Other adjustments follow.

The conferees recognize that NASA is obligated to ensure the well-being of astronauts, who will build the International Space Station (ISS), and live and work there for increasingly longer periods of time. On-orbit stay times beyond 90 days will require implementation of countermeasures against the negative effects of space flight. The basic research and countermeasure development will be done using the ISS crew members as research subjects. This requires establishment of medical baselines prior to flight, close monitoring of in-flight changes to the baseline, including the beneficial impacts of the countermeasures, and post-flight monitoring throughout the rehabilitation process. A key objective of NASA's Bioastronautics Initiative is to re-focus existing NASA biomedical assets to accomplish this aim more effectively.

The conferees understand that NASA has determined that the most effective approach to ensuring synergy between a strong research program and necessary astronaut clinical care is to construct a Bioastronautics Facility at the Johnson Space Center. The facility will be sited at NASA's Johnson Space Center because that is the living and working area of the astronaut corps and the medical support personnel. The facility will provide a necessary focal point for human health care delivery, research, and education for Space Medicine and Research. The research capabilities provided in this facility will be consistent with the NASA analysis of research requirements. This facility will enable access to all peer reviewed researchers, including universities across the country, NASA, NIH, and NSBRI, to carry out their science in a symbiotic laboratory setting and accomplish their goals.

The conferees agree to provide $3,000,000 to complete the facility design effort, and that a design/build approach is being baselined to ensure timely completion of the facility. The conferees further understand that initial construction funding could be required in fiscal year 2001 if the design is completed as planned by mid–2001, and direct NASA to submit an Operating Plan notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate at that time to identify construction funds within ISS resources.

The conferees agree that NASA should develop a 10–year plan for all research efforts related to the International Space Station, including operational needs as proposed by the Senate. NASA is directed to submit this report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate no later than April 15, 2001.

The conferees do not agree with the Senate requirement for a blueprint plan that identifies lead and complimentary universities that will coordinate with NASA for science disciplines that will be the focus of research after assembly of the ISS is complete. The conferees direct NASA to submit a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate which includes various ISS management options. The conferees agree that such a plan will give the Congress the information it needs in order to determine what management structure is best and most able to deliver the benefits of the ISS. The Committees on Appropriations will require this information prior to approving funding for any final agreement. Therefore, the conferees have included an administrative provision which prohibits the expenditure of any funds prior to December 1, 2001 for finalizing an agreement between NASA and a non government organization to conduct research utilization and commercialization management activities of the ISS.

For the past several years, the conferees have expressed dismay at the lack of dedicated life and microgravity research missions being flown on shuttle during station assembly. This problem is made worse by continuing delay in station assembly, leading to a significant backlog of critical research waiting to be flown. The conferees believe it is prudent to plan regular life and microgravity shuttle research missions during station assembly to protect the shuttle flight rate and to prepare experiments for the space station. The conferees therefore direct NASA, within 30 days of enactment of this Act, to submit a plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate which details a schedule for shuttle research missions, beginning after the flight of STS–107 and continuing until the space station reaches its full research capability.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

Appropriates $6,190,700,000 for science, aeronautics and technology instead of $5,579,600,000 as proposed by the House and $5,837,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided is $261,300,000 above the budget request. The amount provided consists of:

$2,508,300,000 for space science.
$316,900,000 for life and microgravity sciences.
$1,498,050,000 for earth sciences.
$1,253,150,000 for aero-sapce technology.
$529,400,000 for space operations.
$134,000,000 for academic programs.
$49,100,000 as a general reduction.

In reaching the amount of $6,190,700,000 appropriated for science, aeronautics and technology, the conferees have included only $8,000,000 for space solar power, $20,000,000 for commercial remote sensing data buys, $20,000,000 for quiet aircraft technology, $10,000,000 for the EPSCoR program, and $19,100,000 for space grant colleges designated under section 208 of the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Act.

The conferees recognize the efforts of NASA, particularly Goddard Space Flight Center, in developing comprehensive programmatic and operations plans for the Independent Verification and Validation Facility and in confirming the Facility's agency-wide role in software reliability. The conferees further recognize NASA's increased commitment to IV&V as a mission critical activity, as evidenced by the increase in funding (to $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001) dedicated to

IV&V activities. The conferees expect NASA to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by May 1, 2001 regarding progress on development of the Facility, its role within NASA and the degree to which new and related software initiatives have been implemented.

SPACE SCIENCE

The conferees have agreed to provide $2,508,300,000 for space science programs. Included in this amount is $75,000,000 for the Mars 2003 Lander program as proposed by NASA in communications with the conferees subsequent to submission of the budget. Of this amount, $2,000,000 is to be financed within the space science account; $7,000,000 is to be derived from the life and microgravity account; $20,000,000 is to be derived from the aeronautics and space technology account; $6,000,000 is to be derived from the mission support account; and $40,000,000 is to be derived from the human space flight account.

Prior conference agreements have directed NASA to establish a goal of competitively selecting 75 percent of space science advanced technology funding. Based upon this direction, NASA recently released an open research announcement in the Cross-Enterprise Technology Development Program (CETDP) that resulted in an impressive response of over 1200 proposals competing for $40,000,000 in funding. The conferees are aware that NASA was only able to award funding for 8 percent of the proposals and that a 92 percent disapproval rate is frustrating to the university community and industry partners. In addition, the conferees note that NASA has expressed concern that the diversion of a high percentage of funds to open solicitations is contributing to a loss of needed ''core competencies'' in technology at the NASA field centers. NASA, on the CETDP, is directed to allocate at least 75% of all new procurement awards through full and open competition. If NASA feels that additional funding is needed in fiscal year 2001 to address transitional core competency issues, then the agency may propose for the consideration by the Committees on Appropriations, a reprogramming of funds from other sources.

The conferees understand that the responsibility and funding for the CETDP is being transferred from the Office of Space Science to the Office of Aerospace Technology. Therefore, the conferees direct that NASA's Office of Aerospace Technology submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by April 30, 2001 which addresses how NASA plans to increase competitive selection of advanced technology funding while maintaining NASA Center core competencies. The report should identify the core competencies by NASA Center that are critical to the long-term future of the Nation's space program and the level of resources required to ensure their support. The NASA core competency strategy should include long-term strategic alliances with universities and industry partners.

The conferees note that applying the recommendations of the Mars Program Independent Assessment Team to all space science programs may lead to cost increases for those programs. The conferees agree that NASA should provide a five-year profile of the costs associated with implementing these recommendations as part of the budget submission for fiscal year 2002, as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided the budget request of $20,000,000 for the Living with a Star program, as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted the funding for this program because of concern about the contracting strategy being used by the program. The NASA Inspector General has reviewed the procurement strategy and the conferees are confident that NASA will take into consideration the recommendations of the Inspector General with regard to this program, as well as the recommendations of the Applied Physics Laboratory and NASA. The conferees agree with the direction of the Senate that NASA should submit a long-term plan to create a resilient Sun-Earth Connection program and that the report should be submitted by February 15, 2001.

The conferees agree that the cost of the Hubble Wide Field Camera 3 should have a cost cap of $75,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees do not agree that cost increases associated with the Hubble Servicing Mission should be allocated to the Human Space Flight account. Instead, the conferees direct NASA to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the policy for allocating cost increases which are associated with launch or payload delays and the rationale for the policy. The report should be provided no later that March 31, 2001.

The conferees agree to the following changes to the budget request:

1. An increase of $1,500,000 for Ohio Wesleyan University for infrastructure needs.
2. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Center for Space Sciences at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas.
3. An increase of $8,000,000 for space solar power.
4. An increase of $5,000,000 for the STEP-AirSEDS tether propulsion program.
5. An increase of $2,500,000 for the Hubble telescope project to initiate a Composites Technology Institute in Bridgeport, West Virginia.
6. An increase of $3,500,000 for a center on life in extreme thermal environments at Montana State University, Bozeman.
7. An increase of $2,500,000 for the Bishop Museum/Mauna Kea Astronomy Education Center.
8. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Chabot Observatory and Science Center, Oakland, California.
9. An increase of $4,000,000 for the Green Bank Radio Astronomy Observatory visitor center.
10. An increase of $2,000,000 for equipment for the South Carolina State Museum's Observatory, Planetarium and Theater.
11. An increase of $8,000,000 for the University of Hawaii for infrastructure needs of the Mauna Kea Education Center.

LIFE AND MICROGRAVITY SCIENCES

The conferees agree to provide $316,900,000 for life and microgravity sciences. This amount includes a reduction of $7,000,000 from the biomedical research and countermeasures program which has been transferred to the space sciences account for the Mars 2003 Lander program. The conferees agree to the following changes to the budget request:

1. An increase of $5,000,000 for the Space Radiation program at Loma Linda University Hospital.
2. An increase of $1,000,000 to EARTH University and the University of Alabama in Birmingham to research Chagas disease.
3. An increase of $500,000 for ongoing research in the area of disease monitoring and diagnosis through the use of medical intelligence for the manned spaceflight effort.
4. An increase of $3,000,000 for the Donald Danforth Plant Science Center's Modern Genetics project.
5. An increase of $15,000,000 for infrastructure needs for the Life Sciences building at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

EARTH SCIENCES

The conferees agree to provide $1,498,050,000 for the earth sciences account.

The conferees take seriously their responsibility to oversee the activities of the various Departments and Agencies and feel the direction provided by the Congress in the Statement of Managers accompanying the Conference Report for prior fiscal years should be implemented without fail. It has come to the attention of the conferees that this has not been the case with the implementation of direction contained in the fiscal year 2000 Appropriations Act and accompanying Statement of Managers. For this reason, the conferees agree with the Senate proposal to suspend the authority of the Office of Earth Science to reprogram any funds in fiscal year 2001 unless specifically authorized by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

The conferees direct NASA to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, by March 15, 2001 with a ten-year strategy and funding profile to extend the benefits of Earth science, technology and data results beyond the traditional science community and address practical, near-term problems. This strategy should incorporate fully the unique data, data products and services available from U.S. companies. NASA is also directed to develop, with universities, existing Applications Centers, such as ARCs and RESACs, NASA Field Centers, and other cognizant Federal agencies, mechanisms through which current public and private remote sensing and related technologies will be made readily available to state and local governments, public agencies and private organizations for applications in agriculture, flood mapping, forestry, environmental protection, urban planning and other land-use issues.

The Vegetation Canopy LIDAR Project (VCL), the first NASA Earth Systems Pathfinder Mission, is designed to provide a global database of forest structure and tree height. The conferees believe that this data will be invaluable as the scientific community continues research into global climate change and related areas. At the same time, the conferees recognize the valuable commercial potential of the data and the associated interest within the commercial sector. The conferees are concerned that if the VCL mission is not launched by 2002, the baseline data needed by the United States scientific and commercial community may be delayed or lost. Therefore, the conferees direct NASA to report by October 2001 on the progress of developing the VCL mission, with the expectation of a Spring 2002 launch date.

The conferees agree to the following changes to the budget request:

1. An increase of $500,000 for the Temporal Landscape Change Research Program to establish a regional baseline monitoring program.
2. An increase of $500,000 for the operations of the applications center for remote sensing at Fulton-Montgomery Community College, Johnston, New York.
3. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Center for Earth Observing and Space Research at George Mason University.
4. An increase of $5,000,000 for NASA's Regional Applications Center for the Northeast.
5. An increase of $2,500,000 for the U.S. portion of the joint U.S./Italian satellite development program to remotely observe forest fires.
6. An increase of $450,000 for continuation of application remote sensing to forestry at the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry.
7. An increase of $4,000,000 for the continuation of programs at the American Museum of Natural History.
8. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Advanced Tropical Remote Sensing Center of the National Center for Tropical Remote Sensing

Applications and Resources at the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science.

9. An increase of $8,800,000 to the Institute for Software Research, for the following activities: $5,000,000 for development and construction of research facilities; $2,300,000 for the development of a Goddard Institute for Systems, Software and Technology Research (GISSTR) in cooperation with the Goddard Space Flight Center's Systems, Technology and Advanced Concepts (STAAC) organization; and $1,500,000 for a microcomputer clustering and data throughput/visualization algorithm research initiative.

10. An increase of $20,000,000 to continue commercial data purchases.

11. An increase of $3,000,000 for the University of South Mississippi for research into remotely sensed data for coastal zone management.

12. An increase of $1,000,000 for carbon cycle remote sensing technology at the KARS Regional Earth Sciences Applications Center at the University of Kansas.

13. An increase of $1,500,000 for the University of North Dakota to support the Upper Midwest Aerospace Consortium.

14. An increase of $1,500,000 for topographic sensor measurement efforts in Alaska.

15. An increase of $2,000,000 for remote ocean sensing research and measurements in the areas of the Bering Sea and the northernmost Pacific Ocean.

16. An increase of $500,000 for continued development of nickel metal hydride battery technology.

17. An increase of $3,000,000 for the NASA International Earth Observing System Natural Resource Training Center at the University of Montana, Missoula.

18. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Pipelines Project at Iowa State University/Southern University—Baton Rouge.

19. An increase of $35,000,000 for the Earth Observing System Data Information System, for a total fiscal year 2001 program level of $277,000,000. These additional funds are for the EOSDIS Core System only so that its total program level in fiscal year 2001 shall be $115,000,000 allocated as follows: First, an additional $22,500,000 should be added to the core ECS program to provide optimized system functionality, planning for future growth and adaptations due to instrument team changes, provision for additional processing, and archival capabilities needed at the DAAC's. Second, the remaining $12,500,000 is to continue and expand the Synergy program that was begun in fiscal year 2000. In fiscal year 2001, the conferees believe the Synergy program should focus on the following: continued development of the current applications to make them accessible to the general public; expansion of the number of info marts/data store fronts to broaden the application base and implementation of a unified access data server for local, State, and Federal agencies and the commercial marketplace. As part of this effort, NASA is directed to integrate the regional earth science applications centers into the Synergy program by the end of fiscal year 2001.

20. The conferees provided the full amount requested for the EOS follow-on. Within the amount provided, the conferees recommend: $1,500,000 for studies initiating a Landsat-7 follow-on commercial data purchase; $2,000,000 for the Global Precipitation Mission for phase A/B studies and preliminary advanced technology development work; $2,000,000 for the Global Earthquake Satellite for phase A/B studies and preliminary advanced technology development work; $1,500,000 for studies related to the ''New DIS'' which the conferees believe should emphasize the re-use of the existing system in order to minimize future costs; $35,600,000 for studies and advanced technology development for the NPOESS preparatory project of which $4,000,000 shall be allocated for the development of high speed data processing and algorithm validation processes that maximize prior year investments in this area; and $2,000,000 to initiate a global wind profile commercial data purchase consistent with the science objectives identified in the National Academy of Sciences study.

AERO-SPACE TECHNOLOGY

The conferees agree to provide $1,253,150,000 for the aero-space technology account. Included in this amount is a reduction of $20,000,000 to the research and technology base with the funds transferred to the space sciences account for the Mars 2003 Lander program.

The conferees agree to provide the budget request of $9,000,000 for the small aircraft transportation system (SATS) as proposed by the Senate. The House had deleted funding for this effort. The House action was based upon limited funding available to NASA and an underlying concern that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) was less than enthusiastic about the program which was not very well defined in the budget submission. Based upon new information provided to the conferees, funding for SATS has been restored to be used for operational evaluations, or proofs of concept where operational evaluations are not possible, of four new capabilities that promise to increase the safe and efficient capacity of the National Airspace System for all NAS users, and to extend reliable air service to smaller communities. These capabilities are:

High-volume operations at airports without control towers or terminal radar facilities.

Lower adverse weather landing minimums at minimally equipped landing facilities.

Integration of SATS aircraft into a higher en route capacity air traffic control system with complex flows and slower aircraft.

Improved single-pilot ability to function competently in complex airspace in an evolving NAS.

The conferees recognize that the expansion of the SATS is a technically high-risk program, and that the expansion of the SATS program to perform operational evaluations on all four capabilities will require additional resources. Therefore, the conferees direct the Administration to include such resources in the fiscal year 2002 budget request for NASA.

It is the expectation of the conferees that SATS will develop and operationally evaluate these four capabilities in a five-year program which will produce sufficient data to support FAA decisions to approve operational use of the capabilities, and FAA and industry decisions to invest in the necessary technologies. The conferees direct that not less than 75% of the funding provided for development of technologies shall be awarded subject to full and open competition. Collaborative industry/university teams are encouraged to compete for these awards. In addition, NASA is directed to transfer funds as required to the FAA for personnel with authority to set criteria and approve test plans.

The usefulness of the data for this purpose will be ensured through the following process:

1. In fiscal year 2001, NASA will plan SATS activities with, and secure the agreement of, FAA staff from aircraft certification, flight standards, air traffic, and airports before undertaking the proof of concept or operational evaluations. This will also be done with appropriate industry involvement.

2. The SATS plan will identify the operational safety criteria required by FAA for each capability, and test plans determined by FAA to be adequate to establish that these criteria are met.

3. The objective of SATS is that the output of the operational evaluation as defined in the plan will be sufficient for the FAA to give full credit to the test data when an applicant subsequently proposes the certification and operational approvals for a system that would implement these SATS capabilities.

NASA and FAA SATS program managers will keep the SATS Subcommittee, a joint subcommittee of NASA's Aero Space Technology Advisory Committee and FAA's Research Engineering and Development Advisory Committee, fully informed of all planning activities. SATS program managers will seek specific advice on their plan from the Subcommittee and respond in writing to such advice. The Advisory Committees will request status reports from the SATS Subcommittee on the planning activities and their conformance to the above directions of the conferees and these reports shall also be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

NASA is directed to provide a report the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the status of implementing this program with the first report to be submitted by July 31, 2001 and subsequent reports to be submitted on each March 31 thereafter.

The conferees agree to provide the budget request for the Space Launch Initiative (SLI) as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in general agreement with the direction in the Senate report with regard to the key principles NASA should maintain throughout the life of the program, namely: (1) any launch vehicles developed fully will be owned and operated by private industry and be capable of competing effectively in the commercial marketplace; and (2) the program will rely on competition from existing and emerging launch service providers to ensure innovations, openness, and resiliency. Further, the conferees are in agreement that at least 75% of SLI funding should be subject to full and open competition and that all NASA Centers should be eligible to participate in the SLI program.

The conferees continue to support the Software Optimization and Reuse Technology (SORT) program, which will help NASA address the growing cost and schedule complexities associated with traditional one-at-a-time software development strategies. The conferees are aware of a recent independent assessment of SORT program efforts at the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) Information Systems Center (ISC), which confirmed the compatibility of GSFC/ISC goals with those of the SORT program. The report confirmed that the technologies proposed under the SORT program would promote improvements in productivity, quality, cost and schedule, but identified communication and management problems between the SORT program and NASA. The conferees fully support the transfer of SORT's management to the GSFC/ISC, and expect the contents of the independent assessment to be integrated into a detailed plan for future SORT activities. The conferees direct GSFC/ISC to submit this plan to Congress no later than April 1, 2001.

The conferees agree to the following changes to the budget request:

1. An increase of $13,000,000 for the Ultra Efficient Engine Technology program.

2. An increase of $2,000,000 for the development of eyetracking technology and applications research.

3. An increase of $500,000 for evaluation and design of Lithium-Ion batteries for use on space shuttles.

4. An increase of $3,000,000 for the NASA-Illinois Technology Commercialization Center at DuPage County Research Park.

5. An increase of $3,000,000 for the University of New Orleans Composites Research Center for Excellence at Michoud, Louisiana.

6. An increase of $5,000,000 for Rotocraft Research and Technology base programs.

7. An increase of $6,000,000 to expand the Space Alliance Technology Outreach Program in the states of Florida, New Mexico, New York, and Texas.

8. An increase of $4,000,000 for deployment of multilateration and Mode-S based Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast sensors for the Helicopter In-Flight Tracking System.

9. An increase of $1,800,000 to augment deployment of an ATIDS multilateration sensor and surveillance server for the Airport Surface Management System.

10. An increase of $1,600,000 for the continued development of the Dynamic Runway Occupancy Measurement System integration with the Multistatic Dependent Surveillance System and SensorBahn server.

11. An increase of $1,000,000 for the remote sensing SAID research program at Syracuse University.

12. An increase of $1,000,000 for Agile Collaboration Environments for Systems Synthesis in Engineering Education.

13. An increase of $1,000,000 for Enhanced Vision Systems development and testing.

14. An increase of $2,000,000 to continue work on SOCRATES.

15. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Center for Emerging Technologies at Stony Brook, State University of New York.

16. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Garrett Morgan Commercialization Initiative in Ohio.

17. An increase of $6,500,000 to the Institute for Software Research, for the following activities: $2,000,000 to perform fundamental research of propellantless space propulsion with NASA's Center of Excellence for Space Propulsion, including the analysis of prototype radio frequency momentum sources and the use of automated tensor algorithms to simulate and evaluate prototype drive mechanisms; $3,500,000 to continue the Self-Adaptive Vehicular Equipment (SAVE) initiative; and $1,000,000 to continue the Breakthrough Propulsion Physics (BPP) program.

18. An increase of $7,500,000 for completion of the National Space Science and Technology Center for infrastructure needs.

19. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Earth Alert project at the Goddard Space Flight Center.

20. An increase of $10,000,000 for a Propulsion Research Laboratory to be located at NASA's Center of Excellence for Space Propulsion at the Marshall Space Flight Center.

21. An increase of $2,000,000 for Montana State University, Bozeman for research in advanced optoelectronic materials.

22. An increase of $1,000,000 for the University of Akron, for nanotechnology research.

23. An increase of $1,000,000 for aerospace projects at MSE Technology Applications in Butte, Montana.

24. An increase of $250,000 for the Oklahoma Aeronautics and Space Commission for sounding rockets.

25. An increase of $1,000,000 for Montana State University for the techlink program.

26. An increase of $500,000 for the National Aviation Hall of Fame for development of exhibits.

27. An increase of $1.500,000 for the National Technology Transfer Center, for a total of $7,300,000.

SPACE OPERATIONS

The conferees have provided $529,400,000 for space operations, the same amount as provided by both the House and Senate.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The conferees have agreed to provide $134,000,000 for academic programs. The conferees agree to the following changes to the budget request:

1. An increase of $3,000,000 for continued academic and infrastructure needs related to the computer sciences, mathematics and physics building at the University of Redlands, Redlands, California.

2. An increase of $1,000,000 for equipment needs at the University of San Diego Science and Education Outreach Center.

3. An increase of $500,000 for Science, Engineering, Math and Aerospace Academy programs at Central Arizona College.

4. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Science Facilities Initiative at Heidelberg College in Ohio.

5. An increase of $1,000,000 for the NASA Glenn ''Gateway to the Future: Ohio Pilot'' project.

6. An increase of $1,500,000 for the Santa Ana College Space Education Center in California.

7. An increase of $5,400,000 for the EPSCoR program for a total funding level of $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2001.

8. An increase of $9,100,000 for the Minority University Research and Education program for a total funding level of $55,000,000 in fiscal year 2001.

9. An increase of $500,000 for a hands-on interactive science education facility at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

10. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Science Learning Center in Hammond, Indiana.

11. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Environmental Sciences Learning Center (part of the California Science Center) in Los Angeles, California.

12. An increase of $2,000,000 for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to implement the Wisconsin Initiative for Math, Science, and Technology.

13. An increase of $2,500,000 for the JASON Foundation.

14. An increase of $1,000,000 for the NASA Center of Excellence in Mathematics, Science and Technology at Texas College in Tyler, Texas.

15. An increase of $2,000,000 for the Lewis and Clark Rediscovery Web Technology Project.

16. An increase of $500,000 for the Aerospace Education Center in Cleveland, Ohio as a national hub for the SEMAA program.

17. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Carl Sagan Discovery Science Center at the Children's Hospital at Montefiore Medical Center to implement the educational programming for this science learning project.

18. An increase of $1,000,000 for the Challenger Learning Center in Kenai, Alaska.

MISSION SUPPORT

Appropriates $2,608,700,000 for mission support instead of $2,584,000,000 as proposed by the House and Senate. The funding level arrived at for this account includes a reduction of $6,000,000 to research operations support from IFMP rescheduling as proposed by NASA to provide additional funding for the Mars 2003 Lander program.

The conferees are aware that NASA owns and operates a small fleet of administrative aircraft that are vital for the oversight and implementation of its mission. The conferees understand that the majority of the aircraft in this fleet are aging, presenting a burden upon NASA management in terms of maintenance requirements and resultant costs. The conferees, therefore, direct that NASA develop a plan to replace these aging administrative aircraft and consider fractional ownership as an alternative. NASA should submit this plan for administrative aircraft replacement to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by April 15, 2001. The conferees continue to believe that fractional ownership may be of value to NASA and have therefore included $2,200,000 to be used for a two-year test of the concept. NASA is directed to enter into a fractional ownership contract, to be fully competed, by June 15, 2001.

The conferees agree to provide $18,000,000 for the E-Complex upgrades at Stennis Space Center and $10,500,000 for a propulsion test operations building and for upgrades to the East/West access road at Stennis. In addition, the funds used for upgrades to the East/West access road may be used to match title 23 highway funds.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conferees agree to provide $23,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General, the same as proposed by both the House and Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The conferees agree to include four administrative provisions which were included in the bill in fiscal year 2000. The fifth administrative provision is addressed at the beginning of the NASA section of this statement. The conferees have not included an administrative provision proposed by the Senate which would have incorporated the Senate report into the bill by reference.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Limits direct loans from the Central Liquidity Facility (CLF) to credit unions from borrowed funds to $1,500,000,000 instead of $3,000,000,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Appropriates $1,000,000 to the National Credit Union Administration for the Community Development Revolving Loan Program for low-income credit unions of which $350,000 is provided specifically for technical assistance, as proposed by the House instead of no funding as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are very supportive of the credit union industry and the service it provides to its members. Increasing the lending cap for the Central Liquidity Facility (CLF) for new direct loans gives greater financial security to the industry and ensures the statutory role of the CLF to provide liquidity to credit unions experiencing unusual or unexpected shortfalls.

The conferees consider loans administered through the CLF necessary in situations when private sources are not available and when unanticipated events are the cause of liquidity drains. The conferees do not expect that loan sales or other business decisions that result in excessive demand for liquidity should be considered emergency events that warrant the use of CLF funds. To this end, the conferees direct the NCUA to develop written policies and procedures to clarify the role of the CLF and the circumstances when the CLF will approve a Regular or Agent Member's request for a CLF advance. This information is to be included in the budget request for fiscal year 2002. The conferees also direct the NCUA to report on the loans made by the CLF for short-term adjustment, seasonal, and protracted adjustment liquidity needs for each month from 1996 through December 2000. This report is to be submitted to the Committees by February 15, 2001. The conferees request that NCUA continue to provide this information on CLF loans on a monthly basis through September 2001.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Appropriates $3,350,000,000 for research and related activities instead of $3,117,690,000 as proposed by the House and $3,245,562,000 as proposed by the Senate. Bill language provides up to $275,592,000 of this amount for Polar research and operations support.

The conferees have included bill language which specifies that $65,000,000 of appropriated funds are to be for a comprehensive research initiative on plant genomes for economically significant crops.

Finally, the conferees have agreed to bill language which: (1) prohibits funds spent in this or any other Act to acquire or lease a research vessel with ice-breaking capability built or retrofitted outside of the United States if such a vessel of United States origin can be obtained at a cost of not more than 50 per centum above the cost of the least expensive, technically acceptable, non-United States vessel; (2) requires that the amount of subsidy or financing provided by a foreign government, or instrumentality thereof, to a vessel's construction shall be included as part of the total cost of such vessel; and (3) provides that should a U.S. vessel as set forth in the foregoing language not be available for leasing for the austral summer Antarctic season of 2002–2003, and thereafter, a vessel of any origin can be leased for a period not to exceed 120 days of that season and every season thereafter until delivery of such a United States vessel occurs.

The conference agreement provides an increase of $384,000,000 above the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level for research and related activities. Within the appropriated level is $215,000,000 for the information technology initiative, $75,000,000 for the biocomplexity initiative, $65,000,000 for plant genome research for economically significant crops, $150,000,000 for the new nanotechnology initiative, $75,000,000 for major research instrumentation, $94,910,000 for facilities within the astronomical sciences activity, and $1,000,000 to begin design and model testing of a vessel to replace the R/V Alpha Helix.

The increase of $15,000,000 provided for astronomical sciences facilities is intended to upgrade specifically facilities and operations, including new construction and instrumentation as appropriate, for the Arecibo Observatory, the Green Bank Telescope, the Very Large Array, the Very Long Baseline Array, and other facilities in need of such attention on a priority basis. The Foundation is directed to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate with a list of facilities and the specific needs of each, on a priority basis, within the Operating Plan submission and on a semi-yearly basis after that.

The conferees have provided $5,000,000 within the total for social and behavioral sciences to initiate a separately competed Children's Research Initiative (CRI). While the NSF does fund some research that provides a better understanding of children, a distinct program is needed if the recommendations of the 1997 National Science and Technology Council report are to be achieved. In fact, as the NSF anticipates potential budget growth in future years, the conferees expect the CRI to be a vital part of any planned program expansion. The NSF should employ its normal peer review process for determining grants for the CRI, and should award both principal investigator and no less than three center awards with this first-year funding.

Highest funding priority should be given to proposals from distinct human sciences units in institutions of higher education that have an interdisciplinary academic program in human and family development, nutrition, and related areas. Proposals should also be evaluated for their effectiveness in utilizing existing delivery systems for program outreach and evaluation to assess how the implementation of research findings can benefit the majority of all children in a given state or region. A strong emphasis should also be placed on pursuing theory-driven, applied policy-related research on children, learning, and the influence of families and communities on child development.

The conferees expect the Foundation to work with the human sciences community in the development of the proposed program guidelines for the CRI and to have awards made by June 2001. Finally, the conferees expect a detailed plan in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission on how the NSF intends to expand the CRI as a multi-year strategic initiative.

The Opportunity Fund has again, without prejudice, not been funded for fiscal year 2001.

Except as previously noted, the conferees expect that the remaining funds will be distributed proportionately and equitably, consistent with the ratio of the budget request level above the fiscal year 2000 funding level, among all of the remaining directorates. In the distribution of funds within each directorate, the NSF is directed to provide each program, project, and activity the same percentage of the overall budget as that provided in the budget request. The conferees request that such distribution be specifically noted in the fiscal year 2001 Operating Plan submission.

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

Appropriates $121,600,000 for major research equipment instead of $76,600,000 as proposed by the House and $109,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides the budget request level for all ongoing projects within the MRE account, including $45,000,000 for the development and construction of a second, single site, five-plus teraflop computing facility. The conferees are encouraged by the recent progress made in the development of the first terascale facility and urge the Foundation to move as quickly as possible in soliciting proposals for the second facility. The conferees urge the Foundation to pay special attention to qualified proposals that will utilize newer generation processors and other equipment as well as exhibit appropriate cost-share benefits as part of a proposal.

The conferees expect the Foundation to provide regular, informal reports as to the progress of the entire terascale program, including updates on construction, acquisition, funding requirements, and other appropriate information associated with this important program.

The conference agreement also provides $12,500,000 to continue production of the High-Performance Instrumented Airborne Platform for Environmental Research (HIAPER). This new high-altitude research aircraft will, upon its completion, be available to support critical and outstanding atmospheric science research opportunities over the next 25 to 30 years.

Budget constraints have forced the conferees to not approve funding for two new starts for fiscal year 2001 under major research equipment, the U.S. Array and San Andreas Fault Observatory at Depth, and the National Ecological Observatory Network. This decision was made without prejudice and does not reflect on the quality of research proposed to be developed through these two programs.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Appropriates $787,352,000 for education and human resources instead of $694,310,000 as proposed by the House and $765,352,000 as proposed by the Senate. Bill language is included which requires that from within available funds, $10,000,000 is for the Office of Innovation Partnerships.

Within this appropriated level, the conferees have provided $75,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) to allow for renewed emphasis on research infrastructure development in the EPSCoR states, as well as to permit full implementation awards to states which have research proposals in the planning process. In addition, the conferees have provided $10,000,000 to fund the Office of Innovation Partnerships. This new office was created last year to, among other things, house the EPSCoR program, and should continue to examine means of helping those non-EPSCoR institutions receiving among the least federal research funding expand their research capacity and competitiveness so as to develop a truly national scientific research community with appropriate research centers located throughout the nation.

The conference agreement provides $15,000,000 for the HBCU-UP program, including $14,000,000 from the EHR account and $1,000,000 from the RRA account. The conferees have provided an increase of $10,000,000 above the budget request level for the Informal Science Education (ISE) program. This increase is intended to provide additional resources to expand the pool of ISE grantees to providers in smaller communities, thus ensuring that the impact of the ISE program reaches an even more diverse audience.

The conference agreement further provides $34,250,000 for Advanced Technological Education; $13,000,000 for the SMETE Digital Library; $19,750,000 for Graduate Teaching Fellowships in K–12 Education; $16,500,000 for programs designed for women and persons with disabilities; $55,200,000 for the Graduate Research Fellowships program; and the fiscal year 2001 budget requests for the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation program, the new Tribal Colleges program, the Minority Graduate Education program, the Centers of Research Excellence in Science and Technology program, and the Model Institutions for Excellence program.

Finally, the conferees have agreed to provide $11,200,000 for the new Scholarships for Service program.

Except as previously noted, the conferees expect that the remaining funds will be distributed proportionately and equitably, consistent with the ratio of the budget request level above the fiscal year 2000 funding level, among all of the remaining directorates. In the distribution of funds within each directorate, the NSF is directed to provide each program, project, and activity the same percentage of the overall budget as that provided in the budget request. The conferees request that such distribution be specifically noted in the fiscal year 2001 Operating Plan submission.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $160,890,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $152,000,000 as proposed by the House and $170,890,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that the increase of $3,000,000 above the budget request is for travel expenses that the budget submission proposed to fund from within the RRA and EHR accounts instead of from within salaries and expenses. Accordingly, the conferees direct the NSF to fund employee travel from within salaries and expenses, consistent with existing practice.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Appropriates $6,280,000 for the Office of Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,700,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees continue to expect the OIG to increase efforts in the areas of cost-sharing, indirect costs, and misconduct in scientific research. The conferees further direct the OIG to evaluate the Foundation's management of its growing program responsibilities.

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Appropriates $90,000,000 for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation as proposed by the House instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Includes language proposed by the House allowing $5,000,000 of the total appropriation to be used for a section 8 homeownership program. The Senate did not include a similar provision.

Includes new language making $2,500,000 available for the purpose of endowing a ''George Knight Scholarship Fund.'' The conferees would like to recognize the retirement of George Knight, executive director of Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation since 1990. Mr. Knight has dedicated more than 24 years of service to the Corporation and its predecessor organization, the Urban Reinvestment Task Force. To acknowledge Mr. Knight's dedication to America's communities, the conferees are designating a set-aside of $2,500,000 to establish a scholarship fund in his honor for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institute. This fund will allow hundreds of local leaders, community developers and residents to have access to high-quality training, which will help them acquire the expertise to improve their communities.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriates $24,480,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $23,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Retains language proposed by the Senate providing a one-year exemption from 31 U.S.C. 1341 if the President deems the exemption necessary in the interest of national defense.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Inserts language proposed by the Senate permitting EPA appropriations to be used for comprehensive conservation and management plans.

Retains language proposed by the House amending the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to implement full cost accounting, allow the transfer of administrative funds and allow the transfer of balances from old accounts to new accounts. The Senate deleted the House language, but included language implementing full cost accounting in a new account structure and limiting the transfer of funds. The Senate had also proposed a requirement for notification if program costs increase by 15 percent.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate defining a qualified student loan.

Retains language proposed by the House prohibiting HUD from using funds for any activity in excess of amounts set forth in the budget estimates to the Congress. The Senate included similar language referencing the budget estimates submitted for appropriations, not the Congress.

Deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds to carry out Executive Order 13083.

Inserts language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting the EPA's expenditure of funds to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance fees for fiscal year 2001. This issue is addressed under the Environmental Protection Agency elsewhere in this joint explanatory statement of the managers.

Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate directing the General Services Administration (GSA) to allocate one of its Senior Executive Service positions for Director, Federal Consumer Information Center. The conferees recognize the GSA has already taken action on this issue.

Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate restricting the use of funds for joint NASA—Air Force research programs.

Modifies language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the designation of any area as an ozone nonattainment area. The conferees agree to limit the prohibition until the Supreme Court rules on this issue or June 15, 2001, whichever comes first.

Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for administration of the Communities for Safer Guns Coalition.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the purpose of lobbying or litigating against any Federal entity or official, with certain exceptions.

Inserts language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for any activity or publication or distribution of literature that is designed to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which Congressional action is not complete.

Inserts language encouraging the use of E-Commerce as a cost effective and efficient method of purchasing needed products in a timely, paperless manner from qualified vendors. In addition, the conferees encourage open, non-proprietary, Internet access to conduct E-Commerce as the use of proprietary software in services can diminish the net value of E-Commerce and limit choices by the customer. The conferees note that the use of E-Commerce is in harmony with the goals of the Federal Acquisition and Streamlining Act of 1994 and will enhance government purchasing efficiency.

Retains language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate requiring HUD to provide detailed descriptions of how funds identified for technical assistance, training, or management in the budget justifications will be utilized.

Inserts language amending the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to allow for insurance, indemnification, and liability protection for experimental aerospace vehicle developers through December 31, 2001.

Inserts language extending for two years and modifying NASA employee buyout authority.

TITLE V—FILIPINO VETERANS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENTS

The conference agreement bill includes a new title that provides more equitable veterans benefits for certain Filipino Army veterans who served with the U.S. Armed Forces and under the U.S. Command during World War II. Under current law these veterans are entitled to compensation from the VA but at a lower level than other veterans and medical care only for service-connected conditions. The changes covered by this amendment include equal disability payments and health care services for those covered veterans who live permanently and legally in the United States, and expanded outpatient healthcare at the Manila VA Outpatient Clinic for these covered veterans who live in the Philippines.

During WW II the Philippines was a Commonwealth of the United States and members of the Commonwealth Army and the New Philippine Scouts were called into service with the U.S. Armed Forces at the order of President Roosevelt. The bravery, sacrifice and commitment of these soldiers to the cause of winning the war are legendary. In 1946, Congress provided $200,000,000 to the Philippines to create their own veterans benefit system and passed the Rescissions Act of 1946 which authorized disability pay at a rate for Filipino veterans significantly below that paid to American veterans, except to the Old Philippine Scouts, who to date receive compensation and medical benefits equal to U.S. veterans. The language added by this title restores a portion of these benefits to the small number of these veterans who live in the U.S. The changes include:

Increasing the disability benefits compensation paid to such veterans who live legally and permanently in the United States to full parity with benefits paid to other entitled veterans. Currently these benefits are paid at a 50 percent level. This affects only the level of benefits paid. No new eligibility is established under this section.

Filipino veterans who already receive medical care at VA facilities for service-connected conditions are made eligible for full medical and related care at medical care facilities on the same basis as other U.S. veterans. Currently these veterans are only eligible for care for treatment of service-connected problems.

Veterans living in the Philippines who already receive medical care at a VA facility for service-connected conditions are made eligible for full medical care at the VA outpatient facility in the Philippines.

The conferees believe that recognizing the service of these loyal veterans through enactment of a more equitable benefit structure is long overdue. Because of the advanced age of this small population, enacting legislation has been given special consideration in this conference agreement.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2001 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2000 amount, the 2001 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2001 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	$99,736,845
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority fiscal year 2001	109,783,099
House bill, fiscal year 2001	103,101,836
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	107,507,953
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2001	107,341,317
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	+7,604,472
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	−2,441,782
House bill, fiscal year 2001	+4,239,481
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	−166,636

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Following is explanatory language on H.R. 5482, as introduced on October 18, 2000.

The conferees on H.R. 4635 agree with the matter included in H.R. 5482 and enacted in this conference report by reference and the following description of it. This bill was developed through negotiations by the conferees on the differences in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 4635. References in the following description to the ''conference agreement'' mean the matter included in the introduced bill enacted by this conference report. References to the House bill mean the House passed version of H.R. 4635. References to the Senate bill or Senate reported bill mean the Senate reported version of H.R.

4635, not the Senate passed version of H.R. 4635, unless otherwise stated.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The conference agreement would enact the provisions of H.R. 5483 as introduced on October 18, 2000. The text of that bill follows:

A BILL Making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, restudy of authorized projects, miscellaneous investigations, and, when authorized by laws, surveys and detailed studies and plans and specifications of projects prior to construction, $160,038,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That in conducting the Southwest Valley Flood Damage Reduction Study, Albuquerque, New Mexico, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall include an evaluation of flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage areas, and the amount of runoff: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $750,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue preconstruction engineering and design for the Murrieta Creek, California flood protection and environmental restoration project in accordance with Alternative 6, based on the Murrieta Creek feasibility report and environmental impact statement dated June 2000 at a total cost of $90,866,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $59,063,900 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $31,803,100.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by laws; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction), $1,717,199,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary for the Federal share of construction costs for facilities under the Dredged Material Disposal Facilities program shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, as authorized by Public Law 104–303; and of which such sums as are necessary pursuant to Public Law 99–662 shall be derived from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund, for one-half of the costs of construction and rehabilitation of inland waterways projects, including rehabilitation costs for the Lock and Dam 12, Mississippi River, Iowa; Lock and Dam 24, Mississippi River, Illinois and Missouri; Lock and Dam 3, Mississippi River, Minnesota; and London Locks and Dam, and Kanawha River, West Virginia, projects; and of which funds are provided for the following projects in the amounts specified:

Elba, Alabama, $8,400,000;

Geneva, Alabama, $10,800,000;

San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, $25,000,000;

San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, $5,000,000;

Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, $10,000,000;

Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, $4,000,000;

Clover Fork, Middlesboro, City of Cumberland, Town of Martin, Pike County (including Levisa Fork and Tug Fork Tributaries), Bell County, Martin County, and Harlan County, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, Kentucky, $20,000,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with planning, engineering, design and construction of the Town of Martin, Kentucky, element, in accordance with Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft Detailed Project Report, Appendix T of the General Plan of the Huntington District Commander;

Jackson County, Mississippi, $2,000,000;

Bosque and Leon Rivers, Texas, $4,000,000; and

Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County Tributaries), Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in West Virginia, $4,100,000:

Provided further, That using $900,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to undertake the Bowie County Levee project, which is defined as Alternative B Local Sponsor Option, in the Corps of Engineers document entitled Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas, Project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee, dated April 1997: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended or obligated to begin Phase II of the John Day Drawdown study or to initiate a study of the drawdown of McNary Dam unless authorized by law: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed hereafter to use available Construction, General funds in addition to funding provided in Public Law 104–206 to complete design and construction of the Red River Regional Visitors Center in the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana at an estimated cost of $6,000,000: Provided further, That section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, is amended by striking ''total cost of $8,600,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''total cost of $15,000,000'': Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for additional emergency bank stabilization measures at Galena, Alaska under the same terms and conditions as previous emergency bank stabilization work undertaken at Galena, Alaska pursuant to Section 116 of Public Law 99–190: Provided further, That with $4,200,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina-Ocean Isle Beach portion in accordance with the General Reevaluation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on May 15, 1998: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use not to exceed $300,000 of funds appropriated herein to reimburse the City of Renton, Washington, at full Federal expense, for mitigation expenses incurred for the flood control project constructed pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 701s at Cedar River, City of Renton, Washington, as a result of overdredging by the Army Corps of Engineers: Provided further, That $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for stabilization and renovation of Lock and Dam 10, Kentucky River, Kentucky, subject to enactment of authorization by law: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate construction of a navigation project at Kaumalapau Harbor, Hawaii: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $2,000,000 of the funds provided herein for Dam Safety and Seepage/Stability Correction Program to design and construct seepage control features at Waterbury Dam, Winooski River, Vermont: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to design and construct barge lanes at the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project, immediately adjacent to either side of the Houston Ship Channel, from Bolivar Roads to Morgan Point, to a depth of 12 feet with prior years' Construction, General carry-over funds: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, may use Construction, General funding as directed in Public Law 105–62 and Public Law 105–245 to initiate construction of an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River, except that the funds shall not become available unless the Secretary of the Army determines that an emergency (as defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)) exists with respect to the emergency need for the outlet and reports to Congress that the construction is technically sound, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable, and in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): Provided further, That the economic justification for the emergency outlet shall be prepared in accordance with the principles and guidelines for economic evaluation as required by regulations and procedures of the Army Corps of Engineers for all flood control projects, and that the economic justification be fully described, including the analysis of the benefits and costs, in the project plan documents: Provided further, That the plans for the emergency outlet shall be reviewed and, to be effective, shall contain assurances provided by the Secretary of State, after consultation with the International Joint Commission, that the project will not violate the requirements or intent of the Treaty Between the United States and Great Britain Relating to Boundary Waters Between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington, January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448; TS 548) (commonly known as the ''Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909''): Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army shall submit the final plans and other documents for the emergency outlet to Congress: Provided further, That no funds made available under this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary of the Army to carry out the portion of the feasibility study of the Devils Lake Basin, North Dakota, authorized under the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–377), that addresses the needs of the area for stabilized lake levels through inlet controls, or to otherwise study any facility or carry out any activity that would permit the transfer of water from the Missouri River Basin into Devils Lake: Provided further, That within available funds, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Rio Grand de Manati flood control project at Barceloneta, Puerto Rico, which was initiated under the authority of the Section 205 program prior to being specifically authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

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

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a and 702g–1), $347,731,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to complete his analysis and determination of Federal maintenance of the Greenville Inner Harbor, Mississippi navigation project in accordance with section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, 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; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation, $1,901,959,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662, may be derived from that Fund, and of which such sums as become available from the special account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l), may be derived from that account for construction, operation, and maintenance of outdoor recreation facilities: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, from the funds provided herein for the operation and maintenance of New York Harbor, New York, is directed to prepare the necessary documentation and initiate removal of submerged obstructions and debris in the area previously marked by the Ambrose Light Tower in the interest of safe navigation: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $500,000 of funds appropriated herein to remove and reinstall the docks and causeway, in kind, at Astoria East Boat Basin, Oregon: Provided further, That $500,000 of the funds appropriated herein for the Ohio River Open Channel, Illinois, Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, project, are provided for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to dredge a channel from the mouth of Wheeling Creek to Tunnel Green Park in Wheeling, West Virginia.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for administration of laws pertaining to regulation of navigable waters and wetlands, $125,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use funds appropriated herein to: (1) by March 1, 2001, supplement the report, Cost Analysis For the 1999 Proposal to Issue and Modify Nationwide Permits, to reflect the Nationwide Permits actually issued on March 9, 2000, including changes in the acreage limits, preconstruction notification requirements and general conditions between the rule proposed on July 21, 1999, and the rule promulgated and published in the Federal Register; (2) after consideration of the cost analysis for the 1999 proposal to issue and modify nationwide permits and the supplement prepared pursuant to this Act and by September 30, 2001, prepare, submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register a Permit Processing Management Plan by which the Corps of Engineers will handle the additional work associated with all projected increases in the number of individual permit applications and preconstruction notifications related to the new and replacement permits and general conditions. The Permit Processing Management Plan shall include specific objective goals and criteria by which the Corps of Engineers' progress towards reducing any permit backlog can be measured; (3) beginning on December 31, 2001, and on a biannual basis thereafter, report to Congress and publish in the Federal Register, an analysis of the performance of its program as measured against the criteria set out in the Permit Processing Management Plan; (4) implement a 1-year pilot program to publish quarterly on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Regulatory Program website all Regulatory Analysis and Management Systems (RAMS) data for the South Pacific Division and North Atlantic Division beginning within 30 days of the enactment of this Act; and (5) publish in Division Office websites all findings, rulings, and decisions rendered under the administrative appeals process for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program as established in Public Law 106–60: Provided further, That, through the period ending on September 30, 2003, the Corps of Engineers shall allow any appellant to keep a verbatim record of the proceedings of the appeals conference under the aforementioned administrative appeals process: Provided further, That within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall require all U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Divisions and Districts to record the date on which a section 404 individual permit application or nationwide permit notification is filed with the Corps of Engineers: Provided further, That the Corps of Engineers, when reporting permit processing times, shall track both the date a permit application is first received and the date the application is considered complete, as well as the reason that the application is not considered complete upon first submission.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to clean up contamination from sites throughout the United States resulting from work performed as part of the Nation's early atomic energy program, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities 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, $152,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation provided in title I of this Act shall be available to fund the activities of the Office of the Chief of Engineers or the executive direction and management activities of the division offices: Provided further, That none of these funds shall be available to support an office of congressional affairs within the executive office of the Chief of Engineers.

REVOLVING FUND

Amounts in the Revolving Fund are available 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $5,000); and during the current fiscal year the Revolving Fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed 100 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement with the City of Grand Prairie, Texas, wherein the City agrees to assume all of the responsibilities of the Trinity River Authority of Texas under Contract No. DACW63–76–C–0166, other than financial responsibilities, except as provided for in subsection (c) of this section. The Trinity River Authority shall be relieved of all of its financial responsibilities under the Contract as of the date the Secretary of the Army enters into the agreement with the City.

(b) In consideration of the agreement referred to in subsection (a), the City shall pay the Federal Government a total of $4,290,000 in two installments, one in the amount of $2,150,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2000, and one in the amount of $2,140,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2003.

(c) The agreement executed pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a provision requiring the City to assume all costs associated with operation and maintenance of the recreation facilities included in the Contract referred to in that subsection.

SEC. 102. Agreements proposed for execution by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works or the United States Army Corps of Engineers after the date of the enactment of this Act pursuant to section 4 of the Rivers and Harbor Act of 1915, Public Law 64–291; section 11 of the River and Harbor Act of 1925, Public Law 68–585; the Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1936, Public Law 75–208; section 215 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, as amended, Public Law 90–483; sections 104, 203, and 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended (Public Law 99–662); section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992, as amended, Public Law 102–580; section 211 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996, Public Law 104–303, and any other specific project authority, shall be limited to credits and reimbursements per project not to exceed $10,000,000 in each fiscal year, and total credits and reimbursements for all applicable projects not to exceed $50,000,000 in each fiscal year.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct the locally preferred plan for flood control, environmental restoration and recreation, Murrieta Creek, California, described as Alternative 6, based on the Murrieta Creek Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement dated October 2000, at a total cost of $89,850,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $57,735,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,115,000.

SEC. 104. ST. GEORGES BRIDGE, DELAWARE.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any activity relating to closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Delaware, including a hearing or any other activity relating to preparation of an environmental impact statement concerning the closure or removal.

SEC. 105. Within available funds under title I, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall provide up to $7,000,000 to replace and upgrade the dam in Kake, Alaska which collapsed July 2000, to provide drinking water and hydroelectricity.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Central Utah Project Completion Act, $38,724,000, to remain available until expended, of which $19,158,000 shall be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account: Provided, That of the amounts deposited into that account, $5,000,000 shall be considered the Federal contribution authorized by paragraph 402(b)(2) of the Central Utah Project Completion Act and $14,158,000 shall be available to the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission to carry out activities authorized under that Act.

In addition, for necessary expenses incurred in carrying out related responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior, $1,216,000, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The following appropriations shall be expended to execute authorized functions of the Bureau of Reclamation:

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For management, development, and restoration of water and related natural resources and for related activities, including the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of reclamation and other facilities, participation in fulfilling related Federal responsibilities to Native Americans, and related grants to, and cooperative and other agreements with, State and local governments, Indian tribes, and others, $678,450,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,916,000 shall be available for transfer to the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund and $39,467,000 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; of which $16,000,000 shall be for on-reservation water development, feasibility studies, and related administrative costs under Public Law 106–163; of which not more than 25 percent of the amount provided for drought emergency assistance may be used for financial assistance for the preparation of cooperative drought contingency plans under title II of Public Law 102–250; and of which not more than $500,000 is for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706: Provided, That such transfers may be increased or decreased within the overall appropriation under this heading: Provided further, That of the total appropriated, the amount for program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund or the Bureau of Reclamation special fee account established by 16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i) shall be derived from that Fund or account: Provided further, That funds contributed under 43 U.S.C. 395 are available until expended for the purposes for which contributed: Provided further, That funds advanced under 43 U.S.C. 397a shall be credited to this account and are available until expended for the same purposes as the sums appropriated under this heading: Provided further, That funds available for expenditure for the Departmental Irrigation Drainage Program may be expended by the Bureau of Reclamation for site remediation on a non-reimbursable basis: Provided further, That section 301 of Public Law 102–250, Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991, as amended, is amended further by inserting ''2000, and 2001'' in lieu of ''and 2000'': Provided further, That the amount authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features by section 10 of Public Law 89–108, as amended by section 8 of Public Law 99–294, section 1701(b) of Public Law 102–575, Public Law 105–245, and Public Law 106–60 is increased by $2,000,000 (October 1998 prices): Provided further, That the amount authorized for Minidoka Project North Side Pumping Division, Idaho, by Section 5 of Public Law 81–864, is increased by $2,805,000: Provided further, That the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 509) is amended as follows: (1) by inserting in Section 4(c) after ''1984,'' and before ''costs'' the following: ''and the additional $95,000,000 further authorized to be appropriated by amendments to that Act in 2000,''; (2) by inserting in section 5 after ''levels),'' and before ''plus'' the following: ''and, effective October 1, 2000, not to exceed an additional $95,000,000 (October 1, 2000, price levels),''; and (3) by striking ''sixty days (which'' and all that follows through ''day certain)'' and inserting ''30 calendar days''.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and/or grants, $8,944,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Small Reclamation Projects Act of August 6, 1956, as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a–422l): Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $27,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the program for direct loans and/or grants, $425,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the total sums appropriated, the amount of program activities that can be financed by the Reclamation Fund shall be derived from that Fund.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

For carrying out the programs, projects, plans, and habitat restoration, improvement, and acquisition provisions of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, $38,382,000, to be derived from such sums as may be collected in the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund pursuant to sections 3407(d), 3404(c)(3), 3405(f), and 3406(c)(1) of Public Law 102–575, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to assess and collect the full amount of the additional mitigation and restoration payments authorized by section 3407(d) of Public Law 102–575.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of policy, administration, and related functions in the office of the Commissioner, the Denver office, and offices in the five regions of the Bureau of Reclamation, to remain available until expended, $50,224,000, to be derived from the Reclamation Fund and be nonreimbursable as provided in 43 U.S.C. 377: Provided, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted as policy and administration expenses.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to purchase or lease water in the Middle Rio Grande or the Carlsbad Projects in New Mexico unless said purchase or lease is in compliance with the purchase requirements of section 202 of Public Law 106–60.

SEC. 202. Funds under this title for Drought Emergency Assistance shall be made available primarily for leasing of water for specified drought related purposes from willing lessors, in compliance with existing State laws and administered under State water priority allocation. Such leases may be entered into with an option to purchase: Provided, That such purchase is approved by the State in which the purchase takes place and the purchase does not cause economic harm within the State in which the purchase is made.

SEC. 203. Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall assess and collect annually from Central Valley Project (CVP) water and power contractors the sum of $540,000 (June 2000 price levels) and remit, without further appropriation, the amount collected annually to the Trinity Public Utilities District (TPUD). This assessment shall be payable 70 percent by CVP Preference Power Customers and 30 percent by CVP Water Contractors. The CVP Water Contractor share of this assessment shall be collected by the Secretary through established Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Operation and Maintenance ratesetting practices. The CVP Power Contractor share of this assessment shall be assessed by Reclamation to the Western Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region (Western), and collected by Western through established power ratesetting practices.

SEC. 204. (a) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall continue funding, from power revenues, the activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program as authorized by section 1807 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672), at not more than $7,850,000 (October 2000 price level), adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(b) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS.—Nothing in this section precludes the use of voluntary financial contributions (except power revenues) to the Adaptive Management Program that may be authorized by law.

(c) ACTIVITIES TO BE FUNDED.—The activities to be funded as provided under subsection (a) include activities required to meet the requirements of section 1802(a) and subsections (a) and (b) of section 1805 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672), including the requirements of the Biological Opinion on the Operation of Glen Canyon Dam and activities required by the Programmatic Agreement on Cultural and Historic Properties, to the extent that the requirements and activities are consistent with the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4672).

(d) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—To the extent that funding under subsection (a) is insufficient to pay the costs of the monitoring and research and other activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program, the Secretary of the Interior may use funding from other sources, including funds appropriated for that purpose. All such appropriated funds shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 205. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to use not to exceed $1,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title II to refund amounts received by the United States as payments for charges assessed by the Secretary prior to January 1, 1994 for failure to file certain certification or reporting forms prior to the receipt of irrigation water, pursuant to sections 206 and 224(c) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (96 Stat. 1226, 1272; 43 U.S.C. 390ff, 390ww(c)), including the amount of associated interest assessed by the Secretary and paid to the United States pursuant to section 224(i) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (101 Stat. 1330–268; 43 U.S.C. 390ww(i)).

SEC. 206. CANYON FERRY RESERVOIR, MONTANA. (a) APPRAISALS.—Section 1004(c)(2)(B) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–713; 113 Stat. 1501A–307) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''be based on'' and inserting ''use'';

(2) in clause (vi), by striking ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law,'' and inserting ''To the extent consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) APPLICABILITY.—This subparagraph shall apply to the extent that its application is practicable and consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition.''.

(b) TIMING.—Section 1004(f)(2) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–714; 113 Stat. 1501A–308) is amended by inserting after ''Act,'' the following: ''in accordance with all applicable law,''.

(c) INTEREST.—Section 1008(b) of title X of division C of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2681–717; 113 Stat. 1501A–310) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 207. Beginning in fiscal year 2000 and thereafter, any amounts provided for the Newlands Water Rights Fund for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Newlands Reclamation Project shall be non-reimbursable.

SEC. 208. USE OF COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT FACILITIES FOR NONPROJECT WATER.—The Secretary of the Interior may enter into contracts with the city of Loveland, Colorado, or its Water and Power Department or any other agency, public utility, or enterprise of the city, providing for the use of facilities of the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Colorado, under the Act of February 21, 1911 (43 U.S.C. 523), for—

(1) the impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water originating on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; and

(2) the exchange of water originating on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains for the purposes specified in paragraph (1), using facilities associated with the Colorado-Big Thompson Project, Colorado.

SEC. 209. AMENDMENT TO IRRIGATION PROJECT CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT OF 1998.—(a) Section 2(a) of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998, Public Law 105–293, is amended by striking the date ''December 31, 2000'', and inserting in lieu thereof the date ''December 31, 2003''; and

(b) Subsection 2(b) of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998, Public Law 105–293, is amended by—

(1) striking the phrase ''not to go beyond December 31, 2001'', and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase ''not to go beyond December 31, 2003''; and

(2) striking the phrase ''terminates prior to December 31, 2000'', and inserting in lieu thereof ''terminates prior to December 31, 2003''.

SEC. 210. Section 202 of division B, title I, chapter 2 of Public Law 106–246 is amended by adding at the end the following: ''This section shall be effective through September 30, 2001.''.

SEC. 211. (a) Section 106 of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 100–675; 102 Stat. 4000 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) REQUIREMENTS TO FURNISH WATER, POWER CAPACITY, AND ENERGY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to fulfill the trust responsibility to the Bands, the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall permanently furnish annually the following:

''(1) WATER.—16,000 acre-feet of the water conserved by the works authorized by title II, for the benefit of the Bands and the local entities in accordance with the settlement agreement: Provided, That during construction of said works, the Indian Water Authority and the local entities shall receive 17 percent of any water conserved by said works up to a maximum of 16,000 acre-feet per year. The Indian Water Authority and the local entities shall pay their proportionate share of such costs as are provided by section 203(b) of title II or are agreed to by them.

''(2) POWER CAPACITY AND ENERGY.—Beginning on the date when conserved water from the works authorized by title II first becomes available, power capacity and energy through the Yuma Arizona Area Aggregate Power Managers (Yuma Area Contractors), at no cost and at no further expense to the United States, the Indian Water Authority, the Bands, and the local entities, in amounts sufficient to convey the water conserved pursuant to paragraph (1) from Lake Havasu through the Colorado River Aqueduct and to the places of use on the Bands' reservations or in the local entities' service areas in accordance with the settlement agreement. The Secretary, through a coterminous exhibit to Bureau of Reclamation Contract No. 6–CU–30–P1136, shall enter into an agreement with the Yuma Area Contractors which shall provide for furnishing annually and permanently said power capacity and energy by said Yuma Area Contractors at no cost and at no further expense to the United States, the Indian Water Authority, the Bands, and the local entities. The Secretary shall authorize the Yuma Area Contractors to utilize Federal project use power provided in Bureau of Reclamation Contracts numbered 6–CU–30–P1136, 6–CU–30–P1137, and 6–CU–30–P1138 for the full range of purposes served by the Yuma Area Contractors, including the purpose of supplying the power capacity and energy to convey the conserved water referred to in paragraph (1), for so long as the Yuma Area Contractors meet their obligation to provide sufficient power capacity and energy for the conveyance of said conserved water. If for any reason the Yuma Area Contractors do not provide said power capacity and energy for the conveyance of said conserved water, then the Secretary shall furnish said power capacity and energy annually and permanently at the lowest rate assigned to project use power within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation in accordance with Exhibit E 'Project Use Power' of the Agreement between Water and Power Resources Service, Department of the Interior, and Western Area Power Administration, Department of Energy (March 26, 1980).''.

(b) Title II of the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Public Law 100–675; 102 Stat. 4000 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 210. ANNUAL REPAYMENT INSTALLMENTS.

''During the period of planning, design, and construction of the works and during the period that the Indian Water Authority and the local entities receive up to 16,000 acre-feet of the water conserved by the works, the annual repayment installments provided in section 102(b) of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act (Public Law 93–320; 88 Stat. 268) shall continue to be non-reimbursable. Nothing in this section shall affect the national obligation set forth in section 101(c) of such Act.''.

SEC. 212. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this section, the term—

(1) ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior;

(2) ''Sly Park Unit'' means the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir, Camp Creek Diversion Dam and Tunnel, and conduits and canals as authorized under the American River Act of October 14, 1949 (63 Stat. 853), including those used to convey, treat, and store water delivered from Sly Park, as well as all recreation facilities thereto; and

(3) ''District'' means the El Dorado Irrigation District.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after date of the enactment of this Act and in accordance with all applicable law, transfer all right, title, and interest in and to the Sly Park Unit to the District.

(c) SALE PRICE.—The Secretary is authorized to receive from the District $2,000,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish the debt under contract number 14–06–200–949IR3, and $9,500,000 to relieve payment obligations and extinguish all debts associated with contracts numbered 14–06–200–7734, as amended by contracts numbered 14–06–200–4282A and 14–06–200–8536A. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the District shall continue to make payments required by section 3407(c) of Public Law 102–575 through year 2029.

(d) CREDIT REVENUE TO PROJECT REPAYMENT.—Upon payment authorized under subsection (b), the amount paid shall be credited toward repayment of capital costs of the Central Valley Project in an amount equal to the associated undiscounted obligation.

(e) FUTURE BENEFITS.—Upon payment, the Sly Park Unit shall no longer be a Federal reclamation project or a unit of the Central Valley Project, and the District shall not be entitled to receive any further reclamation benefits.

(f) LIABILITY.—Except as otherwise provided by law, effective on the date of conveyance of the Sly Park Unit under this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence based on its prior ownership or operation of the conveyed property.

(g) COSTS.—All costs, including interest charges, associated with the Project that have been included as a reimbursable cost of the Central Valley Project are declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY PROGRAMS

ENERGY SUPPLY

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for energy supply, and uranium supply and enrichment activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of not to exceed 17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $660,574,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That, in addition, 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 to be available until September 30, 2002, for the purposes of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology activities.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for non-defense environmental management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction or expansion, $277,812,000, to remain available until expended.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to maintain, decontaminate, decommission, and otherwise remediate uranium processing facilities, $393,367,000, of which $345,038,000 shall be derived from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund, all of which shall remain available until expended: Provided, That $72,000,000 of amounts derived from the Fund for such expenses shall be available in accordance with title X, subtitle A, of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

SCIENCE

For Department of Energy expenses including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, and other expenses necessary for science activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and purchase of not to exceed 58 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $3,186,352,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as

amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $191,074,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: Provided, That not to exceed $2,500,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada solely for expenditures, other than salaries and expenses of State employees, to conduct scientific oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97–425, as amended: Provided further, That $6,000,000 shall be provided to affected units of local governments, as defined in Public Law 97–425, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided further, That the distribution of the funds as determined by the units of local government shall be approved by the Department of Energy: Provided further, That the funds for the State of Nevada shall be made available solely to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management by direct payment and units of local government by direct payment: Provided further, That within 90 days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, the Nevada Division of Emergency Management and the Governor of the State of Nevada and each local entity shall provide certification to the Department of Energy that all funds expended from such payments have been expended for activities authorized by Public Law 97–425 and this Act. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be: (1) used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legislature or for lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913; (2) used for litigation expenses; or (3) used to support multi-State efforts or other coalition building activities inconsistent with the restrictions contained in this Act: Provided further, That all proceeds and recoveries by the Secretary in carrying out activities authorized by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 in Public Law 97–425, as amended, including but not limited to, any proceeds from the sale of assets, shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $35,000), $226,107,000, to remain available until expended, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): Provided, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total $151,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95–238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $75,107,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $31,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles (not to exceed 12 for replacement only), $5,015,186,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That, $130,000,000 shall be immediately available for Project 96–D–111, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory: Provided further, That $69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to the Congress after March 31, 2001, that: (a) includes a recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project; (b) certifies all established project and scientific milestones have been met on schedule and on cost; (c) certifies the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and cost; (d) includes a study of requirements for and alternatives to a 192 beam ignition facility for maintaining the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile; (e) certifies an integrated cost-schedule earned-value project control system has been fully implemented; and (f) includes a 5-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $874,196,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $7,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses for national security and nonproliferation (including transparency) activities in fiscal year 2001.

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, $690,163,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $5,000), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental restoration and waste management activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; and the purchase of 30 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $4,974,476,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

For expenses of the Department of Energy to accelerate the closure of defense environmental management sites, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other necessary expenses, $1,082,714,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

For Department of Energy expenses for privatization projects necessary for atomic energy defense environmental management activities authorized by the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), $65,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, $585,755,000, to remain available until expended, of which $17,000,000 shall be for the Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative upon enactment of authorization legislation into law.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97–425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93–454, are approved for the Nez Perce Tribe Resident Fish Substitution Program, the Cour D'Alene Tribe Trout Production facility, and for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500.

During fiscal year 2001, no new direct loan obligations may be made. Section 511 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–206), is amended by striking the last sentence and inserting ''This authority shall expire January 1, 2003.''.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $3,900,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, amounts collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $34,463,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $26,463,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $20,000,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $15,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, and for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an

amount not to exceed $1,500 in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $28,100,000, to remain available until expended; in addition, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302, not to exceed $4,200,000 in reimbursements, to remain available until expended: Provided, That amounts collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $288,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $288,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $288,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $288,000.

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

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed $1,500, $165,830,000, to remain available until expended, of which $154,616,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, $5,950,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: Provided further, That amounts collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures as follows: for fiscal year 2001, up to $65,224,000; for fiscal year 2002, up to $33,500,000; for fiscal year 2003, up to $30,000,000; and for fiscal year 2004, up to $20,000,000.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, $2,670,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 423 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses (not to exceed $3,000), $175,200,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $175,200,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $0.

RESCISSIONS

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 104–46 for interim storage of nuclear waste, $75,000,000 are transferred to this heading and are hereby rescinded.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated in Public Law 106–60 and prior Energy and Water Development Acts for the Tank Waste Remediation System at Richland, Washington, $97,000,000 of unexpended balances of prior appropriations are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. (a) None of the funds appropriated by 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. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) At least 60 days before a contract award, amendment, or modification for which the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth the reasons for the waiver.

SEC. 302. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to—

(1) develop or implement a workforce restructuring plan that covers employees of the Department of Energy; or

(2) provide enhanced severance payments or other benefits for employees of the Department of Energy,

under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h).

SEC. 303. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation by this Act for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants under section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2644; 42 U.S.C. 7274h) unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to prepare or initiate Requests For Proposals (RFPs) for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

(TRANSFERS OF UNEXPENDED BALANCES)

SEC. 305. 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.

SEC. 306. Of the funds in this Act provided to government-owned, contractor-operated laboratories, not to exceed 6 percent shall be available to be used for Laboratory Directed Research and Development.

SEC. 307. (a) Of the funds appropriated by this title to the Department of Energy, not more than $185,000,000 shall be available for reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses, of which $10,000,000 is available for use by the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy for emergency travel expenses.

(b) Funds appropriated by this title to the Department of Energy may be used to reimburse a Department of Energy management and operating contractor for travel costs of its employees under the contract only to the extent that the contractor applies to its employees the same rates and amounts as those that apply to Federal employees under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, or rates and amounts established by the Secretary of Energy. The Secretary of Energy may provide exceptions to the reimbursement requirements of this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses within the Laboratory Directed Research and Development program.

SEC. 308. No funds are provided in this Act or any other Act for the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory, with the exception of services provided internationally, including services provided on a reimbursable basis, unless the Administrator certifies that such services are not available from private sector businesses.

SEC. 309. None of the funds in this Act may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant which contains concentrations of plutonium in excess of 20 percent by weight for the aggregate of any material category on the date of enactment of this Act, or is generated after such date. For the purposes of this section, the material categories of transuranic waste at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site include: (1) ash residues; (2) salt residues; (3) wet residues; (4) direct repackage residues; and (5) scrub alloy as referenced in the ''Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site''.

SEC. 310. The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration may authorize the plant manager of a covered nuclear weapons production plant to engage in research, development, and demonstration activities with respect to the engineering and manufacturing capabilities at such plant in order to maintain and enhance such capabilities at such plant: Provided, That of the amount allocated to a covered nuclear weapons production plant each fiscal year from amounts available to the Department of Energy for such fiscal year for national security programs, not more than an amount equal to 2 percent of such amount may be used for these activities: Provided further, That for purposes of this section, the term ''covered nuclear weapons production plant'' means the following:

(1) The Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri.

(2) The Y–12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

(3) The Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas.

(4) The Savannah River Plant, South Carolina.

SEC. 311. Notwithstanding any other law, and without fiscal year limitation, each Federal Power Marketing Administration is authorized to engage in activities and solicit, undertake and review studies and proposals relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

SEC. 312. Not more than $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal in Public Law 104–46, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996, may be made available to the Department of Energy upon written certification by the Secretary of Energy to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the Site Recommendation Report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

SEC. 313. TERM OF OFFICE OF PERSON FIRST APPOINTED AS UNDER SECRETARY FOR NUCLEAR SECURITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY. (a) LENGTH OF TERM.—The term of office as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy of the first person appointed to that position shall be 3 years.

(b) EXCLUSIVE REASONS FOR REMOVAL.—The exclusive reasons for removal from office as

Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the person described in subsection (a) shall be inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(c) POSITION DESCRIBED.—The position of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy referred to in this section is the position established by subsection (c) of section 202 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7132), as added by section 3202 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 954).

SEC. 314. SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO MODIFY ORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION. (a) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—Subtitle A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 957; 50 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 3219. SCOPE OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO MODIFY ORGANIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION.

''Notwithstanding the authority granted by section 643 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7253) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy may not establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component, or transfer any function, of the Administration, except as authorized by subsection (b) or (c) of section 3291.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 643 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7253) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''(a) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) The authority of the Secretary to establish, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component of the National Nuclear Security Administration is governed by the provisions of section 3219 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65).''.

SEC. 315. PROHIBITION ON PAY OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN CONCURRENT SERVICE OR DUTIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.—Subtitle C of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65; 50 U.S.C. 2441 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 3245. PROHIBITION ON PAY OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN CONCURRENT SERVICE OR DUTIES INSIDE AND OUTSIDE ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, no funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Energy may be obligated or utilized to pay the basic pay of an officer or employee of the Department of Energy who—

''(1) serves concurrently in a position in the Administration and a position outside the Administration; or

''(2) performs concurrently the duties of a position in the Administration and the duties of a position outside the Administration.

''(b) The provision of this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this section.''.

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $66,400,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100–456, section 1441, $18,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to establish the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including official representation expenses (not to exceed $15,000), $481,900,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount appropriated herein, $21,600,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: Provided further, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $447,958,000 in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That $3,200,000 of the funds herein appropriated for regulatory reviews and assistance to other Federal agencies and States shall be excluded from license fee revenues, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 2214: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation estimated at not more than $33,942,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $5,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at $5,390,000 in fiscal year 2001 shall be retained and be available until expended, for necessary salaries and expenses in this account notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2001 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2001 appropriation estimated at not more than $110,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100–203, section 5051, $2,900,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and to remain available until expended.

TITLE V

FISCAL YEAR 2001 EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to remediate damaged Department of Energy facilities and for other expenses associated with the Cerro Grande fire, $203,460,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be made available to the United States Army Corps of Engineers to undertake immediate measures to provide erosion control and sediment protection to sewage lines, trails, and bridges in Pueblo and Los Alamos Canyons downstream of Diamond Drive in New Mexico: Provided, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $203,460,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: Provided further, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, $11,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for $11,000,000, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. 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.

SEC. 602. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 603. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit until development by the Secretary of the Interior and the State of California of a plan, which shall conform to the water quality standards of the State of California as approved by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to minimize any detrimental effect of the San Luis drainage waters.

(b) The costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the costs of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified by the Secretary of the Interior as reimbursable or nonreimbursable and collected until fully repaid pursuant to the ''Cleanup Program—Alternative Repayment Plan'' and the

''SJVDP—Alternative Repayment Plan'' described in the report entitled ''Repayment Report, Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program, February 1995'', prepared by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. Any future obligations of funds by the United States relating to, or providing for, drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries of such service or studies pursuant to Federal Reclamation law.

SEC. 604. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol.

SEC. 605. FUNDING OF THE COASTAL WETLANDS PLANNING, PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT. Section 4(a) of the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777c(a)), is amended in the second sentence by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2009''.

SEC. 606. REDESIGNATION OF INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION AND DISTRICT. (a) INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The district known as the ''Interstate Sanitation Commission'', established by article III of the Tri-State Compact described in the Resolution entitled, ''A Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to enter into a compact for the creation of the Interstate Sanitation District and the establishment of the Interstate Sanitation Commission'', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 933), is redesignated as the ''Interstate Environmental Commission''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Interstate Sanitation Commission shall be deemed to be a reference to the Interstate Environmental Commission.

(b) INTERSTATE SANITATION DISTRICT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The district known as the ''Interstate Sanitation District'', established by article II of the Tri-State Compact described in the Resolution entitled, ''A Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to enter into a compact for the creation of the Interstate Sanitation District and the establishment of the Interstate Sanitation Commission'', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 932), is redesignated as the ''Interstate Environmental District''.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Interstate Sanitation District shall be deemed to be a reference to the Interstate Environmental District.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

For deposit of an additional amount for fiscal year 2001 into the account established under section 3113(d) of title 31, United States Code, to reduce the public debt, $5,000,000,000.

TITLE VIII

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Section 6101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''September 30, 1999'' and inserting ''September 20, 2005''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''or certificate holder'' after ''licensee''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF CHARGES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The aggregate amount of the annual charges collected from all licensees and certificate holders in a fiscal year shall equal an amount that approximates the percentages of the budget authority of the Commission for the fiscal year stated in subparagraph (B), less—

''(i) amounts collected under subsection (b) during the fiscal year; and

''(ii) amounts appropriated to the Commission from the Nuclear Waste Fund for the fiscal year.

''(B) PERCENTAGES.—The percentages referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

''(i) 98 percent for fiscal year 2001;

''(ii) 96 percent for fiscal year 2002;

''(iii) 94 percent for fiscal year 2003;

''(iv) 92 percent for fiscal year 2004; and

''(v) 90 percent for fiscal year 2005.''.

This Act may be cited as the ''Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001''.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Following is explanatory language on H.R. 5483, as introduced on October 18, 2000.

The conferees on H.R. 4635 agree with the matter included in H.R. 5483 and enacted in this conference report by reference and the following description of it. This bill was developed through negotiations by subcommittee members of the Energy and Water Development Subcommittees of the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 4733, a bill that was vetoed. That vetoed bill has been modified and is included in this conference report. References in the following description to the ''conference agreement'' mean the matter included in the introduced bill enacted by this conference report. References to the House bill mean the House passed version of H.R. 4733. References to the Senate bill mean the Senate passed version of H.R. 4733, not the Senate passed version of H.R. 4635, unless otherwise stated.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 106–693 and Senate Report 106–395 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not contradicted by the report of the Senate or the statement of the managers, and Senate report language which is not contradicted by the report of the House or the statement of the managers is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases where both the House report and Senate report address a particular issue not specifically addressed in the conference report or joint statement of managers, the conferees have determined that the House and Senate reports are not inconsistent and are to be interpreted accordingly. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Senate amendment: The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference are discussed below.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

The conference agreement appropriates $160,038,000 for General Investigations instead of $153,327,000 as proposed by the House and $139,219,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Within available funds, $50,000 is provided for erosion control studies in the Harding Lake watershed in Alaska. The conference agreement deletes the bill language proposed by the Senate for this project.

The conference agreement does not include funds proposed by the House in this account for the Hamilton Airfield Wetlands Restoration project in California and the Ohio River Greenway project in Indiana. Funding for these projects is included in the Construction, General account. The conference agreement does not include funds in this account for the White River, Muncie, Indiana, project. Funding for this project has been included within the amount provided for the Section 1135 program.

The conference agreement includes $150,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake studies of potential navigational improvements, shoreline protection, and breakwater protection at the ports of Rota and Tinian in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The conferees have provided $200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete a comprehensive water management reconnaissance study for ecosystem restoration and related purposes in the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair watersheds in Michigan pursuant to section 426 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Within the amount provided for Research and Development, $200,000 is provided for a topographic/bathymetric mapping project for Coastal Louisiana in cooperation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration at the interagency Federal laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana. The conference agreement does not include bill language proposed by the Senate for this work. The conferees also urge the Corps of Engineers to use available Research and Development funds for a review of innovative dredging technologies for potential implementation in the Peoria Lakes, Illinois, area.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate 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 the feasibility analysis based on policies regarding the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.

The conferees have agreed to include language in the bill which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $750,000 to continue preconstruction engineering and design of the Murrieta Creek, California, flood control project in accordance with Alternative 6, as identified in the Murrieta Creek Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement dated June 2000.

The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate providing funds for the John Glenn Great Lakes Basin Program, the Detroit River, Michigan, project, and the Niobrara River and Missouri River, South Dakota, project. Funds for these projects have been included in the overall amount provided for General Investigations.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate providing funds for the selection of a permanent disposal site for environmentally sound dredged material from navigation projects in the

State of Rhode Island. Funds for this work have been provided within the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General.

Within the amount provided for Flood Plain Management Services, the conference agreement includes $250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake a study of drainage problems in the Winchester, Kentucky, area. In addition, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers to complete a report on flood control problems on Negro Creek at Sprague, Washington.

Within the amount provided for Planning Assistance to States, the conference agreement includes $100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to update the daily flow model for the Delaware River Basin.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates $1,717,199,000 for Construction, General instead of $1,378,430,000 as proposed by the House and $1,361,449,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount recommended by the conferees for the Corps of Engineers construction program represents a significant increase over the budget request and the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000. However, the conferees note that the budget request grossly underfunds many ongoing construction projects, and its enactment would result in increased project costs, major delays in the completion of projects and loss of project benefits. The conferees also note that the Corps of Engineers, through the use of unobligated balances, expects its fiscal year 2000 construction expenditures to be approximately $1,600,000,000.

The conferees note that the Lake Worth Inlet, Florida, sand transfer plant project is behind schedule and expect the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project as expeditiously as possible.

Within the amount provided for the West Virginia and Pennsylvania Flood Control Project, $1,000,000 is provided for the following projects within the State of Pennsylvania: Bloody Run/Everett Borough ($25,000); Shoups Run/Carbon Township ($150,500); Six Mile Run/Coaldale ($125,000); Black Log Creek/Boroughs of Orbisonia and Rockhill Furnace ($127,000); Newton Hamilton Borough ($465,500); and Coal Bank Run/Coalmont Borough ($107,000).

The conference agreement includes $150,000 for the Southeastern Pennsylvania project for the Corps of Engineers to prepare a decision document to determine the Federal interest in and the scope of the problems in the Logan and Feltonville sections of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to use $500,000 to initiate the Hillsboro Inlet, Florida, project in accordance with the Jacksonville District's General Reevaluation Report for the project dated May 2000.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake water related infrastructure projects in northeastern Pennsylvania as authorized by section 502(f)(11) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake water related infrastructure projects in Avis Borough and Renovo Borough, Clinton County, Pennsylvania.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for sanitary sewer and water and wastewater infrastructure projects in Towanencin Township, Pennsylvania, as authorized by section 502(f)(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; $3,000,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the city of St. Louis, Missouri, as authorized by section 502(f)(32) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; and $300,000 for water related infrastructure projects in Lake and Porter Counties, Indiana, as authorized by section 502(f)(12) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. In addition, the conference agreement includes $2,500,000 to carry out environmental infrastructure projects in northeastern Minnesota as authorized by section 569 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes $25,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to design, construct, and operate water quality projects in the San Gabriel Basin of California; and $4,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Brazos River Authority, to participate in investigations and projects in the Bosque and Leon Watersheds in Texas to assess the impact of the perchlorate associated with the former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant at McGregor, Texas.

The conference agreement includes $300,000 for the Corps of Engineers to continue the environmental restoration pilot project at Dog River, Alabama.

The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 for a project to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the City of Lebanon, New Hampshire, as authorized by section 502(f)(37) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; $1,500,000 for environmental infrastructure projects in Ohio authorized in section 594 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999; and $3,000,000 for environmental infrastructure projects in central New Mexico authorized in section 593 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The conference agreement includes a total of $37,100,000 for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project. In addition to the amounts included in the budget request, the conference agreement includes: $4,000,000 for the Clover Fork, Kentucky, element of the project; $4,800,000 for the Middlesboro, Kentucky, element of the project; $1,000,000 for the City of Cumberland, 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 the initiation of 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; $700,000 to continue the detailed project report for the Dickenson County, Virginia, element of the project; $1,500,000 for the Upper Mingo County, West Virginia, element of the project; $1,600,000 for the Kermit, Lower Mingo County (Kermit), West Virginia, element of the project; $400,000 for the Wayne County, West Virginia, element of the project; and $600,000 for the McDowell County, West Virginia, element of the project.

The conference agreement includes $7,000,000 for the Dam Safety and Seepage Stability Correction Program. Of the amount provided, $1,000,000 is for repairs to the Mississinewa Lake, Indiana, project, and up to $2,000,000 is for the Waterbury Dam, Vermont, project.

Within the funds provided for the Missouri River Levee System project, $227,000 is provided for the Unit L15 levee, the same as the budget request. With these funds, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to complete engineering and design, negotiate a Project Cooperation Agreement, and initiate construction of the project.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Rural Nevada project authorized by section 595 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999. Of the amount provided, $1,500,000 is for the Lawton-Verdi, Nevada, sewer inceptor project; $1,000,000 is for the Mesquite, Nevada, project; and $1,500,000 for the Silver Springs, Nevada, sanitary sewer project.

The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to undertake the projects listed in the House and Senate reports and the projects described below for the various continuing authorities programs. The recommended funding levels for those programs are as follows: Section 206—$19,000,000; Section 204—$4,000,000; Section 14—$9,000,000; Section 205—$35,000,000; Section 111—$300,000; Section 107—$11,000,000; Section 1135—$21,000,000; Section 103—$2,500,000; and Section 208—$600,000. The conferees are aware that there are funding requirements for ongoing continuing authorities projects that may not be accommodated within the funds provided for each program. It is not the conferees' intent that ongoing projects be terminated. If additional funds are needed during the year to keep ongoing work in any program on schedule, the conferees urge the Corps of Engineers to reprogram funds into the program within available funds.

Of the amount provided for the Section 14 program, $580,000 is to initiate and complete the planning and design analysis phase, execute a project cooperation agreement, and initiate and complete construction for the Rouge River, Southfield, Michigan, project.

Of the amount provided for the Section 111 program, $300,000 is to prepare a shoreline stabilization study and plans and specifications, and award a construction contract for the Virginia Key, Florida, project.

Of the amount provided for the Section 205 program, $100,000 is to undertake the Columbus, New Mexico, project; and $200,000 is to undertake the Battle Mountain, Nevada, project. The conference agreement deletes the bill language proposed by the Senate for the Hay Creek project. In addition, for the McKeel Brook, Dover and Rockaway Townships, New Jersey, project, the funds provided are to be used to complete plans and specifications and initiate construction of the Morris County plan.

Of the amount provided for the Section 1135 program, $100,000 is to initiate the upland environmental restoration study for the Virginia Key, Florida, project; $300,000 is to prepare an environmental restoration report and prepare a project cooperation agreement for the White River, Muncie, Indiana, project; $250,000 is to initiate and complete a preliminary restoration plan and a feasibility report for the Sand Creek, Newton, Kansas, project; and $200,000 is to initiate the ecosystem restoration report for the Lake Champlain Watershed, Vermont, project. In addition, the Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the most cost effective solution to the water quality degradation and related environmental and public impacts associated with the western jetty at the mouth of the Genessee River at Rochester, New York.

Of the amount provided for the Section 107 program, $810,000 is for construction of the Pemiscot Harbor, Missouri, project; $3,000,000 is for construction of the Ouzinkie Harbor, Alaska, project; and $500,000 is to initiate construction of the South Basin Inner Harbor, Buffalo, New York, project.

The amount provided for the Section 206 program does not include funds for the Upper Truckee River project. Funds for this project are included in the Bureau of Reclamation's Wetlands Development Program. The amount provided for the Section 206 program includes $500,000 for the Hay Creek, Roseau County, Minnesota, project. The conference agreement deletes the bill language proposed by the Senate for the Hay Creek project.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the Aquatic Plant Control program. Within the amount provided, $400,000 is for aquatic weed control in Lake Champlain, Vermont, $250,000 is for aquatic plant control within the State of South Carolina, and $100,000 is for the control and tracking of aquatic plants in the Potomac River in Virginia and Maryland.

The conferees have included language in the bill earmarking funds for the following projects in the amount specified: Elba, Alabama, $8,400,000; Geneva, Alabama, $10,800,000; San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, $5,000,000; San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, $25,000,000; Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana, $10,000,000; Southern and Eastern Kentucky, Kentucky, $4,000,000; Clover Fork, Middlesboro, City of Cumberland, Town of Martin, Pike County (including Levisa Fork and Tug Fork tributaries), Bell County, Martin County, and Harlan County, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, $20,000,000; Jackson County, Mississippi, $2,000,000; Bosque and Leon Rivers, Texas, $4,000,000; Upper Mingo County (including Mingo County Tributaries), Lower Mingo County (Kermit), Wayne County, and McDowell County, West Virginia, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project, $4,100,000.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the Town of Martin element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project in accordance with a Plan A as set forth in the preliminary draft Detailed Project Report, Appendix T of the General Plan of the Huntington District Commander.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $900,000 to undertake the Bowie County Levee project in Texas, which is defined as Alternative B Local Sponsor Option in the Corps of Engineers document entitled Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas, project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee, dated April 1997.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds appropriated in the Act may be used to begin Phase II of the John Day Drawdown study or to initiate a study of the drawdown of McNary Dam unless authorized by law.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use available Construction, General, funds to complete design and construction of the Red River Regional Visitors Center in the vicinity of Shreveport, Louisiana, at an estimated cost of $6,000,000.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which increases the authorization for the Norco Bluffs, California, project.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act for additional emergency bank stabilization measures at Galena, Alaska, under the same terms and conditions as previously undertaken emergency bank stabilization work.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate directing the Corps of Engineers to use $4,200,000 appropriated in the Act to continue construction of the Ocean Isle Beach segment of the Brunswick County Beaches, North Carolina, project in accordance with the General Reevaluation Report approved by the Chief of Engineers on May 15, 1998.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $300,000 of the funds appropriated in the Act to reimburse the City of Renton, Washington, for mitigation expenses incurred for the flood control project constructed on the Cedar River at Renton as a result of over-dredging by the Corps of Engineers.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate subjecting the expenditure of previously appropriated funds for the Devils Lake, North Dakota, project to a number of conditions.

The conference agreement includes language which provides that $2,000,000 shall be available for stabilization and renovation of Lock and Dam 10 on the Kentucky River, subject to the enactment of authorization for the project.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $3,000,000 to initiate construction of a navigation project at Kaumalapau Harbor, Hawaii. The project will consist of a 350-foot long breakwater and a channel depth of 19 feet.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to design and construct seepage control features at Waterbury Dam, Winooski River, Vermont. The Dam Safety and Seepage Correction Program includes up to $2,000,000 to initiate this work. The proposed corrective actions will restore the structural integrity of the dam and reduce the chances of potential failure.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to design and construct barge lanes at the Houston-Galveston Navigation Channels, Texas, project.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to continue construction of the Rio Grand de Manati flood control project at Barceloneta, Puerto Rico.

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

The conference agreement appropriates $347,731,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries instead of $323,350,000 as proposed by the House and $334,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $900,000 for the Southeast Arkansas feasibility study. The House had proposed to fund this study in the General Investigations account.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Secretary of the Army to complete the analysis and determination regarding Federal maintenance of the Greenville Inner Harbor, Mississippi, navigation project in accordance with section 509 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

The conference agreement includes $375,000 for construction of the Yazoo Basin Tributaries project and $47,000,000 for continuing construction of Mississippi River levees. The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding these projects.

The conference agreement includes $7,242,000 for operation and maintenance of Arkabutla Lake; $5,280,000 for operation and maintenance of Grenada Lake; $7,680,000 for operation and maintenance of Sardis Lake; and $4,376,000 for operation and maintenance of Enid Lake. The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding these projects.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

The conference agreement appropriates $1,901,959,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General, instead of $1,854,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,862,471,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $6,755,000 for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers project in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida. The additional funds above the budget request shall be used to implement environmental restoration requirements as specified under the certification issued by the State of Florida under section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and dated October 1999, including $1,200,000 for increased environmental dredging and $500,000 for related environmental studies required by the state water quality certification. The conference agreement does not include bill language proposed by the Senate regarding this project.

The conferees have provided $5,071,000 for the Red Rock Dam and Lake, Iowa, project. The funds provided above the budget request are for repair and replacement of various features of the project including repair of the scouring of the South-East Des Moines levee.

The conference agreement includes $10,400,000 for operation and maintenance of the Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi, project.

The conference agreement includes $1,500,000 over the budget request for the Corps of Engineers to address impacts of recent fires, undertake habitat restoration activities, and address other essential requirements at Cochiti Lake in New Mexico.

The conference agreement includes an additional $3,000,000 for the Jemez Dam, New Mexico, project for the Corps of Engineers to address the impacts of increased water releases required to help sustain the endangered silvery minnow.

The conferees have provided an additional $600,000 for the Waco Lake, Texas, project for the Corps of Engineers to address the higher lake levels associated with the raising of the dam.

The conferees have provided $12,570,000 for the Grays Harbor, Washington, project, including $650,000 for repair of the south jetty, $1,000,000 to complete the rehabilitation of the north jetty at Ocean Shores, and $1,100,000 for the north jetty operations and maintenance study.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which directs the Corps of Engineers to prepare the necessary documents and initiate removal of submerged obstructions in the area previously marked by the Ambrose Light Tower in New York Harbor.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $500,000 for maintenance and repair of the Sakonnet Harbor breakwater in Little Compton, Rhode Island. Funds for this project are included in the amount appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate providing $50,000 for a study of crossings across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The amount provided for operation and maintenance of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal project includes $50,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to determine the adequacy and timing for maintaining good and sufficient crossings across the canal.

Although the conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate regarding the marketing of dredged material from the Delaware River Deepening project, the conferees expect the Corps of Engineers to establish such a program.

The conference agreement includes language which directs the Corps of Engineers to use $500,000 to dredge a channel from the mouth of Wheeling Creek to Tunnel Green Park in Wheeling, West Virginia.

The conference agreement includes language which provides that $500,000 of the

funds provided for the Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon, project shall be used to remove and reinstall the docks and causeway, in kind, at the Astoria East Boat Basin in Oregon.

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to extend the sheet pile wall on the west end of the entrance to the Dillingham, Alaska, small boat harbor, and to replace the existing wooden bulkhead at the city dock under the provisions of Public Law 99–190.

The conferees are aware of costs associated with maintaining and operating the complex computer system used to execute and program activities for the entire Operation and Maintenance program. The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to specifically budget for this computer system in future years and, within available fiscal year 2001 funds, pay for this effort under Operation and Maintenance, General.

The conferees are aware of a plan to improve the effectiveness of public information exhibits located within visitor centers at Corps of Engineers projects. The initial plan will be developed by a multidiscipline team and is scheduled to be completed this year. The conferees expect the plan to be developed within available Operation and Maintenance, General, funds and expect implementation of any plans to be justified in future budget requests.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized and directed to extend the existing Bethel Bank Stabilization project in Alaska an additional 1200 linear feet upstream, and to remove sediments from Brown's Slough that hamper safe navigation.

REGULATORY PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates $125,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Program as proposed by the House instead of $120,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate which will improve the analysis and increase the information available to the public and the Congress regarding the costs of the nationwide permit program and permit processing times.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

The conference agreement appropriates $140,000,000 for the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program as proposed by the House and the Senate.

The conferees concur with the language in the Senate report regarding the Parks Township Shallow Land Disposal Area in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania.

GENERAL EXPENSES

The conference agreement appropriates $152,000,000 for General Expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $149,500,000 as proposed by the House.

REVOLVING FUND

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House and the Senate which provides that amounts in the Revolving Fund are available for the costs of relocating the Corps of Engineers headquarters to the General Accounting Office building.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Section 101. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House 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.

Section 102. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which places a limit on credits and reimbursements allowable per project and annually.

Section 103. The conference agreement includes language authorizing the Corps of Engineers to construct the Murrieta Creek, California, flood control project.

Section 104. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for activities related to the closure or removal of the St. Georges Bridge across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal in Delaware.

Section 105. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that the Secretary of the Army shall provide up to $7,000,000 to replace and upgrade the dam in Kake, Alaska.

Provisions not included in the conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the House extending the authorization for spending Coastal Wetlands Restoration Trust Fund receipts. This matter has been addressed in Title VI. The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the use of continuing contracts for Corps of Engineers projects. The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for the Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi, project and the Gulfport Harbor, Mississippi, project. Funds for those projects are included in the amounts appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, General, and Construction, General, respectively.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the Kihei Area Erosion project in Hawaii. It is the intent of the conferees that the Kihei Area Erosion study shall include an analysis of the extent and causes of the shoreline erosion. Further, a regional economic development (RED) analysis shall be included. The results of the RED analysis shall be displayed in all study documents along with the traditional benefit-cost analysis including recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate regarding the Waikiki Erosion Control project in Hawaii. It is the intent of the conferees that the Waikiki Erosion Control study shall include an analysis of environmental resources that have been, or may be, threatened by erosion of the shoreline. Further, a regional economic development (RED) analysis shall be included. The results of the RED analysis shall be displayed in all study documents along with the traditional benefit-cost analysis including recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate directing the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study to determine the need for providing additional crossing capacity across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal. The conference agreement includes $50,000 under Operation and Maintenance, General for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a study to determine the adequacy and timing for maintaining good and sufficient crossings across the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate expressing the sense of the Senate concerning dredging of the main channel of the Delaware River and language proposed by the Senate regarding the Historic Area Remediation Site.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
ALABAMA				
ALABAMA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE LOCK AND DAM, AL	200	---	200	---
BALDWIN COUNTY WATERSHEDS, AL	200	---	200	---
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	100	---	100	---
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	521	---	521	---
BREWTON AND EAST BREWTON, AL	50	---	50	---
CAHABA RIVER WATERSHED, AL	50	---	50	---
COOSA RIVER, AL	---	---	---	150
DOG RIVER, AL	250	---	250	---
LUBBUB CREEK, AL	50	---	50	---
LUXAPALILA CREEK, LAMAR COUNTY, AL	---	---	100	---
VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY (BIRMINGHAM WATERSHED)	250	---	250	---
ALASKA				
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	108	---	108	---
AKUTAN HARBOR, AK	---	150	---	150
ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK	---	---	50	---
ANIAK, AK	50	---	50	---
BARROW COASTAL STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, AK	150	---	150	---
CHANDALAR RIVER WATERSHED, VENETIE INDIAN, AK	50	---	50	---
CHENA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
CRAIG HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
DELONG MOUNTAIN HARBOR, AK	422	---	700	---
DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	109	---	109	---
DOUGLAS HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	50	---	50
FALSE PASS HARBOR, AK	---	250	---	250
FIRE ISLAND, AK	---	---	100	---
GASTINEAU CHANNEL MODIFICATION, AK	50	---	50	---
HAINES HARBOR, AK	---	---	200	---
KENAI RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK	---	---	200	---
KOTZEBUE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, AK	---	---	150	---
LITTLE DIOMEDE HARBOR, AK	---	---	75	---
MATANUSKA RIVER WATERSHED, AK	100	---	100	---
MEKORYUK HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
NAKNEK RIVER WATERSHED, AK	50	---	50	---
NAPASKIAK HARBOR, AK	69	---	69	---
PERRYVILLE HARBOR, AK	120	---	120	---
PORT LIONS HARBOR, AK	107	---	107	---
QUINHAGAK HARBOR, AK	100	---	100	---
SAINT GEORGE HARBOR IMPROVEMENT, AK	---	---	200	---
SHIP CREEK WATERSHED, AK	53	---	53	---
SITKA HARBOR, AK	---	---	100	---
SKAGWAY HARBOR MODIFICATION, AK	100	---	100	---
UNALAKLEET HARBOR, AK	74	---	74	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	209	---	209	---
UNALASKA HARBOR, AK	---	58	---	58
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	43	---	43	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
VALDEZ HARBOR EXPANSION, AK	---	150	---	150
WHITTIER BREAKWATER, AK	---	---	169	---
AMERICAN SAMOA				
TUTUILA HARBOR, AS	275	---	275	---
ARIZONA				
COLONIAS ALONG THE U.S./MEXICO BORDER, AZ & TX	---	---	---	260
GILA RIVER, NORTHEAST PHOENIX DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	212	---	212	---
LITTLE COLORADO RIVER, AZ	100	---	100	---
PIMA COUNTY, AZ	75	---	175	---
RILLITO RIVER, PIMA COUNTY, AZ	290	---	290	---
RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, AZ	---	250	---	375
RIO SALADO ESTE, AZ	175	---	175	---
RIO SALADO OESTE, AZ	175	---	400	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER (GRANT RD. TO LOWELL RD.), AZ	---	---	300	---
SANTA CRUZ RIVER (PASEO DE LAS IGLESIAS), AZ	100	---	335	---
TRES RIOS, AZ	---	250	---	500
TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ	---	432	---	800
VA SHLY-AY AKIMEL SALT RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT, AZ	---	---	150	---
ARKANSAS				
ARKANSAS RIVER LEVEES, AR	---	---	---	400
ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, AR & OK	753	---	753	---
MAY BRANCH, FORT SMITH, AR	247	---	247	---
NORTH LITTLE ROCK, DARK HOLLOW, AR	---	200	---	500
RED RIVER NAVIGATION STUDY, SOUTHWEST ARKANSAS, AR	200	---	200	---
WHITE RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, AR & MO	500	---	500	---
WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION, AR	---	---	300	---
WHITE RIVER MINIMUM FLOW STUDY, AR	---	---	850	---
CALIFORNIA				
ALISO CREEK MAINSTEM, CA	50	---	500	---
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	---	3,285	---	3,285
ARROYO PASAJERO, CA	---	500	---	500
BOLINAS LAGOON ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	---	300	---	300
CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CA	175	---	175	---
COAST OF CALIFORNIA STORM AND TIDAL WAVE STUDY, CA	---	---	500	---
HUNTINGTON BEACH, BLUFFTOP PARK, CA	---	---	211	---
LAGUNA DE SANTA ROSA, CA	200	---	200	---
LLAGAS CREEK, CA	---	240	---	700
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA	225	---	225	---
LOS ANGELES HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, CA	---	375	---	750
LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA	---	325	---	325
MALIBU CREEK, CA	---	---	400	---
MARE ISLAND, CA	---	---	---	500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
MARINA DEL REY AND BALLONA CREEK, CA	---	---	500	---
MATILIJA DAM, CA	150	---	150	---
MIDDLE CREEK, CA	---	160	---	160
MOJAVE RIVER FORKS DAM, CA	200	---	200	---
MORRO BAY ESTUARY, CA	250	---	900	---
MUGU LAGOON, CA	250	---	250	---
MURRIETA CREEK, CA	---	300	---	750
N CA STREAMS, DRY CREEK, MIDDLETOWN, CA	150	---	150	---
N CA STREAMS, LOWER SACRAMENTO RVR RIPARIAN REVEGETATI	237	---	237	---
N CA STREAMS, MIDDLE CREEK, CA	90	---	90	---
N CA STREAMS, SUISUN MARSH, CA	65	---	65	---
NAPA RIVER, SALT MARSH RESTORATION, CA	300	---	300	---
NAPA VALLEY WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	50	---
NCS, LOWER CACHE CREEK, YOLO COUNTY, WOODLAND AND VIC,	300	---	500	---
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	---	350	---	350
NEWPORT BAY (LA-3 SITE DESIGNATION STUDY), CA	---	---	800	---
NEWPORT BAY/SAN DIEGO CREEK WATERSHED, CA	381	---	381	---
ORANGE COUNTY COAST BEACH EROSION, CA	---	---	475	---
ORANGE COUNTY, SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	100	---	100	---
PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA	---	600	---	1,200
PAJARO RIVER BASIN STUDY, CA	50	---	50	---
PENINSULA BEACH (CITY OF LONG BEACH), CA	---	---	250	---
PINE FLAT DAM, FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT RESTORATION,	---	300	---	300
PORT OF STOCKTON, CA	150	---	150	---
POSO CREEK, CA	150	---	500	---
RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA	---	200	---	200
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	250	---	250	---
RUSSIAN RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CA	200	---	200	---
SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA	300	---	300	---
SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN COMPREHENSIVE BASIN STUDY,	1,500	---	3,000	---
SAN ANTONIO CREEK, CA	125	---	125	---
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA	100	---	100	---
SAN DIEGO COUNTY SHORELINE, CA	---	---	325	---
SAN DIEGO HARBOR, NATIONAL CITY, CA	125	---	125	---
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, CA	250	---	700	---
SAN GABRIEL RIVER TO NEWPORT BAY, CA	---	---	150	---
SAN JACINTO RIVER, CA	225	---	225	---
SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	---	150	---	150
SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, STOCKTON METRO AREA, FARMINGTON D	100	---	100	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CONSUMNES & MOKELUMNE RIVERS,	150	---	150	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CORRAL HOLLOW CREEK, CA	65	---	65	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FRAZIER CREEK, CA	65	---	250	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, C	180	---	180	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, TUOLUMNE RIVER, CA	150	---	300	---
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, WEST STANISLAUS COUNTY, CA	213	---	213	---
SAN JUAN CREEK WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, CA	50	---	200	---
SAN JUAN CREEK, SOUTH ORANGE COUNTY, CA	50	---	50	---
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA	170	---	170	---
SAN PABLO BAY WATERSHED, CA	200	---	200	---
SANTA ROSA CREEK WATERSHED, CA	300	---	300	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
SANTA YNEZ, CA	---	---	100	---
SOLANA BEACH, CA	---	---	350	---
SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STREAMS, CA	---	200	---	200
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SPECIAL AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS, CA.	---	---	1,882	---
STRONG AND CHICKEN RANCH SLOUGHS, CA	150	---	300	---
SUTTER BASIN, CA	150	---	150	---
TAHOE BASIN, CA & NV	150	---	150	---
TIJUANA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, CA	205	---	500	---
TULE RIVER, CA	---	400	---	400
UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	---	500	---	500
UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA	300	---	300	---
UPPER SANTA ANA RIVER WATERSHED, CA	100	---	100	---
VENTURA HARBOR SAND BYPASS, CA	400	---	400	---
WHITE RIVER AND DEER CREEK, CA	150	---	150	---
WESTMINISTER, CA	---	---	100	---
WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CA	---	---	---	500
YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA	---	400	---	400
COLORADO				
CHATFIELD, CHERRY CREEK AND BEAR CREEK RESERVOIRS, CO.	250	---	250	---
FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, CO	---	---	100	---
ZUNI AND SUN VALLEY REACHES, SOUTH PLATTE RIVER, CO	---	---	100	---
COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS				
NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS, CNMI	100	---	150	---
CONNECTICUT				
COASTAL CONNECTICUT ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, CT	80	---	80	---
DELAWARE				
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				
BISCAYNE BAY, FL	543	---	543	---
HILLSBOROUGH RIVER, FL	114	---	114	---
LAKE WORTH INLET, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FL	114	---	114	---
MILE POINT, FL	114	---	114	---
PORT EVERGLADES HARBOR, FL	160	---	160	---
WITHLACOOCHEE RIVER, FL	114	---	114	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
GEORGIA				
ALLATOONA LAKE, ETOWAH RIVER, GA	90	---	90	---
ALLATOONA LAKE, LITTLE RIVER, GA	40	---	40	---
ARABIA MOUNTAIN, GA	---	---	100	---
AUGUSTA, GA	500	---	500	---
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	50	---	---
INDIAN, SUGAR, ENTRENCHMENT AND FEDERAL PRISON CREEKS,	50	---	50	---
LONG ISLAND, MARSH AND JOHNS CREEKS, GA	50	---	50	---
METRO ATLANTA WATERSHED, GA	499	---	499	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, GA	450	---	450	---
SAVANNAH HARBOR EXPANSION, GA	---	100	---	100
SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, GA & SC	400	---	400	---
UTOY, SANDY AND PROCTOR CREEKS, GA	100	---	100	---
HAWAII				
ALA WAI CANAL, OAHU, HI	140	---	140	---
BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI	---	173	---	173
HAWAII WATER MANAGENMENT, HI	---	---	200	---
HONOLULU HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, OAHU, HI	200	---	200	---
KAHUKU, HI	---	---	---	200
KAHULUI HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, MAUI, HI	150	---	150	---
KAWAIHAE DEEP DRAFT HARBOR MODIFICATIONS, HAWAII, HI	40	---	40	---
KIHEI AREA EROSION, HI	---	---	100	---
WAIKIKI EROSION CONTROL, HI	---	---	100	---
IDAHO				
BOISE RIVER, BOISE, ID	165	---	165	---
GOOSE CREEK, OAKLEY, ID	---	---	100	---
KOOTENAI RIVER AT BONNERS FERRY, ID	60	---	60	---
LITTLE WOOD RIVER, GOODING, ID	165	---	165	---
PAYETTE AND SNAKE RIVER, ID	---	---	100	---
ILLINOIS				
ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL	---	200	---	200
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL	---	400	---	400
DES PLAINES RIVER, IL (PHASE II)	250	---	750	---
ILLINOIS BEACH STATE PARK, IL	---	---	---	325
ILLINOIS RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, IL	500	---	500	---
KANKAKEE RIVER BASIN, IL & IN	300	---	600	---
PEORIA RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT, IL	400	---	400	---
ROCK RIVER, IL & WI	700	---	700	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	2,105	---	2,105	---
UPPER MISS & ILLINOIS NAV IMPROVEMENTS, IL, IA, MN, MO	---	4,707	---	4,707
UPPER MISS RVR SYS FLOW FREQUENCY STUDY, IL, IA, MN, M	888	---	888	---
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	---	300	---	300
WOOD RIVER LEVEE, IL	---	310	---	310

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
INDIANA				
INDIANA HARBOR ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, IN	---	---	500	---
JOHN T MYERS LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY	---	2,210	---	2,210
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER (CADDY MARSH DITCH), IN	---	---	---	250
IOWA				
DES MOINES AND RACCOON RIVERS, IA	400	---	600	---
INDIAN CREEK, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IA	80	---	80	---
KANSAS				
TOPEKA, KS	200	---	200	---
TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO	---	353	---	353
UPPER TURKEY RUN CREEK, KS	---	---	100	---
WALNUT AND WHITEWATER RIVER WATERSHEDS, KS	200	---	200	---
KENTUCKY				
BANKLICK CREEK, KY	100	---	100	---
GREENUP LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & OH	---	1,300	---	1,300
LICKING RIVER, CYNTHIANA, KY	260	---	260	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KY	100	---	100	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, MILL CREEK BASIN, KY	250	---	250	---
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, SOUTHWEST, KY	161	---	161	---
OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM SYSTEMS STUDY, KY, IL, IN, PA, WV	4,141	---	4,141	---
OHIO RIVER SHORELINE, PADUCAH, KY	---	---	---	400
LOUISIANA				
AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA.	200	---	400	---
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, BAYOUS CHENE, BOENF & BLACK, LA	---	---	250	---
CALCASIEU LOCK, LA	339	---	339	---
CALCASIEU RIVER BASIN, LA	100	---	300	---
HURRICANE PROTECTION, LA	---	---	100	---
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA	686	---	686	---
JEFFERSON PARISH, LA	---	215	---	500
LAFAYETTE PARISH, LA	---	200	---	200
LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, LA	1,750	---	1,750	---
ORLEANS PARISH, LA	---	164	---	300
ST BERNARD PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	100	---	500	---
ST. CHARLES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL. LA	---	---	100	---
PLAQUEMINES PARISH URBAN FLOOD CONTROL, LA	---	---	100	---
WEST SHORE, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN, LA	346	---	346	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
MARYLAND				
ANACOSTIA RIVER FEDERAL WATERSHED IMPACT ASSESSMENT, M	500	---	500	---
ANACOSTIA RIVER, PG COUNTY LEVEE, MD & DC	455	---	455	---
BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN, GWYNNS FALLS, MD	68	---	68	---
CUMBERLAND, MD	---	700	---	700
EASTERN SHORE, MD	400	---	400	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, MATTAWOMAN, MD	100	---	100	---
LOWER POTOMAC ESTUARY WATERSHED, ST MARY'S, MD	250	---	250	---
PATUXENT RIVER, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD	---	100	---	100
SMITH ISLAND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, MD	---	100	---	100
MASSACHUSETTS				
BLACKSTONE RIVER WATERSHED RESTORATION, MA & RI	310	---	310	---
BOSTON HARBOR, MA (45-FOOT CHANNEL)	150	---	150	---
COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, MA	100	---	100	---
MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MA	---	---	---	500
SOMERSET AND SEARSBURG DAMS, DEERFIELD RIVER, MA & VT.	100	---	100	---
MICHIGAN				
BELL ISLE SHORELINE, DETROIT, MI	---	---	100	---
DETROIT RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, MI	---	---	250	---
DETROIT RIVER MASTER PLAN, MI	---	---	100	---
DETROIT RIVER SEAWALLS, MI	---	---	100	---
JOHN GLENN GREAT LAKES BASIN PROGRAM, MI	---	---	100	---
MUSKEGON LAKE, MI	---	---	100	---
GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION SYSTEM, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA, & WI	---	---	500	---
SAULT STE MARIE (REPLACEMENT LOCK), MI	---	1,000	---	1,000
ST CLAIR RIVER AND LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	---	---	200	---
MINNESOTA				
LOWER ST ANTHONY FALLS RAPIDS RESTORATION, MN	---	---	400	---
UPPER MISS RIVER WATERSHED MGMT, LAKE ITASCA TO L/D 2,	250	---	250	---
MISSISSIPPI				
PEARL RIVER WATERSHED, MS	---	---	50	---
MISSOURI				
CHESTERFIELD, MO	---	250	---	250
HANNIBAL, MO	---	---	100	---
KANSAS CITY, MO & KS	312	---	312	---
MISSOURI & MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJE	500	---	500	---
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNITS L455 & R460-471, MO	220	---	220	---
RIVER DES PERES, MO	---	330	---	330

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
ST LOUIS HARBOR, MO & IL	---	265	---	265
ST. LOUIS FLOOD PROTECTION, MO	---	445	---	445
SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	170	---	170
MONTANA				
LOWER YELLOWSTONE RIVER DIVERSION DAM, MT	---	---	---	100
YELLOWSTONE RIVER CORRIDOR, MT	500	---	500	---
NEBRASKA				
ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE	---	275	---	275
LOWER PLATTE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	217	---	217	---
SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NE	---	220	---	220
NEVADA				
LOWER LAS VEGAS WASH WETLANDS, NV	100	---	500	---
TRUCKEE MEADOWS, NV	---	500	---	500
WALKER RIVER BASIN, NV	100	---	100	---
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
MERRIMACK RIVER BASIN	---	---	500	---
NEW JERSEY				
BARNEGAT BAY, NJ	---	50	---	50
BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	450
BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ	---	---	---	391
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, OAKWOOD BEACH, NJ & DE	---	---	---	222
DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, REEDS BEACH TO PIERCES POINT	---	---	---	135
DELWARE BAY COASTLINE, VILLAS AND VICINITY, NJ & DE	---	---	---	155
DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, NJ	---	---	100	---
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET TO TOWNSENDS INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS TO CAPE MAY POINT, NJ	---	---	---	350
LOWER PASSAIC RIVER, NJ	---	---	100	---
LOWER SADDLE RIVER, NJ	---	---	---	100
MANASQUAN INLET TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	---	---	---	150
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, ENV RESTORATION, NJ	218	---	218	---
PASSAIC RIVER, HARRISON, NJ	---	---	---	300
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, LEONARDO, NJ	550	---	550	---
RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, UNION BEACH, NJ	291	---	291	---
SHREWSBURY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES IN MONMOUTH COUNTY, N	120	---	120	---
SOUTH RIVER, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NJ	450	---	450	---
STONY BROOK, NJ	120	---	120	---
UPPER PASSAIC RIVER AND TRIBS, LONG HILL, MORRIS COUNT	300	---	300	---
UPPER ROCKAWAY RIVER, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ	300	---	300	---
WOODBRIDGE AND RAHWAY, NJ	200	---	200	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
NEW MEXICO				
ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM	50	---	50	---
RIO GRANDE BASIN, NM, CO & TX	500	---	600	---
SANTA CRUZ DAM SEDIMENT STUDY, NM	---	---	100	---
SW VALLEY FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION STUDY, ALBUQUERQUE, N	330	---	330	---
NEW YORK				
ATLANTIC COAST OF NEW YORK MONITORING PROGRAM, NY	---	---	1,000	---
ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	---	347	---	347
AUSABLE RIVER BASIN, ESSEX AND CLINTON COUNTIES, NY	200	---	200	---
BOQUET RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ESSEX COUNTY, NY	200	---	200	---
BRONX RIVER BASIN, NY	250	---	450	---
BUFFALO RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, NY	---	---	100	---
CLINTON COUNTY, NY	150	---	150	---
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	520	---	520	---
FREEPORT CREEK, VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NY	---	---	100	---
HUDSON - RARITAN ESTUARY, NY & NJ	800	---	800	---
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	---	50	---	50
HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY	50	---	50	---
HUDSON RIVER, HUDSON, NY	120	---	120	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, ARVERNE, NY.	50	---	50	---
JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY	296	---	296	---
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY	---	---	200	---
LINDENHURST, NY	100	---	100	---
MONTAUK POINT, NY	---	---	287	---
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY HARBOR, NY & NJ	---	2,528	---	2,528
NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY	259	---	259	---
NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, BAYVILLE, NY	300	---	300	---
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	250	---	250	---
SAW MILL RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NY	50	---	100	---
SAW MILL RIVER AT ELMSFORD/GREENBURGH, NY	---	---	---	750
SOUTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY	90	---	90	---
SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY	400	---	400	---
SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT, NY, PA & MD.	---	100	---	100
UPPER DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NY	776	---	776	---
UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, NY	---	---	1,000	---
NORTH CAROLINA				
BOGUE BANKS, NC	---	---	250	---
CURRITUCK SOUND, NC	100	---	100	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC	50	---	300	---
DARE COUNTY BEACHES, HATTERAS AND ORACOKE ISLAND, NC	---	---	500	---
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	600	---	600	---
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	---	250	---	250
NEUSE RIVER BASIN, NC	100	---	100	---
SURF CITY, NC	---	---	100	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
NORTH DAKOTA				
DEVILS LAKE, ND	50	---	---	4,000
GRAFTON, PARK RIVER, ND	---	900	---	900
RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, ND & MN	---	---	200	---
OHIO				
ASHTABULA RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH	---	384	---	384
BUTLER COUNTY, OH	100	---	100	---
COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA, OH	600	---	600	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, MONDAY CREEK, OH.	306	---	306	---
HOCKING RIVER BASIN ENV RESTORATION, SUNDAY CREEK, OH.	200	---	200	---
MAHONING RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OH & PA	---	---	500	---
MUSKINGUM BASIN SYSTEM STUDY, OH	100	---	100	---
OHIO RIVER FLOW COMMODITY STUDY, OH	---	---	200	---
RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO	100	---	100	---
SANDUSKY RIVER, TIFFIN, OH	---	---	100	---
STEUBENVILLE, OH	---	---	175	---
WESTERN LAKE ERIE BASIN, OH, IN & MI	---	---	100	---
OKLAHOMA				
CIMARRON RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, OK, KS, NM & CO	200	---	200	---
SOUTHEAST OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCE STUDY, OK	200	---	700	---
WARR ACRES, OK	200	---	200	---
OREGON				
COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	---	923	---	---
TILLAMOOK BAY AND ESTUARY ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, OR	274	---	274	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW, OR	210	---	210	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING, OR	114	---	114	---
WILLAMETTE RIVER FLOODPLAIN RESTORATION, OR	200	---	200	---
PENNSYLVANIA				
BEAVER CREEK, CLARION, PA	---	---	100	---
BLOOMSBURG, PA	441	---	441	---
LOWER WEST BR, SUS RIVER, ENV RESTORATION, BUFFALO CRE	250	---	250	---
NEW CASTLE, PA	---	---	100	---
TURTLE CREEK BASIN, UPPER TURTLE CREEK ENV RESTORATION	66	---	66	---
PUERTO RICO				
RIO GUANAJIBO, PR	---	441	---	441

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
RHODE ISLAND				
QUONSET DAVISVILLE PORT, RI	---	---	100	---
RHODE ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, RI	191	---	191	---
RHODE ISLAND SOUTH COAST, HABITAT REST & STRM DMG REDU	54	---	54	---
SOUTH CAROLINA				
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	581	---	581	---
BROAD RIVER BASIN, SC	---	---	200	---
CHARLESTON ESTUARY, SC	150	---	150	---
PAWLEYS ISLAND, SC	219	---	219	---
WACCAMAW RIVER, SC	---	---	100	---
YADKIN - PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, SC & NC	---	50	---	50
SOUTH DAKOTA				
JAMES RIVER, SD	---	---	500	---
NIOBRARA AND MISSOURI RIVERS, SD	---	---	100	---
TENNESSEE				
DAVIDSON COUNTY, TN	200	---	200	---
DUCK RIVER WATERSHED, TN	50	---	50	---
FRENCH BROAD WATERSHED, TN	500	---	500	---
NORTH CHICKAMAUGA CREEK, TN	50	---	50	---
TEXAS				
BOIS D'ARC CREEK, BONHAM, TX	200	---	200	---
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, WHITE OAK BAYOU, TX	230	---	230	---
CITY OF BROWNSVILLE (RESACAS), TX	---	---	100	---
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, LAQUINTA CHANNEL, TX	456	---	456	---
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,008	---	1,008	---
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER, TX	---	100	---	---
FREEPORT AND VINCITY, HURRICANE/FLOOD PROTECTION, TX	---	---	100	---
GIWW MODIFICATIONS, TX	195	---	195	---
GIWW, BRAZOS RIVER TO PORT O'CONNOR, TX	500	---	500	---
GIWW, HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX	728	---	728	---
GIWW, MATAGORDA BAY, TX	---	100	---	200
GIWW, PORT O'CONNOR TO CORPUS CHRISTI BAY, TX	653	---	653	---
GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	434	---	434
GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVER BASINS, TX	200	---	200	---
HUNTING BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	---	100	---	500
LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN, TX	600	---	1,500	---
MIDDLE BRAZOS RIVER, TX	300	---	300	---
NORTH BOSQUE RIVER, TX	---	50	---	50
NORTH PADRE ISLAND, CORPUS CHRISTI, TX	---	164	---	1,000
NORTHWEST EL PASO, TX	280	---	280	---
PECAN BAYOU, BROWNWOOD, TX	---	100	---	100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
RAYMONDVILLE DRAIN, TX	---	100	---	700
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	544	---	544	---
SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TX	114	---	114	---
SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX	---	574	---	574
SULPHUR RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, TX	50	---	50	---
UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX	500	---	1,100	---
UTAH				
PROVO AND VICINITY, UT	100	---	100	---
VIRGINIA				
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	342	---	342	---
AIWW, BRIDGES AT DEEP CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, VA	---	---	170	---
ELIZABETH RIVER BASIN, ENVIR RESTORATION, HAMPTON ROAD	247	---	247	---
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	---	277	---	277
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (SECTION 216)	200	---	200	---
LAKE MERRIWEATHER, GOSHEN DAM AND SPILLWAY, VA	---	---	---	150
LOWER RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER BASIN, VA	300	---	300	---
NEW RIVER BASIN, VA, NC, & WV	---	---	200	---
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, CRANEY ISLAND, VA	1,188	---	1,188	---
POWELL RIVER WATERSHED, VA	165	---	165	---
POWELL RIVER, STRAIGHT, REEDS AND JONES CREEK, VA	---	200	---	200
PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY WATERSHED, VA	205	---	205	---
RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER, EMBREY DAM, VA	257	---	---	600
WASHINGTON				
BELLINGHAM BAY, WA	60	---	60	---
CENTRALIA, WA	---	250	---	1,750
CHEHALIS RIVER BASIN, WA	150	---	150	---
DUWAMISH AND GREEN RIVER BASIN, WA	---	222	---	222
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	---	600	---	1,500
LAKE WALLULA NAVIGATION CHANNEL, COLUMBIA RIVER, WA	---	---	100	---
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	350	---	790	---
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, WA & OR	---	---	100	---
OCEAN SHORES, WA	100	---	100	---
PUGET SOUND CONFINED DISPOSAL SITES, WA	250	---	250	---
PUGET SOUND NEARSHORE MARINE HABITAT RESTORATION, WA	65	---	65	---
SKAGIT RIVER, WA	270	---	270	---
SKOKOMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	100	---	100	---
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER BASIN, WA	---	225	---	225
TRI-CITIES AREA RIVERSHORE ENHANCEMENT, WA	250	---	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST INVESTIGATIONS	BUDGET REQUEST PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	CONFERENCE PLANNING
WEST VIRGINIA				
ERICSON/WOOD COUNTY PUBLIC PORT, WV	---	---	---	500
ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV	---	200	---	200
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	650	---	---
MERCER COUNTY, WV	107	---	107	---
WEIRTON PORT, WV	---	---	---	750
WISCONSIN				
BARABOO RIVER, WI	---	---	100	---
FOX RIVER, WI	---	---	250	---
SAXON HARBOR, WI	---	---	50	---
WYOMING				
JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY	---	100	---	300
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	---
PLANNING ASSISTANCE TO STATES	6,500	---	6,700	---
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	---	-48,493	---
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	101,519	36,181	104,496	55,542

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA		
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,000	2,000
DOG RIVER, AL	---	300
ELBA, AL	---	8,400
GENEVA, AL	---	10,800
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	499	499
WALTER F GEORGE POWERHOUSE AND DAM, AL & GA (MAJOR REH	3,000	3,000
WALTER F GEORGE POWERPLANT, AL & GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,500	2,500
ALASKA		
CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK	1,312	1,312
GALENA, AK	---	3,000
KAKE HARBOR, AK	5,508	5,508
NOME HARBOR, AK	---	1,000
ST PAUL HARBOR, AK	5,616	5,616
ARIZONA		
RIO SALADO, PHOENIX AND TEMPE REACHES, AZ	2,000	2,000
ARKANSAS		
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	3,300	3,300
MONTGOMERY POINT LOCK AND DAM, AR	20,000	40,000
OZARK POWERHOUSE, AR (MAJOR REHAB)	1,230	---
RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR	---	4,000
CALIFORNIA		
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA	10,000	10,000
AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA (FOLSOM DAM MODIFICATIONS	5,000	4,000
BERRYESSA CREEK, CA	---	1,000
CORTE MADERA CREEK, CA	100	100
GUADALUPE RIVER, CA	3,500	7,000
HAMILTON AIRFIELDS WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA	---	2,000
HARBOR/SOUTH BAY WATER RECYCLING, CA	---	2,000
IMPERIAL BEACH, CA	---	800
KAWEAH RIVER, CA	500	3,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	9,821	9,821
LOWER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,485	1,485
MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	760	760
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	500	500
MID-VALLEY AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	2,000	2,000
NAPA RIVER, CA	4,000	4,000
NORCO BLUFFS, CA	---	3,225
PORT OF OAKLAND, CA	---	4,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA	3,300	5,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, CA	4,100	4,100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA	---	250
SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION, CA	---	25,000
SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA	4,000	4,000
SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA	18,000	23,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	5,000	5,000
STOCKTON METROPOLITAN AREA, CA	---	4,000
SUCCESS DAM, TULE RIVER, CA (DAM SAFETY)	1,000	1,000
SURFSIDE-SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CA	---	5,000
UPPER SACRAMENTO AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA	1,665	1,665
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA	1,775	1,775
DELAWARE		
DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HELOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, DE	---	3,000
DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE	254	254
FLORIDA		
BREVARD COUNTY, FL	---	6,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	847	847
CEDAR HAMMOCK, WARES CREEK, FL	200	200
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	92,423	80,423
DADE COUNTY, FL	3,058	8,000
DUVAL COUNTY, FL	3,800	3,800
EVERGLADES AND SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION, FL	20,525	20,525
HILLSBORO AND OKEECHOBEE AQUIFER, FL	4,562	---
HILLSBORO INLET, FL	---	500
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	---	1,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM POWERHOUSE, FL & GA (MAJOR R	4,500	4,500
KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL	20,000	20,000
MANATEE COUNTY, FL	200	200
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	10,828	10,828
MARTIN COUNTY, FL	2,419	2,419
MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL	6,591	6,591
PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL	4,000	7,500
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	706	706
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL	1,321	1,321
ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FL	---	4,000
ST. LUCIE INLET, FL	---	4,000
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	---	300
GEORGIA		
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	---	250
BUFORD POWERHOUSE, GA (MAJOR REHAB)	2,455	2,455
LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC	1,500	1,500
MAYO'S BAR LOCK & DAM, GA	---	400
OATES CREEK, RICHMOND COUNTY, GA (DEF CORR)	332	332
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	2,666	2,666
THURMOND LAKE POWERHOUSE, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	5,000	5,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
HAWAII		
IAO STREAM FLOOD CONTROL, MAUI, HI (DEF CORR)	239	239
KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI	---	3,000
KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI	3,437	3,437
MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI	325	325
IDAHO		
MILO CREEK, ID	---	1,000
ILLINOIS		
CHAIN OF ROCKS CANAL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (DEF CORR)	2,100	2,100
CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL DISPERSAL BARRIER, IL.	400	400
CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL	19,192	19,192
EAST ST LOUIS, IL	900	900
EAST ST LOUIS INTERIOR FLOOD CONTROL	---	150
LOCK AND DAM 24, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	5,750	5,750
LOVES PARK, IL	4,010	4,010
MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL	2,800	7,800
MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO	1,400	1,400
OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, IL & KY	38,142	56,000
UPPER MISS RVR SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROGRAM, IL, IA, MN, MO	18,000	21,000
INDIANA		
CALUMET REGION, IN	---	300
FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN	1,088	1,088
INDIANA HARBOR, IN (CONFINED DISPOSAL FACILITY)	3,291	3,291
INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, IN	---	1,000
INDIANAPOLIS CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN	---	10,000
INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN	934	934
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN	5,343	8,843
OHIO RIVER GREENWAY PUBLIC ACCESS, IN	1,500	1,500
PATOKA LAKE, IN (MAJOR REHAB)	5,200	5,200
IOWA		
LOCK AND DAM 11, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	3,210	---
LOCK AND DAM 12, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IA (MAJOR REHAB)	5,260	5,260
MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	12,000	12,000
MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	4,400	4,650
PERRY CREEK, IA	7,178	7,178
KANSAS		
ARKANSAS CITY, KS	5,100	5,100

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	1,000	1,000
DEWEY LAKE, KY (DAM SAFETY)	3,832	3,832
KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, TENNESSEE RIVER, KY	14,900	30,000
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCK AND DAM #10, KY	---	2,000
MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, KY & IN	14,000	18,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY	---	1,000
METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY	4,000	4,000
SOUTHERN AND EASTERN KENTUCKY, KY	---	4,000
LOUISIANA		
COMITE RIVER, LA	10,000	10,000
INNER HARBOR NAVIGATION CANAL LOCK, LA	14,349	16,349
GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY, LA	---	500
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	18,040	21,040
LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	3,100	10,000
LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,414	2,414
MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET, LA	---	500
MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	719	719
NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	1,800	1,800
SOUTHEAST LOUISIANA, LA	47,260	69,000
WEST BANK VICINITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LA	8,065	8,065
MARYLAND		
ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC	3,951	3,951
ASSATEAGUE ISLAND, MD	2,500	2,500
ATLANTIC COAST OF MARYLAND, MD	185	185
BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD & VA	5,000	3,000
CHESAPEAKE BAY ENV RESTORATION AND PROTECTION, MD, VA.	608	1,058
CHESAPEAKE BAY OYSTER RECOVERY, MD & VA	---	3,000
POPLAR ISLAND, MD	19,190	19,190
MASSACHUSETTS		
CAPE COD CANAL RAILROAD BRIDGE, MA (MAJOR REHAB)	8,600	8,600
TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA	100	100
MINNESOTA		
CROOKSTON, MN	---	1,000
LOCK AND DAM 3, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN (MAJOR REHAB)	5,000	5,000
MARSHALL, MN	1,312	1,312
NORTHEASTERN MINNESOTA, MN	---	2,500
PINE RIVER DAM, CROSS LAKE, MN (DAM SAFETY)	3,873	3,873

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MISSISSIPPI		
DESOTO COUNTY, MS	---	3,000
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	---	200
JACKSON COUNTY WATER SUPPLY, MS	---	2,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	6,663	6,663
WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS, MS	1,337	1,337
PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF WALKIAH BLUFF, MS AND LA	---	1,000
MISSOURI		
BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO	---	200
BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO	10,500	14,500
CAPE GIRARDEAU, JACKSON, MO	2,350	2,350
MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO	3,000	3,000
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	6,500	6,500
ST LOUIS, MO	---	3,000
STE GENEVIEVE, MO	6,000	6,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO & AR (DAM SAFETY)	5,920	5,920
NEBRASKA		
MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD	300	1,800
WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE	1,600	3,000
NEVADA		
RURAL NEVADA, NV	---	4,000
TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV	20,000	21,600
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
LEBANON, NH	---	1,500
NEW JERSEY		
BRIGANTINE INLET/GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET (ABSECON ISL)	---	5,000
CAPE MAY INLET TO LOWER TOWNSHIP, NJ	100	100
DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL, NJ, PA & DE	29,756	29,756
GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET AND PECK BEACH, NJ	5,100	5,100
NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY CHANN	5,649	10,000
PASSAIC RIVER PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS, N	1,700	1,700
PASSAIC RIVER STREAMBANK RESTORATION, NJ	---	3,000
RAMAPO RIVER AT MAHWAH, NJ	---	750
RAMAPO RIVER AT OAKLAND, NJ	2,717	2,717
RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ	4,000	4,000
SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	6,383	6,383
TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ	---	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NEW MEXICO		
ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM	900	900
ALAMOGORDO, NM	3,000	3,000
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO, NM	---	3,000
LAS CRUCES, NM	2,841	2,841
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	600	600
RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,	600	600
NEW YORK		
ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL, NY.	5,000	4,000
ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	500	500
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY,	1,000	1,000
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	500	1,500
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, NY	3,000	3,000
KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ	53,000	53,000
NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NY	---	3,000
ONONDAGA LAKE, NY	---	5,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
AIWW, REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC	1,000	1,000
BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, NC	---	4,200
CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC	2,000	2,000
WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC	---	330
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	40,600	40,600
NORTH DAKOTA		
BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT LAND ACQUISITION, N	4,700	6,000
DEVILS LAKE EMERGENCY OUTLET, ND	24,000	---
GARRISON DAM AND POWER PLANT, ND (MAJOR REHAB)	5,300	5,300
GRAND FORKS, ND - EAST GRAND FORKS, MN	13,044	13,044
HOMME LAKE, ND (DAM SAFETY)	8,000	8,000
SHEYENNE RIVER, ND	2,600	2,600
OHIO		
BEACH CITY LAKE, MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH (DAM SAFETY	897	897
HOLES CREEK, OH	---	1,000
LOWER GIRARD LAKE DAM, OH	---	1,000
METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH	3,024	3,024
MILL CREEK, OH	500	500
OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE, OH	---	1,500
WEST COLUMBUS, OH	6,000	11,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
OKLAHOMA		
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	2,400	2,400
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK (DAM SAFETY)	4,500	4,500
OREGON		
BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)	6,110	6,110
COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA	---	4,500
COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA	5,000	5,000
ELK CREEK LAKE, OR	500	500
LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA	200	200
WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR	8,200	8,200
PENNSYLVANIA		
CLINTON COUNTY, PA	---	500
JOHNSTOWN, PA (MAJOR REHAB)	7,000	7,000
LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	35,000	60,000
NANTY GLO, PA	---	700
NORTHEAST PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	4,000
PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT)	580	580
SAW MILL RUN, PITTSBURGH, PA	4,300	4,300
SCHUYLKILL RIVER PARK, PA	---	1,000
SOUTH CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA ENVIRON IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	---	20,000
SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA, PA	---	150
TOWAMENCIN TOWNSHIP, PA	---	1,000
WILLIAMSPORT, PA	---	446
WYOMING VALLEY, PA (LEVEE RAISING)	23,092	23,092
PUERTO RICO		
ARECIBO RIVER, PR	4,102	5,402
PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR	9,590	9,590
RIO DE LA PLATA, PR	3,493	3,493
RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR	743	750
RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR	198	---
RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR	11,000	13,800
SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR	6,940	6,940
RHODE ISLAND		
FOX POINT HURRICANE BARRIER, RI	---	1,950
SOUTH CAROLINA		
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING & WIDENING)	16,227	16,227
LAKES MARION AND MOULTRIE, SC	---	4,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD	1,500	1,500
CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE, LOWER BRULE SIOUX, SD	4,000	4,000
PIERRE, SD	4,000	6,000
TENNESSEE		
BLACK FOX, MURFREE AND OAKLANDS SPRINGS WETLANDS, TN	---	2,000
HAMILTON COUNTY, TN	---	1,500
TEXAS		
BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS, TX	---	4,000
BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	5,500	6,000
CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	6,104	6,104
CLEAR CREEK, TX	1,525	1,525
DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TX	---	2,000
EL PASO, TX	5,200	5,200
GIWW, ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX	1,176	1,176
HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX	53,492	53,492
JOHNSON CREEK, TX	---	3,000
NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALTWATER BARRIER, TX	9,000	9,000
RED RIVER BASIN CHLORIDE CONTROL, TX	---	1,300
RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, TX	---	900
SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX	900	900
SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX	11,820	11,820
UTAH		
UPPER JORDAN RIVER, UT	800	800
VIRGINIA		
AIWW, BRIDGE AT GREAT BRIDGE, VA	8,492	8,492
ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION, FRONT ROYAL, VA	---	7,000
JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC (MAJOR REHAB)	4,000	4,000
NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA	600	600
ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA	1,000	1,000
SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA	---	3,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	---	20,000
VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT)	---	1,100
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA RIVER FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID	91,000	81,000
LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	1,000	1,000
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	710	710
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY)	2,000	2,000
THE DALLES POWERHOUSE (UNITS 1-14), WA & OR (MAJOR REH	7,000	7,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
WEST VIRGINIA		
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	6,300	10,000
CENTRAL WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	1,500
GREENBRIAR RIVER BASIN, WV	---	1,000
LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	12,100	37,100
LONDON LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV (MAJOR REHAB)	1,800	1,800
LOWER MUD RIVER, WV	---	1,000
MARMET LOCK, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	6,500	10,200
ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER, WV & OH	2,700	2,700
SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA, WV	---	3,000
TYGART LAKE, WV (DAM SAFETY)	4,293	4,293
WEST VIRGINIA AND PENNSYLVANIA FLOOD CONTROL, WV & PA	---	3,000
WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, KANAWHA RIVER, WV	300	300
WISCONSIN		
LAFARGE LAKE, KICKAPOO RIVER, WI	---	2,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION (SECTION 206)	10,000	19,000
AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM	3,000	4,000
BENEFICIAL USES OF DREDGED MATERIAL (SECTION 204)	4,000	4,000
DAM SAFETY AND SEEPAGE/STABILITY CORRECTION PROGRAM	3,000	7,000
DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL FACILITIES PROGRAM	5,000	5,000
EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14)	9,000	9,000
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION	19,200	19,200
FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205)	25,000	35,000
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	11,000
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	14,000	21,000
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	-198,753
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL	1,346,000	1,717,199

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
SURVEYS:		
GENERAL STUDIES:		
ALEXANDRIA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	750	750
DONALDSONVILLE TO THE GULF, LA	1,100	1,100
SPRING BAYOU, LA	100	100
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN ABOVE ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	350	350
COLDWATER RIVER BASIN BELOW ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	100	100
MEMPHIS METRO AREA, TN & MS	657	657
BAYOU METO BASIN, AR	6,500	6,500
SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS, AR	---	900
MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO	2,000	2,000
REELFOOT LAKE, TN & KY	318	368
WOLF RIVER, MEMPHIS, TN	216	216
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	435	435
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS	12,526	13,476
CONSTRUCTION		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	35,690	35,690
FRANCIS BLAND FLOODWAY DITCH (EIGHT MILE CREEK), AR	2,110	2,110
GRAND PRAIRIE REGION, AR	22,800	20,300
HELENA AND VICINITY, AR	2,450	2,450
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	750	750
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	40,621	47,000
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	3,195	4,195
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	10,000	10,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	26,000	26,000
LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY LEVEE, LA	5,500	5,500
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, LA & MS	100	100
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	5,000	5,000
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	2,330	2,330
YAZOO BASIN:	(11,195)	(34,200)
BACKWATER PUMP, MS	500	1,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	3,500	4,500
DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS	---	15,000
MAIN STEM, MS	25	25
REFORMULATION UNIT, MS	300	300
TRIBUTARIES, MS	84	375
UPPER YAZOO PROJECT, MS	6,786	13,000
ST JOHNS BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FLOODWAY, MO	700	5,000
NONCONNAH CREEK, FLOOD CONTROL FEATURE, TN & MS	2,000	2,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN	500	500
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	170,941	203,125

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MAINTENANCE		
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	58,954	56,500
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	421	421
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	442	442
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, NORTH BANK, AR	407	407
LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER, SOUTH BANK, AR	10	10
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN	6,160	8,200
ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	6,775	7,775
TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA	2,384	2,384
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR	1,070	1,070
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	45	45
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	25	25
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA	1,499	1,499
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	9,482	9,482
BATON ROUGE HARBOR, DEVIL SWAMP, LA	210	210
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA	56	56
BONNET CARRE, LA	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	389	389
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	5,739	5,739
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA	916	916
OLD RIVER, LA	4,720	4,720
TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA	3,048	3,048
GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS	626	626
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	193	193
VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS	480	480
YAZOO BASIN:	(24,185)	(34,096)
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS	6,242	7,242
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS	137	4,500
ENID LAKE, MS	3,376	4,376
GREENWOOD, MS	1,007	1,007
GRENADA LAKE, MS	4,232	5,280
MAIN STEM, MS	1,254	1,254
SARDIS LAKE, MS	5,180	7,680
TRIBUTARIES, MS	1,162	1,162
WILL M WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	358	358
YAZOO BACKWATER AREA, MS	431	431
YAZOO CITY, MS	806	806
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	202	202
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	7,000	7,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	113	113
MEMPHIS HARBOR, MCKELLAR LAKE, TN	1,085	1,085
MAPPING	1,129	1,129
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE	139,105	149,602
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	-13,572	-18,472
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	309,000	347,731

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL	1,100	1,100
ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL	5,355	5,355
BAYOU LA BATRE, AL	1,999	1,999
BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL	19,204	20,704
DAUPHIN ISLAND BAY, AL	60	60
DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL	66	66
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL	4,734	4,734
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AL	50	50
MILLERS FERRY LOCK AND DAM, WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LA	4,999	4,999
MOBILE HARBOR, AL	18,665	22,665
MOBILE AREA DIGITAL MAPPING, AL	---	150
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AL	350	350
ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL	4,962	4,962
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AL	120	120
TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	23,547	24,547
WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA	7,373	7,373
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK	1,777	1,777
CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK	1,364	1,364
DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK	423	423
HOMER HARBOR, AK	191	191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AK	35	35
NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK	186	186
NOME HARBOR, AK	386	386
PETERSBURG HARBOR, AK	394	394
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, AK	512	512
WRANGELL NARROWS, AK	2,438	3,838
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE, AZ	1,166	1,166
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AZ	69	69
PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ	1,186	1,186
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, AZ	74	74
WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ	168	168
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE, AR	4,520	4,520
BLAKELY MT DAM, LAKE OUACHITA, AR	5,758	5,758
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR	1,200	1,200
BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR	4,565	4,565
DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR	5,937	5,937
DEGRAY LAKE, AR	4,218	4,218
DEQUEEN LAKE, AR	1,058	1,058
DIERKS LAKE, AR	988	988

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
GILLHAM LAKE, AR	929	929
GREERS FERRY LAKE, AR	5,933	5,933
HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR	304	304
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, AR	294	294
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	19,988	19,988
MILLWOOD LAKE, AR	1,602	1,602
NARROWS DAM, LAKE GREESON, AR	3,604	3,604
NIMROD LAKE, AR	1,416	1,416
NORFORK LAKE, AR	3,626	3,626
OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR	419	419
OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	6,402	6,402
OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR	4,072	4,072
WHITE RIVER, AR	2,258	2,258
YELLOW BEND PORT, AR	125	125
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA	1,854	1,854
BODEGA BAY, CA	---	200
BUCHANAN DAM, H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA	1,580	1,580
CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR, CA	3,000	3,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM, LAKE MENDOCINO, CA	3,403	3,403
CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA	---	500
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA	4,437	4,687
FARMINGTON DAM, CA	313	313
HIDDEN DAM, HENSLEY LAKE, CA	1,616	1,616
HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA	4,710	4,710
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CA	843	843
ISABELLA LAKE, CA	793	793
JACK D. MALTESTER CHANNEL (SAN LEANDRO MARINA), CA	---	1,500
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA	170	170
LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA	3,910	3,910
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA	3,956	3,956
MARINA DEL REY, CA	5,335	5,335
MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA	288	288
MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA	251	251
MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA	170	1,170
MOSS LANDING HARBOR, CA	---	700
NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA	1,778	1,778
NEW MELONES LAKE, DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL, CA	1,135	1,135
NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA	40	40
OAKLAND HARBOR, CA	8,118	8,118
OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA	1,535	2,035
PINE FLAT LAKE, CA	2,248	2,248
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, CA	1,256	1,256
REDWOOD CITY HARBOR, CA	---	400
RICHMOND HARBOR, CA	5,774	5,774
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA	2,037	2,037
SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.	1,113	1,113
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA	163	163

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY, DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA	2,382	2,382
SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA	---	200
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA	2,000	2,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA	2,573	2,573
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA	2,028	2,028
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA	3,086	3,086
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA	1,615	1,615
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CA	1,153	1,153
SUCCESS LAKE, CA	1,898	1,898
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA	3,117	3,117
TERMINUS DAM, LAKE KAWEAH, CA	1,659	1,659
VENTURA HARBOR, CA	2,240	3,440
YUBA RIVER, CA	74	74
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO	425	425
CHATFIELD LAKE, CO	1,568	1,568
CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO	707	707
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, CO	67	67
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO	1,543	1,543
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, CO	209	209
TRINIDAD LAKE, CO	619	619
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT	309	309
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT	399	399
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT	269	269
HOP BROOK LAKE, CT	819	819
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT	335	335
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT	344	344
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT	311	311
THOMASTON DAM, CT	581	581
WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT	506	506
DELAWARE		
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	19,707	14,757
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	433	433
WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE	3,217	3,217
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC	910	910
POTOMAC RIVER BELOW WASHINGTON, DC	235	235
WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC	38	38

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FLORIDA		
AIWW, NORFOLK, VA TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC &.	1,660	1,660
CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL	7,625	7,625
CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL	10,558	10,558
ESCAMBIA AND CONECUH RIVERS, FL	1,000	1,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL	2,705	2,705
FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL	1,051	1,051
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, FL	100	100
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R,.	147	147
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL	4,035	4,035
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL	7,755	7,755
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,855	5,855
MANATEE HARBOR, FL	3,080	3,080
MIAMI HARBOR, FL	1,323	1,323
MIAMI RIVER, FL	---	4,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL	5,811	5,811
PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL	4,577	4,577
PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL	50	50
PENSACOLA HARBOR, FL	---	2,000
PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL	46	46
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR, FL	---	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, FL	600	600
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL	3,340	4,500
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, FL	50	50
ST PETERSBURG HARBOR, FL	3,280	6,580
TAMPA HARBOR, FL	6,308	6,308
WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL	35	35
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE, GA	4,520	6,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &	5,055	6,755
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA	2,460	2,460
BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA	5,271	5,271
BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA	7,275	7,275
CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA	7,489	7,489
HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC	11,875	11,875
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, GA	100	100
J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC	10,585	10,585
RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	6,190	6,190
SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA	13,869	14,369
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA	650	650
WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL	3,977	4,977
HAWAII		
BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI	153	153
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, HI	165	165
KAHULUI HARBOR, HI	1,296	1,296

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, HI	706	706
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID	2,291	2,291
DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID	2,689	2,689
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, ID	73	73
LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID	1,206	1,206
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, ID	332	332
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL & IN	4,758	4,758
CARLYLE LAKE, IL	5,112	5,112
CHICAGO HARBOR, IL	2,762	2,762
CHICAGO RIVER, IL	362	362
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL	195	195
ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL	562	562
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVR PORTION), IL & IN	22,808	23,808
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (MVS PORTION), IL & IN	1,598	1,598
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IL	473	473
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL	2,081	2,081
LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL	837	837
LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL	5,209	5,209
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVR PORTION)	39,842	43,842
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVS PORTION)	14,499	16,999
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IL	43	43
REND LAKE, IL	3,904	3,904
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IL	97	97
WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL	1,473	1,473
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN	782	782
BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN	1,937	2,437
CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN	732	732
CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN	864	864
INDIANA HARBOR, IN	429	429
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IN	101	101
J EDWARD ROUSH LAKE, IN	824	824
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN	806	1,206
MISSISSINEWA LAKE, IN	1,182	1,182
MONROE LAKE, IN	799	799
PATOKA LAKE, IN	731	731
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, IN	42	42
SALAMONIE LAKE, IN	749	749
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, IN	62	62

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE, IA	2,952	2,952
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, IA	738	738
MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA	146	146
MISSOURI RIVER - RULO TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO	5,250	5,950
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO RULO, IA & NE	2,111	2,111
RATHBUN LAKE, IA	2,058	2,058
RED ROCK DAM AND LAKE RED ROCK, IA	3,827	5,071
SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA	4,074	4,074
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE, KS	1,621	1,621
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS	1,197	1,197
EL DORADO LAKE, KS	487	487
ELK CITY LAKE, KS	728	728
FALL RIVER LAKE, KS	1,429	1,429
HILLSDALE LAKE, KS	908	908
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KS	36	36
JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS	1,186	1,531
KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS	1,541	1,541
MARION LAKE, KS	1,354	1,354
MELVERN LAKE, KS	1,872	1,872
MILFORD LAKE, KS	1,906	1,906
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS	1,074	1,074
PERRY LAKE, KS	1,966	1,966
POMONA LAKE, KS	1,830	1,830
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, KS	193	193
TORONTO LAKE, KS	673	673
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS	2,546	2,546
WILSON LAKE, KS	2,017	2,017
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY & TN	10,330	10,330
BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,544	2,544
BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY	1,497	1,497
BUCKHORN LAKE, KY	1,685	1,685
CARR CREEK LAKE, KY	1,542	1,542
CAVE RUN LAKE, KY	868	868
DEWEY LAKE, KY	1,429	1,429
ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY	361	361
FISHTRAP LAKE, KY	1,890	1,890
GRAYSON LAKE, KY	1,366	1,366
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY	1,079	1,079
GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY	2,917	2,917
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, KY	123	123
KENTUCKY RIVER, KY	1,149	1,149
KENTUCKY RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS 5-14, KY	---	750

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY	1,357	1,357
LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY	21	21
MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY	714	714
MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY	100	100
NOLIN LAKE, KY	2,285	2,285
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN & OH	31,813	31,813
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN & OH	6,007	6,007
PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,016	1,016
ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY	1,827	1,827
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY	1,048	1,048
WOLF CREEK DAM, LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY	5,892	5,892
YATESVILLE LAKE, KY	1,211	1,211
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	14,026	14,026
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA	570	570
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA	509	509
BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE JUMP WATERWAY, LA	726	726
BAYOU PIERRE, LA	25	25
BAYOU SEGNETTE WATERWAY, LA	735	735
BAYOU TECHE AND VERMILION RIVER, LA	48	48
BAYOU TECHE, LA	132	132
CADDO LAKE, LA	127	127
CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA	12,117	12,117
FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA	5,354	5,354
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA	19,478	21,478
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA	3,175	3,175
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, LA	268	268
J BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY, LA	8,907	11,907
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA	559	559
MADISON PARISH PORT, LA	108	108
MERMENTAU RIVER, LA	1,933	1,933
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA	2,773	2,773
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO,	63,359	63,359
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, LA	11,286	11,286
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, LA	80	80
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA	2,000	2,000
WALLACE LAKE, LA	233	233
WATERWAY FROM INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY TO B DULAC, LA	45	45
MAINE		
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, ME	1,060	1,060
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, ME	17	17
UNION RIVER, ME	---	900
WELLS HARBOR, ME	1,455	2,205

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD	455	455
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	710	710
BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS (50 FOOT), MD	16,354	16,354
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV	141	141
HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD	55	55
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MD	327	327
JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV	1,616	1,616
OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD	1,810	1,810
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MD	450	450
RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD	70	70
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, MD	140	140
ST JEROME CREEK, MD	175	175
TOLCHESTER CHANNEL, MD	5,801	6,801
TWITCH COVE AND BIG THOROFARE RIVER, MD	75	75
UPPER THOROFARE, MD	220	220
WICOMICO RIVER, MD	740	740
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM, MA	368	368
BIRCH HILL DAM, MA	439	439
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA	361	361
CAPE COD CANAL, MA	8,787	8,787
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA	213	213
CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA	147	147
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA	267	267
HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA	462	462
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MA	125	125
KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA	390	390
LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA	461	461
NEW BEDFORD AND FAIRHAVEN HARBOR, MA	310	310
NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN AND ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER,	480	480
PLYMOUTH HARBOR, MA	500	500
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MA	3,113	3,113
SALEM HARBOR, MA	200	200
TULLY LAKE, MA	436	436
WEST HILL DAM, MA	647	647
WESTVILLE LAKE, MA	342	342
MICHIGAN		
ALPENA HARBOR, MI	203	203
ARCADIA HARBOR, MI	85	85
BLACK RIVER, PORT HURON, MI	306	306
CEDAR RIVER HARBOR, MI	---	1,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI	458	458
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI	118	118
DETROIT RIVER, MI	2,342	2,342

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI	130	130
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI	1,264	1,264
HOLLAND HARBOR, MI	905	905
INLAND ROUTE, MI	33	33
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MI	205	305
KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI	256	256
LELAND HARBOR, MI	168	168
LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI	663	663
MANISTEE HARBOR, MI	272	272
MANISTIQUE HARBOR, MI	239	239
MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI	174	174
MONROE HARBOR, MI	695	695
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI	---	150
ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI	603	603
PENTWATER HARBOR, MI	450	450
PORTAGE LAKE HARBOR, MI	1,974	1,974
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MI	275	275
ROUGE RIVER, MI	417	417
SAGINAW RIVER, MI	1,453	1,453
SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI	10	10
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI	481	481
ST CLAIR RIVER, MI	996	996
ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI	1,194	1,194
ST MARYS RIVER, MI	20,502	23,502
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MI	3,197	3,197
WHITE LAKE HARBOR, MI	290	290
MINNESOTA		
BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	178	178
DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	5,310	5,310
DULUTH ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY STUDY, MN	---	320
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN	186	186
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MN	154	154
LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	453	453
MINNESOTA RIVER, MN	196	196
MISS RIVER BTWN MO RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS (MVP PORTION)	42,765	42,765
ORWELL LAKE, MN	315	315
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MN	25	25
RED LAKE RESERVOIR, MN	101	101
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN	2,805	2,805
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, MN	64	64
TWO HARBORS, MN	208	208
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR, MS	801	801
CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS	122	122
EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS	150	150
GULFPORT HARBOR, MS	2,500	2,500

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MS	360	360
MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS	133	133
OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS	955	955
PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS	3,406	10,400
PEARL RIVER, MS & LA	250	250
ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS	645	645
YAZOO RIVER, MS	115	115
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO	184	295
CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO	5,196	5,196
CLEARWATER LAKE, MO	2,015	2,015
HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO	7,688	7,688
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, MO	473	473
LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO	854	854
LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO	931	931
MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	13,384	13,384
NEW MADRID HARBOR, MO	259	354
POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO	2,065	2,065
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, MO	26	26
SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO	1,160	1,160
SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO	401	401
STOCKTON LAKE, MO	3,486	3,486
TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO	6,485	6,485
UNION LAKE, MO	10	10
MONTANA		
FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT	3,620	3,620
LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT	2,273	2,273
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	6,151	6,241
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE	2,198	2,198
MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO,	709	709
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWK	125	125
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN COLLABORATIVE WATER PLANNING (NWO	125	125
PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE	721	721
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE	796	796
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NE	327	327
NEVADA		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NV	34	34
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	522	522
PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV	193	193

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM, NH	389	389
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH	412	412
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH	478	478
HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH	984	984
OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH	554	554
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME	---	250
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH	469	469
NEW JERSEY		
BARNEGAT INLET, NJ	1,400	1,400
COLD SPRING INLET, NJ	580	580
DELAWARE RIVER AT CAMDEN, NJ	19	19
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	16,355	17,855
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ	3,180	3,180
NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ	2,005	2,005
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVERS, NJ	120	120
PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD WARNING SYSTEMS, NJ	425	425
RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ	140	140
RARITAN RIVER, NJ	120	120
SALEM RIVER, NJ	278	278
SHREWSBURY RIVER, MAIN CHANNEL, NJ	175	175
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM, NM	1,315	1,315
COCHITI LAKE, NM	1,766	3,266
CONCHAS LAKE, NM	1,037	1,537
GALISTEO DAM, NM	305	305
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NM	50	50
JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM	445	3,445
SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM	846	1,026
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, NM	73	73
TWO RIVERS DAM, NM	313	313
UPPER RIO GRANDE WATER OPERATIONS MODEL, NM	---	1,250
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE, NY	468	468
ARKPORT DAM, NY	257	257
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY	2,966	2,966
BUFFALO HARBOR, NY	176	176
DUNKIRK HARBOR, NY	310	310
EAST RIVER, NY	750	750
EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY	2,250	2,250
EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY	473	473
FIRE ISLAND INLET TO JONES INLET, NY	340	340
FIRE ISLAND INLET, NY	1,000	1,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FLUSHING BAY AND CREEK, NY	490	490
GREAT SOUTH BAY, NY	1,540	1,540
HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY	1,265	1,265
HUDSON RIVER, NY (MAINT)	2,485	2,485
HUDSON RIVER, NY (O&C)	1,340	1,340
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NY	460	460
JAMAICA BAY, NY	1,410	1,410
JONES INLET, NY	200	200
LONG ISLAND INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NY	2,190	2,190
MORICHES INLET, NY	980	980
MT MORRIS LAKE, NY	1,958	1,958
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY	6,720	6,720
NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ	5,030	5,030
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	740	740
NEW YORK HARBOR, NY	12,319	12,319
OSWEGO HARBOR, NY	353	353
PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY	200	200
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NY	3,038	3,038
ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY	725	725
SAG HARBOR, NY	1,600	1,600
SHINNECOCK INLET, NY	2,000	2,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY	739	739
STURGEON POINT HARBOR, NY	15	15
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, NY	564	564
WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY	517	517
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC	5,831	5,831
B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC	1,500	1,500
BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC	350	350
BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC	627	627
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC	897	897
CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC	1,430	1,430
FALLS LAKE, NC	1,276	1,276
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, NC	22	22
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC	455	455
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC	4,995	4,995
MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	45	45
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC	4,737	4,737
NEW RIVER INLET, NC	825	825
NEW TOPSAIL INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC	610	610
PAMLICO AND TAR RIVERS, NC	139	139
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, NC	64	64
ROANOKE RIVER, NC	100	100
W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC	1,742	1,742
WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC	8,405	8,405

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE, ND	241	241
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND	8,513	8,563
HOMME LAKE, ND	153	153
LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND	1,230	1,230
PIPESTEM LAKE, ND	401	401
SOURIS RIVER, ND	292	292
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH	790	790
ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH	750	750
BERLIN LAKE, OH	3,270	3,270
CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH	1,309	1,309
CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH	1,175	1,175
CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH	3,915	5,915
CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH	735	735
DEER CREEK LAKE, OH	745	745
DELAWARE LAKE, OH	777	777
DILLON LAKE, OH	709	709
FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH	1,785	1,785
HURON HARBOR, OH	790	790
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OH	240	240
LORAIN HARBOR, OH	2,152	2,152
MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	25	25
MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH	1,033	1,033
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH	1,329	1,329
MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH	7,993	7,993
NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH	544	544
PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH	661	661
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OH	85	85
ROCKY RIVER HARBOR, OH	---	590
ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH	30	30
SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH	870	870
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OH	174	174
TOLEDO HARBOR, OH	4,550	4,550
TOM JENKINS DAM, OH	350	350
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH	565	565
WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH	821	821
OKLAHOMA		
ARCADIA LAKE, OK	417	417
BIRCH LAKE, OK	480	480
BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK	1,471	1,971
CANDY LAKE, OK	18	168
CANTON LAKE, OK	2,656	2,656
COPAN LAKE, OK	823	823
EUFAULA LAKE, OK	7,240	7,240

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK	5,954	5,954
FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK	838	838
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK	209	209
HEYBURN LAKE, OK	557	557
HUGO LAKE, OK	1,639	1,639
HULAH LAKE, OK	447	447
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OK	72	72
KAW LAKE, OK	1,756	1,756
KEYSTONE LAKE, OK	6,435	6,435
MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, OK	4,588	4,588
OOLOGAH LAKE, OK	2,353	2,353
OPTIMA LAKE, OK	63	63
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR, LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK	32	32
PINE CREEK LAKE, OK	1,160	1,160
ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK	4,001	4,001
SARDIS LAKE, OK	944	944
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OK	386	386
SKIATOOK LAKE, OK	947	947
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK	3,178	3,178
WAURIKA LAKE, OK	1,441	1,441
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK	3,297	3,297
WISTER LAKE, OK	729	1,429
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE, OR	748	748
BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR	332	332
BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	6,250	6,250
CHETCO RIVER, OR	435	435
COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	16,274	18,874
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	7,403	7,403
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	357	357
COOS BAY, OR	4,144	4,144
COQUILLE RIVER, OR	316	316
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR	919	919
COUGAR LAKE, OR	705	705
DEPOE BAY, OR	3	363
DETROIT LAKE, OR	672	672
DORENA LAKE, OR	580	580
FALL CREEK LAKE, OR	619	619
FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR	1,277	1,277
GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR	1,050	1,050
HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR	408	408
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, OR	220	220
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,507	4,507
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR	1,990	1,990
LOST CREEK LAKE, OR	2,919	2,919
MCNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA	4,989	4,989
PORT ORFORD, OR	702	702
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, OR	200	200

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ROGUE RIVER, OR	641	641
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, OR	67	67
SIUSLAW RIVER, OR	822	822
SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR	176	176
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, OR	134	134
TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OR	148	148
UMPQUA RIVER, OR	1,421	1,421
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR	1,234	1,234
WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION, OR	285	285
WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR	646	646
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR	7,895	7,895
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA	6,905	6,905
ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA	608	608
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA	216	216
BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA	832	832
BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA	2,121	2,121
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA	1,259	1,259
COWANESQUE LAKE, PA	1,785	2,035
CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA	1,491	1,491
CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA	659	659
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA	903	903
ERIE HARBOR, PA	125	125
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA	713	713
FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA	663	663
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA	321	321
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, PA	95	95
JOHNSTOWN, PA	13	13
KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA	1,472	1,472
LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA	1,778	1,778
MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA	1,392	1,392
MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA	14,293	14,293
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, PA, OH & WV	22,407	22,407
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, PA, OH & WV	218	218
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, PA	88	88
PROMPTON LAKE, PA	437	437
PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA	13	13
RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA	3,533	4,783
SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA	740	740
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA	2,644	2,644
STILLWATER LAKE, PA	334	334
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, PA	70	70
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES, PA	2,382	3,352
TIONESTA LAKE, PA	1,788	1,788
UNION CITY LAKE, PA	258	258
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA	817	817
YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA	517	517
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA & MD	2,011	2,011

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
RHODE ISLAND		
PROVIDENCE RIVER AND HARBOR, RI	584	1,584
SAKONNET HARBOR, RI	---	500
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC	3,629	5,629
CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	7,145	7,145
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC	3,235	3,235
FOLLY RIVER, SC	266	266
GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC	5,234	5,234
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, SC	26	26
MURRELLS INLET, SC	---	1,000
PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC	21	21
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, SC	60	60
SHIPYARD RIVER, SC	477	477
TOWN CREEK, SC	398	398
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM, LAKE SHARPE, SD	6,422	6,502
COLD BROOK LAKE, SD	496	496
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD	172	172
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD	8,852	8,942
LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN	580	580
MISSOURI R BETWEEN FORT PECK DAM AND GAVINS PT, SD, MT	586	586
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	11,192	11,282
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, SD	306	306
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE, TN	6,070	6,070
CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN	5,307	5,307
CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, TN	1,900	1,900
CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	4,916	4,916
DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN	4,191	4,191
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TN	5	5
J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN	3,278	3,278
OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN	6,326	6,326
TENNESSEE RIVER, TN	14,484	14,484
WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN	348	348
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE, TX	738	738
ARKANSAS - RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VI	1,340	1,340
BARBOUR TERMINAL CHANNEL, TX	314	314
BARDWELL LAKE, TX	1,453	1,453
BAYPORT SHIP CHANNEL, TX	1,810	1,810

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
BELTON LAKE, TX	3,103	3,103
BENBROOK LAKE, TX	1,975	1,975
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	2,029	2,029
CANYON LAKE, TX	2,689	2,689
CHANNEL TO PORT MANSFIELD, TX	2,627	2,627
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX	5,036	5,036
DENISON DAM, LAKE TEXOMA, TX	5,517	5,517
DOUBLE BAYOU, TX	805	805
ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX	10	10
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM, LAKE O' THE PINES, TX	2,801	2,801
FREEPORT HARBOR, TX	4,802	4,802
GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX	87	87
GIWW, CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX	752	752
GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,573	1,573
GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX	2,433	2,433
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX	21,765	21,765
HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX	1,203	1,203
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX	8,137	8,137
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, TX	393	393
JIM CHAPMAN LAKE, TX	1,144	1,144
JOE POOL LAKE, TX	759	759
LAKE KEMP, TX	201	201
LAVON LAKE, TX	2,439	2,439
LEWISVILLE DAM, TX	2,959	2,959
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX	4,315	4,315
MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX	2,953	2,953
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX	1,524	1,524
NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX	1,785	1,785
O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX	1,005	1,005
PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX	941	941
PROCTOR LAKE, TX	1,709	1,709
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, TX	75	75
RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX	1,002	1,002
SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX	10,013	10,013
SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX	4,191	4,191
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, TX	249	249
SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX	2,773	2,773
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX	1,744	1,744
TEXAS CITY SHIP CHANNEL, TX	371	371
TOWN BLUFF DAM, B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX	2,007	2,007
TRINITY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, TX	29	29
TEXAS WATER ALLOCATION ASSESMENT	---	1,500
WACO LAKE, TX	2,301	2,901
WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX	1,208	1,208
WHITNEY LAKE, TX	4,680	4,680
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX	2,643	2,643

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
UTAH		
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, UT	55	55
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, UT	305	305
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT	607	607
BURLINGTON HARBOR, VT	---	1,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY	46	46
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT	561	561
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT	583	583
TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT	629	629
UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT	464	464
VIRGINIA		
APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA	593	593
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - ACC, VA	1,750	1,750
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY - DSC, VA	1,325	1,325
CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA	120	120
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA	877	877
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA	1,465	1,465
HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM	995	995
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, VA	77	77
JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA	4,294	4,294
JOHN H KERR LAKE, VA & NC	8,041	8,041
JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA	1,525	1,525
LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA	605	605
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	225	225
NORFOLK HARBOR, VA	6,105	6,105
NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA	406	406
OCCOQUAN RIVER,VA	---	1,000
PAGAN RIVER, VA	145	145
PHILPOTT LAKE, VA	3,060	3,060
POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA	410	410
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, VA	617	617
RUDEE INLET, VA	646	646
STARLINGS CREEK, VA	551	551
THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA	204	204
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA	1,185	1,185
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA	2,113	2,113
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR	3	3
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK AND SAND ISLAND, WA	6	6
EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA	1,212	1,212
GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA	9,820	12,570
HOWARD HANSON DAM, WA	1,849	1,849

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA	6,094	6,094
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WA	146	146
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA	6,797	6,797
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA	1,537	1,537
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA	4,291	4,291
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA	2,821	2,821
MILL CREEK LAKE, WA	925	925
MT ST HELENS SEDIMENT CONTROL, WA	312	312
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA	2,440	2,440
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS, WA	316	316
PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA	967	967
QUILLAYUTE RIVER, WA	37	1,037
SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS, WA	415	415
SEATTLE HARBOR, EAST WATERWAY CHANNEL DEEPENING, WA	100	450
SEATTLE HARBOR, WA	714	714
STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA	205	205
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WA	56	56
TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA	78	78
THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR	3,432	3,432
WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA	---	650
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE, WV	1,137	1,137
BLUESTONE LAKE, WV	1,689	4,800
BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,723	1,723
EAST LYNN LAKE, WV	1,714	1,714
ELKINS, WV	16	16
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS, WV	91	91
KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV	7,782	7,782
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV, KY & OH	15,934	15,934
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, WV, KY & OH	2,786	2,786
R D BAILEY LAKE, WV	1,934	1,934
STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV	1,216	1,216
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV	1,526	1,526
SUTTON LAKE, WV	1,903	1,903
TYGART LAKE, WV	3,568	3,568
WHEELING CREEK, WV	---	500
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR, WI	170	170
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE, WI	735	735
FOX RIVER, WI	3,252	3,252
GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI	1,640	1,640
KENOSHA HARBOR, WI	925	925
KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI	490	490
LA FARGE LAKE, WI	53	53
MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI	738	738
MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI	819	819

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST	CONFERENCE
SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI	290	290
STURGEON BAY HARBOR AND LAKE MICHIGAN SHIP CANAL, WI	1,534	1,534
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS, WI	28	28
TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI	537	537
WYOMING		
JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY	1,163	1,163
MISCELLANEOUS		
COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM	3,000	2,750
CULTURAL RESOURCES (NAGPRA/CURATION)	3,000	1,500
DREDGE WHEELER READY RESERVE	13,500	8,000
DREDGING DATA AND LOCK PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM	1,166	1,000
DREDGING OPERATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH (DOER)	8,000	7,000
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	1,700
NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM	40	40
NATIONAL DAM SECURITY PROGRAM	25	25
NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAMS (NEPP)	6,000	4,000
PERFORMANCE BASED BUDGETING SUPPORT PROGRAM	1,650	415
PROTECTING, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS(SEC 3)	50	50
RECREATION MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROGRAM (RMSP)	1,950	1,500
REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT SEDIMENT DEMO PROGRAM	1,500	1,500
RELIABILITY MODELS PROGRAM FOR MAJOR REHABILITATION	675	675
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	-43,867
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	1,854,000	1,901,959

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates $39,940,000 to carry out the provisions of the Central Utah Project Completion Act as proposed by the House and the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation. Additional items of the conference agreement are discussed below.

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

The conference agreement appropriates $678,450,000 for Water and Related Resources instead of $635,777,000 as proposed by the House and $655,192,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $39,467,000 for the Central Arizona Project as proposed by the House.

The additional funds provided by the House under the California Investigations Program for studies of ways to increase the reliability of water supplies in southern Orange County, California, have been included under the Southern California Investigations Program.

The conference agreement includes an additional $1,000,000 for the Columbia and Snake Rivers Salmon Recovery project. The additional funds may be used for water acquisition and other actions that may be required by Endangered Species Act biological opinions concerning the operation and maintenance of Bureau of Reclamation projects.

The conference agreement includes an increase of $4,758,000 over the budget request for the Middle Rio Grande project in New Mexico for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake research, monitoring, and modeling of evapotranspiration, implement a program for the transplant of silvery minnow larvae and young-of-year, and carry out habitat conservation and restoration activities along the middle Rio Grande River valley as specified in the Senate report. Additional funding is also provided for Bureau of Reclamation participation in the recent settlement regarding the recovery of the Rio Grande silvery minnow.

The conference agreement includes $2,960,000 for the Title XVI Water Reclamation and Reuse Program. Of the funds provided, $500,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to participate with the City of Espanola, New Mexico, in a feasibility study to investigate opportunities to reclaim and reuse municipal wastewater and naturally impaired surface and groundwater, and $300,000 is provided to continue the Phoenix Metropolitan Water Reclamation and Reuse (Aqua Fria) project in Arizona. In addition, $1,000,000 is provided for the Bureau of Reclamation to support the WateReuse Foundation's research program as described in the House report.

The conferees have provided $5,000,000 for the Drought Emergency Assistance Program to address the severe drought conditions that currently exist in New Mexico and other western states. The conferees direct the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation to the need for the acquisition of water for the San Carlos Reservoir on the Gila River in Arizona.

The conference agreement includes $8,500,000 for the Native American Affairs Program of the Bureau of Reclamation, of which $200,000 is for the Bureau to undertake studies, in consultation and cooperation with the Jicarilla Apache Tribe, of the most feasible method of developing a safe and adequate municipal, rural and industrial water supply for the residents of the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation in New Mexico.

Of the amount provided for the Wetlands Development Program, $1,500,000 is provided for design and construction of the restoration of the Upper Truckee River in the vicinity of the airport at South Lake Tahoe, California, including channel realignment, and meadow and floodplain restoration.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House 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, California, diversion tunnel or restoration of the American River channel through the Auburn Dam construction site.

The conferees have included language in the bill proposed by the Senate which provides that $16,000,000 shall be available for the Rocky Boys Indian Water Rights Settlement project in Montana; provides that not more than $500,000 shall be available for projects carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps; increases the amount authorized for Indian municipal, rural, and industrial water features of the Garrison Diversion project in North Dakota by $2,000,000; and amends the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978.

The conference agreement deletes bill language proposed by the Senate providing $2,300,000 for the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Water Reclamation and Reuse project. Funding for this project is included in the total amount appropriated for Water and Related Resources.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The conference agreement appropriates $9,369,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation Loan Program account as proposed by the House and the Senate.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT RESTORATION FUND

The conference agreement appropriates $38,382,000 for the Central Valley Project Restoration Fund as proposed by the House and the Senate.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement appropriates $50,224,000 for Policy and Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $47,000,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Section 201. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which 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.

Section 202. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that funds for Drought Emergency Assistance are to be used primarily for leasing of water for specified drought related purposes from willing lessors in compliance with State laws. The language also provides that leases may be entered into with an option to purchase provided the purchase is approved in the State in which the purchase takes place and does not cause economic harm in the State in which the purchase is made.

Section 203. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the House which 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. The language has been amended to clarify that the payments to the Trinity Public Utilities District will be made without the need for appropriations.

Section 204. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate regarding the activities of the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program. The language in the Senate bill has been amended to increase the funding limit for the program to not more than $7,850,000, adjusted for inflation, and to not preclude voluntary contributions to the Adaptive Management Program.

Section 205. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to use not to exceed $1,000,000 to refund amounts received by the United States as payments for charges assessed by the Secretary prior to January 1, 1994, for failure to file certain certification or reporting forms prior to the receipt of project water pursuant to sections 206 and 224(c) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982.

Section 206. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Canyon Ferry Reservoir, Montana, Act.

Section 207. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides that beginning in fiscal year 2000 and thereafter, any amounts provided for the Newlands Water Rights Fund for purchasing and retiring water rights in the Newlands Reclamation Project shall be nonreimbursable.

Section 208. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which permits the use of Colorado-Big Thompson Project facilities for nonproject water.

Section 209. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which amends the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998.

Section 210. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the Senate which extends through fiscal year 2001 the prohibition on the use of funds to further reallocate Central Arizona Project water until the enactment of legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make allocations and enter into contracts for the delivery of Central Arizona Project water.

Section 211. The conference agreement includes language which amends the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act, Public Law 100–675.

Section 212. The conference agreement includes language providing for the conveyance of the Sly Park Unit in California to the El Dorado Irrigation District.

Provision not included in the conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include a provision proposed by the Senate related to recreation development within the State of Montana.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE 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
HOPI/WESTERN NAVAJO WATER DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	---	---	1,000	---
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	---	1,293	---
CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT RECYCLING PROJ.....	500	---	824	---
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	---	1,124	---
VENTURA RIVER PROJECT, CASITAS DAM.....	---	5,500	---	5,500

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
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	---	5,622	---
DRAIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY, BOISE PROJECT	250	---	500	---
IDAHO INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	248	---	248	---
MINIDOKA AREA PROJECTS	3,466	1,841	3,766	1,841
MINIDOKA NORTHSIDE DRAINWATER MANAGEMENT PROJECT	288	---	288	---
KANSAS				
KANSAS INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	400	---	400	---
WICHITA PROJECT	---	226	---	226
MONTANA				
CANYON FERRY RESRVOIR	---	---	325	---
FORT PECK RURAL COUNTY WATER SYSTEM	---	---	1,500	---
FORT PECK, DRY PRAIRIE RURAL WATER SYSTREM	---	---	435	---
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	---	16,000	---
NEBRASKA				
MIRAGE FLATS PROJECT	35	53	35	53
NORTH LOOP DIVISION, MIRDAN CANAL	---	---	1,750	---
NEBRASKA INVESTIGATIONS PROGRAM	17	---	17	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
NEVADA				
LAKE MEAD/LAS VEGAS WASH PROGRAM	800	---	1,500	---
LAHONTAN BASIN PROJECT	6,864	1,577	6,864	1,577
NEWLANDS PROJECT WATER RIGHTS FUND	---	---	2,700	---
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER RECYCLING	---	---	500	---
WALKER RIVER BASIN PROJECT	---	---	300	---
NEW MEXICO				
ALBUQUERQUE METRO AREA WATER & RECLAMATION REUSE	---	---	2,300	---
CARLSBAD PROJECT	2,345	607	2,345	857
EASTERN NEW MEXICO WATER SUPPLY	---	---	250	---
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE PROJECT	2,604	8,480	7,362	8,480
NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT	---	---	450	---
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	21,416	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	---	1,000	---
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

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
TUALATIN VALLEY WATER SUPPLY FEASIBILITY STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT, PHASE III STUDY	100	---	100	---
UMATILLA PROJECT	571	1,723	571	1,723
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM	---	---	1,000	---
MID-DAKOTA RURAL WATER PROJECT	6,000	40	8,000	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
HASKELL STREET RECLAIMED WATER PROJECT	---	---	500	---
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	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
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	---	150	---
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	---	5,000	---
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	4,240
FEDERAL BUILDING SEISMIC SAFETY PROGRAM.....	---	1,400	---	1,000
GENERAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES.....	1,842	---	1,700	---
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	6,484	---	5,884	---
LOWER COLORADO RIVER OPERATIONS PROGRAM.....	13,729	---	11,729	---
MISCELLANEOUS FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS.....	---	506	---	506
NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION.....	1,300	---	1,300	---
NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS PROGRAM.....	8,500	---	8,500	---
NEGOTIATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WATER MARKETING.....	1,254	---	1,000	---
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.....	169	865	169	865
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM - OTHER PROJ.....	3,232	25,667	3,232	25,667
POWER PROGRAM SERVICES.....	1,023	473	1,023	473
PUBLIC ACCESS AND SAFETY PROGRAM.....	464	---	464	---
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	---	2,000	---
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:				
ADVANCED WATER TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	1,225	---	1,225	---
APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,249	---	3,249	---
DESALINATION RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.....	300	---	1,300	---
HYDROELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE PROT/EHNANCE.....	660	---	660	---
TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM.....	283	---	283	---
WATERSHED/RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.....	933	---	933	---
SITE SECURITY.....	---	1,043	---	1,043
SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION.....	263	---	263	---
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,840	---	1,000	---
TITLE XVI WATER RECLAMATION AND REUSE PROGRAM.....	1,460	---	2,960	---
UNITED STATES/MEXICO BORDER ISSUES- TECH SUPPORT.....	50	---	50	---
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM.....	7,605	---	7,100	---
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT.....	3,750	---	3,250	---

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	-31,120	---	-47,720	---
TOTAL, WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES.....	353,822	289,236	389,864	288,586

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET REQUEST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	BUDGET REQUEST FACILITIES OM&R	CONFERENCE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	CONFERENCE FACILITIES OM&R
LOAN PROGRAM				
CALIFORNIA				
CASTROVILLE IRRIGATION WATER SUPPLY PROJECT.....	1,300	---	1,300	---
SALINAS VALLEY WATER RECLAMATION.....	800	---	800	---
SAN SEVAINE CREEK WATER PROJECT.....	6,844	---	6,844	---
VARIOUS				
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	425	---	425	---
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	9,369	---	9,369	---

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs, and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The conferees strongly support the progress being made by the Office of Engineering and Construction Management in bringing standardization, discipline, oversight, and increased professionalism to the Department's project management efforts. The project engineering and design (PED) process developed by the Department represents significant progress toward correcting serious management deficiencies that have historically plagued the Department's construction projects. The conferees believe that implementation of the PED process for all construction and environmental projects throughout the Department will provide the assurance necessary to eliminate the current requirement for an external independent review of all projects prior to releasing funds for construction. The conferees expect the continuation of the external independent review process as discussed in both the House and Senate reports.

PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES

The conferees have provided statutory limitations on the number of passenger motor vehicles that can be purchased by the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2001. These limitations are included each year, but the Department has been interpreting this limitation to mean that sport utility vehicles are not considered passenger motor vehicles and do not count against the appropriation ceiling. The conferees consider this to be disingenuous at best and a violation of the appropriations language at worst.

The conferees expect the Department to adhere strictly to the limits set for the purchase of motor vehicles. It is the intention of the conferees in prescribing these limitations that sport utility vehicles are to be considered passenger motor vehicles and, therefore, subject to the limitation. Further, the Department is to provide a full and complete accounting of the current motor vehicle inventory at each location. The Department should work with the Committees on Appropriations to ensure that the report provides the necessary information.

CONTRACTOR TRAVEL

The conference agreement includes a statutory provision limiting reimbursement of Department of Energy management and operating contractors for travel expenses to not more than $185,000,000. This limitation consists of $175,000,000 for contractor travel and a reserve fund of $10,000,000 to be administered by the Department's Chief Financial Officer and released for emergency travel requirements.

The Department had requested $200,000,000 for contractor travel. The reduction in fiscal year 2001 is not to be prorated, but should be applied to those organizations that appear to have the most questionable travel practices. This is not meant to restrict trips between laboratories to coordinate on program issues.

INDEPENDENT CENTERS

The Department is to identify all independent centers at each DOE laboratory and facility in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission. These centers are to be funded directly in program accounts, rather than overhead, with the exception of those centers which clearly benefit more than one program at a laboratory or facility. The Department is directed to provide a list of any centers that are funded through overhead accounts with the fiscal year 2002 budget submission.

REPROGRAMMINGS

The conference agreement does not provide the Department of Energy with any internal reprogramming flexibility in fiscal year 2001 unless specifically identified by the House, Senate, or conference agreement. Any reallocation of new or prior year budget authority or prior year deobligations must be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in advance, in writing, and may not be implemented prior to approval by the Committees.

LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The conference agreement includes an allowance of six percent for the laboratory directed research and development (LDRD) program and two percent for nuclear weapons production plants. Travel costs for LDRD are exempt from the contractor travel ceiling. The conferees direct the Department's Chief Financial Officer to develop and execute a financial accounting report of LDRD expenditures by laboratory and weapons production plant. This report, due to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by December 31, 2000, and each year thereafter, should provide costs by personnel salaries, equipment, and travel. The Department should work with the Committees on the specific information to be included in the report.

SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY BUDGET AMENDMENT

The conferees have chosen to reflect the amounts requested for safeguards and security funding in the manner proposed in the budget amendment submitted to Congress by the Department. Adjustments have been made in each account to reflect the consolidation of safeguards and security costs into a few major accounts and the transfer of these costs from overhead accounts to specific program line items. However, the conferees do not concur with the amendment to the extent its purpose is to reorganize all safeguards and security functions at the Department under the control and direction of the Office of Security and Emergency Operations, or any other entity not part of line management. The conferees agree that the direct responsibility for safeguards and security must be united and integrated with the responsibility of line operations.

ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REQUIREMENTS

The conferees agree with the House report language on augmenting Federal staff, overhead costs reviews and reprogramming guidelines.

GENERAL REDUCTIONS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE SPECIFIC PROGRAM DIRECTIONS

The Department is directed to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by January 15, 2001, on the actual application of any general reductions of funding or use of prior year balances contained in the conference agreement. In general, such reductions should not be applied disproportionately against any program, project, or activity. However, the conferees are aware there may be instances where proportional reductions would adversely impact critical programs and other allocations may be necessary. The report should also include the distribution of the safeguards and security funding adjustments.

ENERGY SUPPLY

The conference agreement provides $660,574,000 for Energy Supply instead of $616,482,000 as proposed by the House and $691,520,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes the House proposal to make funds available until expended rather than the Senate proposal to limit availability to two years. The conference agreement does not include the Senate bill language transferring funds from the United States Enrichment Corporation or earmarking funds for a variety of projects to demonstrate alternative energy technologies.

RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES

The conference agreement provides $422,085,000 instead of $390,519,000 as proposed by the House and $444,117,000 as proposed by the Senate for renewable energy resources.

Biomass/biofuels.—The conference agreement includes $112,900,000 for biomass/biofuels. The conferees have provided $26,740,000 for research to be managed by the Office of Science, the same as the budget request. The conference agreement includes $40,000,000 for power systems and $46,160,000 for the transportation program. The conference agreement does not include prescriptive language specifying funding allocations as contained in the House and Senate reports.

The conferees encourage the Department to continue the integrated approach to bioenergy activities and recommend the use of up to $18,000,000 within available funds for the bioenergy initiative. Funding for this initiative may be derived from both the power and transportation programs.

In the power program, the conference agreement provides $2,000,000 for the Iowa switch grass project which is a multi-year project; $4,000,000 for the McNeill biomass plant in Burlington, Vermont; $395,000 for the final Federal contribution to the Vermont agriculture methane project; $500,000 for the bioreactor landfill project to be administered by the Environmental Education and Research Foundation and Michigan State University; $1,000,000 for methane energy and agriculture development (MEAD) in Tillamook Bay, Oregon; and $1,000,000 for the Mount Wachusett College biomass conversion project in Massachusetts.

The Department is to accelerate the large-scale biomass demonstration at the Winona, Mississippi, site.

The conference agreement provides $4,000,000 in power systems to support a project to demonstrate a commercial facility employing the thermo-depolymerization technology at a site adjacent to the Nevada Test Site. The project shall proceed on a cost-shared basis where Federal funding shall be matched in at least an equal amount with non-Federal funding.

In the transportation program, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for continuation of biomass research at the Energy and Environmental Research Center on the integration of biomass with fossil fuels for advanced power systems transportation fuels; $600,000 for the University of Louisville to work on the design of bioreactors for production of fuels and chemicals for ethanol production; and $2,000,000 for the design and construction of a demonstration facility for regional biomass ethanol manufacturing in southeast Alaska.

The conference agreement also includes $2,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute to be derived equally from power and transportation systems.

Funding allocated by the Department for the regional biomass program and feedstock production should be derived equally from the power and transportation programs.

Geothermal.—The conference agreement includes $27,000,000 for geothermal activities. The conference agreement does not include language specifying funding allocations as contained in the Senate report. The conferees have provided $2,000,000 to complete

the Lake County Basin 2000 Geothermal project in Lake County, California.

Hydrogen.—The conference agreement includes $29,970,000 for hydrogen activities, including $350,000 for the Montana Trade Port Authority in Billings, Montana; $250,000 for the gasification of Iowa switch grass; and $800,000 for the ITM Syngas project.

The conferees have also provided $2,000,000 for the multi-year demonstration of an underground mining locomotive and an earth loader powered by hydrogen at existing facilities within the State of Nevada. The demonstration is subject to a private sector industry cost-share of not less than an equal amount, and a portion of these funds may also be used to acquire a prototype hydrogen fueling appliance to provide on-site hydrogen in the demonstration.

Hydropower.—The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for hydropower. The conferees are aware that the Department is funding research that is supposed to be applicable to the needs of the large dams in the northwest United States. The Department is concerned that the Federal power marketing administrations are not involved in developing this research program. The Department is directed to provide a report coordinated with the power marketing administrations that indicates how this hydropower research is applicable to the current and future needs of the power marketing administrations and the schedule by which this research will provide useable products.

Solar Energy.—The conference agreement includes $110,632,000 for solar energy programs. The conference agreement does not include language specifying funding allocations as contained in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement provides $13,800,000 for concentrating solar power, including $1,000,000 to initiate planning of a one MW dish engine field validation power project at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The conference agreement includes $78,622,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, including up to $3,000,000 for the million solar roofs initiative. The conferees have provided $1,500,000 for the Southeast and Southwest photovoltaic experiment stations.

The conference agreement includes $3,950,000 for solar building technology research.

Wind.—The conference agreement includes $40,283,000 for wind programs. The conference agreement does not include prescriptive language specifying allocations as included in the Senate report. The conferees have provided $1,000,000 for the Kotzebue wind project. Of the funding for wind energy systems, not less than $5,000,000 shall be made available for new and ongoing small wind programs, including not less than $2,000,000 for the small wind turbine development project. From within available funds, $100,000 has been provided for a wind turbine and for educational purposes at the Turtle Mountain Community College in North Dakota.

Electric energy systems and storage.—The conference agreement includes $52,000,000 for electric energy systems and storage. The conferees urge the Department to support the university, industry-based partnership at the University of California-Irvine Advanced Power and Energy Program to conduct energy and information related technology demonstrations to accelerate the development and deployment of cost-efficient technologies benefiting all energy consumers affected by a deregulated energy industry.

The conference agreement includes $6,000,000 to accelerate the development and application of high temperature superconductor technologies through joint efforts among DOE laboratories, universities, and industry to be led by Los Alamos and Oak Ridge National Laboratories.

The conference agreement includes $500,000 for completion of the distributed power demonstration project begun last year at the Nevada Test Site.

Renewable Support and Implementation.—The conference agreement includes $21,600,000 for renewable support and implementation programs.

The Federal Energy Management Program should report to the Committees on Appropriations by December 31, 2001, on the accomplishments of the Departmental energy management program with the fiscal year 2001 appropriations including the number of energy efficiency projects funded, the number of energy savings performance contracts supported, and the total estimated savings.

From within available funds, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for the Office of Arctic Energy as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for the international renewable energy program. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is to be provided to International Utility Efficiency Partnerships, Inc. (IUEP). The IUEP shall competitively award all projects, continuing its leadership role in reducing carbon dioxide emissions using voluntary market-based mechanisms.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the renewable energy production incentive program.

The conference agreement includes $6,600,000 for renewable Indian energy resources projects as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for renewable program support, of which $1,000,000 is for an Indoor Air Quality and Energy Conservation Research Planning grant to study and develop technologies to improve air quality within homes and buildings.

Program direction.—The conference agreement includes $18,700,000 for program direction. The conferees have provided additional funding to support implementation of the management reforms identified in the recent National Academy of Public Administration review.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The conference agreement provides $259,925,000 for nuclear energy activities instead of $231,815,000 as proposed by the House and $262,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Advanced radioisotope power systems.—The conference agreement includes $32,200,000, an increase over the budget request of $30,864,000. The additional funds are to maintain the infrastructure to support future national security needs and NASA missions.

Isotope support.—The conference agreement includes a total program level of $27,215,000 for the isotope program. This amount is reduced by offsetting collections of $8,000,000 to be received in fiscal year 2001, resulting in a net appropriation of $19,215,000. The conferees understand that the total estimated cost of Project 99–E–201, the isotope production facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, has increased significantly due to factors outside the control of the Office of Nuclear Energy and have included $2,500,000 to partially cover these additional costs.

University reactor fuel assistance and support.—The conference agreement includes $12,000,000, the same as the budget request.

Research and development.—The conference agreement provides $47,500,000 for nuclear energy research and development activities.

The conference agreement includes $5,000,000, the same as the budget request, for nuclear energy plant optimization. The conferees direct the Department to ensure that projects are funded jointly with non-Federal partners and that total non-Federal contributions are equal to or in excess of total Department contributions to projects funded in this program.

The conferees have provided $35,000,000 for the nuclear energy research initiative.

The conference agreement includes $7,500,000 for nuclear energy technologies. The Senate had included these activities in the nuclear energy research initiative program. Funding of $4,500,000 is provided to develop a road map for the commercial deployment of a next generation power reactor; $1,000,000 for the preparation of a detailed assessment that analyzes and describes the changes needed to existing advanced light water reactor (ALWR) designs; $1,000,000 for planning and implementation of initiatives in support of an advanced gas reactor; and $1,000,000 to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of deployment of small modular reactors.

Infrastructure.—The conference agreement includes the budget request of $39,150,000 for ANL-West Operations, $9,000,000 for test reactor landlord activities, and $44,010,000 for the Fast Flux Test Facility.

Nuclear facilities management.—The conference agreement adopts the budget structure proposed by the House and provides $34,850,000 for nuclear facilities management activities, the same as the budget request.

The conference agreement provides the full amount of the budget request to complete draining and processing EBR-II primary sodium. The conferees direct the Department to notify the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations immediately if any issues arise that would delay the Department's scheduled date to complete these activities.

Uranium programs.—The conference agreement transfers the budget request of $53,400,000 for uranium programs to a new appropriation account, Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.

Program direction.—The conference agreement includes $22,000,000 for program direction. This reduction reflects the transfer of 25 employees in the field and up to 5 employees at Headquarters who managed the uranium programs to the Office of Environmental Management.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conference agreement includes $35,998,000 for non-defense environment, safety and health activities. The conferees direct that the reduction from the budget request be directed to eliminate lower-priority activities currently funded in this program. The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 to be transferred to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as proposed by the House. The conferees expect the Department to budget for this activity in fiscal year 2002.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The conference agreement includes $8,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

The conference agreement also includes $47,100,000, the same amount as the budget request, for research performed by the Office of Science related to renewable energy technologies, and $2,352,000 proposed as an offset from nuclear energy royalties to be received in fiscal year 2001. A reduction of $16,582,000 reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement provides $277,812,000 for Non-Defense Environmental Management instead of $281,001,000 as proposed by the House and $309,141,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funding of $5,000,000 is

provided to expedite environmental cleanup at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. No funding has been provided for the Atlas site in Moab, Utah, which has not been authorized. The recommendation transfers $1,900,000 from the post-2006 program to the site/project completion program to maintain the schedule for completing cleanup of three Oakland geographic sites.

URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION

The conference agreement provides $393,367,000 for uranium activities instead of $301,400,000 as proposed by the House and $297,778,000 as proposed by the Senate, and adopts the budget structure proposed by the House.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

The conference agreement includes $345,038,000 for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund. This includes $273,038,000 for cleanup activities and $72,000,000 for uranium and thorium reimbursements. The conferees recognize there are eligible uranium and thorium licensee claims under Title X of the Energy Policy Act that have been approved for reimbursement, but not yet paid in full. Additional funding of $42,000,000 over the budget request of $30,000,000 has been provided for these payments.

URANIUM PROGRAMS

The conference agreement provides $62,400,000 for uranium activities, an increase of $9,000,000 over the budget request of $53,400,000. Additional funding of $9,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, has been provided for activities associated with the depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6) management and conversion project.

DOMESTIC URANIUM INDUSTRY

The conferees are very concerned about the front end of the U.S. nuclear fuel cycle. The conferees direct the Secretary to work with the President and other Federal agencies to ensure that current laws with respect to the privatization of USEC and with respect to the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and their impact on United States domestic capabilities are carried out. In addition, the Secretary is instructed to take timely measures to ensure that conversion capability is not lost in the United States. The conferees expect that any such measures will not interfere with the implementation of the Russian HEU agreement and the important national security goals it is accomplishing.

The conferees direct the Secretary to undertake an evaluation and make specific recommendations on the various options to sustain a domestic uranium enrichment industry in the short and long-term to be delivered to Congress no later than December 31, 2000. The Secretary's evaluation shall include recommendations for dealing with the Portsmouth facility and its role in maintaining a secure and sufficient domestic supply of enriched uranium. Further, this investigation should consider the technological viability and commercial feasibility of all proposed enrichment technologies including various centrifuge options, AVLIS and SILEX technologies, or other emerging technology. The evaluation should also consider the role of the Federal government in developing and supporting the implementation and regulation of these new technologies in order to secure a reliable and competitive source of domestic nuclear fuel.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENT

A reduction of $14,071,000 reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

SCIENCE

The conference agreement provides $3,186,352,000 instead of $2,830,915,000 as proposed by the House and $2,870,112,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include the Senate language earmarking funds for various purposes and limiting funding for the small business innovation research program.

High energy physics.—The conference agreement provides $726,130,000 for high energy physics and reflects the adjustments recommended in the Science budget amendment submitted by the Department. Funding of $230,931,000 has been provided for facility operations at the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

Nuclear physics.—The conference agreement provides $369,890,000 for nuclear physics, the same as the original budget request.

Biological and environmental research.—The conference agreement includes $500,260,000 for biological and environmental research. The conferees have included $20,135,000 for the low-dose effects program, an increase of $8,453,000 over the budget request. The conference agreement provides $9,000,000 for molecular nuclear medicine.

The conferees have provided the budget request of $2,500,000 for the Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics at Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The conference agreement includes $2,000,000 for the Discovery Science Center in Orange County, California; $1,500,000 for the Children's Hospital emergency power plant in San Diego; $1,000,000 for the Center for Science and Education at the University of San Diego; $500,000 for the bone marrow transplant program at Children's Hospital Medical Center Foundation in Oakland, California; $1,000,000 for the North Shore Long Island Jewish Health System in New York; $1,700,000 for the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago; $2,000,000 for the Livingston Digital Millenium Center to be located at Tulane University; and $1,000,000 for the Center for Nuclear Magnetic Resonance at the University of Alabama-Birmingham.

The conference agreement includes $3,000,000 for the Nanotechnology Engineering Center at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana; $2,000,000 for the School of Public Health at the University of South Carolina for modernization upgrades; $2,000,000 for the National Center for Musculoskeletal Research at the Hospital for Special Surgery in New York; and $1,300,000 for the Western States Visibility Assessment Program at New Mexico Tech to trace emissions resulting from energy consumption.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for high temperature super conducting research and development at Boston College; $2,500,000 for the positron emission tomography facility at West Virginia University; $1,000,000 for the advanced medical imaging center at Hampton University; $500,000 for the Natural Energy Laboratory in Hawaii; $800,000 for the Child Health Institute of New Brunswick, New Jersey; and $900,000 for the linear accelerator for University Medical Center of Southern Nevada.

The conference agreement also includes $200,000 for the study of biological effects of low level radioactive activity at University of Nevada-Las Vegas; $1,000,000 for the Medical University of South Carolina Oncology Center; $11,000,000 for development of technologies using advanced functional brain imaging methodologies, including magnetoencephalography, for conduct of basic research in mental illness and neurological disorders, and for construction; $2,000,000 for a science and technology facility at New Mexico Highlands University; $2,000,000 for the University of Missouri-Columbia to expand the federal investment in the university's nuclear medicine and cancer research capital program; and $2,000,000 for the Inland Northwest Natural Resources Research Center at Gonzaga University.

Basic energy sciences.—The conference agreement includes $1,013,370,000 for basic energy sciences. The conferees have included $8,000,000 for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).

Spallation Neutron Source.—The recommendation includes $278,600,000, including $259,500,000 for construction and $19,100,000 for related research and development, the same as the amended budget request, for the Spallation Neutron Source.

Advanced scientific computing research.—The conference agreement includes $170,000,000 for advanced scientific computing research.

Energy research analyses.—The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for energy research analyses, the same amount provided by the House and the Senate.

Multiprogram energy labs—facility support.—The conference agreement includes $33,930,000 for multi-program energy labs-facility support.

Fusion energy sciences.—The conference agreement includes $255,000,000, as proposed by the House, for fusion energy sciences.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $49,818,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Science. This is offset by a reduction of $38,244,000 that is to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program Direction.—The conference agreement includes $139,245,000 for program direction. Funding of $4,500,000 has been provided for science education.

Funding adjustments.—A reduction of $38,244,000 reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. A general reduction of $34, 047,000 has been applied to this account.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement provides $191,074,000 for Nuclear Waste Disposal instead of $213,000,000 as proposed by the House and $59,175,000 as proposed by the Senate. Combined with the appropriation of $200,000,000 to the Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal account, a total of $391,074,000 will be available for program activities in fiscal year 2001. The funding level reflects a reduction of $39,500,000 from the budget request and the transfer of $6,926,000 in safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

In addition, the conferees recommend that $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities in Public Law 104–46 may be made available upon written certification by the Secretary of Energy to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the site recommendation report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

Site recommendation report.—The conferees reiterate the expectation by Congress that the Department submit its site recommendation report in July 2001 according to the current schedule. While the conference agreement does not provide the full funding requested by the Department, the conferees expect the Department to promptly submit a reprogramming request if it becomes apparent that limited funding will delay the site recommendation report beyond July 2001.

The conferees further expect that, if the site is approved, the Department will continue to analyze further design improvements and enhancements between that time

and the submittal of a license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

State oversight funding.—The conference agreement includes $2,500,000 for the State of Nevada. This funding will be provided to the Department of Energy which will reimburse the State for actual expenditures on appropriate scientific oversight responsibilities conducted pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. These funds are to be provided to the Nevada Division of Emergency Management for program management and execution and may not be used for payment of salaries and expenses for State employees.

Local oversight funding.—The conference agreement includes $6,000,000 for affected units of local government. The conferees expect the Department to provide the full amount of funding allocated to the State and local counties for oversight activities. Any proposed reduction to the amounts identified by Congress for State and local oversight will require prior approval of a reprogramming request by the Committees on Appropriations.

Limitation on the use of funds to promote or advertise public tours.—The conferees direct that none of the funds be used to promote or advertise any public tour of the Yucca Mountain facility, other than public notice that is required by statute or regulation.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides $226,107,000 for Departmental Administration instead of $153,527,000 as proposed by the House and $210,128,000 as proposed by the Senate. Additional funding adjustments include a transfer of $25,000,000 from Other Defense Activities; the use of $8,000,000 of prior year balances; and a reduction of $18,000 for safeguards and security costs. Revenues of $151,000,000 are estimated to be received in fiscal year 2001, resulting in a net appropriation of $75,107,000.

The conference agreement provides $5,000,000 for the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the House. All funds for the newly established National Nuclear Security Administration have been provided in the defense portion of this bill.

The conference agreement provides $32,148,000 for the Chief Financial Officer, an increase of $1,400,000 over the budget request of $30,748,000. These additional funds are to support the DOE project management career development program.

Working capital fund.—The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House prohibiting funding Federal employee salaries and expenses in the working capital fund. However, any proposal by the Department to transfer salaries and expenses to the working capital fund will require prior approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Cost of work for others.—The conference agreement includes a one-time increase of $40,000,000 in the cost of work for others program to accommodate safeguards and security requirements. It is anticipated that this amount will be offset by an estimated $40,000,000 in revenues derived from non-Department of Energy customers for the purpose of funding safeguards and security activities throughout the Department. In fiscal year 2002 and beyond, the conferees expect the Department to submit a safeguards and security budget that includes amounts obtained previously from other agencies or customers.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement provides $31,500,000 for the Inspector General as proposed by the House instead of $28,988,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House requiring a study of the economic basis of recent gasoline price levels.

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The conferees support the Administrator's efforts to establish and fill critical positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The conferees agree that the Administrator's authority should not be impacted by any action that would otherwise limit or preclude hiring which may occur as a result of a change of administrations, and that the Administrator should to the maximum extent possible under applicable statutes proceed with effecting appointments.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement provides $5,015,186,000 for Weapons Activities instead of $4,579,684,000 as proposed by the House and $4,883,289,000 as proposed by the Senate. Statutory language proposed by the House limiting the funds availability to two years has not been included by the conferees.

Reprogramming.—The conference agreement provides limited reprogramming authority of $5,000,000 or 5 percent, whichever is less, within the Weapons Activities account without submission of a reprogramming to be approved in advance 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. This should provide the needed flexibility to manage this account.

Congressional notification within 30 days of the use of this reprogramming authority is required. Transfers which would result in increases or decreases in excess of $5,000,000 or 5 percent to an individual program account during the fiscal year require prior notification and approval from the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The Department is directed to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations by January 15, 2001, that reflects the allocation of the safeguards and security reduction, the use of prior year balances and the application of general reductions, and any proposed accounting adjustments.

Directed stockpile work.—In stockpile research and development, additional funding of $19,000,000 has been provided for life extension development activities and to support additional sub-critical experiments. Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided to support activities required to maintain the delivery date for a certified pit. No additional funds are provided for cooperative research on hard and deeply buried targets.

Funding for stockpile maintenance has been increased by $22,000,000 as follows: $13,000,000 for life extension operations and development and engineering activities; $5,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; and $4,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant.

Funding for stockpile evaluation has been increased by $23,000,000 as follows: $6,000,000 for the elimination of the testing backlog and joint test equipment procurements; $8,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $6,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; and $3,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant.

Campaigns.—The conference agreement provides $41,400,000 for pit certification, the same as the budget request. Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided for dynamic materials properties to support the maintenance of core scientific capabilities, Liner Demonstration Experiments, and other various multi-campaign supporting physics demonstrations for the Atlas pulsed power facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Nevada Test Site.

An additional $15,000,000 has been provided to support research, development and preconceptual design studies for an advanced hydrodynamic test facility using protons.

Additional funding of $17,000,000 has been provided for enhanced surveillance activities as follows: $3,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; $7,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $4,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; $1,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant; and $2,000,000 to support accelerated deployment of test and diagnostic equipment.

Funding for pit manufacturing readiness is increased by $17,000,000. An increase of $2,000,000 is provided to initiate conceptual design work on a pit manufacturing facility. Additional funding of $15,000,000 is provided to support the pit production program which is now behind schedule and over cost. The conferees strongly support the Senate language regarding the Department's lack of attention to this critical program and the requirement for a progress report by December 1, 2000, and each quarter thereafter.

An additional $5,000,000 has been provided to the Y–12 Plant for secondary readiness.

Inertial Fusion.—The conference agreement includes $449,600,000 for the inertial fusion program in the budget structure proposed by the House.

Additional funding of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House has been provided to further development of high average power lasers. The conference agreement includes the budget request of $9,750,000 for the Naval Research Laboratory and the budget request of $32,150,000 for the University of Rochester. The conference agreement reflects the transfer of $40,000,000 from National Ignition Facility (NIF) operations funding to the NIF construction project.

The conference agreement provides $2,500,000 from within available funds to transfer the Petawatt Laser from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to the University of Nevada-Reno, as proposed by the Senate.

National Ignition Facility.—The conference agreement provides $199,100,000 for continued construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF). The conferees have included a directed reduction of $25,000,000 in the Weapons Activities account which is to be applied to programs under the direction of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

The conferees have included statutory language providing that only $130,000,000 shall be made available for NIF at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 and the remaining $69,100,000 shall be available only upon a certification after March 31, 2001, by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration that several requirements have been met. These requirements include:

A. A recommendation on an appropriate path forward for the project based on a detailed review of alternative construction options that would (1) focus on first achieving operation of a 48 or 96 beam laser; (2) allow for the full demonstration of a such a system in support of the stockpile stewardship program before proceeding with construction and operation of a larger laser complex; and (3) include a program and funding plan for the possible future upgrade to a full NIF configuration. The recommendation should include identification of available ''off-ramps'' and decision points where the project could be scaled to a smaller system.

B. Certification that project and scientific milestones as established in the revised construction project data sheet for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2000 and the first two quarters of fiscal year 2001 have been met on schedule and on cost.

C. Certification that the first and second quarter project reviews in fiscal year 2001 determined the project to be on schedule and

cost and have provided further validation to the proposed path forward.

D. Completion of a study that includes conclusions as to whether the full-scale NIF is required in order to maintain the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile, and whether alternatives to the NIF could achieve the objective of maintaining the safety and reliability of the current nuclear weapons stockpile.

E. Certification that the NIF project has implemented an integrated cost-schedule earned-value project control system by March 1, 2001.

F. A five-year budget plan for the stockpile stewardship program that fully describes how the NNSA intends to pay for NIF over the out years and what the potential for other impacts on the stockpile stewardship program will be.

The conferees remain concerned about the Department's proposed budget increase and schedule delay for the NIF at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The conferees believe that previously the Department of Energy, and most recently the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), may have failed to examine adequately options for NIF that have fewer than the full 192 beams. For example, a preferred course for NIF may be to complete 48 or 96 beams as soon as possible (although block procurement of infrastructure and glass may be considered), bring the reduced NIF into operation, perform the necessary scientific and technical tests to evaluate whether a full NIF will work and its impact on stockpile stewardship, and then develop a path forward for NIF that balances its scientific importance within the overall needs of the stockpile stewardship program. To move on this path in fiscal year 2001, the conferees recommend that $199,100,000 be appropriated for NIF as follows: $74,100,000 as originally proposed for Project 96–D–111, $40,000,000 from NIF operations funding within the budget request for LLNL, $25,000,000 to be identified within the budget request at LLNL, plus an additional $60,000,000 in new appropriations.

Furthermore, the conferees direct the Administration to prepare a budget request for fiscal year 2002 that fully reflects a balanced set of programs and investments within the stockpile stewardship program, and that the overall budget profile over the next eight years will accommodate a $3.4 billion NIF along with the other critical aspects of the program.

Defense computing and modeling.—The conference agreement provides $786,175,000 for defense computing modeling and the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative in the budget structure proposed by the House. The recommendation is $10,000,000 less than the budget request, and the reduction should be taken against lower priority activities.

Tritium.—A total of $167,000,000 is provided for continued research and development on a new source of tritium. Funding of $15,000,000 has been provided for design only activities in Project 98–D–126, Accelerator Production of Tritium.

Readiness in technical base and facilities.—The conference agreement includes several funding adjustments transferring funds from this program to individual campaigns.

For operations of facilities, $137,300,000 has been transferred to the inertial fusion program. An additional $36,000,000 has been provided to the production plants for replacement of critical infrastructure and equipment as follows: $12,000,000 for the Kansas City Plant; $12,000,000 for the Pantex Plant; $10,000,000 for the Y–12 Plant; and $2,000,000 for the Savannah River Plant.

Additional funding of $10,000,000 has been provided for the operation of pulsed power facilities; $20,000,000 for microsystems and microelectronics activities at the Sandia National Laboratory; $7,000,000 for a replacement CMR facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and $3,100,000 to fund the transition period for the new contractor at the Pantex Plant in Texas.

For program readiness, the conference agreement transfers $7,400,000 to the inertial fusion program and adds $6,100,000 for the TA–18 relocation.

For nuclear weapons incident response, a new program established in readiness technical base and facilities, the conference agreement provides $56,289,000. Funding of $44,205,000 for the nuclear emergency search team and $12,084,000 for the accident response group was transferred from the emergency management program in the Other Defense Activities account.

Special projects are supported at the budget request of $48,297,000. Additional funds have not been provided for AMTEX. From within available funds, $1,000,000 has been provided to support a program in partnership with university systems to meet the needs of the NNSA.

For materials recycling, the conference agreement provides an additional $8,000,000 to maintain restart schedules for hydrogen fluoride and wet chemistry operations at the Y–12 Plant.

For containers, the conference agreement provides an additional $4,000,000 to support the effort to repackage pits which is currently behind schedule at the Pantex Plant due to operational problems.

Funding for advanced simulation and computing has been transferred to the defense computing and modeling campaign.

The conference agreement does not provide additional funding to process uranium-233 as proposed by the Senate, but the conferees expect the Department to act expeditiously to process this material in a manner that would retain and make available isotopes for beneficial use. The Department should provide to the House and Senate Committees a report on the status of this project by March 1, 2001.

Construction projects.—The conference agreement provides $35,500,000 for preliminary project engineering and design. Funding of $20,000,000 is provided for design and supporting infrastructure upgrades for the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Applications facility at Sandia National Laboratory; $5,000,000 for proof of concept and completion of facility operational capability for the Atlas pulsed power machine at the Nevada Test Site; and $1,000,000 for initiation of design activities for the relocation of the TA–18 nuclear materials handling facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $377,596,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Defense Programs. This is offset by a reduction of $310,796,000 to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $224,071,000 for program direction as proposed by the Senate.

Funding adjustments.—The conference agreement includes the use of $13,647,000 in prior year balances and a reduction of $310,796,000 that reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. In addition, the conference agreement includes a general reduction of $35,700,000 of which $25,000,000 is to be taken against programs at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

The conference agreement provides $874,196,000 for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation instead of $861,477,000 as proposed by the House and $908,967,000 as proposed by the Senate. Statutory language proposed by the House limiting the funds availability to two years has not been included by the conferees. Statutory language proposed by the Senate to earmark funding for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology has not been included. The conferees have provided a total of $53,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative within this account.

Limitation on Russian and Newly Independent States' (NIS) program funds.—The conferees are concerned about the amount of funding for Russian and NIS programs which remains in the United States for Department of Energy contractors and laboratories rather than going to the facilities in Russia and the NIS. The conferees direct that not more than the following percentages of funding may be spent in the United States in fiscal year 2001 for these programs: Materials Protection, Control and Accounting, 43%; International Proliferation Prevention Program, 40%; Nuclear Cities Initiative, 49%; Russian Plutonium Disposition, 38%; and International Nuclear Safety, 78%.

The conferees expect the Department to continue to increase the level of funding which is provided to Russia versus the funding which remains in the United States for Department of Energy contractors and laboratories in each subsequent year. The Department is to provide a report to the Committees by January 31, 2001, and each subsequent year on the amount of funding provided to Russia and NIS in each program area. The Department should work with the Committees on the specific information to be included in the report.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development.—The conference agreement provides $252,990,000 for nonproliferation and verification research and development. Funding of $17,000,000 has been provided for the nonproliferation and international security center (NISC) at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and $1,000,000 for the Incorporated Research Institutions for Seismology PASSCAL Instrument Center.

Concerns have been raised repeatedly that there should be more opportunity for open competition in certain areas of the nonproliferation and verification research and development program. A recent report by an outside group established by the Department to review the Office of Nonproliferation Research and Engineering included a similar recommendation. The report stated that, ''There should be greater opportunity for the wider U.S. scientific and technical community to contribute to the success of the NN–20 portfolio. This can be done through open competition administered by DOE Headquarters and through partnerships chosen and managed by the DOE national laboratories.'' . . . ''Areas that come to mind as candidates for open competition include seismic verification technologies for very low yield underground nuclear tests and chemical and biological agent detection and identification technologies. Other possible areas might be specialized electronic chip development and certain radio-frequency technologies.''

The conferees expect the Department to act in good faith on the recommendations provided by the external review group, and direct the Department to initiate a free and open competitive process for 25 percent of its research and development activities during fiscal year 2001 for ground-based systems treaty monitoring. The competitive process should be open to all Federal and non-Federal entities.

The conferees direct the Department to report to the Committees on Appropriations on the status of implementing the external review panel's recommendations and the results of the directed open competition by March 30, 2001.

Arms control.—The conference agreement provides $152,014,000 for arms control activities including $24,500,000 for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention and $27,500,000 for the Nuclear Cities Initiative. In addition to the $10,000,000 added to the Nuclear Cities Initiative, the conferees have provided another $19,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative in the arms control program to be distributed as follows: $15,000,000 for spent fuel dry storage; $500,000 for the plutonium registry at Mayak; $2,500,000 for geologic repository cooperation research and planning; and $1,000,000 for research reactor spent fuel acceptance.

International materials protection, control and accounting (MPC&A).—The conference agreement includes $173,856,000 for the MPC&A program including $24,000,000 for the long-term Russian initiative. The conferees have provided $5,000,000 for plutonium storage at Mayak and $19,000,000 for expanded MPC&A activities at Russian naval sites.

HEU transparency implementation.—The conference agreement provides $15,190,000, the same as the budget request.

International nuclear safety.—The conference agreement provides $20,000,000, the same as the budget request, for the international nuclear safety program. This funding is to be used only for activities in support of completing the upgrades to Soviet-designed nuclear reactors. From within available funds, the conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for a cooperative effort between the United States and Russia to address intergranular stress corrosion cracking and restore the structural integrity of Russian nuclear plants until decommissioning.

Fissile materials disposition.—The conference agreement provides $249,449,000 for fissile materials disposition. Funding of $139,517,000, as proposed by the House, has been provided for the U.S. surplus materials disposition program. The conference agreement provides $26,000,000 for Project 99–D–143, the MOX fuel fabrication facility.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $51,468,000 for the program direction account as proposed by the House. The conferees are aware that the Department does not have enough qualified Federal employees available to manage the nonproliferation and national security programs, particularly the Russian programs. The conferees will favorably consider a reprogramming of funds from program areas to the program direction account as Federal employees are hired to replace the contractor employees who currently oversee these programs.

Funding adjustment.—The conference agreement includes a reduction of $40,245,000 that reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS

The conference agreement provides $690,163,000 for Naval Reactors instead of $694,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and $677,600,000 as proposed by the House. Additional funding of $17,000,000 is provided to optimize the program to shutdown prototype reactors and complete all major inactivation work by fiscal year 2002.

Funding adjustment.—The conference agreement includes a reduction of $4,437,000 that reflects the transfer of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The conference agreement provides $10,000,000 for this new account as proposed by the Senate. These funds are provided to the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration for the costs associated with hiring new employees and establishing the office.

OTHER DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

The conference agreement provides $4,974,476,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of $4,522,707,000 as proposed by the House and $4,635,763,000 as proposed by the Senate. Additional funding of $1,082,714,000 is contained in the Defense Facilities Closure Projects account and $65,000,000 in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account for a total of $6,122,190,000 provided for all defense environmental management activities.

The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the House pertaining to the use of funds for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant or language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for programs to be managed by the Carlsbad office of the Department of Energy.

The conference agreement limits the number of motor vehicles that can be purchased in fiscal year 2001 to not more than 30 for replacement only. The conferees have included an additional reporting requirement on the entire Department and have specified that sport utility vehicles are to be counted within this ceiling.

National monument designation.—The conferees agree that no funds spent by the Department for the coordination, integration, or implementation of a management plan related to the Hanford Reach National Monument shall result in the reduction or delay of cleanup at the Hanford site.

Site/Project Completion.—The conference agreement provides an additional $11,000,000 for F and H-area stabilization activities at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina as proposed by the House, and $19,000,000 to address funding shortfalls at the Hanford site in Richland, Washington, as proposed by the Senate. Funding of $12,308,000 has been transferred to other accounts as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement supports the budget request of $2,500,000 for the cooperative agreement with WERC and provides $25,000 for an independent evaluation of the mixed-waste landfill at Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico.

For construction, the conference agreement provides $17,300,000 for Project 01–D–414, preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D). Project 01–D–415, 235–F packaging and stabilization, at the Savannah River Site has been funded at $4,000,000. Funding of $500,000 requested for Project 01–D–402, INTEC cathodic protection system expansion project, at Idaho Falls has been transferred to the new PE&D project. Funding of $27,932,000 for the Highly Enriched Blend Down Facility has been transferred to the fissile materials disposition program.

Post 2006 Completion.—The conference agreement includes an additional $10,000,000 to maintain schedules required by revised compliance agreements with the State of Washington as proposed by the Senate, and $6,000,000 to support transuranic and low-level waste activities at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina as proposed by the House. Funding of $10,000,000 for the Four Mile Branch project and $18,000,000 for the Consolidated Incinerator Facility at the Savannah River Site has not been provided as proposed by the House. Funding of $18,692,000 has been transferred to the Science and Technology program.

The conference agreement provides $400,000 to begin design activities for a subsurface geosciences laboratory at Idaho.

From within available funds for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, $1,000,000 has been provided for a transparency demonstration project.

A total of $3,000,000 has been provided to support a program with the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission to demonstrate technologies to reduce hazardous waste streams and to support the Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative.

Funding of $1,300,000 for Project 01–D–403, immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, at Richland, Washington, has been transferred to the PE&D project in site/project completion account.

Office of River Protection.—The conference agreement provides $757,839,000 for the Office of River Protection at the Hanford site in Washington. The conference agreement provides $377,000,000 for Project 01–D–416, Tank Waste Remediation System, at Richland, Washington, to vitrify the high-level waste in underground tanks. Funding to vitrify waste at the Hanford site was requested in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account in fiscal year 2001. However, due to the failure of the contractor to provide a viable cost estimate under the concept of a ''privatized'' contract, the contract will now be structured as a cost plus incentive fee contract and will be funded in the regular appropriation account.

Science and technology development.—The conference agreement provides $256,898,000 for the science and technology development program. Funding of $21,000,000 has been transferred to this account for the Idaho validation and verification program. This transfer is not intended to reduce the environmental management base program in Idaho. The Department is directed to provide $10,000,000 for the next round of new and innovative research grants in the environmental management science program in fiscal year 2001, and $10,000,000 for technology deployment activities.

The conference agreement provides $4,000,000 for the international agreement with AEA Technology; $4,500,000 for the Diagnostic Instrumentation and Analysis Laboratory; $4,350,000 for the university robotics research program; an additional $1,000,000 for the D&D focus area; and up to $4,000,000 to continue evaluation, development and demonstration of the Advanced Vitrification System upon successful completion of supplemental testing. The conferees have provided $2,000,000 to the National Energy Technology Laboratory to be used for the continuation of the Mid-Atlantic Recycling Center for End-of-Life Electronics initiative (MARCEE) in cooperation with the Polymer Alliance Zone.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the long-term stewardship program to be administered at Headquarters and $4,000,000 for the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory. No funds are provided for the low dose radiation effects program, as the entire Senate recommended amount is provided within the Office of Science.

Safeguards and security.—Consistent with the Department's amended budget request for safeguards and security, the conference agreement includes $203,748,000 for safeguards and security activities at laboratories and facilities managed by the Office of Defense Programs. This is offset by a reduction of $193,217,000 to be allocated among the various programs which budgeted for safeguards and security costs in their overhead accounts.

Program direction.—The conferees have provided $363,988,000 for the program direction account. This funding level reflects the transfer of the uranium programs from the office of nuclear energy to the office of environmental management. Funding of

$4,100,000 has been provided to allow for the transfer of up to 5 employees from Headquarters and 25 employees at Oak Ridge who manage the uranium programs.

Funding adjustments.—The conference agreement includes the use of $34,317,000 of prior year balances and $50,000,000 in pension refunds, the same as the budget request. The conference agreement includes a reduction of $193,217,000 that reflects the allocation of safeguards and security costs in accordance with the Department's amended budget request. A general reduction of $10,700,000 has also been included.

DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS

The conference agreement appropriates $1,082,714,000 the same as the amended budget request. The conferees expect the Department to request adequate funds to keep each of these projects on a schedule for closure by 2006 or earlier.

Any savings resulting from safeguards and security costs are to be retained and used for cleanup activities at the closure sites.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The conference agreement provides $65,000,000 for the defense environmental management privatization program instead of $259,000,000 as proposed by the House and $324,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides no funds for the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) project at Hanford. Funding for this project, which had previously been considered as a privatization contract, has been transferred to the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account.

The conference agreement also includes a rescission of $97,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for the TWRS project in the Defense Environmental Management Privatization appropriation account.

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement appropriates $585,755,000 for Other Defense Activities instead of $592,235,000 as proposed by the House and $579,463,000 as proposed by the Senate. Details of the conference agreement are provided below.

SECURITY AND EMERGENCY OPERATIONS

For nuclear safeguards and security, the conference agreement provides $116,409,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have provided $3,000,000 for the critical infrastructure protection program, an increase of $600,000 over fiscal year 2000. The conference agreement also provides $2,000,000 to procure safety locks to meet Federal specifications.

The conference agreement provides $33,000,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request.

The conference agreement includes $33,711,000 for emergency management. Funding of $3,600,000 was transferred to the program direction account to reflect the conversion of contractor employees to Federal employees at a substantial cost savings. Funding of $44,205,000 for the nuclear emergency search team and $12,084,000 for the accident response group was transferred to the Weapons Activities account.

Program direction.—The conference agreement provides $92,967,000 for the program direction account as proposed by the House. This reflects the transfer of $3,600,000 from the emergency management program.

INTELLIGENCE

The conference agreement includes $38,059,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate to support the Department's intelligence program.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

The conference agreement includes $45,200,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate to support the Department's counterintelligence program.

ADVANCED ACCELERATOR APPLICATIONS

The conference agreement provides $34,000,000 to establish a new program for advanced accelerator applications, including $3,000,000 for research and development of technologies for economic and environmentally sound refinement of spent nuclear fuel at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas.

The Department is directed to prepare a program plan for managing and executing this program using the extensive expertise of the Office of Science and the Office of Defense Programs in accelerator research, design, and applications, and the expertise of the Office of Nuclear Energy in transmutation of nuclear waste. This program plan should be submitted to the Committees by March 1, 2001.

The conferees make no recommendation as to how the Department should manage the advanced accelerator application program.

INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT AND PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE

The conference agreement provides $14,937,000, the same as the budget request for the office of independent oversight and performance assurance.

ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH (DEFENSE)

The conference agreement provides $125,567,000 for defense-related environment, safety and health activities. The conferees have provided $3,000,000 to establish a program at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas for Department-wide management of electronic records; $1,750,000 for the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky to undertake epidemiological studies of workers; $880,000 to provide medical screening for workers employed at the Amchitka nuclear weapons test site; and $500,000 for the State of Nevada to address deficiencies in the Cancer Registry, Vital Statistics, and Birth Defects Registry activities.

The conference agreement includes $17,000,000 for the Department's administrative costs associated with the proposed Energy Employees Compensation Initiative. These funds are not available until the program is authorized by law.

WORKER AND COMMUNITY TRANSITION

The conference agreement provides $24,500,000 for the worker and community transition program, including $2,100,000 for infrastructure improvements at the former Pinellas plant. The conferees expect that communities denied funds in fiscal year 2000 will be granted priority status in fiscal year 2001.

The conference agreement provides that no funds may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

The conference agreement provides $25,000,000 for national security programs administrative support instead of $51,000,000 as proposed by the House and no funding as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

The conference agreement provides $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate.

FUNDING ADJUSTMENTS

A reduction of $595,000 and the elimination of the $20,000,000 offset to user organizations for security investigations reflects the allocation of the safeguards and security amended budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement provides $200,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $292,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

The conferees have included the statutory language extending Bonneville's voluntary separation incentive program until January 1, 2003.

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.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $3,900,000, the same as the budget request, for the Southeastern Power Administration.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement includes $28,100,000, the same as the budget request, for the Southwestern Power Administration.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides $165,830,000, instead of $164,916,000 as proposed by the Senate and $160,930,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement increases the amount of purchase power and wheeling to $65,224,000 and increases offsetting collections by the same amount. Funding of $5,950,000 is provided for the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account.

FALCON AND AMISTAD FUND

The conference agreement includes $2,670,000, the same as the budget request, for the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $175,200,000, the same as the budget request for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

RESCISSIONS

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

The conference agreement includes language rescinding $75,000,000 from funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal in Public Law 104–46, the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

The conference agreement includes language rescinding $97,000,000 from the Defense Environmental Management Privatization account. Funds were appropriated in this account in prior years for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Project. This project is no longer being considered for a privatization contract. It has been transferred to the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation account and will be funded there in future appropriation acts.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds may be used to award a management and operating contract unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures, or the Secretary of Energy grants a waiver to allow for such a deviation. Section 301 does not preclude extension of a contract awarded using competitive procedures.

Sec. 302. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that none of the funds 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.

Sec. 303. The conference agreement modifies a provision proposed by the House that none of the funds may be used to augment the $24,500,000 made available for obligation for severance payments and other benefits and community assistance grants unless the Department of Energy submits a reprogramming request subject to approval by the appropriate Congressional committees.

Sec. 304. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that none of the funds may be used to prepare or initiate Requests for Proposals for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress in the current fiscal year. This provision precludes the Department from initiating activities for new programs which have been proposed in the budget request, but which have not yet been funded by Congress.

Sec. 305. The conference agreement includes a provision proposed by the House and Senate that permits the transfer and merger of unexpended balances of prior appropriations with appropriation accounts established in this bill.

Sec. 306. The conference agreement includes language providing that not to exceed 6 percent of funds shall be available for Laboratory Directed Research and Development.

Sec. 307. The conference agreement includes language limiting to $185,000,000 the funds available for reimbursement of management and operating contractor travel expenses. Of the $185,000,000, $175,000,000 is available for contractor travel and $10,000,000 is to be held in reserve by the Department's Chief Financial Officer for emergency travel requirements. The language also requires the Department of Energy to reimburse contractors for travel consistent with regulations applicable to Federal employees and specifies that the travel ceiling does not apply to travel funded from Laboratory Directed Research and Development funds.

Sec. 308. The conference agreement includes language prohibiting the Bonneville Power Administration from performing energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory.

Sec. 309. The conference agreement includes language limiting the types of waste that can be disposed of in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. None of the funds may be used to dispose of transuranic waste in excess of 20 percent plutonium by weight for the aggregate of any material category. At the Rocky Flats site, this provision includes ash residues; salt residues; wet residues; direct repackage residues; and scrub alloy as referenced in the ''Final Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Certain Plutonium Residues and Scrub Alloy Stored at the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site''.

Sec. 310. The conference agreement includes language allowing the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to authorize certain nuclear weapons production plants to use not more than 2 percent of available funds for research, development and demonstration activities.

Sec. 311. The conference agreement includes language allowing each Federal power marketing administration to engage in activities relating to the formation and operation of a regional transmission organization.

Sec. 312. The conference agreement includes language that would permit the Secretary of Energy to use $10,000,000 of funds previously appropriated for interim waste storage activities for Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal upon receipt of written certification that the site recommendation report cannot be completed on time without additional funding.

Sec. 313. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate that would provide a three year term of office for the first person appointed to the position of the Under Secretary of Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy.

Sec. 314. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate limiting the authority of the Secretary of Energy to modify the organization of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Sec. 315. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Report on impacts of limits on on-site storage.—The conference agreement does not include statutory language proposed by the Senate, but the conferees direct that not later than 90 days after enactment of the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress a report containing a description of all alternatives that are available to the Northern States Power Company and the Federal government to allow the company to continue to operate the Prairie Island nuclear generating plant until the end of the term of the license issued to the company by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in view of a law of the State of Minnesota that limits the quantity of spent nuclear fuel that may be stored at the plant, assuming that the existing Federal and State laws remain unchanged.

Report on electricity prices.—The conferees note that California is currently experiencing an energy crisis. Wholesale electricity prices have soared, resulting in electrical bills that have increased by as much as 300 percent in the San Diego area. Conferees understand that the staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is currently investigating the crisis. The Commission is directed to submit to Congress a report on the results of the investigation no later than December 1, 2000. The report shall include identification of the causes of the San Diego price increases, a determination whether California wholesale electricity markets are competitive, a recommendation whether a regional price cap should be set in the Western States, a determination whether manipulation of prices has occurred at the wholesale level, and a determination of remedies, including legislation or regulations, that are necessary to correct the problem and prevent similar incidents in California and elsewhere in the United States.

Provisions not adopted by the conferees.—The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House and Senate prohibiting the use of funds for contracts modified in a manner that deviates from the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate allowing the Secretary of Energy to enter into multiyear contracts without obligating the estimated costs.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring the Department of Energy's laboratories to provide an annual funding plan to the Department.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House prohibiting the payment of Federal salaries in the working capital fund.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of funds to establish or maintain independent centers at Department of Energy laboratories or facilities. The conference agreement includes report language requiring the Department to identify these centers in the budget request.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House requiring a report on activities of the executive branch to address high gasoline prices and develop an overall national energy strategy.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of funds to restart the High Flux Beam Reactor.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the inclusion of costs of protecting fish and wildlife within the rates charged by the Bonneville Power Administration.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the cost of construction of the National Ignition Facility.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring an evaluation of innovative technologies for demilitarization of weapons components and treatment of hazardous waste.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report on national energy policy.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate noting concern with the House provision on limiting funds for worker and community transition. The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report on the impact of State-imposed limits on spent nuclear fuel storage. This requirement has been included in report language.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate limiting the use of funds to promote or advertise public tours at Yucca Mountain. This requirement has been included in report language.

CONFERENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The conference agreement's detailed funding recommendations for programs in title III are contained in the following table.

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
ENERGY SUPPLY		
RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES		
Renewable energy technologies		
Biomass/biofuels energy systems		
Power systems	47,830	40,000
Transportation	54,110	46,160
Subtotal, Biomass/biofuels energy systems	101,940	86,160
Biomass/biofuels energy research	26,740	26,740
Subtotal, Biomass	128,680	112,900
Geothermal technology development	26,970	27,000
Hydrogen research	22,940	27,000
Hydrogen energy research	2,970	2,970
Subtotal, Hydrogen	25,910	29,970
Hydropower	5,000	5,000
Solar energy		
Concentrating solar power	14,940	13,800
Photovoltaic energy systems	81,450	75,775
Photovoltaic energy research	2,847	2,847
Subtotal, Photovoltaic	84,297	78,622
Solar building technology research	4,470	3,950
Solar photoconversion energy research	14,260	14,260
Subtotal, Solar energy	117,967	110,632
Wind energy systems	50,140	40,000
Wind energy research	283	283
Subtotal, Wind	50,423	40,283
Total, Renewable energy technologies	354,950	325,785

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Electric energy systems and storage		
High temperature superconducting R&D	31,900	37,000
Energy storage systems	5,000	6,000
Transmission reliability	10,960	9,000
Total, Electric energy systems and storage	47,860	52,000
Renewable support and implementation		
Departmental energy management	4,988	2,000
International renewable energy program	11,460	5,000
Renewable energy production incentive program	4,000	4,000
Renewable Indian energy resources	5,000	6,600
Renewable program support	6,500	4,000
Total, Renewable support and implementation	31,948	21,600
National renewable energy laboratory	1,900	4,000
Program direction	18,159	18,700
TOTAL, RENEWABLE ENERGY RESOURCES	454,817	422,085

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NUCLEAR ENERGY		
Advanced radioisotope power system	30,864	32,200
Isotopes		
Isotope support and production	16,218	24,715
Construction		
99-E-201 Isotope production facility (LANL)	500	2,500
Subtotal, Isotope support and production	16,718	27,215
Offsetting collections	---	-8,000
Total, Isotopes	16,718	19,215
University reactor fuel assistance and support	12,000	12,000
Research and development		
Nuclear energy plant optimization	5,000	5,000
Nuclear energy research initiative	34,903	35,000
Nuclear energy technologies	---	7,500
Total, Research and development	39,903	47,500
Infrastructure		
ANL-West operations	---	39,150
Fast flux test facility (FFTF)	38,524	44,010
Test reactor area landlord	7,415	7,575
Construction		
99-E-200 Test reactor area electrical utility upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	879	925
95-E-201 Test reactor area fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	458	500
Subtotal, Construction	1,337	1,425
Subtotal, Test reactor area landlord	8,752	9,000
Total, Infrastructure	47,276	92,160

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Nuclear facilities management	66,126	---
Nuclear facilities management		
EBR-II shutdown	---	8,800
Disposition of spent fuel and legacy materials	---	16,200
Disposition technology activities	---	9,850
Total, Nuclear facilities management	---	34,850
Uranium programs	47,779	---
Program direction	27,620	22,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	288,286	259,925

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Environment, safety and health	19,906	16,000
Program direction	19,998	19,998
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH	39,904	35,998
ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		
Technical information management program	1,802	1,600
Program direction	7,335	7,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	9,137	8,600
Subtotal, Energy supply	792,144	726,608
Renewable energy research program	-47,100	-47,100
Transfer from Geothermal and USEC	-12,000	---
Offset from nuclear energy royalties	-2,352	-2,352
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-16,582
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY	730,692	660,574

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
Site closure	81,248	81,636
Site/project completion	63,798	61,621
Post 2006 completion	137,766	137,744
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-3,189
TOTAL, NON-DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	282,812	277,812
URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND		
Decontamination and decommissioning	264,588	---
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	30,000	---
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING	294,588	---
URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION		
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund		
Decontamination and decommissioning	---	273,038
Uranium/thorium reimbursement	---	72,000
Total, Uranium enrichment D&D fund	---	345,038
Other Uranium Activities		
Maintenance of facilities and inventories	---	29,193
Pre-existing liabilities	---	11,330
Depleted UF6 conversion project	---	21,877
Total, Other uranium activities	---	62,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-14,071
TOTAL, URANIUM FACILITIES MAINTENANCE AND REMEDIATION	---	393,367

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
SCIENCE		
High energy physics		
Research and technology	236,000	234,720
Facility operations	440,872	459,010
Construction		
00-G-307 SLAC office building	5,200	5,200
99-G-306 Wilson hall safety improvements, Fermilab	4,200	4,200
98-G-304 Neutrinos at the main injector, Fermilab	23,000	23,000
Subtotal, Construction	32,400	32,400
Subtotal, Facility operations	473,272	491,410
Total, High energy physics	709,272	726,130
Nuclear physics	365,069	369,890
Biological and environmental research	435,954	497,760
Construction		
01-E-300 Laboratory for Comparative and Functional Genomics, ORNL	2,500	2,500
Total, Biological and environmental research	438,454	500,260

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Basic energy sciences		
Materials sciences	448,964	456,111
Chemical sciences	219,090	223,229
Engineering and geosciences	40,304	40,816
Energy biosciences	33,662	33,714
Construction		
99-E-334 Spallation neutron source (ORNL)	261,900	259,500
Total, Basic energy sciences	1,003,920	1,013,370
Advanced scientific computing research	179,817	170,000
Energy research analyses	988	1,000
Multiprogram energy labs - facility support		
Infrastructure support	1,023	1,160
Oak Ridge landlord	7,475	10,711
Construction		
MEL-001 Multiprogram energy laboratory infrastructure projects, various locations	22,059	22,059
Total, Multiprogram energy labs - fac. support	30,557	33,930
Fusion energy sciences program	243,907	255,000
Safeguards and security	49,818	49,818
Program direction		
Field offices	82,929	83,307
Headquarters	51,408	51,438
Science education	6,500	4,500
Total, Program direction	140,837	139,245
Subtotal, Science	3,162,639	3,258,643
General reduction	---	-34,047
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-38,244
TOTAL, SCIENCE	3,162,639	3,186,352

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Repository program	255,034	135,200
Program direction	63,540	62,800
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-6,926
TOTAL, NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	318,574	191,074

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION		
Administrative operations		
Salaries and expenses		
Office of the Secretary	6,648	5,000
Board of contract appeals	878	878
Chief financial officer	30,748	32,148
Contract reform	2,500	2,500
Congressional and intergovernmental affairs	5,146	5,000
Economic impact and diversity	5,126	5,126
General counsel	22,724	22,724
International affairs	9,400	8,500
Management and administration	78,882	77,800
Policy office	6,688	6,600
Public affairs	4,150	3,900
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	172,890	170,176
Program support		
Minority economic impact	1,498	1,500
Policy analysis and system studies	406	422
Environmental policy studies	1,600	1,000
Corporate management information program	12,000	12,000
Subtotal, Program support	15,504	14,922
Total, Administrative operations	188,394	185,098
Cost of work for others	34,027	74,027
Subtotal, Departmental Administration	222,421	259,125
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments	-8,000	-8,000
Transfer from other defense activities	---	-25,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-18
Total, Departmental administration (gross)	214,421	226,107
Miscellaneous revenues	-128,762	-151,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net)	85,659	75,107

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General	33,000	31,500

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES		
Stewardship operation and maintenance		
Directed stockpile work		
Stockpile research and development	243,300	272,300
Stockpile maintenance	257,994	279,994
Stockpile evaluation	151,710	174,710
Dismantlement/disposal	29,260	29,260
Production support	149,939	149,939
Field engineering, training and manuals	4,400	4,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	-17,427	---
Subtotal, Directed stockpile work	819,176	910,603
Campaigns		
Primary certification	41,400	41,400
Dynamic materials properties	64,408	74,408
Advanced radiography	43,000	58,000
Construction		
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	35,232	35,232
Subtotal, Advanced radiography	78,232	93,232
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	106,651
Advanced design and production technologies	75,735	75,735
Inertial confinement fusion	120,800	250,500
Construction		
96-D-111 National ignition facility, LLNL	73,469	199,100
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	194,269	449,600

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Defense computing and modeling	249,100	716,175
Construction		
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	2,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,900	5,000
00-D-105 Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	6,700
Subtotal, Construction	69,900	70,000
Subtotal, Defense computing and modeling	319,000	786,175
Pit manufacturing readiness	108,038	125,038
Secondary readiness	15,000	20,000
Materials readiness	40,511	40,511
Tritium readiness	77,000	77,000
Construction		
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, SR	75,000	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of Tritium, various locations	---	15,000
Subtotal, Construction	75,000	90,000
Subtotal, Tritium readiness	152,000	167,000
Reduction for safeguards and security	-52,204	---
Subtotal, Campaigns	1,251,304	2,105,014

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Readiness in technical base and facilities		
Operations of facilities	1,313,432	1,252,232
Program readiness	75,800	74,500
Nuclear weapons incident response	---	56,289
Special projects	48,297	48,297
Material recycle and recovery	22,018	30,018
Containers	7,876	11,876
Storage	9,075	9,075
Advanced simulation and computing	477,075	---
Reduction for safeguards and security	-220,867	---
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,732,706	1,482,287
Construction		
01-D-103 Preliminary project engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	14,500	35,500
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,749	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	3,000
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,975	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,786	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,200	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	1,874	2,000
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	23,566	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	4,998	4,998
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	30,767	30,767
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,864	2,918

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project (LANL)	13,337	13,337
Subtotal, Construction	138,616	160,085
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and fac	1,871,322	1,642,372
Total, Stewardship operation and maintenance	3,941,802	4,657,989
Transportation safeguards division		
Operations and equipment	79,357	79,357
Program direction	36,316	36,316
Total, Transportation safeguards division	115,673	115,673
Safeguards and security	356,840	356,840
Construction		
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project (LANL), Los Alamos, NM	18,043	18,043
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	2,713
Subtotal, Construction	20,756	20,756
Total, Safeguards and security	377,596	377,596
Program direction	204,154	224,071
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,639,225	5,375,329
Use of prior year balances	---	-13,647
General reduction	---	-35,700
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-310,796
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,639,225	5,015,186

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION		
Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	216,550	235,990
Construction		
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	7,000	17,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification, R&D	223,550	252,990
Arms control	119,915	152,014
International materials protection, control, and accounting	146,081	173,856
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia	100,000	---
HEU transparency implementation	15,166	15,190
International nuclear safety	18,902	20,000
Fissile materials disposition		
U.S. surplus materials disposition	117,912	139,517
Russian surplus materials disposition	34,803	40,000
Program direction - MD	9,878	---
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	20,000	20,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility various locations	15,000	26,000
Subtotal, Construction	38,000	69,932
Total, Fissile materials disposition	200,593	249,449
Program direction	41,383	51,468
Use of prior year balances	---	-526
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-40,245
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	865,590	874,196

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
NAVAL REACTORS		
Naval reactors development	623,063	644,500
Construction		
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations.	11,400	11,400
01-D-200 Major office replacement building, Schenectady, NY	1,300	1,300
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	16,000
Subtotal, Construction	28,700	28,700
Total, Naval reactors development	651,763	673,200
Program direction	21,320	21,400
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-4,437
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	673,083	690,163
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR		
Office of the Administrator	---	10,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	6,177,898	6,589,545

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT.		
Site/project completion		
Operation and maintenance	856,812	919,167
Construction		
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion project, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Idaho Falls, ID	481	---
01-D-407 Highly enriched uranium (HEU) blend down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	---
01-D-414 Preliminary project, engineering and design (PE&D), various locations	---	17,300
01-D-415 235-F packaging and stabilization project, Savannah River, SC	---	4,000
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	7,714	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory (INEL), ID	4,277	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	3,949	3,949
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River site, Aiken, SC	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
Subtotal, Construction	69,434	62,344
Total, Site/project completion	926,246	981,511

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Post 2006 completion		
Operation and maintenance	2,453,735	2,251,514
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	420,000
Construction		
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	27,212
Office of River Protection		
Operation and maintenance	---	309,619
Construction		
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	1,300	---
01-D-416 Tank waste remediation system, Richland, WA	---	377,000
99-D-403 Infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	46,023	46,023
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	17,385
Subtotal, Construction	72,520	448,220
Subtotal, Office of River Protection	72,520	757,839
Total, Post 2006 completion	2,973,467	3,456,565

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
Science and technology	195,032	256,898
Safeguards and security	203,748	203,748
Program direction	347,881	363,988
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	4,646,374	5,262,710
Use of prior year balances	-34,317	-34,317
Pension refund	-50,000	-50,000
General reduction	---	-10,700
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-193,217
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRON. RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT	4,562,057	4,974,476
DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS		
Site closure	1,027,942	1,027,942
Safeguards and security	54,772	54,772
TOTAL, DEFENSE FACILITIES CLOSURE PROJECTS	1,082,714	1,082,714
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION		
Privatization initiatives, various locations	539,976	90,092
Use of prior year balances	-25,092	-25,092
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MGMT. PRIVATIZATION	514,884	65,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	6,159,655	6,122,190

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES		
Other national security programs		
Security and emergency operations		
Nuclear safeguards	123,566	116,409
Security investigations	38,597	33,000
Emergency management	91,773	33,711
Program direction	89,367	92,967
Subtotal, Security and emergency operations	343,303	276,087
Intelligence	35,010	36,059
Construction		
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	1,975	2,000
Subtotal, Intelligence	36,985	38,059
Counterintelligence	44,328	45,200
Advanced accelerator applications	---	34,000
Independent oversight and performance assurance		
Program direction	14,937	14,937
Environment, safety and health (Defense)	85,963	102,963
Program direction - EH	22,604	22,604
Subtotal, Environment, safety & health (Defense)	108,567	125,567
Worker and community transition	21,497	21,500
Program direction - WT	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Worker and community transition	24,497	24,500
National Security programs administrative support	---	25,000
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	3,000
Subtotal, Other defense activities	575,617	586,350
Reduction for safeguards and security	---	-595
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	575,617	585,755

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL		
Defense nuclear waste disposal	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	13,042,170	13,497,490
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Purchase power and wheeling	34,463	34,463
Program direction	5,000	5,000
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	39,463	39,463
Offsetting collections	-34,463	-34,463
Use of prior year balances	-1,100	-1,100
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,900	3,900
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses	3,795	3,795
Purchase power and wheeling	288	288
Program direction	18,388	18,388
Construction	6,817	6,817
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	29,288	29,288
Offsetting collections	-288	-288
Use of prior year balances	-900	-900
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	28,100	28,100

Department of Energy (in thousands)

	Budget Request	Conference
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
Operation and maintenance		
Construction and rehabilitation	23,115	23,115
System operation and maintenance	36,104	36,104
Purchase power and wheeling	35,500	65,224
Program direction	106,644	106,644
Utah mitigation and conservation	5,036	5,950
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance	206,399	237,037
Offsetting collections	-35,500	-65,224
Use of prior year balances	-5,983	-5,983
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	164,916	165,830
FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND		
Operation and maintenance	2,670	2,670
TOTAL, POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS	199,586	200,500
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION		
Federal energy regulatory commission	175,200	175,200
FERC revenues	-175,200	-175,200
TOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	---	---
Defense nuclear waste disposal (rescission)	-85,000	-75,000
Defense environmental privatization (rescission)	---	-97,000
GRAND TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	18,064,720	18,341,776

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $66,400,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of $63,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

The conference agreement includes $18,500,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 for the Delta Regional Authority as proposed by the Senate.

DENALI COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes $30,000,000 for the Denali Commission as proposed by the Senate.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes $481,900,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate, to be offset by revenues of $447,958,000, for a net appropriation of $33,942,000. This reflects the statutory language adopted by the conference to reduce the revenues collected in fiscal year 2001 by 2 percent.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conference agreement includes $5,500,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate, to be offset by revenues of $5,390,000, for a net appropriation of $110,000. This reflects the statutory language adopted by the conference to reduce the revenues collected in fiscal year 2001 by 2 percent.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

The conference agreement provides $2,900,000 instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate establishing a Presidential Energy Commission.

TITLE V

FISCAL YEAR 2001 EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

CERRO GRANDE FIRE ACTIVITIES

The conference agreement includes an emergency appropriation of $203,460,000 as proposed by the Senate for Cerro Grande Fire Activities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.

The recommendation includes $46,860,000 for repair and risk mitigation associated with physical damage and destruction; $25,400,000 for restoring services; $18,000,000 for emergency response; and $15,000,000 for resuming laboratory operations.

In addition, funding is provided for the following construction projects: $6,100,000 for Project 97–D–102, Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest Facility (DAHRT); $25,000,000 for Project 01–D–701, Site-wide Fire Alarm System Replacement; $20,000,000 for Project 01–D–702, Emergency Operations Center Replacement and Relocation; $29,100,000 for Project 01–D–703, TA–54 Waste Management Mitigation; $10,000,000 for Project 01–D–704, Office Building Replacement Program for Vulnerable Facilities; and $8,000,000 for Project 01–D–705, Multi-channel Communications System. The Department is directed to include construction project data sheets for these projects in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes an emergency appropriation of $11,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Commission for the North Fork Hughes River Watershed project in Ritchie County, West Virginia.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 601. The conference agreement includes language directing that none of the funds in this Act or any prior appropriations 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.

Sec. 602. The conference agreement includes language regarding the purchase of American-made equipment and products, and prohibiting contracts with persons falsely labeling products as made in America.

Sec. 603. The conference agreement includes language providing that no funds may be used to determine the final point of discharge for the interceptor drain for the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project until certain conditions are met. The language also provides that the costs of the Kesterson Reservoir Cleanup Program and the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program shall be classified as reimbursable or non-reimbursable by the Secretary of the Interior and that any future obligation of funds for drainage service or drainage studies for the San Luis Unit shall be fully reimbursable by San Luis Unit beneficiaries pursuant to Reclamation law.

Sec. 604. The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate limiting the use of funds to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementing the Kyoto Protocol. The conferees do not concur with the report language proposed by the House.

Sec. 605. The conference agreement includes language extending the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act.

Sec. 606. The conference agreement includes language redesignating the Interstate Sanitation Commission as the Interstate Environmental Commission.

Provisions not adopted.—The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House amending the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House limiting the use of funds to pay salaries of employees of the Department of Energy who refused to take polygraph examinations.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate repealing sections of Public Law 106–246.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring the Tennessee Valley Authority to complete an environmental impact statement before proceeding with the sale of mineral rights.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate requiring a report to Congress on electricity prices. This requirement has been included in report language.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the House prohibiting the use of funds to pay an individual who simultaneously holds positions within the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy. This matter has been addressed in section 315.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The conference agreement includes language providing funds to reduce the public debt.

TITLE VIII

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

The conference agreement includes language extending the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) authority to assess license and annual fees through fiscal year 2005. This extension is necessary to provide the resources needed to fund the activities of the Commission. The conferees have also provided authority to reduce the fee recovery requirement from 100 percent to 98 percent in fiscal year 2001, and further decrease the fee incrementally until the fee recovery requirement is reduced to 90 percent in 2005. This will address fairness and equity concerns relating to charging NRC licensees for agency expenses which do not provide a direct benefit to them.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2001 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2000 amount, the 2001 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2001 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	$21,647,047
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	23,146,559
House bill, fiscal year 2001	22,204,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	23,131,901
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2001	24,088,380
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	+2,441,333
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	+941,821
House bill, fiscal year 2001	+1,884,380
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	+956,479

JAMES T. WALSH,
TOM DELAY,
DAVE HOBSON,
JOE KNOLLENBERG,
RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
ANNE M. NORTHUP,
JOHN E. SUNUNU,
VIRGIL GOODE, Jr.,
BILL YOUNG,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
MARCY KAPTUR,
CARRIE P. MEEK,
DAVID E. PRICE,
BUD CRAMER,
DAVE OBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
CONRAD BURNS,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
TED STEVENS,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
PATRICK LEAHY,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
TOM HARKIN,
ROBERT C. BYRD,

HARRY REID,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEADERSHIP LACKING ON HMO REFORM

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted a one minute at an unusual time of the day because this House has passed one of the strongest HMO reform bills that I have seen. We passed it over a year ago, and yet this bill still languishes in its House-Senate conference committee. Obviously we need more effort to make sure that we pass a national HMO reform bill.

This issue is important to the voters, and it has been, and that is why when I listened to the presidential debates last night, I heard it come up a number of times, how we needed a strong managed care reform or HMO reform bill.

Let me set the record straight: the Texas legislature passed a bill in 1995 that was a strong HMO reform bill. In 1995, the Texas legislature passed a strong HMO reform bill. It was vetoed by Governor Bush. In 1997, they passed another bill that became law without his signature. Last night, listening to the debates, you would have thought there had been a lot of exercise in leadership on HMO reform in the Governor's office in Texas.

What we need is strong leadership in the White House for an HMO reform bill, because it does not look like it is going to happen this year. So next year we will need it. Our bill, the Dingell-Norwood bill, was actually patterned after the Texas law of 1997.

So, just like you want to hear the rest of the story, the whole point is that we need strong HMO reform legislation, it needs to pass the House and the Senate, and it needs to have the aggressive activity from a chief executive in the President of the United States. I would hope that the people would realize for the record who is embellishing their record now.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4461) ''An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.''

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak this evening on an issue that is critically important for communities throughout my district and across this country and that is school construction.

I am pleased to be joined this evening by several of my Democratic colleagues in a series of special order speeches to call on the Republican leadership to pass real school construction legislation before this Congress adjourns.

Since the beginning of my service in the United States House nearly 4 years ago, I worked hard with members of both bodies across the partisan aisle to craft a creative legislative response to the urgent problem of overcrowded schools, run-down facilities and the widespread use of trailers and closets as classrooms.

Mr. Speaker, across my district and many places in this country, our schools are bursting at the seams. Just about every day I hear from teachers, parents, students and others that the need for better schools for our children to learn and teachers to teach are desperately needed.

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that so many Members have come together to support a common sense bipartisan piece of legislation to address this problem.

H.R. 4094, the Rangel-Johnson-Etheridge bill, has enjoyed the support of 228 cosponsors in the House, Republicans and Democrats alike. This important bill would provide about $25 billion in new school construction bonds for communities throughout this country.

We now have a clear majority of the Members in the U.S. House who will vote for this bill if we can just get it to the floor for a vote; but, unfortunately, the Republican leadership continues to keep it tied up in committee.

Mr. Speaker, this refusal to act on this common sense bipartisan bill to build and renovate schools stands in sharp contrast to the blatant manipulation of the appropriations bills to bring pork back to their home districts.

For example, the Transportation appropriations bill is full of earmarked projects for the House districts of powerful Members of the Republican leadership. Senator JOHN MCCAIN of the other body stood on that floor, and I quote, said ''there were over $700 million in transit earmarks in the Chicago Metropolitan Transit Authority in the home district of the Speaker of the House, and yet the Republican leadership refuses to allow an up and down vote on our modest proposal to provide tax credits to help finance just a few neighborhood schools.''

The Transportation appropriations bill also reported earmarks of $102 million for something called the U.S. 82 Bridge across the Mississippi River in Greenville, Mississippi, in the home State of the majority leader of the other body; and yet the Republican leadership of this Congress refuses to have a vote for simple school construction for the children of this country.

Mr. Speaker, as the former chairman of my State's House Committee on Appropriations, I know well the need for government investment in certain projects to help give people a hand up, but I also know that budgets and appropriations represent more than just items on the balance sheet. They represent our values.

What does it say about the values of this Congress that the leadership refuses to allow a vote on a bipartisan school construction bill, while at the same time it loads up must-pass bills with these special-interest pork projects?

The Interior appropriations bill contains many special items earmarked. For example, there is $500,000 for a National First Ladies Library in Ohio for a senior ranking member. It contains $176,000 for the Reindeer Herders Association, and it contains $1.5 million to refurbish the Vulcan Statue in Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, these projects may have their merit. I am not an expert on every line item in an appropriations bill; but as the former superintendent of my State schools, I do know that our schools are bursting at the seams. Our communities need our help to help build and modernize schools, reduce classroom sizes and relieve overcrowding and enhance good order and discipline in classrooms and improving education for all of our children.

H.R. 4094 will not solve all of our problems, but it is a good step in the right direction; and I urge the Republican leadership of this House to bring this common sense bill to the floor without further delay and let us pass it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H.R. 4094, AMERICA'S BETTER CLASSROOM ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, the challenge confronting us today and the future of education in America is before us. We, as a Nation, must put education as the number one priority if we are to meet the needs of the 21st century, if we are to look at where our children are going to be. We need to invest in education. We need to make sure that class size reduction is in our classroom.

We need to make sure that we do modernization in our classroom. If we look at today's society, if we look at where we were, many years ago many of us were very fortunate, that when we went to school, class sizes were small, we were able to have the relationship between 25 and one ratio. In today's classroom, we have 45 to one ratio. It is ridiculous.

How can we have our children learn? How can we get them to progress and how can we hold accountability when we have so many students in our classroom? We have to put a high priority, that is why we have to look at modernization. We have to look at classroom reduction. If not, what is going to happen to our children? And if we look at modernization, we also have to look to create an atmosphere that is good for our children as well.

When they go into the classroom, we want to make sure that the faucets work well, that there is no broken window, there are no leaking roofs. If we look at technology, we want to make sure that everybody is competitive, that our children and others have the same opportunity that other individuals have. It can only happen if we fund education at the highest level.

What we also have to make sure that we do is, if we have 100-some teachers that we have the accountability. If it is not there, what is going to happen to us? What is going to happen to our children? Our children are at stake. Our future is at stake. They are our future. They are our future taxpayers. They are the ones that are going to guide our Nation, but it is our responsibility to provide for them; and if not, we fail America, we fail our children.

Let me tell say, Mr. Speaker, we have to invest more, and the agenda by the Democratic Party right now and the bipartisan H.R. 4094 deals with a lot of these problems right now, deals with the classroom size, deals with modernization, deals with teacher training, deals with incentives, deals with tax breaks; and at the same time we also have to provide incentives for students to go on to our community colleges and our State colleges.

In California alone, we have over 6 million students in K through 12. If we do not begin to take steps to build additional schools, what is going to happen to our children there? And these children that are ready to go on to a 4-year institution or community colleges where they are overcrowded, what is going to happen to them? Are they going to have access to our community colleges or State colleges or universities?

The answer is no. That is why we also have to provide a tax incentive and tax break and a tax tuition to make sure our children have that opportunity. We all have to come together. This is not a partisan issue. This is a bipartisan issue. This is about America. This is about our children. This is about investment.

Let me tell my colleagues, when I hear teachers telling me that they are out buying supplies because we are not providing the funding. My son is a teacher at a junior high school and he is going out and spending money. He just became a teacher this year, and let me tell my colleagues he is going out and buying supplies. They should not have to buy supplies. We should fund education. We are not investing enough in education.

The Republican Party plan right now does not invest enough money in education. We have to put more money in education. It is an investment in the future and at the same time we have to deal with Head Start programs, preschool programs, after-school programs, provide the incentives so our children have that opportunity to learn in an environment that is conducive. How can someone go to a school in our ghettos and some of our other areas where they are not even fixed and they are not compared to other institutions, and they look at TV and they see a modern school in that area and they say the environment is great?

Well, teachers have to also be motivated. They are motivated when they know they have good schools, they have the equipment, they have the tools and the instruments to teach our children. It can only happen if we provide those funds.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work ahead of us. We have got a big agenda ahead of us right now, but we have to come together; and if we do not come together, America will lose.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION PROPOSED RULE FOR AUDITING FIRMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about the rule proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, that would affect the consulting affiliates of auditing firms.

The proposed rule was brought to my attention over a month ago by constituents concerned about its effect on large accounting firms who also perform consulting services for their clients.

In response to the concerns raised by some of my constituents, I wrote to SEC Chairman Arthur Levitt and asked that the comment period on the rule be extended past its September 25 deadline and that the rule be modified to address the concerns raised by members of the accounting industry.

Under no circumstance was it my desire or intention to delay the ultimate decision to next year and a new commission. I particularly want to go on record as opposing any attempt to require a delay through legislative means.

I continue to believe all parties involved, including the accounting industry, should strive to reach a workable and mutually agreeable compromise before a final determination is made. It is my hope as the SEC moves forward with this rule they will remain open to the comments and concerns raised by the accounting industry and the challenges it faces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIERNEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OUTRAGE AT STATE DEPARTMENT'S DISMISSAL OF SAILORS WHO DIED ON THE U.S.S. COLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my outrage at our State Department's callous and thoughtless dismissal of the young men and women who died on the U.S.S. Cole.

I will quote from an October 16 State Department memorandum telling Voice of America to quash an editorial on terrorism, and I quote from that: ''The 17 or so dead sailors does not compare to the 100-plus Palestinians who have died in recent weeks.''

Since when are American lives less valuable to our State Department than Palestinian lives? Yes, my colleagues heard me right: our State Department dismissed the lives of our young sailors who died on the U.S.S. Cole. Something is really wrong when the Federal bureaucracy is writing off our servicemen while the rest of the Nation is mourning.

Mr. Speaker, I do sincerely grieve for the Palestinians and Israelis who have lost their lives in the tragic conflict over the recent weeks; however, when our own State Department dismisses the lives of our young men and women protecting our national interests overseas, something is truly wrong and heads should roll.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the State Department's memorandum for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and would like to thank C-N-S-News.com and its executive editor Scott Hogenson for breaking this important story and shedding light on this contemptible behavior by our State Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

END-OF-THE-YEAR SPENDING ORGY IN CONGRESS RIGHT NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we seem to have an end-of-the-year spending orgy going on in Congress right now. David Broder mentions in his column in The Washington Post today that spending for fiscal year 2001 will be $100 billion more than allowed under the last major budget deal, according to the ''Congressional Quarterly.''

Apparently most of the congressional leadership feels that we have to give into the excessive spending demanded by the President, because the alternative is to shut down the government. Unfortunately, there simply are not enough fiscal conservatives to override presidential vetoes. However, we are spending away a surplus that we do not yet have.

We are jeopardizing the economy and our children's future in the process. We now have a foreign trade deficit of almost a billion dollars a day. This means we are buying roughly $350 billion a year from other countries more than we are selling to them. This is primarily because we have entered into bad trade deals, deals good for some big multinational companies, but very bad for small American businesses and American workers.

Most economists agree that we lose roughly 20,000 jobs per billion, and no country can sustain a $350 billion-a-year trade deficit for very long. Do we ever wonder why so many young people are working as waiters or waitresses or why so many young people are going to graduate school because the good jobs are not there for even college graduates like they used to be?

Along with this foreign trade deficit is all the spending our government does in and for other countries. The liberals found out many years ago that foreign aid was very unpopular, so they just started spending foreign aid money through numerous other foreign programs.

They will very misleadingly say that our foreign aid money is less than 1 percent of our Federal budget. What they do not say is that we spend in addition to regular foreign aid, many billions more through the military, the Agriculture and Commerce Departments, the State Department, the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and on and on and on.

This administration has deployed our troops around the world more times than the six previous administrations put together, mostly just turning our military in international social workers. Billions and billions and billions in Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia and Kosovo. Right now we are spending $2 billion a year on what the Associated Press has described as a forgotten war against Iraq.

□ 1915

Most of our people do not even realize we are still bombing there against a nation now so weak that it is absolutely no threat to us at all unless our continued bombing forces them into some type of desperate terrorist actions.

Many large companies benefit greatly from these trade deals and from our sending billions to other countries in military or non-military missions. They and their allies in the national media and elsewhere have made it politically incorrect to oppose these trade deals or oppose sending mega billions overseas.

Those who do oppose all this foreign spending or these trade deals that benefit big international corporations are very falsely accused of being isolationists. However, if Members hear anyone make this charge, they should realize immediately that this name-calling simply means that the person calling someone an isolationist is trying to avoid an argument on the merits.

This Nation should be friends with every nation. We should have all sorts of foreign exchange programs and diplomatic relations, and send our experts in every field when requested, and lead international fundraising in times of human catastrophe. But this does not mean that we should keep sending billions and billions overseas, or continually bombing people who have not threatened us, or be the world's policeman through our military.

President Kennedy said in 1961 that with just 6 percent of the world's population, we must realize that we are neither omnipotent nor omniscient, and that there is not an American solution to every world problem. Now we are less than 4 percent of the world's population.

George Washington warned against entangling alliances with foreign countries, and Dwight Eisenhower warned against a military-industrial complex that would commit us all over the world simply so that it and its companies could get more money.

Professor John Moser, writing in the Autumn 1999 issue of Ohio History, noted that Senator Robert Taft was often falsely called an isolationist when he was really a conservative nationalist. Moser writes of Taft: ''. . .he was remarkably prescient on many of the problems inherent in a highly interventionist foreign policy: unprecedented accumulation of power in the hands of the executive branch of the government, curtailment of civil liberties at home, the charge of 'imperialism' arising from American influence abroad, and most importantly, the danger of what Paul Kennedy referred to as 'imperial overreach,' the extension of overseas commitments beyond the ability of a nation to meet them.''

Senator Taft once said, ''Nothing can destroy this country except the overextension of our resources.'' We should heed these words today.

STUDENT LOAN DEFAULT RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, there is much good news in higher education this year and we should take a few moments in the House of Representatives to take note of it. This is news for which we can all take some credit—the Congress, the Administration, borrowers, colleges and universities, lenders, loan guaranty agencies—so it is in that spirit that I offer these observations.

Twenty to 25 years ago, few people left college with student loan debt. But today, student loans are a fact of life for millions of students and graduates. They have opened the door of opportunity to individuals who otherwise would have no options to improve their earning potential.

President Clinton recently announced that the student loan cohort default rate is the lowest on record, falling from a high of 22.4 to 6.9 percent.

This represents a savings to taxpayers of approximately $7 billion over the period from fiscal year 1993 to fiscal year 2000. But more importantly, it speaks volumes about the Department of Education's program flexibility and willingness to work with borrowers.

Secretary of Education Riley noted that this record has been achieved by ''a robust economy, strong department management, tougher enforcement tools authorized by Congress, and stepped up efforts by colleges, lenders, guaranty agencies, and others.''

What makes this even more noteworthy is that the decline in defaults came at a time when student loan volume was tripling and educational opportunity was expanding to more low-income students, entailing higher risks. It is a great achievement.

The President also recently announced a reduction in interest rates for students in the Direct Loan Program who make their first 12 payments on time. Students have especially welcomed this reduction in college costs. Student organization leaders have noted that all students benefit when the Direct Loan Program can offer the same kinds of repayment incentives as the bank-based Federal Family Education Loan Program.

This encourages healthy competition between the programs, which makes students the ultimate beneficiaries.

This reduction is possible because of the change Congress made in the 1998 Higher

Education Amendments. These changes gave the Secretary the authority to offer the same kind of repayment incentives to Direct Loan borrowers as exist in the bank-based program.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that there is a third piece of good news in which Congress has played an important role. In fiscal year 2000 alone, $4 billion has been recovered on defaulted loans through vigorous collection efforts by the Department of Education and the loan guaranty agencies. Congress authorized the use of offsetting Federal income tax refunds, wage garnishment, and other methods to aid in the collection of these loans.

What is important, however, is that defaulters also have the opportunity to get out of default through loan consolidation and the opportunity to repay their loans based on their income. We must never burden students with loans they cannot repay, and much of our current as well as future savings will be due to the appropriate use of the carrot as well as the stick.

Declining default rates, increased collections, savings produced by the direct student loan program—when we combine the fruits of all these labors, the end result is that we are saving American taxpayers $18 billion.

Too often we overlook the good news in education and fail to note the successes of our legislation and its implementation.

Let us take a moment here to offer congratulations to all for the excellent news coming out of higher education this year.

DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Democratic education agenda for the 107th Congress.

We live in a changed world: a new economy, new technology, and new family realities. More than ever, we all need our children to achieve their full potential. But our children are not getting the support they need.

Our friends in the majority promised radical improvements for public education when they gained control of the House 6 years ago. They said they would get the government out of our schools, and they followed through on that pledge by trying to abolish the Department of Education.

They continually turned their backs on their responsibility to focus on the priorities of the American people. Saying the Federal government has no place in our public schools did nothing to lift up a child or to help a parent, and the American people rightly rejected their plan.

I quote the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), when I say, ''It is time for a new vision.''

While looking forward to the 107th Congress, Democrats will make six new commitments to modernize our public schools and lift up every child:

First, we will recruit and train high quality teachers and principals. Because America's public schools are attended by 90 percent of American children, we need to ensure that every class is led by a highly-qualified teacher; we also aim to establish new incentives to recruit highly-qualified teachers.

Secondly, we will reduce class size. We will recruit 100,000 highly-qualified teachers and reduce class sizes for grades one through three to a national average of 18 children;

Thirdly, we will build accountability measures to ensure that school districts and States set high standards and help every student achieve by building on proven reforms;

Fourthly, we will build new schools and repair existing ones. The Federal help to renovate 6,000 local public schools and repair an additional 8,300 schools to improve learning conditions is vital to our children's future.

We will aim to expand educational technology. We will continue to provide schools with Internet capacity, and bring new technology into the classrooms.

Finally, we will promote lifelong learning in all of our public schools. Our agenda wants to put America on the path to have preschool universally available to every child, and to bring the dream of a college education closer to reality for everyone by making tuition more affordable through tax relief, and by increasing funds for college grants and loans.

These simple six steps will ensure that our children are guaranteed the education they deserve.

Since coming to the House of Representatives, I have worked to bring Congress to the classroom. Two years ago, I visited Crispus Attucks Junior High School, which was my alma mater. Crispus Attucks is a good example of what can be achieved when people in government are committed to public education and public schools.

The school created a good learning environment and provides training on computers and the Internet.

I worked to have Crispus Attucks High School connected with a school in Darby, United Kingdom, and they are doing a tremendous job because they have similar characteristics, and are getting acquainted in a very vital way with each other.

However, more help is needed. With information technology now a key element of the global economy, we must make sure that our children are prepared to use this technology when they enter the world of work.

The Democratic agenda aims to secure computers for all schools. The future of our children is vital, and Federal help must not be seen as negative big government intervention.

The educator and author Derek Bok once wrote, ''If you think education is expensive, try ignorance.'' Bad House majority policies have cost America dearly. Children are being neglected, and they cannot raise themselves.

We would provide $1.7 billion for reducing class size. The opposition did not guarantee one Federal dollar for class size reduction.

We would provide a new $1 billion teacher quality initiative, whereas the opposition has rejected this proposal and has proposed funding lower than this for two combined programs.

We would provide $1.3 billion to leverage about $6.7 billion in grants and loans to fund school renovation. The opposition rejects this approach.

All of our proposals, including funding for after-school programs, safe-and-drug-free schools, accountability and the Head Start and Gear-Up programs have either been rejected or cut dramatically by the House leadership. This is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stand up for education and for our schools, and work towards a better America for all of our children. If we do not stand up for education and our schools, we will fall for anything.

CONGRATULATIONS TO PROFESSOR DANIEL J. MCFADDEN ON WINNING NOBEL PRIZE FOR ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize and to congratulate a distinguished member of the University of California at Berkeley, Professor Daniel J. McFadden.

Last week, Professor McFadden, along with Professor James Heckman of the University of Chicago, received the Nobel Prize for Economics.

Together, through their research and observations, they have contributed significantly to the understanding of individual and societal behavior. Their vital work cuts across disciplinary barriers and greatly enhances our understanding of economics and public policy.

Prior to joining the world of the academic and social sciences community at the University of California at Berkeley in 1963, Professor McFadden, like many of us, attended public school.

As a young man during his college years, he was always attracted to the studies of human behavior. His passion for the field of behavioral sciences and the drive to learn and analyze human behavior helped launch an ambitious career and a lifelong commitment to the study of behavioral and social sciences.

Subsequently, Dr. McFadden developed and linked these behavioral theories to mathematics, statistics, and economics.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to congratulate and recognize Professor McFadden for this lifetime of achievements. His dedication and his outstanding work in economics have contributed significantly to our society.

The implications of his research extend far beyond the ivory tower. Because of his efforts, governmental

agencies and city planners in the United States are able to make better decisions about health care services, social services, employment programs, transportation, and other critical areas of modern life.

The cities of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay area, for example, owe a great deal of the work to Professor McFadden in terms of his research in helping to shape the design of our Bay Area Rapid Transit commuter train system, which is very crucial to tens of thousands of people for their daily commute to work.

Professor Daniel McFadden joins 16 other Berkeley colleagues as Nobel Prize winners. This impressive roster of intellectuals also demonstrates the commitment of this university to the larger social and economic world. As an alumna of the University of California at Berkeley, I am especially proud of these accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I congratulate Professor McFadden for his Nobel Prize award. I appreciate having this opportunity to express my appreciation for the hard work and commitment of our most recent Nobel Prize winner in economics, Professor Daniel J. McFadden.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the Congress education agenda, or lack of one.

Two months ago, the Nation's schools opened their doors to the largest number of students in history. Yet, the Nation began the 2000–2001 academic year facing a national education crisis.

Our teachers and students are struggling to teach and learn in underfunded, inadequate, substandard, and crowded conditions. The average American school building is now more than 40 years old, and the estimated price tag to bring our schools into good condition is $127 billion.

Many of our Nation's communities, like my own, are working to build and modernize schools, but they lack or have very limited funding.

Our President has proposed a school construction tax credit to help communities build and modernize 6,000 schools, and grants and loans for emergency repairs to nearly 5,000 schools a year for 5 years. This school construction relief has bipartisan support in the House of Representatives, and needs to be voted on.

Mr. Speaker, there is also substantial support in the House of Representatives for H.R. 4094, the Rangel-Johnson bill, which would amend the Tax Code to provide incentives for school construction and modernization. It has more than 225 cosponsors. I ask my colleagues to include the provisions of that bill in the final agreement, as well.

But school modernization and reconstruction is only a beginning. Mr. Speaker, in the district of the Virgin Islands, which I represent, just under 3,000 members of the American Federation of Teachers are in the fifth day of a strike for retroactive wages and better working conditions.

When our teachers strike, our students suffer. We need the Federal government to help us in many areas so we can better address our teachers' very valid concerns and their long overdue salary increases.

We in the Congressional Black Caucus have an important education agenda. We are calling for a public school emergency recovery program, which comprehensively addresses the needs of our poorest and most needy schools. It will cost $10 billion of the surplus.

The schools in my and other districts need this help. It is more important than a tax break for the richest 1 percent in our country, and it is a much better and more effective way to address the needs of education than our vouchers, which at best is a risky deflection of funding from public schools, where most of our Nation's children are educated.

Mr. Speaker, my daughter Rabiah is a second grade teacher at Barnard School here in the District, a school that would benefit from the CBC's proposed initiative. This week, she and other teachers are being sent home. She had 22 students in her class. Barnard School and many others need more teachers, not less, to meet the needs of their children.

The time has come for us to send a message across the Nation that our children are a priority and that we value and will invest in the education that they receive. We need to pass a budget that reflects investment in school modernization, that addresses the needs of our teachers by creating smaller classes, by increasing opportunities for training, by giving them more support staffing and programs, and by providing incentives to keep good teachers in our classrooms.

I urge our leadership to follow the will of the majority of the Members of this House by bringing to the floor and passing an education budget that fully responds to the real education needs of all segments of our Nation.

□ 1930

I echo the President's call for continued work to strengthen accountability and raise test scores; to turn around failing schools or shut them down or put them under new management; to expand after school programs and college opportunities for young people; and to ensure a qualified teacher in every class.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the end of this session of Congress, we will be saying good-bye to several of our colleagues. One of them is a steadfast champion of education as well as labor, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY). As he leaves the House after his years of distinguished service, he leaves us in this country an outstanding legacy which includes enacting legislation to strengthen Head Start, elementary and secondary education programs, and college financial aid programs, as well as many other mainstays of American education.

I can think of no more fitting tribute to his service than passing landmark funding for this Nation's public schools and creating the Congressional Black Caucus' public school emergency recovery program.

Mr. Speaker, the outcome of our end-of-the-term negotiations this year must begin with an education budget that ensures a 21st century education for each and every one of our Nation's children, truly leaving not one of them behind.

GOVERNMENT MUST DO MORE TO IMPROVE EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years, the American people have, through numerous focus groups and polls, sent a strong message to all elected officials. Government must do more to improve education. Government at every level, the local level, the State level, and at the Federal level must do more to improve education.

Now we are finally approaching the closing days of the 106th Congress, the scandal of this session of Congress is that, despite the existence of a $230 billion Federal surplus, to date, the Republican majority has refused to respond to the clear demand of the American voters.

The Republicans have chosen to move in the opposite direction. Republican inaction is sabotaging the Federal effort to improve our schools. Even long-standing programs, such as ESEA Title I have not been reauthorized by this Republican-controlled Congress. Only destructive proposals are being placed on the negotiations table by the Republicans.

Publicly funded school vouchers and block grants are two of the most dangerous Republican proposals on the table. Both of these radical programs will hasten the demise of the public school systems in our Nation.

We call on President Clinton to rule that block grants and vouchers are nonnegotiable items in the end game negotiations that are now beginning to take place. Title I block grants are nonnegotiable. We refuse to accept a situation where block grants would return the power to the States using Federal money to decide how Title I will be spent.

It is the neglect, the savage neglect over the years of the States that have created conditions in our inner city

communities and poverty rural communities that the Federal Government found necessary to address when the Elementary and Secondary Education System Act was established.

Why should we abandon the very schools and communities that the Elementary and Secondary Education System Act was meant to help? There is no honorable trade-off possible for block grants and vouchers. We hope that, in the negotiations, there will be a flat refusal to trade off with the Republicans on block grants and vouchers.

The bad news is that Republicans have turned their backs on education as the number one priority of the American people. But the good news is that Democrats have responded vigorously. All year long, we have made proposals.

Democrats have proposed two school construction initiatives. One that most people know about is the Rangel-Johnson initiative that proposes to pay the interest on money borrowed by States and local governments. Up to $25 billion would be covered by a Federal allocation of about $4 billion to cover the interest. The President has also proposed a direct appropriations initiative of $1.3 billion.

Democrats support funding for smaller class sizes. Democrats support funding for more teachers in the classrooms, and therefore the ratio of students to teachers would be a more acceptable ratio and encourage greater teaching.

But one cannot have smaller class sizes if one does not have the classrooms. The construction initiative is vital to the implementation of the Democratic initiative to get smaller class sizes. Certainly in the poorest schools in the poorest communities, we do not have the classes for the smaller class sizes.

The 21st century learning centers proposed by the Democrats for after-school programs, for summer school programs, those programs also need room to operate in. One cannot operate effective summer schools unless one has buildings that are air conditioned in most parts of the country.

The community technology centers are an initiative of this Democratic administration. They want to expand that. We need space. We need buildings.

An increase in Head Start and preschool programs is another Democratic initiative. We cannot increase Head Starts in the poorest communities where they are most needed. We cannot increase preschool programs in the poorest communities where they are most needed unless we have new facilities. We have to have better buildings and more buildings in order to accommodate these programs.

In our inner-city communities, school construction comes first. In Brooklyn, in my 11th Congressional District, we worked vigorously to get rid of coal burning schools, schools that have furnaces that burn coal. I am happy to report that the end is almost in sight, that the School Construction Authority in New York City has an agenda where by the end of the year 2001, there will be no more coal burning furnaces in our schools.

It is imperative that we act now to construct more schools. The Democratic initiative is necessary.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the public schools in our country. I know that should not be a major statement, but after hearing all of what people want to do with vouchers and everything else, maybe we need to have an affirmative affirmation that says, yes, we support our public schools in our country.

Some of the key priorities for our public schools are class size reduction, school modernization, and technology improvements of both our elementary and our secondary schools.

We need to fund the President's plans for school modernization and class size reduction, to ensure that our most valuable national resource, our children, will not continue to suffer from substandard school facilities and overcrowded classrooms.

Studies by the National Center for Education Statistics show that, on the average, public schools in America are 42 years old. School buildings begin rapid deterioration after 40 years. Additionally, 30 percent of our schools were built before 1970 and have never been renovated.

These schools are also lagging behind in our efforts to connect every classroom to the Internet. Only 42 percent of schools built before 1985 are connected to the Internet, compared to almost 60 percent of those built since.

According to GAO's estimate, it would cost $112 billion to bring all our Nation's schools into good overall condition.

In my home State of Texas, where my wife teaches algebra, we have over 4 million students in almost 7,000 schools. Of those schools, 76 percent of the Texas schools need repairs or upgrades just to reach the ''good'' condition; 46 percent need repairs to a building such as plumbing, electrical, heating or cooling systems; 60 percent have at least one environmental quality like air quality, ventilation, or lighting; and the student-to-computer ratio stands 11 to 1, 11 to 1 student-computer ratio. So one just has to wait one's turn for the use of that computer.

The cost for this alone in Texas is estimated to be $10 billion to modernize school infrastructure and over $4 billion to address the technology needs.

Aging schools, however, are not the only problem we have before us. We have to address the growing student population.

Again, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics, elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record-high 52.7 million, will climb to 54.3 million by 2008.

Again, in Texas, we see similar trends. Our education system has stretched past a breaking point when one adds in the expected growth in the number of students.

Over the next decade, the number of students in the elementary and secondary schools are expected to grow almost 8 percent in Texas alone, approximately 316,000 students. It is estimated almost 13,000 new classrooms will have to be built to handle this influx of new students.

Voters in my own hometown in Houston are trying to address this problem. In a recent Houston ISD bond election, they approved $678 million to repair over 70 schools and to build 10 new ones. Fifty of the schools in HISD are over 50 years old. Twenty-five are over 70 years old. Much more is needed because they downsized it.

Also, voters in the Aldine school district where my wife teaches just approved a $115.8 million bond package that would fund six new schools, a transportation center, and would provide upgrades for existing campuses.

Aldine Independent School District is already feeling the impact of increased enrollment with the number of students having grown over 1,200 each year for the last 7 years.

$678 million and $115 million sound like a lot of money, but it is really a drop in the bucket. School populations continue to increase, newer schools are beginning to show wear and tear; and facilities must be upgraded to keep our schools equipped with the cutting edge technology our children will need to be competitive in tomorrow's job market.

These numbers show that it is absolutely vital that Congress address the conditions of our Nation's schools now because the situation will obviously get worse.

Now, most of the school construction comes from, first, local money but also State money. But we need to make sure that we help what we can. Even if it is only a few pennies on the dollar, Mr. Speaker, we can help. That is the reason I support the President's plan to reduce the class size and build more classrooms.

Additionally, I join my colleagues from around the country sponsoring legislation that will make tax credit bonds available to our schools, offer incentives for teachers who choose to teach at low-income or underserved areas and offer tax credits and student loan forgiveness for college students who choose to make teaching their profession.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these important initiatives, and that we can work together and provide funding for our schools to educate our children. Our most important natural resource is the brains in our children that are being educated today.

GOVERNOR BUSH MISSES MARK ON COUNTRY PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a great fiscal debate in which the Governor of Texas tells us that, under his plan, every American who pays taxes will get tax relief. He is completely wrong. He should know that there are 15 million Americans who pay Federal taxes, who pay FICA taxes out of their wages that will not get a penny out of his tax plan, because he ignores the working poor. Those who care for people in nursing homes, those who clean our buildings and wash our cars are left behind. What is worse, of course, is that he provides almost half the benefits to the richest 1 percent of Americans.

Now, what concerns me most about the Governor's statements is that he mocks the importance of fiscal responsibility when he tells the country that the prosperity of the last 8 years has nothing to do with governmental decisions made in Washington.

He is correct that the lion's share of the credit for our national prosperity goes to American workers whose ingenuity, hard work and inventiveness is building a new economy. But for political gain, he denies that there is another essential element, and that is fiscal responsibility here in Washington.

By denying that what we do here in Washington has anything to do with how the economy performs, he grants to us a fiscal license, a statement that government has nothing to do with prosperity, hence government can do whatever it wants.

The fact is otherwise. The facts are that, during the mid-1980s and the late 1980s and the early 1990s, Americans were hard working and inventive and ingenious, and yet we did not have prosperity in this country.

□ 1945

Why? Because we had a budget deficit that was growing every year and threatened to swallow up private savings in our economy. We cannot afford the license the political rhetoric from the Governor of Texas would grant.

Now, we are told by the Governor that he does not want to provide so much benefit to the upper 1 percent. He tells us that his plan will provide only $223 billion of tax relief to that richest 1 percent over the next 10 years. He does this by ignoring the second largest piece of his proposal, and that is his repeal of the estate tax. He tries to minimize the fiscal effect of that by using fuzzy phase-in figures.

But the fact is the estate tax will be producing $50 billion a year, $500 billion over 10 years, which means the wealthiest 1 percent, over a 10-year period, will be getting $700 billion of tax relief, not just the $223 billion the Governor admits to. That is why when we look at the estate tax and the income tax the conclusion is clear: he provides more tax relief for the wealthiest 1 percent than everything he proposes to do to help our health care system, to strengthen Medicare, to strengthen the military and to provide for our schools combined.

It is time that we focus on the fiscal details of the plans of those who are running for President. This is not a popularity contest.

THE NATIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to live in an exciting and prosperous time. The Internet has bridged gaps between generations and nations. Biotechnology has produced medical miracles. Our cars have more computing power than the Apollo spacecraft. Success in this information age depends not just on how well we educate our children generally but how well we educate them in science and mathematics specifically.

Following the launch of Sputnik in 1957, major steps were taken in the United States to improve resources going into science. The goal was to pursue a superior technical workforce. This produced generations of scientists and engineers who have contributed greatly to our economic and technical accomplishments. I am a product of the Sputnik revolution. I have spent several decades in the world of teaching and physics research. But now, as a policymaker, I see the shortcomings of our earlier revolution in science and mathematics education, and I see the need to increase our effort for science and mathematics education today.

The push for improving public competence in science and mathematics is justified by economics, national security, and arguments about democracy. It is also important for personal fulfillment. Mathematics and science bring order and harmony and balance to our lives. They teach us that our world is intelligible and not capricious. They give us the skill for lifelong learning; really for creating progress itself. From the evidence we currently have at hand, it is clear we are not providing this quality education in math and science to our children.

I am proud to have been one of four Members of the House and Senate to serve on the National Commission on the Teaching of Mathematics and Science, chaired by former Senator and astronaut, John Glenn, and including leaders from industry, academia and professional and educational organizations. The Glenn Commission, as it has come to be known, was established to improve math and science education throughout the United States, and in its report, released 3 weeks ago, ''Before It's Too Late,'' the commission identifies teaching as the most powerful instrument for reform; and thus teaching is the place to begin.

The commission calls for major changes throughout the teaching profession, the scientific professions, and the institutions that produce our teachers. Our country must devote attention to the quality, quantity and professional work environment of teachers in science and mathematics. In the next 10 years, we will have to recruit and hire 2.2 million teachers just to stay even with attrition in the teaching force. Most of these teachers, including all elementary schoolteachers, will be called on to teach science, and many will feel inadequate to teach it.

Along with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who also served on the commission, I am introducing legislation that seeks to make these changes. The National Improvement in Mathematics and Science Teaching Act, as it is called, establishes a new title in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to improve the quality of math and science education.

Specifically, this Glenn Commission bill establishes a State assistance grant program to recruit quality teachers into the field. Under this program, every State will receive funding that they can use for a variety of purposes that are designed to attract new and qualified math and science teachers. States can establish a loan forgiveness program, signing bonuses, or even create a career ladder for math and science teachers. The bill also establishes a similar grant program to improve professional development of these teachers. Like the previous grant program, States would have the flexibility to use these funds on a variety of activities, including master teacher initiatives, summer fellowships in relevant industries, or summer workshops, among other things.

The Glenn Commission bill establishes 15 John Glenn academies to recruit recent college graduates and mid-career professionals to compete for 3,000 prestigious 1-year paid academy fellowships. The fellows will be nationally recruited for a 1-year intensive course on effective teaching methods in mathematics and science. In return, these Glenn fellows will agree to teach for 5 years in districts with science and math teacher shortages. I am pleased that this bill establishes a grant program to address the achievement gap in math and science education.

Lastly, this bill establishes industry tax credits and deductions designed to encourage partnerships between schools and business and industry. Specifically, industries can receive tax credits for creating summer fellowships for math and science teachers. Likewise, businesses can receive deductions for donating new math and science equipment and materials to our public schools.

We are just days away from the end of the 106th Congress, so some may

wonder why I am introducing a bill so late in this congressional session. In fact, I could have waited to introduce this bill at the start of the next session, but I see this as a critical problem that needs to be addressed starting now. The Glenn Commission only released its report a few weeks ago, and I believe it is important to get to work as quickly as possible to address the recommendations of this commission.

We should not wait until next year to address an issue that will have such a huge impact on the future of our children and our country. If we are going to make a difference in the education and the lives of our citizens, it is imperative that we start making changes right away.

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and I are trying to do this, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I stand here and think about how the economy is booming, we talk about how many jobs that have been created; yet we have record unemployment, and we are passing bills to bring people over under the H–1B visas to take the better jobs. Now, I do not have a problem with that, Mr. Speaker; but we have got to educate the people here so that we do not continue to do this forever.

It has been said that a school is four walls and a roof with a future inside. If that is true, then we need to start to look at the investments that we make in education. I have heard far too much about the trillion dollar tax break and far too little on the investment in our future, which is with our young people. It is very simple. It is so easy. And this administration has taken a lead in standing firm and holding the line, hopefully until we can get some of these issues addressed.

All of us know we need additional teachers and after-school programs. We all know that we need to do something about our buildings. In my State of Texas there are buildings that have more portables than the main building, and some of the portables are a block from the first restroom that kids can go to. I do not believe that we think that all of this ought to be left to the local districts because they simply cannot afford it when the districts are poor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wealthy Nation. This is a Nation that can do about whatever it wants to, and I do not believe that we are thinking soundly when we are willing to leave here without addressing the real needs of our future, which is our students. We have to get rid of these leaky inadequate buildings that have no heat, no running water, and are not even in a condition to be wired properly for today's education. Yet we continue to talk about how much we can give for a tax break.

I do not know why it is so difficult to understand that kids simply cannot grasp what they are being taught if they are in a class with too many other children and only one teacher. In my State of Texas, the ratio is one teacher for 22 children. That is really above the national average, but every one of those asks for a waiver each year so that they can have even more students in a class. Just imagine young children coming to school for the first time and finding themselves in a class of 25, 30, and 40 children with one teacher. We wonder why they do not do well on tests and wonder why they drop out or start being absent from school. No child wants to feel that they are being left out, and yet that is what we are getting when we have our classes that are too large because we do not have enough teachers.

One of the reasons we do not have enough teachers is because we do not pay them adequately. If we graduate young teachers now from college that are well prepared for today's classrooms, they can get a job making twice as much almost anywhere else. We have got to address the issue of educating our young people, and we have to acknowledge that we have a long ways to go in many of these communities.

The answer is not vouchers for a private school. I do not have a thing against private schools. I think whoever wants to send their children to private schools should be able to do that. But I do not think it should be with taxpayers' money while we are neglecting the public schools, which is where 90 percent of the children have to go. Imagine kids still going to school in areas that are not safe, where half the teachers are eligible for retirement, but they simply cannot retire because they do not have anyone to replace them. They go into schools that are not equipped with our technology and computer hardware that we all say we have to have.

In spite of all this, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership stands in the way of bringing a bill to the floor to just spend a portion of what we call the surplus to address these basic needs. I am hoping that we can remember our ABC's. A, for additional teachers and additional after-school programs. Without additional teachers, my own State will lose something like $146.8 million to reduce overcrowded classroom sizes.

And B is for building improvements. Current estimates indicate that my State faces $13.7 billion in costs for school modernization; 76 percent of the schools in Texas report a need to upgrade or repair buildings.

And C, of course, Mr. Speaker, is reducing classroom size. Hopefully, that is simple enough that all of us can remember that and not go home this session without addressing this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON address the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATIONS TO CHRISTINE MARTIN, NEW J-SCHOOL DEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to Christine Martin, who was recently named dean of the Perley Isaac Reed School of Journalism at West Virginia University.

Dean Martin lead the school of journalism in an interim capacity for 1 year before receiving a permanent appointment. In that short term, she has greatly contributed to a first-class faculty with the addition of award-winning journalists George Esper and Terry Wimmer.

Mr. Speaker, in tribute to this talented, well-respected educator and journalist, and in recognition of her many achievements, I provide for the RECORD a recent newspaper article written on the occasion of her appointment as dean and extend my congratulations.

MARTIN SELECTED AS NEW J-SCHOOL DEAN

(By Chandra Broadwater)

Christine Martin, a West Virginia University journalism professor and interim dean of the Perley Isaac Reed School of Journalism, was selected as the permanent dean of the school last week.

The selection of Martin formally concluded a nationwide search for the position.

Martin was named to the post of dean after the search was narrowed down to three total finalists.

''I think that the school of journalism will be very well served with Chris as dean,'' Dean Bill Deaton of the College of Human Resources and Education and chair of the Journalism Dean Search Committee said. ''She's demonstrated through her progress as interim dean her ability to effectively work with different media in the school.''

Martin will be the first woman to lead the school and the sixth dean in its history.

''I've worked with Chris since I came to WVU in 1996 and I had also known her from a Pennsylvania paper that we both worked at,'' journalism professor and search committee member Leslie Rubinkowski said. ''I know her as being an excellent journalist and good editor. She brings a lot of these qualities to her job.''

Rubinkowski also acknowledges that Martin did a great job in getting projects within the journalism school started.

''Chris has spearheaded many projects in the last year,'' she said. ''Under her guidance, we are redesigning the journalism curriculum. The way that scholarships are awarded has been changed and Journalism Week, which faded away in the last five years, was revived.''

In addition to noting Martin's work in creating the Vietnam war correspondent women's panel, Rubinkowski ultimately felt that Martin was chosen as dean of the journalism school because of the respectable and likeable persona that she reflects.

''People like and respect her because she's a good journalist and leader.''

After coming to WVU in 1990 as an associate professor, Martin directed the school's writing program, chaired the news editorial sequence and coordinated its honors program.

Before coming to WVU, she taught writing, literature and journalism at Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pa. Martin also worked as a reporter, education writer and news editor for the Pittsburgh Tribune Review and the Uniontown Herald-Standard.

Martin is also a 1999 Freedom Forum Teacher of the Year, a 1998 Carnegie Foundation Professor of the Year (the only one in West Virginia), a 1997–98 WVU Foundation Outstanding Teacher and the 1996–97 Journalism Teacher of the Year.

Martin also began a program that brings together WVU and state newsrooms called, ''Bridging the Gap: A Personnel and Resource Exchange.'' In addition to her work with WVU, she conducts writing workshops for newspapers across the state.

Martin also co-directs the reporting and writing fellowship program for college graduates at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Fla. every summer.

Martin earned her undergraduate degree in English from California University (Pa.). She also holds a master's degree from the University of Maryland, where she is currently completing a Ph.D. in American studies.

Martin currently is in Vietnam, pursuing her interests in female war correspondents who covered the Vietnam War. She was unavailable for comment.

□ 2000

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington, I was determined to make education our Nation's number one priority. That commitment has not changed.

What has changed is my understanding of what it takes so that our children are ready to learn when they enter the classroom. We can have the best schools and the best teachers in the world; but if our children do not enter the classroom ready to succeed, those schools and those teachers and those students will fail.

Let us face it, if today's children are lucky enough to have two parents living with them, chances are both parents work outside the home, they work long hours, they commute long distances, and it is our children who are being left behind.

It is certainly not their parents' fault. They are working and commuting long hours to support their families. But it is our children who are paying the price because their parents need to earn a living. That is not right. Parents should not have to choose between financial stability and their children's emotional stability. We need to help parents bridge the gap between work and family so their children are ready to learn when they enter the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, we know that learning does not start on the first day of kindergarten. Children are growing and changing from the very day they are born. Study after study has shown that the first 3 years are critical to a child's development. Provisions need to be made for families so that they can be together at these critical times so parents can be with new babies and newly adopted children.

Paid family leave is a key tool we can use to make sure that children get off to a positive start and that their parents can be with them at these critical times. And by providing parents with voluntary universal prekindergarten programs, we will give them the chance to get their children on the right track. Programs like Head Start and Early Head Start show us that pre-K programs work. All parents should have the option of enrolling their children in a structured, quality, voluntary pre-K program.

With parents working hard, children are spending more and more time in child care. Ensuring that quality child care is available to all children will go a long way to making sure that our children are ready to learn when they go to school.

We need more good child care, including care for children under the age of 3 and for night and weekend workers. But it is not just young children who are coming to school unprepared. Older children face challenges also.

Title XI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which I wrote and saw signed into law in my first term, needs to be expanded. It needs to be expanded to allow schools to use more Federal funds for in-school support services for students and for their families.

Services such as after-school programs, mentoring programs, tutoring and counseling help young people address their angers and their frustrations and their fears before they have tragic consequences, and these programs ensure that young people are ready to learn when they enter the classroom.

Also, Mr. Speaker, students cannot learn when they are hungry. It is proven that those students who eat breakfast do better on tests, they are more well-behaved in school, and they miss less time from school than those who do not eat breakfast. We need to make sure every child starts the day off with a good meal.

My pilot Federal breakfast program, which is underway in five school districts across the Nation, is the first step toward a universal school breakfast program.

We must also make quality education accessible to all of our children. That means building new, modern schools that are welcoming to those with disabilities as well as to those without. That means making sure that no one is left behind.

In the high-tech global economy, however, those without a high-tech education, those without high-tech skills will be left behind. That is why we must make sure that minorities and women are encouraged to study math, science, technology, and engineering. Females make up slightly more than 50 percent of this country's population, but less than 30 percent of America's scientists are women.

My ''Go Girl'' bill will create a bold new workforce of energized young women in science, math and technology careers.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EDUCATION IS KEY TO OPPORTUNITY, EQUALITY, AND SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but listen to the Members who have preceded me in discussing what I think is a universal issue, and that is to help our children in this Nation learn.

Education is the key to opportunity, the key to equality, the key to success. Unfortunately, we have failed in creating opportunities for excellence.

It is difficult for a country as powerful as America and Members of the United States Congress to be able to come to the floor of the House and admit, in some part, failure. That is why it is so very important for us to emphasize what needs to be done and to also emphasize that all cannot be done at the local level.

Education is national. It should be a national priority. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is vital that, before we leave this session, we focus on issues such as reducing class size so that our children can get individual tutoring and teaching and nurturing so that education is fun and education for them is a positive experience.

To do that, we must admit that our schools in America are crumbling and local jurisdictions cannot build all of the schools that are needed. Every one of us have schools in our community that have portable buildings, limited

heat, limited air conditioning. They were only supposed to be there on a temporary basis. Yet first-graders and kindergartners and second-graders are all in these portable buildings maybe high school students and middle school students. And for some, in inclement weather, those individuals have to leave those portables to go to the restroom facilities, gym facilities.

What kind of life is that for our children?

We need increased teacher salaries. We need to respect teachers for the learning and the knowledge that they bring to the classroom. And, yes, we need the training of more math and science teachers.

I have seen the actual results of that. The ranking member on the Committee on Immigration Claims, we supported H–1B non-immigrant visas to help in our high-technology industry. But, Mr. Speaker, the real issue is are we preparing Americans for those jobs, are we training incumbent workers, are we training college students? There has to be a greater opportunity and there must be a greater access and opportunity for education.

I visited with some of my elementary school students this past week from Henderson Elementary School, hard-working students. But yet, Mr. Speaker, they had maybe three computers to a classroom, maybe not that many. I asked the 10-year-old and 9-year-old how often they got to the computer, and they said maybe once or twice or three times a week. Even if there is slightly more than that, that is not enough to prepare a technologically educated society.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we do more for education.

Let me just simply close on another and different note, but I think it is extremely important to clarify something very close to my heart as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, a cosponsor of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 and 2000. There seems to be a lot of debate about this, Mr. Speaker. But let me clarify the record.

Coming from Texas, all of the world's eyes were on Jasper, Texas, in 1998 when the heinous act of James Byrd, Jr. was discovered, the dismemberment of a man because of his color. Out of that terrible tragedy, legislators such as Representatives Senfronia Thompson of Texas, Senator Rodney Ellis of Texas, Joe Deshotel, a cosponsor, and many others put forward the Hate Crimes Act of Texas in order to ensure that this terrible act would be an illegal act not only in Texas but to show the world what Texas was made of.

That act was dealing with race, ethnicity, gender, disability, religion or sexual orientation. It was inclusive. It was constitutionally secure. It would pass constitutional muster, unlike the legislation of 1991, which was simply a Hate Crimes Reporting Act that I believe the Governor of the State of Texas was referring to in all of his debates.

We do not have a real hate crimes legislation or bill in the State of Texas. And when the family of James Byrd, Jr. went to the Governor's office and begged for his support for that very strong legislative initiative, he did not give it. Plain and simple, the signals went out to the Senate that it was not a legislative initiative that the Governor's office was supporting.

It passed the House, with Speaker Laney, the Democratic speaker in the House of Representatives in the State of the Texas. But in a Republican Senate in the State of Texas, it could not pass.

The Governor of my State, Governor Bush, did not help it pass and did not support its passage. And now we do not have, in light of the heinous act, murderous act against James Byrd, Jr., not even as a tribute to him could we pass a real hate crimes bill in the State of Texas.

I hope this Congress will take up the challenge and stop the opposing of a real hate crimes legislation that could be passed in this session and do what is right. We could not do what was right for Texas. Let us do what is right for all of America and make it a Federal law, and let us not stand in the way of acknowledging that that country abhors hateful acts because they are simply different. As the Voters' Rights Act was passed and the Civil Rights Act was passed, we can pass a real civil rights bill, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, and tell America and the world that we stand not for hate but for inclusion and empowerment.

SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss Social Security. It is going to be almost like a professor lecturing a class. So everybody that is interested in Social Security should listen up. Those that are not interested in Social Security should be because it is America's biggest program, probably the United States Government's most important program.

When I came to Congress in 1993, I left the Michigan Senate as chairman of the Taxation Committee. At that time, we were looking at the consequences of low investment and savings. I discovered that, in the United States, we have the lowest savings of any industrialized country in the world. And then I started looking at Social Security and the problems that Social Security was having in terms of the demographics in terms of financing the current promises in future years.

When I came to Congress, what I did in 1993, I introduced my first Social Security bill. And then 2 years later, in 1995, 1997, and 1999, I introduced subsequent Social Security bills, all scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years.

I have been serving as chairman of the Bipartisan Task Force on Social Security in the Committee on the Budget. With testimony we received, we came up with 18 unanimous recommendations of what should be in a Social Security bill. I incorporated those and introduced a bipartisan bill that is now before the House.

I would suggest to everybody, current retirees, near retirees and young workers and young people in general to start looking at Social Security because it has the potential of developing a generational warfare if we continue to make promises of increased Social Security benefits and then we simply satisfy that challenge by increasing taxes on future generations.

Let me just say that if we do nothing, if we add no more benefits to Social Security or Medicare or Medicaid but continue under the existing programs to keep those programs solvent, we will have to have a payroll tax to keep Social Security and Medicaid and Medicare solvent that will take 47 percent of our wages.

□ 2015

Right now the FICA tax is 15 percent of wages.

The Social Security Benefit Guarantee Act. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt created the Social Security program over 6 decades ago, he wanted it to feature a private sector component to build retirement income. Social Security was supposed to be one leg of a three-legged stool to support retirees. It was supposed to go hand in hand with personal savings and private pension plans, and it is interesting, searching in the archives for some of the testimony back in 1935 when we started Social Security, to see that the Senate on two different occasions voted that it should allow private investment savings as an alternative to the government doing it; but when the House and the Senate went to conference, the decision was made that year to simply have it a totally government program, and that is what it is, a pay-as-you-go program where existing workers pay in their taxes to support existing retirees.

The demographics, the problem of demographics, fewer workers and more retirees, which we will get into in a moment. The system is really stretched to its limits. Seventy-eight million baby boomers begin retiring in 2008. These are the high-income people in general. That means they go out of the paying-in mode, paying in their taxes, directly related to their higher incomes, and start taking out benefits again directly related to what their incomes have been. That is when the problem starts. Social Security spending exceeds tax revenues starting in 2015. We increased the Social Security taxes substantially in 1983 so currently, temporarily, there are huge

surpluses coming in, and we have been spending that surplus for other government programs.

Social Security trust funds go broke in 2037, although the crisis could arrive much sooner. The crisis is going to arrive when we need to start coming up with the money that we borrowed and spent for other programs in the past, and that is the real problem. That is the real challenge.

Insolvency is not some guess or estimate. Insolvency is certain. We know how many people there are, and we know when they are going to retire. We know that people will live longer in retirement, and our estimates on how long they live have been fairly accurate over the past. We know how much they will pay into Social Security and taxes, and we know how much they are going to take out under the benefit structure we have. Payroll taxes will not cover benefits starting in 2015, and the shortfalls will add up to $120 trillion of extra money needed over and above what is coming in in taxes, $120 trillion between 2015 and 2075.

To put that in perspective, I am not sure any of us really know how much a trillion dollars is, but our spending that we are going to end up for this current fiscal year that we have just started is going to be approximately $1.9 trillion. Just for Social Security over the next 75 years, we are going to need to come up with an additional $120 trillion. It is a huge problem, and it is so frustrating that we have not paid attention to it.

We have let the last 8 years go because politicians have been afraid that they would be demagogued in the election. We have missed an opportunity over the last 8 years by not having the leadership in the White House to move ahead with saving Social Security. Instead, we have had words saying Social Security should come first but no legislation proposed that could be scored to keep Social Security solvent over the next 75 years.

Here is part of the demographic problems. The coming Social Security crisis, pay-as-you-go retirement system, will not meet the challenge of demographic change.

Workers per Social Security beneficiary. Back in 1940, here are 38 workers paying in their taxes for every one retiree. Today there are three workers paying in their taxes for every one retiree, and the estimate is by 2025 there are only going to be two workers paying in their benefits that is going to cover the Social Security check for every one retiree. So if that person's Social Security benefits end up being whatever, $15,000, or $1,200, $1,500 a month, those two workers are going to have to pay in that $600 or $750 a month each to cover those benefits of that one retiree. So we would let taxes go that high.

This depicts sort of graphically the short-term surplus and the long-term future deficits. Remember, I mentioned this red represents $120 trillion, $120 trillion that we are going to be short; that that much more is needed over and above the Social Security taxes to accommodate the promises that we have made in Social Security. Because we have been raising taxes a great deal on the fewer and fewer workers, we have ended up with a short-term surplus, and Republicans came in as a majority in 1995 and for the first time we started not using all of the Social Security surplus for other government program spending. For the first time in 40 years we started saying, look, we have to stop spending the Social Security surplus, and last year we called it a lockbox. Whatever it is called, what we did was made a decision, and we enforced it by saying we are not going to spend any of the Social Security surplus on any other programs.

We talk about all of these huge surpluses. Most of the surplus coming in is from the Social Security tax.

Let me just give three numbers in terms of what is going to happen this current fiscal year that started the first of this month. This year we are estimating that we are going to take in $533 billion of Social Security taxes, $533 billion coming in. What is needed to pay benefits this year is $367 billion. That means we have a surplus in Social Security of $166 billion. So the $166 billion that is coming in from the Social Security tax, where we are really at this time at least overtaxing American workers to come up with the extra money and we are using that extra money to pay down the debt held by the public. So what we will do is we will write an IOU to the Social Security trust fund. There is a box down in Maryland full of IOUs where we have spent the money in the past, where we have borrowed it and spent it for other things; and this current year we expect to take $166 billion for the Social Security surplus, write an IOU for it, and use that money to pay down the public debt.

This is Barry Pump. I do not know if the cameras see him; but Barry Pump is from Iowa, one of our star pages. So I thank Barry very much.

Economic growth will not fix Social Security. So some have said the economy is great, it is going to mean that we are not going to have the Social Security problems; let us keep this economy rolling and we can quit worrying about Social Security. Untrue.

Social Security benefits are indexed to wage growth. So the higher one's wages, when they retire the higher their benefits.

So an increased economy means that more taxes are paid in earlier; but later on when one eventually retires, they are going to take more benefits out. So the growing expanding economy, the way we have Social Security structured right now, is not going to solve the problem. I mean, that is why 4 years ago when I introduced my bill Social Security was estimated to go insolvent, to not have enough money coming in in 2012.

The expanding economy over the last 3 years has grown enough, a lot of it coming in from capital gains taxes, by the way, has grown enough that short-term, as far as the extra money coming in, means that we will have enough money to cover benefits another extra 3 years until 2015. Growth makes the numbers look better now but leaves a larger hole to fill later.

The administration has used these short-term advantages as an excuse to do nothing; and I just want to emphasize that this growing economy, though they can say, look, the Social Security trust fund is going to be there to pay benefits until 2035, it used to be 2032, or we are not going to have enough money coming in from the Social Security tax by 2012, now we are extended to 2015, does not solve the long-term financial fiscal problems for Social Security because the paychecks going out later on are going to be that much greater.

I think this is important that most Americans do not realize. Somehow they feel that somehow they earn something with a Social Security account, a Social Security fund. Not true. There is no Social Security account with their name on it. These trust fund balances, and I am quoting from the Office of Management and Budget of this administration, these trust fund balances are available to finance future benefit payments and other trust fund expenditures but only in a bookkeeping sense. They are claims on the Treasury that when redeemed will have to be financed by raising taxes, borrowing from the public, or reducing benefits or somehow reducing other government expenditures.

Again, the source is the Office of Management and Budget. I think it is interesting to note that the Supreme Court now in two decisions has ruled that there is no entitlement for Social Security. Regardless of how many years one paid into Social Security, Social Security is a tax. The benefits are whatever Congress and the President decide those benefits are going to be. So what we have seen in the past, when there was a financial problem in 1977, 1983, when they were coming short of money, they reduced benefits and increased taxes. I just stress as vigorously as I can that it is going to be unconscionable to yet again raise taxes on the American worker.

We will see a chart later I have, but right now 75 percent of American workers pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax.

This represents the public debt versus the Social Security shortfall. Our total debt in this country, what we owe the trust funds and what we owe in Treasury bills, is $3.4 trillion. The shortfall of Social Security between now and 2057 is $46.6 trillion.

Vice President GORE is suggesting that if we pay off this debt by using extra Social Security money coming in and any other surplus that can be found, that if we pay off this debt it is going to solve this problem and keep

Social Security solvent until 2057. It is like adding another giant IOU to the trust fund. So technically if this Chamber passed a bill saying we are going to write an IOU for $9 trillion to the Social Security trust fund, the actuaries would say well, this will keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. The fact is that the challenge, the problem, is coming up with those dollars once we have fewer dollars coming in on the taxes than are required for the benefits.

I am going to portray this in another way. The blue at the bottom, the light blue, represents the $260 billion that we are now using to pay on financing the debt, the interest on that particular debt approaching $300 billion. Vice President GORE is suggesting that if we dedicate somehow this savings every year for the next 75 years to Social Security, it will keep Social Security solvent.

So what the difference between the $46.6 trillion that is needed and what this interest savings will be is $35 trillion. So the red part of this graph represents the shortfall that still is going to be there even if this Chamber and the Senate and the President has the guts, has the intestinal fortitude, to dedicate this kind of interest rate savings to Social Security. It is a problem that cannot be solved by adding IOUs.

□ 2030

The biggest risk is doing nothing at all. Social Security has a total unfunded liability of over $9 trillion. I mentioned that over the next 75 years you need $120 trillion of future dollars, that inflated future dollar. To raise that $120 trillion over the next 75 years, you need $9 trillion today. So Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggests that we need $9 trillion today, so put it in a real interest bearing account that will bring in 6 to 7 percent real return in order to accommodate the $120 trillion shortfall over the next 75 years.

Nine trillion dollars we have got to come up with today if we are going to solve the problem and not make any changes in this program, and not get any better return on the investment than we are getting on Social Security now, which is less than 2 percent for the average taxpayer.

The Social Security trust fund contains nothing but IOUs. To keep paying promised Social Security benefits, the payroll tax will have to be increased by nearly 50 percent, or benefits will have to be cut by 30 percent.

Everyone should start out with a prerequisite that we are not going to increase taxes once again, and we are not going to cut benefits for existing retirees or near term retirees. Somehow we have got to do a better job on getting a better return on that investment.

The Social Security lockbox. A little bit of a gimmick, but it has served us well in trying to make sure that we do not spend the Social Security surplus. It saves the Social Security trust fund dollars for Social Security. It keeps Washington's big spenders from using trust fund dollars for other government spending.

I have heard the Vice President say, look, we need that lockbox for Social Security. The House, this Chamber, has passed the lockbox language. We have sent it to the Senate. Now the Democrats in the Senate are filibustering that so it is not passed into a bill and sent to the President.

If Vice President GORE really wants to implement that lockbox provision to make sure that we do not spend the Social Security surplus, then I think probably all he has to do is tell that particular Chamber that they should go ahead and pass the legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair would remind the gentleman not to cast reflections on the other Chamber, such as characterizing Senate action or their activities.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would apologize if I did that.

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber passed the bill. It has languished over in the Senate. With the Vice President's help, I am sure we could get it through the Senate Chamber.

The diminishing return of your Social Security investment. The average Social Security taxpayer will receive a 1.9 percent interest rate, real interest rate return, on what that worker and their employer, or, if they are self-employed, what they pay into Social Security. So the average worker is not going to live long enough, even though our life spans are substantially increasing, to get back what they have paid in in Social Security tax. So that is part of the problem, is getting a better return on that investment.

The real return on Social Security is 1.9 percent for most workers, and it shows a negative return, as you see over here, for some, compared to over 7 percent for the marketplace. So the marketplace for the last 120 years has averaged a return of 7 percent, a real return. This is what this graph depicts.

You have a negative return if you happen to be a minority. The reason is that a young black worker today, their life expectancy is about 62.5 years. That means they can work all their life, paying into Social Security, but, on average, they die before they start taking any benefits out, and they are substantially shortchanged. But even the average, even the best, even the person that lives to be 105, on average they are only going to get a return that is 1.9 percent real return on the money, tax money, that has been sent in. And this is over and above that amount of the Social Security tax that is used for insurance, for disability insurance. This only counts that amount that is put into the OSDI fund. Again, on the average, the market return is 7 percent.

Another way of depicting the problem, because it is sort of like maybe the mechanic that knows the operation of the internal combustion engine, so they are very careful about taking care of their automobile, and they change the oil and they do the lubrication on a regular basis.

Well, I have been studying Social Security now for 7 years. I know the internal workings of Social Security, and it is running out of lubrication. The friction currently on Social Security means that there are going to be tremendous problems in the future, and that huge liability is going to fall on our kids and our grandkids.

I am a farmer from Michigan, and traditionally we have always tried to pay down the farm mortgage in an effort to leave our kids a little better off. This government, this Congress, this White House, is now taking a course where we are jeopardizing the potential happiness and success of our kids and our grandkids by leaving them this great huge obligation. We have got to deal with it, we have got to change it. It has to be more than rhetoric. It has got to be real action for written bills that can keep Social Security solvent.

This chart, very briefly, is the number of years it takes to get back your Social Security tax. If you were lucky enough to retire in 1940, because of the low taxes, you could get back everything you and your employer paid in in 2 months. By 1980, you have to live 4 years after retirement.

If you retire in 2005, you have got to live 23 years after retirement to break even, to get back just what you and your employer put in into the tax. In 1983, they increased the age limit that starts this next year, and that is why this sort of levels off up here. But by 2015 and 2025, you are going to have to live 26 years after you retire in order to get back what you and your employer paid in. I am not sure our medical technology is going to be that good by that time. It may be, but a better way to do it is to make some changes now that will mean that our kids and our grandkids are not put under this huge burden and that they can appreciate the benefits of Social Security, as their grandparents and their parents hopefully have.

This is a picture of my grandkids getting ready for Halloween. Whether it is Selena or James or Henry or George, he is a real tiger, or Emily or Clair or Francis or Nicholas. Nicholas is now 13. When he retires, he is going to have this challenge, not to mention his younger brothers and sisters and cousins, that they are going to have if we do not do something on Social Security.

I put the picture of my grandkids on my office wall. As I walk out to vote, I try to make my voting decisions on how it will affect this country and the future generations of this country 15, 20, 30, 40 years from now.

We have got to start looking longer range. We have got to start dealing with the two important programs that

we have for seniors, Medicare and Social Security; and Medicaid with nursing home care is another issue that we have got to start dealing with.

We cannot keep putting it off simply because it is hard, because it is a difficult problem, simply because somebody might criticize us for things or portions that we do in it. Somehow Republicans and Democrats have got to get together and seriously move ahead.

This chart represents what we have done in the past. I do not know if the cameras still show my grandkids, but imagine them up there, because what we are going to do with their taxes down here can be very significant. Here is what we have done in 1940, 1960, 1980 and 2000. In 1940 the rate was 2 percent and the base was $3,000. So the total amount of tax for the employee and the employer was $60, combined; combined.

In 1960, it got to 6 percent, and the base was $4,800. So you, the employee, paid 3 percent on the first $4,800, and the employer paid the same; a maximum tax combined for the employee and the employer of $288.

It got up to 1980, and they raised the tax again; got into a little problem, so this Chamber decided, well, an easy way to do it is load more taxes on the American worker. So, again we increased the tax up to 10.16 on the first $25,900, total possible tax for employee and employer combined, $2,631.

In 2000, we got up to 12.4 percent on the first $76,200, a total tax now of $9,448.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to congratulate my friend. I just walked in, and I see the picture and I see the headline saying ''increasing payroll taxes again is not the answer.''

I would like to say that I could not agree with the gentleman more. Obviously increasing the payroll taxes would be a horrible thing on those struggling workers, certainly the middle-income wage earners.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to compliment my colleague on this very interesting special order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would certainly thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of our Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, just finishing the taxes, and maybe really what we have not finished is the bottom line. If we do not get a better return on the investment, we are in for real problems. Governor Bush has suggested that we have some real investment that stays within Social Security; that is not going outside of the Social Security system, but simply allows a better return on some of the money.

We can do better. As we know, you can get a CD and do better than a 1.9 percent return. Any return that we can expand over and above 1.9 percent on average is going to mean that retirees live a better life.

My oldest grandson's name is Nick Smith. Maybe that is my immorality. But Nick painted the fence for us this past year. He made $180, and I said, Nick, you really need to put some of that into a Roth IRA. Then I went through the tables year by year on the magic of compound interest. So we went year by year and found out that by age 66, he would have almost $70,000; and if he waited until he was 72 to take that money out at the rate investments have been earning money over the last 100 years on average, it would end up $140,000.

He said, well, grandpa, can I still put some money, maybe, in your Roth IRA, but I want to save most of it to buy a car.

That is part of the problem we are facing today. Our savings and investment in this country is still low, and that means two things. It means we do not have the money to do the research, to put into the companies, to expand to the best possible state-of-the-art machinery to compete in this world, but it also means that the retirement for these individuals is not going to be as good as it really could be.

With good investments, let me say, and I am going to show you some examples from Texas and California, with good investments, a modest-income worker today can retire as a rich retiree. This is one of the problems why it is so important, I think, that we do not again raise taxes on the working poor in this country, on the average working family.

This pie chart represents that 78 percent of families now pay more in the payroll tax than they do the income tax.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, 78 percent of our families pay more in the FICA tax than the payroll deduction. Actually, it drops down to 74; 74 percent pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax.

Let us not raise taxes again. The longer we put off this decision, the longer we put off this decision, the more drastic the changes are going to have to be. So the bills that I introduced in 1995 and 1997 were less drastic, it did not have to make the kind of changes, but the bill I introduced this year actually had to borrow some money from the onbudget surplus to accommodate the transition to make the system work, to make the system solvent, without reducing any benefits for existing or near-term retirees and without increasing taxes. The longer we wait, the more drastic the solution. So let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, the six principles of saving Social Security that Governor Bush has proposed, that are consistent with the bills many of us have introduced: protect current and future beneficiaries; allow freedom of choice; preserve the safety net; make Americans better off, not worse off; create a fully funded system; no tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk just for a second about personal retirement accounts. They do not come out of Social Security. They stay in Social Security, and they are part of your retirement. They can only be used for retirement purposes, and the way Governor Bush has proposed, the way I have proposed, the way the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) have all proposed is that we have limited safe investments, that we can only invest in certain safe investments, such as an IRA or a 401(k) or the Thrift Savings Plan that we have for Federal employees, where you get your choice of four or five safe investments to invest in, and then you can only use it for retirement purposes.

They become part of your Social Security retirement benefits. A worker will own his or her retirement account; and if you die before you reach retirement age, it is not a case where you get zero, zip, nothing; but it will go into your estate for your heirs and, again, limited to safe investments that will earn more than the 1.9 percent paid by Social Security. That is dramatic maybe, but no new taxes, no cut in benefits for existing or near-term retirees.

Mr. Speaker, I borrowed a lot of these charts from Senator ROD GRAMS. He has also introduced a Social Security bill that keeps Social Security solvent that allows choice within safe savings accounts. Personal retirement accounts offer more retirement security. If John Doe makes an average of $36,000 a year, he can expect monthly pays of $6,514 from his personal retirement account compared to Social Security, which is $1,280. And that is because of the magic of compound interest.

Mr. Speaker, choosing personal accounts, in our law in 1935, we gave State and local governments the option of whether or not to go into Social Security or set up their own retirement pension system, where they could do their own investments for their own pension. The Galveston County, Texas, employees reap the benefits. Employees of Galveston County, Texas, opted out of Social Security.

This is how they faired: death benefits under Social Security $253. You get a burial benefit. Under the Galveston plan, you get $75,000 death benefit. Disability benefits per month, Social Security $1,280, and Galveston plan, they are ending up with $2,749.

This is disability. This is retirement. The retirement benefits per month, retirement is the same as disability under Social Security $1,280; but under the Galveston plan for retirement benefits, it is $4,790 a month compared to Social Security of $1,280 a month for that same person if they had paid into Social Security and let government use the money the way the government administers and uses this program. Spouses and survivors benefit under the Galveston County plan.

I use these plans to try to argue to my grandson Nick Smith why the magic of compound interest is so important and why savings and investment now can make a huge difference.

This is a quote from a young lady whose husband died, and she said, ''Thank God that some wise men privatized Social Security here. If I had regular Social Security, I'd be broke.'' After her husband died, Wendy Colehill used her death-benefit check of $126,000 to pay for his funeral expenses and she entered college. Under Social Security, she would have received a mere $255. Fairly young, so he died at an early age, she was not eligible for all of those benefits.

How do we save Social Security? That is the question. Right now, as chairman of the Joint Task Force on Social Security, some of the witnesses came in making predictions with the new RD&A technology, the new gene sequencing, where the new gene catalog and the nanotechnology that is developing very rapidly, they were estimating that within 25 years a person would have the option of whether or not they wanted to live to be 100 years old; and within 35 years, our technology would be such that they could have the option of whether or not to live to be 120 years old. Tremendous policy implications, let alone the increased argument that young people more than ever before should be as diligent as possible to save and invest today.

You should take that money out, get it out, have it directly taken out of your paycheck, maybe, something to add to those retirement benefits, because you need that personal savings on top of Social Security even at its best, even if we can solve it.

Again, San Diego enjoys the personal retirement accounts because they opted out of Social Security. A 30-year-old employee who earns a salary of $30,000 for 35 years and contributes 6 percent to his personal retirement account would receive $3,000 per month in retirement. Under the current system, he would contribute twice as much, but receive only $1,077 in Social Security.

The difference between the San Diego system and the PRAs and the Social Security is more than the difference in a check. It is also the difference between ownership and depending on politicians in Washington on what they do with your Social Security. Even those who oppose PRAs agree they offer more retirement security.

This is interesting. It is a letter from Senator BARBARA BOXER, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN, and Senator TED KENNEDY to President Clinton allow the PRAs in San Diego to continue and not go into Social Security. They said in the letter to the President, quote, ''Millions of our constituents will receive higher retirement benefits from their current public pensions than they would under Social Security. So let them keep Social Security. At least that has to be an option.''

Nobody is proposing, Governor Bush is not proposing that it be a mandate. Everybody is saying it is still an option whether you want the potential to earn more money where it belongs to you, where it is in your account; but if you want to stay in the existing system, you can.

The United States certainly trails other countries in saving its retirement system. In the 18 years since Chile offered PRAs, 95 percent of Chilean workers have created accounts. Their average rate of return has been 11.3 percent per year. Among others, Australia, Britain, Switzerland offer workers PRAs.

I represented this country in an international conclave, if you will, discussing public pension retirement benefits and listening to those other countries what they are doing to very quickly move ahead with getting a better return on some of that investment. It made me feel somewhat embarrassed as we lag behind, as we have been unwillingly to step up to the plate, if you will, and make some solid decisions that are going to save Social Security, one of our most important programs.

British workers chose PRAs with 10 percent returns. And who could blame them compared to our 1.9 percent return we are getting? Two out of three British workers enrolled in the second tier Social Security, they have half of it they allow to go into the second tier. They chose to enroll in PRAs. The British workers have enjoyed a 10 percent on their pension investment.

Over the past few years, the pool of PRAs in Britain exceeds nearly $1.4 trillion larger than their entire economy and larger than the private pensions of all other European countries combined. So what we have now is other European countries that are following the lead of Australia, Chile, Great Britain in terms of looking at ways to get a better return on the investment that is coming in.

Based on a family income of $58,475, the return on a PRA is even better. If you invest 2 percent of what you earn versus 6 percent for pink or if you are investing 10 percent, which is the dark purple, and if you were to invest that kind of money over 20 years and 30 years and 40 years, even at the 2 percent, you see you have $55,000 at the end of 20 years. That is the magic of compound interest. In 30 years, it keeps going up, and by 40 years, it is worth $278,000.

Look at what happens if you were to invest 10 percent and the Social Security tax is now 12.4 percent. It takes about 2 percent for the disability insurance program. Nobody is touching that. That insurance has to stay in place for the disability portion; but eventually, if you were allowed to invest 10 percent or you dig into your pocket and come up with other investments to account for 10 percent, in 40 years that would be worth $1,389,000; and if you have a 10 percent return on that, you would not have to go into the base, but just the interest would be $138,000 a year. A 5 percent return would be half of that, or about 70,000 a year.

The magic of compound interest is important. Somehow we have to allow and provide ways for more Americans to save and invest more.

Mr. Speaker, I saved out the chart of my grandkids just to stress with every grandparent, with every parent that might be listening tonight, with every young student who is really the kids that are at risk for the kind of future that we might give them, if we do nothing, because the potential is that they are going to have to pay huge tax obligations, Vice President Gore by suggesting that we add another IOU and take the interest savings and apply it to other Social Security and, therefore, the trust fund gets big enough to pay it simply demands that sometime in the future, somebody is going to have to come up with that money to pay off the trust fund.

To do that, what we have done in the past is increase taxes; that is the easiest thing for this Chamber to do. It is the worst thing for our economy. There are only three ways to come up with the money. Let me point that out; I will put my pointer down so I can use my hands as I conclude this last statement.

Some people have said, do not worry, there is a trust fund out there. If we use the payback, the money from the trust fund, Social Security will last until 2035; and for the most of us, that is long enough.

I would suggest to you that there is no difference between having a trust fund and not having a trust fund, if we are going to keep our commitment that we are going to provide the benefits that we promised, because if we do not have a trust fund, the way to come up with the money to continue paying benefits is threefold. You either borrow the money from the public, and all the leading economists say if we were to borrow $120 trillion over the next 75 years, it would so disrupt our economy that it would be disastrous for the United States of America.

□ 2100

So if we cannot borrow it, then how about the option of increasing taxes? That is the other option, increasing taxes.

Of course, the third option is cutting benefits. What they did in 1973 and again in 1983, before I got here, was they did both, increased taxes and cut benefits. Let us not do that again.

Those are the same alternatives we would have if we have a trust fund. So to pay back the money that is in the trust fund, we still have to raise taxes or cut other spending, or increase public borrowing. So, in effect, it is the same having or not having a trust fund.

It is important to pay down the public debt. It is a good start. It means we do not start spending the money for other government programs, and that is the danger.

The argument between the Republicans and the Democrats is, the Republicans say, let us get the money out

of town. Otherwise, we will spend it. The Democrats say, we will pay down the debt but we have a lot of increased spending we want to do.

The challenge is not whether we cut spending or pay down the debt, the challenge is, are we going to hold down spending in this country? Can we get this money out of town in some way?

The first choice would be to continue to pay down the debt held by the public with all of these surpluses that we bring in. We have decided 2 weeks ago, our Republican majority, that we were going to draw a line in the sand. Like last year, we drew a line in the sand saying, here is the social security lockbox. We are not going to spend any of the social security surplus for any government programs.

We held to it, we did it. That was good. This year we went further. We said, of all of the social security surplus, of all of the surplus coming into all of the other 120 trust funds, where most of the money is coming from, of all of the surplus, on-budget and off-budget, we are going to take 90 percent of that and use that money to pay down the debt held by the public.

Good. Good policy. That leaves 10 percent that we are arguing about, and that we hope to conclude this budget and this spending this year as we argue about that remaining 10 percent. But I think we have the edge now in the support of public opinion that we at least take 90 percent of all that surplus and use it to pay down the public debt.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 114, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–989) on the resolution (H. Res. 637) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–990) on the resolution (H. Res. 638) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2796, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–991) on the resolution (H. Res. 639) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Michigan) submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–992) on the resolution (H. Res. 640) providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make reference initially to last night's debate between Vice President AL GORE and Texas Governor Bush, but my focus this evening is on health insurance and the various health care issues that have come into play in this Congress, as well as in the presidential debate last evening.

I have always felt that one of the most important issues that we face and one of the biggest concerns that I have is the inability of many Americans to find health insurance, to be covered by health insurance. The candidates last night presented starkly different views on how to extend coverage to the 42.6 million Americans who currently lack health insurance. That is a large segment of our population, 42.6 million Americans, and it continues to grow.

During their exchange on this issue last night, the Governor said something which I found to be very telling and very disturbing. I wanted to read back what Governor Bush said during the debate. He said, ''There is an issue with uninsured. There sure is. And we have got uninsured in my State. Ours is a big State, a fast-growing State. We share a common border with another nation, but we are providing health care for our people.''

Continuing, the Governor added, ''One thing about insurance, that's a Washington term.''

Mr. Speaker, I was very offended by Governor Bush's referring to insurance, in this context health insurance, as a Washington term. In fact, I consider that remark very elitist and really absurd. All American parents who are out in the real world struggle to find a way to provide insurance for their children. I think they should be very alarmed when the Governor views health insurance as a Washington thing.

Really, all Americans should be alarmed because of his statement that somehow this is a Washington thing. Does that mean that Governor Bush thinks it is okay, for example, that my colleagues here, I will use the opposition, the Republican Members of Congress, the fact that they have health insurance and 42.6 million Americans do not?

And really, I would like to look at Governor Bush's record on the issue of health insurance, because I think that by referring to it as a Washington thing, he belittles it and shows that he really does not have much concern about the 42 million Americans that do not have health insurance.

If we look at the Governor's record in Texas, it shows that Texas has the highest number of uninsured children in the country. When setting up the State's Child Health Insurance Program, which we adopted as a Federal program in this House and was signed into law by President Clinton, but when setting up the State's Child Health Insurance Program pursuant to and with Federal money, Governor Bush wanted to set the eligibility threshold at only 150 percent of the Federal poverty level.

I say that by way of contrast to my own State of New Jersey, which also has a Republican Governor, but set 350 percent of the Federal poverty level for that CHIP Federal kids' health insurance program, or more than twice the level that Governor Bush proposed in Texas.

Now, what happened eventually is the Texas legislature came forward and said they wanted to push this eligibility threshold up to 200 percent, which Governor Bush eventually signed. But the point of the matter, the fact of the matter is that it was possible under the Federal law to push this eligibility higher and to include more children under the Texas child health care program, and Governor Bush did not do it.

So when he says that insurance is a Washington thing, does that mean that he does not really care that much about the kids in Texas, that they should not be able to take advantage of

the Federal program and Federal dollars that are allowing them to be covered by health insurance?

When it comes to insuring adults, Governor Bush's record is really no better than it is with the kids. Texas has the highest percentage of uninsured low-income adults, 51 percent, in the Nation. Its Medicaid eligibility level is just a paltry $4,728 in annual income for parents of three-person families.

A little later I am going to get into the proposals that Vice President GORE and President Clinton and the Democrats in the House have put forward to try to get more adults insured. We care deeply to try to end the problem of the uninsured in this country. If that is a Washington thing, so be it. But I would maintain it is an American thing, that kids are suffering because they do not have health insurance, parents are suffering because they do not have health insurance.

When it comes to overall spending on health in the State of Texas, the Governor has distorted his own record. He made it look like health care is a much bigger priority for him than it really is.

In last week's debate, the previous debate prior to last night, Governor Bush said Texas had spent $4.7 billion on health care under his administration when in fact that is simply not true. Something like $3.5 billion of that money came from private and local sources and not the State expenditure.

I am trying to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that access to health insurance is simply not a priority for the Governor, not a priority in terms of spending, not a priority in terms of trying to get the State of Texas to cover more kids and more adults.

The lack of health insurance in the United States is not a problem that should be cavalierly dismissed as a Washington thing by any policymaker or any politician, let alone a candidate for the President of the United States. It is a very real problem that affects real Americans with real consequences.

Let me just give some statistics about why I say that, and why it is true that health insurance is not just a Washington thing, but something that everyone in the country has to be worried about.

There are millions of American parents who are unable to take sick and suffering children to the doctor because they simply cannot afford it. There are 27,000 uninsured women who are diagnosed with breast cancer every year, and are 50 percent more likely to die from it because they are uninsured. There are older couples whose hopes for a dignified retirement after a lifetime of work are swept away in an instant by an unexpected avalanche of medical debt. There are young families whose hopes for the future are destroyed when a breadwinner dies or is disabled because an illness was not diagnosed and treated in a timely fashion.

Eighty-three thousand Americans die each year because they do not have insurance, and as a result, do not get adequate or timely care. I can assure the Members, Mr. Speaker, that to them, insurance is far more than just a Washington term to their families.

The Federal government and State governments across the country have spent the last 10 years trying to stem the tide of people turning to the emergency room for their medical care.

I know Governor Bush throughout the debates has talked about the fact that, you know, you can go to an emergency room in Texas, you can go to a hospital emergency room. The problem with that is that that is not really good health care because there is no prevention. If we have preventative care and take measures before we have to go to an emergency room, our likelihood of doing well and living longer and not being disabled are much greater.

Preventative care does not just save lives and stop tragedies before they occur, it is also more efficient and less expensive for everybody, including the Federal government. Those facts are understood by health experts, but not a lot of times by politicians.

I would say the same thing to the Governor: Rather than talk about the fact that people in Texas have access to an emergency room, put programs in effect so people can get health insurance and can take the preventative measures so they do not have to wait until they get so sick that they have to go to an emergency room.

Governor Bush's view that insurance is a Washington term may be a view that is held by wealthy people who have insurance and can foot the bill easily for any medical emergency that may arise, but it is definitely a view that is clearly out of touch with the American mainstream.

It is a view every American, particularly those without insurance, should be aware of in this political season. It is a view that, if followed, will throw a monkey wrench in both private sector and public efforts to bring down the cost of health care, and it is a view that nobody who is interested in addressing the problems of the uninsured in this country should for a single second take seriously.

I know it sounds very critical of me to talk about the Governor in this light, but it really annoyed me to hear the term ''insurance'' somehow referred to as a Washington term, as if the rest of the country or the average person was not concerned about it. I know that they are.

I want to spend some time also this evening contrasting, if you will, not only the presidential candidates but the parties on the issue of health care. I know it sounds very political, but the bottom line is that this Congress only has another week or so before it adjourns.

The Democrats, including myself, over the last 2 years that this Congress has been in session have put forth a number of proposals, whether it is a prescription drug benefit under Medicare or it is HMO reform with the Patients' Bill of Rights, or it is the idea that whatever surplus is available should be primarily used to shore up social security and Medicare, or it is the idea of trying to cover more kids or more parents.

We have been out there putting forth, with President Clinton and Vice President GORE's support, many proposals that would address some of the problems that Americans face with health insurance, whether they are uninsured or they have some type of insurance that is inadequate.

It really galls me to think that we are here at the 11th hour and most of these problems have not been addressed by the Republican leadership on the other side of the aisle, and will not be addressed if Governor Bush is elected president.

So I think it is important to contrast the candidates and the parties on health care. I am just going to take a little time tonight if I could to give my own view, and then give the view of an independent group that has analyzed the proposals that have been put forth by both sides.

I want to start with the issue of prescription drugs, because I think right now the fact that so many seniors and disabled people who have Medicare are not able to access prescription drugs is a major problem, almost a crisis in the country.

If we listen to what George Bush has been saying, what Governor Bush has been saying, he is saying that he wants to provide some sort of prescription drug program that would provide coverage initially through State-based low-income-only programs, and then through HMOs and insurance companies.

I say that because what the Governor has proposed is not to bring prescription drugs under the rubric of Medicare, but rather, to give a subsidy or a voucher, if you will, to low-income people so they can go out and try to buy prescription drug policies in the open market, in the private market.

That is very different from what Vice President Gore and the Democrats have been saying. I think it was clearly defined in last night's debate. What Vice President Al Gore has been saying is that Medicare is a successful program that provides coverage for one's hospital care and for one's doctor's care, and it would not be that difficult and would not cost that much money, particularly if we have a surplus, for the Federal government to provide prescription drug benefits under Medicare, as well.

So that is the major difference between the Democrat and the Republican proposals. The Democrats are saying they want to expand Medicare to include prescription drugs. The Republicans are saying they do not want to use Medicare as the vehicle, they want to give a subsidy or they want to

give a voucher, or in the case of Governor Bush's proposal, a voucher essentially just for low-income people.

There are a lot of other differences, but I just want to say, Members do not have to take my word for it. There is an organization called Families USA which just put out a report on health care and the 2000 election.

I just want to describe Families USA. Families USA is a nonprofit, nonpartisan consumer health organization established under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code that has never endorsed, supported, nor opposed any political candidate, and they are not doing it now.

In addition, Families USA has spent two decades working on various aspects of our health care system, and has amassed considerable expertise on health issues. The Democrats and myself have cited them many times, and the Republicans as well.

On the issue of prescription drugs, and I just want to run through this, if I could, in their report that just came out they say, ''There is a marked contrast between the two candidates on this issue.''

□ 2115

Vice President GORE intends to establish a voluntary prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program, and I stress in the Medicare program. This would ensure that all seniors and people with disabilities gain access to prescription drug coverage. It would also enable Medicare to bring its considerable market clout on behalf of program beneficiaries to the bargaining table.

Now, that sounds a little bureaucratic, but let me explain what that means. One of the biggest problems with prescription drugs right now is the cost for seniors. If they do not have some kind of coverage through their employer or through some sort of coverage that they are able to purchase, which many do not, then they have to go buy it on the open market at the local pharmacy, and the cost is prohibitive.

There is a price discrimination between seniors who have to just go buy the prescription at the local pharmacy out-of-pocket versus seniors who happen to be fortunate to be in some sort of plan, either through their employer or in some other way.

But what Vice President GORE does and what the Democrats do with their Medicare prescription drug proposal is they give the seniors who are now part of this plan clout with regard to prices, because they establish a benefit provider in each region of the country that will bargain for the best price, just like an HMO does, for example, for the prescription drugs, and that brings the price down. So that is what they are talking about here when Families USA says that the Democratic plan is better.

Then they say in the Families USA report, they contrast Governor Bush's approach by way of contrast. Initially he relies on State-run pharmaceutical programs and subsequently on insurance companies, HMOs, to offer prescription drug coverage.

To date, however, State pharmaceutical programs reach only a tiny portion of seniors who need drug coverage, and such assistance is usually confined to seniors with very low incomes.

The point is that the Republican plan is only going to help seniors with low incomes. It is not going to help the vast majority of seniors with middle incomes, which basically are the people that are crying out for some sort of help.

In addition, in analyzing the Bush plan, Families USA's assessment says that private health plans and insurance companies have very limited success in providing drug coverage for seniors.

I mention that because what they are basically saying here is that, if one gives the senior or the disabled person the voucher, the way Governor Bush has proposed, to go out and try to buy prescription drug coverage in the open market, not under Medicare, they are not going to be able to find it. They are not going to find an insurance company that will offer that for the price of the subsidy that the Bush plan proposes.

Now, additionally, what Families USA says about the GORE plan, the Democratic Medicare prescription drug plan, is that it is very specific in detailing the drug coverage that is guaranteed to every Medicare beneficiary as well as the cost sharing that seniors would have to pay.

So what we are saying in the Democratic plan is that we are going to be able to guarantee one to have any drug that is medically necessary. We are going to tell one exactly what the premium is, exactly what one is going to get.

Under the Bush proposal, on the other hand, decision making about the specifics of the drug benefit as well as out-of-pocket costs are left to the private insurance companies and the HMOs. So, again, one does not really know what one is getting.

But I want to stress again the difference here, the difference is the Bush Republican plan is a voucher plan. It does not come under the rubric of Medicare. The Democratic plan, the Gore plan, is an expansion of Medicare that covers prescription drugs just in the same way that hospital care and physician care is provided under Medicare right now.

Now, let me go to a second category here because I want to cover each of these health care issues because I think they are so important in terms of contrasting the difference between the parties.

The second one is the future of Medicare itself. Medicare, as we know, in the next, maybe, 10, 20 years, not right away, but at some point in the future will start to run out of money because there are going to be so many baby boomers that become 65, that become seniors, that there is not enough money to pay for it.

Now, what President Clinton and Vice President GORE have been saying is that they want to use most of the surplus to shore up the Social Security program and the Medicare program.

But what we see is that, instead, by contrast, Governor Bush talks about restructuring the Medicare program in ways that I believe that will increasingly privatize and encourage people to opt out of Medicare or go to private insurance.

I do not want to dwell on that too much because I want to get to the next issue, which is I think so important and, again, became an issue in last night's debate, right at the beginning of the debate.

That is HMO reform. HMO reform is clearly something that so many Americans are concerned about because more and more people are in HMOs, and they find that they are victims of various abuses, primarily because what they find is that decisions about what kind of Medicare they get, whether they get a particular operation, whether they get to stay in the hospital a particular length of time is determined, not by their physician and themselves as a patient, but by the insurance companies. Naturally they do not like it because it lends itself to all kinds of abuse.

Well, it was interesting last night because, during the debate, Governor Bush said that he was in support of HMO reform and that he mentioned that, in the State of Texas, his home State, that they actually had passed legislation that would provide for certain patient protections if one was in an HMO.

But the interesting thing about it is Governor Bush used the example of HMO reform to say he would be successful if he were to be elected President because, in Texas, he was able to bring both parties together and everyone together to pass patient protections.

Well, I have to point out that, when the issue of patients' rights in the context of HMO reform first came up in the tax legislature and the bill was passed in 1995, Governor Bush actually vetoed the legislation.

So he talked about playing a role and bringing people together, the Texas legislature decided they wanted HMO reform, he vetoes the bill. Well, a couple years later, in 1997, there was again passed in the Texas legislature legislation to protect patients in the context of HMOs. This was a very comprehensive HMO reform that Governor Bush referred to in last night's debate. Well, this time, even though he opposed the legislation and refused to sign it, he let it become law.

That is hardly an advocate for patients' rights. That is hardly someone who, as he says, is trying to bring people together to pass legislation. You veto it once and then you say, okay, I do not like it, but I will let it become law without my signature.

What it means is this was happening despite what Governor Bush wanted. He did not want it to happen, but he did not want to stop it probably because he was afraid of the political consequences if he vetoed it again.

By contrast, Vice President GORE last night and throughout the 7 years now that he has been the Vice President, with the support of Democrats and some Republicans as well in Congress, has been an advocate on a Federal level for a comprehensive HMO reform bill which Vice President GORE mentioned last night, the Norwood-Dingell bill.

He was very specific about bringing up that legislation in the debate last evening and asking Governor Bush repeatedly whether he supported the Norwood-Dingell bill and, of course, Governor Bush would not say whether he supported it or not. If he would not admit he supported it, I would say we have to assume he does not support it.

It is a much stronger bill than even what the Texas legislature passed without Governor Bush's signature. It is a bill that is vehemently opposed by the HMOs and the health insurance industry and all of the special interests and very much supported by the majority of the American people.

We passed the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Norwood-Dingell bill here in the House of Representatives. Almost every Democrat voted for it, and some Republicans voted for it too, otherwise it wouldn't have passed. In fact, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), one of the sponsors, is a Republican, the lead sponsor.

But the bottom line is that the Republicans both here, the Republican leadership, both here in this House as well as in the other body, have tried to kill this bill ever since it passed. It went to conference. I was part of the conference committee. It has never come out of conference.

I would almost guarantee that, in the week or two we have left here, it will not appear on the floor of this House or this Senate. It will not go to the President. It will not become law. Why? Because basically what it does is it does two major things. It says that decisions about what is medically necessary, what kind of care one gets, what kind of operation one gets, how long one stays in the hospital, decisions about what is medically necessary are going to be made by the physician and the patient, not by the insurance companies; and the insurance companies oppose that tooth and nail because they want to make the decisions to save money.

Secondly, it has very good enforcement so that if, in fact, one is denied care by one's insurance company, one has a way of redressing one's grievances by going to an independent panel that will review the decision and have the power to overturn it or ultimately going to a court of law and having the decision overturned so that one can get the medical care that one's doctor and that one feels is necessary.

So, again, marked contrast here between the views of the two candidates, the Presidential candidates as well as the parties on this issue.

I do not mean to suggest that all the Republicans are bad on this, because some of them are good. But the Republican leadership in the House as well as in the Senate, as well as Governor Bush, refuse to support the Patients' Bill of Rights, the Norwood-Dingell bill.

Let me go to an issue that I mentioned earlier, and that is the whole issue of increased access and for people to be covered with insurance who do not have it. I am not going to keep repeating over an over again what Governor Bush said about insurance being a Washington thing. I think he probably regrets that he made the statement, hopefully. But the bottom line is we still have over 40 million Americans who are uninsured. What are we going to do about it.

Again, I would like to contrast the records between the two candidates and again between the two parties. Fortunately, here in the House of Representatives, the effort to expand coverage for children was successfully passed on a bipartisan basis, the CHIP program. Initially, the Republican leadership opposed it, but eventually they came around to passing it, and it was passed on a bipartisan basis.

But what happened is that when this program then was given back to the States to handle it and to try to handle it in a way that would provide for coverage for the 5 million kids that it was meant to try to deal with and to give health insurance, as I mentioned already, Governor Bush, in his capacity as Governor of Texas, tried to make the eligibility for the program very minimal, only 150 percent of the poverty level. In terms of the outreach to try to get kids signed up for the program, he was very ineffective.

In fact, the situation in Texas got so bad that a Federal judge just ruled a few weeks ago that Texas had to, under pain of the court's action or penalty, do a better job about enrolling kids in Medicaid as well as the CHIP program. So they were not even doing a good job getting kids enrolled in Medicaid at the very low end of poverty, let alone the ones that are eligible for the Federal CHIP program.

Now, by contrast, what Vice President GORE has been saying, and he mentioned it in the debate last night, is that he wants to expand the eligibility at the Federal level, and that money then goes back to the States so kids whose parents are even at a higher income can join up in the Federal-State health insurance program called CHIP.

He suggests raising the CHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, eligibility to 250 percent of the Federal poverty level. He also says that, if you are parents and your income is even higher than, that he will allow you to buy into CHIP or Medicaid for children with family incomes above 250 percent of the Federal poverty level.

Now of course Vice President GORE successfully pushed for enactment of the existing CHIP program which Governor Bush tried to cut back in the State of Texas. But beyond that, what the Democrats and what Vice President Gore are now proposing is that the CHIP program be even expanded to cover the parents of the kids who are eligible for CHIP. Basically, this is a way of now expanding health insurance for people who were working but whose incomes are too high to be eligible for Medicaid.

What I would stress again, Mr. Speaker, is that, when we talk about Vice President Gore's program and the Democratic initiative here with children, the CHIP program, and expanding it to adults, we are not talking about people who are on welfare. They are usually eligible for Medicaid. We are talking about working people who on the job, because of their low income or because the employer does not offer it, are not able to get health insurance. These are working people. These are people oftentimes who have two or even three jobs, and they are not able to offer health insurance for their kids or for themselves.

So what Vice President GORE is saying is let us take this CHIP program, which is working, and let us expand it to the parents. If we enroll the parents, we also find that that means that they are more likely to get into the program and enroll their kids.

Some parents, unfortunately, selfishly, will not enroll their kids if they are not eligible for the program.

□ 2130

Vice President GORE has also been saying that with regard to the other large group of people that are uninsured, which are the people between 55 and 65, we call them near elderly, who are not yet eligible for Medicare, that they would be able to buy into the Medicare program and pay so much a month, $300 or $400 a month, to buy into the Medicare program. It is another way of expanding access to health insurance for people who are currently uninsured.

Now, I have made reference once so far this evening to the Families USA report in the context of prescription drug coverage, but I wanted to make reference to it again, if I could, in the context of health coverage for children and expanding the CHIP program to include more kids at higher incomes and also for their parents. If we look at this Families USA report, and I will not repeat what Bush and GORE are proposing, but I wanted to just give a little bit of the analysis that the Families USA report provides.

The report says, under the section that deals with expanding insurance for adults, that at the centerpiece of his proposal to expand coverage Governor Bush proposes to establish a refundable tax credit for people and families who purchase health coverage on

their own if they do not receive insurance through their employers and do not qualify for Medicaid or any other government assistance. For individuals with incomes below $15,000 per year, the tax credit would equal $1,000 and would taper off as an individual's income increases above $15,000. For families with incomes below $30,000 per year, the tax credit would equal $2,000 and would taper off as the family's income increases above $30,000.

Now, Governor Bush has made reference to these tax credits, $1,000 or $2,000 depending on where one is below a certain income, and he suggests that that is one way of expanding coverage. This contrasts of course to what Vice President GORE has been saying about expanding the CHIP program for children and expanding it to include adults, the parents of those kids, as well as GORE's proposal to let the near elderly buy into Medicare.

Well, this is how Families USA assesses the two proposals. It says Governor Bush's proposals to expand health coverage for adults are likely to be ineffectual and in some respects may even be harmful. Because of its limited size, the tax credit proposal for low- and moderate-income individuals and families who purchase their own health coverage is unlikely to make a significant dent in the number of people who are uninsured.

Today, the average cost of a family health plan purchased by an employer is $6,351 per year, and coverage purchased by families in the individual market typically cost considerably more. As a result, a family would need to spend more than $4,300 over and above the $2,000 family tax credit simply to pay for premiums. This amount would constitute over 14 percent of income for a family earning $30,000 a year and over one-fifth of the income of a family with $20,000 in annual income. Either way, the tax credit would still leave most of these families with an inability to purchase health coverage.

Now, to his credit, Governor Bush is at least proposing something, and I will grant him that. But it is not anything that is going to be effective in expanding health coverage for those who are uninsured.

Vice President GORE's proposal, by contrast, and this is what Families USA says, to expand health coverage for adults builds on public programs, such as Medicaid, CHIP, and Medicare that work well. His proposal to establish CHIP-type health coverage for low-wage working parents will not only provide increased coverage for those parents but is likely to spur children's enrollment in CHIP as families are enabled to enroll together. The Medicare buy-in proposal is projected to increase health coverage for approximately 300,000 near-elderly persons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend too much more time, and I think my time is probably running out; but I just wanted to say this in conclusion. I do not look at these health care issues from the point of view of ideology. I know that generally most Republicans tend to be more conservative than most Democrats, and more Democrats are liberal, even though not all of them are. But the bottom line is, I do not look at the ideology. I look at what works. And the difference between what Vice President GORE and Governor Bush are proposing and between what most of the Democrats and most of the Republicans are proposing, I think really does not come down so much to ideology but what works practically.

Practically speaking, if we want to provide a prescription drug coverage program for seniors, we should put it under Medicare, because Medicare works. And we should not look at the Republican proposals to provide some voucher that assume that people are going to go out and buy coverage that does not exist.

And the same thing is true for the CHIP program and the efforts to try to expand health coverage for the uninsured. Basically what Vice President GORE and the Democrats have been doing here for the last 6 years is advocating and, in some cases passing, legislation that would provide for the government to set up a program like CHIP through the States that people can pretty much be guaranteed that they are going to have health insurance. It is health insurance that is provided by the government.

Now, I am not saying that we want national health insurance, but where we have gaps and people who are working and still having the inability to get health insurance on the open market, the government needs to step in. That is what Vice President GORE proposed with CHIP. It is working. That is what he proposes for expanding coverage for the near elderly and for the parents whose kids are in CHIP. What Governor Bush is proposing as an alternative is simply to give a tax credit, which once again will not provide the money or the ability for those families to buy health insurance.

So all I am saying is that there are huge contrasts here between the two presidential candidates. There are huge contrasts between the parties on these various health care issues. And I think the major difference is that the Democrats are proposing plans that will actually work and make a difference for people who do not have health insurance, or who do not have prescription drugs, and who suffer from the abuses of HMOs. That is why what we are proposing should be passed.

My greatest regret in this Congress is that on many occasions when the Democrats have tried to put forward these programs they have not been successful because the Republican leadership has opposed them. We have had a few occasions where the Republicans have joined us, but in most cases they have not. And it is a very sad commentary that this Congress is going to end within the next week or two not having addressed these major problems that face so many Americans.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN E. PORTER, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the Porter special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to host this special order tonight for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for giving up his time to allow us to honor this very special gentleman tonight.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is retiring, after serving in Congress for 21 years. It is difficult for those of us who are gathered to honor JOHN tonight to sum up in the short time everything that he has done for the 10th Congressional District of Illinois and for his country since joining this body in 1980. It is my hope, based on the words that my colleagues and I will offer tonight, that all who are within the sound of our voices will understand the tremendous character of this man and all that he has accomplished, most notably in the areas of human rights, health research, and protecting the environment.

It is also my hope that based on our comments JOHN PORTER will know how well-respected he is, not only by his congressional colleagues but by the elected officials of his home State and district, his staff, former staff, his constituents, and the many groups who have had the pleasure of working with him throughout the years.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, we will hear of the legacy JOHN has created during his years of service in this body. We will hear a small part of the large impact he has made on his district, his State, his country, and the world.

I have a confession to make. I am an unabashed JOHN PORTER fan. It is not because I have lived for many years in his district and know how well his leadership and his views suit those of his constituents there, nor is it because of the small kindnesses he has always personally shown to me. Those are reasons enough to sing the praises of this wonderful man. Like hundreds of thousands of men and women in Illinois, throughout the United States and around the four corners of this globe, I know and love this man for his great

humanity, his concern for the underdog, and his unquestioned commitment to making this world a better place in which to live.

When I was elected in 1998, to serve the people of the 13th District of Illinois here in Congress, I knew that it would be helpful for me to look at the other members of the Illinois delegation for guidance. Knowing his excellent reputation, JOHN PORTER was the first person I sought out. Asking him for input was easy, given our similar political ideologies. However, I doubt JOHN, and the ease with which he provided advice, fully understood how much guidance he truly gave.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn to some of my colleagues so that they too can share their thoughts on our dear friend. And I will first yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD). As my colleagues know, before his election, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) served as the chief of staff to then House minority leader, Bob Michel of Illinois. In this capacity he had the opportunity to work on a number of issues with JOHN PORTER and, as a result, probably knows him as well or better than any other Member in this body.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time that has been set aside here by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) to honor our colleague, JOHN PORTER.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN deserves to be honored. JOHN has been an outstanding Member of this body. Prior to coming to the House of Representatives, he served with great distinction in the Illinois House of Representatives.

JOHN has known political turmoil in his life because he has been through some very, very tough elections. I think people who have not really followed his career should know that JOHN is probably as good a politician as there is. In order to get to this body, one has to be a politician, and JOHN has been, particularly in the early days of his election to the House of Representatives, come through some very, very close elections in the district that he represents.

JOHN represents a district north of Chicago, primarily Lake and McHenry County, Lake County primarily, and it is an area that is not really considered a suburban area of Chicago but kind of an entity unto its own. His district runs right up against the Wisconsin border. JOHN has done so well in representing his district that the last several years, he has had elections that were less contentious and the people of his district have recognized the many good things that he has been able to do.

Serving on the Committee on Appropriations, JOHN is known as a cardinal. What that means is that he is a chairman of a subcommittee. If not the most important, certainly one of the most important subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, the Labor-HHS subcommittee, which is the subcommittee that really looks very carefully at dollars that are provided for medical care and dollars that are provided for research. And JOHN has really set a legacy for himself in terms of his commitment to cancer research, to Alzheimer's research, to AIDS research, and to so many of the real, real serious kinds of diseases that face our country.

JOHN PORTER has been at the forefront of making a commitment of dollars to really find cures for these dreaded diseases; as I said, whether it be cancer or Alzheimer's or AIDS, or any other number of diseases. So he has been a leader in this area. And I really think it will be his legacy that he will be remembered for the enormous commitment that he made to research and particularly research to the National Institutes of Health, the National Cancer Institute, and so many of these programs here in Washington that try to reach out and find the very best people in America to help us find cures for these dreaded diseases.

JOHN has been a wonderful public servant not only for the 10th district but also for the State of Illinois and for the country. He has been a strong, strong leader in human rights and has lead the cause of human rights in many different parts of the world that go unrecognized in so many ways because they do not always get the headlines. But I think those people that have worked with JOHN on human rights issues recognize the leadership that he has provided in that area.

□ 2145

So an outstanding career, an outstanding career of leadership, an outstanding career of commitment to the people of Illinois, to the people of the 10th district, and to the people of this country.

JOHN has also been a regular attender of our delegation lunches. And those of us that attend those very regularly, as I know the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), do enjoy sharing our apple pie with JOHN. Because of all I guess the funny things I will remember about JOHN is that he loves apple pie, and he cannot sit through a lunch with just one piece of apple pie. And so the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) or myself or somebody is always passing him an additional piece of apple pie. That is something that I think I will always remember about JOHN in terms of sort of the funny things, the humorous things, the human things that happen in this business.

So we will miss JOHN for his leadership and his commitment. I am delighted to have had a chance to say a word or two about his leadership, and I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for setting aside this time to do that.

I know that all of us wish JOHN PORTER good luck and Godspeed in whatever he does. We will surely miss him.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Is it not curious that it is always the thinnest people that can eat two pieces of pie while the rest of us try to avoid them so we can pass them on to him?

Mr. LAHOOD. I would agree.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, the other area that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and I see a lot of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is at the ''Tuesday Lunch Bunch That Meets on Wednesday But Does Not Have Lunch Group.'' We spent meetings once a week to discuss issues that are important to those of us that belong in that group what we call the ''Republican Moderates.''

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

I should note that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) will hold a similar special order next week for another Member from Illinois who is retiring from the 106th Congress, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), who we will hear from in just a few minutes. But, unfortunately, we are losing two great members of the Illinois delegation due to retirement this year, and it is our pleasure to honor both of them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for arranging this special order. I wish we did not have to have our next one next week. I wish we were finished with our business. But I look forward to taking up that cause next week.

Of course we are here to pay tribute to who has become a good friend of mine, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is retiring. It has really been an honor and a privilege to serve with him in the House of Representatives.

I have always been impressed by his commitment to his ideas and his beliefs. He has always been a gentleman and treated even newbies like myself as a colleague and as an equal. I have learned much about the process in this House of Representatives by observing how JOHN PORTER has gone about doing his business, and I appreciated his tutelage and his friendship.

Most important, however, is that I have a newfound respect for our Nation's efforts and ongoing need for medical research. As we all know here, and it is nice to be able to publicly acclaim the ongoing efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) to increase Federal funding for medical research as our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), just mentioned.

Prior to coming to Congress, I had little knowledge of how much our Government played in the fight against diseases and how much it emphasized

medical research. Thanks to JOHN, I now not only understand that role, but I am now an advocate for expanding it.

Far too many of us do not think of sickness or diseases until we have a loved one who is faced with it. We are lucky and the Nation is lucky to have a person like JOHN PORTER who has worked hard to ensure that quality health care will be available when we need it.

There are many people involved in providing health care, whether it is the hospitals, big inner-city hospitals or rural hospitals, community health centers, home health, visiting nurses, you name it, there are many people working diligently in the fields. Most of them are working long hours for little to no pay. They have an advocate here in Washington, D.C., who has also worked numerous long hours, sometimes without recognition, a champion in health care and health care delivery and medical research. And that is Mr. JOHN PORTER.

We have benefited from his time here in this body. We have benefited as a people. We have benefited as colleagues. We have benefited as a Nation. I have benefited personally from observing his leadership and his thoughtful, deliberate process to help in the benefit of all.

I would really like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for arranging this special order and paying tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER). It is an important thing to do before we adjourn in this Congress, and her thoughtfulness in remembering him goes a long way and adds to her credentials as being a great new Member who we are glad to have here.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, it really is a pleasure to be on the Illinois delegation. I think that we have had such a unique opportunity for both sides of the aisle to work so carefully together. So I think that we are going to miss the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) so much because of his contribution to that Illinois delegation.

We have another Member, as I mentioned before, from Illinois. So I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), my friend and colleague. Unfortunately, like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) is stepping down at the end of this Congress. That is not the only thing that these two men have in common, however.

Much, like they have been in this body for 9 years together. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) served together in the Illinois General Assembly in the mid-1970s. So they have been traveling on the same circuit for a long time. I am happy to have the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) here to say something about the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for putting this special order together for our friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and for allowing me to take a few minutes to talk about JOHN and some of the experiences that we have experienced over the years.

I must say that the gentlewoman is a wonderful addition to our delegation and she is such a good participant in all that we do here and I appreciate that and I will miss working with her.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) though has spent 11 terms here in this body. That is hard to believe, but that is 22 years.

Prior to that, as the gentlewoman said, he was in the Illinois Assembly. I was kind of looking back at my figures here and I realized that JOHN came 2 years before I did. He will have had a career of 28 years in public office. And at the end of my term, I will have put in 26 years.

Besides that, JOHN and I had offices next to each other in Springfield in, I think it is, the Illinois State Office Building behind the Capitol. So we shared a great many things. I do not think we had to share a secretary, as many members do share a secretary, but we did not have the same one. But we would be in there late at night, which is the way the legislature operated back then, and we would have a lot of time to visit about family and our children and those things. So JOHN and I reached a deep friendship early on in our political career.

JOHN then ran for Congress. I do not know exactly how that was, but he ran three times to get to Congress for one term. And there was, I think, an election he lost and than a special election. And then by the time he had done those two elections, it was time for the next election to get him a full term here. So he worked very hard to become a Member of Congress.

After he got here, he went on the Committee on Appropriations. And as he leaves, he leaves as one of the 13 cardinals of that committee, which is an attainment that many here would like to emulate. Few get the opportunity to be one of the cardinals in the appropriations process.

I have heard my other colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), talk about some of his priorities there. And I know that JOHN has had a very kind heart. He is certainly a compassionate conservative in the best sense of the word.

JOHN is a very quiet man. His area now is Labor HHS, one of the hardest of the appropriation bills to pass. And while I know that that sometimes worries JOHN greatly at the end of the sessions, I have seen him go through that, he is always so mild mannered about it. I do not know if I could keep my restraint as much as JOHN does in handling that bill and all the rhetoric that goes on on this floor about that bill.

But he has done many other things in his career here. He has been a great supporter of the Pottawattamie Airport and the Waukegan Regional Airport. And through those efforts, those institutions in his area, his district, have grown and they brought air service to northern Illinois and he has helped secure the funding for very important improvements there.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) also worked to help local school districts particularly address the shortfall in impact in Federal aid. This may seem like kind of a strange thing to talk about, but that is very important to school districts. Because when they do not get that Federal aid, they have got to reach into their pocket and take it out of the money that they normally would have to spend for education that they get out of their local tax dollars. And that Federal aid comes because of the military people who were in those school districts, and that is very important.

He has been an advocate for strengthening ethics in Government and reforming the way this institution, the U.S. Congress, operates.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has advanced legislation to make urgently needed improvements in Congress's internal standards, and I think that we should thank him for that. That is a thankless job but one that we have to continue to work on always.

He has been a fighter against drunk driving and instrumental in the passage of legislation mandating a 21-year-old drinking age in this country.

He has worked to prevent the spread of chemical weapons. He authored the Chemical and Biological Weapons Nonproliferation Act and directed the Secretary of Commerce to develop effective export controls to prevent the spread of deadly chemical and biological weapons to other nations.

He has been a leading voice in support of human rights and democratic reforms in China and Hong Kong. He led the successful effort to defend the Great Lakes Naval Training Center against the threat of closure during the most recent round of cutbacks considered by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. The decision to keep this center open is expected to bring 8,000 jobs to his area.

Did my colleagues know that that is the only base we have in Illinois? Many States have a number of military installations. Sometimes we talk about how much comes back to our State in tax dollars. Well, one reason we are a little behind some of our sister States is that we only have one major military installation left in our State, where we used to have a number of them. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is to receive the thanks for protecting that important installation.

I would just say in closing that I consider JOHN PORTER a true friend, a real gentleman, a fine legislator, and I know that he will go on to do many,

many other fine things in service of his country and his State.

I thank the gentlewoman very much for allowing me the time to talk about my friend.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to hear what the gentleman had to say about him. I know that he is both of our friends, and we will miss him. It is nice that the gentleman has expressed that so eloquently.

□ 2200

We will now move to Arkansas. I am pleased to yield the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) serves on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of which John Porter is the chairman. So given the attention and controversy that our appropriation bill always seems to attract, I know that John Porter and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) have gone through some interesting battles together. So I am happy that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Dickey) could join us tonight to honor our friend John Porter.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for her thoughtfulness in remembering this fine gentleman.

I would like to state a little bit for the listeners and the viewers just exactly what type of a committee he has been the chairman of. The Committee on Appropriations has 13 subcommittees. One subcommittee is called the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. It has over maybe 820 agencies or programs that it administers. JOHN PORTER is the chairman, and I have been a committee member now for 6 years. This will be my sixth year.

A chairman and the subcommittee members get to know each other quite well. They first of all have to jockey for positions to see who is doing what and what positions we have and what favors and corresponding votes that you give and take, and then you set about trying to find out exactly what the purpose of the committee is.

JOHN PORTER took this chairmanship as if he was made for it. It is the most amazing match I have ever seen. Of course, he had been on it as a minority member for some time but as chairman I have sat and watched him and listened to story after story after story of pain, suffering and human misery. He has done it always with attention and he has asked questions. We sometimes in this committee get what is called compassion fatigue. We hear these sad stories and all of these circumstances where people are just left out alone and this committee is the one with the heart, as I call it, of the Committee on Appropriations and we are the ones that go out and try to help others.

JOHN EDWARD, as I call him, has been just a wonderful, patient listener and been an active participant in trying to help use the Federal resources to help the people who are suffering.

As that chairman, he has shown a great gift in bipartisanship, and that is one of the reasons why he can come to this floor and pass these bills. We sometimes have to pass them with just Republican votes, sometimes with Republican and Democrat votes, but mainly it is because of the controversy in the legislation, it is generally considered liberal. The appropriations are considered liberal. He goes and he tells the story and he does not do it in a bragging sort of way or in an emotional sort of way, and maybe he is not even charismatic in his approach but he just methodically explains each part of the bill and he answers questions and he gets the rhetoric from the other side, the loyal opposition as we call it, and I think it is a great thing to watch him go about it.

He led me quite a bit in health care, in that I could not quite understand what our commitment was and the number of dollars that we were spending, let us say on the National Institutes of Health. He kept saying, no, this is the thing we ought to do and this will be something that you will look back over the years as being the best thing that you have done on any of these committees; and he is probably right.

Dr. Francis Collins came to Hot Springs, Arkansas, in my district not long ago and explained the human genome project. That would not have been done, in my opinion, without JOHN EDWARD PORTER being there trying to in a five-year period of time double the budget of the National Institutes of Health. He had a vision for what that institute, the National Institutes of Health, could do and then he stayed with it.

He was constantly going over there. He was taking us over there. He was having their staff come and explain things to us, but without his leadership and understanding I do not think it would have ever worked.

I have also had an opportunity to go with him on a human rights and health mission to China and Cambodia and Hong Kong and other places, and I not only watched how he was able to speak to the people of those countries and in a knowing way he had been there before or he had talked to them or they had been to America and he had visited with them there and he was an outstanding spokesman. The chairman of the CODEL, as we call it, always leads the introduction and always gives the acceptance to the welcome in each country and he was an outstanding ambassador for our country. I mean, he was so well spoken and calm and did such a good job representing what we consider the best of our country, and that is our concern for people who are suffering and who need care.

Some of the things that we worked on besides the NIH was TRIO, where we rescued the program from a cut. TRIO is a program that encourages kids who are not from a family whose parents are college graduates and which says if you want to stay after school, if you want to stay on the weekends, if you want to come back and have extra work in the summer, we will match your ambition with assistance. Money has been added for the TRIO program year after year after year.

AHEC, which is a program providing for health care to rural areas, has seen a dramatic increase. Head Start has seen a dramatic increase in our committee. All of this shows what JOHN EDWARD PORTER was doing as a leader.

There are some problems that I have had with him, of course. In the early days, a chairman just kind of controls things. He is kind of upset about it so I was always badgering him and keeping him with amendments and he was having to deal with my activist type of approach. He is completely different in that respect, and he is always well prepared, always thinks out his product and it is kind of hard for him to see some of us who were just firing off in several different directions at once. One time in particular it was late at night, I can remember, like 11:00 or 12:00 at night and everybody was talking in the committee and I just stood up kind of kiddingly and said, Mr. Chairman, I think you have lost control of this meeting, and he said one reason I have lost control is you are standing up. Why do you not sit down?

He had that way of doing it. So I sat down and we got on with the business, but he got a kick out of that.

I think one of the reasons, and he will not admit it, but one of the reasons he is leaving is because we have term limits in the chairmanships. We have imposed that on ourselves in the House rules. He has a term limit. He knows that he could not go to another committee that would be as satisfying in his heart and his soul as this one. He knows if he went to another committee he could be chairman, but that he might want to stay here and not being chairman is a factor. I think this might be laid at the feet of term limits, the term limits program; but he probably would not say it. He is too much of a gentleman to say something like that.

I am going to miss him. It might surprise him for me to say that because we have really fought hard on several different issues and compromised and worked out our differences as we have had them, but he is such a fine gentleman. It is a pleasure for me to participate in this special order for JOHN EDWARD PORTER. We will miss you, JOHN.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) for his comments. It is nice to hear from somebody who has worked so closely with Mr. PORTER and had such a wonderful experience from it.

I would like to enter into the record, as I said before I had some statements, and this is from Governor George Ryan the governor of the State of Illinois. I am going to read some of it. I will not read the whole thing but that will be

submitted for the record. This letter says,

Dear John, on behalf of the State of Illinois please accept our heartfelt gratitude for your extraordinary contributions during a lifetime of public service. On the occasion of your retirement from the U.S. Congress, it is fair to recognize and applaud what you have accomplished for your constituents, for people within Illinois and throughout the United States. It is also not an exaggeration to highlight the fact that your leadership in human rights and on environmental issues has benefited people around the world. You are a strong advocate for a thoughtful Federal appropriations process, a clean environment and adequate funding for the arts.

You have earned an influential role among the green Republicans to fight for the Nation's environmental interests in Congress. And you are only one of five House members ever to be appointed to the board of directors of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Your service in Illinois began in the Illinois House of Representatives during 1972 and I am proud that we served together in the State House before you were elected to Congress in 1980. Those of us who were fortunate to work with you then have not been surprised by what you have accomplished since. As a champion and supporter of the National Institutes of Health, your efforts have helped the Institute bring about numerous medical and health advances. You have successfully advocated Federal funding to expand the Metro commuter rails into the northern suburbs of Illinois, including many towns in your district. The 290 acres of open space at Fort Sheridan is an outgrowth of your creative determination and ability to persuade the Federal Government to transfer the land to the Lake County Forest Preserve District when Fort Sheridan was closed. That this land transfer occurred without cost to the district and continues to exist as an open space for all to enjoy is among your most special contributions. The Great Lakes Naval Station remains open, viable and an economic anchor in Illinois because of your efforts. Among the critical military missions conducted here is Navy and Coast Guard training. Your commitment and effectiveness as an advocate of free trade continues to produce immeasurable economic benefits for the people of Illinois. Our farmers have more markets in which to sell their crops and livestock. Our business community has additional opportunities to positively impact their bottom line. Our workers enjoy a more stable work environment with better compensation.

Additional contributions that will not be forgotten include your efforts for comprehensive flood control measures for the north branch of the Chicago River; the enhancement of safety and operational capacities at Waukegan Airport, including new instrument landing equipment and runway improvements. Waukegan Harbor has been cleaned up with Federal resources and payments you helped secure from the firm who did the polluting.

On behalf of my family and our shared constituents within all walks of life in Illinois, thank you for all you have accomplished. Your ideas and experience and voice in Congress will be sorely missed. We wish you the very best in your next endeavor and hope that it brings you all the joy and happiness that you deserve. Please extend our very best regards to your entire family and especially your children, John, Ann, David, Robin and Donna. Sincerely George H. Ryan, Governor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
WASHINGTON OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 11, 2000.

Hon. JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
Chairman, Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOHN: On behalf of the State of Illinois, please accept our heartfelt gratitude for your extraordinary contributions during a lifetime of public service.

On the occasion of your retirement from the US Congress, it's fair to recognize and applaud what you have accomplished for your constituents, for people within Illinois and throughout the United States. It's also not an exaggeration to highlight the fact that your leadership in human rights and on environmental issues has benefited people around the world.

You are a strong advocate for a thoughtful federal appropriations process, a clean environment and adequate funding for the arts. You have earned an influential role among the ''Green Republicans'' to fight for the nation's environmental interests in Congress. And you are one of only five House members ever to be appointed to the Board of Directors of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Your service in Illinois began in the Illinois House of Representatives during 1972 and I'm proud that we served together in the State House before you were elected to Congress in 1980. Those of us who were fortunate to work with you then haven't been surprised by what you have accomplished since.

The National Institutes of Health and biomedical research have been huge beneficiaries of your legislative skills and your leadership as Chairman of the Labor/HHS Appropriation Subcommittee. As a champion and supporter of the NIH, your efforts have helped the Institute bring about numerous medical and health advances.

You have successfully advocated federal funding to expand the METRA Commuter rails into the northern suburbs of Illinois, including many towns in your district. The METRA extension into these areas via the Wisconsin Central tracks has stimulated wide ranging economic expansion. The passenger rail service this expansion made possible connected the northern suburbs to O'Hare International Airport and Chicago's Union Station.

The 290 acres of open space at Fort Sheridan is an outgrowth of your creativity, determining and your ability to persuade the federal government to transfer the land to the Lake County Forest Preserve District when Fort Sheridan was closed. That this land transfer occurred without cost to the District and continues to exist as open space for all to enjoy is among your most special contributions.

The Great Lakes Naval Station remains open, viable and an economic anchor in Illinois because of your efforts. Among the critical military missions conducted here is Navy and Coast Guard training.

Illinois is among the first tier of states benefiting from new opportunities to market our products, produce and ideas internationally. Your commitment and effectiveness as an advocate of free trade continues to produce immeasurable economic benefits for the people of Illinois. Our farmers have more markets in which to sell their crops and livestock. Our business community has additional opportunities to positively impact their bottom line. Our workers enjoy a more stable work environment with better compensation.

Additional contributions that will not be forgotten include your efforts for comprehensive flood control measures for the North Branch of the Chicago River. The enhancement of safety and operational capabilities at Waukegan Airport, including new instrument landing equipment and runway improvements. Waukegan Harbor has been cleaned up with federal resources and payments you helped secure from the firm who did the polluting.

On behalf of my family and our shared constituents from all walks of life within Illinois, thank you for all that you have accomplished. Your ideas, experience and voice in Congress will be sorely missed. We wish you the very best in your next endeavor and hope that it brings you all the joy and happiness that you deserve. Please extend our very best regards to your entire family and especially your children—John, Ann, David, Robin, and Donna.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. RYAN,
Governor.

I think it is amazing all of the correspondence that we have had. The praise from several fellow Illinoians for JOHN PORTER's service in Illinois include a couple of members from the Illinois delegation that I would like to summarize what they have submitted. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) points out that not only has JOHN's work resulted in millions of dollars going to fund biomedical research but his legacy will be saving lives. While they have not always agreed on every issue, he commends John for his conservative stance on fiscal issues and his unwavering commitment to eliminating deficits and balancing the Federal budgets. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) touts JOHN's efforts to ensure funding for the National Institutes of Health, and his dedication to human rights issues. He expresses his admiration for JOHN's work in the Illinois delegation and on the Committee on Appropriations. He states that his friendship will be missed.

A couple of comments from former chiefs of staff to JOHN PORTER. Mark Kirk states that America is not great because we are rich or field the most powerful military. We are great because our Nation has been the largest force for good on this earth. JOHN PORTER and the Human Rights Caucus made our values and respect for human rights an essential part of our country's mission to the world. We here in Illinois will miss JOHN PORTER's calm, intellectual and dignified service to the Nation.

At this point, I would like to submit his letter.

MARK STEVEN KIRK
Glenview, Illinois, October 18, 2000.

Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT: I want to applaud you for leading today's Special Order for John Porter.

Our country and future generations owe a real debt to Congressman Porter. he led our nation's commitment to double funding for medical research. It was his decision that laid the foundation for the mapping of the human genome, finding the cause of Alzheimer's disease and a cure for some types of diabetes. John Porter's legacy is one of longer, healthier lives, not just for our nation but the world.

John Porter also embodies the values we hold most dear. America is not great because

we are rich or field the most powerful military. We are great because our nation has been the largest force for good on this Earth. We enshrined our values in the Bill of Rights and exported them through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. John Porter and the Human Rights Caucus made our values and respect for human rights an essential part of our country's mission to the world.

After 21 years of John Porter's service to the nation, human freedom has spread throughout Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, turning enemies into allies. The new leaders in many of these countries were once prisoners of conscience whose best friend and advocate was John Edward Porter. The bond they formed in prison cells with their voice and friend in Congress will reap a permanent reward to the United States.

We here in Illinois will miss John Porter's calm, intellectual and dignified service to the nation. He served us all in the highest tradition of public service and commitment to the greater good.

Sincerely,

MARK KIRK.

Another chief of staff, Robert Bradner, who worked for JOHN for 13 years, cites a specific example of JOHN's foresight. Fifteen years ago, before anyone saw it as a problem, JOHN began pointing out the potential problems with Social Security. While many thought it to be an act of political suicide, he had the courage to take on the issue of Social Security reform. Popular wisdom has finally caught up with him.

□ 2215

Robert further states, ''JOHN'S belief in a fair process and his ability to work on the basis of mutual respect with colleagues of widely divergent views allowed him to shepherd difficult legislation through the House over the past 6 years that he has been the chairman of the Labor-HHS Committee, in a manner that confirmed to all the true measure of his policy making talent.''

I continue with Robert Bradner. ''Ultimately, I regard JOHN PORTER as a teacher. He taught me and a number of others who passed through his offices about the honor of public service and the importance of ideas.''

OCTOBER 18, 2000.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JUDY: I am delighted that you have organized a special order on the eve of John Porter's retirement from the House of Representatives to commemorate his many years of public service.

I had the great honor to work for John Porter for a total of thirteen years, both during the time that he served as a member of the minority party in the House, and later when he rose to an important chairmanship in the majority. A litany of all that he accomplished in that time would run many pages. However, I would like to share a few observations.

During the 1980s, John Porter distinguished himself as a tireless advocate for human rights and the environment, as a defender of the rights of women and an advocate for a common sense approach to family planning, and as a fierce opponent of federal budget deficits. One accomplishment deserves particular note, for it is emblematic of both his intelligence and his political courage. Fifteen years ago, John began pointing out the dangerous growth of unfunded liabilities in the Social Security system and, soon thereafter, he began introducing legislation to provide for individual social security retirement accounts. At the time, such behavior was considered an act of political suicide. But John had the courage to take on the issue, and a constituency that trusted and valued sound judgment over demagoguery. He was well ahead of his time in seeing this problem for what it was. Today, the popular wisdom has finally caught up with where John was well over a decade ago: recognizing this as a serious problem and beginning to come to grips with solutions. Indeed, a very closely related proposal to John's original legislation is playing a very prominent role in the current Presidential election.

Later in his career, John had the opportunity to accede to the Chairmanship of the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Subcommittee. This was no easy assignment. In recent years, the Labor–HHS bill has been a place where some of the most passionately held beliefs of conservatives and liberals about the shape and size of government and a myriad of emotional social issues collide headlong. And it is the place where, on an annual basis, those disagreements must somehow be resolved. I would argue that John Porter was almost uniquely qualified for this most difficult assignment. This capability stemmed not from his views on any particular issue but rather from the innate decency that he has always shown to his co-workers and his strong belief that the process by which issues are resolved in a democracy is of equal, if not greater, importance than the particular outcome achieved on a particular issue on a particular day. John's belief in a fair process and his ability to work on the basis of mutual respect with colleagues of widely divergent views allowed him to shepherd this most difficult legislation through the House over the past six years in a manner that confirmed to all the true measure of his policy making talent.

Ultimately, I regard John Porter as a teacher. He taught me, and a number of others who passed through his offices, about the honor of public service and the importance of ideas. He encouraged intellectual discourse and vigorous policy discussion within the office toward the goal of developing a better understanding of the issues and a sounder approach to policy. And he showed me that, on the most trying and emotional issues facing the Congress—such as the resolution to authorize hostilities against Iraq—there is no substitute for a member of Congress that exercises, to the best of their ability, independent judgment to ascertain the best course of action and the courage to support that course.

I thank you again for your efforts in organizing this fine tribute to John Porter, and join with you and so many others in wishing John all the best in his future endeavors.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BRADNER.

Another Chief of Staff, Gordon MacDougall, cites JOHN'S motivation for reducing Federal budget deficits as being ''based on his conviction of public service as a responsibility for perpetuating our free and democratic society.'' He also praises JOHN as being a champion of the ideals upon which our system of governing was originally based. He states that ''today's young Americans and their children will be better off for Congressman PORTER'S 20 years of devoted service in Congress.''

OCTOBER 18, 2000.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BIGGERT: I understand that you have organized a ''Special Order'' to celebrate the career of Congressman John E. Porter, and that you have invited former staff to Congressman Porter to contribute sstatements.

I was fortunate to have been introduced to Congressman Porter in 1983, during his second term in Congress. I was subsequently offered a position as Legislative Assistant in his office beginning in January, 1984. I was promoted to the position of Administrative Assistant in 1995, and served on his staff until early 1997. Since leaving his office I have had the opportunity to continue a professional and a personal relationship with Congressman Porter.

John Porter is an individual of high integrity and deep intellect. He has an unwavering commitment to our open system of representative democracy. I believe that he is one of the finest Members of Congress to serve during the last quarter of the 20th Century.

During the first eighteen years of his career, Congressman Porter devoted the majority of his time to efforts to reduce federal budget deficits. In my view, his motivation was not simple or myopic fiscal conservatism, his motivation was based on his conviction of public services as a responsibility for perpetuating our free and democratic society. Congressman Porter remained focused for the majority of his tenure in Congress on adopting fiscal policies to enable future generations to avoid being burdened with federal debt. Coming generations of Americans will benefit from his steady and deliberate effort to help balance the federal budget. I am pleased for Congressman Porter that he has been able to stay in the House long enough to see a balanced federal budget.

With federal fiscal policy coming into balance during the past two years, Congressman Porter has refocused his efforts on federal programs of significance to future generations of Americans. He has led an effort in the House to increase funding for medical research, an investment which will improve the quality of life for future generations of all mankind. Also during this period he has conscientiously worked to forward proposals to stabilize a Social Security system which, without changes, will not last to serve our children.

John Porter has been a champion of the ideals upon which our system of governing was originally based. He is a unique individual, and his character and demeanor will be missed in future Congresses. Today's young Americans and their children will be better off for Congressman Porter's twenty years of devoted service in Congress. I wish him well.

Sincerely,

GORDON P. MACDOUGALL

We also heard from former Illinois officials, Mr. Speaker. Former Illinois State Representative David Barkhausen from JOHN PORTER'S district states that ''one has only to look at the example of JOHN PORTER to recognize that in him we have truly had an exemplary leader and representative in the mold that our Founding Fathers envisioned. The impact of his many contributions will endure, as will the high standards of public service that he has held high for others to follow.''

LAKE BLUFF, IL,
October 18, 2000.

Re ''Special Orders'' tribute for John Porter.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JUDY: It is my pleasure and privilege to participate in this special tribute to Congressman John Porter from his colleagues and friends.

I am fortunate that my service in the Illinois General Assembly from 1981–1997 (2 years in the House and 14 in the Senate) coincided with most of John's years of service in Washington. He was both a great leader and team player. He also recruited and maintained a staff that was second to none and that was always extremely courteous, cooperative, and effective.

John Porter has been an extraordinarily thoughtful and conscientious Congressman and a model servant. He has combined the characteristics that everyone could hope for in a Congressman from our kind of district. He is a deep and original thinker who has greatly influenced important policies in such areas as health care research. He has reflected and continuously sought the views of his constituents while maintaining an admirable independence of judgment. And he has been extremely attentive to problems and projects of local interest and influential in offering solutions.

In the final Presidential debate last night, the candidates were asked at the end what might help to overcome the cynical and negative views that so many citizens have of their government and its leaders. Cloning John Porter might be one effective solution. One has only to look at the example of John Porter to recognize that, in him, we have truly had an exemplary leader and representative in the mold that our Founding Fathers envisioned. We owe him our deep thanks for the many good years of service he has given us. The impact of his many contributions will endure, as will the high standards of public service that he has held high for others to follow.

I am confident that we can look forward to additional, important contributions from Congressman Porter in the service of his country. For now, I want to join all of you in this heartfelt, if inadequate, praise for his job extraordinarily well done as a member of the United States Congress for the past 21 years.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. BARKHAUSEN.

Illinois State Senator Kathleen Parker worked on JOHN'S campaign for state representative, how many years ago was that, and remembers that he once tracked down a cabinet member in an airport to resolve a problem for a constituent. She further states that he was a man of integrity and, above all, a true friend.

ILLINOIS STATE SENATE,
Springfield, IL, October 18, 2000.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BIGGERT: Thank you for the opportunity to be included in a Congressional tribute to John Porter.

It's hard to believe that John will have served for 22 years in Congress. It seems like yesterday when I worked on his campaign for State Representative!

I can tell you that through the years Congressman Porter has been loved by his district. He has never forgotten his constituents. While in Washington John has been ever mindful of local views and issues.

Congressman Porter's staff is, if not the best, tied with the best in the country. They work hard, are always responsive and are a pleasure to work with. They work closely with John enabling him to take personal interest in helping his constituents. In one case that I know of Congressman Porter even went as far as to track down a cabinet member in an airport to resolve a problem for an individual in his district.

Out of the four ways to leave office John is leaving the only good way! He has served the Northshore area of Illinois well. He leaves us with the memory of a true statesman and Congressman that we can always admire and be proud of. A man of integrity and above all a true friend.

We will miss John as our Congressman. However, we are hopeful that there is a future ahead in some capacity he may serve our country again. We will all be better off if that occurs.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN K. PARKER,
State Senator, 29th District.

Illinois State Representative Jeff Schoenberg recounts the first time he met JOHN PORTER was when he was working in his first paid political job for JOHN's election opponent, then Congressman Abner Mikva. Despite these beginnings, Jeff has had an extremely good working relationship with JOHN, and states their offices have maintained a ''seamless cooperation'' in serving the residents of Chicago's North Shore. He agrees that JOHN will best be remembered for his commitment and diligence in bettering the lives of millions of Americans.

His words commending Congressman PORTER follow:

Please allow me to join the many others in offering my best wishes to my colleague and constituent, Congressman John Porter, in his future endeavors.

I must concede that I first became acquainted with John when I was hired in 1978 for my first paid position in politics, as a young field organizer for his election opponent, then Congressman Abner Mikva. Nonetheless, despite that less than auspicious beginning to our working relationship, it has been an extraordinary pleasure to work with Congressman Porter to address our mutual constituent concerns and district needs.

For the past ten years, our offices have maintained a seamless cooperation in serving the residents of Chicago's North Shore. And on the issues that matter most to those who we serve—whether it has been funding for health care and medical research, deficit reduction and greater fiscal accountability in government, or most recently, when we worked shoulder-to-shoulder with the United Power for Action and Justice coalition to increase the availability of funding for affordable housing and health insurance for lower-income women and children—John Porter will always be remembered for his commitment and diligence in bettering the lives of millions of Americans.

I wish Congressman Porter the best of luck and hope his tenure in the Illinois legislature and the United States Congress will continue to inspire young people to public service.

May you continue to go from strength to strength, John, in your pursuit of just causes.

Sincerely,

JEFF SCHOENBERG.

Illinois State Senator Adeline Geo-Karis appreciates how responsive JOHN always was to her constituents, and states how much he will be missed.

ILLINOIS STATE SENATE,
Springfield, IL, October 18, 2000.

Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT,
13th Congressional District.

DEAR JUDY: I worked with John Porter in the Illinois House, and he became my Congressman. He was always very responsive to my District and to my people, and he did a great job for the 10th District.

I wish him the best that life has to offer and I shall miss him.

Sincerely,

ADELINE J. GEO-KARIS,
Senator—31st District,
Assistant Majority Leader.

Illinois State Representative Elizabeth Coulson states that she will always remember the lessons she learned from JOHN, and that his work on environmental issues was second to none.

ELIZABETH COULSON,
STATE REPRESENTATIVE,
Springfield, IL, October 17, 2000.

Hon. JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
Congressman, 10th District,
Deerfield, IL.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PORTER: Congratulations on eleven terms in the United States House. We will miss your compassion and good judgment in our 10th District.

As a State Representative, I have often looked to your leadership as an example. I watch with great interest your lead on the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Subcommittees. Your work on environmental issues is second to none. Again, we will miss you.

You will always be remembered for your independent thinking. As I continue my career in Government I will remember the lessons that I learned from you. I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors!

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH COULSON,
State Representative, 57th District.

I would like to take a moment to highlight one of JOHN's most notable achievements, and that is his commitment to biomedical research. He is truly a champion in this field, as has been noted by so many who I have quoted. His work on the National Institutes of Health deserves particular mention.

When he became chairman of the Labor-HHS appropriations subcommittee in 1995, NIH had been appropriated $11.3 billion for the previous fiscal year. While that is hardly small chump change, JOHN recognized that NIH is responsible for so many of our country's scientific advances and could be responsible for so much more with additional funding.

As a Congress we set out a few years ago, with the guidance of JOHN, to double the funding for the NIH, and JOHN has done this almost all by himself during his tenure. In the long-awaited conference report for Labor-HHS bill, he has set aside $20.5 billion for NIH. That is a 15 percent increase over last year, and an astounding 81 percent increase during his chairmanship.

These increases in funding for NIH mean good things for so many people. It will, we hope, lead to cures for cancer, AIDS, heart disease, diabetes, depression, Alzheimer's and so many others. In fact, earlier this year in the Wall Street Journal, Al Hunt wrote that this funding increase ''may be the

most significant achievement of this GOP Congress.''

The chairman of Research America, a former representative, Paul Rogers, said in the same article that achieving the consensus necessary for this increase ''would have been very difficult without JOHN PORTER. He has been the main purpose in this effort.'' With that praise, Mr. Rogers perhaps understated JOHN PORTER's role: He was the single motivating force.

This, of course, is not the only praise that JOHN has received, and I could use up the entire hour reciting the organizations that have honored JOHN for his support for biomedical research. Suffice it to say, it is a long and noteworthy list, from the American Medical Association, to the American Society of Microbiology. So, on behalf of the American public who benefits from this critical research done at the NIH, I know we thank JOHN PORTER.

I would also like to take a moment to pay tribute to John Porter's outstanding human rights record. In 1983, after witnessing the severity of human right violations in the former Soviet Union, JOHN helped to form the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. He knew that applying Congressional pressure on foreign governments could be a significant step towards ending human rights abuses around the world.

I doubt that even JOHN PORTER anticipated how successful the caucus would ultimately turn out to be, with a bipartisan membership now totaling 257 Members. Under JOHN's solid leadership, the Human Rights Caucus thoroughly reviewed the actions of and subsequently condemned Chinese authorities for the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident. Under JOHN's leadership the caucus has held regular briefings on important human rights issues, including religious freedom in China, the oppressive regime of the late Nigerian dictator Sani Abacha, the plight of North Korean refugees living in China, and the abhorrent use of children soldiers, just to name a few.

In addition to his work with the caucus, JOHN has been heavily involved personally in human rights work. He has provided a clear and loud voice for the oppressed, and has strongly supported human rights and democratic reform all over the world.

JOHN also cosponsored a Congressional fast and prayer vigil in which numerous Members of Congress fasted on behalf of specific oppressed individuals. Because of his leadership in this area, Representative PORTER received the Anatoly Shcharansky Freedom Award from the Chicago Action for Soviet Jewry, who described him aptly as ''a champion of human rights and a powerful ally in the struggle against oppression and the fight for basic human freedoms.''

JOHN introduced legislation to create a Radio Free China, a broadcasting service to bring uncensored news reports directly to the Chinese people without government intrusion. He then jointly introduced Radio Free Asia to serve China, North Korea, Burma, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Congress authorized the program and JOHN quickly secured funding for the new service.

A Member of Congress who has served more than 20 years can amass a great deal of influence. JOHN PORTER as chairman of an influential appropriations subcommittee is certainly no exception. However, JOHN has bucked the trend and has not used his power and influence for his own personal gain or enrichment. He has used his influence to help those less fortunate than himself, those less fortunate than most Americans.

Gerald LeMelle, Deputy Executive Director for Amnesty International USA, eloquently summed this up when he said of Representative PORTER at a recent farewell reception, ''Whether from your keynote speech at the Latin American Ambassadors Colloquium in 1991, or your steadfast support on issue after issue, you have always been there for us and for human rights, with integrity and principle.''

I agree. JOHN PORTER has always been beside those who could not fight for themselves. For this I admire him.

JOHN PORTER has been a leader in so many areas, and in the middle of our testimonies to him on health care, human rights and health research, it is also important to emphasize his active interest and leadership on issues involving the environment. His record is clear enough on this point and long enough to document his strong and consistent support for major environmental legislation, including the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Wilderness Protection Act, the National Park Protection Act and the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

But the fine print of his record also reflects his love of animals and his love of the outdoors. For instance, he voted for the Endangered Species Act and against the inhumane use of animals in product testing and the use of cruel leghold traps. Ten years ago JOHN successfully stopped the radical destruction of tropical rain forests in developing nations by tying future lending to conservation efforts to protect the forests and the wetlands.

Today he is fighting for the protection of the American bear with legislation to stop the illegal poaching of bears for their paws and gallbladders, which has garnered the support of 142 other Members of Congress. For these and many other efforts, he has received awards, honors and accolades from national and international environment groups like the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the United Nations Environmental Program and Conservation International.

JOHN is even the recipient of the prestigious Lorax Award from the Global Tomorrow Coalition, a group representing over 100 environmental organizations. But, most important to the people of the Tenth District of Illinois, have been JOHN's efforts to protect human health and the environment at home.

He orchestrated an agreement between the government and the polluters of Waukegan Harbor on Lake Michigan to clean it up. He led an effort to preserve the 290 acres of open space on the northern part of Fort Sheridan and make it available for recreation by transferring it from the army to the Lake County Forest Preserve District at no cost.

He sought and found effective solutions to help area residents and businesses along the North Branch of the Chicago River who suffered from flood damage. Thanks to his efforts, flood waters are now diverted from people's basements to a number of large reservoirs.

JOHN also has been a leading supporter of environmental projects that benefit all the residents of northeastern Illinois. He obtained funding to study Lake Michigan's shoreline erosion and to stabilize it. He introduced legislation to alleviate high water levels in Lake Michigan by increasing water diversion down the Illinois River and secured additional funding for wetland preservation.

So whether you are a resident of JOHN PORTER's district, the City of Chicago and any of its suburbs, or the tropical rain forests of any developing nation, your environment has been positively impacted by the efforts of a great environmental advocate, our friend, JOHN PORTER.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that I also have received a statement from the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), and I would like to just say that he also applauds his work to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health and biomedical research, and says that believing that more funds would lead to more cures for disease and other medical advances. Chairman PORTER embarked on an ambitious program to double the NIH budget.

I would like to also say that he particularly remembers his work with JOHN PORTER as a Member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. In particular, he recalls one battle that was waged with Mr. PORTER. They worked together, in 1997, when they opposed certain provisions of the fiscal year 1998 foreign operations appropriation bill that they thought should not have been included. He says the one thing that he could say about JOHN PORTER is that he always he always stands up for his principles, and, in this particular case, like so many others, he prevailed in the end because he knew the facts and he knew the cause was just.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) says that she had had the privilege of working with Mr. PORTER on such a wide variety of issues; women's rights, health care, human rights, family planning, the environment and many, many more.

□ 2230

He was always a tremendous advocate for bipartisan cooperation. Over the years, they often worked together to forge common sense solutions to important issues facing our Nation. She says that she knows that there are many Members of Congress who would join her in this sentiment, and she believes that that alone is an outstanding tribute to any Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. In the case of Congressman PORTER, it is an exceptionally fitting tribute.

She had the distinct pleasure of working with Mr. PORTER on international family planning issues and stood together in opposition to any antidemocratic gag rules which would interfere with the availability of family planning around the world.

On this issue, as with so many others, Congressman PORTER has touched so many lives; it is hard to measure the full impact of his efforts.

I would like to then turn to some remarks which I think are very fitting, and that is a thank you to Mr. PORTER from his staff. And they have said that the House of Representatives and the 10th District of Illinois will not be the same next year as Congressman JOHN PORTER sets off on a new career path. Members of his staff would like to take this opportunity to express their gratitude for the journey that they have traveled with him over the past 21 years.

Mr. Speaker, I will quote:

Some of us have worked for the Congressman almost his entire time in office. Our longevity is a testament to the respect and appreciation we have for his honesty, integrity, and leadership. The Boss, as we affectionately called him, has been the one constant amidst the hectic pace of a congressional office caught in a whirlwind of issues, including a government shutdown and impeachment hearings.

He has vigorously pursued those issues of greatest interest to him, including biomedical research, human rights, and environmental conservation. He has never wavered from his duty to fairly represent the people of Illinois' 10th Congressional District.

Congressman Porter rarely lets an occasion go by without acknowledging his appreciation for what he calls ''the best congressional staff in America.'' However, leadership and success come from the top.

Congressman Porter has set service to his constituents as the highest priority. From his impeccable manners, to his insistence that no constituent request goes without response, he has taught us that everyone is to be treated equally.

The honor of working for Congressman John Porter has enriched our lives in more ways than we can ever express.

In the communities of Illinois' wonderful 10th Congressional District, it is a name that commands respect. We know this because we hear his praises sung daily. Even constituents who disagree with his vote respect his judgment and his courage to vote his conscience.

So as you move on, Boss, we wish you the great success in your next endeavor. We know that you will continue to contribute your many talents to helping the people of this great Nation. Thank you, Congressman Porter for setting the standard that others follow. Thank you for giving us the joy of working in this exciting environment that allows us to learn something new each day and be of service to others.

Thank you for standing by us during the ups and downs we have experienced in our personal lives over the past 21 years. Most of all, thank you for letting us be members of the Porter family, to work for you and be with you. We have loved every minute.

Signed Linda Maneck, Dee Jay Kweder, Ed Kelly, Ginny Hotaling, Carol Joy Cunningham, Mary Jane Partridge, Nancy Johnson, Linda Mae Carlson, Jerri Lohman, Katharine Fisher, Spencer Perlman, Jeannette Windon, Michael Liles, Erik Rasmussen, Jori Frahler and David Fabrycky.''

Is that not a nice tribute to have from the members of your staff?

Mr. Speaker, much has been written during this presidential election year of legacy of what a public servant bequests to his succeeding generations, not just on his last days in office, but over the entirety of his career.

Let me close tonight's special order by summing up the sentiments expressed by my colleagues regarding the legacy of our esteemed colleague, JOHN EDWARD PORTER.

What we have heard tonight is that JOHN PORTER has not sought out glory or tried to advance his name at any cost. JOHN is the kind of Congressman that will leave a long record of accomplishments when he walks out of this Chamber as we adjourn sine die.

First, JOHN leaves a great legacy to the 10th District in the State of Illinois. As our governor, State senators and representatives mentioned in their letters and as my colleagues from Illinois attested tonight, JOHN's contributions are without equal. Among the many projects for which he will be remembered, his funding for the METRA Commuter rails that link the northern suburbs of Illinois with downtown Chicago and O'Hare Airport.

Second, JOHN leaves a great legacy to this country. His crusade to increase NIH funding will no doubt lead one day to the cures for the diseases that will save millions of lives. His work on behalf of women's and children's health issues, it is unparalleled.

JOHN leaves a great legacy for our world community. He has represented those around the world who are not able to represent themselves. JOHN fights not only for the most popular crusades, but also for the countries and people forgotten by the glare of CNN. This is a proud legacy.

Perhaps most importantly, JOHN leaves a great legacy for the people whose lives he has personally and directly touched. The thoughtful and loving testimony shared here tonight by his staff and former staff members speak out volumes on the quality and decency of this fine man.

Tonight we heard of the legacy that JOHN has created during his years of service in this body. We heard but a small part of the large impact he has made on his district, his State, his country, and the world.

But tonight is not a leave-taking. It is the exciting commencement of the next stage of JOHN's career. We will all watch with great pride and interest the new challenges that JOHN will decide to tackle in the months and years to come. We all will know that whatever cause or causes he chooses to take on in his next career will be benefited and blessed by his fine touch.

They say there is no limit to the amount of good that a man can do in this world if he does not care who gets the credit. Well, JOHN never cares and never has cared who has gotten the credit, and JOHN can never be credited sufficiently for the great good he has done in this world.

We will all miss JOHN PORTER a great deal, but we are all honored to have been able to serve with a leader of such integrity, dedication, and commitment to principle.

Tonight we celebrate his legacy, we delight in his friendship, and we wish JOHN EDWARD PORTER the very best that life has to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following speech:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GERALD LEMELLE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA, ON THE OCCASION OF A FAREWELL RECEPTION FOR REPRESENTATIVE JOHN PORTER, CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS, OCTOBER 3, 2000

Distinguished members of Congress, distinguished staff, dear friends and colleagues, it is my bittersweet pleasure to be here to bid farewell to our dear friend and Co-Chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, Congressman John Porter.

Chairman Porter has been a key leader in ensuring that the Congressional Human Rights Caucus did not just survive the abolition of caucuses, but has managed to thrive—even ''thrive'' might be an understatement! Today, the Human Rights Caucus has an almost frantic pace of briefings—Guatemala, Burma, Sudan, Algeria, East Timor, Turkey—it matters not the range of countries or even issues, all these countries are covered in a week, with recognized experts or with the activists who are on the front line of these issues! But the Caucus does not cover only countries in the headlines but countries and peoples forgotten by the glare of CNN. The Caucus is here to ensure that human rights around the world remain a focal point for congressional activity—even when Congress gets caught up in other business. And for that, sir, we salute you.

But Chairman Porter has gone beyond the Caucus in his pursuit of human rights. When Native American leaders converged on Washington earlier this year to call for the release of Leonard Peltier, they found a receptive ear in Chairman Porter who hosted an important briefing in which we in Amnesty International were honored to participate. When the Turkish government has gone on a public relations offensive, or when the Administration despite its wiser counsel has decided to pursue arms transfers to that NATO ally, it is Congressman Porter who has been publicly on the side of human rights.

In 1995, at a briefing organized by the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, when Nigeria was suffering under the oppression of the late dictator Sani Abacha, Chairman Porter was one of the few voices calling Abacha what he was—a dictator—and one of the lone voices blasting the Administration's policy.

And of course we cannot talk about the Chairman without talking about Kathryn Porter, a human rights activist in her own

right. While her work on behalf of the Kurdish people and Afghani women is widely recognized and celebrated, we also remember the singular courage she exhibited when she spent some time with Jennifer Harbury in Guatemala, on a lonely stretch of rural road outside an Army base.

While a politician might boast of the state dinners he or she has attended, Chairman Porter attended a ''stateless'' dinner on behalf of Chinese dissidents. While politics is well tuned to the powerful and the popular, Chairman Porter has stood by the underdogs, supporting the rights of religious and ethnic minorities throughout the world, including the Armenians and the Ba'hais. While many in Congress have shunned the challenge of confronting the violations by powerful allies such as Saudi Arabia, Chairman Porter seems to embrace such opportunities. While governments and their representatives tend to have relationships with other governments, we can safely say that Chairman Porter has built relationships with peoples.

We in Amnesty International USA with its 300,000 members in the United states and more than a million members worldwide can say that we are a grateful people for your leadership and your support. I should also add, if I want my staff not to kill me, that your staff has also been fabulous, including Rachel Helfand, Karen Davis, Heidi Gasch, Katharine Fisher, Kelly Currie, and Jeannette Windon. We have grown to respect and rely on them as well.

Whether from your keynote speech at the Latin American Ambassadors Colloquium in 1991 or your steadfast support in issue after issue, you have always been there for us and for human rights, with integrity and principle that is second to none. Dear Chairman Porter, it's not just staffers who voted you number one Congressperson who will be missed most—we also read Washingtonian magazine—we too will miss you deeply.

Thank you sir for your wonderful example and contribution to human rights. You are a real hero to us.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today we salute the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JOHN EDWARD PORTER, as he prepares to retire after 20 years of dedicated service in the House of Representatives, to the people of Illinois, and to our Nation. I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to him and the legacy he leaves behind.

Mr. PORTER embodies a unique blend of fiscal conservatism and social moderation. He is known as a most thoughtful, articulate, and responsible member of the Appropriations Committee, a consistent advocate for human rights for all people, a protector of volunteers to encourage their greater participation in their communities, and a supporter of programs that help men, women, and children in need to have full and productive lives.

It has been my honor to serve with Mr. PORTER as a member of the House Appropriations Committee for the past six years. As Chairman of its Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee, he has had the Herculean task of shepherding the largest domestic spending bill through our committee and this Chamber. Not only does this bill contain a substantial amount of money, it also contains a substantial amount of controversial policy issues. Mr. PORTER has done an excellent job of balancing all the competing interests as he worked to craft his annual bill.

In this regard, I applaud especially his work to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health and biomedical research. Believing that more funds would lead to more cures for diseases and other medical advances, Chairman PORTER embarked on an ambitious program to double the NIH budget over five years. Against all odds, and under tight budget constraints, he has managed to increase NIH funding by 15 percent a year for the past three years. At this rate, Congress would meet his goal of doubling that budget in five years. I hope that my colleagues would continue toward that objective and that his leadership with the NIH will be remembered as one of his greatest legacies.

On a more personal note, I particularly remember our work as members of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. In particular, I recall one battle we waged together in 1997 when we opposed certain provisions of the Fiscal Year 1998 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill that we thought should not have been included. One thing you can say about JOHN PORTER, he always stands up for his principles. In this particular case, like so many others, he prevailed in the end because he knew the facts and the cause was just.

My work with Mr. PORTER was not just confined to the Appropriations Committee, as both of us have been members of the Tuesday Lunch Bunch. Here we consumed a lot of pizza and discussed issues facing us in Congress that deserved extra attention and deliberation.

While we are saddened to see Mr. PORTER retire, we join in wishing him well in the future and thanking him for the high standard he has set for all of us.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Illinois delegation for organizing this Special Order tonight, and I want to thank my friend JUDY BIGGERT for coordinating this particular effort honoring Congressman JOHN EDWARD PORTER.

I am here to honor my friend, Chairman JOHN PORTER, who is retiring at the end of this session of Congress. Mr. PORTER has been a good friend, he has been a terrific legislative partner, and he has been a superior legislator.

I have had the privilege of working with Mr. PORTER on such a wide variety of issues—women's rights, health care, human rights, family planning, the environment, and many, many more. He has always been a tremendous advocate for bipartisan cooperation. Over the years, we have often worked together to forge commonsense solutions to important issues facing our Nation. And I know that there are many Members of Congress who would join me in this sentiment. I believe that alone is an outstanding tribute to any Member of this House. In the case of Congressman PORTER, it is an exceptionally fitting tribute.

I had the distinct pleasure of working with Mr. PORTER on international family planning issues. We stood together in opposition to any anti-democratic gag rules, which interfere with the availability of family planning around the world. On this issue, as with so many others, Congressman JOHN PORTER has touched so many lives, it is hard to measure the full impact of his efforts.

He is a leader on protecting the environment. As co-chair of the Human Rights Caucus, he has been a leader on human rights. As Chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee, he has been a leader on biomedical research.

This year, I am proud to serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. And every year, the Women's Caucus testified before his subcommittee.

Congresswomen would line up to testify about a whole host of issues—family planning, women's health, title IX, biomedical research, education funding, diabetes, cancer, heart disease, obesity, long-term health care, breast cancer, teen pregnancy, mental health, AIDS, osteoporosis, STD's, child care, homelessness, Head Start, pediatric asthma, violence against women, and many more subjects.

Chairman PORTER often said it was his favorite day in the subcommittee. Mr. PORTER was always interested, attentive, informed, and compassionate. We always knew we had a real advocate and friend on so many of these important issues in Chairman PORTER. He will be sorely missed by the Women's Caucus, he will be missed by the entire Congress, and his leadership will be missed by countless Americans whose lives have been touched by his work.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I know JOHN PORTER as a friend and as a member of the Appropriations Committee. We have served together on the committee during his entire twenty year tenure in Congress.

JOHN PORTER will be remembered as one of the most consistent fiscal conservatives on the Appropriations Committee during his service in office. During his first fourteen years as a minority member of the Labor-Health-and-Human Resources Subcommittee, JOHN worked tirelessly to assure strict oversight of the agencies under his jurisdiction. During that period, we looked to his leadership to hold the line on excessive spending by that subcommittee.

Also during our period together in the minority, JOHN worked hard to reform a budget process which he thought contributed to excessive Federal spending. As a member of the majority, JOHN has continued fighting to reform the budget process during the past six years. He has argued throughout his career that adopting a bipartisan budget resolution in March of each year would help restrain domestic spending at the end of each year. We will remember his thoughtful and wise counsel on how to use the budget process to control Federal spending.

As Chairman of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee JOHN has worked closely with the minority. He is respected equally by both Republicans and Democrats on the committee for his bipartisan approach. JOHN has worked effectively with the minority to manage and control Federal appropriations, and to establish and impose performance measures on Federal agencies. He has gained the respect of all of those who have worked closely with him.

Some of our colleagues will remember JOHN for his strong commitment to medical research. JOHN has championed medical research because of his belief in a better society for our children. His leadership on funding for medical research reflects his concern for the well being of all people.

He has used his position on the Appropriations Committee to make the Federal Government more accountable to taxpayers. JOHN has insisted, like his subcommittee predecessor Bill Natcher, on attending every oversight and public hearing. In order to ensure that all of his colleagues have a chance to amend the Labor-HHS bill, he has insisted on bringing the bill to the House floor every year. JOHN has managed the Labor-HHS in a manner which reflects the principles of our representative democracy.

We will miss JOHN's integrity and his independence. JOHN's work in Congress during the past twenty years will contribute to a stronger democracy for future generations. We will miss him as a leading member of the Appropriations Committee, and we hope that he will stay in close contact with all of his former colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding Member of Congress and an individual who has helped make this Nation a better place for families, our veterans, and our armed forces.

Mr. PORTER first came to Congress in 1980. Since that time he has become a recognized leader in health care issues. He has always done a commendable job in working in a bipartisan manner to fund valuable programs through the most difficult of situations. His keen interest in supporting health care, education and labor issues, has helped set Federal priorities in those critical areas which further the best interests of our country.

Mr. PORTER and I share an interest in health care issues, which I developed in my days in the Ohio State Senate. I have always appreciated Chairman PORTER's leadership in supporting needed programs in the Labor/Health and Human Services bill to benefit pediatric care, physician training, mental health services, and other important health programs.

As a former Army Reservist, Mr. PORTER has approved a valued member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, where I serve as Chairman. Mr. PORTER has always been a strong advocate for improving the living and working conditions for our military personnel and their families and he will be missed on our subcommittee.

Today, as we honor Mr. PORTER, I am pleased to join with his friends and colleagues, his wife, Kathryn, and his children, in wishing him all the best in the years to come and to thank him for his years of dedicated service to our Nation.

As Ohio's Seventh District Representative to the Congress of the United States, I take this opportunity to join with members of the Ohio delegation and other members of the Appropriations Committee to honor the efforts and the many outstanding achievements of Representative JOHN PORTER. His many contributions as a member of the House of Representatives and leadership as a valued Committee Chairman will be remembered.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Illinoisan and a dedicated Congressman. My colleague, Congressman JOHN EDWARD PORTER, dedicated 20 years of his life to serve as the Representative from Illinois' Tenth Congressional District. At the helm of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER worked diligently to forge bipartisanship in the appropriations process.

Over the course of Congressman PORTER's tenure in the House of Representatives, he has taken a leadership role on health care issues. As Chairman of the Labor, HHS and Education appropriations since 1995, he was successful in making biomedical research one of our Nation's highest priorities. This is evidenced in the fact that during his tenure as Chairman, Congressman PORTER doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Congressman PORTER understands the great promise that NIH's research holds for saving lives and conquering diseases such as cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's disease, heart disease, and many others. In addition, he worked tirelessly to provide more funding for community health centers that serve the indigent poor.

I can speak endlessly on Representative PORTER's accomplishments, but I would be remiss if I did not point out that beyond his stellar accomplishments, he is a man of honor and integrity. And as Congressman PORTER enters into retirement, I am grateful to have served with a Member of such high esteem.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today to join my colleagues in paying special tribute to my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Mr. JOHN PORTER. Mr. PORTER and I have worked on many bipartisan issues to improve our nation and home state of Illinois including many health care initiatives. Since coming to Congress, I have appreciated his friendship and admired his work within the Illinois delegation and on the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PORTER began his distinguished career as an attorney, having graduated from the University of Michigan in 1961. JOHN PORTER has represented the 10th District and the State of Illinois well. He has dedicated himself to representing the citizens of the Great State of Illinois and has been tireless in his efforts to ensure medical research at NIH will continue and is adequately funded. In addition, he has helped countless people in the United States and around the world in an effort to resolve human rights issues.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN PORTER has served this institution well and he will be greatly missed. I wish Mr. PORTER and his family well in the years to come.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to give this tribute to my good friend and colleague JOHN PORTER. John has served with distinction and honor with me for nearly 22 years in the United States House of Representatives.

JOHN is retiring this year as a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee, Vice-Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and Chairman of the Labor, Health & Human Services and Education Subcommittee. He also serves on the Military Construction Subcommittee.

Like all Congressmen, he on occasion has had things happen to bring him back down to earth. Several years ago when flying into O'Hare he stopped to freshen up before leaving the airport. After washing his hands he went to dry them. The hand dryer had a note attached to it that read: ''Press here for a message from your Congressman.''

On a more serious note, JOHN is founder and co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, a voluntary bipartisan association of members of Congress working to identify, monitor and end human rights violations worldwide.

JOHN also has nearly as large a kennel of bulldogs called Watchdogs of the Treasury from the National Taxpayers Union as I have in my office.

But JOHN has a record we should all be envious of—in 1992, he was one of only six out of 435 House members named a ''Taxpayer Superhero'' by the Grace Commission's Citizens Against Government Waste.

In 1994, he was one of only 35 members of the House to be cited by the Grace Commission for his votes against higher spending and taxes.

In 1997, JOHN had the best score of any House member in the bipartisan Concord Coalition's analysis of spending votes, earning him a place on the Coalition's ''Honor Roll'' of members with the strongest commitment to eliminating deficits and balancing the budget. The Concord Coalition placed him on its ''Honor Roll'' again for his 1998 voting record.

JOHN is regarded as one of the leaders of the ''Green Republicans'' in the House. A supporter of the Clean Air and Clean Water Act, he has enacted landmark legislation to stop destruction of tropical rainforests, fought to prevent unregulated export of waste, and has advocated new standards for recycling and energy efficiency.

A strong supporter of the arts and humanities, JOHN was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in 1999, one of only five House members to receive this honor.

We all know JOHN loves golf almost as much as politics. JOHN will now have more time to spending working on his swing on the golf course. It is indeed an honor for me to salute Congressman JOHN PORTER.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to say good-bye to one of my dearest friends in this Chamber. I know that the entire House shares my sense of loss in the departure of one of the truly great legislators who has served this body for now over 20 years, the gentleman from Illinois, my friend JOHN EDWARD PORTER, I know that not only the 10th District of Illinois will miss him sorely.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a very junior Member of this House, I one day received a request from a young but already distinguished Republican, who wanted to meet with me. As you can imagine, I was impressed and honored to receive such a request, and I happily agreed to this meeting. I still remember vividly that day in my office with JOHN, his wife Katharine Cameron Porter, and my wife Annette. What resulted from this meeting was not only the start of our long friendship with JOHN and Katharine Porter, but also that JOHN and Katharine suggested the creation of what I consider one of the most important entities in this body—the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. JOHN and Katharine both experienced government harassment first hand, when the female members of their congressional delegation to the former Soviet Union were strip searched.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN and I have proudly co-chaired the Congressional Human Rights Caucus since its inception in 1983, and have seen it grow into easily the most active working group on any issue on the Hill with currently over 257 Members from both sides of the aisle. No one can ever measure how many countless people JOHN PORTER has helped, how many people he has given hope, how many times he has spoken out in the defense of human rights, how often he has fought human rights violations wherever they occurred. The Caucus Mandate states, that the purpose of our organization is to ''focus bipartisan attention on the most fundamental American values: the sanctity of the individual and the inalienable rights on which the Founders created our country,'' In doing that, and in continuing to do that, JOHN PORTER is a true American hero.

I am grateful that JOHN PORTER invited me to serve with him as co-chairman of the

Human Rights Caucus. Annette and I are proud and honored to be his friends, and I know that he and I will continue to work on human rights issues. Farewell and Godspeed, and good luck in all your future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Congressional Human Rights Caucus formerly said good-bye to our outstanding Co-Chairman in a moving reception. Let there be no mistake, JOHN PORTER is still needed, and I know that he will always be closely involved with the human rights community in whatever capacity. For those Members of the Caucus who unfortunately could not attend our farewell to JOHN, let me just say that it was one of the most moving events the Caucus has held. Leaders of the human rights community representing organizations from around the world came to pay tribute to his outstanding leadership. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD two of the most moving tributes.

The first one is by our outstanding Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Harold Hongju Koh, and the second by Gerald LeMelle, Deputy Executive Director for Amnesty International USA.

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY HAROLD HONGJU KOH

I am honored to join Members of Congress in this special tribute to the remarkable Rep. John Porter. A friend and ally to human rights activists and survivors, John has used his extraordinary talents and his time in Congress for decades to bring human rights issues and concerns to their rightful place on the national agenda. The work of John and the brilliant Tom Lantos in forming the Congressional Human Rights Caucus captures everything we seek in an American human rights policy: bipartisan, principled, global, executed by a genuine partnership between the executive and legislative branches, and deeply committed not just to addressing broad policy questions, but to improving the plight of individual people.

Those of us in the Department of State, in particular at the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, are blessed because our work receives such strong bipartisan support on Capitol Hill. There are many Members, on both sides of the aisle, who care deeply and passionately about human rights and fundamental freedoms. But passion needs a leader. And John, along with Tom Lantos, has been more than their leader—he has been their inspiration. Let me also take this occasion to pay tribute to John's own inspiration—Katharine Porter—who by her own witness, has given so much of herself for so many years to improving human rights for so many.

To highlight John's many accomplishments would take the rest of the evening. Let me say only that Congressional leadership on human rights issues has largely been the result of John's and Tom's joint vision, activism, and hard work. John not only established himself as a leader in the struggle for human dignity, by calling upon Colleagues to join the Caucus, he has focused their combined energies on a range of human rights issues that others said were losing propositions. From East Berlin to East Timor, the positive developments of the past seventeen years demonstrated again and again just how wrong John's critics were. Together with Katherine and their partners in this endeavor, Tom and Annette Lantos, John has challenged all of us to season after season of work on behalf of human rights victims. He initiated briefings, speeches, letters, phone calls, prayer vigils, and even fasts so that cause after cause was heard. He challenged us to remain dedicated to the principle that the cause of liberty is always worth the effort.

John Porter has been the conscience of the Congress on human rights. Although he now changes venue, whatever path he now chooses, he will surely remain a powerful ally in the struggle for human rights. As the Assistant Secretary for Democracy, however, I have half a mind to move to his district and exercise my vote, repeatedly, to force him to stay in office! Congressman Porter, Katharine: Good Luck and Godspeed.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GERALD LEMELLE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA

Distinguished member of Congress, distinguished staff, dear friends and colleagues, it is my bittersweet pleasure to be here to bid farewell to our dear friend and Co-Chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, Congressman John Porter.

Chairman Porter has been a key leader in ensuring that the Congressional Human Rights Caucus did not just survive the abolition of caucuses, but has managed to thrive—even ''thrive'' might be an understatement! Today, the Human Rights Caucus has an almost frantic pace of briefings—Guatemala, Burma, Algeria, East Timor, Turkey—it matters not the range of countries or even issues, all these countries are covered in a week, with recognized experts or with the activists who are on the front line of these issues! But the Caucus does not cover only countries in the headlines but countries and peoples forgotten by the glare of CNN. The Caucus is here to ensure that human rights around the world remain a focal point for congressional activity—even when Congress gets caught up in other business. And for that, we salute you.

But Chairman Porter has gone beyond the Caucus in his pursuit of human rights. When Native American leaders converged on Washington earlier this year to call for the release of Leonard Peltier, they found a receptive ear in Chairman Porter who posted an important briefing in which we in Amnesty International were honored to participate. When the Turkish government has gone on a public relations offensive, or when the Administration despite its wiser counsel had decided to pursue arms transfers to that NATO ally, it is Chairman Porter who has been publicly on the side of human rights.

In 1995, at a briefing organized by the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, when Nigeria was suffering under the oppression of the late dictator Sani Abacha, Chairman Porter was one of few voices calling Abacha what he was—a dictator—and one of the lone voices blasting the Administration's policy.

And of course we cannot talk about the Chairman without talking about Kathryn Porter, a human rights activist in her own right. While her work on behalf of the Kurdish people and Afghani women is widely recognized and celebrated, we also remember the singular courage she exhibited when she spent time with Jennifer Harbury in Guatemala, on a lonely stretch of rural road outside an Army base.

While a politician might boast of the state dinners he or she has attended, Chairman Porter attended a ''stateless'' dinner on behalf of Chinese dissidents. While politics is well tuned to the powerful and the popular, Chairman Porter has stood by the underdogs, supporting the rights of religious and ethnic minorities throughout the world, including the Armenians and the Ba'hais. While many in Congress have shunned the challenge of confronting the violations by powerful allies such as Saudi Arabia, Chairman Porter seems to embrace such opportunities. While governments and their representatives tend to have relationships with other governments, we can safely say that Chairman Porter has built relationships with peoples.

We in Amnesty International USA with its 30,000 members in the United States and more than a million members worldwide can say that we are greatful people for your leadership and your support. I should also add, if I want my staff not to kill me, that your staff has also been fabulous, including Rachel Helfand, Karen Davis, Heidi Gasch, Katharine Fisher, Kelly Currie, and Jeanette Windon. We have grown to respect and rely on them as well.

Whether from your keynote speech at the Latin American Ambassadors Colloquium in 1991 or your steadfast support in issue after issue, you have always been there for us and for human rights, with integrity and principle that is second to none. Dear Chairman Porter, it's not just staffers who voted you number one Congressperson who will be missed most—we also read Washingtonian magazine—we too will miss you deeply.

Thank you sir for your wonderful example and contribution to human rights. You are a real hero to us.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to rise to honor the retirement of a colleague who has been an outstanding leader of this body.

I have had the opportunity to work with JOHN PORTER since he first came to this Chamber back in 1980. He brought with him honor to this job, and has shown great commitment and dedication to his country.

Prior to his election to Congress, JOHN practiced law and served in the Illinois House of Representatives for eight years. He brought with him a great deal of legislative experience and has shown a rich understanding of the legislative process. The leadership skills that have allowed him to accomplish so much are inspiring.

JOHN has accomplished a great deal while serving as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. He has diligently worked to allocate funds for family planning and for Medicaid.

JOHN has worked to revitalize involvement in the political process, trying to draw voters in, to take part in the legislative process. He has been an advocate for education. He has also worked tirelessly to increase spending on medical research, recognizing the need to find cures for many life-threatening diseases.

As Chairman of the International Relations Committee, I am pleased to note that JOHN PORTER co-founded the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, and has in that capacity worked to raise awareness of the injustices that have been occurring in other countries.

JOHN PORTER has been a reformer who has crossed party lines on many issues. He has earned the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His courage, and his dedication to his constituents is to be commended.

To JOHN's wife, Kathryn, and their five children, we wish you all the best. I am sure you are as proud as we are of the many great years of service JOHN has given to his office, to his constituents, and to our nation.

JOHN PORTER has been a great asset to this body, having fought hard for the people of his Congressional district and our nation. We all wish JOHN good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, Chairman JOHN PORTER. JOHN PORTER is retiring from the U.S. House of Representatives after eleven impressive terms. Although I am sure that JOHN will continue to be

active on issues such as health care, the environment, and human rights, his presence will be missed by the House of Representatives as a whole and by the Illinois delegation in particular.

As Chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, JOHN has been a tireless advocate of the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health. In fact, JOHN has worked to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health, with a goal of doubling spending from fiscal year 1997 to 2002. Because of JOHN's efforts, Congress is on track to meet this important goal. By increasing funding for biomedical research into effective treatments and possible cures for diabetes, cancer, AIDS, and other life-threatening diseases, JOHN is helping to save lives. He is also helping to save our nation billions of dollars in health care costs. This is a proud legacy to leave behind.

In addition, JOHN can be proud of his active involvement in protecting and promoting human rights around the world. JOHN is the founder and co-chairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, a voluntary bipartisan association of Members of Congress working to identify, monitor and end human rights violations worldwide. I am proud to be one of the 250 Members of Congress who participate in this important caucus. JOHN cares deeply about the plight of the persecuted around the world and has regularly engaged in fasts and prayer vigils to bring needed national attention to the issue of human rights. Although JOHN's leadership and active participation will be sorely missed, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus will continue JOHN's crusade to protect and promote human rights around the globe. Again, this a proud legacy to leave behind.

Finally, although JOHN and I do not always agree on all issues, I have always admired his conservative stance on fiscal issues. I also consider myself a fiscal conservative and admire JOHN's unwavering commitment to eliminating deficits and balancing the federal budget. He should be proud that he is leaving Congress in an era of balanced budgets and record budget surpluses.

Again, although I am sure that JOHN will remain active on issues like health care, the environment, and human rights, he will be missed here in the House of Representatives. He has served his constituents and the nation well. I wish JOHN the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PASCRELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of wife's surgery.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOLLOHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 34. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

H.R. 208. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contributions of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 707. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1654. An act to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1715. An act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950.

H.R. 2389. An act to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of pubic schools, roads, and other purposes.

H.R. 2842. An act to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2879. An act to provide for the placement at the Lincoln Memorial of a plague commemorating the speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., known as the ''I Have a Dream'' speech.

H.R. 2883. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the provisions governing acquisition of citizenship by children born outside of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2984. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey to the Loup Basin Reclamation District, the Sargant River Irrigation District, and the Farwell Irrigation District, Nebraska, property comprising the assets of the Middle Loup Division of the Missouri River Basin Project, Nebraska.

H.R. 3235. An act to improve academic and social outcomes for youth and reduce both juvenile crime and the risk that youth will become victims of crime by providing productive activities conducted by law enforcement personnel during nonschool hours.

H.R. 3236. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Utah, to use Weber Basin Project facilities for the impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes.

H.R. 3292. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.

H.R. 3468. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah.

H.R. 3577. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho.

H.R. 3767. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make improvements to, and permanently authorize, the visa waiver pilot program under section 217 of such Act.

H.R. 3986. An act to provide for a study of the engineering feasibility of a water exchange in lieu of electrification of the Chandler Pumping Plant at Prosser Diversion Dam, Washington.

H.R. 3995. An act to establish procedures governing the responsibilities of court-appointed receivers who administer departments, offices, and agencies of the District of Columbia government.

H.R. 4002. An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to revise and improve provisions relating to famine prevention and freedom from hunger.

H.R. 4259. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4386. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

H.R. 4389. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution facilities to the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

H.R. 4681. An act to provide for the adjustment of status of certain Syrian nationals.

H.R. 4828. An act to designate the Steens Mountain Wilderness Area and the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area in Harney County, Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5107. An act to make certain corrections in copyright law.

H.R. 5417. An act to rename the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act as the ''McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act''.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 624. An act to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 1809. An act to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2686. An act to amend chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, to modify rates relating to reduced rate mail matter, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10611. A letter from the Multimedia Systems Manager, Communications and Information, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visual Information Documentation Program (RIN: 0701–AA–63) received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

10612. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a Technology Control Assessment Plan pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

10613. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulations Requiring Manufacturers to Assess the Safety and Effectiveness of New Drugs and Biological Products in Pediatric Patients; Technical Amendment [Docket No. 97N–0165] received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10614. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Determination of Critical Habitat for the San Diego Fairy Shrimp (Branchinecta sandiegoensis) (RIN: 1018–AF97) received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10615. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department on the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to Gas Valuation Regulations for Indian Leases (RIN: 1010–AC72) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10616. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Dealer and Vessel Reporting Requirements [Docket No. 991104295–0259–02; I.D. 100599D] (RIN: 0648–AM74) received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10617. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surf Clam and Ocean Quahog Fishery; Suspension of Minimum Surf Clam Size for 2001 [I.D. 100400C) received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10618. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Winter II Period [Docket No. 000119014–0137–02; I.D. 100400D] received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10619. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Special Management Zones [Docket No. 000616183–0278–02; I.D. 053000E] (RIN: 0648–AN35) received October 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10620. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transporation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Traffic Separation Scheme: In the Approaches to Los Angeles—Long Beach, California [USCG–2000–7695] (RIN: 2115–AF99) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10621. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transporation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Strategic Booming Exercise in the Cape May Harbor, Cape May, NJ [CGD05–00–047] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10622. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for FAA Services for Certain Flights; Extension of Comment Period [Docket No. FAA–00–7018; Admt. No. 187–11] (RIN: 2120–AG17) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10623. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Service Difficulty Reports [Docket No. 28293; Amendment No. 135–78] (RIN: 2120–AF71) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10624. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Air Tour Limitations in the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area; Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Flight Rules Area and Flight Free Zones—received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10625. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30205; Amdt. No. 2013] received October, 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10626. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30204; Amdt. No. 2012] received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10627. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000–NE–38–AD; Amendment 39–11913; AD 2000–20–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10628. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; CSX Railroad Bridge (South Fork of the New River), Ft. Lauderdale, Broward County, FL [CGD07–00–092] received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10629. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Florida East Coast Railway Bridge, across the Okeechobee Waterway, mile 7.4, at Stuart, Martin County, FL [CGD07–00–097] October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10630. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technical Amendments; Organizational Changes; Miscellaneous Editorial Changes and Conforming Amendments [USCG–2000–7790] received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10631. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Allowing Alternatives to Incandescent Light in Private Aids to Navigation [USCG 2000–7466] (RIN: 2115–AF98) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10632. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Milford Haven, Virginia [CGD05–00–042] received October 16, 20000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10633. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone and Anchorage Regulations; Delaware Bay and River [CGD05–00–048] (RIN: 2115–AA98) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10634. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Thunderbird Air Show, Long Island Sound, Governor Alfred E. SMITH/Sunken Meadow State Park, Kings Park, NY [CGD01–00–224] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10635. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit—received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10636. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Preparer Due Diligence Requirements for Determining Earned Income Credit Eligibility (RIN: 1545–AW74) received October 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 3250. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of minority individuals; with an amendment (Rept. 106–986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1552. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the Marine Research and related environmental research and development program activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–987 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALSH: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4635. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–988). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 637. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 638. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 639. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 2796) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–991). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 640. Resolution providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 106–992). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1552. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than October 20, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 5482. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PACKARD:

H.R. 5483. A bill making appropriations energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 5484. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits tax on electricity sold in Orange and San Diego Counties in California during the summer of 2000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 5485. A bill to temporarily exempt from restrictions on carriage in coastwise trade the transport of petroleum and petroleum products between ports designated by the President; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. DUNN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 5486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include wireless telecommunications equipment in the definition of qualified technological equipment for purposes of determining the depreciation treatment of such equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EHRLICH:

H.R. 5487. A bill to establish the W. John Child Memorial Foreign Language Award to recognize foreign language proficiency by members of the Foreign Service who are employees of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5488. A bill to strengthen the National Defense Features program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5489. A bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the families of deceased law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BOYD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5490. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an Office of Air Force Research and enhance research functions of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5491. A bill to suspend until June 30, 2003, the duty on certain R-core transformers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 5492. A bill to require nationals of the United States that employ individuals in a foreign country to provide full transparency and disclosure in all their operations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 5493. A bill to improve the ability of local communities to participate in Federal land management planning conducted by the Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior and to respond to the local impacts of the heavy public use of the Federal lands administered by these agencies; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RILEY (for himself and Mr. EVERETT):

H.R. 5494. A bill to ensure that certain property which was taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Poarch Band of Creek Indians of Alabama to protect such land from development shall not be used for gaming; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 5495. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SOUDER:

H.R. 5496. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide for maintenace and repair of buildings and properties located on lands in the National Wildlife Refuge System by lessees of such facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for certain audio or video postproduction equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EWING:

H.R. 5498. A bill to permit landowners to assert otherwise available State law defenses against real property claims by Indian tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 114. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COLLINS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 641. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Federal Prison Industries, Inc., should immediately cease taking excess Federal computer equipment and selling such computer equipment and other excess Federal property in the commercial market; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 642. A resolution to honor Drs. Eric R. Kandel and Paul Greengard for being awarded the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine for 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 995: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1396: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1515: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1890: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2635: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2720: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3003: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 3052: Mr. COX.

H.R. 3202: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 3218: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 3463: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 3590: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3766: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 4042: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 4127: Mr. COX.

H.R. 4272: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 4273: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 4277: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 4412: Ms. CARSON and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 4467: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4471: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 4543: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DEMINT, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 4547: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4698: Mr. COX.

H.R. 4723: Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 4728: Mr. EVANS and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 4740: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WU, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 4773: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 4825: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 4887: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. CARSON and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4971: Mr. WOLF, Mr. WEXLER, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 4976: Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 5079: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 5080: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 5090: Mr. COX.

H.R. 5091: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 5095: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5137: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5247: Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 5265: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 5344: Mr. COX.

H.R. 5349: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 5361: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 5401: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5423: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 5475: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 5479: Mr. STARK and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H. Con. Res. 337: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H. Con. Res. 421: Mr. TANNER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. FORD.

H. Con. Res. 426: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. KASICH.

H. Res. 146: Ms. BALDWIN.

H. Res. 203: Mr. PICKERING.

H. Res. 631: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 635: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. EWING, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BACA, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DICKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

S. 2796

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Development Act of 2000''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorization.
Sec. 102. Small projects for flood damage reduction.
Sec. 103. Small project for bank stabilization.
Sec. 104. Small projects for navigation.
Sec. 105. Small project for improvement of the quality of the environment.
Sec. 106. Small projects for aquatic ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 107. Small project for shoreline protection.
Sec. 108. Small project for snagging and sediment removal.
Sec. 109. Petaluma River, Petaluma, California.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Cost sharing of certain flood damage reduction projects.
Sec. 202. Harbor cost sharing.
Sec. 203. Nonprofit entities.
Sec. 204. Rehabilitation of Federal flood control levees.
Sec. 205. Flood mitigation and riverine restoration program.
Sec. 206. Tribal partnership program.
Sec. 207. Native American reburial and transfer authority.
Sec. 208. Ability to pay.
Sec. 209. Interagency and international support authority.
Sec. 210. Property protection program.
Sec. 211. Engineering consulting services.
Sec. 212. Beach recreation.
Sec. 213. Performance of specialized or technical services.
Sec. 214. Design-build contracting.
Sec. 215. Independent review pilot program.
Sec. 216. Enhanced public participation.
Sec. 217. Monitoring.
Sec. 218. Reconnaissance studies.
Sec. 219. Fish and wildlife mitigation.
Sec. 220. Wetlands mitigation.
Sec. 221. Credit toward non-Federal share of navigation projects.
Sec. 222. Maximum program expenditures for small flood control projects.
Sec. 223. Feasibility studies and planning, engineering, and design.
Sec. 224. Administrative costs of land conveyances.
Sec. 225. Dam safety.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Nogales Wash and Tributaries, Nogales, Arizona.
Sec. 302. John Paul Hammerschmidt Visitor Center, Fort Smith, Arkansas.
Sec. 303. Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas.
Sec. 304. Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous, Arkansas.
Sec. 305. Cache Creek basin, California.
Sec. 306. Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California.
Sec. 307. Norco Bluffs, Riverside County, California.
Sec. 308. Sacramento deep water ship channel, California.
Sec. 309. Sacramento River, Glenn-Colusa, California.
Sec. 310. Upper Guadalupe River, California.
Sec. 311. Brevard County, Florida.
Sec. 312. Fernandina Harbor, Florida.
Sec. 313. Tampa Harbor, Florida.
Sec. 314. East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois.
Sec. 315. Kaskaskia River, Kaskaskia, Illinois.
Sec. 316. Waukegan Harbor, Illinois.
Sec. 317. Cumberland, Kentucky.
Sec. 318. Lock and Dam 10, Kentucky River, Kentucky.
Sec. 319. Saint Joseph River, South Bend, Indiana.
Sec. 320. Mayfield Creek and tributaries, Kentucky.
Sec. 321. Amite River and tributaries, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.
Sec. 322. Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System, Louisiana.
Sec. 323. Atchafalaya River, Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black Louisiana.
Sec. 324. Red River Waterway, Louisiana.
Sec. 325. Thomaston Harbor, Georges River, Maine.
Sec. 326. Breckenridge, Minnesota.
Sec. 327. Duluth Harbor, Minnesota.
Sec. 328. Little Falls, Minnesota.
Sec. 329. Poplar Island, Maryland.

Sec. 330. Green Brook Sub-Basin, Raritan River basin, New Jersey.
Sec. 331. New York Harbor and adjacent channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey.
Sec. 332. Passaic River basin flood management, New Jersey.
Sec. 333. Times Beach nature preserve, Buffalo, New York.
Sec. 334. Garrison Dam, North Dakota.
Sec. 335. Duck Creek, Ohio.
Sec. 336. Astoria, Columbia River, Oregon.
Sec. 337. Nonconnah Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi.
Sec. 338. Bowie County levee, Texas.
Sec. 339. San Antonio Channel, San Antonio, Texas.
Sec. 340. Buchanan and Dickenson Counties, Virginia.
Sec. 341. Buchanan, Dickenson, and Russell Counties, Virginia.
Sec. 342. Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia.
Sec. 343. Wallops Island, Virginia.
Sec. 344. Columbia River, Washington.
Sec. 345. Mount St. Helens sediment control, Washington.
Sec. 346. Renton, Washington.
Sec. 347. Greenbrier Basin, West Virginia.
Sec. 348. Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia.
Sec. 349. Water quality projects.
Sec. 350. Project reauthorizations.
Sec. 351. Continuation of project authorizations.
Sec. 352. Declaration of nonnavigability for Lake Erie, New York.
Sec. 353. Project deauthorizations.
Sec. 354. Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 355. Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

Sec. 401. Studies of completed projects.
Sec. 402. Watershed and river basin assessments.
Sec. 403. Lower Mississippi River resource assessment.
Sec. 404. Upper Mississippi River basin sediment and nutrient study.
Sec. 405. Upper Mississippi River comprehensive plan.
Sec. 406. Ohio River System.
Sec. 407. Eastern Arkansas.
Sec. 408. Russell, Arkansas.
Sec. 409. Estudillo Canal, San Leandro, California.
Sec. 410. Laguna Creek, Fremont, California.
Sec. 411. Lake Merritt, Oakland, California.
Sec. 412. Lancaster, California.
Sec. 413. Napa County, California.
Sec. 414. Oceanside, California.
Sec. 415. Suisun Marsh, California.
Sec. 416. Lake Allatoona Watershed, Georgia.
Sec. 417. Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 418. Chicago sanitary and ship canal system, Chicago, Illinois.
Sec. 419. Long Lake, Indiana.
Sec. 420. Brush and Rock Creeks, Mission Hills and Fairway, Kansas.
Sec. 421. Coastal areas of Louisiana.
Sec. 422. Iberia Port, Louisiana.
Sec. 423. Lake Pontchartrain seawall, Louisiana.
Sec. 424. Lower Atchafalaya basin, Louisiana.
Sec. 425. St. John the Baptist Parish, Louisiana.
Sec. 426. Las Vegas Valley, Nevada.
Sec. 427. Southwest Valley, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Sec. 428. Buffalo Harbor, Buffalo, New York.
Sec. 429. Hudson River, Manhattan, New York.
Sec. 430. Jamesville Reservoir, Onondaga County, New York.
Sec. 431. Steubenviille, Ohio.
Sec. 432. Grand Lake, Oklahoma.
Sec. 433. Columbia Slough, Oregon.
Sec. 434. Reedy River, Greenville, South Carolina.
Sec. 435. Germantown, Tennessee.
Sec. 436. Houston ship channel, Galveston, Texas.
Sec. 437. Park City, Utah.
Sec. 438. Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Sec. 439. Upper Des Plaines River and tributaries, Illinois and Wisconsin.
Sec. 440. Delaware River watershed.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Bridgeport, Alabama.
Sec. 502. Duck River, Cullman, Alabama.
Sec. 503. Seward, Alaska.
Sec. 504. Augusta and Devalls Bluff, Arkansas.
Sec. 505. Beaver Lake, Arkansas.
Sec. 506. McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, Arkansas and Oklahoma.
Sec. 507. Calfed Bay Delta program assistance, California.
Sec. 508. Clear Lake basin, California.
Sec. 509. Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California.
Sec. 510. Huntington Beach, California.
Sec. 511. Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California.
Sec. 512. Penn Mine, Calaveras County, California.
Sec. 513. Port of San Francisco, California.
Sec. 514. San Gabriel basin, California.
Sec. 515. Stockton, California.
Sec. 516. Port Everglades, Florida.
Sec. 517. Florida Keys water quality improvements.
Sec. 518. Ballard's Island, La Salle County, Illinois.
Sec. 519. Lake Michigan Diversion, Illinois.
Sec. 520. Koontz Lake, Indiana.
Sec. 521. Campbellsville Lake, Kentucky.
Sec. 522. West View Shores, Cecil County, Maryland.
Sec. 523. Conservation of fish and wildlife, Chesapeake Bay, Maryland and Virginia.
Sec. 524. Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts.
Sec. 525. Soo Locks, Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.
Sec. 526. Duluth, Minnesota, alternative technology project.
Sec. 527. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Sec. 528. St. Louis County, Minnesota.
Sec. 529. Wild Rice River, Minnesota.
Sec. 530. Coastal Mississippi wetlands restoration projects.
Sec. 531. Missouri River Valley improvements.
Sec. 532. New Madrid County, Missouri.
Sec. 533. Pemiscot County, Missouri.
Sec. 534. Las Vegas, Nevada.
Sec. 535. Newark, New Jersey.
Sec. 536. Urbanized peak flood management research, New Jersey.
Sec. 537. Black Rock Canal, Buffalo, New York.
Sec. 538. Hamburg, New York.
Sec. 539. Nepperhan River, Yonkers, New York.
Sec. 540. Rochester, New York.
Sec. 541. Upper Mohawk River basin, New York.
Sec. 542. Eastern North Carolina flood protection.
Sec. 543. Cuyahoga River, Ohio.
Sec. 544. Crowder Point, Crowder, Oklahoma.
Sec. 545. Oklahoma-tribal commission.
Sec. 546. Columbia River, Oregon and Washington.
Sec. 547. John Day Pool, Oregon and Washington.
Sec. 548. Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay estuary program, Oregon and Washington.
Sec. 549. Skinner Butte Park, Eugene, Oregon.
Sec. 550. Willamette River basin, Oregon.
Sec. 551. Lackawanna River, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 552. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 553. Access improvements, Raystown Lake, Pennsylvania.
Sec. 554. Upper Susquehanna River basin, Pennsylvania and New York.
Sec. 555. Chickamauga Lock, Chattanooga, Tennessee.
Sec. 556. Joe Pool Lake, Texas.
Sec. 557. Benson Beach, Fort Canby State Park, Washington.
Sec. 558. Puget Sound and adjacent waters restoration, Washington.
Sec. 559. Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, Willapa Bay, Washington.
Sec. 560. Wynoochee Lake, Wynoochee River, Washington.
Sec. 561. Snohomish River, Washington.
Sec. 562. Bluestone, West Virginia.
Sec. 563. Lesage/Greenbottom Swamp, West Virginia.
Sec. 564. Tug Fork River, West Virginia.
Sec. 565. Virginia Point Riverfront Park, West Virginia.
Sec. 566. Southern West Virginia.
Sec. 567. Fox River system, Wisconsin.
Sec. 568. Surfside/Sunset and Newport Beach, California.
Sec. 569. Illinois River basin restoration.
Sec. 570. Great Lakes.
Sec. 571. Great Lakes remedial action plans and sediment remediation.
Sec. 572. Great Lakes dredging levels adjustment.
Sec. 573. Dredged material recyling.
Sec. 574. Watershed management, restoration, and development.
Sec. 575. Maintenance of navigation channels.
Sec. 576. Support of Army civil works program.
Sec. 577. National recreation reservation service.
Sec. 578. Hydrographic survey.
Sec. 579. Lakes program.
Sec. 580. Perchlorate.
Sec. 581. Abandoned and inactive noncoal mine restoration.
Sec. 582. Release of use restriction.
Sec. 583. Comprehensive environmental resources protection.
Sec. 584. Modification of authorizations for environmental projects.
Sec. 585. Land transfers.
Sec. 586. Bruce F. Vento Unit of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, Minnesota.
Sec. 587. Waurika Lake, Oklahoma.
Sec. 588. Columbia River Treaty fishing access.
Sec. 589. Devils Lake, North Dakota.

TITLE VI—COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION

Sec. 601. Comprehensive Everglades restoration plan.
Sec. 602. Sense of Congress concerning Homestead Air Force Base.

TITLE VIII—MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION

Sec. 701. Definitions.
Sec. 702. Missouri River Trust.
Sec. 703. Missouri River Task Force.
Sec. 704. Administration.
Sec. 705. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Army.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

SEC. 101. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.

(a) PROJECTS WITH CHIEF'S REPORTS.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the

plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the respective reports designated in this subsection:

(1) BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 26, 2000, at a total cost of $51,203,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $33,282,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $17,921,000.

(2) PORT OF NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Port of New York and New Jersey, New York and New Jersey: Report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 2, 2000, at a total cost of $1,781,235,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $738,631,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,042,604,000.

(B) CREDIT.—The Secretary may provide the non-Federal interests credit toward cash contributions required—

(i) before, during, and after construction for planning, engineering and design, and construction management work that is performed by the non-Federal interests and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project; and

(ii) during and after construction for the costs of the construction that the non-Federal interests carry out on behalf of the Secretary and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project.

(b) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO FINAL REPORT.—The following projects for water resources development and conservation and other purposes are authorized to be carried out by the Secretary substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject the conditions, recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers if a favorable report of the Chief is completed not later than December 31, 2000:

(1) FALSE PASS HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, False Pass Harbor, Alaska, at a total cost of $15,164,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $8,238,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $6,926,000.

(2) UNALASKA HARBOR, ALASKA.—The project for navigation, Unalska Harbor, Alaska, at a total cost of $20,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,000,000.

(3) RIO DE FLAG, FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Rio de Flag, Flagstaff, Arizona, at a total cost of $24,072,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $15,576,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,496,000.

(4) TRES RIOS, ARIZONA.—The project ecosystem restoration, Tres Rios, Arizona, at a total cost of $99,320,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $62,755,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $36,565,000.

(5) LOS ANGELES HARBOR, CALIFORNIA.—The project for navigation, Los Angeles Harbor, California, at a total cost of $153,313,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $43,735,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $109,578,000.

(6) MURRIETTA CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration, Murrietta Creek, California, described as alternative 6, based on the District Engineer's Murrietta Creek feasibility report and environmental impact statement dated October 2000, at a total cost of $89,850,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $57,735,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $32,115,000. The locally preferred plan described as alternative 6 shall be treated as a final favorable report of the Chief Engineer's for purposes of this subsection.

(7) SANTA BARBARA STREAMS, LOWER MISSION CREEK, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Santa Barbara streams, Lower Mission Creek, California, at a total cost of $18,300,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,200,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,100,000.

(8) UPPER NEWPORT BAY, CALIFORNIA.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Upper Newport Bay, California, at a total cost of $32,475,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $21,109,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,366,000.

(9) WHITEWATER RIVER BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Whitewater River basin, California, at a total cost of $27,570,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $17,920,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,650,000.

(10) DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Delaware Coast from Cape Henlopen to Fenwick Island, at a total cost of $5,633,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,661,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,972,000.

(11) PORT SUTTON, FLORIDA.—The project for navigation, Port Sutton, Florida, at a total cost of $6,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $4,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $2,000,000.

(12) BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HAWAII.—The project for navigation, Barbers Point Harbor, Hawaii, at a total cost of $30,003,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $18,524,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,479,000.

(13) JOHN MYERS LOCK AND DAM, INDIANA AND KENTUCKY.—The project for navigation, John Myers Lock and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky, at a total cost of $182,000,000. The costs of construction of the project shall be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(14) GREENUP LOCK AND DAM, KENTUCKY AND OHIO.—The project for navigation, Greenup Lock and Dam, Kentucky and Ohio, at a total cost of $175,000,000. The costs of construction of the project shall be paid ½ from amounts appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and ½ from amounts appropriated from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund.

(15) OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM, KENTUCKY, ILLINOIS, INDIANA, OHIO, PENNSYLVANIA, AND WEST VIRGINIA.—Projects for ecosystem restoration, Ohio River Mainstem, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, at a total cost of $307,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $200,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $107,700,000.

(16) MONARCH-CHESTERFIELD, MISSOURI.—The project for flood damage reduction, Monarch-Chesterfield, Missouri, at a total cost of $67,700,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $44,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $23,700,000.

(17) ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Antelope Creek, Lincoln, Nebraska, at a total cost of $49,788,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $24,894,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $24,894,000.

(18) SAND CREEK WATERSHED, WAHOO, NEBRASKA.—The project for ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction, Sand Creek watershed, Wahoo, Nebraska, at a total cost of $29,212,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $17,586,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,626,000.

(19) WESTERN SARPY AND CLEAR CREEK, NEBRASKA.—The project for flood damage reduction, Western Sarpy and Clear Creek, Nebraska, at a total cost of $20,600,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $13,390,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $7,210,000.

(20) RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, CLIFFWOOD BEACH, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Cliffwood Beach, New Jersey, at a total cost of $5,219,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,392,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $1,827,000.

(21) RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, PORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Port Monmouth, New Jersey, at a total cost of $32,064,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $20,842,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,222,000.

(22) DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NORTH CAROLINA.—The project for hurricane and storm damage reduction, Dare County beaches, North Carolina, at a total cost of $69,518,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $49,846,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $19,672,000.

(23) WOLF RIVER, TENNESSEE.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Wolf River, Tennessee, at a total cost of $10,933,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $7,106,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,827,000.

(24) DUWAMISH/GREEN, WASHINGTON.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Duwamish/Green, Washington, at a total cost of $115,879,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $75,322,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $40,557,000.

(25) STILLAGUMAISH RIVER BASIN, WASHINGTON.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Stillagumaish River basin, Washington, at a total cost of $24,223,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $16,097,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $8,126,000.

(26) JACKSON HOLE, WYOMING.—The project for ecosystem restoration, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, at a total cost of $52,242,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $33,957,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $18,285,000.

SEC. 102. SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s):

(1) BUFFALO ISLAND, ARKANSAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Buffalo Island, Arkansas.

(2) ANAVERDE CREEK, PALMDALE, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Anaverde Creek, Palmdale, California.

(3) CASTAIC CREEK, OLD ROAD BRIDGE, SANTA CLARITA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Castaic Creek, Old Road bridge, Santa Clarita, California.

(4) SANTA CLARA RIVER, OLD ROAD BRIDGE, SANTA CLARITA, CALIFORNIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Santa Clara River, Old Road bridge, Santa Clarita, California.

(5) COLUMBIA LEVEE, COLUMBIA, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Columbia Levee, Columbia, Illinois.

(6) EAST-WEST CREEK, RIVERTON, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, East-West Creek, Riverton, Illinois.

(7) PRAIRIE DU PONT, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Prairie Du Pont, Illinois.

(8) MONROE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Monroe County, Illinois.

(9) WILLOW CREEK, MEREDOSIA, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Willow Creek, Meredosia, Illinois.

(10) DYKES BRANCH CHANNEL, LEAWOOD, KANSAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dykes Branch channel improvements, Leawood, Kansas.

(11) DYKES BRANCH TRIBUTARIES, LEAWOOD, KANSAS.—Project for flood damage reduction, Dykes Branch tributary improvements, Leawood, Kansas.

(12) KENTUCKY RIVER, FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY.—Project for flood damage reduction, Kentucky River, Frankfort, Kentucky.

(13) LAKES MAUREPAS AND PONTCHARTRAIN CANALS, ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain Canals, St. John the Baptist Parish, Louisiana.

(14) PENNSVILLE TOWNSHIP, SALEM COUNTY, NEW JERSEY.—The project for flood damage reduction, Pennsville Township, Salem County, New Jersey.

(15) HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Hempstead, New York.

(16) HIGHLAND BROOK, HIGHLAND FALLS, NEW YORK.—Project for flood damage reduction, Highland Brook, Highland Falls, New York.

(17) LAFAYETTE TOWNSHIP, OHIO.—Project for flood damage reduction, Lafayette Township, Ohio.

(18) WEST LAFAYETTE, OHIO.—Project for flood damage reduction, West LaFayette, Ohio.

(19) BEAR CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, MEDFORD, OREGON.—Project for flood damage reduction, Bear Creek and tributaries, Medford, Oregon.

(20) DELAWARE CANAL AND BROCK CREEK, YARDLEY BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for flood damage reduction, Delaware Canal and Brock Creek, Yardley Borough, Pennsylvania.

(21) FIRST CREEK, FOUNTAIN CITY, KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE.—Project for flood damage reduction, First Creek, Fountain City, Knoxville, Tennessee.

(22) MISSISSIPPI RIVER, RIDGELY, TENNESSEE.—Project for flood damage reduction, Mississippi River, Ridgely, Tennessee.

(b) MAGPIE CREEK, SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—In formulating the project for Magpie Creek, California, authorized by section 102(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 281) to be carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), the Secretary shall consider benefits from the full utilization of existing improvements at McClellan Air Force Base that would result from the project after conversion of the base to civilian use.

SEC. 103. SMALL PROJECTS FOR BANK STABILIZATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r):

(1) MAUMEE RIVER, FORT WAYNE, INDIANA.—Project for bank stabilization, Maumee River, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

(2) BAYOU SORRELL, IBERVILLE PARISH, LOUISIANA.—Project for bank stabilization, Bayou Sorrell, Iberville Parish, Louisiana.

SEC. 104. SMALL PROJECTS FOR NAVIGATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(1) WHITTIER, ALASKA.—Project for navigation, Whittier, Alaska.

(2) CAPE CORAL, FLORIDA.—Project for navigation, Cape Coral, Florida.

(3) EAST TWO LAKES, TOWER, MINNESOTA.—Project for navigation, East Two Lakes, Tower, Minnesota.

(4) ERIE BASIN MARINA, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.—Project for navigation, Erie Basin marina, Buffalo, New York.

(5) LAKE MICHIGAN, LAKESHORE STATE PARK, MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.—Project for navigation, Lake Michigan, Lakeshore State Park, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

(6) SAXON HARBOR, FRANCIS, WISCONSIN.—Project for navigation, Saxon Harbor, Francis, Wisconsin.

SEC. 105. SMALL PROJECT FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for improvement of the quality of the environment, Nahant Marsh, Davenport, Iowa, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 1135(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a(a)).

SEC. 106. SMALL PROJECTS FOR AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for each of the following projects and, if the Secretary determines that a project is appropriate, may carry out the project under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330):

(1) ARKANSAS RIVER, PUEBLO, COLORADO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Arkansas River, Pueblo, Colorado.

(2) HAYDEN DIVERSION PROJECT, YAMPA RIVER, COLORADO.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Hayden Diversion Project, Yampa River, Colorado.

(3) LITTLE ECONLOCKHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Little Econlockhatchee River basin, Florida.

(4) LOXAHATCHEE SLOUGH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Loxahatchee Slough, Palm Beach County, Florida.

(5) STEVENSON CREEK ESTUARY, FLORIDA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Stevenson Creek estuary, Florida.

(6) CHOUTEAU ISLAND, MADISON COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Chouteau Island, Madison County, Illinois.

(7) SAGINAW BAY, BAY CITY, MICHIGAN.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Saginaw Bay, Bay City, Michigan.

(8) RAINWATER BASIN, NEBRASKA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Rainwater Basin, Nebraska.

(9) CAZENOVIA LAKE, MADISON COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Cazenovia Lake, Madison County, New York, including efforts to address aquatic invasive plant species.

(10) CHENANGO LAKE, CHENANGO COUNTY, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Chenango Lake, Chenango County, New York, including efforts to address aquatic invasive plant species.

(11) EAGLE LAKE, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Eagle Lake, New York.

(12) OSSINING, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Ossining, New York.

(13) SARATOGA LAKE, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Saratoga Lake, New York.

(14) SCHROON LAKE, NEW YORK.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Schroon Lake, New York.

(15) MIDDLE CUYAHOGA RIVER.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Middle Cuyahoga River, Kent, Ohio.

(16) CENTRAL AMAZON CREEK, EUGENE, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Central Amazon Creek, Eugene, Oregon.

(17) EUGENE MILLRACE, EUGENE, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Eugene Millrace, Eugene, Oregon.

(18) LONE PINE AND LAZY CREEKS, MEDFORD, OREGON.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Lone Pine and Lazy Creeks, Medford, Oregon.

(19) TULLYTOWN BOROUGH, PENNSYLVANIA.—Project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Tullytown Borough, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 107. SMALL PROJECT FOR SHORELINE PROTECTION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for shoreline protection, Hudson River, Dutchess County, New York, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, may carry out the project under section 3 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property'', approved August 13, 1946 (33 U.S.C. 426g; 60 Stat. 1056).

SEC. 108. SMALL PROJECT FOR SNAGGING AND SEDIMENT REMOVAL.

The Secretary shall conduct a study for a project for clearing, snagging, and sediment removal, Sangamon River and tributaries, Riverton, Illinois. If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project under section 2 of the Flood Control Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 177).

SEC. 109. PETALUMA RIVER, PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out the Petaluma River project, at the city of Petaluma, Sonoma County, California, to provide a 100-year level of flood protection to the city in accordance with the detailed project report of the San Francisco District Engineer, dated March 1995, at a total cost of $32,227,000.

(b) COST SHARING.—Cost sharing for the project shall be determined in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(a)), as in effect on October 11, 1996.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for any project costs that the non-Federal sponsor has incurred in excess of the non-Federal share of project costs, regardless of the date such costs were incurred.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. COST SHARING OF CERTAIN FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) LEVEL OF FLOOD PROTECTION.—If the Secretary determines that it is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, to construct a flood control project for an area using an alternative that will afford a level of flood protection sufficient for the area not to qualify as an area having special flood hazards for the purposes of the national flood insurance program under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Secretary, at the request of the non-Federal interest, shall recommend the project using the alternative. The non-Federal share of the cost of the project assigned to providing the minimum amount of flood protection required for the area not to qualify as an area having special flood hazards shall be determined under subsections (a) and (b).''.

SEC. 202. HARBOR COST SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 101 and 214 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 and 2241; 100 Stat. 4082–4084 and 4108–4109) are each amended by striking ''45 feet'' each place it appears and inserting ''53 feet''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only to a project, or separable element of a project, on which a contract for physical construction has not been awarded before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. NONPROFIT ENTITIES.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING.—Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1272) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act

of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), a non-Federal sponsor for any project carried out under this section may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.''.

(b) PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.—Section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), a non-Federal sponsor for any project carried out under this section may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.''.

(c) LAKES PROGRAM.—Section 602 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148–4149) is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) NONPROFIT ENTITIES.—Notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b), a non-Federal sponsor for any project carried out under this section may include a nonprofit entity, with the consent of the affected local government.''.

SEC. 204. REHABILITATION OF FEDERAL FLOOD CONTROL LEVEES.

Section 110(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4622) is amended by striking ''1992,'' and all that follows through ''1996'' and inserting ''2001 through 2005''.

SEC. 205. FLOOD MITIGATION AND RIVERINE RESTORATION PROGRAM.

Section 212(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (22);

(2) by striking the period at end of paragraph (23) and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(24) Lester, St. Louis, East Savanna, and Floodwood Rivers, Duluth, Minnesota;

''(25) Lower Hudson River and tributaries, New York;

''(26) Susquehanna River watershed, Bradford County, Pennsylvania; and

''(27) Clear Creek, Harris, Galveston, and Brazoria Counties, Texas.''.

SEC. 206. TRIBAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with Indian tribes and other Federal agencies, to study and determine the feasibility of implementing water resources development projects that will substantially benefit Indian tribes, and are located primarily within Indian country (as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code), or in proximity to an Alaska Native village (as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)).

(b) CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior on studies conducted under this section.

(c) CREDITS.—For any study conducted under this section, the Secretary may provide credit to the Indian tribe for services, studies, supplies, and other in-kind consideration where the Secretary determines that such services, studies, supplies, and other in-kind consideration will facilitate completion of the study. In no event shall such credit exceed the Indian tribe's required share of the cost of the study.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. Not more than $1,000,000 appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used to substantially benefit any one Indian tribe.

(e) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community of Indians, including any Alaska Native village, which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

SEC. 207. NATIVE AMERICAN REBURIAL AND TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Indian tribes, may identify and set aside land at civil works projects managed by the Secretary for use as a cemetery for the remains of Native Americans that have been discovered on project lands and that have been rightfully claimed by a lineal descendant or Indian tribe in accordance with applicable Federal law. The Secretary, in consultation with and with the consent of the lineal descendant or Indian tribe, may recover and rebury the remains at such cemetery at Federal expense.

(b) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may transfer to an Indian tribe land identified and set aside by the Secretary under subsection (a) for use as a cemetery. The Secretary shall retain any necessary rights-of-way, easements, or other property interests that the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the purpose of the project.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''Indian tribe'' and ''Native American'' have the meaning such terms have under section 2 of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001).

SEC. 208. ABILITY TO PAY.

Section 103(m) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any cost-sharing agreement under this section for construction of an environmental protection and restoration, flood control, or agricultural water supply project shall be subject to the ability of a non-Federal interest to pay.

''(2) CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.—The ability of a non-Federal interest to pay shall be determined by the Secretary in accordance with criteria and procedures in effect under paragraph (3) on the day before the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000; except that such criteria and procedures shall be revised, and new criteria and procedures shall be developed, within 180 days after such date of enactment to reflect the requirements of such paragraph (3).''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A)(ii);

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

SEC. 209. INTERAGENCY AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT AUTHORITY.

The first sentence of section 234(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2323a(d)) is amended to read as follows: ''There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $250,000 per fiscal year for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2000.''.

SEC. 210. PROPERTY PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to implement a program to reduce vandalism and destruction of property at water resources development projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. In carrying out the program, the Secretary may provide rewards to individuals who provide information or evidence leading to the arrest and prosecution of individuals causing damage to Federal property, including the payment of cash rewards.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $500,000 per fiscal year for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2000.

SEC. 211. ENGINEERING CONSULTING SERVICES.

In conducting a feasibility study for a water resources project, the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, should not employ a person for engineering and consulting services if the same person is also employed by the non-Federal interest for such services unless there is only 1 qualified and responsive bidder for such services.

SEC. 212. BEACH RECREATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In studying the feasibility of and making recommendations concerning potential beach restoration projects, the Secretary may not implement any policy that has the effect of disadvantaging any such project solely because 50 percent or more of its benefits are recreational in nature.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION AND REPORTING OF BENEFITS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and implement procedures to ensure that all of the benefits of a beach restoration project, including those benefits attributable to recreation, hurricane and storm damage reduction, and environmental protection and restoration, are adequately considered and displayed in reports for such projects.

SEC. 213. PERFORMANCE OF SPECIALIZED OR TECHNICAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before entering into an agreement to perform specialized or technical services for a State (including the District of Columbia), a territory, or a local government of a State or territory under section 6505 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary shall certify that—

(1) the services requested are not reasonably and expeditiously available through ordinary business channels; and

(2) the Corps of Engineers is especially equipped to perform such services.

(b) SUPPORTING MATERIALS.—The Secretary shall develop materials supporting such certification under subsection (a).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each calendar year, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the requests described in subsection (a) that the Secretary received during such calendar year.

(2) CONTENTS.—With respect to each request, the report transmitted under paragraph (1) shall include a copy of the certification and supporting materials developed under this section and information on each of the following:

(A) The scope of services requested.

(B) The status of the request.

(C) The estimated and final cost of the requested services.

(D) Each district and division office of the Corps of Engineers that has supplied or will supply the requested services.

(E) The number of personnel of the Corps of Engineers that have performed or will perform any of the requested services.

(F) The status of any reimbursement.

SEC. 214. DESIGN-BUILD CONTRACTING.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary may conduct a pilot program consisting of not

more than 5 projects to test the design-build method of project delivery on various civil engineering projects of the Corps of Engineers, including levees, pumping plants, revetments, dikes, dredging, weirs, dams, retaining walls, generation facilities, mattress laying, recreation facilities, and other water resources facilities.

(b) DESIGN-BUILD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''design-build'' means an agreement between the Federal Government and a contractor that provides for both the design and construction of a project by a single contract.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall report on the results of the pilot program.

SEC. 215. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PILOT PROGRAM.

Title IX of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4183 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 952. INDEPENDENT REVIEW PILOT PROGRAM.

''(a) PROJECTS SUBJECT TO INDEPENDENT REVIEW.—The Secretary shall undertake a pilot program in fiscal years 2001 through 2003 to determine the practicality and efficacy of having feasibility reports of the Corps of Engineers for eligible projects reviewed by an independent panel of experts. The pilot program shall be limited to the establishment of panels for not to exceed 5 eligible projects.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PANELS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a panel of experts for an eligible project under this section upon identification of a preferred alternative in the development of the feasibility report.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—A panel established under this section shall be composed of not less than 5 and not more than 9 independent experts who represent a balance of areas of expertise, including biologists, engineers, and economists.

''(3) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENTS.—The Secretary shall not appoint an individual to serve on a panel of experts for a project under this section if the individual has a financial interest in the project or has with any organization a professional relationship that the Secretary determines may constitute a conflict of interest or the appearance of impropriety.

''(4) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult the National Academy of Sciences in developing lists of individuals to serve on panels of experts under this section.

''(5) COMPENSATION.—An individual serving on a panel of experts under this section may not be compensated but may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

''(c) DUTIES OF PANELS.—A panel of experts established for a project under this section shall—

''(1) review feasibility reports prepared for the project after the identification of a preferred alternative;

''(2) receive written and oral comments of a technical nature concerning the project from the public; and

''(3) transmit to the Secretary an evaluation containing the panel's economic, engineering, and environmental analyses of the project, including the panel's conclusions on the feasibility report, with particular emphasis on areas of public controversy.

''(d) DURATION OF PROJECT REVIEWS.—A panel of experts shall complete its review of a feasibility report for an eligible project and transmit a report containing its evaluation of the project to the Secretary not later than 180 days after the date of establishment of the panel.

''(e) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—After receiving a timely report on a project from a panel of experts under this section, the Secretary shall—

''(1) consider any recommendations contained in the evaluation;

''(2) make the evaluation available for public review; and

''(3) include a copy of the evaluation in any report transmitted to Congress concerning the project.

''(f) COSTS.—The cost of conducting a review of a project under this section shall not exceed $250,000 and shall be a Federal expense.

''(g) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2003, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program together with the recommendations of the Secretary regarding continuation, expansion, and modification of the pilot program, including an assessment of the impact that a peer review program would have on the overall cost and length of project analyses and reviews associated with feasibility reports and an assessment of the benefits of peer review.

''(h) ELIGIBLE PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'eligible project' means—

''(1) a water resources project that has an estimated total cost of more than $25,000,000, including mitigation costs; and

''(2) a water resources project—

''(A) that has an estimated total cost of $25,000,000 or less, including mitigation costs; and

''(B)(i) that the Secretary determines is subject to a substantial degree of public controversy; or

''(ii) to which an affected State objects.''.

SEC. 216. ENHANCED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 905 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ENHANCED PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish procedures to enhance public participation in the development of each feasibility study under subsection (a), including, if appropriate, establishment of a stakeholder advisory group to assist the Secretary with the development of the study.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—If the Secretary provides for the establishment of a stakeholder advisory group under this subsection, the membership of the advisory group shall include balanced representation of social, economic, and environmental interest groups, and such members shall serve on a voluntary, uncompensated basis.

''(3) LIMITATION.—Procedures established under this subsection shall not delay development of any feasibility study under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 217. MONITORING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a monitoring program of the economic and environmental results of up to 5 eligible projects selected by the Secretary.

(b) DURATION.—The monitoring of a project selected by the Secretary under this section shall be for a period of not less than 12 years beginning on the date of its selection.

(c) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall transmit to Congress every 3 years a report on the performance of each project selected under this section.

(d) ELIGIBLE WATER RESOURCES PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''eligible project'' means a water resources project, or separable element thereof—

(1) for which a contract for physical construction has not been awarded before the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) that has a total cost of more than $25,000,000; and

(3)(A) that has as a benefit-to-cost ratio of less than 1.5 to 1; or

(B) that has significant environmental benefits or significant environmental mitigation components.

(e) COSTS.—The cost of conducting monitoring under this section shall be a Federal expense.

SEC. 218. RECONNAISSANCE STUDIES.

Section 905(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2282(b)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence by inserting after ''environmental impacts'' the following: ''(including whether a proposed project is likely to have environmental impacts that cannot be successfully or cost-effectively mitigated)''; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''The Secretary shall not recommend that a feasibility study be conducted for a project based on a reconnaissance study if the Secretary determines that the project is likely to have environmental impacts that cannot be successfully or cost-effectively mitigated.''.

SEC. 219. FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION.

(a) DESIGN OF MITIGATION PROJECTS.—Section 906(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' and inserting ''(A)''; and

(2) by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(B)'';

(3) by striking ''(d) After the date'' and inserting the following:

''(d) MITIGATION PLANS AS PART OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—After the date'';

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DESIGN OF MITIGATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall design mitigation projects to reflect contemporary understanding of the science of mitigating the adverse environmental impacts of water resources projects.

''(3) RECOMMENDATION OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall not recommend a water resources project unless the Secretary determines that the adverse impacts of the project on aquatic resources and fish and wildlife can be cost-effectively and successfully mitigated.''; and

(5) by aligning the remainder of the text of paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (3) of this subsection) with paragraph (2) (as added by paragraph (4) of this subsection).

(b) CONCURRENT MITIGATION.—

(1) INVESTIGATION.—The Comptroller General shall conduct an investigation of the effectiveness of the concurrent mitigation requirements of section 906 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2283). In conducting the investigation, the Comptroller General shall determine whether or not there are instances in which less than 50 percent of required mitigation is completed before initiation of project construction and the number of such instances.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the investigation.

SEC. 220. WETLANDS MITIGATION.

In carrying out a water resources project that involves wetlands mitigation and that has an impact that occurs within the service area of a mitigation bank, the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable and where appropriate, shall give preference to the use of the mitigation bank if the bank contains sufficient available credits to offset the impact and the bank is approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 Fed. Reg. 58605 (November 28, 1995)) or other applicable Federal law (including regulations).

SEC. 221. CREDIT TOWARD NON-FEDERAL SHARE OF NAVIGATION PROJECTS.

The second sentence of section 101(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (3) and'' and inserting ''paragraph (3),''; and

(2) by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4), and the costs borne by the non-Federal interests in providing additional capacity at dredged material disposal areas, providing community access to the project (including such disposal areas), and meeting applicable beautification requirements''.

SEC. 222. MAXIMUM PROGRAM EXPENDITURES FOR SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS.

Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) is amended by striking ''$40,000,000'' and inserting ''$50,000,000''.

SEC. 223. FEASIBILITY STUDIES AND PLANNING, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN.

Section 105(a)(1)(E) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215(a)(1)(E)) is amended by striking ''Not more than ½ of the'' and inserting ''The''.

SEC. 224. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the administrative costs associated with the conveyance of property to a non-Federal governmental or nonprofit entity shall be limited to not more than 5 percent of the value of the property to be conveyed to such entity if the Secretary determines, based on the entity's ability to pay, that such limitation is necessary to complete the conveyance. The Federal cost associated with such limitation shall not exceed $70,000 for any one conveyance.

(b) SPECIFIC CONVEYANCE.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority consideration to the conveyance of 10 acres of Wister Lake project land to the Summerfield Cemetery Association, Wister, Oklahoma, authorized by section 563(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 359–360).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $150,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

SEC. 225. DAM SAFETY.

(a) INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF OTHER DAMS.—

(1) INVENTORY.—The Secretary shall establish an inventory of dams constructed by and using funds made available through the Works Progress Administration, the Works Projects Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—In establishing the inventory required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall also assess the condition of the dams on such inventory and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the dams.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the inventory and assessment required by this section.

(c) INTERIM ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that a dam referred to in subsection (a) presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary is authorized to carry out measures to prevent or mitigate against such risk.

(2) EXCLUSION.—The assistance authorized under paragraph (1) shall not be available to dams under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this subsection shall be 65 percent of such cost.

(d) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate State dam safety officials and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section a total of $25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999, of which not more than $5,000,000 may be expended on any one dam.

TITLE III—PROJECT-RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. NOGALES WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, NOGALES, ARIZONA.

The project for flood control, Nogales Wash and Tributaries, Nogales, Arizona, authorized by section 101(a)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4606), and modified by section 303 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3711), is further modified to provide that the Federal share of the costs associated with addressing flood control problems in Nogales, Arizona, arising from floodwater flows originating in Mexico shall be 100 percent.

SEC. 302. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT VISITOR CENTER, FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS.

Section 103(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4813) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking ''LAKE'' and inserting ''VISITOR CENTER''; and

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking ''at the John Paul Hammerschmidt Lake, Arkansas River, Arkansas'' and inserting ''on property provided by the city of Fort Smith, Arkansas, in such city''.

SEC. 303. GREERS FERRY LAKE, ARKANSAS.

The project for flood control, Greers Ferry Lake, Arkansas, authorized by the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes'', approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1218), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct water intake facilities for the benefit of Lonoke and White Counties, Arkansas.

SEC. 304. TEN- AND FIFTEEN-MILE BAYOUS, ARKANSAS.

The project for flood control, Saint Francis River Basin, Missouri and Arkansas, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 172), is modified to expand the boundaries of the project to include Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous near West Memphis, Arkansas. Notwithstanding section 103(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4086), the flood control work at Ten- and Fifteen-Mile Bayous shall not be considered separable elements of the project.

SEC. 305. CACHE CREEK BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, Cache Creek Basin, California, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4112), is modified to direct the Secretary to evaluate the impacts of the new south levee of the Cache Creek settling basin on the city of Woodland's storm drainage system and to mitigate such impacts at Federal expense and a total cost of $2,800,000.

SEC. 306. LARKSPUR FERRY CHANNEL, LARKSPUR, CALIFORNIA.

The project for navigation, Larkspur Ferry Channel, Larkspur, California, authorized by section 601(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148), is modified to direct the Secretary to prepare a limited reevaluation report to determine whether maintenance of the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified. If the Secretary determines that maintenance of the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, the Secretary shall carry out the maintenance.

SEC. 307. NORCO BLUFFS, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

Section 101(b)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667) is amended by striking ''$8,600,000'' and all that follows through ''$2,150,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $11,250,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,750,000''.

SEC. 308. SACRAMENTO DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.

The project for navigation, Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4092), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide credit to the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the value of dredged material from the project that is purchased by public agencies or nonprofit entities for environmental restoration or other beneficial uses.

SEC. 309. SACRAMENTO RIVER, GLENN-COLUSA, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood control, Sacramento River, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, California, and for other purposes'', approved March 1, 1917 (39 Stat. 949), and modified by section 102 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1990 (103 Stat. 649), section 301(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3110), title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 1841), and section 305 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 299), is further modified to direct the Secretary to provide the non-Federal interest a credit of up to $4,000,000 toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for direct and indirect costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in carrying out activities (including the provision of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas) associated with environmental compliance for the project if the Secretary determines that the activities are integral to the project. If any of such costs were incurred by the non-Federal interests before execution of the project cooperation agreement, the Secretary may reimburse the non-Federal interest for such pre-agreement costs instead of providing a credit for such pre-agreement costs to the extent that the amount of the credit exceeds the remaining non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

SEC. 310. UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CALIFORNIA.

The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Upper Guadalupe River, California, authorized by section 101(a)(9) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 275), is modified to provide that the non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be 50 percent, with an estimated Federal cost and non-Federal cost of $70,164,000 each.

SEC. 311. BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

(a) INCLUSION OF REACH.—The project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, authorized by section 101(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3667), is modified to provide that, notwithstanding section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, the Secretary may incorporate in the project any or all of the 7.1-mile reach of the project that was deleted from the south reach of the project, as described in paragraph (5) of the Report of the Chief of Engineers, dated December 23, 1996, if the Secretary determines,

in coordination with appropriate local, State, and Federal agencies, that the project as modified is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—Section 310(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 301) is amended by inserting ''shoreline associated with the'' after ''damage to the''.

SEC. 312. FERNANDINA HARBOR, FLORIDA.

The project for navigation, Fernandina Harbor, Florida, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, completion, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 14, 1880 (21 Stat. 186), is modified to authorize the Secretary to realign the access channel in the vicinity of the Fernandina Beach Municipal Marina 100 feet to the west. The cost of the realignment, including acquisition of lands, easements, rights-of-way, and dredged material disposal areas and relocations, shall be a non-Federal expense.

SEC. 313. TAMPA HARBOR, FLORIDA.

The project for navigation, Tampa Harbor, Florida, authorized by section 4 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of September 22, 1922 (42 Stat. 1042), is modified to authorize the Secretary to deepen and widen the Alafia Channel in accordance with the plans described in the Draft Feasibility Report, Alafia River, Tampa Harbor, Florida, dated May 2000, at a total cost of $61,592,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $39,621,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $21,971,000.

SEC. 314. EAST SAINT LOUIS AND VICINITY, ILLINOIS.

The project for flood protection, East Saint Louis and vicinity, Illinois (East Side levee and sanitary district), authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1082), is modified to include ecosystem restoration as a project purpose.

SEC. 315. KASKASKIA RIVER, KASKASKIA, ILLINOIS.

The project for navigation, Kaskaskia River, Kaskaskia, Illinois, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1175), is modified to include recreation as a project purpose.

SEC. 316. WAUKEGAN HARBOR, ILLINOIS.

The project for navigation, Waukegan Harbor, Illinois, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, completion, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 14, 1880 (21 Stat. 192), is modified to authorize the Secretary to extend the upstream limit of the project 275 feet to the north at a width of 375 feet if the Secretary determines that the extension is feasible.

SEC. 317. CUMBERLAND, KENTUCKY.

Using continuing contracts, the Secretary shall initiate construction of the flood control project, Cumberland, Kentucky, authorized by section 202(a) of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), in accordance with option 4 contained in the draft detailed project report of the Nashville District, dated September 1998, to provide flood protection from the 100-year frequency flood event and to share all costs in accordance with section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213).

SEC. 318. LOCK AND DAM 10, KENTUCKY RIVER, KENTUCKY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may take all necessary measures to further stabilize and renovate Lock and Dam 10 at Boonesborough, Kentucky, with the purpose of extending the design life of the structure by an additional 50 years, at a total cost of $24,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $12,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $12,000,000.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the term ''stabilize and renovate'' includes the following activities: stabilization of the main dam, auxiliary dam and lock; renovation of all operational aspects of the lock; and elevation of the main and auxiliary dams.

SEC. 319. SAINT JOSEPH RIVER, SOUTH BEND, INDIANA.

Section 321(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 303) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking ''TOTAL'' and inserting ''FEDERAL''; and

(2) by striking ''total'' and inserting ''Federal''.

SEC. 320. MAYFIELD CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, KENTUCKY.

The project for flood control, Mayfield Creek and tributaries, Kentucky, carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), is modified to provide that the non-Federal interest shall not be required to pay the unpaid balance, including interest, of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

SEC. 321. AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LOUISIANA.

The project for flood damage reduction and recreation, Amite River and Tributaries, East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana, authorized by section 101(a)(21) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 277), is modified to provide that cost sharing for the project shall be determined in accordance with section 103(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213), as in effect on October 11, 1996.

SEC. 322. ATCHAFALAYA BASIN FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LOUISIANA.

The Atchafalaya Basin Floodway System project, authorized by section 601 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142), is modified to authorize the Secretary to construct the visitor center and other recreational features identified in the 1982 project feasibility report of the Corps of Engineers at or near the Lake End Park in Morgan City, Louisiana.

SEC. 323. ATCHAFALAYA RIVER, BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF, AND BLACK, LOUISIANA.

The project for navigation Atchafalaya River and Bayous Chene, Boeuf, and Black, Louisiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 731), is modified to direct the Secretary to investigate the problems associated with the mixture of freshwater, saltwater, and fine river silt in the channel and to develop and carry out a solution to the problem if the Secretary determines that the work is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

SEC. 324. RED RIVER WATERWAY, LOUISIANA.

The project for mitigation of fish and wildlife loses, Red River Waterway, Louisiana, authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4142) and modified by section 4(h) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4016), section 102(p) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4613), and section 301(b)(7) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3710), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to purchase mitigation lands in any of the 7 parishes that make up the Red River Waterway District, including the parishes of Caddo, Bossier, Red River, Natchitoches, Grant, Rapides, and Avoyelles.

SEC. 325. THOMASTON HARBOR, GEORGES RIVER, MAINE.

The project for navigation, Georges River, Maine (Thomaston Harbor), authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 215), is modified to redesignate the following portion of the project as an anchorage area: The portion lying northwesterly of a line commencing at point N86,946.770, E321,303.830 thence running northeasterly about 203.67 feet to a point N86,994.750, E321,501.770.

SEC. 326. BRECKENRIDGE, MINNESOTA.

(a) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood control, Breckenridge, Minnesota, carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s), shall be $10,500,000.

(b) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project described in subsection (a) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in the project in accordance with this section.

SEC. 327. DULUTH HARBOR, MINNESOTA.

The project for navigation, Duluth Harbor, Minnesota, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is modified to include the relocation of Scenic Highway 61, including any required bridge construction.

SEC. 328. LITTLE FALLS, MINNESOTA.

The project for clearing, snagging, and sediment removal, East Bank of the Mississippi River, Little Falls, Minnesota, authorized under section 3 of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved March 2, 1945 (33 U.S.C. 603a), is modified to direct the Secretary to construct the project substantially in accordance with the plans contained in the feasibility report of the District Engineer, dated June 2000.

SEC. 329. POPLAR ISLAND, MARYLAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for beneficial use of dredged material at Poplar Island, Maryland, authorized by section 537 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3776), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide the non-Federal interest credit toward cash contributions required—

(1) before and during construction of the project, for the costs of planning, engineering, and design and for construction management work that is performed by the non-Federal interest and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project; and

(2) during construction of the project, for the costs of the construction that the non-Federal interest carries out on behalf of the Secretary and that the Secretary determines is necessary to carry out the project.

(b) REDUCTION.—The private sector performance goals for engineering work of the Baltimore District of the Corps of Engineers shall be reduced by the amount of the credit under paragraph (1).

SEC. 330. GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, RARITAN RIVER BASIN, NEW JERSEY.

The project for flood control, Green Brook Sub-Basin, Raritan River Basin, New Jersey, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4119), is modified to direct the Secretary to prepare a limited reevaluation report to determine the feasibility of carrying out a nonstructural flood damage reduction project at the Green Brook Sub-Basin. If the Secretary determines that the nonstructural project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the nonstructural project.

SEC. 331. NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NEW JERSEY.

The project for navigation, New York Harbor and adjacent channels, Port Jersey, New Jersey, authorized by section 202(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4098) and modified by section 337 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 306–307), is further modified to authorize the Secretary to provide the non-Federal interests credit toward cash contributions required—

(1) before, during, and after construction for planning, engineering and design, and construction management work that is performed by the non-Federal interests and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project; and

(2) during and after construction for the costs of construction that the non-Federal interests carry out on behalf of the Secretary and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project.

SEC. 332. PASSAIC RIVER BASIN FLOOD MANAGEMENT, NEW JERSEY.

(a) REEVALUATION OF FLOODWAY STUDY.—The Secretary shall review the Passaic River Floodway Buyout Study, dated October 1995, conducted as part of the project for flood control, Passaic River Main Stem, New Jersey and New York, authorized by section 101(a)(18) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4607–4610), to calculate the benefits of a buyout and environmental restoration using the method used to calculate the benefits of structural projects under section 308(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2318(b)).

(b) REEVALUATION OF 10-YEAR FLOODPLAIN STUDY.—The Secretary shall review the Passaic River Buyout Study of the 10-year floodplain beyond the floodway of the Central Passaic River Basin, dated September 1995, conducted as part of the Passaic River Main Stem project to calculate the benefits of a buyout and environmental restoration using the method used to calculate the benefits of structural projects under section 308(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2318(b)).

(c) PRESERVATION OF NATURAL STORAGE AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reevaluate the acquisition of wetlands in the Central Passaic River Basin for flood protection purposes to supplement the wetland acquisition authorized by section 101(a)(18)(C)(vi) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4609).

(2) PURCHASE.—If the Secretary determines that the acquisition of wetlands evaluated under paragraph (1) is cost-effective, the Secretary shall purchase the wetlands, with the goal of purchasing not more than 8,200 acres.

(d) STREAMBANK EROSION CONTROL STUDY.—The Secretary shall review relevant reports and conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration, erosion control, and streambank restoration along the Passaic River, from Dundee Dam to Kearny Point, New Jersey.

(e) PASSAIC RIVER FLOOD MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal interest, shall establish a task force, to be known as the ''Passaic River Flood Management Task Force'', to provide advice to the Secretary concerning reevaluation of the Passaic River Main Stem project.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force shall be composed of 22 members, appointed as follows:

(A) APPOINTMENT BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall appoint 1 member to represent the Corps of Engineers and to provide technical advice to the task force.

(B) APPOINTMENTS BY GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY.—The Governor of New Jersey shall appoint 20 members to the task force, as follows:

(i) 2 representatives of the New Jersey legislature who are members of different political parties.

(ii) 3 representatives of the State of New Jersey.

(iii) 1 representative of each of Bergen, Essex, Morris, and Passaic Counties, New Jersey.

(iv) 6 representatives of governments of municipalities affected by flooding within the Passaic River Basin.

(v) 1 representative of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission.

(vi) 1 representative of the North Jersey District Water Supply Commission.

(vii) 1 representative of each of—

(I) the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions;

(II) the Passaic River Coalition; and

(III) the Sierra Club.

(C) APPOINTMENT BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK.—The Governor of New York shall appoint 1 representative of the State of New York to the task force.

(3) MEETINGS.—

(A) REGULAR MEETINGS.—The task force shall hold regular meetings.

(B) OPEN MEETINGS.—The meetings of the task force shall be open to the public.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The task force shall submit annually to the Secretary and to the non-Federal interest a report describing the achievements of the Passaic River flood management project in preventing flooding and any impediments to completion of the project.

(5) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may use funds made available to carry out the Passaic River Basin flood management project to pay the administrative expenses of the task force.

(6) TERMINATION.—The task force shall terminate on the date on which the Passaic River flood management project is completed.

(f) ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN THE FLOODWAY.—Section 1148 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4254; 110 Stat. 3718–3719), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) CONSISTENCY WITH NEW JERSEY BLUE ACRES PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out this section in a manner that is consistent with the Blue Acres Program of the State of New Jersey.''.

(g) STUDY OF HIGHLANDS LAND CONSERVATION.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the State of New Jersey, may study the feasibility of conserving land in the Highlands region of New Jersey and New York to provide additional flood protection for residents of the Passaic River Basin in accordance with section 212 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 U.S.C. 2332).

(h) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall not obligate any funds to carry out design or construction of the tunnel element of the Passaic River Main Stem project.

SEC. 333. TIMES BEACH NATURE PRESERVE, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.

The project for improving the quality of the environment, Times Beach Nature Preserve, Buffalo, New York, carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a), is modified to include recreation as a project purpose.

SEC. 334. GARRISON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA.

The Garrison Dam, North Dakota, feature of the project for flood control, Missouri River Basin, authorized by section 9(a) of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891), is modified to direct the Secretary to mitigate damage to the water transmission line for Williston, North Dakota, at Federal expense and a total cost of $3,900,000.

SEC. 335. DUCK CREEK, OHIO.

The project for flood control, Duck Creek, Ohio, authorized by section 101(a)(24) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3665), is modified to authorize the Secretary carry out the project at a total cost of $36,323,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $27,242,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $9,081,000.

SEC. 336. ASTORIA, OREGON.

The project for navigation, Columbia River, Astoria, Oregon, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), is modified to provide that the Federal share of the cost of relocating causeway and mooring facilities located at the Astoria East Boat Basin shall be 100 percent but shall not exceed $500,000.

SEC. 337. NONCONNAH CREEK, TENNESSEE AND MISSISSIPPI.

The project for flood control, Nonconnah Creek, Tennessee and Mississippi, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), is modified to authorize the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that it is feasible—

(1) to extend the area protected by the flood control element of the project upstream approximately 5 miles to Reynolds Road; and

(2) to extend the hiking and biking trails of the recreational element of the project from 8.8 to 27 miles.

SEC. 338. BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE, TEXAS.

The project for flood control, Red River below Denison Dam, Texas and Oklahoma, authorized by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 647), is modified to direct the Secretary to implement the Bowie County levee feature of the project in accordance with the plan described as Alternative B in the draft document entitled ''Bowie County Local Flood Protection, Red River, Texas Project Design Memorandum No. 1, Bowie County Levee'', dated April 1997. In evaluating and implementing the modification, the Secretary shall allow the non-Federal interest to participate in the financing of the project in accordance with section 903(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4184) to the extent that the Secretary's evaluation of the modification indicates that applying such section is necessary to implement the modification.

SEC. 339. SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

The project for flood control, San Antonio channel, Texas, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1259) as part of the comprehensive plan for flood protection on the Guadalupe and San Antonio Rivers in Texas, and modified by section 103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (90 Stat. 2921), is further modified to include environmental restoration and recreation as project purposes.

SEC. 340. BUCHANAN AND DICKENSON COUNTIES, VIRGINIA.

The project for flood control, Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River, authorized by section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1981 (94 Stat. 1339), and modified by section 352 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3724–3725), is further modified to direct the Secretary to determine the ability of Buchanan and Dickenson Counties, Virginia, to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of the

project based solely on the criteria specified in section 103(m)(3)(A)(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(m)(3)(A)(i)).

SEC. 341. BUCHANAN, DICKENSON, AND RUSSELL COUNTIES, VIRGINIA.

At the request of the John Flannagan Water Authority, Dickenson County, Virginia, the Secretary may reallocate, under section 322 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4643–4644), water supply storage space in the John Flannagan Reservoir, Dickenson County, Virginia, sufficient to yield water withdrawals in amounts not to exceed 3,000,000 gallons per day in order to provide water for the communities in Buchanan, Dickenson, and Russell Counties, Virginia, notwithstanding the limitation in section 322(b) of such Act.

SEC. 342. SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA.

The project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection, Sandbridge Beach, Virginia Beach, Virginia, authorized by section 101(22) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4804), is modified to direct the Secretary to provide 50 years of periodic beach nourishment beginning on the date on which construction of the project was initiated in 1998.

SEC. 343. WALLOPS ISLAND, VIRGINIA.

Section 567(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 367) is amended by striking ''$8,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

SEC. 344. COLUMBIA RIVER, WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for navigation, Columbia River, Washington, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 13, 1902 (32 Stat. 369), is modified to direct the Secretary, in the operation and maintenance of the project, to mitigate damages to the shoreline of Puget Island, at a total cost of $1,000,000.

(b) ALLOCATION.—The cost of the mitigation shall be allocated as an operation and maintenance cost of the Federal navigation project.

SEC. 345. MOUNT ST. HELENS, WASHINGTON.

The project for sediment control, Mount St. Helens, Washington, authorized by chapter IV of title I of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985 (99 Stat. 318–319), is modified to authorize the Secretary to provide such cost-effective, environmentally acceptable measures as are necessary to maintain the flood protection levels for Longview, Kelso, Lexington, and Castle Rock on the Cowlitz River, Washington, identified in the October 1985 report of the Chief of Engineers entitled ''Mount St. Helens, Washington, Decision Document (Toutle, Cowlitz, and Columbia Rivers)'', printed as House Document number 99–135.

SEC. 346. RENTON, WASHINGTON.

(a) MAXIMUM FEDERAL EXPENDITURE.—The maximum amount of Federal funds that may be expended for the project for flood control, Renton, Washington, carried out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, shall be $5,300,000.

(b) REVISION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall revise the project cooperation agreement for the project described in subsection (a) to take into account the change in the Federal participation in the project in accordance with this section.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—The Secretary may reimburse the non-Federal interest for the project described in subsection (a) for costs incurred to mitigate overdredging.

SEC. 347. GREENBRIER BASIN, WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 579(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790) is amended by striking ''$12,000,000'' and inserting ''$73,000,000''.

SEC. 348. LOWER MUD RIVER, MILTON, WEST VIRGINIA.

The project for flood damage reduction, Lower Mud River, Milton, West Virginia, authorized by section 580 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3790), is modified to direct the Secretary to carry out the project substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the watershed plan prepared by the Natural Resources Conservation Service for the project, dated 1992.

SEC. 349. WATER QUALITY PROJECTS.

Section 307(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4841) is amended by striking ''Jefferson and Orleans Parishes'' and inserting ''Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Tammany Parishes''.

SEC. 350. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following projects may be carried out by the Secretary, and no construction on any such project may be initiated until the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, as appropriate:

(1) NARRAGUAGUS RIVER, MILBRIDGE, MAINE.—Only for the purpose of maintenance as anchorage, those portions of the project for navigation, Narraguagus River, Milbridge, Maine, authorized by section 2 of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, completion, and preservation of certain works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 14, 1880 (21 Stat. 195), and deauthorized under section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (75 Stat. 1173), lying adjacent to and outside the limits of the 11-foot and 9-foot channel authorized as part of the project for navigation, authorized by such section 101, as follows:

(A) An area located east of the 11-foot channel starting at a point with coordinates N248,060.52, E668,236.56, thence running south 36 degrees 20 minutes 52.3 seconds east 1567.242 feet to a point N246,798.21, E669,165.44, thence running north 51 degrees 30 minutes 06.2 seconds west 839.855 feet to a point N247,321.01, E668,508.15, thence running north 20 degrees 09 minutes 58.1 seconds west 787.801 feet to the point of origin.

(B) An area located west of the 9-foot channel starting at a point with coordinates N249,673.29, E667,537.73, thence running south 20 degrees 09 minutes 57.8 seconds east 1341.616 feet to a point N248,413.92, E668,000.24, thence running south 01 degrees 04 minutes 26.8 seconds east 371.688 feet to a point N248,042.30, E668,007.21, thence running north 22 degrees 21 minutes 20.8 seconds west 474.096 feet to a point N248,480.76, E667,826.88, thence running north 79 degrees 09 minutes 31.6 seconds east 100.872 feet to a point N248,499.73, E667,925.95, thence running north 13 degrees 47 minutes 27.6 seconds west 95.126 feet to a point N248,592.12, E667,903.28, thence running south 79 degrees 09 minutes 31.6 seconds west 115.330 feet to a point N248,570.42, E667,790.01, thence running north 22 degrees 21 minutes 20.8 seconds west 816.885 feet to a point N249,325.91, E667,479.30, thence running north 07 degrees 03 minutes 00.3 seconds west 305.680 feet to a point N249,629.28, E667,441.78, thence running north 65 degrees 21 minutes 33.8 seconds east 105.561 feet to the point of origin.

(2) CEDAR BAYOU, TEXAS.—The project for navigation, Cedar Bayou, Texas, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved September 19, 1890 (26 Stat. 444), and modified by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 926), and deauthorized by section 1002 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4219), except that the project is authorized only for construction of a navigation channel 12 feet deep by 125 feet wide from mile −2.5 (at the junction with the Houston Ship Channel) to mile 11.0 on Cedar Bayou.

(b) REDESIGNATION.—The following portion of the 11-foot channel of the project for navigation, Narraguagus River, Milbridge, Maine, referred to in subsection (a)(1) is redesignated as anchorage: starting at a point with coordinates N248,413.92, E668,000.24, thence running south 20 degrees 09 minutes 57.8 seconds east 1325.205 feet to a point N247,169.95, E668,457.09, thence running north 51 degrees 30 minutes 05.7 seconds west 562.33 feet to a point N247,520.00, E668,017.00, thence running north 01 degrees 04 minutes 26.8 seconds west 894.077 feet to the point of origin.

SEC. 351. CONTINUATION OF PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)), the following projects shall remain authorized to be carried out by the Secretary:

(1) The projects for flood control, Sacramento River, California, modified by section 10 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 900–901).

(2) The project for flood protection, Sacramento River from Chico Landing to Red Bluff, California, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 314).

(b) LIMITATION.—A project described in subsection (a) shall not be authorized for construction after the last day of the 7-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, unless, during such period, funds have been obligated for the construction (including planning and design) of the project.

SEC. 352. DECLARATION OF NONNAVIGABILITY FOR LAKE ERIE, NEW YORK.

(a) AREA TO BE DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE; PUBLIC INTEREST.—Unless the Secretary finds, after consultation with local and regional public officials (including local and regional public planning organizations), that the proposed projects to be undertaken within the boundaries in the portions of Erie County, New York, described in subsection (b), are not in the public interest then, subject to subsection (c), those portions of such county that were once part of Lake Erie and are now filled are declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—The portion of Erie County, New York, referred to in subsection (a) are all that tract or parcel of land, situate in the Town of Hamburg and the City of Lackawanna, County of Erie, State of New York, being part of Lots 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the Ogden Gore Tract and part of Lots 23, 24, and 36 of the Buffalo Creek Reservation, Township 10, Range 8 of the Holland Land Company's Survey and more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike (66.0 feet wide), said point being 547.89 feet South 19°36′46″ East from the intersection of the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike (66.0 feet wide) and the northerly line of the City of Lackawanna (also being the southerly line of the City of Buffalo); thence South 19°36′46″ East along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike

(66.0 feet wide) a distance of 628.41 feet; thence along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike as appropriated by the New York State Department of Public Works as shown on Map No. 40–R2, Parcel No. 44 the following 20 courses and distances:

(1) South 10°00′07″ East a distance of 164.30 feet;

(2) South 18°40′45″ East a distance of 355.00 feet;

(3) South 71°23′35″ West a distance of 2.00 feet;

(4) South 18°40′45″ East a distance of 223.00 feet;

(5) South 22°29′36″ East a distance of 150.35 feet;

(6) South 18°40′45″ East a distance of 512.00 feet;

(7) South 16°49′53″ East a distance of 260.12 feet;

(8) South 18°34′20″ East a distance of 793.00 feet;

(9) South 71°23′35″ West a distance of 4.00 feet;

(10) South 18°13′24″ East a distance of 132.00 feet;

(11) North 71°23′35″ East a distance of 4.67 feet;

(12) South 18°30′00″ East a distance of 38.00 feet;

(13) South 71°23′35″ West a distance of 4.86 feet;

(14) South 18°13′24″ East a distance of 160.00 feet;

(15) South 71°23′35″ East a distance of 9.80 feet;

(16) South 18°36′25″ East a distance of 159.00 feet;

(17) South 71°23′35″ West a distance of 3.89 feet;

(18) South 18°34′20″ East a distance of 180.00 feet;

(19) South 20°56′05″ East a distance of 138.11 feet;

(20) South 22°53′55″ East a distance of 272.45 feet to a point on the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike.

Thence southerly along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike, South 18°36′25″ East, a distance of 2228.31 feet; thence along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike as appropriated by the New York State Department of Public Works as shown on Map No. 27 Parcel No. 31 the following 2 courses and distances:

(1) South 16°17′25″ East a distance of 74.93 feet;

(2) along a curve to the right having a radius of 1004.74 feet; a chord distance of 228.48 feet along a chord bearing of South 08°12′16″ East, a distance of 228.97 feet to a point on the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike.

Thence southerly along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike, South 4°35′35″ West a distance of 940.87 feet; thence along the westerly highway boundary of Hamburg Turnpike as appropriated by the New York State Department of Public Works as shown on Map No. 1 Parcel No. 1 and Map No. 5 Parcel No. 7 the following 18 courses and distances:

(1) North 85°24′25″ West a distance of 1.00 feet;

(2) South 7°01′17″ West a distance of 170.15 feet;

(3) South 5°02′54″ West a distance of 180.00 feet;

(4) North 85°24′25″ West a distance of 3.00 feet;

(5) South 5°02′54″ West a distance of 260.00 feet;

(6) South 5°09′11″ West a distance of 110.00 feet;

(7) South 0°34′35″ West a distance of 110.27 feet;

(8) South 4°50′37″ West a distance of 220.00 feet;

(9) South 4°50′37″ West a distance of 365.00 feet;

(10) South 85°24′25″ East a distance of 5.00 feet;

(11) South 4°06′20″ West a distance of 67.00 feet;

(12) South 6°04′35″ West a distance of 248.08 feet;

(13) South 3°18′27″ West a distance of 52.01 feet;

(14) South 4°55′58″ West a distance of 133.00 feet;

(15) North 85°24′25″ West a distance of 1.00 feet;

(16) South 4°55′58″ West a distance of 45.00 feet;

(17) North 85°24′25″ West a distance of 7.00 feet;

(18) South 4°56′12″ West a distance of 90.00 feet.

Thence continuing along the westerly highway boundary of Lake Shore Road as appropriated by the New York State Department of Public Works as shown on Map No. 7, Parcel No. 7 the following 2 courses and distances:

(1) South 4°55′58″ West a distance of 127.00 feet;

(2) South 2°29′25″ East a distance of 151.15 feet to a point on the westerly former highway boundary of Lake Shore Road.

Thence southerly along the westerly formerly highway boundary of Lake Shore Road, South 4°35′35″ West a distance of 148.90 feet; thence along the westerly highway boundary of Lake Shore Road as appropriated by the New York State Department of Public Works as shown on Map No. 7, Parcel No. 8 the following 3 courses and distances:

(1) South 55°34′35″ West a distance of 12.55 feet;

(2) South 4°35′35″ West a distance of 118.50 feet;

(3) South 3°04′00″ West a distance of 62.95 feet to a point on the south line of the lands of South Buffalo Railway Company.

Thence southerly and easterly along the lands of South Buffalo Railway Company the following 5 courses and distances:

(1) North 89°25′14″ West a distance of 697.64 feet;

(2) along a curve to the left having a radius of 645.0 feet; a chord distance of 214.38 feet along a chord bearing of South 40°16′48″ West, a distance of 215.38 feet;

(3) South 30°42′49″ West a distance of 76.96 feet;

(4) South 22°06′03″ West a distance of 689.43 feet;

(5) South 36°09′23″ West a distance of 30.93 feet to the northerly line of the lands of Buffalo Crushed Stone, Inc.

Thence North 87°13′38″ West a distance of 2452.08 feet to the shore line of Lake Erie; thence northerly along the shore of Lake Erie the following 43 courses and distances:

(1) North 16°29′53″ West a distance of 267.84 feet;

(2) North 24°25′00″ West a distance of 195.01 feet;

(3) North 26°45′00″ West a distance of 250.00 feet;

(4) North 31°15′00″ West a distance of 205.00 feet;

(5) North 21°35′00″ West a distance of 110.00 feet;

(6) North 44°00′53″ West a distance of 26.38 feet;

(7) North 33°49′18″ West a distance of 74.86 feet;

(8) North 34°26′26″ West a distance of 12.00 feet;

(9) North 31°06′16″ West a distance of 72.06 feet;

(10) North 22°35′00″ West a distance of 150.00 feet;

(11) North 16°35′00″ West a distance of 420.00 feet;

(12) North 21°10′00″ West a distance of 440.00 feet;

(13) North 17°55′00″ West a distance of 340.00 feet;

(14) North 28°05′00″ West a distance of 375.00 feet;

(15) North 16°25′00″ West a distance of 585.00 feet;

(16) North 22°10′00″ West a distance of 160.00 feet;

(17) North 2°46′36″ West a distance of 65.54 feet;

(18) North 16°01′08″ West a distance of 70.04 feet;

(19) North 49°07′00″ West a distance of 79.00 feet;

(20) North 19°16′00″ West a distance of 425.00 feet;

(21) North 16°37′00″ West a distance of 285.00 feet;

(22) North 25°20′00″ West a distance of 360.00 feet;

(23) North 33°00′00″ West a distance of 230.00 feet;

(24) North 32°40′00″ West a distance of 310.00 feet;

(25) North 27°10′00″ West a distance of 130.00 feet;

(26) North 23°20′00″ West a distance of 315.00 feet;

(27) North 18°20′04″ West a distance of 302.92 feet;

(28) North 20°15′48″ West a distance of 387.18 feet;

(29) North 14°20′00″ West a distance of 530.00 feet;

(30) North 16°40′00″ West a distance of 260.00 feet;

(31) North 28°35′00″ West a distance of 195.00 feet;

(32) North 18°30′00″ West a distance of 170.00 feet;

(33) North 26°30′00″ West a distance of 340.00 feet;

(34) North 32°07′52″ West a distance of 232.38 feet;

(35) North 30°04′26″ West a distance of 17.96 feet;

(36) North 23°19′13″ West a distance of 111.23 feet;

(37) North 7°07′58″ West a distance of 63.90 feet;

(38) North 8°11′02″ West a distance of 378.90 feet;

(39) North 15°01′02″ West a distance of 190.64 feet;

(40) North 2°55′00″ West a distance of 170.00 feet;

(41) North 6°45′00″ West a distance of 240.00 feet;

(42) North 0°10′00″ East a distance of 465.00 feet;

(43) North 2°00′38″ West a distance of 378.58 feet to the northerly line of Letters Patent dated February 21, 1968 and recorded in the Erie County Clerk's Office under Liber 7453 of Deeds at Page 45.

Thence North 71°23′35″ East along the north line of the aforementioned Letters Patent a distance of 154.95 feet to the shore line; thence along the shore line the following 6 courses and distances:

(1) South 80°14′01″ East a distance of 119.30 feet;

(2) North 46°15′13″ East a distance of 47.83 feet;

(3) North 59°53′02″ East a distance of 53.32 feet;

(4) North 38°20′43″ East a distance of 27.31 feet;

(5) North 68°12′46″ East a distance of 48.67 feet;

(6) North 26°11′47″ East a distance of 11.48 feet to the northerly line of the aforementioned Letters Patent.

Thence along the northerly line of said Letters Patent, North 71°23′35″ East a distance of 1755.19 feet; thence South 35°27′25″ East a distance of 35.83 feet to a point on the U.S. Harbor Line; thence, North 54°02′35″ East along the U.S. Harbor Line a distance of 200.00 feet; thence continuing along the U.S. Harbor Line, North 50°01′45″ East a distance of 379.54 feet to the westerly line of the lands of Gateway Trade Center, Inc.; thence along the lands of Gateway Trade Center, Inc. the following 27 courses and distances:

(1) South 18°44′53″ East a distance of 623.56 feet;

(2) South 34°33′00″ East a distance of 200.00 feet;

(3) South 26°18′55″ East a distance of 500.00 feet;

(4) South 19°06′40″ East a distance of 1074.29 feet;

(5) South 28°03′18″ East a distance of 242.44 feet;

(6) South 18°38′50″ East a distance of 1010.95 feet;

(7) North 71°20′51″ East a distance of 90.42 feet;

(8) South 18°49′20″ East a distance of 158.61 feet;

(9) South 80°55′10″ East a distance of 45.14 feet;

(10) South 18°04′45″ East a distance of 52.13 feet;

(11) North 71°07′23″ East a distance of 102.59 feet;

(12) South 18°41′40″ East a distance of 63.00 feet;

(13) South 71°07′23″ West a distance of 240.62 feet;

(14) South 18°38′50″ East a distance of 668.13 feet;

(15) North 71°28′46″ East a distance of 958.68 feet;

(16) North 18°42′31″ West a distance of 1001.28 feet;

(17) South 71°17′29″ West a distance of 168.48 feet;

(18) North 18°42′31″ West a distance of 642.00 feet;

(19) North 71°17′37″ East a distance of 17.30 feet;

(20) North 18°42′31″ West a distance of 574.67 feet;

(21) North 71°17′29″ East a distance of 151.18 feet;

(22) North 18°42′31″West a distance of 1156.43 feet;

(23) North 71°29′21″ East a distance of 569.24 feet;

(24) North 18°30′39″ West a distance of 314.71 feet;

(25) North 70°59′36″ East a distance of 386.47 feet;

(26) North 18°30′39″ West a distance of 70.00 feet;

(27) North 70°59′36″ East a distance of 400.00 feet to the place or point of beginning.

Containing 1,142.958 acres.

(c) LIMITS ON APPLICABILITY; REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—The declaration under subsection (a) shall apply to those parts of the areas described in subsection (b) which are filled portions of Lake Erie. Any work on these filled portions is subject to all applicable Federal statutes and regulations, including sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U.S.C. 401 and 403), commonly known as the River and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899, section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(d) EXPIRATION DATE.—If, 20 years from the date of enactment of this Act, any area or part thereof described in subsection (a) of this section is not occupied by permanent structures in accordance with the requirements set out in subsection (c) of this section, or if work in connection with any activity permitted in subsection (c) is not commenced within 5 years after issuance of such permits, then the declaration of nonnavigability for such area or part thereof shall expire.

SEC. 353. PROJECT DEAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The following projects or portions of projects are not authorized after the date of enactment of this Act:

(1) BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, JACKSON, ALABAMA.—The project for navigation, Black Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, vicinity of Jackson, Alabama, authorized by section 106 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987 (100 Stat. 3341–199).

(2) SACRAMENTO DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL, CALIFORNIA.—The portion of the project for navigation, Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, California, authorized by section 202(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4092), beginning from the confluence of the Sacramento River and the Barge Canal to a point 3,300 feet west of the William G. Stone Lock western gate (including the William G. Stone Lock and the Bascule Bridge and Barge Canal). All waters within such portion of the project are declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States solely for purposes of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 525 et seq.) and section 9 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 401), commonly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriation Act of 1899.

(3) BAY ISLAND CHANNEL, QUINCY, ILLINOIS.—The access channel across Bay Island into Quincy Bay at Quincy, Illinois, constructed under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577).

(4) WARSAW BOAT HARBOR, ILLINOIS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1175), known as the Warsaw Boat Harbor, Illinois.

(5) ROCKPORT HARBOR, ROCKPORT, MASSACHUSETTS.—The following portions of the project for navigation, Rockport Harbor, Massachusetts, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577):

(A) The portion of the 10-foot harbor channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N605,741.948, E838,031.378, thence running north 36 degrees 04 minutes 40.9 seconds east 123.386 feet to a point N605,642.226, E838,104.039, thence running south 05 degrees 08 minutes 35.1 seconds east 24.223 feet to a point N605,618.100, E838,106.210, thence running north 41 degrees 05 minutes 10.9 seconds west 141.830 feet to a point N605,725.000, E838,013.000, thence running north 47 degrees 19 minutes 04.1 seconds east 25.000 feet to the point of origin.

(B) The portion of the 8-foot north basin entrance channel the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N605,742.699, E837,977.129, thence running south 89 degrees 12 minutes 27.1 seconds east 54.255 feet to a point N605,741.948, E838,031.378, thence running south 47 degrees 19 minutes 04.1 seconds west 25.000 feet to a point N605,725.000, E838,013.000, thence running north 63 degrees 44 minutes 19.0 seconds west 40.000 feet to the point of origin.

(C) The portion of the 8-foot south basin anchorage the boundaries of which begin at a point with coordinates N605,563.770, E838,111.100, thence running south 05 degrees 08 minutes 35.1 seconds east 53.460 feet to a point N605,510.525, E838,115.892, thence running south 52 degrees 10 minutes 55.5 seconds west 145.000 feet to a point N605,421.618, E838,001.348, thence running north 37 degrees 49 minutes 04.5 seconds west feet to a point N605,480.960, E837,955.287, thence running south 64 degrees 52 minutes 33.9 seconds east 33.823 feet to a point N605,466.600, E837,985.910, thence running north 52 degrees 10 minutes 55.5 seconds east 158.476 feet to the point of origin.

(6) SCITUATE HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The portion of the project for navigation, Scituate Harbor, Massachusetts, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 1249), consisting of an 8-foot anchorage basin and described as follows: Beginning at a point with coordinates N438,739.53, E810,354.75, thence running northwesterly about 200.00 feet to coordinates N438,874.02, E810,206.72, thence running northeasterly about 400.00 feet to coordinates N439,170.07, E810,475,70, thence running southwesterly about 447.21 feet to the point of origin.

(7) DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN.—The portion of the project for navigation, Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 212), known as the 21st Avenue West Channel, beginning at the most southeasterly point of the channel N423074.09, E2871635.43 thence running north-northwest about 1854.83 feet along the easterly limit of the project to a point N424706.69, E2870755.48, thence running northwesterly about 111.07 feet to a point on the northerly limit of the project N424777.27, E2870669.46, thence west-southwest 157.88 feet along the north limit of the project to a point N424703.04, E2870530.38, thence south-southeast 1978.27 feet to the most southwesterly point N422961.45, E2871469.07, thence northeasterly 201.00 feet along the southern limit of the project to the point of origin.

(8) TREMLEY POINT, NEW JERSEY.—The portion of the Federal navigation channel, New York and New Jersey Channels, New York and New Jersey, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1028), and modified by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 164), that consists of a 35-foot deep channel beginning at a point along the western limit of the authorized project, N644100.411, E129256.91, thence running southeasterly about 38.25 feet to a point N644068.885, E129278.565, thence running southerly about 1,163.86 feet to a point N642912.127, E129150.209, thence running southwesterly about 56.89 feet to a point N642864.09, E2129119.725, thence running northerly along the existing western limit of the existing project to the point of origin.

(9) ANGOLA, NEW YORK.—The project for erosion protection, Angola Water Treatment Plant, Angola, New York, constructed under section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 (33 U.S.C. 701r).

(10) WALLABOUT CHANNEL, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK.—The portion of the project for navigation, Wallabout Channel, Brooklyn, New York, authorized by the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1124), that is located at the northeast corner of the project and is described as follows:

Beginning at a point forming the northeast corner of the project and designated with the coordinate of North N 682,307.40; East

638,918.10; thence along the following 6 courses and distances:

(A) South 85 degrees, 44 minutes, 13 seconds East 87.94 feet (coordinate: N 682,300.86 E 639,005.80).

(B) North 74 degrees, 41 minutes, 30 seconds East 271.54 feet (coordinate: N 682,372.55 E 639,267.71).

(C) South 4 degrees, 46 minutes, 02 seconds West 170.95 feet (coordinate: N 682,202.20 E 639,253.50).

(D) South 4 degrees, 46 minutes, 02 seconds West 239.97 feet (coordinate: N 681,963.06 E 639,233.56).

(E) North 50 degrees, 48 minutes, 26 seconds West 305.48 feet (coordinate: N 682,156.10 E 638,996.80).

(F) North 3 degrees, 33 minutes, 25 seconds East 145.04 feet (coordinate: N 682,300.86 E 639,005.80).

(b) ROCKPORT HARBOR, MASSACHUSETTS.—The project for navigation, Rockport Harbor, Massachusetts, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), is modified—

(1) to redesignate a portion of the 8-foot north outer anchorage as part of the 8-foot approach channel to the north inner basin described as follows: the perimeter of the area starts at a point with coordinates N605,792.110, E838,020.009, thence running south 89 degrees 12 minutes 27.1 seconds east 64.794 feet to a point N605,791.214, E838,084.797, thence running south 47 degrees 18 minutes 54.0 seconds west 40.495 feet to a point N605,763.760, E838,055.030, thence running north 68 degrees 26 minutes 49.0 seconds west 43.533 feet to a point N605,779.750, E838,014.540, thence running north 23 degrees 52 minutes 08.4 seconds east 13.514 feet to the point of origin; and

(2) to realign a portion of the 8-foot north inner basin approach channel by adding an area described as follows: the perimeter of the area starts at a point with coordinates N605,792.637, E837,981.920, thence running south 89 degrees 12 minutes 27.1 seconds east 38.093 feet to a point N605,792.110, E838,020.009, thence running south 23 degrees 52 minutes 08.4 seconds west 13.514 feet to a point N605,779.752, E838,014.541, thence running north 68 degrees 26 minutes 49.0 seconds west 35.074 feet to the point of origin.

SEC. 354. WYOMING VALLEY, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The project for flood control, Wyoming Valley, Pennsylvania, authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124) is modified as provided in this section.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROJECT ELEMENTS.—The Secretary shall construct each of the following additional elements of the project to the extent that the Secretary determines that the element is technically feasible, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified:

(1) The River Commons plan developed by the non-Federal sponsor for both sides of the Susquehanna River beside historic downtown Wilkes-Barre.

(2) Necessary portal modifications to the project to allow at grade access from Wilkes-Barre to the Susquehanna River to facilitate operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation of the project and to restore access to the Susquehanna River for the public.

(3) A concrete capped sheet pile wall in lieu of raising an earthen embankment to reduce the disturbance to the Historic River Commons area.

(4) All necessary modifications to the Stormwater Pump Stations in Wyoming Valley.

(5) All necessary evaluations and modifications to all elements of the existing flood control projects to include Coal Creek, Toby Creek, Abrahams Creek, and various relief culverts and penetrations through the levee.

(c) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall credit the Luzerne County Flood Protection Authority toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for the value of the Forty-Fort ponding basin area purchased after June 1, 1972, by Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, for an estimated cost of $500,000 under section 102(w) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (102 Stat. 508) to the extent that the Secretary determines that the area purchased is integral to the project.

(d) MODIFICATION OF MITIGATION PLAN AND PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—

(1) MODIFICATION OF MITIGATION PLAN.—The Secretary shall provide for the deletion, from the Mitigation Plan for the Wyoming Valley Levees, approved by the Secretary on February 15, 1996, the proposal to remove the abandoned Bloomsburg Railroad Bridge.

(2) MODIFICATION OF PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall modify the project cooperation agreement, executed in October 1996, to reflect removal of the railroad bridge and its $1,800,000 total cost from the mitigation plan under paragraph (1).

(e) MAXIMUM PROJECT COST.—The total cost of the project, as modified by this section, shall not exceed the amount authorized in section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4124), with increases authorized by section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4183).

SEC. 355. REHOBOTH BEACH AND DEWEY BEACH, DELAWARE.

The project for storm damage reduction and shoreline protection, Rehoboth Beach and Dewey Beach, Delaware, authorized by section 101(b)(6) of the Water Resources development Act of 1996, is modified to authorize the project at a total cost of $13,997,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $9,098,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $4,899,000, and an estimated average annual cost of $1,320,000 for periodic nourishment over the 50-year life of the project, with an estimated annual Federal cost of $858,000 and an estimated annual non-Federal cost of $462,000.

TITLE IV—STUDIES

SEC. 401. STUDIES OF COMPLETED PROJECTS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1830) of each of the following completed projects:

(1) ESCAMBIA BAY AND RIVER, FLORIDA.—Project for navigation, Escambia Bay and River, Florida.

(2) ILLINOIS RIVER, HAVANA, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Illinois River, Havana, Illinois, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1583).

(3) SPRING LAKE, ILLINOIS.—Project for flood control, Spring Lake, Illinois, authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1584).

(4) PORT ORFORD, OREGON.—Project for flood control, Port Orford, Oregon, authorized by section 301 of River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1092).

SEC. 402. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

Section 729 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4164) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 729. WATERSHED AND RIVER BASIN ASSESSMENTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may assess the water resources needs of interstate river basins and watersheds of the United States. The assessments shall be undertaken in cooperation and coordination with the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate agencies, and may include an evaluation of ecosystem protection and restoration, flood damage reduction, navigation and port needs, watershed protection, water supply, and drought preparedness.

"(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with Federal, tribal, State, interstate, and local governmental entities in carrying out the assessments authorized by this section. In conducting the assessments, the Secretary may accept contributions of services, materials, supplies and cash from Federal, tribal, State, interstate, and local governmental entities where the Secretary determines that such contributions will facilitate completion of the assessments.

"(c) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary shall give priority consideration to the following interstate river basins and watersheds:

"(1) Delaware River.

"(2) Potomac River.

"(3) Susquehanna River.

"(4) Kentucky River.

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $15,000,000.".

SEC. 403. LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER RESOURCE ASSESSMENT.

(a) ASSESSMENTS.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee, shall undertake, at Federal expense, for the Lower Mississippi River system—

(1) an assessment of information needed for river-related management;

(2) an assessment of natural resource habitat needs; and

(3) an assessment of the need for river-related recreation and access.

(b) PERIOD.—Each assessment referred to in subsection (a) shall be carried out for 2 years.

(c) REPORTS.—Before the last day of the second year of an assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and the States of Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee, shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the assessment to Congress. The report shall contain recommendations for—

(1) the collection, availability, and use of information needed for river-related management;

(2) the planning, construction, and evaluation of potential restoration, protection, and enhancement measures to meet identified habitat needs; and

(3) potential projects to meet identified river access and recreation needs.

(d) LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER SYSTEM DEFINED.—In this section, the term "Lower Mississippi River system" means those river reaches and adjacent floodplains within the Lower Mississippi River alluvial valley having commercial navigation channels on the Mississippi mainstem and tributaries south of Cairo, Illinois, and the Atchafalaya basin floodway system.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,750,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 404. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN SEDIMENT AND NUTRIENT STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct, at Federal expense, a study—

(1) to identify significant sources of sediment and nutrients in the Upper Mississippi River basin; and

(2) to describe and evaluate the processes by which the sediments and nutrients move, on land and in water, from their sources to the Upper Mississippi River and its tributaries.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior.

(c) COMPONENTS OF THE STUDY.—

(1) COMPUTER MODELING.—As part of the study, the Secretary shall develop computer models at the subwatershed and basin level to identify and quantify the sources of sediment and nutrients and to examine the effectiveness of alternative management measures.

(2) RESEARCH.—As part of the study, the Secretary shall conduct research to improve understanding of—

(A) the processes affecting sediment and nutrient (with emphasis on nitrogen and phosphorus) movement;

(B) the influences of soil type, slope, climate, vegetation cover, and modifications to the stream drainage network on sediment and nutrient losses; and

(C) river hydrodynamics in relation to sediment and nutrient transformations, retention, and movement.

(d) USE OF INFORMATION.—Upon request of a Federal agency, the Secretary may provide information to the agency for use in sediment and nutrient reduction programs associated with land use and land management practices.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study, including findings and recommendations.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000.

SEC. 405. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Section 459(e) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 333) is amended by striking ''date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''first date on which funds are appropriated to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 406. OHIO RIVER SYSTEM.

The Secretary may conduct a study of commodity flows on the Ohio River system at Federal expense. The study shall include an analysis of the commodities transported on the Ohio River system, including information on the origins and destinations of these commodities and market trends, both national and international.

SEC. 407. EASTERN ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reevaluate the recommendations in the Eastern Arkansas Region Comprehensive Study of the Memphis District Engineer, dated August 1990, to determine whether the plans outlined in the study for agricultural water supply from the Little Red River, Arkansas, are feasible and in the Federal interest.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the reevaluation.

SEC. 408. RUSSELL, ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall evaluate the preliminary investigation report for agricultural water supply, Russell, Arkansas, entitled ''Preliminary Investigation: Lone Star Management Project'', prepared for the Lone Star Water Irrigation District, to determine whether the plans contained in the report are feasible and in the Federal interest.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 409. ESTUDILLO CANAL, SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction along the Estudillo Canal, San Leandro, California.

SEC. 410. LAGUNA CREEK, FREMONT, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction in the Laguna Creek watershed, Fremont, California.

SEC. 411. LAKE MERRITT, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for ecosystem restoration, flood damage reduction, and recreation at Lake Merritt, Oakland, California.

SEC. 412. LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall evaluate the report of the city of Lancaster, California, entitled ''Master Plan of Drainage'', to determine whether the plans contained in the report are feasible and in the Federal interest, including plans relating to drainage corridors located at 52nd Street West, 35th Street West, North Armargosa, and 20th Street East.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 413. NAPA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project to address water supply, water quality, and groundwater problems at Miliken, Sarco, and Tulocay Creeks in Napa County, California.

(b) USE OF EXISTING DATA.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall use data and information developed by the United States Geological Survey in the report entitled ''Geohydrologic Framework and Hydrologic Budget of the Lower Miliken-Sarco-Tulocay Creeks Area of Napa, California''.

SEC. 414. OCEANSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study, at Federal expense, to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection at Oceanside, California. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall determine the portion of beach erosion that is the result of a Navy navigation project at Camp Pendleton Harbor, California.

SEC. 415. SUISUN MARSH, CALIFORNIA.

The investigation for Suisun Marsh, California, authorized under the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–60), shall be limited to evaluating the feasibility of the levee enhancement and managed wetlands protection program for Suisun Marsh, California.

SEC. 416. LAKE ALLATOONA WATERSHED, GEORGIA.

Section 413 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 324) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 413. LAKE ALLATOONA WATERSHED, GEORGIA.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a comprehensive study of the Lake Allatoona watershed, Georgia, to determine the feasibility of undertaking ecosystem restoration and resource protection measures.

''(b) MATTERS TO BE ADDRESSED.—The study shall address streambank and shoreline erosion, sedimentation, water quality, fish and wildlife habitat degradation and other problems relating to ecosystem restoration and resource protection in the Lake Allatoona watershed.''.

SEC. 417. CHICAGO RIVER, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for shoreline protection along the Chicago River, Chicago, Illinois.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult, and incorporate information available from, appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies.

SEC. 418. CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL SYSTEM, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the advisability of reducing the use of the waters of Lake Michigan to support navigation in the Chicago sanitary and ship canal system, Chicago, Illinois.

SEC. 419. LONG LAKE, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for environmental restoration and protection, Long Lake, Indiana.

SEC. 420. BRUSH AND ROCK CREEKS, MISSION HILLS AND FAIRWAY, KANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall evaluate the preliminary engineering report for the project for flood control, Mission Hills and Fairway, Kansas, entitled ''Preliminary Engineering Report: Brush Creek/Rock Creek Drainage Improvements, 66th Street to State Line Road'', to determine whether the plans contained in the report are feasible and in the Federal interest.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 421. COASTAL AREAS OF LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing measures to floodproof major hurricane evacuation routes in the coastal areas of Louisiana.

SEC. 422. IBERIA PORT, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for navigation, Iberia Port, Louisiana.

SEC. 423. LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN SEAWALL, LOUISIANA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a post-authorization change report on the project for hurricane-flood protection, Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, authorized by section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1077), to incorporate and accomplish structural modifications to the seawall providing protection along the south shore of Lake Pontchartrain from the New Basin Canal on the west to the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal on the east.

SEC. 424. LOWER ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LOUISIANA.

As part of the Lower Atchafalaya basin reevaluation study, the Secretary shall determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction, Stephensville, Louisiana.

SEC. 425. ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH, LOUISIANA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood damage reduction on the east bank of the Mississippi River in St. John the Baptist Parish, Louisiana.

SEC. 426. LAS VEGAS VALLEY, NEVADA.

Section 432(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 327) is amended by inserting ''recreation,'' after ''runoff),''.

SEC. 427. SOUTHWEST VALLEY, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO.

Section 433 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 327) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) EVALUATION OF FLOOD DAMAGE REDUCTION MEASURES.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall evaluate flood damage reduction measures that would otherwise be excluded from the feasibility analysis based on policies of the Corps of Engineers concerning the frequency of flooding, the drainage area, and the amount of runoff.''.

SEC. 428. BUFFALO HARBOR, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the advisability and potential impacts of declaring as non-navigable a portion of the channel at Control Point Draw, Buffalo Harbor, Buffalo New York.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study conducted under this section shall include an examination of other options to meet intermodal transportation needs in the area.

SEC. 429. HUDSON RIVER, MANHATTAN, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a Hudson River Park in Manhattan, New York City, New York. The study shall address the issues of shoreline protection, environmental protection and restoration, recreation, waterfront access, and open space for the area between Battery Place and West 59th Street.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult the Hudson River Park Trust.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the result of the study, including a master plan for the park.

SEC. 430. JAMESVILLE RESERVOIR, ONONDAGA COUNTY, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, flood damage reduction, and water quality, Jamesville Reservoir, Onondaga County, New York.

SEC. 431. STEUBENVIILLE, OHIO.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of developing a public port along the Ohio River in the vicinity of Steubenville, Ohio.

SEC. 432. GRAND LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

Section 560(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3783) is amended—

(1) by striking ''date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000''; and

(2) by inserting ''and Miami'' after ''Pensacola Dam''.

SEC. 433. COLUMBIA SLOUGH, OREGON.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete under section 1135 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2309a) a feasiblility study for the ecosystem restoration project at Columbia Slough, Oregon. If the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary may carry out the project on an expedited basis under such section.

SEC. 434. REEDY RIVER, GREENVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, flood damage reduction, and streambank stabilization on the Reedy River, Cleveland Park West, Greenville, South Carolina.

SEC. 435. GERMANTOWN, TENNESSEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for flood control and related purposes along Miller Farms Ditch, Howard Road Drainage, and Wolf River Lateral D, Germantown, Tennessee.

(b) COST SHARING.—The Secretary—

(1) shall credit toward the non-Federal share of the costs of the feasibility study the value of the in-kind services provided by the non-Federal interests relating to the planning, engineering, and design of the project, whether carried out before or after execution of the feasibility study cost-sharing agreement if the Secretary determines the work is necessary for completion of the study; and

(2) for the purposes of paragraph (1), shall consider the feasibility study to be conducted as part of the Memphis Metro Tennessee and Mississippi study authorized by resolution of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, dated March 7, 1996.

(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not reject the project under the feasibility study based solely on a minimum amount of stream runoff.

SEC. 436. HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, GALVESTON, TEXAS.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing barge lanes adjacent to the Houston Ship Channel from Redfish Reef to Morgan Point in Galveston, Texas.

SEC. 437. PARK CITY, UTAH.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the feasibility of carrying out a project for water supply, Park City, Utah.

SEC. 438. MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall evaluate the report for the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, entitled ''Interim Executive Summary: Menominee River Flood Management Plan'', dated September 1999, to determine whether the plans contained in the report are cost-effective, technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and in the Federal interest.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the evaluation.

SEC. 439. UPPER DES PLAINES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ILLINOIS AND WISCONSIN.

Section 419 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 324–325) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall provide the non-Federal interest credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the study for work performed by the non-Federal interest before the date of the study's feasibility cost-share agreement if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the study.''.

SEC. 440. DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct studies and assessments to analyze the sources and impacts of sediment contamination in the Delaware River watershed.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—Activities authorized under this section shall be conducted by a university with expertise in research in contaminated sediment sciences.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $5,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(2) CORPS OF ENGINEERS EXPENSES.—10 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be used by the Corps of Engineers district offices to administer and implement studies and assessments under this section.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. BRIDGEPORT, ALABAMA.

(a) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall review the construction of a channel performed by the non-Federal interest at the project for navigation, Tennessee River, Bridgeport, Alabama, to determine the Federal navigation interest in such work.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—If the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that the work performed by the non-Federal interest is consistent with the Federal navigation interest, the Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest an amount equal to the Federal share of the cost of construction of the channel.

SEC. 502. DUCK RIVER, CULLMAN, ALABAMA.

The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to the city of Cullman, Alabama, in the management of construction contracts for the reservoir project on the Duck River.

SEC. 503. SEWARD, ALASKA.

The Secretary shall carry out, on an emergency one-time basis, necessary repairs of the Lowell Creek Tunnel in Seward, Alaska, at Federal expense and a total cost of $3,000,000.

SEC. 504. AUGUSTA AND DEVALLS BLUFF, ARKANSAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may operate, maintain, and rehabilitate 37 miles of levees in and around Augusta and Devalls Bluff, Arkansas.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—After incurring any cost for operation, maintenance, or rehabilitation under subsection (a), the Secretary may seek reimbursement from the Secretary of the Interior of an amount equal to the portion of such cost that the Secretary determines is a benefit to a Federal wildlife refuge.

SEC. 505. BEAVER LAKE, ARKANSAS.

The contract price for additional storage for the Carroll-Boone Water District beyond that which is provided for in section 521 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 345) shall be based on the original construction cost of Beaver Lake and adjusted to the 2000 price level net of inflation between the date of initiation of construction and the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 506. McCLELLAN-KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA.

Taking into account the need to realize the total economic potential of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River navigation system, the Secretary shall expedite completion of the Arkansas River navigation study, including the feasibility of increasing the authorized channel from 9 feet to 12 feet and, if justified, proceed directly to project preconstruction engineering and design.±

SEC. 507. CALFED BAY DELTA PROGRAM ASSISTANCE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate with appropriate Federal and State agencies in planning and management activities associated with the CALFED Bay Delta Program (in this section referred to as the ''Program'') and shall, to the maximum extent practicable and in accordance with all applicable laws, integrate the activities of the Corps of Engineers in the San Joaquin and Sacramento River basins with the long-term goals of the Program.

(b) COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary—

(1) may accept and expend funds from other Federal agencies and from public, private, and non-profit entities to carry out ecosystem restoration projects and activities associated with the Program; and

(2) may enter into contracts, cooperative research and development agreements, and cooperative agreements, with Federal and public, private, and non-profit entities to carry out such projects and activities.

(c) GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE.—For the purposes of the participation of the Secretary under this section, the geographic scope of the Program shall be the San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary and their watershed (also known as the ''Bay-Delta Estuary''), as identified in the agreement entitled the ''Framework Agreement Between the Governor's Water Policy Council of the State of California and the Federal Ecosystem Directorate''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

SEC. 508. CLEAR LAKE BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

Amounts made available to the Secretary by the Energy and Water Appropriations Act, 2000 (113 Stat. 483 et seq.) for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Clear Lake basin, California, to be carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), may only be used for the wetlands restoration and creation elements of the project.

SEC. 509. CONTRA COSTA CANAL, OAKLEY AND KNIGHTSEN, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall carry out a project for flood damage reduction under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) at the Contra Costa Canal, Oakley and Knightsen, California, if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

SEC. 510. HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall carry out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) a project for flood damage reduction in Huntington Beach, California, if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

SEC. 511. MALLARD SLOUGH, PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall carry out under section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (33 U.S.C. 701s) a project for flood damage reduction in Mallard Slough, Pittsburg, California, if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified.

SEC. 512. PENN MINE, CALAVERAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Penn Mine, Calaveras County, California, carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), $4,100,000 for the Federal share of costs incurred by the non-Federal interest for work carried out by the non-Federal interest for the project.

(b) SOURCE OF FUNDING.—Reimbursement under subsection (a) shall be from amounts appropriated before the date of enactment of this Act for the project described in subsection (a).

SEC. 513. PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

(a) EMERGENCY MEASURES.—The Secretary shall carry out, on an emergency basis, measures to address health, safety, and environmental risks posed by floatables and floating debris originating from Piers 24 and 64 in the Port of San Francisco, California, by removing such floatables and debris.

(b) STUDY.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to determine the risk to navigation posed by floatables and floating debris originating from Piers 24 and 64 in the Port of San Francisco, California, and the cost of removing such floatables and debris.

(c) FUNDING.—There is authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 514. SAN GABRIEL BASIN, CALIFORNIA.

(a) SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There shall be established within the Treasury of the United States an interest bearing account to be known as the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund (in this section referred to as the ''Restoration Fund'').

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Restoration Fund shall be administered by the Secretary, in cooperation with the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority or its successor agency.

(3) PURPOSES OF FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amounts in the Restoration Fund, including interest accrued, shall be utilized by the Secretary—

(i) to design and construct water quality projects to be administered by the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority and the Central Basin Water Quality Project to be administered by the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and

(ii) to operate and maintain any project constructed under this section for such period as the Secretary determines, but not to exceed 10 years, following the initial date of operation of the project.

(B) COST-SHARING LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not obligate any funds appropriated to the Restoration Fund in a fiscal year until the Secretary has deposited in the Fund an amount provided by non-Federal interests sufficient to ensure that at least 35 percent of any funds obligated by the Secretary are from funds provided to the Secretary by the non-Federal interests. The San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority shall be responsible for providing the non-Federal amount required by the preceding sentence. The State of California, local government agencies, and private entities may provide all or any portion of such amount.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal and State laws.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect other Federal or State authorities that are being used or may be used to facilitate the cleanup and protection of the San Gabriel and Central groundwater basins. In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall integrate such activities with ongoing Federal and State projects and activities. None of the funds made available for such activities pursuant to this section shall be counted against any Federal authorization ceiling established for any previously authorized Federal projects or activities.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Restoration Fund established under subsection (a) $85,000,000. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(2) SET-ASIDE.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1), no more than $10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Central Basin Water Quality Project.

(e) ADJUSTMENT.—Of the $25,000,000 made available for San Gabriel Basin Groundwater Restoration, California, under the heading ''Construction, General'' in title I of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001—

(1) $2,000,000 shall be available only for studies and other investigative activities and planning and design of projects determined by the Secretary to offer a long-term solution to the problem of groundwater contamination caused by perchlorates at sites located in the city of Santa Clarita, California; and

(2) $23,000,000 shall be deposited in the Restoration Fund, of which $4,000,000 shall be used for remediation in the Central Basin, California.

SEC. 515. STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall evaluate the feasibility of the Lower Mosher Slough element and the levee extensions on the Upper Calaveras River element of the project for flood control, Stockton Metropolitan Area, California, carried out under section 211(f)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3683), to determine the eligibility of such elements for reimbursement under section 211 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 701b–13). If the Secretary determines that such elements are technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, the Secretary shall reimburse under section 211 of such Act the non-Federal interest for the Federal share of the cost of such elements.

SEC. 516. PORT EVERGLADES, FLORIDA.

Notwithstanding the absence of a project cooperation agreement, the Secretary shall reimburse the non-Federal interest for the project for navigation, Port Everglades Harbor, Florida, $15,003,000 for the Federal share of costs incurred by the non-Federal interest in carrying out the project and determined by the Secretary to be eligible for reimbursement under the limited reevaluation report of the Corps of Engineers, dated April 1998.

SEC. 517. FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority, appropriate agencies of municipalities of Monroe County, Florida, and other appropriate public agencies of the State of Florida or Monroe County, the Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to carry out projects for the planning, design, and construction of treatment works to improve water quality in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary.

(b) CRITERIA FOR PROJECTS.—Before entering into a cooperation agreement to provide assistance with respect to a project under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that—

(1) the non-Federal sponsor has completed adequate planning and design activities, as applicable;

(2) the non-Federal sponsor has completed a financial plan identifying sources of non-Federal funding for the project;

(3) the project complies with—

(A) applicable growth management ordinances of Monroe County, Florida;

(B) applicable agreements between Monroe County, Florida, and the State of Florida to manage growth in Monroe County, Florida; and

(C) applicable water quality standards; and

(4) the project is consistent with the master wastewater and stormwater plans for Monroe County, Florida.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—In selecting projects under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consider whether a project will have substantial water quality benefits relative to other projects under consideration.

(d) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with—

(1) the Water Quality Steering Committee established under section 8(d)(2)(A) of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and Protection Act (106 Stat. 5054);

(2) the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force established by section 528(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3771–3773);

(3) the Commission on the Everglades established by executive order of the Governor of the State of Florida; and

(4) other appropriate State and local government officials.

(e) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section shall be 35 percent.

(2) CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide the non-Federal interest credit toward cash contributions required—

(i) before and during the construction of the project, for the costs of planning, engineering, and design, and for the construction

management work that is performed by the non-Federal interest and that the Secretary determines is necessary to implement the project; and

(ii) during the construction of the project, for the construction that the non-Federal interest carries out on behalf of the Secretary and that the Secretary determines is necessary to carry out the project.

(B) TREATMENT OF CREDIT BETWEEN PROJECTS.—Any credit provided under this paragraph may be carried over between authorized projects.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $100,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 518. BALLARD'S ISLAND, LASALLE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

The Secretary may provide the non-Federal interest for the project for the improvement of the quality of the environment, Ballard's Island, LaSalle County, Illinois, carried out under section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C 2309a), credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for work performed by the non-Federal interest after July 1, 1999, if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

SEC. 519. LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, ILLINOIS.

Section 1142(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (110 Stat. 4253; 113 Stat. 339) is amended by inserting after ''2003'' the following: ''and $800,000 for each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2003,''.

SEC. 520. KOONTZ LAKE, INDIANA.

The Secretary shall provide the non-Federal interest for the project for aquatic ecosystem restoration, Koontz Lake, Indiana, carried out under section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (22 U.S.C. 2330), credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for work performed by the non-Federal interest before the date of execution of the project cooperation agreement if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

SEC. 521. CAMPBELLSVILLE LAKE, KENTUCKY.

The Secretary shall repair the retaining wall and dam at Campbellsville Lake, Kentucky, to protect the public road on top of the dam at Federal expense and a total cost of $200,000.

SEC. 522. WEST VIEW SHORES, CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall carry out an investigation of the contamination of the well system in West View Shores, Cecil County, Maryland. If the Secretary determines that a disposal site for a Federal navigation project has contributed to the contamination of the well system, the Secretary may provide alternative water supplies, including replacement of wells, at Federal expense.

SEC. 523. CONSERVATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE, CHESAPEAKE BAY, MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA.

Section 704(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2263(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''In addition, there is authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 to carry out paragraph (4).''.

SEC. 524. MUDDY RIVER, BROOKLINE AND BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

The Secretary shall carry out the project for flood damage reduction and environmental restoration, Muddy River, Brookline and Boston, Massachusetts, substantially in accordance with the plans, and subject to the conditions, described in the draft evaluation report of the New England District Engineer entitled ''Phase I Muddy River Master Plan'', dated June 2000.

SEC. 525. SOO LOCKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, MICHIGAN.

The Secretary may not require a cargo vessel equipped with bow thrusters and friction winches that is transiting the Soo Locks in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, to provide more than 2 crew members to serve as line handlers on the pier of a lock, except in adverse weather conditions or if there is a mechanical failure on the vessel.

SEC. 526. DULUTH, MINNESOTA, ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT.

(a) PROJECT AUTHORIZATION.—Section 541(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3777) is amended—

(1) by striking ''implement'' and inserting ''conduct full scale demonstrations of''; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: '', including technologies evaluated for the New York/New Jersey Harbor under section 405 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2239 note; 106 Stat. 4863)''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 541(b) of such Act is amended by striking ''$1,000,000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000''.

SEC. 527. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the State of Minnesota, shall design and construct the project for environmental restoration and recreation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, substantially in accordance with the plans described in the report entitled ''Feasibility Study for Mississippi Whitewater Park, Minneapolis, Minnesota'', prepared for the Minnesota department of natural resources, dated June 30, 1999.

(b) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the project shall be determined in accordance with title I of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2211 et seq.).

(2) LANDS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The non-Federal interest shall provide all lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for construction of the project and shall receive credit for the cost of providing such lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

(3) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, REHABILITATION, AND REPLACEMENT.—The operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of the project shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(4) CREDIT FOR NON-FEDERAL WORK.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for work performed by the non-Federal interest before the date of execution of the project cooperation agreement if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 528. ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINNESOTA.

The Secretary shall carry out under section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) a project in St. Louis County, Minnesota, by making beneficial use of dredged material from a Federal navigation project.

SEC. 529. WILD RICE RIVER, MINNESOTA.

The Secretary shall prepare a general reevaluation report on the project for flood control, Wild Rice River, Minnesota, authorized by section 201 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1825), and, if the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified, shall carry out the project. In carrying out the reevaluation, the Secretary shall include river dredging as a component of the study.

SEC. 530. COASTAL MISSISSIPPI WETLANDS RESTORATION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to further the purposes of section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326) and section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2330), the Secretary shall participate in restoration projects for critical coastal wetlands and coastal barrier islands in the State of Mississippi that will produce, consistent with existing Federal programs, projects, and activities, immediate and substantial restoration, preservation, and ecosystem protection benefits, including the beneficial use of dredged material if such use is a cost-effective means of disposal of such material.

(b) PROJECT SELECTION.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal, tribal, State, and local agencies, may identify and implement projects described in subsection (a) after entering into an agreement with an appropriate non-Federal interest in accordance with this section.

(c) COST SHARING.—Before implementing any project under this section, the Secretary shall enter into a binding agreement with the non-Federal interests. The agreement shall provide that the non-Federal responsibility for the project shall be as follows:

(1) To acquire any lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for implementation of the project.

(2) To hold and save harmless the United States free from claims or damages due to implementation of the project, except for the negligence of the Federal Government or its contractors.

(3) To pay 35 percent of project costs.

(d) NONPROFIT ENTITY.—For any project undertaken under this section, a non-Federal interest may include a nonprofit entity with the consent of the affected local government.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $10,000,000.

SEC. 531. MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) MISSOURI RIVER MITIGATION PROJECT.—The project for mitigation of fish and wildlife losses, Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Project, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska authorized by section 601(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4143) and modified by section 334 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 306), is further modified to authorize $200,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2010 to be appropriated to the Secretary for acquisition of 118,650 acres of land and interests in land for the project.

(b) UPPER MISSOURI RIVER AQUATIC AND RIPARIAN HABITAT MITIGATION PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) STUDY.—The Secretary shall complete a study that analyzes the need for additional measures for mitigation of losses of aquatic and terrestrial habitat from Fort Peck Dam to Sioux City, Iowa, resulting from the operation of the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir project in the States of Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the study.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the affected State fish and wildlife agencies, shall develop and administer a pilot mitigation program that—

(A) involves the experimental releases of warm water from the spillways at Fort Peck

Dam during the appropriate spawning periods for native fish;

(B) involves the monitoring of the response of fish to, and the effectiveness toward the preservation of native fish and wildlife habitat as a result of, such releases; and

(C) requires the Secretary to provide compensation for any loss of hydropower at Fort Peck Dam resulting from implementation of the pilot program; and

(D) does not effect a change in the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual.

(3) RESERVOIR FISH LOSS STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the North Dakota Game and Fish Department and the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks, shall complete a study to analyze and recommend measures to avoid or reduce the loss of fish, including rainbow smelt, through Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Oahe Dam in South Dakota.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report describing the results of the study.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated—

(A) to complete the study under paragraph (3) $200,000; and

(B) to carry out the other provisions of this subsection $1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2010.

(c) MISSOURI AND MIDDLE MISSISSIPPI RIVERS ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.—Section 514(g) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 342) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to pay the Federal share of the cost of carrying out activities under this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2010.''.

SEC. 532. NEW MADRID COUNTY, MISSOURI.

For purposes of determining the non-Federal share for the project for navigation, New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), the Secretary shall consider Phases 1 and 2 as described in the report of the District Engineer, dated February 2000, as one project and provide credit to the non-Federal interest toward the non-Federal share of the combined project for work performed by the non-Federal interest on Phase 1 of the project.

SEC. 533. PEMISCOT COUNTY, MISSOURI.

The Secretary shall provide the non-Federal interest for the project for navigation, Caruthersville Harbor, Pemiscot County, Missouri, carried out under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577), credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project for in-kind work performed by the non-Federal interest after December 1, 1997, if the Secretary determines that the work is integral to the project.

SEC. 534. LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the Las Vegas Wash Coordinating Committee.

(2) PLAN.—The term ''Plan'' means the Las Vegas Wash comprehensive adaptive management plan, developed by the Committee and dated January 20, 2000.

(3) PROJECT.—The term ''Project'' means the Las Vegas Wash wetlands restoration and Lake Mead water quality improvement project and includes the programs, features, components, projects, and activities identified in the Plan.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior and in partnership with the Committee, shall participate in the implementation of the Project to restore wetlands at Las Vegas Wash and to improve water quality in Lake Mead in accordance with the Plan.

(2) COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal interests shall pay 35 percent of the cost of any project carried out under this section.

(B) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal interests shall be responsible for all costs associated with operating, maintaining, replacing, repairing, and rehabilitating all projects carried out under this section.

(C) FEDERAL LANDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section on Federal lands shall be 100 percent, including the costs of operation and maintenance.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 535. NEWARK, NEW JERSEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Using authorities under law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies shall assist the State of New Jersey in developing and implementing a comprehensive basinwide strategy in the Passaic, Hackensack, Raritan, and Atlantic Coast floodplain areas for coordinated and integrated management of land and water resources to improve water quality, reduce flood hazards, and ensure sustainable economic activity.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, STAFF, AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT.—The heads of the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a) may provide technical assistance, staff, and financial support for the development of the floodplain management strategy.

(c) FLEXIBILITY.—The heads of the Federal agencies referred to in subsection (a) shall exercise flexibility to reduce barriers to efficient and effective implementation of the floodplain management strategy.

(d) RESEARCH.—In coordination with academic and research institutions for support, the Secretary may conduct a study to carry out this section.

SEC. 536. URBANIZED PEAK FLOOD MANAGEMENT RESEARCH, NEW JERSEY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a research program to evaluate opportunities to manage peak flood flows in urbanized watersheds located in the State of New Jersey.

(b) SCOPE OF RESEARCH.—The research program authorized by subsection (a) shall be accomplished through the New York District of Corps of Engineers. The research shall include the following:

(1) Identification of key factors in the development of an urbanized watershed that affect peak flows in the watershed and downstream.

(2) Development of peak flow management models for 4 to 6 watersheds in urbanized areas with widely differing geology, shapes, and soil types that can be used to determine optimal flow reduction factors for individual watersheds.

(c) LOCATION.—The activities authorized by this section shall be carried out at the facility authorized by section 103(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 106 Stat. 4812–4813, which may be located on the campus of the New Jersey Institute of Technology.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall evaluate policy changes in the planning process for flood damage reduction projects based on the results of the research under this section and transmit to Congress a report on such results not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $11,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2000.

SEC. 537. BLACK ROCK CANAL, BUFFALO, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall provide technical assistance in support of activities of non-Federal interests related to the dredging of Black Rock Canal in the area between the Ferry Street Overpass and the Peace Bridge Overpass in Buffalo, New York.

SEC. 538. HAMBURG, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall complete the study of a project for shoreline erosion, Old Lake Shore Road, Hamburg, New York, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary shall carry out the project.

SEC. 539. NEPPERHAN RIVER, YONKERS, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to the city of Yonkers, New York, in support of activities relating to the dredging of the Nepperhan River outlet, New York.

SEC. 540. ROCHESTER, NEW YORK.

The Secretary shall complete the study of a project for navigation, Rochester Harbor, Rochester, New York, and, if the Secretary determines that the project is feasible, the Secretary shall carry out the project.

SEC. 541. UPPER MOHAWK RIVER BASIN, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the State of New York, shall conduct a study, develop a strategy, and implement a project to reduce flood damages, improve water quality, and create wildlife habitat through wetlands restoration, soil and water conservation practices, nonstructural measures, and other appropriate means in the Upper Mohawk River Basin, at an estimated Federal cost of $10,000,000.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall implement the strategy under this section in cooperation with local landowners and local government. Projects to implement the strategy shall be designed to take advantage of ongoing or planned actions by other agencies, local municipalities, or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with expertise in wetlands restoration that would increase the effectiveness or decrease the overall cost of implementing recommended projects and may include the acquisition of wetlands, from willing sellers, that contribute to the Upper Mohawk River basin ecosystem.

(c) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies as well as appropriate nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with expertise in wetlands restoration, with the consent of the affected local government. Financial assistance provided may include activities for the implementation of wetlands restoration projects and soil and water conservation measures.

(d) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under this section shall be 25 percent and may be provided through in-kind services and materials.

(e) UPPER MOHAWK RIVER BASIN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Upper Mohawk River basin'' means the Mohawk River, its tributaries, and associated lands upstream of the confluence of the Mohawk River and

Canajoharie Creek, and including Canajoharie Creek, New York.

SEC. 542. EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA FLOOD PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to assist the State of North Carolina and local governments in mitigating damages resulting from a major disaster, the Secretary shall carry out flood damage reduction projects in eastern North Carolina by protecting, clearing, and restoring channel dimensions (including removing accumulated snags and other debris) in the following rivers and tributaries:

(1) New River and tributaries.

(2) White Oak River and tributaries.

(3) Neuse River and tributaries.

(4) Pamlico River and tributaries.

(b) COST SHARE.—The non-Federal interest for a project under this section shall—

(1) pay 35 percent of the cost of the project; and

(2) provide any lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and material disposal areas necessary for implementation of the project.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may not reject a project based solely on a minimum amount of stream runoff.

(d) MAJOR DISASTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''major disaster'' means a major disaster declared under title IV of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 et seq.) and includes any major disaster declared before the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $3,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2003.

SEC. 543. CUYAHOGA RIVER, OHIO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance to non-Federal interests for an evaluation of the structural integrity of the bulkhead system located along the Cuyahoga River in the vicinity of Cleveland, Ohio, at a total cost of $500,000.

(b) EVALUATION.—The evaluation described in subsection (a) shall include design analysis, plans and specifications, and cost estimates for repair or replacement of the bulkhead system.

SEC. 544. CROWDER POINT, CROWDER, OKLAHOMA.

At the request of the city of Crowder, Oklahoma, the Secretary shall enter into a long-term lease, not to exceed 99 years, with the city under which the city may develop, operate, and maintain as a public park all or a portion of approximately 260 acres of land known as Crowder Point on Lake Eufaula, Oklahoma. The lease shall include such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines are necessary to protect the interest of the United States and project purposes and shall be made without consideration to the United States.

SEC. 545. OKLAHOMA-TRIBAL COMMISSION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives makes the following findings:

(1) The unemployment rate in southeastern Oklahoma is 23 percent greater than the national average.

(2) The per capita income in southeastern Oklahoma is 62 percent of the national average.

(3) Reflecting the inadequate job opportunities and dwindling resources in poor rural communities, southeastern Oklahoma is experiencing an out-migration of people.

(4) Water represents a vitally important resource in southeastern Oklahoma. Its abundance offers an opportunity for the residents to benefit from their natural resources.

(5) Trends as described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) are not conducive to local economic development, and efforts to improve the management of water in the region would have a positive outside influence on the local economy, help reverse these trends, and improve the lives of local residents.

(b) SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In view of the findings described in subsection (a), and in order to assist communities in southeastern Oklahoma in benefiting from their local resources, it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the State of Oklahoma and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and the Chickasaw Nation, Oklahoma, should establish a State-tribal commission composed equally of representatives of such Nations and residents of the water basins within the boundaries of such Nations for the purpose of administering and distributing from the sale of water any benefits and net revenues to the tribes and local entities within the respective basins;

(2) any sale of water to entities outside the basins should be consistent with the procedures and requirements established by the commission; and

(3) if requested, the Secretary should provide technical assistance, as appropriate, to facilitate the efforts of the commission.

SEC. 546. COLUMBIA RIVER, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) MODELING AND FORECASTING SYSTEM.—The Secretary shall develop and implement a modeling and forecasting system for the Columbia River estuary, Oregon and Washington, to provide real-time information on existing and future wave, current, tide, and wind conditions.

(b) USE OF CONTRACTS AND GRANTS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary is encouraged to use contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants with colleges and universities and other non-Federal entities.

SEC. 547. JOHN DAY POOL, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) EXTINGUISHMENT OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS AND USE RESTRICTIONS.—With respect to the lands described in each deed listed in subsection (b)—

(1) the reversionary interests and the use restrictions relating to port or industrial purposes are extinguished;

(2) the human habitation or other building structure use restriction is extinguished in each area where the elevation is above the standard project flood elevation; and

(3) the use of fill material to raise areas above the standard project flood elevation, without increasing the risk of flooding in or outside of the floodplain, is authorized, except in any area constituting wetland for which a permit under section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) would be required.

(b) AFFECTED DEEDS.—The following deeds are referred to in subsection (a):

(1) The deeds executed by the United States and bearing Morrow County, Oregon, Auditor's Microfilm Numbers 229 and 16226.

(2) The deed executed by the United States and bearing Benton County, Washington, Auditor's File Number 601766, but only as that deed applies to the following portion of lands conveyed by that deed:

A tract of land lying in Section 7, Township 5 north, Range 28 east of the Willamette meridian, Benton County, Washington, said tract being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the point of intersection of the centerlines of Plymouth Street and Third Avenue in the First Addition to the Town of Plymouth (according to the duly recorded Plat thereof);

thence westerly along the said centerline of Third Avenue, a distance of 565 feet;

thence south 54° 10′ west, to a point on the west line of Tract 18 of said Addition and the true point of beginning;

thence north, parallel with the west line of said Section 7, to a point on the north line of said Section 7;

thence west along the north line thereof to the northwest corner of said Section 7;

thence south along the west line of said Section 7 to a point on the ordinary high water line of the Columbia River;

thence northeasterly along said high water line to a point on the north and south coordinate line of the Oregon Coordinate System, North Zone, said coordinate line being east 2,291,000 feet;

thence north along said line to a point on the south line of First Avenue of said Addition;

thence westerly along First Avenue to a point on southerly extension of the west line of Tract 18;

thence northerly along said west line of Tract 18 to the point of beginning.

(3) The deed recorded October 17, 1967, in book 291, page 148, Deed of Records of Umatilla County, Oregon, executed by the United States.

(c) NO EFFECT ON OTHER NEEDS.—Nothing in this section affects the remaining rights and interests of the Corps of Engineers for authorized project purposes.

SEC. 548. LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER AND TILLAMOOK BAY ESTUARY PROGRAM, OREGON AND WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct studies and ecosystem restoration projects for the lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay estuaries, Oregon and Washington.

(b) USE OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ESTUARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out ecosystem restoration projects under this section, the Secretary shall use as a guide the Lower Columbia River estuary program's comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330).

(B) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out ecosystem restoration projects under this section for the lower Columbia River estuary in consultation with the States of Oregon and Washington, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Forest Service.

(2) TILLAMOOK BAY ESTUARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out ecosystem restoration projects under this section, the Secretary shall use as a guide the Tillamook Bay national estuary project's comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330).

(B) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall carry out ecosystem restoration projects under this section for the Tillamook Bay estuary in consultation with the State of Oregon, the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Forest Service.

(c) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out ecosystem restoration projects under this section, the Secretary shall undertake activities necessary to protect, monitor, and restore fish and wildlife habitat.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary may not carry out any activity under this section that adversely affects—

(A) the water-related needs of the lower Columbia River estuary or the Tillamook Bay estuary, including navigation, recreation, and water supply needs; or

(B) private property rights.

(d) PRIORITY.—In determining the priority of projects to be carried out under this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Implementation Committee of the Lower Columbia River Estuary Program and the Performance Partnership Council of the Tillamook Bay National Estuary Project, and shall consider the recommendations of such entities.

(e) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) STUDIES.—Studies conducted under this section shall be subject to cost sharing in accordance with section 105 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2215).

(2) ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Non-Federal interests shall pay 35 percent of the cost of any ecosystem restoration project carried out under this section.

(B) ITEMS PROVIDED BY NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—Non-Federal interests shall provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations necessary for ecosystem restoration projects to be carried out under this section. The value of such land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations shall be credited toward the payment required under this paragraph.

(C) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—Not more than 50 percent of the non-Federal share required under this subsection may be satisfied by the provision of in-kind services.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Non-Federal interests shall be responsible for all costs associated with operating, maintaining, replacing, repairing, and rehabilitating all projects carried out under this section.

(4) FEDERAL LANDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this section on Federal lands shall be 100 percent, including costs of operation and maintenance.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER ESTUARY.—The term ''lower Columbia River estuary'' means those river reaches having navigation channels on the mainstem of the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington west of Bonneville Dam, and the tributaries of such reaches to the extent such tributaries are tidally influenced.

(2) TILLAMOOK BAY ESTUARY.—The term ''Tillamook Bay estuary'' means those waters of Tillamook Bay in Oregon and its tributaries that are tidally influenced.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000.

SEC. 549. SKINNER BUTTE PARK, EUGENE, OREGON.

Section 546(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 351) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''If the Secretary participates in the project, the Secretary shall carry out a monitoring program for 3 years after construction to evaluate the ecological and engineering effectiveness of the project and its applicability to other sites in the Willamette Valley.''

SEC. 550. WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREGON.

Section 547 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 351–352) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) RESEARCH.—In coordination with academic and research institutions for support, the Secretary may conduct a study to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 551. LACKAWANNA RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 539(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3776) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (1)(A);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (1)(B) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) the Lackawanna River, Pennsylvania.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 539(d) of such Act (110 Stat. 3776–3777) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a)(1)(A) and'' and inserting ''(a)(1)(A),''; and

(2) by inserting '', and $5,000,000 for projects undertaken under subsection (a)(1)(C)'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 552. PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to the Delaware River Port Authority to deepen the Delaware River at Pier 122 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 553. ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS, RAYSTOWN LAKE, PENNSYLVANIA.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania may transfer any unobligated funds made available to the Commonwealth for item number 1278 of the table contained in section 1602 of Public Law 105–178, to the Secretary for access improvements at the Raystown Lake project, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 554. UPPER SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN, PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW YORK.

Section 567 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3787–3788) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(2) and inserting the following:

''(2) The Susquehanna River watershed upstream of the Chemung River, New York, at an estimated Federal cost of $10,000,000.''; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—In conducting the study and developing the strategy under this section, the Secretary shall enter into cooperation agreements to provide financial assistance to appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies as well as appropriate nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with expertise in wetlands restoration, with the consent of the affected local government. Financial assistance provided may include activities for the implementation of wetlands restoration projects and soil and water conservation measures.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGY.—The Secretary shall undertake development and implementation of the strategy under this section in cooperation with local landowners and local government officials. Projects to implement the strategy shall be designed to take advantage of ongoing or planned actions by other agencies, local municipalities, or nonprofit, nongovernmental organizations with expertise in wetlands restoration that would increase the effectiveness or decrease the overall cost of implementing recommended projects and may include the acquisition of wetlands, from willing sellers, that contribute to the Upper Susquehanna River basin ecosystem.''.

SEC. 555. CHICKAMAUGA LOCK, CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE.

(a) TRANSFER FROM TVA.—The Tennessee Valley Authority shall transfer $200,000 to the Secretary for the preparation of a report of the Chief of Engineers for a replacement lock at Chickamauga Lock and Dam, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall accept and use the funds transferred under subsection (a) to prepare the report referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 556. JOE POOL LAKE, TEXAS.

If the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, enters into a binding agreement with the Secretary under which—

(1) the city agrees to assume all of the responsibilities (other than financial responsibilities) of the Trinity River Authority of Texas under Corps of Engineers contract #DACW63–76–C–0166, including operation and maintenance of the recreation facilities included in the contract; and

(2) to pay the Federal Government a total of $4,290,000 in 2 installments, 1 in the amount of $2,150,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2000, and 1 in the amount of $2,140,000, which shall be due and payable no later than December 1, 2003,

the Trinity River Authority shall be relieved of all of its financial responsibilities under the contract as of the date the Secretary enters into the agreement with the city.

SEC. 557. BENSON BEACH, FORT CANBY STATE PARK, WASHINGTON.

The Secretary shall place dredged material at Benson Beach, Fort Canby State Park, Washington, in accordance with section 204 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (33 U.S.C. 2326).

SEC. 558. PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS RESTORATION, WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may participate in critical restoration projects in the area of the Puget Sound and its adjacent waters, including the watersheds that drain directly into Puget Sound, Admiralty Inlet, Hood Canal, Rosario Strait, and the eastern portion of the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

(b) PROJECT SELECTION.—The Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal, tribal, State, and local agencies, (including the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, Northwest Straits Commission, Hood Canal Coordinating Council, county watershed planning councils, and salmon enhancement groups) may identify critical restoration projects and may implement those projects after entering into an agreement with an appropriate non-Federal interest in accordance with the requirements of section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b) and this section.

(c) PROJECT COST LIMITATION.—Of amounts appropriated to carry out this section, not more than $2,500,000 may be allocated to carry out any project.

(d) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal interest for a critical restoration project under this section shall—

(A) pay 35 percent of the cost of the project;

(B) provide any lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas necessary for implementation of the project;

(C) pay 100 percent of the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs associated with the project; and

(D) hold the United States harmless from liability due to implementation of the project, except for the negligence of the Federal Government or its contractors.

(2) CREDIT.—The Secretary shall provide credit to the non-Federal interest for a critical restoration project under this section for the value of any lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and dredged material disposal areas provided by the non-Federal interest for the project.

(3) MEETING NON-FEDERAL COST SHARE.—The non-Federal interest may provide up to 50 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this section through the provision of services, materials, supplies, or other in-kind services.

(e) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''critical restoration project'' means a water resource project that will produce, consistent with existing Federal programs, projects, and activities, immediate and substantial environmental protection and restoration benefits.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $40,000,000.

SEC. 559. SHOALWATER BAY INDIAN TRIBE, WILLAPA BAY, WASHINGTON.

(a) PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL ON SHORE.—For the purpose of addressing coastal erosion, the Secretary shall place, on an emergency one-time basis, dredged material from a Federal navigation project on the shore of the tribal reservation of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, Willapa Bay, Washington, at Federal expense.

(b) PLACEMENT OF DREDGED MATERIAL ON PROTECTIVE DUNES.—The Secretary shall place dredged material from Willapa Bay on the remaining protective dunes on the tribal reservation of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, at Federal expense.

(c) STUDY OF COASTAL EROSION.—The Secretary shall conduct a study to develop long-term solutions to coastal erosion problems at the tribal reservation of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe at Federal expense.

SEC. 560. WYNOOCHEE LAKE, WYNOOCHEE RIVER, WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The city of Aberdeen, Washington, may transfer its rights, interests, and title in the land transferred to the city under section 203 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4632) to the city of Tacoma, Washington.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The transfer under this section shall be subject to the conditions set forth in section 203(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4632); except that the condition set forth in paragraph (1) of such section shall apply to the city of Tacoma only for so long as the city of Tacoma has a valid license with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relating to operation of the Wynoochee Dam, Washington.

(c) LIMITATION.—The transfer under subsection (a) may be made only after the Secretary determines that the city of Tacoma will be able to operate, maintain, repair, replace, and rehabilitate the project for Wynoochee Lake, Wynoochee River, Washington, authorized by section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1193), in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may issue to ensure that such operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation is consistent with project purposes.

(d) WATER SUPPLY CONTRACT.—The water supply contract designated as DACWD 67–68–C–0024 shall be null and void if the Secretary exercises the reversionary right set forth in section 203(b)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 4632).

SEC. 561. SNOHOMISH RIVER, WASHINGTON.

In coordination with appropriate Federal, tribal, and State agencies, the Secretary may carry out a project to address data needs regarding the outmigration of juvenile chinook salmon in the Snohomish River, Washington.

SEC. 562. BLUESTONE, WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Tri-Cities Power Authority of West Virginia is authorized to design and construct hydroelectric generating facilities at the Bluestone Lake facility, West Virginia, under the terms and conditions of the agreement referred to in subsection (b).

(b) AGREEMENT.—

(1) AGREEMENT TERMS.—Conditioned upon the parties agreeing to mutually acceptable terms and conditions, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, may enter into a binding agreement with the Tri-Cities Power Authority under which the Tri-Cities Power Authority agrees to each of the following:

(A) To design and construct the generating facilities referred to in subsection (a) within 4 years after the date of such agreement.

(B) To reimburse the Secretary for—

(i) the cost of approving such design and inspecting such construction;

(ii) the cost of providing any assistance authorized under subsection (c)(2); and

(iii) the redistributed costs associated with the original construction of the dam and dam safety if all parties agree with the method of the development of the chargeable amounts associated with hydropower at the facility.

(C) To release and indemnify the United States from any claims, causes of action, or liabilities which may arise from such design and construction of the facilities referred to in subsection (a), including any liability that may arise out of the removal of the facility if directed by the Secretary.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The agreement shall also specify each of the following:

(A) The procedures and requirements for approval and acceptance of design, construction, and operation and maintenance of the facilities referred in subsection (a).

(B) The rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of each party to the agreement.

(C) The amount of the payments under subsection (f) of this section and the procedures under which such payments are to be made.

(c) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—No Federal funds may be expended for the design, construction, and operation and maintenance of the facilities referred to in subsection (a) prior to the date on which such facilities are accepted by the Secretary under subsection (d).

(2) REIMBURSEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if requested by the Tri-Cities Power Authority, the Secretary may provide, on a reimbursable basis, assistance in connection with the design and construction of the generating facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(d) COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) TRANSFER OF FACILITIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon completion of the construction of the facilities referred to in subsection (a) and final approval of such facility by the Secretary, the Tri-Cities Power Authority shall transfer without consideration title to such facilities to the United States, and the Secretary shall—

(A) accept the transfer of title to such facilities on behalf of the United States; and

(B) operate and maintain the facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary is authorized to accept title to the facilities pursuant to paragraph (1) only after certifying that the quality of the construction meets all standards established for similar facilities constructed by the Secretary.

(3) AUTHORIZED PROJECT PURPOSES.—The operation and maintenance of the facilities shall be conducted in a manner that is consistent with other authorized project purposes of the Bluestone Lake facility.

(e) EXCESS POWER.—Pursuant to any agreement under subsection (b), the Southeastern Power Administration shall market the excess power produced by the facilities referred to in subsection (a) in accordance with section 5 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s; 58 Stat. 890).

(f) PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, is authorized to pay in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into under subsection (b) out of the revenues from the sale of power produced by the generating facility of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration—

(1) to the Tri-Cities Power Authority all reasonable costs incurred by the Tri-Cities Power Authority in the design and construction of the facilities referred to in subsection (a), including the capital investment in such facilities and a reasonable rate of return on such capital investment; and

(2) to the Secretary, in accordance with the terms of the agreement entered into under subsection (b) out of the revenues from the sale of power produced by the generating facility of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration, all reasonable costs incurred by the Secretary in the operation and maintenance of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(g) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF ENERGY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Southeastern Power Administration, is authorized—

(1) to construct such transmission facilities as necessary to market the power produced at the facilities referred to in subsection (a) with funds contributed by the Tri-Cities Power Authority; and

(2) to repay those funds, including interest and any administrative expenses, directly from the revenues from the sale of power produced by such facilities of the interconnected systems of reservoirs operated by the Secretary and marketed by the Southeastern Power Administration.

(h) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section affects any requirement under Federal or State environmental law relating to the licensing or operation of such facilities.

SEC. 563. LESAGE/GREENBOTTOM SWAMP, WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 30 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4030) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) HISTORIC STRUCTURE.—The Secretary shall ensure the stabilization and preservation of the structure known as the Jenkins House located within the Lesage/Greenbottom Swamp in accordance with standards for sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places.''.

SEC. 564. TUG FORK RIVER, WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to non-Federal interests for projects located along the Tug Fork River in West Virginia and identified by the master plan developed pursuant to section 114(t) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4820).

(b) PRIORITIES.—In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the primary development demonstration sites in West Virginia identified by the master plan referred to in subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $1,000,000.

SEC. 565. VIRGINIA POINT RIVERFRONT PARK, WEST VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may provide planning, design, and construction assistance to non-Federal interests for the project at Virginia Point, located at the confluence of the Ohio and Big Sandy Rivers in West Virginia, identified by the preferred plan set forth in the feasibility study dated September 1999, and carried out under the West Virginia-Ohio River Comprehensive Study authorized by a resolution dated September 8, 1988, by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $3,100,000.

SEC. 566. SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA.

Section 340(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4856) is amended by inserting ''environmental restoration,'' after ''distribution facilities,''.

SEC. 567. FOX RIVER SYSTEM, WISCONSIN.

Section 332(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4852) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such terms and conditions may include a payment or payments to the State of Wisconsin to be used toward the repair and rehabilitation of the locks and appurtenant features to be transferred.''.

SEC. 568. SURFSIDE/SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

The Secretary shall treat the Surfside/Sunset Newport Beach element of the project for beach erosion, Orange County, California, authorized by section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1177), as continuing construction.

SEC. 569. ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN RESTORATION.

(a) ILLINOIS RIVER BASIN DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Illinois River basin'' means the Illinois River, Illinois, its backwaters, side channels, and all tributaries, including their watersheds, draining into the Illinois River.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall develop, as expeditiously as practicable, a proposed comprehensive plan for the purpose of restoring, preserving, and protecting the Illinois River basin.

(2) TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE APPROACHES.—The comprehensive plan shall provide for the development of new technologies and innovative approaches—

(A) to enhance the Illinois River as a vital transportation corridor;

(B) to improve water quality within the entire Illinois River basin;

(C) to restore, enhance, and preserve habitat for plants and wildlife; and

(D) to increase economic opportunity for agriculture and business communities.

(3) SPECIFIC COMPONENTS.—The comprehensive plan shall include such features as are necessary to provide for—

(A) the development and implementation of a program for sediment removal technology, sediment characterization, sediment transport, and beneficial uses of sediment;

(B) the development and implementation of a program for the planning, conservation, evaluation, and construction of measures for fish and wildlife habitat conservation and rehabilitation, and stabilization and enhancement of land and water resources in the basin;

(C) the development and implementation of a long-term resource monitoring program; and

(D) the development and implementation of a computerized inventory and analysis system.

(4) CONSULTATION.—The comprehensive plan shall be developed by the Secretary in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, the State of Illinois, and the Illinois River Coordinating Council.

(5) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the comprehensive plan.

(6) ADDITIONAL STUDIES AND ANALYSES.—After transmission of a report under paragraph (5), the Secretary shall continue to conduct such studies and analyses related to the comprehensive plan as are necessary, consistent with this subsection.

(c) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary, in cooperation with appropriate Federal agencies and the State of Illinois, determines that a restoration project for the Illinois River basin will produce independent, immediate, and substantial restoration, preservation, and protection benefits, the Secretary shall proceed expeditiously with the implementation of the project.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out projects under this subsection $100,000,000 for fiscal years 2001 through 2004.

(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out any project under this subsection shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(d) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) WATER QUALITY.—In carrying out projects and activities under this section, the Secretary shall take into account the protection of water quality by considering applicable State water quality standards.

(2) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In developing the comprehensive plan under subsection (b) and carrying out projects under subsection (c), the Secretary shall implement procedures to facilitate public participation, including providing advance notice of meetings, providing adequate opportunity for public input and comment, maintaining appropriate records, and making a record of the proceedings of meetings available for public inspection.

(e) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall integrate and coordinate projects and activities carried out under this section with ongoing Federal and State programs, projects, and activities, including the following:

(1) Upper Mississippi River System-Environmental Management Program authorized under section 1103 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652).

(2) Upper Mississippi River Illinois Waterway System Study.

(3) Kankakee River Basin General Investigation.

(4) Peoria Riverfront Development General Investigation.

(5) Illinois River Ecosystem Restoration General Investigation.

(6) Conservation Reserve Program and other farm programs of the Department of Agriculture.

(7) Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (State) and Conservation 2000, Ecosystem Program of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

(8) Conservation 2000 Conservation Practices Program and the Livestock Management Facilities Act administered by the Illinois Department of Agriculture.

(9) National Buffer Initiative of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(10) Nonpoint source grant program administered by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.

(f) JUSTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2) or any other provision of law, in carrying out activities to restore, preserve, and protect the Illinois River basin under this section, the Secretary may determine that the activities—

(A) are justified by the environmental benefits derived by the Illinois River basin; and

(B) shall not need further economic justification if the Secretary determines that the activities are cost-effective.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any separable element intended to produce benefits that are predominantly unrelated to the restoration, preservation, and protection of the Illinois River basin.

(g) COST SHARING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of projects and activities carried out under this section shall be 35 percent.

(2) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, REHABILITATION, AND REPLACEMENT.—The operation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement of projects carried out under this section shall be a non-Federal responsibility.

(3) IN-KIND SERVICES.—The value of in-kind services provided by the non-Federal interest for a project or activity carried out under this section may be credited toward not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of the project or activity. In-kind services shall include all State funds expended on programs and projects which accomplish the goals of this section, as determined by the Secretary. Such programs and projects may include the Illinois River Conservation Reserve Program, the Illinois Conservation 2000 Program, the Open Lands Trust Fund, and other appropriate programs carried out in the Illinois River basin.

(4) CREDIT.—

(A) VALUE OF LANDS.—If the Secretary determines that lands or interests in land acquired by a non-Federal interest, regardless of the date of acquisition, are integral to a project or activity carried out under this section, the Secretary may credit the value of the lands or interests in land toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project or activity. Such value shall be determined by the Secretary.

(B) WORK.—If the Secretary determines that any work completed by a non-Federal interest, regardless of the date of completion, is integral to a project or activity carried out under this section, the Secretary may credit the value of the work toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project or activity. Such value shall be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 570. GREAT LAKES.

(a) GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL.—Section 516 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 2326b) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (e) the following:

''(3) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2003, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the Secretary's activities under this subsection.''; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking ''There is authorized'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized'';

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) GREAT LAKES TRIBUTARY MODEL.—In addition to amounts made available under paragraph (1), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out subsection (e) $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006.''; and

(C) by aligning the remainder of the text of paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph) with paragraph (2) (as added by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph).

(b) ALTERNATIVE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop and transmit to Congress a plan to enhance the application of ecological principles and practices to traditional engineering problems at Great Lakes shores.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $200,000. Activities under this subsection shall be carried out at Federal expense.

(c) FISHERIES AND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall develop and transmit to Congress a plan for implementing Corps of Engineers activities, including ecosystem restoration, to enhance the management of Great Lakes fisheries.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $300,000. Activities under this subsection shall be carried out at Federal expense.

SEC. 571. GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS AND SEDIMENT REMEDIATION.

Section 401 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 1268 note; 110 Stat. 3763; 113 Stat. 338) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(A) by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''35 percent'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (3);

(B) in the first sentence of paragraph (4) by striking ''50 percent'' and inserting ''35 percent''; and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3); and

(3) in subsection (c) by striking ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2000.'' and inserting ''$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.''.

SEC. 572. GREAT LAKES DREDGING LEVELS ADJUSTMENT.

(a) DEFINITION OF GREAT LAKE.—In this section, the term ''Great Lake'' means Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron (including Lake St. Clair), Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario (including the St. Lawrence River to the 45th parallel of latitude).

(b) DREDGING LEVELS.—In operating and maintaining Federal channels and harbors of, and the connecting channels between, the Great Lakes, the Secretary shall conduct such dredging as is necessary to ensure minimal operation depths consistent with the original authorized depths of the channels and harbors when water levels in the Great Lakes are, or are forecast to be, below the International Great Lakes Datum of 1985.

SEC. 573. DREDGED MATERIAL RECYCLING.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall conduct a pilot program to provide incentives for the removal of dredged material from a confined disposal facility associated with a harbor on the Great Lakes or the Saint Lawrence River and a harbor on the Delaware River in Pennsylvania for the purpose of recycling the dredged material and extending the life of the confined disposal facility.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of completion of the pilot program, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the program.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $2,000,000.

SEC. 574. WATERSHED MANAGEMENT, RESTORATION, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 503(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3756–3757; 113 Stat. 288) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(28) Tomales Bay watershed, California.

''(29) Kaskaskia River watershed, Illinois.

''(30) Sangamon River watershed, Illinois.

''(31) Lackawanna River watershed, Pennsylvania.

''(32) Upper Charles River watershed, Massachusetts.

''(33) Brazos River watershed, Texas.''.

SEC. 575. MAINTENANCE OF NAVIGATION CHANNELS.

Section 509(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3759; 113 Stat. 339) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(16) Cameron Loop, Louisiana, as part of the Calcasieu River and Pass Ship Channel.

''(17) Morehead City Harbor, North Carolina.''.

SEC. 576. SUPPORT OF ARMY CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.

The requirements of section 2361 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any contract, cooperative research and development agreement, cooperative agreement, or grant entered into under section 229 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3703) between the Secretary and Marshall University or entered into under section 350 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 310) between the Secretary and Juniata College.

SEC. 577. NATIONAL RECREATION RESERVATION SERVICE.

Notwithstanding section 611 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1999 (112 Stat. 2861–515), the Secretary may participate in the National Recreation Reservation Service on an interagency basis and fund the Department of the Army's share of the cost of activities required for implementing, operating, and maintaining the Service.

SEC. 578. HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY.

The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration to require the Secretary, not later than 60 days after the Corps of Engineers completes a project involving dredging of a channel, to provide data to the Administration in a standard digital format on the results of a hydrographic survey of the channel conducted by the Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 579. PERCHLORATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local government agencies, may participate in studies and other investigative activities and in the planning and design of projects determined by the Secretary to offer a long-term solution to the problem of groundwater contamination caused by perchlorates.

(b) INVESTIGATIONS AND PROJECTS.—

(1) BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Brazos River Authority, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects in the Bosque and Leon River watersheds in Texas to assess the impact of the perchlorate associated with the former Naval ''Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant'' at McGregor, Texas.

(2) CADDO LAKE.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects relating to perchlorate contamination in Caddo Lake, Texas.

(3) EASTERN SANTA CLARA BASIN.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal, State, and local government agencies, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects related to sites that are sources of perchlorates and that are located in the city of Santa Clarita, California.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $25,000,000, of which not to exceed $8,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(1), not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(2), and not to exceed $7,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(3).

SEC. 580. ABANDONED AND INACTIVE NONCOAL MINE RESTORATION.

Section 560 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (33 USC 2336; 113 Stat. 354–355) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''and design'' and inserting ''design, and construction'';

(2) in subsection (c) by striking ''50'' and inserting ''35'';

(3) in subsection (e) by inserting ''and colleges and universities, including the members of the Western Universities Mine-Land Reclamation and Restoration Consortium, for the purposes of assisting in the reclamation of abandoned noncoal mines and'' after ''entities''; and

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) NON-FEDERAL INTERESTS.—In this section, the term 'non-Federal interests' includes, with the consent of the affected local government, nonprofit entities, notwithstanding section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b).

''(g) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of the costs of operation and maintenance for a project carried out under this section shall be 100 percent.

''(h) CREDIT.—A non-Federal interest shall receive credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of a project under this section for design and construction services and other in-kind consideration provided by the non-Federal interest if the Secretary determines that such design and construction services and other in-kind consideration are integral to the project.

''(i) COST LIMITATION.—Not more than $10,000,000 of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section may be allotted for projects in a single locality, but the Secretary may accept funds voluntarily contributed by a non-Federal or Federal entity for the purpose of expanding the scope of the services requested by the non-Federal or Federal entity.

''(j) NO EFFECT ON LIABILITY.—The provision of assistance under this section shall not relieve from liability any person that would otherwise be liable under Federal or State law for damages, response costs, natural resource damages, restitution, equitable relief, or any other relief.

''(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $45,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 581. LAKES PROGRAM.

Section 602 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4148–4149) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting ''and activity'' after ''project'';

(2) in subsection (c) by inserting ''and activities under subsection (f)'' before the comma; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) CENTER FOR LAKE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, OTSEGO LAKE, NEW YORK.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall construct an environmental education and research facility at Otsego Lake, New York. The purpose of the Center shall be to—

''(A) conduct nationwide research on the impacts of water quality and water quantity on lake hydrology and the hydrologic cycle;

''(B) develop technologies and strategies for monitoring and improving water quality in the Nation's lakes; and

''(C) provide public education regarding the biological, economic, recreational, and aesthetic value of the Nation's lakes.

''(2) USE OF RESEARCH.—The results of research and education activities carried out at the Center shall be applied to the program under subsection (a) and to other Federal programs, projects, and activities that are intended to improve or otherwise affect lakes.

''(3) BIOLOGICAL MONITORING STATION.—A central function of the Center shall be to research, develop, test, and evaluate biological monitoring technologies and techniques for potential use at lakes listed in subsection (a) and throughout the Nation.

''(4) CREDIT.—The non-Federal sponsor shall receive credit for lands, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations toward its share of project costs.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to sums authorized by subsection (d), there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection $6,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 582. RELEASE OF USE RESTRICTION.

(a) RELEASE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Tennessee Valley Authority shall grant a release or releases, without monetary consideration, from the restriction covenant which requires that property described in subsection (b) shall at all times be used solely for the purpose of erecting docks and buildings for shipbuilding purposes or for the manufacture or storage of products for the purpose of trading or shipping in transportation.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—This section shall apply only to those lands situated in the city of Decatur, Morgan County, Alabama, and running along the easterly boundary of a tract of land described in an indenture conveying such lands to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation dated July 29, 1954, and recorded in deed book 535 at page 6 in the office of the Probate Judge of Morgan County, Alabama, which are owned or may hereafter be acquired by the Alabama Farmers Cooperative, Inc.

SEC. 583. COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under section 219(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835), the Secretary may provide technical, planning, and design assistance to non-Federal interests to carry out water-related projects described in this section.

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding section 219(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835), the non-Federal share of the cost of each project assisted in accordance with this section shall be 25 percent.

(c) PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS.—The Secretary may provide assistance in accordance with subsection (a) to each of the following projects:

(1) MARANA, ARIZONA.—Wastewater treatment and distribution infrastructure, Marana, Arizona.

(2) EASTERN ARKANSAS ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY, ARKANSAS.—Water-related infrastructure, Eastern Arkansas Enterprise Community, Cross, Lee, Monroe, and St. Francis Counties, Arkansas.

(3) CHINO HILLS, CALIFORNIA.—Storm water and sewage collection infrastructure, Chino Hills, California.

(4) CLEAR LAKE BASIN, CALIFORNIA.—Water-related infrastructure and resource protection, Clear Lake Basin, California.

(5) DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA.—Resource protection and wastewater infrastructure, Desert Hot Springs, California.

(6) EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA.—Regional water-related infrastructure, Eastern Municipal Water District, California.

(7) HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA.—Water supply and wastewater infrastructure, Huntington Beach, California.

(8) INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA.—Water infrastructure, Inglewood, California.

(9) LOS OSOS COMMUNITY SERVICE DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA.—Wastewater infrastructure, Los Osos Community Service District, California.

(10) NORWALK, CALIFORNIA.—Water-related infrastructure, Norwalk, California.

(11) KEY BISCAYNE, FLORIDA.—Sanitary sewer infrastructure, Key Biscayne, Florida.

(12) SOUTH TAMPA, FLORIDA.—Water supply and aquifer storage and recovery infrastructure, South Tampa, Florida.

(13) FORT WAYNE, INDIANA.—Combined sewer overflow infrastructure and wetlands protection, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

(14) INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.—Combined sewer overflow infrastructure, Indianapolis, Indiana.

(15) ST. CHARLES, ST. BERNARD, AND PLAQUEMINES PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Water and wastewater infrastructure, St. Charles, St. Bernard, and Plaquemines Parishes, Louisiana.

(16) ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST AND ST. JAMES PARISHES, LOUISIANA.—Water and sewer improvements, St. John the Baptist and St. James Parishes, Louisiana.

(17) UNION COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—Water infrastructure, Union County, North Carolina.

(18) HOOD RIVER, OREGON.—Water transmission infrastructure, Hood River, Oregon.

(19) MEDFORD, OREGON.—Sewer collection infrastructure, Medford, Oregon.

(20) PORTLAND, OREGON.—Water infrastructure and resource protection, Portland, Oregon.

(21) COUDERSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA.—Sewer system extensions and improvements, Coudersport, Pennsylvania.

(22) PARK CITY, UTAH.—Water supply infrastructure, Park City, Utah.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for providing assistance in accordance with subsection (a) to the projects described in subsection (c).

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(e) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR CRITICAL RESOURCE PROJECTS.—The Secretary may provide assistance in accordance with subsection (a) and assistance for construction for each the following projects:

(1) DUCK RIVER, CULLMAN, ALABAMA.—$5,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, Duck River, Cullman, Alabama.

(2) UNION COUNTY, ARKANSAS.—$52,000,000 for water supply infrastructure, including facilities for withdrawal, treatment, and distribution, Union County, Arkansas.

(3) CAMBRIA, CALIFORNIA.—$10,300,000 for desalination infrastructure, Cambria, California.

(4) LOS ANGELES HARBOR/TERMINAL ISLAND, CALIFORNIA.—$6,500,000 for wastewater recycling infrastructure, Los Angeles Harbor/Terminal Island, California.

(5) NORTH VALLEY REGION, LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA.—$14,500,000 for water infrastructure, North Valley Region, Lancaster, California.

(6) SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.—$10,000,000 for water-related infrastructure, San Diego County, California.

(7) SOUTH PERRIS, CALIFORNIA.—$25,000,000 for water supply desalination infrastructure, South Perris, California.

(8) AURORA, ILLINOIS.—$8,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure to reduce or eliminate combined sewer overflows, Aurora, Illinois.

(9) COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.—$35,000,000 for water-related infrastructure and resource protection and development, Cook County, Illinois.

(10) MADISON AND ST. CLAIR COUNTIES, ILLINOIS.—$10,000,000 for water and wastewater assistance, Madison and St. Clair Counties, Illinois.

(11) IBERIA PARISH, LOUISIANA.—$5,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Iberia Parish, Louisiana.

(12) KENNER, LOUISIANA.—$5,000,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Kenner, Louisiana.

(13) GARRISON AND KATHIO TOWNSHIP, MINNESOTA.—$11,000,000 for a wastewater infrastructure project for the city of Garrison and Kathio Township, Minnesota.

(14) NEWTON, NEW JERSEY.—$7,000,000 for water filtration infrastructure, Newton, New Jersey.

(15) LIVERPOOL, NEW YORK.—$2,000,000 for water infrastructure, including a pump station, Liverpool, New York.

(16) STANLY COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA.—$8,900,000 for wastewater infrastructure, Stanly County, North Carolina.

(17) YUKON, OKLAHOMA.—$5,500,000 for water-related infrastructure, including wells, booster stations, storage tanks, and transmission lines, Yukon, Oklahoma.

(18) ALLEGHENY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$20,000,000 for water-related environmental infrastructure, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.

(19) MOUNT JOY TOWNSHIP AND CONEWAGO TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—$8,300,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Mount Joy Township and Conewago Township, Pennsylvania.

(20) PHOENIXVILLE BOROUGH, CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.—$2,400,000 for water and sewer infrastructure, Phoenixville Borough, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

(21) TITUSVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA.—$7,300,000 for storm water separation and treatment plant upgrades, Titusville, Pennsylvania.

(22) WASHINGTON, GREENE, WESTMORELAND, AND FAYETTE COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.—$8,000,000 for water and wastewater infrastructure, Washington, Greene, Westmoreland, and Fayette Counties, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 584. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS.

Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835, 4836) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)(6) by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$30,000,000'';

(2) in subsection (f)(4) by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$35,000,000'';

(3) in subsection (f)(21) by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000'';

(4) in subsection (f)(25) by striking ''$5,000,000'' and inserting ''$15,000,000'';

(5) in subsection (f)(30) by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000'';

(6) in subsection (f)(43) by striking ''$15,000,000'' and inserting ''$35,000,000''; and

(7) in subsection (f) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(44) WASHINGTON, D.C., AND MARYLAND.—$15,000,000 for the project described in subsection (c)(1), modified to include measures to eliminate or control combined sewer overflows in the Anacostia River watershed.''.

SEC. 585. LAND CONVEYANCES.

(a) THOMPSON, CONNECTICUT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed without consideration to the town of Thompson, Connecticut, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 1.36-acre parcel of land described in paragraph (2) for public ownership and use by the town for fire fighting and related emergency services purposes.

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is in the town of Thompson, county of Windham, State of Connecticut, on the northerly side of West Thompson Road owned by the United States and shown as Parcel A on a plan by Provost, Rovero, Fitzback entitled ''Property Survey Prepared for West Thompson Independent Firemen Association #1'' dated August 24, 1998, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a bound labeled WT–276 on the northerly side line of West Thompson Road, so called, at the most south corner of the Parcel herein described and at land now or formerly of West Thompson Independent Firemen Association No. 1;

Thence in a generally westerly direction by said northerly side line of West Thompson Road, by a curve to the left, having a radius of 640.00 feet a distance of 169.30 feet to a point;

Thence North 13 degrees, 08 minutes, 37 seconds East by the side line of said West Thompson Road a distance of 10.00 feet to a point;

Thence in a generally westerly direction by the northerly side line of said West Thompson Road, by a curve to the left having a radius of 650.00 feet a distance of 109.88

feet to a bound labeled WT–123, at land now or formerly of the United States of America;

Thence North 44 degrees, 43 minutes, 07 seconds East by said land now or formerly of the United States of America a distance of 185.00 feet to a point;

Thence North 67 degrees, 34 minutes, 13 seconds East by said land now or formerly of the United States of America a distance of 200.19 feet to a point in a stonewall;

Thence South 20 degrees, 49 minutes, 17 seconds East by a stonewall and by said land now or formerly of the United States of America a distance of 253.10 feet to a point at land now or formerly of West Thompson Independent Firemen Association No. 1;

Thence North 57 degrees, 45 minutes, 25 seconds West by land now or formerly of said West Thompson Independent Firemen Association No. 1 a distance of 89.04 feet to a bound labeled WT–277;

Thence South 32 degrees, 14 minutes, 35 seconds West by land now or formerly of said West Thompson Independent Firemen Association No. 1 a distance of 123.06 feet to the point of beginning.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the parcel described in paragraph (2) ceases to be held in public ownership or used for fire fighting and related emergency services, all right, title, and interest in and to the parcel shall revert to the United States.

(b) SIBLEY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries Conducting Sibley Memorial Hospital (in this subsection referred to as the ''Hospital'') by quitclaim deed under the terms of a negotiated sale, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the 8.864-acre parcel of land described in paragraph (2) for medical care and parking purposes. The consideration paid under such negotiated sale shall reflect the value of the parcel, taking into consideration the terms and conditions of the conveyance imposed under this subsection.

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel described as follows: Beginning at a point on the westerly right-of-way line of Dalecarlia Parkway, said point also being on the southerly division line of part of Square N1448, A&T Lot 801 as recorded in A&T 2387 and part of the property of the United States Government, thence with said southerly division line now described:

(A) North 35° 05′ 40″ West—436.31 feet to a point, thence

(B) South 89° 59′ 30″ West—550 feet to a point, thence

(C) South 53° 48′ 00″ West—361.08 feet to a point, thence

(D) South 89° 59′ 30″ West—466.76 feet to a point at the southwesterly corner of the aforesaid A&T Lot 801, said point also being on the easterly right-of-way line of MacArthur Boulevard, thence with a portion of the westerly division line of said A&T Lot 801 and the easterly right-of-way line of MacArthur Boulevard, as now described.

(E) 78.62 feet along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of 650.98 feet, chord bearing and distance of North 06° 17′ 20″ West—78.57 feet to a point, thence crossing to include a portion of aforesaid A&T Lot 801 and a portion of the aforesaid Dalecarlia Reservoir Grounds, as now described

(F) North 87° 18′ 21″ East—258.85 feet to a point, thence

(G) North 02° 49′ 16″ West—214.18 feet to a point, thence

(H) South 87° 09′ 00″ West—238.95 feet to a point on the aforesaid easterly right-of-way line of MacArthur Boulevard, thence with said easterly right-of-way line, as now described

(I) North 08° 41′ 30″ East—30.62 feet to a point, thence crossing to include a portion of aforesaid A&T Lot 801 and a portion of the aforesaid Dalecarlia Reservoir Grounds, as now described

(J) North 87° 09′ 00″ East—373.96 feet to a point, thence

(K) North 88° 42′ 48″ East—374.92 feet to a point, thence

(L) North 56° 53′ 40″ East—53.16 feet to a point, thence

(M) North 86° 00′ 15″ East—26.17 feet to a point, thence

(N) South 87° 24′ 50″ East—464.01 feet to a point, thence

(O) North 83° 34′ 31″ East—212.62 feet to a point, thence

(P) South 30° 16′ 12″ East—108.97 feet to a point, thence

(Q) South 38° 30′ 23″ East—287.46 feet to a point, thence

(R) South 09° 03′ 38″ West—92.74 feet to the point on the aforesaid westerly right-of-way line of Dalecarlia Parkway, thence with said westerly right-of-way line, as now described

(S) 197.74 feet along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of 916.00 feet, chord bearing and distance of South 53° 54′ 43″ West—197.35 feet to the place of beginning.

(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under this subsection shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(A) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE PARCEL.—The Secretary shall include in any deed conveying the parcel under this section a restriction to prevent the Hospital, and its successors and assigns, from constructing any structure, other than a structure used exclusively for the parking of motor vehicles, on the portion of the parcel that lies between the Washington Aqueduct and Little Falls Road.

(B) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN LEGAL CHALLENGES.—The Secretary shall require the Hospital, and its successors and assigns, to refrain from raising any legal challenge to the operations of the Washington Aqueduct arising from any impact such operations may have on the activities conducted by the Hospital on the parcel.

(C) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall require that the conveyance be subject to the retention of an easement permitting the United States, and its successors and assigns, to use and maintain the portion of the parcel described as follows: Beginning at a point on the easterly or South 35° 05′ 40″ East—436.31 foot plat line of Lot 25 as shown on a subdivision plat recorded in book 175 page 102 among the records of the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia, said point also being on the northerly right-of-way line of Dalecarlia Parkway, thence running with said easterly line of Lot 25 and crossing to include a portion of the aforsaid Dalecarlia Reservoir Grounds as now described:

(i) North 35° 05′ 40″ West—495.13 feet to a point, thence

(ii) North 87° 24′ 50″ West—414.43 feet to a point, thence

(iii) South 81° 08′ 00″ West—69.56 feet to a point, thence

(iv) South 88° 42′ 48″ West—367.50 feet to a point, thence

(v) South 87° 09′ 00″ West—379.68 feet to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of MacArthur Boulevard, thence with said easterly right-of-way line, as now described

(vi) North 08° 41′ 30″ East—30.62 feet to a point, thence crossing to include a portion of the aforesaid Dalecarlia Reservoir Grounds, as now described

(vii) North 87° 09′ 00″ East—373.96 feet to a point, thence

(viii) North 88° 42′ 48″ East—374.92 feet to a point, thence

(ix) North 56° 53′ 40″ East—53.16 feet to a point, thence

(x) North 86° 00′ 15″ East—26.17 feet to a point, thence

(xi) South 87° 24′ 50″ East—464.01 feet to a point, thence

(xii) North 83° 34′ 31″ East—50.62 feet to a point, thence

(xiii) South 02° 35′ 10″ West—46.46 feet to a point, thence

(xiv) South 13° 38′ 12″ East—107.83 feet to a point, thence

(xv) South 35° 05′ 40″ East—347.97 feet to a point on the aforesaid northerly right-of-way line of Dalecarlia Parkway, thence with said right-of-way line, as now described

(xvi) 44.12 feet along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of 855.00 feet, chord bearing and distance of South 58° 59′ 22″ West—44.11 feet to the place of beginning containing 1.7157 acres of land more or less as now described by Maddox Engineers and Surveyors, Inc., June 2000, Job #00015.

(4) APPRAISAL.—Before conveying any right, title, or interest under this subsection, the Secretary shall obtain an appraisal of the fair market value of the parcel.

(c) ONTONAGON, MICHIGAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed without consideration to the Ontonagon County Historical Society all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land underlying and immediately surrounding the lighthouse at Ontonagon, Michigan, consisting of approximately 1.8 acres, together with any improvements thereon, for public ownership and for public purposes.

(2) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of the real property described in paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the real property described in paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or used for public purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to the property shall revert to the United States.

(d) PIKE COUNTY, MISSOURI.—

(1) LAND EXCHANGE.—Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), at such time as S.S.S., Inc. conveys all right, title, and interest in and to the parcel of land described in paragraph (2)(A) to the United States, the Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed all right, title, and interest in the parcel of land described in paragraph (2)(B) to S.S.S., Inc.

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The parcels of land referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

(A) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—8.99 acres with existing flowage easements situated in Pike County, Missouri, adjacent to land being acquired from Holnam, Inc. by the Corps of Engineers.

(B) FEDERAL LAND.—8.99 acres situated in Pike County, Missouri, known as Government Tract Numbers FM–46 and FM–47, administered by the Corps of Engineers.

(3) CONDITIONS.—The exchange of land under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following conditions:

(A) DEEDS.—

(i) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The conveyance of the land described in paragraph (2)(A) to the Secretary shall be by a quitclaim deed acceptable to the Secretary.

(ii) FEDERAL LAND.—The instrument of conveyance used to convey the land described in paragraph (2)(B) to S.S.S., Inc. shall contain such reservations, terms, and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary to allow the United States to operate and maintain the Mississippi River 9-Foot Navigation Project.

(B) REMOVAL OF IMPROVEMENTS.—S.S.S., Inc. may remove any improvements on the land described in paragraph (2)(A). The Secretary may require S.S.S., Inc. to remove any improvements on the land described in paragraph (2)(A). In either case, S.S.S., Inc. shall hold the United States harmless from liability, and the United States shall not incur costs associated with the removal or relocation of any of the improvements.

(C) TIME LIMIT FOR EXCHANGE.—The land exchange under paragraph (1) shall be completed not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(D) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The Secretary shall provide the legal description of the lands described in paragraph (2). The legal description shall be used in the instruments of conveyance of the lands.

(4) VALUE OF PROPERTIES.—If the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the land conveyed to S.S.S., Inc. by the Secretary under paragraph (1) exceeds the appraised fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the land conveyed to the United States by S.S.S., Inc. under paragraph (1), S.S.S., Inc. shall make a payment equal to the excess in cash or a cash equivalent to the United States.

(e) CANDY LAKE PROJECT, OSAGE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA.—Section 563(c)(1)(B) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 357) is amended by striking ''a deceased individual'' and inserting ''an individual''.

(f) MANOR TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with this subsection, the Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed to the township of Manor, Pennsylvania, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 113 acres of real property located at Crooked Creek Lake, together with any improvements on the land.

(2) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of the real property described in paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary may convey under this subsection without consideration any portion of the real property described in paragraph (1) if the portion is to be retained in public ownership and be used for public park and recreation or other public purposes.

(4) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that any portion of the property conveyed under paragraph (3) ceases to be held in public ownership or to be used for public park and recreation or other public purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to such portion of property shall revert to the Secretary.

(5) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The township of Manor, Pennsylvania shall be responsible for all costs associated with a conveyance under this subsection, including the cost of conducting the survey referred to in paragraph (2).

(g) NEW SAVANNAH BLUFF LOCK AND DAM, SAVANNAH RIVER, SOUTH CAROLINA, BELOW AUGUSTA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed to the city of North Augusta and Aiken County, South Carolina, the lock, dam, and appurtenant features at New Savannah Bluff, including the adjacent approximately 50-acre park and recreation area with improvements of the navigation project, Savannah River Below Augusta, Georgia, authorized by the first section of the River and Harbor Act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 924), subject to the execution of an agreement by the Secretary and the city of North Augusta and Aiken County, South Carolina, that specifies the terms and conditions for such conveyance.

(2) TREATMENT OF LOCK, DAM, APPURTENANT FEATURES, AND PARK AND RECREATION AREA.—The lock, dam, appurtenant features, adjacent park and recreation area, and other project lands, to be conveyed under paragraph (1) shall not be treated as part of any Federal water resources project after the effective date of the transfer.

(3) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Operation and maintenance of all features of the navigation project, other than the lock, dam, appurtenant features, adjacent park and recreation area, and other project lands to be conveyed under paragraph (1), shall continue to be a Federal responsibility after the effective date of the transfer under paragraph (1).

(h) TRI-CITIES AREA, WASHINGTON.—Section 501(i) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3752–3753) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (1) the following: ''; except that any of such local governments, with the agreement of the appropriate district engineer, may exempt from the conveyance to the local government all or any part of the lands to be conveyed to the local government''; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of paragraph (2)(C) the following: ''; except that approximately 7.4 acres in Columbia Park, Kennewick, Washington, consisting of the historic site located in the Park and known and referred to as the Kennewick Man Site and such adjacent wooded areas as the Secretary determines are necessary to protect the historic site, shall remain in Federal ownership''.

(i) BAYOU TECHE, LOUISIANA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After renovations of the Keystone Lock facility have been completed, the Secretary may convey by quitclaim deed without consideration to St. Martin Parish, Louisiana, all rights, interests, and title of the United States in the approximately 12.03 acres of land under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary in Bayou Teche, Louisiana, together with improvements thereon. The dam and the authority to retain upstream pool elevations shall remain under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall relinquish all operations and maintenance of the lock to St. Martin Parish.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The following conditions apply to the transfer under paragraph (1):

(A) St. Martin Parish shall operate, maintain, repair, replace, and rehabilitate the lock in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary which are consistent with the project's authorized purposes.

(B) The Parish shall provide the Secretary access to the dam whenever the Secretary notifies the Parish of a need for access to the dam.

(C) If the Parish fails to comply with subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall notify the Parish of such failure. If the parish does not correct such failure during the 1-year period beginning on the date of such notification, the Secretary shall have a right of reverter to reclaim possession and title to the land and improvements conveyed under this section or, in the case of a failure to make necessary repairs, the Secretary may effect the repairs and require payment from the Parish for the repairs made by the Secretary.

(j) JOLIET, ILLINOIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed without consideration to the Joliet Park District in Joliet, Illinois, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of real property located at 622 Railroad Street in the city of Joliet, consisting of approximately 2 acres, together with any improvements thereon, for public ownership and use as the site of the headquarters of the park district.

(2) SURVEY TO OBTAIN LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The exact acreage and the legal description of the real property described in paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or to be used as headquarters of the park district or for other purposes, all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert to the United States.

(k) OTTAWA, ILLINOIS.—

(1) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—Subject to the terms, conditions, and reservations of paragraph (2), the Secretary shall convey by quitclaim deed to the Young Men's Christian Association of Ottawa, Illinois (in this subsection referred to as the ''YMCA''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of the easements acquired for the improvement of the Illinois Waterway project over a parcel of real property owned by the YMCA, known as the ''Ottawa, Illinois YMCA Site'', and located at 201 E. Jackson Street, Ottawa, La Salle County, Illinois (portion of NE ¼, S11, T33N, R3E 3PM), except that portion lying below the elevation of 461 feet National Geodetic Vertical Datum.

(2) CONDITIONS.—The following conditions apply to the conveyance under paragraph (1):

(A) The exact acreage and the legal description of the real property described in paragraph (1) shall be determined by a survey that is satisfactory to the Secretary.

(B) The YMCA shall agree to hold and save the United States harmless from liability associated with the operation and maintenance of the Illinois Waterway project on the property desscribed in paragraph (1).

(C) If the Secretary determines that any portion of the property that is the subject of the easement conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be used as the YMCA, all right, title, and interest in and to such easement shall revert to the Secretary.

(l) ST. CLAIR AND BENTON COUNTIES, MISSOURI.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the Iconium Fire Protection District, St. Clair and Benton counties, Missouri, by quitclaim deed and without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land described in paragraph (2).

(2) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is the tract of land located in the Southeast ¼ of Section 13, Township 39 North, Range 25 West, of the Fifth Principal Meridian, St. Clair County, Missouri, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the Southwest corner of Section 18, as designated by Corps survey marker AP 18–1, thence northerly 11.22 feet to the southeast corner of Section 13, thence 657.22 feet north along the east line of Section 13 to Corps monument 18 1–C lying within the right-of-way of State Highway C, being the point of beginning of the tract of land herein described; thence westerly approximately 210 feet, thence northerly 150 feet, thence easterly approximately 210 feet to the east line of Section 13, thence southerly along said east line, 150 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.723 acres, more or less.

(3) REVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that the property conveyed under paragraph (1) ceases to be held in public ownership or to be used as a site for a fire station, all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert to the United States.

(m) GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY OF PROPERTY SCREENING PROVISIONS.—Section 2696 of title 10, United

States Code, shall not apply to any conveyance under this section.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require that any conveyance under this section be subject to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(3) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall be responsible for all reasonable and necessary costs, including real estate transaction and environmental compliance costs, associated with the conveyance.

(4) LIABILITY.—An entity to which a conveyance is made under this section shall hold the United States harmless from any liability with respect to activities carried out, on or after the date of the conveyance, on the real property conveyed. The United States shall remain responsible for any liability with respect to activities carried out, before such date, on the real property conveyed.

SEC. 586. BRUCE F. VENTO UNIT OF THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA WILDERNESS, MINNESOTA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The portion of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, Minnesota, situated north and cast of the Gunflint Corridor and that is bounded by the United States border with Canada to the north shall be known and designated as the ''Bruce F. Vento Unit of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness''.

(b) LEGAL REFERENCE.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the area referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Bruce F. Vento Unit of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness''.

SEC. 587. WAURIKA LAKE, OKLAHOMA.

The remaining obligation of the Waurika Project Master Conservancy District payable to the United States Government in the amounts, rates of interest, and payment schedules is set at the amounts, rates of interest, and payment schedules that existed, and that both parties agreed to, on June 3, 1986, and may not be adjusted, altered, or changed without a specific, separate, and written agreement between the District and the United States Government.

SEC. 588. COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS.

Section 401(d) of the Act entitled ''An Act to establish procedures for review of tribal constitutions and bylaws or amendments thereto pursuant to the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 987)'', approved November 1, 1988 (102 Stat. 2944), is amended by striking ''$2,000,000'' and inserting ''$4,000,000''.

SEC. 589. DEVILS LAKE, NORTH DAKOTA.

No appropriation shall be made to construct an emergency outlet from Devils Lake, North Dakota, to the Sheyenne River if the final plans for the emergency outlet have not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

TITLE VI—COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION

SEC. 601. COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Central and Southern Florida Project'' means the project for Central and Southern Florida authorized under the heading ''CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA'' in section 203 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1176).

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''Central and Southern Florida Project'' includes any modification to the project authorized by this section or any other provision of law.

(2) GOVERNOR.—The term ''Governor'' means the Governor of the State of Florida.

(3) NATURAL SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''natural system'' means all land and water managed by the Federal Government or the State within the South Florida ecosystem.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''natural system'' includes—

(i) water conservation areas;

(ii) sovereign submerged land;

(iii) Everglades National Park;

(iv) Biscayne National Park;

(v) Big Cypress National Preserve;

(vi) other Federal or State (including a political subdivision of a State) land that is designated and managed for conservation purposes; and

(vii) any tribal land that is designated and managed for conservation purposes, as approved by the tribe.

(4) PLAN.—The term ''Plan'' means the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan contained in the ''Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement'', dated April 1, 1999, as modified by this section.

(5) SOUTH FLORIDA ECOSYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''South Florida ecosystem'' means the area consisting of the land and water within the boundary of the South Florida Water Management District in effect on July 1, 1999.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''South Florida ecosystem'' includes—

(i) the Everglades;

(ii) the Florida Keys; and

(iii) the contiguous near-shore coastal water of South Florida.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Florida.

(b) COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN.—

(1) APPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as modified by this section, the Plan is approved as a framework for modifications and operational changes to the Central and Southern Florida Project that are needed to restore, preserve, and protect the South Florida ecosystem while providing for other water-related needs of the region, including water supply and flood protection. The Plan shall be implemented to ensure the protection of water quality in, the reduction of the loss of fresh water from, and the improvement of the environment of the South Florida ecosystem and to achieve and maintain the benefits to the natural system and human environment described in the Plan, and required pursuant to this section, for as long as the project is authorized.

(B) INTEGRATION.—In carrying out the Plan, the Secretary shall integrate the activities described in subparagraph (A) with ongoing Federal and State projects and activities in accordance with section 528(c) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769). Unless specifically provided herein, nothing in this section shall be construed to modify any existing cost share or responsibility for projects as listed in subsection (c) or (e) of section 528 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3769).

(2) SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall carry out the projects included in the Plan in accordance with subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), and (E).

(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out activities described in the Plan, the Secretary shall—

(I) take into account the protection of water quality by considering applicable State water quality standards; and

(II) include such features as the Secretary determines are necessary to ensure that all ground water and surface water discharges from any project feature authorized by this subsection will meet all applicable water quality standards and applicable water quality permitting requirements.

(iii) REVIEW AND COMMENT.—In developing the projects authorized under subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall provide for public review and comment in accordance with applicable Federal law.

(B) PILOT PROJECTS.—The following pilot projects are authorized for implementation, after review and approval by the Secretary, at a total cost of $69,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $34,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $34,500,000:

(i) Caloosahatchee River (C–43) Basin ASR, at a total cost of $6,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $3,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $3,000,000.

(ii) Lake Belt In-Ground Reservoir Technology, at a total cost of $23,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $11,500,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $11,500,000.

(iii) L–31N Seepage Management, at a total cost of $10,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $5,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $5,000,000.

(iv) Wastewater Reuse Technology, at a total cost of $30,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $15,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $15,000,000.

(C) INITIAL PROJECTS.—The following projects are authorized for implementation, after review and approval by the Secretary, subject to the conditions stated in subparagraph (D), at a total cost of $1,100,918,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $550,459,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $550,459,000:

(i) C–44 Basin Storage Reservoir, at a total cost of $112,562,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $56,281,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $56,281,000.

(ii) Everglades Agricultural Area Storage Reservoirs—Phase I, at a total cost of $233,408,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $116,704,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $116,704,000.

(iii) Site 1 Impoundment, at a total cost of $38,535,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $19,267,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $19,267,500.

(iv) Water Conservation Areas 3A/3B Levee Seepage Management, at a total cost of $100,335,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,167,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $50,167,500.

(v) C–11 Impoundment and Stormwater Treatment Area, at a total cost of $124,837,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $62,418,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $62,418,500.

(vi) C–9 Impoundment and Stormwater Treatment Area, at a total cost of $89,146,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $44,573,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $44,573,000.

(vii) Taylor Creek/Nubbin Slough Storage and Treatment Area, at a total cost of $104,027,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $52,013,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $52,013,500.

(viii) Raise and Bridge East Portion of Tamiami Trail and Fill Miami Canal within Water Conservation Area 3, at a total cost of $26,946,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $13,473,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $13,473,000.

(ix) North New River Improvements, at a total cost of $77,087,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $38,543,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $38,543,500.

(x) C–111 Spreader Canal, at a total cost of $94,035,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $47,017,500 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $47,017,500.

(xi) Adaptive Assessment and Monitoring Program, at a total cost of $100,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $50,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $50,000,000.

(D) CONDITIONS.—

(i) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—Before implementation of a project described in any of clauses (i) through (x) of subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall review and approve for the project a project implementation report prepared in accordance with subsections (f) and (h).

(ii) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate the project implementation report required by subsections (f) and (h) for each project under this paragraph (including all relevant data and information on all costs).

(iii) FUNDING CONTINGENT ON APPROVAL.—No appropriation shall be made to construct any project under this paragraph if the project implementation report for the project has not been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(iv) MODIFIED WATER DELIVERY.—No appropriation shall be made to construct the Water Conservation Area 3 Decompartmentalization and Sheetflow Enhancement Project (including component AA, Additional S–345 Structures; component QQ Phase 1, Raise and Bridge East Portion of Tamiami Trail and Fill Miami Canal within WCA 3; component QQ Phase 2, WCA 3 Decompartmentalization and Sheetflow Enhancement; and component SS, North New River Improvements) or the Central Lakebelt Storage Project (including components S and EEE, Central Lake Belt Storage Area) until the completion of the project to improve water deliveries to Everglades National Park authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r–8).

(E) MAXIMUM COST OF PROJECTS.—Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2280) shall apply to each project feature authorized under this subsection.

(c) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To expedite implementation of the Plan, the Secretary may implement modifications to the Central and Southern Florida Project that—

(A) are described in the Plan; and

(B) will produce a substantial benefit to the restoration, preservation and protection of the South Florida ecosystem.

(2) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—Before implementation of any project feature authorized under this subsection, the Secretary shall review and approve for the project feature a project implementation report prepared in accordance with subsections (f) and (h).

(3) FUNDING.—

(A) INDIVIDUAL PROJECT FUNDING.—

(i) FEDERAL COST.—The total Federal cost of each project carried out under this subsection shall not exceed $12,500,000.

(ii) OVERALL COST.—The total cost of each project carried out under this subsection shall not exceed $25,000,000.

(B) AGGREGATE COST.—The total cost of all projects carried out under this subsection shall not exceed $206,000,000, with an estimated Federal cost of $103,000,000 and an estimated non-Federal cost of $103,000,000.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF FUTURE PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for a project authorized by subsection (b) or (c), any project included in the Plan shall require a specific authorization by Congress.

(2) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Before seeking congressional authorization for a project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to Congress—

(A) a description of the project; and

(B) a project implementation report for the project prepared in accordance with subsections (f) and (h).

(e) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out a project authorized by subsection (b), (c), or (d) shall be 50 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—The non-Federal sponsor with respect to a project described in subsection (b), (c), or (d), shall be—

(A) responsible for all land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations necessary to implement the Plan; and

(B) afforded credit toward the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out the project in accordance with paragraph (5)(A).

(3) FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal sponsor with respect to a project authorized by subsection (b), (c), or (d) may use Federal funds for the purchase of any land, easement, rights-of-way, or relocation that is necessary to carry out the project if any funds so used are credited toward the Federal share of the cost of the project.

(B) AGRICULTURE FUNDS.—Funds provided to the non-Federal sponsor under the Conservation Restoration and Enhancement Program (CREP) and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) for projects in the Plan shall be credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the Plan if the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that the funds provided may be used for that purpose. Funds to be credited do not include funds provided under section 390 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 1022).

(4) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Notwithstanding section 528(e)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3770), the non-Federal sponsor shall be responsible for 50 percent of the cost of operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation activities authorized under this section. Furthermore, the Seminole Tribe of Florida shall be responsible for 50 percent of the cost of operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation activities for the Big Cypress Seminole Reservation Water Conservation Plan Project.

(5) CREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 528(e)(4) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 3770) and regardless of the date of acquisition, the value of lands or interests in lands and incidental costs for land acquired by a non-Federal sponsor in accordance with a project implementation report for any project included in the Plan and authorized by Congress shall be—

(i) included in the total cost of the project; and

(ii) credited toward the non-Federal share of the cost of the project.

(B) WORK.—The Secretary may provide credit, including in-kind credit, toward the non-Federal share for the reasonable cost of any work performed in connection with a study, preconstruction engineering and design, or construction that is necessary for the implementation of the Plan if—

(i)(I) the credit is provided for work completed during the period of design, as defined in a design agreement between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor; or

(II) the credit is provided for work completed during the period of construction, as defined in a project cooperation agreement for an authorized project between the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor;

(ii) the design agreement or the project cooperation agreement prescribes the terms and conditions of the credit; and

(iii) the Secretary determines that the work performed by the non-Federal sponsor is integral to the project.

(C) TREATMENT OF CREDIT BETWEEN PROJECTS.—Any credit provided under this paragraph may be carried over between authorized projects in accordance with subparagraph (D).

(D) PERIODIC MONITORING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To ensure that the contributions of the non-Federal sponsor equal 50 percent proportionate share for projects in the Plan, during each 5-year period, beginning with commencement of design of the Plan, the Secretary shall, for each project—

(I) monitor the non-Federal provision of cash, in-kind services, and land; and

(II) manage, to the maximum extent practicable, the requirement of the non-Federal sponsor to provide cash, in-kind services, and land.

(ii) OTHER MONITORING.—The Secretary shall conduct monitoring under clause (i) separately for the preconstruction engineering and design phase and the construction phase.

(E) AUDITS.—Credit for land (including land value and incidental costs) or work provided under this subsection shall be subject to audit by the Secretary.

(f) EVALUATION OF PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before implementation of a project authorized by subsection (c) or (d) or any of clauses (i) through (x) of subsection (b)(2)(C), the Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal sponsor, shall complete, after notice and opportunity for public comment and in accordance with subsection (h), a project implementation report for the project.

(2) PROJECT JUSTIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962–2) or any other provision of law, in carrying out any activity authorized under this section or any other provision of law to restore, preserve, or protect the South Florida ecosystem, the Secretary may determine that—

(i) the activity is justified by the environmental benefits derived by the South Florida ecosystem; and

(ii) no further economic justification for the activity is required, if the Secretary determines that the activity is cost-effective.

(B) APPLICABILITY.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any separable element intended to produce benefits that are predominantly unrelated to the restoration, preservation, and protection of the natural system.

(g) EXCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS.—The following Plan components are not approved for implementation:

(1) WATER INCLUDED IN THE PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any project that is designed to implement the capture and use of the approximately 245,000 acre-feet of water described in section 7.7.2 of the Plan shall not be implemented until such time as—

(i) the project-specific feasibility study described in subparagraph (B) on the need for and physical delivery of the approximately 245,000 acre-feet of water, conducted by the Secretary, in cooperation with the non-Federal sponsor, is completed;

(ii) the project is favorably recommended in a final report of the Chief of Engineers; and

(iii) the project is authorized by Act of Congress.

(B) PROJECT-SPECIFIC FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The project-specific feasibility study referred to in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a comprehensive analysis of the structural facilities proposed to deliver the approximately 245,000 acre-feet of water to the natural system;

(ii) an assessment of the requirements to divert and treat the water;

(iii) an assessment of delivery alternatives;

(iv) an assessment of the feasibility of delivering the water downstream while maintaining current levels of flood protection to affected property; and

(v) any other assessments that are determined by the Secretary to be necessary to complete the study.

(2) WASTEWATER REUSE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—On completion and evaluation of the wastewater reuse pilot project described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(iv), the Secretary, in an appropriately timed 5-year report, shall describe the results of the evaluation of advanced wastewater reuse in meeting, in a cost-effective manner, the requirements of restoration of the natural system.

(B) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress the report described in subparagraph (A) before congressional authorization for advanced wastewater reuse is sought.

(3) PROJECTS APPROVED WITH LIMITATIONS.—The following projects in the Plan are approved for implementation with limitations:

(A) LOXAHATCHEE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE.—The Federal share for land acquisition in the project to enhance existing wetland systems along the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge, including the Stazzulla tract, should be funded through the budget of the Department of the Interior.

(B) SOUTHERN CORKSCREW REGIONAL ECOSYSTEM.—The Southern Corkscrew regional ecosystem watershed addition should be accomplished outside the scope of the Plan.

(h) ASSURANCE OF PROJECT BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The overarching objective of the Plan is the restoration, preservation, and protection of the South Florida Ecosystem while providing for other water-related needs of the region, including water supply and flood protection. The Plan shall be implemented to ensure the protection of water quality in, the reduction of the loss of fresh water from, the improvement of the environment of the South Florida Ecosystem and to achieve and maintain the benefits to the natural system and human environment described in the Plan, and required pursuant to this section, for as long as the project is authorized.

(2) AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to ensure that water generated by the Plan will be made available for the restoration of the natural system, no appropriations, except for any pilot project described in subsection (b)(2)(B), shall be made for the construction of a project contained in the Plan until the President and the Governor enter into a binding agreement under which the State shall ensure, by regulation or other appropriate means, that water made available by each project in the Plan shall not be permitted for a consumptive use or otherwise made unavailable by the State until such time as sufficient reservations of water for the restoration of the natural system are made under State law in accordance with the project implementation report for that project and consistent with the Plan.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Any person or entity that is aggrieved by a failure of the United States or any other Federal Government instrumentality or agency, or the Governor or any other officer of a State instrumentality or agency, to comply with any provision of the agreement entered into under subparagraph (A) may bring a civil action in United States district court for an injunction directing the United States or any other Federal Government instrumentality or agency or the Governor or any other officer of a State instrumentality or agency, as the case may be, to comply with the agreement.

(ii) LIMITATIONS ON COMMENCEMENT OF CIVIL ACTION.—No civil action may be commenced under clause (i)—

(I) before the date that is 60 days after the Secretary and the Governor receive written notice of a failure to comply with the agreement; or

(II) if the United States has commenced and is diligently prosecuting an action in a court of the United States or a State to redress a failure to comply with the agreement.

(C) TRUST RESPONSIBILITIES.—In carrying out his responsibilities under this subsection with respect to the restoration of the South Florida ecosystem, the Secretary of the Interior shall fulfill his obligations to the Indian tribes in South Florida under the Indian trust doctrine as well as other applicable legal obligations.

(3) PROGRAMMATIC REGULATIONS.—

(A) ISSUANCE.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for public comment, with the concurrence of the Governor and the Secretary of the Interior, and in consultation with the Seminole Tribe of Florida, the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Commerce, and other Federal, State, and local agencies, promulgate programmatic regulations to ensure that the goals and purposes of the Plan are achieved.

(B) CONCURRENCY STATEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Governor shall, not later than 180 days from the end of the public comment period on proposed programmatic regulations, provide the Secretary with a written statement of concurrence or nonconcurrence. A failure to provide a written statement of concurrence or nonconcurrence within such time frame will be deemed as meeting the concurrency requirements of subparagraph (A)(i). A copy of any concurrency or nonconcurrency statements shall be made a part of the administrative record and referenced in the final programmatic regulations. Any nonconcurrency statement shall specifically detail the reason or reasons for the nonconcurrence.

(C) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Programmatic regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall establish a process—

(I) for the development of project implementation reports, project cooperation agreements, and operating manuals that ensure that the goals and objectives of the Plan are achieved;

(II) to ensure that new information resulting from changed or unforeseen circumstances, new scientific or technical information or information that is developed through the principles of adaptive management contained in the Plan, or future authorized changes to the Plan are integrated into the implementation of the Plan; and

(III) to ensure the protection of the natural system consistent with the goals and purposes of the Plan, including the establishment of interim goals to provide a means by which the restoration success of the Plan may be evaluated throughout the implementation process.

(ii) LIMITATION ON APPLICABILITY OF PROGRAMMATIC REGULATIONS.—Programmatic regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall expressly prohibit the requirement for concurrence by the Secretary of the Interior or the Governor on project implementation reports, project cooperation agreements, operating manuals for individual projects undertaken in the Plan, and any other documents relating to the development, implementation, and management of individual features of the Plan, unless such concurrence is provided for in other Federal or State laws.

(D) SCHEDULE AND TRANSITION RULE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—All project implementation reports approved before the date of promulgation of the programmatic regulations shall be consistent with the Plan.

(ii) PREAMBLE.—The preamble of the programmatic regulations shall include a statement concerning the consistency with the programmatic regulations of any project implementation reports that were approved before the date of promulgation of the regulations.

(E) REVIEW OF PROGRAMMATIC REGULATIONS.—Whenever necessary to attain Plan goals and purposes, but not less often than every 5 years, the Secretary, in accordance with subparagraph (A), shall review the programmatic regulations promulgated under this paragraph.

(4) PROJECT-SPECIFIC ASSURANCES.—

(A) PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor shall develop project implementation reports in accordance with section 10.3.1 of the Plan.

(ii) COORDINATION.—In developing a project implementation report, the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor shall coordinate with appropriate Federal, State, tribal, and local governments.

(iii) REQUIREMENTS.—A project implementation report shall—

(I) be consistent with the Plan and the programmatic regulations promulgated under paragraph (3);

(II) describe how each of the requirements stated in paragraph (3)(B) is satisfied;

(III) comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(IV) identify the appropriate quantity, timing, and distribution of water dedicated and managed for the natural system;

(V) identify the amount of water to be reserved or allocated for the natural system necessary to implement, under State law, subclauses (IV) and (VI);

(VI) comply with applicable water quality standards and applicable water quality permitting requirements under subsection (b)(2)(A)(ii);

(VII) be based on the best available science; and

(VIII) include an analysis concerning the cost-effectiveness and engineering feasibility of the project.

(B) PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor shall execute project cooperation agreements in accordance with section 10 of the Plan.

(ii) CONDITION.—The Secretary shall not execute a project cooperation agreement until any reservation or allocation of water for the natural system identified in the project implementation report is executed under State law.

(C) OPERATING MANUALS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor shall develop and issue, for each project or group of projects, an operating manual that is consistent with the water reservation or allocation for the natural system described in the project implementation report and the project cooperation agreement for the project or group of projects.

(ii) MODIFICATIONS.—Any significant modification by the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor to an operating manual after the operating manual is issued shall only be carried out subject to notice and opportunity for public comment.

(5) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—

(A) NO ELIMINATION OR TRANSFER.—Until a new source of water supply of comparable quantity and quality as that available on the date of enactment of this Act is available to replace the water to be lost as a result of implementation of the Plan, the Secretary and the non-Federal sponsor shall not eliminate or transfer existing legal sources of water, including those for—

(i) an agricultural or urban water supply;

(ii) allocation or entitlement to the Seminole Indian Tribe of Florida under section 7 of the Seminole Indian Land Claims Settlement Act of 1987 (25 U.S.C. 1772e);

(iii) the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida;

(iv) water supply for Everglades National Park; or

(v) water supply for fish and wildlife.

(B) MAINTENANCE OF FLOOD PROTECTION.—Implementation of the Plan shall not reduce levels of service for flood protection that are—

(i) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) in accordance with applicable law.

(C) NO EFFECT ON TRIBAL COMPACT.—Nothing in this section amends, alters, prevents, or otherwise abrogates rights of the Seminole Indian Tribe of Florida under the compact among the Seminole Tribe of Florida, the State, and the South Florida Water Management District, defining the scope and use of water rights of the Seminole Tribe of Florida, as codified by section 7 of the Seminole Indian Land Claims Settlement Act of 1987 (25 U.S.C. 1772e).

(i) DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Governor shall within 180 days from the date of enactment of this Act develop an agreement for resolving disputes between the Corps of Engineers and the State associated with the implementation of the Plan. Such agreement shall establish a mechanism for the timely and efficient resolution of disputes, including—

(A) a preference for the resolution of disputes between the Jacksonville District of the Corps of Engineers and the South Florida Water Management District;

(B) a mechanism for the Jacksonville District of the Corps of Engineers or the South Florida Water Management District to initiate the dispute resolution process for unresolved issues;

(C) the establishment of appropriate timeframes and intermediate steps for the elevation of disputes to the Governor and the Secretary; and

(D) a mechanism for the final resolution of disputes, within 180 days from the date that the dispute resolution process is initiated under subparagraph (B).

(2) CONDITION FOR REPORT APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall not approve a project implementation report under this section until the agreement established under this subsection has been executed.

(3) NO EFFECT ON LAW.—Nothing in the agreement established under this subsection shall alter or amend any existing Federal or State law, or the responsibility of any party to the agreement to comply with any Federal or State law.

(j) INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor, in consultation with the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force, shall establish an independent scientific review panel convened by a body, such as the National Academy of Sciences, to review the Plan's progress toward achieving the natural system restoration goals of the Plan.

(2) REPORT.—The panel described in paragraph (1) shall produce a biennial report to Congress, the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Governor that includes an assessment of ecological indicators and other measures of progress in restoring the ecology of the natural system, based on the Plan.

(k) OUTREACH AND ASSISTANCE.—

(1) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND OPERATED BY SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS.—In executing the Plan, the Secretary shall ensure that small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals are provided opportunities to participate under section 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)).

(2) COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that impacts on socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, including individuals with limited English proficiency, and communities are considered during implementation of the Plan, and that such individuals have opportunities to review and comment on its implementation.

(B) PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES.—The Secretary shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that public outreach and educational opportunities are provided, during implementation of the Plan, to the individuals of South Florida, including individuals with limited English proficiency, and in particular for socially and economically disadvantaged communities.

(l) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Beginning on October 1, 2005, and periodically thereafter until October 1, 2036, the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Commerce, and the State of Florida, shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Plan. Such reports shall be completed not less often than every 5 years. Such reports shall include a description of planning, design, and construction work completed, the amount of funds expended during the period covered by the report (including a detailed analysis of the funds expended for adaptive assessment under subsection (b)(2)(C)(xi)), and the work anticipated over the next 5-year period. In addition, each report shall include—

(1) the determination of each Secretary, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, concerning the benefits to the natural system and the human environment achieved as of the date of the report and whether the completed projects of the Plan are being operated in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of subsection (h);

(2) progress toward interim goals established in accordance with subsection (h)(3)(B); and

(3) a review of the activities performed by the Secretary under subsection (k) as they relate to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals and individuals with limited English proficiency.

(m) REPORT ON AQUIFER STORAGE AND RECOVERY PROJECT.—Not later than 180 after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing a determination as to whether the ongoing Biscayne Aquifer Storage and Recovery Program located in Miami-Dade County has a substantial benefit to the restoration, preservation, and protection of the South Florida ecosystem.

(n) FULL DISCLOSURE OF PROPOSED FUNDING.—

(1) FUNDING FROM ALL SOURCES.—The President, as part of the annual budget of the United States Government, shall display under the heading ''Everglades Restoration'' all proposed funding for the Plan for all agency programs.

(2) FUNDING FROM CORPS OF ENGINEERS CIVIL WORKS PROGRAM.—The President, as part of the annual budget of the United States Government, shall display under the accounts ''Construction, General'' and ''Operation and Maintenance, General'' of the title ''Department of Defense—Civil, Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil'', the total proposed funding level for each account for the Plan and the percentage such level represents of the overall levels in such accounts. The President shall also include an assessment of the impact such funding levels for the Plan would have on the budget year and long-term funding levels for the overall Corps of Engineers civil works program.

(o) SURPLUS FEDERAL LANDS.—Section 390(f)(2)(A)(i) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (110 Stat. 1023) is amended by inserting after ''on or after the date of enactment of this Act'' the following: ''and before the date of enactment of the Water Resource Development Act of 2000''.

(p) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision or remedy provided by this section is found to be unconstitutional or unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction, any remaining provisions in this section shall remain valid and enforceable.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING HOMESTEAD AIR FORCE BASE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Everglades is an American treasure and includes uniquely-important and diverse wildlife resources and recreational opportunities;

(2) the preservation of the pristine and natural character of the South Florida ecosystem is critical to the regional economy;

(3) as this legislation demonstrates, Congress believes it to be a vital national mission to restore and preserve this ecosystem and accordingly is authorizing a significant Federal investment to do so;

(4) Congress seeks to have the remaining property at the former Homestead Air Base conveyed and reused as expeditiously as possible, and several options for base reuse are being considered, including as a commercial airport; and

(5) Congress is aware that the Homestead site is located in a sensitive environmental location, and that Biscayne National Park is only approximately 1.5 miles to the east, Everglades National Park approximately 8 miles to the west, and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary approximately 10 miles to the south.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) development at the Homestead site could potentially cause significant air, water, and noise pollution and result in the degradation of adjacent national parks and other protected Federal resources;

(2) in their decisionmaking, the Federal agencies charged with determining the reuse of the remaining property at the Homestead base should carefully consider and weigh all available information concerning potential environmental impacts of various reuse options;

(3) the redevelopment of the former base should be consistent with restoration goals, provide desirable numbers of jobs and economic redevelopment for the community, and be consistent with other applicable laws;

(4) consistent with applicable laws, the Secretary of the Air Force should proceed as quickly as practicable to issue a final SEIS and Record of Decision so that reuse of the former air base can proceed expeditiously;

(5) following conveyance of the remaining surplus property, the Secretary, as part of his oversight for Everglades restoration, should cooperate with the entities to which the various parcels of surplus property were conveyed so that the planned use of those properties is implemented in such a manner as to remain consistent with the goals of the Everglades restoration plan; and

(6) by August 1, 2002, the Secretary should submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress on actions taken and make any recommendations for consideration by Congress.

TITLE VII—MISSOURI RIVER RESTORATION

SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) PICK-SLOAN PROGRAM.—The term ''Pick-Sloan program'' means the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 891).

(2) PLAN.—The term ''plan'' means the plan for the use of funds made available by this title that is required to be prepared under section 705(e).

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of South Dakota.

(4) TASK FORCE.—The term ''Task Force'' means the Missouri River Task Force established by section 705(a).

(6) TRUST.—The term ''Trust'' means the Missouri River Trust established by section 704(a).

SEC. 702. MISSOURI RIVER TRUST.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a committee to be known as the Missouri River Trust.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Trust shall be composed of 25 members to be appointed by the Secretary, including—

(1) 15 members recommended by the Governor of South Dakota that—

(A) represent equally the various interests of the public; and

(B) include representatives of—

(i) the South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources;

(ii) the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks;

(iii) environmental groups;

(iv) the hydroelectric power industry;

(v) local governments;

(vi) recreation user groups;

(vii) agricultural groups; and

(viii) other appropriate interests;

(2) 9 members, 1 of each of whom shall be recommended by each of the 9 Indian tribes in the State of South Dakota; and

(3) 1 member recommended by the organization known as the ''Three Affiliated Tribes of North Dakota'' (composed of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara tribes).

SEC. 703. MISSOURI RIVER TASK FORCE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Missouri River Task Force.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Task Force shall be composed of—

(1) the Secretary (or a designee), who shall serve as Chairperson;

(2) the Secretary of Agriculture (or a designee);

(3) the Secretary of Energy (or a designee);

(4) the Secretary of the Interior (or a designee); and

(5) the Trust.

(c) DUTIES.—The Task Force shall—

(1) meet at least twice each year;

(2) vote on approval of the plan, with approval requiring votes in favor of the plan by a majority of the members;

(3) review projects to meet the goals of the plan; and

(4) recommend to the Secretary critical projects for implementation.

(d) ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which funding authorized under this title becomes available, the Secretary shall submit to the other members of the Task Force a report on—

(A) the impact of the siltation of the Missouri River in the State, including the impact on the Federal, State, and regional economies, recreation, hydropower generation, fish and wildlife, and flood control;

(B) the status of Indian and non-Indian historical and cultural sites along the Missouri River;

(C) the extent of erosion along the Missouri River (including tributaries of the Missouri River) in the State; and

(D) other issues, as requested by the Task Force.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the State, and Indian tribes in the State.

(e) PLAN FOR USE OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE BY THIS TITLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which funding authorized under this title becomes available, the Task Force shall prepare a plan for the use of funds made available under this title.

(2) CONTENTS OF PLAN.—The plan shall provide for the manner in which the Task Force shall develop and recommend critical restoration projects to promote—

(A) conservation practices in the Missouri River watershed;

(B) the general control and removal of sediment from the Missouri River;

(C) the protection of recreation on the Missouri River from sedimentation;

(D) the protection of Indian and non-Indian historical and cultural sites along the Missouri River from erosion;

(E) erosion control along the Missouri River; or

(F) any combination of the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (E).

(3) PLAN REVIEW AND REVISION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall make a copy of the plan available for public review and comment before the plan becomes final, in accordance with procedures established by the Task Force.

(B) REVISION OF PLAN.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force may, on an annual basis, revise the plan.

(ii) PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT.—In revising the plan, the Task Force shall provide the public the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed revision to the plan.

(f) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the plan is approved by the Task Force under subsection (c)(2), the Secretary, in coordination with the Task Force, shall identify critical restoration projects to carry out the plan.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out a critical restoration project after entering into an agreement with an appropriate non-Federal interest in accordance with section 221 of the Flood Control Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1962d–5b).

(3) INDIAN PROJECTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that not less than 30 percent of the funds made available for critical restoration projects under this title shall be used exclusively for projects that are—

(A) within the boundary of an Indian reservation; or

(B) administered by an Indian tribe.

(g) COST SHARING.—

(1) ASSESSMENT.—

(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out the assessment under subsection (d) shall be 50 percent.

(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out the assessment under subsection (d) may be provided in the form of services, materials, or other in-kind contributions.

(2) PLAN.—

(A) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of preparing the plan under subsection (e) shall be 50 percent.

(B) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Not more than 50 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of preparing the plan under subsection (e) may be provided in the form of services, materials, or other in-kind contributions.

(3) CRITICAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A non-Federal cost share shall be required to carry out any critical restoration project under subsection (f) that does not primarily benefit the Federal Government, as determined by the Task Force.

(B) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of carrying out a critical restoration project under subsection (f) for which the Task Force requires a non-Federal cost share under subparagraph (A) shall be 65 percent, not to exceed $5,000,000 for any critical restoration project.

(C) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 50 percent of the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out a critical restoration project described in subparagraph (B) may be provided in the form of services, materials, or other in-kind contributions.

(ii) REQUIRED NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—For any critical restoration project described in subparagraph (B), the non-Federal interest shall—

(I) provide all land, easements, rights-of-way, dredged material disposal areas, and relocations;

(II) pay all operation, maintenance, replacement, repair, and rehabilitation costs; and

(III) hold the United States harmless from all claims arising from the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project.

(iii) CREDIT.—The non-Federal interest shall receive credit for all contributions provided under clause (ii)(I).

SEC. 704. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title diminishes or affects—

(1) any water right of an Indian tribe;

(2) any other right of an Indian tribe, except as specifically provided in another provision of this title;

(3) any treaty right that is in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) any external boundary of an Indian reservation of an Indian tribe;

(5) any authority of the State that relates to the protection, regulation, or management of fish, terrestrial wildlife, and cultural and archaeological resources, except as specifically provided in this title; or

(6) any authority of the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, or the head of any other Federal agency under a law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(B) the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.);

(C) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(D) the Act entitled ''An Act for the protection of the bald eagle'', approved June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(E) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(F) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(G) the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

(H) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.);

(I) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.); and

(J) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(b) FEDERAL LIABILITY FOR DAMAGE.—Nothing in this title relieves the Federal Government of liability for damage to private property caused by the operation of the Pick-Sloan program.

(c) FLOOD CONTROL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary shall retain the authority to operate the Pick-Sloan program for the purposes of meeting the requirements of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 33 U.S.C. 701–1 et seq.).

SEC. 705. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005, $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and $10,000,000 in fiscal year 2010. Such funds shall remain available until expended.